Northumbria Research Link

ADAPTATION TO SURVIVE: BRITISH HORROR CINEMA OF THE 1960S AND 1970S

SOPHIE FREEMAN

PhD

March 2018

ADAPTATION TO SURVIVE:
BRITISH HORROR CINEMA OF THE 1960S AND 1970S

SOPHIE FREEMAN

A thesis submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements of the University of Northumbria at Newcastle for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Research undertaken in the Faculty of Arts, Design & Social Sciences

March 2018

Abstract

The thesis focuses on British horror cinema of the 1960s and 1970s. This was a lively period in British horror history which produced over two hundred films, but it has often been taken for granted in critical work on both British horror and British national cinema, with most of the films concerned left underexplored or ignored entirely. In part, this reflects a widespread critical belief that British horror was safer, less socially questioning and generally less interesting than American horror from the same period. The thesis addresses the question of how British horror developed throughout the 1960s and 1970s. It identifies key cycles and clusters of production and significant innovations within British horror as the genre sought to engage with and remain relevant in relation to changing social attitudes. In particular, it focuses on representations of gender, the family and inter-generational conflict, as well as exploring the post-colonial context of British horror in this period. It also considers the relation between British horror's development and broader changes in international, and especially American, horror history. British horror emerges as an area of culture that connects with, and in some cases anticipates, key developments in international horror. In this manner, the importance of British horror of the 1960s and 1970s is established. This is achieved through detailed analysis of a wide range of films, coupled with a contextualisation of those films in terms of the industrial, socio-historical and generic circumstances of their production.

Contents

<u>Acknowledgments</u>

Declaration

I declare that the work contained in this thesis has not been submitted for any other award and that it is all my own work. I also confirm that this work fully acknowledges opinions, ideas, and contributions from the work of others.

All appropriate ethical clearance has been sought.

I declare that the Word Count of this Thesis is 80,497 words.

Name: Sophie Freeman

Signature:

Date: 22/03/2018

INTRODUCTION

The national cinema of a country is often viewed as a window on the society which produced it.[1] This extends to specific genres, including horror. For Britain, Hammer films are synonymous with British horror output, having been a dominant force in the industry since the 1950s until their demise in the mid 1970s. The British horror cinema of the 1960s and 1970s was an active and lively area of production in the history of the genre, however it is overshadowed by the much-vaunted 1950s period of production. This thesis intends to change the perceptions of British horror cinema of the 1960s and 1970s and establish it as a period of dynamic film production in its own right, with its own traits and shifting preoccupations, and to disentangle the history of British horror from the perceived dominance of Hammer. By using an inclusive approach to the films, it will be possible to generate a new history of the British horror genre, rather than a narrow definition based on one production company. Hammer will still be included in this study, as to remove it from this thesis would add to the existing issue of there being a false sense of the period. Currently Hammer is examined by the majority of existing studies,[2] but there is so much more to the production company which can be uncovered by exploring the films in tandem with non-Hammer product.

British horror cinema is commonly seen as truly beginning in the 1950s[3] with the emergence of Hammer and its gothic horrors as a force to be reckoned with, including *The Curse of Frankenstein* (Terence Fisher, 1957), *Dracula* (Terence Fisher, 1958), *The Revenge of Frankenstein* (Terence Fisher, 1958), *The Hound of the Baskervilles* (Terence Fisher, 1959), and *The Mummy* (Terence Fisher, 1959). This is noted by Peter Hutchings,[4] Gary A. Smith,[5] and David Pirie[6] in relation to this flurry of activity from Hammer when the horror genre had been relatively inactive through the earlier part of the 1950s. Hutchings asserts that the output of Hammer was most cohesive in "the years of Hammer's unquestioned dominance of British horror between 1956 and 1964,"[7]

furthering the perception that British horror and Hammer have become inextricably connected within academia from the 1950s onwards. These horror films of the late 1950s present active professional male authority figures who confront the threat with what Peter Hutchings calls "a robust physicality, an insistence on the solid and corporeal nature of the conflict between the forces of good and evil."[8] The authority of the male is emphasised by his dominance of the environment, the threat is destroyed, and order is restored.

Hammer not only made use of similar themes and figures, but also staff and filming locations. This resulted in films which were visually connected in terms of actors, directors, camera styles, *mise-en-scène*, and editing. The most common combinations of personnel were the actors Christopher Lee and Peter Cushing with director Terence Fisher, which visually reinforced the sense of Hammer's dominance. However, British horror of the 1960s and 1970s produced over 200 films from multiple companies. These films included a wide range of style, narrative, production company, and personnel, and included such key texts as Independent Artists' *Night of the Eagle* (Sidney Hayers, 1962), Glendale's *The Asphyx* (Peter Newbrook, 1972), Tigon's *The Blood Beast Terror* (Vernon Sewell, 1968), and *Terror* (Norman J. Warren, 1978). British horror cinema did not stick to the Hammer 'formula,' nor did it end with Hammer's last horror film *To the Devil a Daughter* (Peter Sykes) in 1976.

Problematically there remains an issue with the manner in which the British horror cinema of the 1960s and 1970s has been addressed. It is still excluded from being examined as significant within texts on British national cinema and is misunderstood due to the dominance of Hammer and its presence in the 1950s. The source of this master narrative is David Pirie, who in 1973 started the discussion of British horror cinema with *A Heritage of Horror: The English Gothic Cinema*,[9] but with a focus on

the gothic for which Hammer's film productions were known, which set the trend for academic writing on British horror of the period for years to come.

There is extensive existing work on the timeframe in question, but no in-depth piece which examines the horror output in the 1960s and 1970s as a period in its own right. Works on the history of British national cinema frequently address Hammer but little else,[10] and works on horror cinema as a genre present the same issue.[11] The majority of academic focus on the British films produced in the 1960s and 1970s focuses on specific films within articles which do not have the space to be able to perform an in-depth study.[12] This has resulted in a restricted number of films being studied and a narrowing of the field.

With a lack of thorough attention paid to the British horror produced in the 1960s and 1970s, there is a loss of understanding of the genre and therefore a part of British cultural history is misunderstood. Currently the genre is being addressed by isolating specific films, production companies, or directors, which has resulted in a somewhat "splatter-gun" approach and therefore has created a very narrow and impressionistic account of the period, rather than an inclusive and unifying approach which is needed to account for the two decades as a whole. The narrative needs to be re-written. It is clear from reviewing the available literature on British horror cinema of the 1960s and 1970s that Pirie and the synoptic works that followed had an extensive effect on the perception of British horror in the 1960s and 1970s throughout the literature that followed. This has led to an approach to British horror which continually traces the decline of the horror genre in Britain, linking it to the rise and fall of Hammer. This thesis will fill the gaps and correct the misconceptions regarding British horror cinema of the 1960s and 1970s by demonstrating that British horror survived via adaptation and a rapid onset of independent productions taking over when the bigger studios began to deteriorate. It will also be looking at the less well-explored Hammer productions to show that even

Hammer has been characterised in an unhelpful manner which further distorted the existing view on British horror of the period.

What can be found in the output of films during this time is many clusters or cycles of films. By examining the films in terms of clusters rather than taking a linear approach to the films of the 1960s and 1970s which traces the decline of the genre, it will be possible to present a new approach that is synchronic. The concept of cycles has been noted by Mark Betz[13] and Amanda Klein[14] previously, but not in relation to British horror cinema of this time period. Specifically, Betz refers to *filone* in the context of tracing the development of European art cinema, arguing that "[T]his idea of the *filone* – as seam, lode, vein, streak, current, thread –is thus one that I consider to be of potentially great value as a methodology for understanding, in stylistic as well as historical terms, the development of art cinema in Europe in the postwar era,"[15] and the *filone* can similarly be applied to British horror, especially with the Italian term referring to mainly popular forms of genre cinema. This is due to the nature of the output of British horror as much more multi-faceted than the linear approaches that have previously been traced.

The cycles do not present a fixed approach, but are in a state of constant change, mirroring the structure of cycles identified in American film by Klein. Klein identifies cycles as "fascinating precisely because they resist neat categorizations and have the potential to disrupt or complicate the discrete categories frequently generated by genre studies"[16] and this may be due to the manner in which "[b]ecause they are so dependent on audience desires, film cycles are also subject to defined time constraints; most cycles are financially viable for only five to ten years. After that point, a cycle must be updated or altered in order to continue to turn a profit."[17] Key to establishing a cycle is the need for the original to be a commercial or critical success, as this convinces other filmmakers to seek to reproduce the successful elements and generate the cycle,[18] with

changes being made as and when needed to keep the cycle commercially viable. This results in the nature of British horror as made up of cycles, and not as a straight forward genre.

Once the many strands and subgenres which form its structure are uncovered, it becomes clear that the 1960s and 1970s horror genre was a dynamic and complex period of production in Britain. This thesis will demonstrate this by taking a comprehensive approach to the films rather than using the currently-dominant strategy of grouping the films by director or production company, and will examine the films in terms of chronological shifts. This will allow the films to stand as individual texts and produce a comprehensive analysis of the films in context of the socio-cultural era that produced them. With this inclusive approach to the films, a new comprehensive narrative of British horror cinema will be developed, with Hammer still taken into account in order to reassess existing attitudes to the studio within the context of the two decades.

Research Questions and Methodology

Currently the gaps in knowledge have presented an opportunity for this thesis to conduct greater research into key areas that raise important issues about British horror cinema in the 1960s and 1970s. These issues have become research questions will be answered formally with in-depth research and new approaches. Specifically, these questions are how did British horror cinema of the 1960s and 1970s adapt in a shifting cultural and economic climate, how did it differ from the initial horrors of the late 1950s, how were the cycles of subgeneric films linked to the culture that produced them, and what light can be shed on the period of horror by marginalised films that have as yet not been examined in depth?

This thesis will establish how British horror functioned differently to the manner stated by the master narrative, that it adapted to survive by evolving and shifting with current trends during the time of its production. By using an inclusive approach, it will be possible to examine far more films than have been examined previously, allowing trends and themes to be uncovered and addressed which previously have not been. In so doing, the 1960s and 1970s films will be shown to be demonstrably different to their 1950s counterparts, allowing them to be viewed as a period of horror cinema in its own right. What it will not be able to do is cover every film made in the two decades due to the sheer number of films and the restriction of space available.

This approach involves an inclusive viewing of all available material to identify thematic clusters and cycles of films as a way of capturing particular features of British horror in the periods under discussion. There are numerous other clusters of films that could have been used, but I have selected the ones for the thesis on the basis of their variety, importance and weight. As no definitive list of British horror films exists due to the manner in which horror films take on generic conventions from other genres, and the manner in which the films were both marketed and received. Some critics may disagree with the titles used within this thesis, but due to its inclusive approach the films have been selected based on whether they fit the category of British horror from the 1960s and 1970s. This will allow full inclusivity that has not previously been used in examinations of British horror cinema of the 1960s and 1970s.

The body of films within this thesis was generated by using existing literature, the British Board of Film Classification, and production company lists of releases in order to establish a cohesive list of film titles that form the British horror cinema of the 1960s and 1970s. A film will be classified as British through an extensive use of British personnel both in front of and behind the camera, British production studios, British settings, and a mixture of the three. A film will be considered to be of the horror genre

based on its use of the generic conventions associated with the horror genre itself. If a film fits both the horror genre and the British film requirements then it will be considered to be a British horror film for the purposes of this thesis. From this list, it is possible to identify the groups necessary for this work.

Importantly for this thesis, is that films produced by the Hammer studios will be included. This is due to using an inclusive approach which would be undermined by excluding the studio, and it will also allow a reassessment of Hammer films during the 1960s and 1970s. Not including Hammer would also create a false sense of the period and contribute further to the existing issue of British horror being misrepresented through selectivity. Some of the films produced by Hammer will be used as key films for examination within this thesis in order to draw out comparisons and commonalities within the body of films, and to show that Hammer was not as static as has been previously alleged and the myth perpetuated through the work of Pirie and others.[19] It would be doing a disservice to the British horror cinema of the 1960s and 1970s to sideline a key film demonstrating important elements to be examined, just because it came from Hammer.

In addition to textual analysis, theoretical perspectives to be used in this work include psychoanalysis and feminism. These are particularly important to the examination of gender and its representation in the films.

Psychoanalysis is key to the examination of the films, their characters, and their responses. For example, psychoanalysis allows a deeper dissection of the films, to unpick the motivations and actions of the characters, as well as their reactions to narrative events. This will reveal meaning within the films, and allow the reflectionist approach to be more nuanced and effective when the films are contextualised in the social-cultural and historical period in which they were produced. Furthermore, some of the films raise the issue of psychoanalysis which became fashionable within the

mainstream at the time, such as *Hands of the Ripper* (Peter Sasdy, 1971) and *Demons of the Mind* (Peter Sykes, 1972) which overtly highlight psychoanalysis and its use by practitioners within the films.

Likewise, feminism is integral to the study of gender within the films and especially to the representation of women in the narratives. With the rise of feminism itself within the 1960s and 1970s – contemporaneous to the production of these films – the manner in which the films react to the societal shifts that resulted from this is of great importance. By adopting a feminist approach to the films, with particular attention to the positioning of the female, her role within the film, her monstrousness and objectified status in many of the films, and how this can be analysed in terms of meaning within the films. It is through this representation of the female within the films that connections can be found within the environment which produced the films. As feminism as a movement was on the rise in the 1960s and 1970s, it is even more important that feminism is used as a theoretical approach to the films and that the reaction of the films to the movement itself is observed and interpreted.

This work is one of interpretation, rather than an in depth examination of the industry using primary research. This is due to the sheer numbers of productions made by so many companies and individuals, which presents an abundance of material over the two decades that demonstrates a shift in representation but also produces links, connections, and shifts in the representation of different societal groups and themes. Once these films are assembled as a whole, these emerging themes and connections cannot be ignored and an interpretive approach is the most appropriate to deal with the material, and to build a new narrative of the British horror cinema and illustrate the manner in which it responded to the socio-cultural and historical context that produced it. This work does not seek to examine the industry in depth, or to seek to use primary sources, as these could produce a tainted view due to issues including the films being

marketed in specific ways to exaggerate the content, with companies vying for higher

certifications than would have been awarded so as to sensationalise the product, and for

the potential that those involved sought to play up specific elements in the films in order

to publicise them. As there were so many films made by production companies set up to

produce one film a for profit and then disbanded, the availability of primary research

material to examine and use to support the analysis of the films would pose restrictions,

and cause a significant imbalance in favour of the more prolific production companies

whose materials were preserved and are publicly available in archives. There is also an

element that at the times that the films were produced, it may not have been a conscious

decision by the filmmakers to add specific meaning to the film, and so this would not be

present in the primary source material available but is rather interpreted after the fact

through analysis and a reflectionist approach. By conducting this work of interpretation,

it will be possible to produce a new understanding of British horror by examining the

films as a collective across the two decades in the context of the society that produced

them, and observing the manner in which they responded to cultural shifts and events

through this timeline.

Groupings

In brief, but detailed below, this thesis will employ a methodology which will

address the films of the period in an overarching manner, rather than isolating a small

group which fit a paradigm. This was achieved by viewing all of the approximately two

hundred horror genre productions where possible and identifying shifts, themes and

'threads' within the period. With the horror genre so rich in meaning and interpretation

according to many theoretical approaches,[20] there is much to be uncovered when all the

films have been examined and compared, especially within thematic clusters. This has

happened with some small groupings such as the so-called Sadian trilogy[21] and

9

Hammer's 'women in fear' films[22] which have been referred to in the literature review which follows in the next chapter. Therefore, combining close textual analysis with an inclusive approach to the films of the period will yield greater results in areas previously unexamined by current academia.

Groups can be constructed according to authorship (by director), by company within the industry, and most importantly, thematically. It is possible to group the films according to director or production company, which highlights the numbers of independent production companies and the shift towards companies being set up to produce single films before disbanding rather than the use of multiple-film studios. Thus, even grouping systems which would seem to be of little value reveal much about the British horror cinema's adaptation techniques. Amanda Ann Klein's work on American film cycles argues that

> the formation and longevity of film cycles are a direct result of their immediate financial viability as well as the public discourses circulating around them […] Because they are so dependent on audience desires, film cycles are also subject to defined time constraints: most film cycles are financially viable for only five to ten years,[23]

which is equally applicable to the subgeneric cycles of British horrors as it is to American cinema. These subgeneric cycles can be grouped under thematic clusters, or groupings. By identifying these groups of films, it will be possible to identify the trends in British cinema, and therefore if this is reflected in British cultural trends. Cycles are important for this work as when the films are viewed and laid out chronologically, similar concerns and themes appear in multiple films, which form groups. For example there are the transforming female monsters, vampire films, serial killers with psychological issues, malevolent male authority figures, matriarchs as the threat. The duration of these similarities varies from small cycles such as lesbian vampires, to the entirety of the period such as the witch films. However, when examined closer, these groupings present similar ideas and a progression in the cycle can be found

from the initial film that starts the cycle, through to the final film in it. However, these cycles can be grouped under larger overarching themes which makes them more manageable for the purposes of this work, as to attempt to cover each individual cycle separately would be unwieldy and would not allow the detail required.

Although cycles have been addressed as a pattern in film by Klein, this work seeks to cover a wide range of films over two decades, to demonstrate the shift in attitudes and representation. This will be explored by using themes that contain the cycles, including the representation of men, women, the family, post-colonial attitudes, supernatural threats, and the transition of British horror through the two decades. This will also allow the films to demonstrate connections as a whole body of work, rather than isolating them according to production company or director which would result in creating a false narrative of the history of British horror. Using the themes allows a thorough investigation of the films and the manner in which the films shift in their representation of key elements and concerns through the two decades.

This thesis will focus on thematic groupings of these subgeneric cycles, and highlight important films which may have been previously marginalised. Even within these subgeneric cycles there are even smaller cycles of films which would fit more closely with Klein's cycles, such as the 'supernatural' grouping, which includes the occult, malevolent spirits, witchcraft, vampire, and lesbian vampire cycles. Films are also not restricted to one group, but can be part of many due to the nature of the film and its themes.

Identifying the groupings according to theme and subgeneric cycle will reveal more links between films and the shifts within the British horror cinema industry, pinpointing the changes and when they occurred allowing the films to demonstrate their groupings and how they connect to the society in which they were produced. As it stands, there are thirty-three possible subgeneric groupings that can be addressed within this thesis,

which are listed in the Appendix, the majority of which have never been addressed. As it is not practical to examine each individually within this thesis in the detail required, they have been assembled under the six overarching themes of family, female gender, male gender, supernatural, psychological, and post-colonial, with each forming a chapter in which these themes and groupings will be discussed.

I have selected these groupings as the themes within them are repetitive throughout the period to the extent to that they are reflective of societal concerns. However, they cannot be examined in isolation as this would divorce them from the context of Britain in the 1960s and 1970s, and so a reflectionist approach will be included in this work which takes into account the socio-cultural situation in which the films were produced. The reflectionist approach is key to this work. When examining the output of the British horror cinema for two decades, it would be a disservice to divorce the films themselves from the society which produced them, and to deny that there is a connection. Analysis of the films produces a wealth of interpretation and meaning, demonstrating that the reflectionist approach is one that is appropriate and should not be ignored. This use of a reflectionist approach will support this period being defined as a dynamic time of production in its own right, differentiated from the 1950s horror genre in Britain.

Analysis of the films produces a wealth of interpretation and meaning, demonstrating that the reflectionist approach is one that is appropriate and should not be ignored There are however, critics of such an approach. Sue Harper and Justin Smith argue that the 1970s are resistant to such an approach,[24] namely that the films produced in this time period across all genres "do not seem to deal with social and sexual transformations of the period in any predictable way, which renders the reflectionist model obsolete."[25] Similarly, Rigby argues that labelling *The Plague of the Zombies*

(John Gilling, 1966) and *The Reptile* (John Gilling, 1966) as anti-colonial is "fanciful."[26]

There are critics of the approach, with concerns that meaning is being forced upon the films, and that due to the time that it takes to produce a film it would not be possible for them to reflect current events and attitudes. In other words, that the analyser is bringing their knowledge of historical events and creating a biased reading that seeks to find meaning that simply is not there, such is the criticism of Siegfried Kracauer reading the rise of fascism in German Expressionism noted by Catherine Fowler in her introduction to part three of *The European Cinema Reader*.[27] Sian Barber takes issue with the reflectionist approach in film due to a lack of immediacy: "film is *not* a mirror and cannot 'reflect' society in a straightforward way. Other visual forms such as television have a greater sense of immediacy which allows them to respond much more quickly to specific events."[28] Barber is also critical of Siegfried Kracauer linking the films made in 1920s Germany to the dark *zeitgeist* of Weimar Germany and the rise of fascism, stating that only some films can capture a social mood, and that this can only be identified retrospectively[29] as "paradoxically, some films *can* capture the zeitgeist or tap into a prevailing cultural feeling or social mood."[30] However, the sheer number of films showing similar concerns across the two decades demonstrates that meaning is not being forced upon the films but is already within the texts - this repetition of ideas and attitudes in the films cannot be a coincidence. Similarly, the alleged issue that films take too long to produce to react to current events is countered by the speed with which these films were made and released, with a large proportion being made by production companies set up solely to make the film on a low budget by tapping into trends to make a quick profit as a large proportion were in fact exploitation films.

That reflectionist approaches are most useful in a retrospective manner is not a weakness, as this thesis will be using the approach across a large number of films several decades after their production, and in doing so the shifts and changes in the films have presented a reflection of the social and cultural attitudes in Britain at the time of their production. For example, Pete Walker is highlighted as taking inspiration for his films from contemporary events in Steve Chibnall's book on the director,[31] and the Suez crisis is frequently cited as being an influence on the production of Hammer's *The Mummy*.[32][vii] This thesis will demonstrate the usefulness of a reflectionist approach, and that the films were indeed interpreting the social mood and current events.

This ability to connect to trends and events highlights that exploitation films were an important part of the British horror cinema of the 1960s and 1970s, with many of the independent filmmakers such as Pete Walker and Norman J. Warren considered to be exploitation film makers by academic writers including Paul Wells,[33] Sue Harper and Justin Smith.[34] The nature of the exploitation film is that they are made quickly on low budgets in order to capitalise on a popular trend, topic, or subgenre. In terms of the films being examined, these elements range from sex, violence, and horror, to the vogue for martial arts with the kung fu-vampire film *The Legend of the 7 Golden Vampires* (Roy Ward Baker, 1974) and blaxploitation with *The Beast Must Die* (Paul Annett, 1974). Exploitation films need to react quickly to changing trends in order to promote the exploitation element before it is no longer profitable, which also results in cycles of films that revolve around these elements. As a result, it is possible to see the importance of reacting with speed to social, cultural, and historical events in the exploitation cinema, including in the horror cinema of Britain in the 1960s and 1970s.

In the rapidly-changing industrial and social circumstances of the time period, the film industry had to adapt to survive difficult circumstances, with British horror cinema included. This is evinced by sudden cycles of films and subgenres, such as the

witchcraft and occult films as identified by Leon Hunt[35] which were made at the same time as a rise in subcultures and societal interest in the occult. By drawing upon socio-cultural sources regarding the time period including the popularisation of psychiatry and in particular the work of R. D Laing on the family,[36] Claude Lévi-Strauss,[37] and approaches to gender and the rise of feminism from Joni Lovenduski[38] and Barbara Caine[39] among others, it will be possible to identify underlying currents and subcultures, as well as historical events that could have impacted upon which kinds of horror films were made.

With this information about the different groupings and significant shifts in the horror genre, it will then be possible to identify connections to the changing socio-cultural and economic state of Britain during the time of the productions. A connection to the changing economic climate of the industry is already demonstrated by the decline and eventual failure of the larger studios in the horror genre which could no longer support themselves with British horror films, and the rise of the independents and single-film production companies who saw a gap in the market and used multiple sources to fund low-budget films which were part of the subgeneric cycles. It makes sense that small outfits would invest in a film which would make money, one that would act on current trends and be connected to issues at stake in the society that would receive the film. The independents could afford to lose money on a film even less than the studios, and this also explains the splintering into subgenres and the hybrids, which produced, among many others, the kung fu-vampire Hong Kong co-production of *The Legend of the 7 Golden Vampires*. This led to subgeneric cycles focusing on a profitable element, with the cycles ending when they were no longer financially viable.

Chapters

Thus, the overarching approach to be used is an inclusive thematic-oriented one which will also be the structure of this thesis, with successive chapters focusing on different thematic elements and the groupings which make up each of the themes, namely the secular and supernatural, family, gender, and the post-colonial era. Each of these themes is seen to play an important part in British horror during the period, with shifts in each theme/category over the two decades showing the changing period and its impact on horror further demonstrating that this period in horror was different to the previous output and that it should be examined as a historical period in its own right. Likewise, research into this historical period in British culture yields evidence of a turbulent era of socio-cultural shifts in terms of family and gender relations, the collapse of Empire and a problematic economic and political situation. Just as film experienced a problematic era, so did the culture which produced it, with the rise of feminism, the position of men and the family structure both being queried as a result of the changing role of women, the end of Empire, Britain's place in the world being cast in doubt, political turmoil with governments switching repeatedly, and counter-cultures emerging in youth culture which led to further questioning of the family, as well as interest in the occult rising.

Each category will be examined in-depth with various films which demonstrate the links between horror cinema and the culture producing it. This will require close textual analysis of each relevant film, tracking the ways in which the groups of films change thematically and the manner in which this connects to the socio-cultural environment in which it was produced.

Following immediately in the next chapter will be a review of existing literature relating to British horror of the 1960s and 1970s. This will also establish the current approaches to defining Hammer and the horror cinema of the 1950s, in order to

demonstrate what this thesis is differentiating the horror of the 1960s and 1970s against. This will more clearly establish the gaps in existing knowledge, as well as illustrating how the master narrative of British horror was started and then perpetuated over several decades. Key texts and theorists will be examined, including major works by David Pirie,[40] Peter Hutchings,[41] and Jonathan Rigby,[42] before moving onto genre-based works, film historians, national cinema texts, and articles focusing on individual films or directors. This will be conducted in a chronological manner allowing the trajectory of the master narrative to be explored, including how this has been maintained through the different stages of academic works which address and/or marginalise the British horror cinema of the 1960s and 1970s.

The second chapter will focus on the two thematic cycles of the supernatural and psychological horrors. In particular the occult, evil spirits and witchcraft cycles that emerged during a time when there was a similar surge in countercultures around the occult and witchcraft needs to be examined, with key films including *The City of the Dead* (John Llewellyn Moxey, 1960), Hammer's *The Devil Rides Out* (Terence Fisher, 1968) and *Terror*. The use of Hammer here will show the progression of the theme of the supernatural through the decade, and demonstrate that there is an underlying context that has not previously been explored as canonically Hammer. There has also been a previous lack of analysis of the secular/rational horrors from *Peeping Tom* (Michael Powell, 1960) onwards which treats them as horror cinema, this is due to the perceived status of many of these films as 'thrillers' and therefore they have not been analysed or approached using horror genre theory. Important to this chapter is Andrew Tudor's *Monsters and Mad Scientists: A Cultural History of the Horror Film*[43] and Isabel Cristina Pinedo's work on postmodernity in contemporary horror cinema.[44] Both rely on the idea of the secular and supernatural horror as an opposition marking the shift to postmodernism in the horror genre at large from 1968 onwards. Their respective work

will be used in analysis of the supernatural and psychological horrors to demonstrate that British horror of the 1960s and 1970s displayed traits common to the American horror films which have been credited with starting the postmodern horror phase, including *Night of the Living Dead* (George A. Romero, 1968) among others.

The next two chapters will explore the changing representation of the female and the male in British horror of the period. Firstly, there is a notable shift towards evil main female threats, and also later the emergence of strong female leads as opposed to weaker males such as in Pete Walker's films and the 'final girl' they often represent. Other groupings of British horror cinema use the main female character as a subject under threat either physically, mentally, or both. This occurred in an era of major legislative change for women amidst still-shifting gender roles, and with the classification changes at the BBFC there was a strong increase in sexploitation content. This chapter will be covering the changing attitudes to women in British horror with a view to using psychoanalysis, but owing to the strong use of monstrous women in Hammer's films they will be used extensively in the chapter and open up new avenues in the understanding of the studio.

Changing representations of the male in British horror will be examined in the fourth chapter. There will be a specific focus on the male authority figure, and his decline into obsolescence occurring simultaneously with the emergence of corrupt male authority, as well as an investigation of the 'broken male' displaying masculinity as being in crisis. As with the previous chapter, this one will address male representation in the context of the shifting British society and culture that produced the films, with a focus on the decline and corruption of Hammer's authority figures, *Witchfinder General* (Michael Reeves, 1968), and the *Phibes* films (*Abominable Dr Phibes* (Robert Fuest, 1971), *Dr Phibes Rises Again* (Robert Fuest, 1972)) among others.

The chapter on family will examine the changing portrayal of the familial setup and its change over the period. When the time period is examined, it becomes clear that the patriarchal family structure so cemented by 1950s ideology was breaking down, which can be interpreted as being linked to the production of several films focusing on a 'broken family' being made in a short period of time. Similarly, this overall family grouping contains such threads as age abusing youth, cursed families, the evil child, and children following in the footsteps of 'evil' parents. *Demons of the Mind*, *Mumsy, Nanny, Sonny and Girly* (Freddie Francis, 1970), *The Asphyx*, *The Psychopath* (Freddie Francis,1966), and *Twisted Nerve* (Roy Boulting, 1968) will be used to illustrate the changes throughout the decade. This chapter will fully address the issue in horror cinema in the 1960s and 1970s of the collapsing and corruption of the family unit which was under pressure in reality from social and legislative changes during the period, and how these changes appear to have manifested in horror cinema.

Finally, this thesis will address the issue of post-colonial elements present in the films coinciding with the Empire breaking up at rapid speed and the repercussions of the colonial past impacting on the present. This can be found within some of the films, especially Hammer's output, which will result in a heavier use of Hammer films within the chapter. However, this will also produce a new way of reading Hammer's productions which has not been previously seen as canon. There is a certain sense of the past being inescapable in the 1960s and 1970s, even within the contemporary-set films, and a need to leave it behind and work through the trauma it causes the protagonists. This will involve an examination of British horror in terms of post-colonialism, and post-colonial guilt, an element that American horror cinema of the same time did not possess, and therefore requires analysis as a unique aspect to British horror of the 1960s and 1970s.

These chapters will build an accurate image of the British horror cinema of the 1960s and 1970s and correct the current misconceptions; to rewrite the accepted academic history of the genre during this time period. In view of the existing literature on British horror cinema of the 1960s and 1970s, it is necessary to further research the area and demonstrate the true nature of the films produced; to show that this era of British horror cinema was a period in its own right and not dependent on following a formula established by the Hammer 'gothic films' of the late 1950s.

This work will demonstrate that British horror evolved and adapted to survive the difficult situation that the industry found itself in, that it reflected the issues at stake in the socio-cultural environment it was produced in, and that it became the realm of the independents and entrepreneurs with the fall of the studios. An inclusive approach using close textual analysis of the entire period of films will yield greater results and allow all of the films attention, making them all equally 'worthy' and uncovering previously-unknown connections and works. Changing the current view of the 1960s and 1970s British horror cinema is an important step towards reclaiming such a large part of cinematic history, even if some would deem it to be trash and cult and therefore unworthy of examination. There is more to British horror of the 1960s-1970s than Hammer and a few directors of note, and this will be demonstrated in this thesis.

CHAPTER 1

Critical approaches to British Horror Cinema

Introduction

In his book *The Hellraiser Films and their Legacy*, Paul Kane discusses press reactions to *Hellraiser* (Clive Barker, 1987). In response to one review that labels it the best horror film ever made in Britain, Kane remarks somewhat dismissively "which is saying very little at the time."[1] *Hellraiser* was one of the few horror films produced in Britain during the 1980s, a period in which the British horror genre seemed generally moribund, with the film itself, with all its sado-masochistic imagery, as different from older forms of British horror as it is possible to be. However, even here Kane's throwaway remark displays a rejection of that older British horror and indeed a retrospective simplification of it that can be found more widely in the critical literature on British horror cinema.

Before embarking on an examination of the existing literature specific to the 1960s and 1970s, it is useful to address the 1950s British horror cinema with which it is so indelibly associated, and which is commonly seen as possessing cohesive qualities associated with Hammer. Peter Hutchings and his 1993 work *Hammer and Beyond: The British Horror Film* is the key text in this area. Hutchings identifies several of these elements of the 1950s films: the figure of the male middle-class civilian professional, the authority belonging to this professional, a physicality of presence,[2] and culmination in the containment of the threat through a "no-nonsense approach to various manifestations of evil."[3] In particular the professional and his "domination and mastery of the environment is one of the distinguishing features of 1950s Hammer horror."[4] Importantly, Hutchings also identifies a link between the professional and male sexuality, in that

> [a]uthority is inalienably patriarchal in Hammer horror of this period; it also tends to be associated with celibacy. (Think, for example, of Van Helsing and Sherlock Holmes.) Male sexual desire is itself nearly always seen as either weakening or evil. In line with this, female characters have little or no autonomy in these films but are usually defined as an essentially sexual threat for male characters.[5]

Women in these films are subservient to the male, or their sexuality makes them a danger. Female characters are not active, not associated with authority, and adopt the positions and roles that would suit the historical settings or risk being repositioned.

Hutchings also briefly explores the tendency of the 1950s films being based sometimes centuries in the past, with two options being possible. The first is that the "historical setting thereby opened up between film and audience, enables a more fantastic, stylised acting out of events, unencumbered as it is with the suggestions of realism carried by modern locations."[6] This increased the distance between audience and horror, rendering it less disturbing, but also "the period settings permitted a conservative nostalgia for a fixed social order, one in which the powerless were legitimate prey."[7] The other benefit of this period setting is the use by Hammer of Bray Studios, which were in reality a country house estate with large grounds and nearby woods for location filming.

Using the gothic settings available in combination with the gothic literature as source material naturally led to Hammer's 1950s films producing a repetition of gothic horrors in quick succession which continue into the 1960s. As a result, Hammer relied on its narratives and sets correlating for a coherent film product that could be successful, leading to the repetition of gothic horrors. This brought a cohesive visual appearance to the films, furthering the concept that British horror had a certain aesthetic through repetition of its use.

However, it is clear from viewing the horror films produced in Britain in the 1960s and 1970s that they do not fit this mould that was established in the 1950s. Even Hammer varied its product from those it made in the late 1950s. The rest of this

literature review will appraise the existing academic work on the 1960s and 1970s British horror cinema, and assess it in terms of how it has approached the subject matter or contributed to its marginalisation, as well as establishing the gaps in knowledge that require addressing in order to build a new and accurate history of the genre.

It has often been the fate of British horror cinema to be critically vilified or, worse, critically marginalised or ignored. As Hutchings has noted, most histories of British cinema written during the 1960s and 1970s paid little or no attention to horror, even though it was a commercially important area of British film production.[8] Since then, there has been a significant increase in the critical attention paid to British horror, with much of this part of a wider exploration of British film as a distinctive national cinema.[9]

This chapter considers the range of approaches that have been deployed in relation to British horror, with a particular focus on assessing horror production in the 1960s and 1970s. It will suggest that certain assumptions about the historical development of the British horror film underpin many of these approaches in a manner that does not benefit an understanding of post-1950s horror. As we will see, part of the trajectory of critical work on British horror has entailed engaging with a progressively wider range of horror films, to a certain extent responding to Petley and Chibnall's criticism in their introduction to *British Horror Cinema* that "in the case of texts on British horror cinema, too many fail to progress beyond considering what has become a pretty limited canon."[10] In some ways this thesis is part of that trajectory inasmuch as it will include discussions of horror films rarely if ever discussed critically before, alongside analyses of more canonical British horrors. However, its engagement here with some of the conceptual limitations evident in previous work on British horror will point the way forward to a different approach to the genre so far as understanding its nature and its historical development are concerned.

Literature Review

The idea that British horror, at least from the 1950s onwards, has a cohesive identity can be seen as linked to the prominence of Hammer as the most prolific horror production company. Despite Hammer's horror breakthrough *The Quatermass Xperiment* (Val Guest, 1955), it is generally accepted that British horror as a distinctive category of British film production began with a flurry of gothic activity from Hammer, beginning with *The Curse of Frankenstein*, closely followed by a series of other productions, including *Dracula*, *The Revenge of Frankenstein* and *The Mummy*. With these and other films produced throughout the 1950s and early 1960s, Hammer set a standard for gothic colour horrors through what appeared, to some at least, to be a consistent visual style and thematic character.

As Leon Hunt stated in 1998 "[t]he history of British horror tends to be written as the history of Hammer films,"[11] and this assertion holds true in light of the academic work on British horror cinema of the 1960s and 1970s. Hammer is held up as the icon of the British horror industry, referred to as the Golden Age, labelled by Peter Hutchings as "[t]he most famous (or infamous), influential and commercially successful sector of British horror,"[12] and treated as the stable force synonymous with the genre:

> *Curse of Frankenstein*, *Dracula*, *The Hound of the Baskervilles*, *The Mummy*, and the *Gorgon*, embody the Hammer aesthetic in its most accomplished form. These five films can be seen as centres of gravity within Hammer horror, in the same way that Hammer horror itself provides a basic definitional model of British horror cinema in general.[13]

It is no coincidence that Gary A. Smith's book is titled *Uneasy Dreams: The Golden Age of British Horror Films, 1956-1976*,[14] which is the timeframe which Hammer was active in the horror industry. As Smith puts it

> That this era of film production should have started and finished with two films from Hammer is fitting and not at all surprising. Hammer "led the way" and was the most prolific producer of horror during the twenty years that the genre flourished in the British film industry.[15]

Smith's introduction to his book revolves around the rise and fall of Hammer, with any reference to other film producers being linked or compared to the company in some way. This is not unusual in itself where the production company is concerned, as Smith's is part of a long line of works focusing on Hammer as being key to British horror that started with David Pirie.

Pirie regards Hammer as a bastion of the British horror industry, celebrating their stability and use of the British gothic tradition, and lamenting the changes that came in the 1960s and 1970s. He says of the final Karnstein vampire film *Twins of Evil* (John Hough, 1971) that "Peter Cushing's part as the puritan witchhunter is wholly insubstantial and again the emphasis is limitingly on sex."[16] This leads Pirie to a conclusion that

> Gradually the directorial and dramatic weight which was given in Fisher's work to the spiritual element in the films (Van Helsing, Professor Meister, etc) has been eroded, and accompanying this process the evil male vampire tends more and more to give way to a sexually omniscient woman.[17]

Tellingly, Pirie has identified a shift in Hammer, but fails to investigate it fully. The change is from the dominance of the gothic and the male as found in the Terence Fisher Hammer films, to the rise of the female and her control of her own sexuality. His lack of further exploration of this important element has allowed a narrative of British horror as linked to the gothic and the formulae laid down by the Hammer horrors of the later 1950s.

However, there is a lack of discussion regarding some key areas of Hammer and its relation to both gender and the post-colonial attitudes found within the films. To address the post-colonial first, Rigby raises the issue of the anti-colonial in both *The Plague of the Zombies* and *The Reptile*, however, he labels this as incorrect and 'fanciful.'[18] This is in response to Pirie stating that the two films feature "communities threatened by a kind of alien and inexplicable plague which has been imported from the East via a

corrupt aristocracy: both are, by implication at least, violently anti-colonial,"[19] an aspect which is also picked up by I. Q. Hunter.[20] Further examination of this area is required in tandem with non-Hammer product to fully demonstrate a lasting preoccupation with the post-colonial.

The role of the female in British horror has been similarly under-examined. In *Women in British Cinema: Mad, Bad and Dangerous to Know*,[21] Sue Harper briefly addresses the issue of attitudes to women within the horror genre in Britain. Harper identifies that

> It was with the historical horror films that Hammer began to exploit the symbolic resonances of their female characters to the full. They prepared the ground for the sustained treatment of female sexuality which Hammer undertook in the 1960s. […] In *Dracula*, both heroines enjoy the vampire's unconventional style of coitus. They are transformed by his unratified penetration, which destroys them as moral beings. Only penetration by the stake of the celibate Van Helsing (Peter Cushing) can restore them to the moral mainstream.[22]

The 1950 films are primarily concerned with female sexuality as presenting a danger that can be easily repositioned by the male. Whereas in the 1960s, Harper argues, the films focused on taboos and oppositions, with female blood as a pollutant being a preoccupation.[23]

Harper's remarks on Hammer women of the 1960s are taken one step further, with her argument that "Hammer producers were responding *negatively* to contemporary changes in female mores, constructing films which were meant to operate as a corrective."[24] This indicates that Hammer can be read using a reflectionist approach, and as a result the films of the 1960s, and not just Hammer, require much further investigation for their attitudes to the female. With regards to the 1970s, Harper remarks along with Justin Smith in their book *British Film Culture in the 1970s: The Boundaries of Pleasure* that "the studio maintained its conservative position on female sexuality,"[25] but do not elaborate extensively on this point. As a result there is much scope for

investigation regarding the position of the female in 1970s British horror as well as the 1960s.

Key to establishing the formation of this approach to British horror in these Hammer-centric terms was David Pirie with his seminal work on British horror *A Heritage of Horror: The English Gothic Cinema.*[26] Pirie discusses British horror in terms of it being part of a longstanding cultural tradition of the Gothic, with literary figures such as Bram Stoker and Mary Shelley forming the origins of the tradition that British horror cinema draws upon.[27] This is emphasised in his statement within the introduction to his book that

> [t]he rather striking truth is that in international commercial terms, the British cinema (including not just Hammer but other smaller companies: this is a national phenomenon) has effectively and effortlessly dominated the 'horror' market over a period of almost twenty years with a series of films which, whatever their faults, are in no way imitative of American or European models but derive in general from literary sources.[28]

The use of the Gothic literary tradition is key for Pirie, who holds up the Gothic as the true form of British horror based on the form's *literary* roots and traditions, rather than films which digress from them. It is not insignificant that Pirie is using the Gothic literary traditions of British horror as the "true mark" of the genre, as this utilises the cultural caché of literature to raise the horror genre from a position of undeserving low culture, to being worthy of attention at an academic level. The use of literature as a high cultural tradition is being used to legitimise the field of horror in this first major academic work on British horror cinema.

Pirie asserts that "English film-makers were among the slowest to capitalise on their own native Gothic tradition,"[29] and in this manner indicates that those films not taking up the literary Gothic form are lacking a cohesiveness, one which can be used to identify the films of Hammer. In establishing the 'true' and cohesive form of British horror as rooted in Gothic literature, Pirie's work has helped to perpetuate another

tradition, one in which academia has adopted Pirie's approach to British horror cinema as being of the Gothic form typified by Hammer. This had led to the centrality of Hammer in the academic narrative of British horror cinema.

Within Pirie's discussions on British horror of the 1960s and 1970s, most of the examples deployed are Hammer films with Gothic settings of the kind privileged elsewhere in Pirie's book. Pirie does however choose to briefly highlight other studios and the work of other directors including Don Sharp, John Gilling, and Vernon Sewell, but this limited coverage leaves very little space to discuss the works of the individual directors.[30] Significantly, the majority of directors he does address had worked for Hammer. As a result, even when Pirie is not discussing Hammer specifically, he is focusing on Hammer personnel. However, whilst Pirie held up Terence Fisher as an important icon of horror film directors, Freddie Francis does not receive this treatment despite his extensive work for Amicus, among other companies, which Pirie himself mentions.[31] Arguably, this is due to Fisher working on Hammer's films that conform to Pirie's Gothic standard compared to Francis's more varied output.

Amicus, which tended to favour contemporary settings and often drew upon American sources for inspiration,[32] does feature within Pirie's discussions, but this lasts only for two pages. One part of this is Pirie's highlighting of "*Torture Garden*, with its devastating final episode about Edgar Poe's return from the grave."[33] The film named here is significant as Pirie briefly admires the last scene about a literary figure rather than the rest of the film, then devotes the final page of his discussions on Amicus to *The Skull* (Freddie Francis, 1965), with its plot revolving around a long-dead writer. Other Amicus product of a non-portmanteau format and not using historic literary figures is dismissed, including *The Psychopath* and *The Deadly Bees* (Freddie Francis, 1966), which Pirie asserts "have little to recommend them."[34]

Pirie acknowledges other horrors produced by Amicus and directors other than Fisher, but he does not connect them to the heritage of British horror or see a worthy diversion for horror until 1968 and Michael Reeves whom he deems to have "pioneered a new approach to British horror."[35] The new approach which Pirie writes of in discussion of Reeves is that "he was the kind of film-maker which British cinema needed (and still needs) so desperately badly: someone who could merge the popular tradition of the horror film with more avant-garde concerns without rearing the curious bastard which so often results from such experiments."[36] This explains his idealising Hammer's earlier product rather than that of other producers who were quicker to adapt and form part of the 'change' in the 1960s towards increasing the amount of violent and sexual content which Pirie deems unreflective of the English Gothic traditions, producing what he deems "curious bastard[s]."[37]

By identifying this shift in British horror cinema emerging in the 1960s, Pirie highlights the decade's horror output and its difference to that of the 1950s briefly in a section on emerging young horror directors post-Reeves. However, this focuses on the formal approach of the director as *auteur* rather than content and ends with a refocus on Hammer, particularly on how its previous Gothic traditions were being replaced by overt sexuality. He demonstrates this by comparing the earlier "discreetly sensual female vampires" of Hammer to the later Karnstein films, arguing that the sensuality of the female vampires has been replaced with overt sexuality, that the subtlety once present in the films is missing, and that the narratives have lost solidity to filmmakers attempting the Freudian qualities of European horror. In short, Pirie sees a lack of understanding and loyalty to the 'tradition' of British horror.[38] Here, Pirie identifies a progressive lack of attention to historical tradition and movement away from it to take in European influence which his choice of language indicates is also accompanied by a decline in quality. This diminution of British Gothic qualities and 'cultural tradition'

native to Britain is a progression towards a 'Europeanisation' of British horror during

what Pirie describes as "an increasing public sophistication, which appears to have

taken place most rapidly during the late 1960s.[39]

It is significant in light of Pirie's attitude to the European influences being felt in

the horror films being produced that he indicates that the future of British horror lies in

emulating *American* horror. He argues that *Night of the Living Dead* and *Invasion of the*

Body Snatchers (Don Siegel, 1956) are

> both immensely powerful testaments to the fact that horror themes can be merged
> *overtly* yet inextricably with subversive and complex
> social/psychological/political ideas […] the two more recent films point towards
> such a possibility of an increasing sophisticated and flexible approach to such
> material, which need not necessarily involve sacrificing the resonance and power
> of the basic English myths.[40]

Thus, Pirie is indicating that the American horror cinema was leading the way in the

development of the genre in a manner which Pirie finds favourable in comparison to

British horror progression. Problematically the centrality of English Gothic tradition for

Pirie and the shadow that his work has cast on the narrative of British horror cinema has

resulted in more attention given to the Hammer gothics and the rise of American horror.

With the Gothic tradition and Hammer established by Pirie as the main form of

British horror, he emphasises that this is especially the case when Terence Fisher is

involved, stating "it is particularly gratifying to be able to record that at the end of 1972

Hammer at last hired Terence Fisher to make another film."[41] This perceived stability of

the genre in its purest form as being superior to non-gothic productions continues into

the second version of Pirie's book wherein it is not insignificant that the Appendix gives

two lists, those of Hammer's film releases, and Terence Fisher's films as director,[42]

whilst all other British horror films are included in a separate filmography. That Pirie

continues this attitude to non-Hammer product in the second edition of his work

demonstrates the longevity of the shadow cast by his original text in its approach to

British horror. *A New Heritage of Horror: The English Gothic Cinema* details the end of British horror cinema as being synonymous with Hammer's demise, labelling *To the Devil a Daughter* as part of "the last days of the world boom in horror that had begun in the UK in the late 1950s and petered out sometime in the middle of the 1970s."[43] This is in spite of his coverage of British horror after the 1970s, which adds further text after the original work to cover the years after his first book was published. This provides an updated reassertion of the decline of British horror in the 1960s and 1970s from an initial explosion of Hammer-dominated activity in the late 1950s and early 1960s.

A further synoptic study, and the first academic text on British horror of the period, is Peter Hutchings' *Hammer and Beyond: The British Horror Film* from 1993.[44] Within his book, Hutchings has noted the decided absence of a meaningful discussion of British horror throughout the 1980s, stating that

> [i]t is surprising given the upsurge of critical interest in British cinema that has taken place in the 1980s that so little has been written on British horror outside of a few isolated essays and remarks in essays on other related subjects since *A Heritage of Horror*.[45]

This highlights the lack of attention that British horror cinema garnered since Pirie's work, with no real challenges to the approach that he established. However, Hutching's work is equally Hammer-centric, especially for its core focus on their films made between 1956-1964 with Peter Cushing, Terence Fisher and Christopher Lee all present as a triumvirate of key personnel, leaving very few pages not devoted to Hammer films. Despite being called *Hammer and Beyond: The British Horror Film*, there is not a lot of text which does not revolve around Hammer, Dracula, or Frankenstein, which arguably would be considered the 'beyond,' and thereby compounding the marginalisation of the other producers that Pirie began.

Usefully Hutchings focuses on male authority as key to the earlier Hammer releases and the way in which it declines throughout the period being examined. This decline of

authority is explicitly linked to the decline of Hammer in Hutchings's work, however, the decline of authority figures in British horror goes much further than Hammer and can actually be identified as a concern throughout the genre and the two decades being examined. This is an aspect that is not found within the master narrative that currently dominates British horror history and as a result needs to be investigated further. Problematically the Pirie-established concept of British horror being tied to Hammer remains in place here. Namely this is the idea that "British horror as a distinct category of a national cinema was not to survive the widespread collapse in British film production that occurred in the mid-1970s"[46] which is when Hammer ceased production, a notion which this thesis intends to challenge.

Jonathan Rigby's *English Gothic: A Century of Horror Cinema*[47] marks the beginning of a departure from a concentration on Hammer by using an inclusive approach which allows previously sidelined films to be acknowledged. The text itself is expansive and seeks to cover one hundred years of English horror films. As a result, the volume of non-Hammer output is demonstrated through the overviews of the films which are presented in chronological order as opposed to in-depth discussion of the interrelations between them. However, the inherent problem in trying to cover a century of films is that the ambitious scope of the project prevents extensive examination of the films included. The book highlights 100 key films in this 100 year period but with very little space to do this in detail. Although Rigby does illustrate that a vast amount of films were made, but have been neglected, the nature of his work does not allow any kind of in-depth examination for the majority of them, therefore not remedying the perceived dominance of Hammer.

Rigby is unable to truly overturn the previously-established dominance of Hammer in British horror cinema. However, Rigby's work is useful for this thesis in highlighting films to be included and the brief overviews of many that could potentially present a

challenge to the Hammer-dominated works that came before. It does seem from this that there is still space for a more inclusive and detailed account of British horror, especially in the 1960s and 1970s. This in turn potentially has implications for our understanding of the relations of British horror, Hammer based or otherwise, to both Gothic and non-Gothic elements. This in turn will allow for an alternative narrative of British horror in the period.

Within the synoptic texts which I have discussed so far there is a continued centrality of Hammer as the driving force in British horror cinema, demonstrating that Pirie's first work cast a long shadow over the later writings on British horror film of the time, with Hutchings and Rigby aiding in the reiteration of this approach. Even in Pirie's updated version of his book in 2008, there is no reassessment of the previous work from 1973. As a result of the approach established by Pirie which dominated for several decades, the horror cinema in Britain is overly-reduced from what might be seen as a variety of approaches, styles, and cycles of horror films to being synonymous with Hammer product. It is this multi-faceted face of British horror that this work will look to address. Significantly, these three key authors (Pirie, Hutchings and Rigby) became a cornerstone for academia surrounding British horror cinema.

This master narrative has led to Hammer becoming the central theme of work on British horror. An example of this is Gary Smith's *Uneasy Dreams: The Golden Age of British Horror Films, 1956-1976*[48] which uses Hammer as the key to British horror cinema by naming the golden age as the years between Hammer's release of *X The Unknown* (Leslie Norman, 1956) and Hammer's last horror film *To The Devil a Daughter*. With so much focus on Hammer, which includes entire books based on the production company such as Marcus Hearn and Alan Barnes' *The Hammer Story: The Authorised History of Hammer Films*[49] and Denis Meikle's *A History of Horrors: The*

Rise and Fall of the House of Hammer,[50] Hammer increasingly dominated work on British horror cinema.

Problematically, competition from America is credited by many critics with being responsible for the 'demise' of British horror cinema and usually its alleged premature death with Hammer's downfall, which fails to recognise the longevity of the genre beyond Hammer. For example, *Night of the Living Dead* is often accused of bringing about the end of British horror, including by David Sanjek,[51] despite being made in 1968, which is eight years before Hammer's last horror film in 1976. Other academics choose to blame *The Omen* (Richard Donner, 1976) which was released the same year as *To the Devil a Daughter* and is viewed as a superior film with similar themes, although Pirie labels it "only technically a British film."[52] Other critics and historians blame the "[t]he new wave of American horror films, which emerged between the late 70s and mid-80s, [and] overshadowed British horrors."[53] However, all of these groups fail to acknowledge that British horror cinema survived to the end of the 1970s and therefore beyond the demise of Hammer which had lost its dominance of the market to the smaller and more independent filmmakers. Ignoring the existence of these films is equal to pretending part of British culture simply vanished, especially when films were still being released.

The effect of the synoptic studies tracing the decline of British horror and the dominance of Hammer can be seen continuing within the writings of the 1990s and 2000s. This time period saw the emergence of a flurry of activity from film historians including Andrew Spicer,[54] Steve Chibnall,[55] and James Chapman,[56] whose work draws upon an association of the decline of British horror with that of Hammer, which has implications for the range of films that get discussed and how they are valued. Leon Hunt tries to contextualise British horror within the society that produced it rather than in connection to the fall of Hammer in his chapter "Grim flarey tales: British horror in

the 1970s"[57] but does not go far enough and is limited to one chapter. His exploration of the representation of the permissive society within the horror films of the late 1960s and early 1970s highlights a conflict between the older restrained generation and the youthful protagonists deemed to be in need of repression for their permissive behaviour. Hunt notes this theme particularly in horror films of the time which employed sexploitation, and that this presents a barrier to their being truly progressive in terms of their attitudes to and critiques of the establishment.[58] However, the book which contains the chapter is very useful in terms of its exploration of British culture in the 1970s and aiding in determining where British horror cinema fit into such a landscape of low culture and the national cinema itself.

Addressing texts on British cinema is an appropriate place to assess how British horror of the 1960s and 1970s is currently deemed to fit into the national cinema historically. However, considering the manner in which Pirie categorised the Gothic horror as a product of British cultural history, academic writing on British national cinema and culture of the 1960s and 1970s in particular often sidelines or completely ignores horror product from the period. Justine Ashby and Andrew Higson's edited collection *British Cinema, Past and Present*[59] is a prime example that contains very few references to horror cinema despite including Peter Hutching's article on Roy Ward Baker as an *auteur*.[60] Likewise, Justin Smith and Sue Harper in their recent publication *British Film Culture of the 1970s: The Boundaries of Pleasure*[61] state quite early in their work that horror films did not interpret the climate in which they were produced, yet argue within their book that British cinema itself in the 1970s displayed a common mood, tone, visual and performance style, amongst other aspects, and that there was a purveying sense of anxiety and irony. However, their exclusion of the horror genre from participating in this collective mood is disconcerting and needs addressing, especially

since Ian Conrich, whose article will be discussed later, also recognises this 'mood'[62] in British horror.

Despite their aforementioned contention that horror films do not reflect the period in which they were made, Harper and Smith's *British Film Culture of the 1970s: The Boundaries of Pleasure* is still a very useful text in terms of its detailing of how the film industry functioned during the 1970s. In this manner, it aids in contextualising the films, such as Sian Barber's article on the BBFC in the 1970s and its details of how films were censored, pushed the boundaries, and at times asked for a higher certification than the BBFC had planned to award.[63]

Sporadic treatment of the horror genre in writing on British cinema continues into Sarah Street's *British National Cinema* which devotes less than three pages to British horror cinema of the 1970s,[64] with almost a page of this devoted to *Don't Look Now* (Nicholas Roeg, 1973) and very few pages in total concerning horror films in general over the course of history. The only films mentioned - for most do not get any examination from Street - are those that have already been covered many times and are either raised to 'reputable and worthy of examination' status by virtue of director: Michael Reeves' *Witchfinder General* and Pete Walker's *House of Whipcord* (1974) are the focus of academic texts on their directors;[65] are connected to Hammer and other studios: *Blood From the Mummy's Tomb* (Seth Holt, 1971) and *Countess Dracula* (Peter Sasdy, 1970); or have been raised to cult status such as *The Wicker Man* (Robin Hardy, 1973).

Regardless of which category these films fall into (made worthy by director or studio), they have, for the most part, already been identified and examined by previous academics including Peter Hutchings, Steve Chibnall and David Sanjek.[66] This lack of the British horror genre in a book on British national cinema is certainly concerning, for the entire genre has been marginalised here. This extends into the second edition of the

text even after the emergence of much critical work on the British horror film since Street's 1997 edition. The marginalisation of this highly significant period of British horror production has helped to perpetuate the master narrative of British horror as being defined by the Hammer gothic, and created an illusion that the rest of the horror films produced effectively did not exist. In this manner, the lack of attention paid to British horror cinema has resulted in the loss of understanding of twenty years of horror cinema, a significant element of British national cinema, and therefore of British cultural history itself.

Equally problematic is that Andrew Spicer's *Typical Men: The Representation of Masculinity in Popular British Cinema* ends each chapter around 1970 which Spicer argues is "the date by which cinema had been undeniably supplanted by television as the central popular cultural medium."[67] Ending his examinations in 1970 is highly problematic as there were still significant developments visible throughout the 1970s British horror cinema where the representation of masculinity is concerned, which Spicer has effectively discounted from being of any importance, as well as the following decades before the 2003 publication of his work. Spicer's work is also significant in that he does not engage with the horror genre, leaving a gap in his work and producing an area of comparison as to whether British horror cinema was following any similar patterns to the rest of British cinema contemporary to it, or if there was a shift in masculinity which was isolated to horror cinema.

A text which engages with British horror on a different and useful level is Cynthia Hendershot's *I Was a Cold War Monster: Horror Films, Eroticism, and the Cold War Imagination*.[68] Throughout, Hendershot addresses American horror cinema, but draws links and comparisons with British horror films of the same period. The key argument for Hendershot is that

> [h]orror films provide a guide to many of the sociological fears of the cold war era. Because of their frequently naive approach to the fears of the time, they give

the audiences metaphors for the monsters that plagued British and American society in the 1950s-1960s.[69]

In this manner, Hendershot is arguing that similar anxieties and attitudes were present in both American and British horror, and although they may have addressed them in different ways, the horror cinema was a technique for manifesting these issues and following them through to their narrative conclusion – whether this resulted in death or neutralising the threat. There is, however, still a focus on the Hammer films of the period within Hendershots' work due to a focus on the use of the figures of Dracula and the Mummy.

The lasting influence of Pirie's work can be seen clearly in the exclusion of the small independent production companies and their directors from the history of British horror cinema, and British cinema more generally. For example, Robert Shail documents that he has included 'significant' figures in *British Film Directors: A Critical Guide*:

> [t]he majority of directors included have amassed a substantial body of work over a number of years, but some have been included even though their output has been small because they have made a particularly distinctive contribution to the national film culture.[70]

Writing in 2007, Shail includes Pete Walker and Michael Reeves, both of whose work and lives had already been documented in significant books by Steve Chibnall (*Making Mischief: The Cult Films of Pete Walker*[71]) and Benjamin Halligan (*Michael Reeves*[72]) which elevated them as *auteurs*, but neglects the vast majority of multiple-film directors in the horror genre including Norman J. Warren and Robert Hartford-Davis to name just two.

Despite the marginalisation of British horror in works focusing on British national cinema, there are still some useful articles in edited collections that focus in some way on the period being examined, such as Peri Bradley's "Hideous Sexy: The Eroticized

Body and Deformity in 1970s British Horror Films" in Paul Newland's *Don't Look Now: British Cinema in the 1970s*.[73] Bradley recognises the critical disdain for horror films of the period, arguing that "[w]hen placed in the milieu of the 'tasteless' era of the 1970s and faced with the fact that they are also British, these films struggle to maintain any vestige of critical sanction or approval that renders them worthy of academic scrutiny."[74] That these films are not deemed worthy prevents an open dialogue on a larger scale, and therefore obstructing the revision of the Pirie master narrative of a British horror cinema defined by the 'gothics' of the late 1950s Hammer, and the decline of the genre with the production company.

Part of creating an inclusive account of British horror cinema in the 1960s and 1970s is to increase the number of films being deemed worthy of discussion. Some small groups of films not conforming to Pirie's ideal have already been recognised and examined, such as: the films dubbed by David Pirie as the Sadian trilogy – *Horrors of the Black Museum* (Arthur Crabtree, 1959), *Circus of Horrors* (Sidney Hayers, 1960) and *Peeping Tom*;[75] the female madness films identified by Steven Schneider in his article in the much-referenced collection *British Horror Cinema* edited by Steve Chibnall and Julian Petley;[76] and the witch-finding subgenre Leon Hunt names.[77] This has led to films being examined for their connections to each other in opposition to the Hammer gothics as groups established without using the director as *auteur* or the production company, such as John Hamilton's two volumes *X-Cert: The British Independent Horror Film, 1951-1970 and X-Cert 2: The British Independent Horror Film, 1971-1983* published in 2012 and 2014.[78]

Similarly, there are many edited works and articles on individual films from the period which have been emerging in recent years, with Leon Hunt, I.Q. Hunter, and Xavier Mendik presenting some of the most useful pieces and differing viewpoints on the same films. This has led to various interpretations and an increasing dialogue on

specific films, such as the work on *The Legend of the 7 Golden Vampires* from Hunt[79] and Hunter.[80] Although this has brought some academic attention to British horror cinema of the 1960s and 1970s, it is only concerned with a very limited number of films, and, in the case of *The Legend of the 7 Golden Vampires*, to films made by the major production companies of the period (here Hammer is referred to as a major company in British horror due to its sizeable output and one-time dominance of the horror genre). There are however, discussions of lesser known films made by much smaller production companies to be found, such as *Death Line* (aka *Raw Meat,* Gary Sherman, 1972). Nick Freeman's article focusing on *Death Line*, *Dracula A.D. 1972* (Alan Gibson, 1972), and *Theatre of Blood* (Douglas Hickox, 1973), celebrates *Death Line* as a success full of hidden depths able to fuse the past and present through the location of the London underground system.[81] This is complemented by Marcelle Perks's article on *Death Line*, which also explains an additional effect of films receiving less critical attention: "[t]here are certain films which remain mostly obscure to mainstream audiences but which supply a litmus test for informed good taste among *real* horror fans." [82] These films have been raised as worthy *outside* of major critical works and on a much smaller scale that garners little publicity.

Similarly, there are useful sections on British horror from Patrick Allmer, Emily Brick, and David Huxley in their text *European Nightmares: Horror Cinema in Europe Since 1945*.[83] The most useful chapter focuses on *Village of the Damned* (Wolf Rilla, 1960), with John Sears interrogating the film in a manner which links it heavily to the socio-cultural climate which produced it.[84] The inclusion of this chapter, however, limits the exploration of British horror produced at this time to one film, and the only other chapter on the genre in Britain focuses on the modern era from the 1980s onwards.[85] Most problematic is the introduction to British horror within the text, which focuses on the master narrative of Hammer and its style of gothic horrors dominating

the market,[86] reconfirming that the roots of British horror is in the Gothic literary tradition[87] as espoused previously by Pirie and discussed above. It argues that the success of British horror

> was due to prolific production of gothic horrors (often harking back to the literary tradition mentioned above) by companies like Amicus, Tigon and, most famously, Hammer, featuring actors such as Christopher Lee and Peter Cushing. That these companies were allowed to produce horror films in an ideological climate hostile to horror, is largely due to their resemblance to costume and historical dramas, their avoidance of overt sexual or political meanings and their conventionality of language and action.[88]

This is a troubling statement, as it demonstrates that even in 2012 the master narrative established by David Pirie and continued through the synoptic studies is still dominating academic approaches to British horror cinema. As yet, there is no major work that addresses the 1960s and 1970s period of British horror cinema, in a comprehensive manner, as an era of the genre with its own merits.

When it comes to the diversity of British horror cinema of the 1960s and 1970s, it is notable that where academic works have been slow to begin to recognise this, the non-academic fan press, and publishers that are not viewed as "high-brow" have been much quicker. The 'fanzine' *Little Shoppe of Horrors* has been running for several decades, calling itself "The Journal of Classic British Horror Films." Richard Klemenson published the first issue in June 1972, but there has been a running theme of a focus on Hammer.[89] Likewise FAB Press has published *Ten Years of Terror: British Horror Films of the 1970s*,[90] *Unruly Pleasures: The Cult Film and its Critics*,[91] and *Making Mischief: The Cult Films of Pete Walker*.[92] Since 1990 the magazine *The Dark Side*[93] has been published on a bi-monthly basis and edited by Allan Bryce. The magazine focuses on new releases as well as older horror films. All of these sources provide accessible texts focusing on specific films and directors for the most part, with *Ten Years of Terror: British Horror Films of the 1970s*,[94] providing an overview of the 1970s as more of a reference guide. Overall, they have been able begin discussions of

the British horror films which the larger academic approaches to genre and national cinema have marginalised.

As can be seen from articles focusing on very small groups and individual films it is clear that British horror cinema is now being recognised as not tied exclusively to the 'gothic trappings' of the Hammer films in the 1950s. In addition, there is a reclamation of the directors of the 1960s and 1970s British horror cinema with books devoted to them as *auteurs* in contradiction to the dominance of Hammer and its personnel. A major example is Steve Chibnall marking Pete Walker as innovative due to his rejection of the traditions of Hammer and Pirie's work in *Making Mischief: The Cult Films of Pete Walker*.[95] Walker's films were previously sidelined,[96] until Chibnall's 1998 monograph, contextualising both the films and the director in the industry and society in which production occurred, providing in-depth analysis, and interviews with the director about his work and opinions on it.

Chibnall's book presents an argument for Walker's films being demonstrative of a new direction in which British horror moved in the 1960s and 1970s, providing an answer to Pirie's assertions that a new direction in horror was needed that built on the Gothic traditions he favours. However, Pirie directly rebukes Chibnall's notion in his updated *A New Heritage of Horror*, "[t]o me, the films of Pete Walker and McGillivray look more and more like highly commendable (and brave) steps on the road to the dark alternative British comedy of the 1980s than a new direction for the British horror movie."[97] Thus, once again, Pirie maintains that the Gothic tradition is the preferred form for British horror cinema, reinforcing the narrative he established in 1973.

Despite this, Chibnall's major work on Walker stands in opposition to previous opinion on the British horror cinema, giving attention solely to previously-ignored films. This approach had previously been taken in 1991 by Wheeler W. Dixon's *The Films of Freddie Francis*,[98] examining the films in depth and providing interviews with

the director, but in the late 1990s and early 2000s the approach resurfaced with other directors including Roy Ward Baker,[99] Terence Fisher,[100] and Michael Reeves[101] having their films and lives documented in a similar fashion. One text that offers a variation on the theme is *Beasts In the Cellar: The Exploitation Film Career of Tony Tenser*[102] which focuses on Tigon's producer, Tony Tenser and the films his companies were responsible for.

However, these books concern all the films made by the directors/producers and not just their horror genre films. Although this has opened up the field to move away from the Hammer-dominated history of British horror cinema, the director-centric approach produced by these texts keeps the narrative of the horror genre in Britain in the 1960s and 1970s studio and director-centric. Therefore, it still ignores the majority of the films produced in the 1970s made by independents who, like Walker, saw a gap in the market when the American funding left and tried to fill it with their product.[103] In this manner, the *auteur* texts cannot address films that cannot be grouped under the banner of a single director. The other issue at stake here is that these works are heavily biased in favour of the director as the most important aspect, not the films themselves, regardless of the film's success or lack thereof.

These texts focusing on specific directors, as well as articles addressing small groups of and individual films represent alternative accounts of parts of the British horror genre in the 1960s and 1970s, but what is required is an in-depth questioning of the master narrative established by Pirie by using a new approach in order to produce a more accurate account of British horror cinema in the two decades.

To elaborate there are two potential approaches: one of cohesion in the genre and one of a fragmented identity, the latter of which is a more recent development. Firstly, Hammer in the late 1950s is credited with starting the 'golden age' of British horror. Problematically Hammer's timespan of productions is sometimes also referred to as the

'British horror cycle' which prevents the 1960s and 1970s from being viewed as a separate entity from the 1950s. Andrew Higson sees British cinema, and not specifically horror, in the 1970s as "the continuation of the cinema of the 1950s, with the buoyancy of the mid-1960s as a temporary aberration,"[104] indicating an attitude that British cinema in the 1970s, and British horror included within this, had not changed from the 1950s and is not a period in its own right.

Contrarily, Ian Conrich, whose article features in Shail's *Seventies British Cinema*,[105] recognises that British horror cinema changed, or adapted, in order to survive the increasingly difficult circumstances and socio-cultural climate of production. He argues that British horror not only attempted to emulate American horror successes, but even took to producing hybrid films such as *Captain Kronos: Vampire Hunter* (Brian Clemens, 1974), and *The Beast Must Die*. Conrich's article is very useful for its acknowledgement and brief exploration of British horror adapting to survive, however, it will be necessary to take issue when Conrich argues that:

> As the British horror movie had mutated and diversified to compete and exist within the challenging industrial climate of the 1970s, it had lost a generic identity that had arguably been the British film industry's most stable throughout the 1960s.[106]

This is problematic, as there were so many cycles and subgenres at work in British horror cinema that there was no singular fixed identity in British horror during the 1960s, as this thesis will argue. Hammer had a more fixed horror output identity during the 1960s as it was one of the slowest to recognise the need to change its formula to compete and retain its dominance over British horror. Despite this, its non-horror product diversified with adventure films such as *She* (Robert Day, 1965), *The Viking Queen* (Don Chaffey, 1967), and their final film of the two decades, *The Lady Vanishes* (Anthony Page, 1979), not to mention their numerous comedies and television series *Journey to the Unknown* (Alan Gibson et al, 1968-1969). Illustrating the focus on

Hammer further, is that despite Amicus also having a formula of sorts and being known for its portmanteau horror films it has yet to garner as much academic attention as Hammer. As James Chapman argues:

> To date, Amicus has not received anything like the attention devoted to Hammer, though a strong case could be made that in the early 1970s it was the more creative force at a time when Hammer seemed to have run out of residual cultural and economic energy.[107]

Chapman's argument helps to demonstrate the dominance of Hammer as the master narrative of British horror cinema of the 1960s and 1970s that is slowly being eroded as attention is drawn to other producers, and to individual films. However, all of these articles are addressing fractions of the British horror cinema of the 1960s and 1970s. What is required is an examination of the two decades which shows that the genre was formed of themes, groupings, changing subcycles, and a shifting attitude. This is because currently within texts on British cinema, there is a shortage of writing which explores British horror cinema of the 1960s and 1970s using an approach which embraces a wide range of films not connected by director or production company, treats the period as separate from the 1950s, and situates it in the socio-cultural climate which produced it. Such an approach entails identifying trends, themes and recurrences of elements which occur within the period of films, which form groups of films, giving them an identity and connections.

Having identified the gaps in knowledge and formulated the research questions based on these in the introduction, what will now follow is in-depth examination of key films grouped by themes and concepts in order to interrogate the existing master narrative and present a new approach to British horror of the 1960s and 1970s.

CHAPTER 2

The Paranoid and the Postmodern in British Horror Cinema of the 1960s and the 1970s

Introduction

In the previous chapter it was demonstrated that the focus of much critical writing on British horror cinema has been on the national, cultural, or social context of those films produced during the 1950s and that there has been a lack of analysis of developments in the 1960s and 1970s. Following on from this, this chapter will establish frameworks showing that an understanding of the development of British horror after the formative 1950s period does not have to be limited by a methodology focused on placing the films in question in a national context. In order to do this, the approaches developed by Andrew Tudor and Isabel Cristina Pinedo in relation to the evolution of the horror cinema as a genre into new forms during the 1960s and 1970s will be applied to the British horror cinema of that same period.[1] Although Tudor and Pinedo's ideas are usually associated with the development of the modern American horror cinema, they do make reference to British horror films. Indeed, it is striking how much their ideas can be applied to British horror, especially as it develops during the 1960s and 1970s.

Both Tudor and Pinedo maintain that the horror genre went through a transition during the 1960s that resulted in new forms of the genre that altered the existing conventions and structures of the horror film. For Tudor, this shift was from what he defines as 'secure' horror to 'paranoid' horror,[2] and for Pinedo it involved the creation of what she terms the 'postmodern' horror film.[3] This chapter will argue that the transformations they explore actually occurred earlier in Britain than in the more

American-focused model of the horror genre that they use as the main basis for their respective works. More generally, by viewing key developments in 1960s and 1970s British horror in the light of Tudor and Pinedo's conceptualisation of horror history, the idea of a linear evolution from Hammer horror in the late 1950s to the very different productions of Pete Walker and Norman J. Warren in the mid to late 1970s is disrupted. In fact, a more fragmented picture emerges from this that demonstrates a less linear progression of British horror, but one that is actually more varied.

Due to the sheer volume of British horror films made in the 1960s and 1970s, it is helpful to apply Tudor's and Pinedo's concepts to two subgenres that spanned the two decades and would appear to be diametrically opposed groupings: the occult horror film, and the psychological horror film. These two strands of the horror genre in Britain have been less analysed and celebrated and have often been sidelined in favour of the Hammer gothic films (some of which are supernatural). Yet they both can be seen as central to the development of more modern forms of horror as it developed internationally from the early 1960s onwards. Looking at them in the context of British horror thus helps to diminish further an account of the films being limited by their national context.

In order to do this, this chapter will firstly present and explore the ideas of Tudor and Pinedo and how they can be used to chart the development of British horror cinema in the 1960s and 1970s. The following sections will use their concepts to chart the progression of British occult and psychological horror films in the 1960s and 1970s. The fact that the films to be discussed are from a variety of production companies and directors will show that the changes were not restricted to Hammer. This inclusive and chronological structure will allow a discussion of British horror cinema away from the concepts of tradition and heritage which has previously produced a 'stable' view of British horror. In doing so, this chapter will produce a map of British horror as an entity

that is liable to sudden and short term change and far more unstable than previously perceived.

Tudor and Pinedo

In his influential monograph *Monsters and Mad Scientists: a Cultural History of the Horror Movie* (1989), Andrew Tudor argues of the horror genre that "[f]rom whatever angle we approach the overall development of the genre, we encounter a distinct shift in emphasis somewhere in the sixties" involving "characteristic narratives, settings, styles, and motifs."[4] As a result of this Tudor creates two distinctive and sequential types of horror cinema categories in the time periods of pre-1960, and post-1960 which he labels 'secure' and 'paranoid' horror respectively.[5] Tudor's model of secure and paranoid horror suggests that the two categories of film are different in terms of the nature of the threat, its pursuer/victim, the expert, and the restoration of social order. In defining the two categories, Tudor states that secure horror tends to have an expert present to restore social order through the elimination of a threat within human control, whereas in paranoid horror there is a questioning of authority:

> "Here, both the nature and course of the threat are out of human control, and […] disorder often emerges from *within* humans to potentially disrupt the whole ordered world. Expertise is no longer effective; indeed experts and representatives of institutional order are often impotent in the face of impending apocalypse […] Lacking control of our inner selves, we have no means of resisting, and there is a certain inevitability to humanity's final defeat."[6]

Tudor's typology of horror involves categorising all horror films according to three key sets of oppositions concerning the nature of the threat as 1. secular/supernatural, 2. autonomous/dependent, and 3. internal/external. In this manner he differentiates between secure and paranoid horror. The secure horror that Tudor argues is dominant before the 1960s frequently uses an external and/or dependent threat in a narrative

structure whereby "instability is introduced into an apparently stable situation, the threat to stability is resisted, the threat is removed and stability is restored."[7] By contrast, Tudor's version of paranoid horror is defined through an autonomous and internal threat that is often undefeated.

Tudor summarises these differences in a table, which demonstrates that there is evidently a movement through the history of the genre that can be seen in the contrary qualities of the two tendencies of the horror film that he identifies as follows:[8]

Secure		Paranoid
Knowledge	Invasion	Metamorphosis
(closed)		(open)
successful human intervention		failed human intervention
effective expertise		ineffective expertise
authorities as credible protectors of order		escalating, unstoppable disorder
external 'distant' threats		internal 'proximate' threats
involvement with expert		involvement with victim
centre-periphery structure		family and small group structure
clearly marked known/unknown		diffuse known/unknown
life/death; secular/supernatural; human/alien; normal/abnormal matter		conscious/unconscious; normal/abnormal sexuality; social order/disorder; health/disease

It is important to note that Tudor sees a linear progression in the development of the horror genre "[t]hough there have always been instances both of *secure* and of *paranoid*

horror, historically the one has succeeded the other as the genre's dominant form"[9] in a process that focuses on the 1960s and early 1970s.

Pinedo builds on Tudor's work in a more complex manner, arguing that what she refers to as 'postmodern' horror began in 1968,[10] with *Night of the Living Dead* as her earliest key example.[11] Important to her methodology, is the idea of a shift from 'classical' to postmodern horror, wherein institutional powers and order collapse with no expert to rely on, which mirrors Tudor's secure and paranoid categories. 'Classical' horror is here akin to the 'secure' horror described by Tudor as possessing the three-part narrative that ensures the dispatching of the threat which disrupted the status quo, usually by an expert, leaving full closure and the restoration of societal order at the end of the narrative. There is "a secure Manichean worldview in which the threats to the social order are largely external and (hu)man agency prevails, largely in the figure of the masterful male subject."[12]

An interesting element of postmodern horror for Pinedo is that

a degree of license is granted to the horror film as incoherence and violation enter the narrative and visual lexicon of the genre audience through repeated viewings. Indeed, the genre audience acquires a taste for the destructuring tendency of the contemporary horror film, and a willingness not to resist it.[13]

It is in this way that the horror film can transgress existing rules and tendencies of the classical horror and develop new forms, becoming postmodern. As such, the postmodern horror film does not always have to be visually and narratively coherent.

For Pinedo, postmodern horror results in narratives containing brutal violence enacted on the body by threats that will return, as there is no narrative closure to guarantee their demise. Pinedo argues that these elements are evident in the so-called 'new wave' of American directors: "[t]he postmodern horror film is exemplified by films" made by John Carpenter, Wes Craven, and Romero amongst others.[14] At the

same time, Pinedo, like Tudor, does not always present classical and postmodern horror as entirely separate from each other. For example, Pinedo's definition of postmodern horror overlaps significantly with her definition of classical.

Specifically, argues Pinedo, the postmodern horror has the following five characteristics:

1. Horror constitutes a violent disruption of the everyday world.

2. Horror transgresses and violates boundaries.

3. Horror throws into question the validity of rationality.

4. Postmodern horror repudiates narrative closure.

5. Horror produces a bounded experience of fear.[15]

To elaborate on statement five, this means that the audience experiences fear and terror through associating with the protagonist on the screen, but unlike the protagonist they will remain safe from the physical threat which inspires the fear. It is a case of fear as a form of entertainment without any consequences.

To take Tudor and Pinedo together, there are more similarities than the nature of their categories of horror film. Namely, there is a dominance of American horror films examined in their approaches. In the case of Pinedo, her work is examining the American horror film almost exclusively, with very minimal passing references to British films, with *Dr Jekyll and Sister Hyde* (Roy Ward Baker, 1971) and *The Haunting* (Robert Wise, 1963). However, she does not examine these films in any kind of depth. Tudor states that his work covers 990 films distributed in Britain, but his arguments and examples do not focus on British films. This lack of British films examined by Tudor and Pinedo has added to the impression that American films are the true examples of this kind of horror, with this in turn masking the development of

British horror cinema within the same timeframe. To a certain extent, this reflects a broader view that new exciting forms of American horror were responsible for the eclipse of British horror during the late 1960s and 1970s.

However, Tudor highlights that there was a transitional process from secure/classical to paranoid/postmodern.[16] A similar situation occurs in Pinedo's work, as despite already naming *Night of the Living Dead* as exemplary of a postmodern horror made in the year she argues postmodern horror began, Pinedo does provide a somewhat contradictory disclaimer later that the transition from classical to postmodern was "a process of uneven development in that each film both uses and departs from the rules and that this process does not itself follow clear and definite rules."[17] As Pinedo does not name any specific films when she writes this, but instead states 'each,' this indicates that all films made had elements of the postmodern. Arguably, then, Pinedo can be seen as stating that the shift to postmodern horror was a lengthy process that produced films containing both classical and postmodern horror elements, with 'pure' postmodern horror films first present in 1968 with Romero's film. This is evident as she states that in the 1950s gothic monsters faded from use, but in reality Hammer continued to produce them, along with other companies, into the 1970s. This indicates that there was not an end of the former categories and a sudden switch to paranoid/postmodern. As such the old and new forms of horror cinema were existing simultaneously with films able to contain elements from both.

Despite the assertion that American horror became postmodern with *Night of the Living Dead*, British horror became postmodern before American horror for several reasons. The postmodern American horror is seen to have its roots in the melting pot of late 1960s war, politics, and reactive society in America. Britain had a similar set of issues in the late 1950s and early 1960s, with the shadow of the Blitz and invasion threats in the recent Second World War, a mistrust in politics with regular changes to the

government, and the collapse of the Empire that used to provide a sense of security and prestige. Society itself went through a lot of change with the shift in the role of women during the war and continuing through the two decades, youth subcultures emerging, the breakdown of traditional family structures, and challenges to patriarchal authority at home and abroad. It can be seen that right at the beginning of the 1960s there was a challenge to and decline of benevolent authority in the films produced, and a rise in internal human threats. This creates a pervading sense of paranoia that the threat is no longer visibly obvious, that it is secreted within society to threaten and wreak destruction from within. Importantly, no one is safe, there is no guaranteed help to eliminate the threat, and the potential for anyone to secretly be the killer preying on the rest of society.

For Britain, the constant state of flux in society was building to a head earlier than in America, with additional pressures including the loss of Empire and the decline in power in foreign affairs due to challenges from former colonies and protectorates. These crises can be seen feeding into the films from the beginning of the period being examined, and this needs to be both acknowledged and explored.

The rest of this chapter will apply Tudor and Pinedo's work to the British horror cinema of the 1960s and 1970s, specifically to the occult film and the psychological horror film. In doing this, this thesis will demonstrate that the trends and developments in British horror films of this period can be mapped onto the concepts developed by Tudor and Pinedo. Moreover, it will also demonstrate that the kinds of changes in horror identified by Tudor and Pinedo are not only as visible in British horror as they are in American horror, but in some instances they are appearing earlier than they do in American horror. One outcome of this will be an enhanced understanding of how British horror was undergoing significant changes from the early 1960s onwards.

The Paranoid and the Postmodern in the British Occult Subgenre in the 1960s and 1970s

Two films were released in 1960 in which a young woman is brutally stabbed to death in a hotel. One of these films was, of course, *Psycho* (Alfred Hitchcock, 1960), which for both Tudor and Pinedo is a key text in the development of a new form of horror. The other, much less well-known film was a British horror, albeit one with American settings and the girl stabbed to death in a room below the motel – *The City of the Dead*. The use of this highly disruptive narrative device of killing the main protagonist before the half way point of the narrative, along with the contemporary setting and use of younger protagonists is used to mark *Psycho* as highly influential in terms of the development of horror,[18] and postmodern horror in particular,[19] but *The City of the Dead* is a *British* film about witchcraft and has not received the same kind of attention. These films were produced more or less simultaneously, and there is no evidence that one was emulating the other. Instead, they together arguably represent important changes in the way that horror was operating generally, in particular through an increased emphasis on shock tactics. Another similarity between the films is that resolving the female protagonist's (Nan Barlow (Venetia Stevenson)) disappearance and confronting her witch killers is left to her sibling, Richard (Dennis Lotis) and boyfriend, Bill (Tom Naylor).

Tudor argues that

> [s]ecure horror is secure both in the sense that it presumes an ultimately safe world and that the modes of involvement made available to us are founded on the expectation of final security. As proxy participants we *know* that we will survive to fight another day and that we are appropriately equipped to defeat all kinds of threats. Genuine doubt is almost entirely absent.[20]

For the main protagonist to be killed so early within the narrative destroys the guarantee of survival and with it the security of the proxy participant. This fits more closely with Tudor's paranoid horror summation as follows

> [e]veryone is open to attack, and no one stands out as the inevitable locus of successful resistance. Instead we have no choice but to become involved with characters whose survival is doubtful and who, in the absence of authoritative defenders, are thrown back onto their own resources.[21]

This is true of the killing of the main protagonist in both *Psycho* and *The City of the Dead*, with the audience left to transfer their attachment to the new protagonists.

The City of the Dead is one of early examples of British horror's occult subgenre, unlike *Psycho*. The occult horror is here defined as those films which feature threats to the protagonists involving witchcraft, Satanism, cults, and other demonic threats. Unlike the 1950s, in which *Night of the Demon* (Jacques Tourneur, 1957) is the only British occult horror film, the 1960s and 1970s had a plethora of occult-themed films, allowing the subgenre to come to the fore.

The City of the Dead demonstrates that from the beginning of the 1960s, British occult horror can be seen as displaying at least some of the qualities of Tudor and Pinedo's paranoid/postmodern categories. Tudor argues of 'secure' horror that "the powers of disorder are always defeated by expertise and coercion, the genre world's authorities […] remaining credible protectors of individual and social order"[22] with a tendency towards external threats. However, in paranoid horror in particular, the nature of the threat is internal, human, and autonomous, with the figure of the witch epitomising this, as "[i]nternal threats, precisely because they are internal, often blur the distinction between known and unknown, allowing the one to conceal the disturbing co-presence of the other."[23] As will be demonstrated this can be found in the collapse of expertise, the decline of complete closure, and the diminution of authority's ability to

repel the threat, with an example of this being the destruction of the coven in *The City of the Dead* through the actions of the two young males who only know from an elderly expert that they need to use the sign of the cross.

However, this is not the only element of the paranoid/postmodern present at this time in the occult horror films. What can also be found is an erosion of authoritative structures in British occult horror which is mapped onto a gender politics in which male authority, and the rationality associated with it, is increasingly thrown into disarray by the exercise of an occult female power. With the occult as emblematic of a non-patriarchal, female, non-Christian, and irrational power, it represents an opposition to male patriarchal authority. As Carol Clover argues regarding American occult horror but equally applicable here, the films depict a crisis in contemporary masculinity through films which "depict a fundamental clash between White Science, identified with Western rational tradition and represented by white men, and Black Magic, associated with a variety of social minorities"[24] with women being one of these minorities. Male over-reliance on the fixed notion of rationality and science, and unwillingness to yield to the irrational associated with the female leaves the male exposed and at risk to challenge.[25] An undermining of patriarchy in the occult horror film is therefore an important aspect to be explored within this section, especially in the context of the privileging of male authority evident in many Hammer horror films of the 1950s.

From the early 1960s onwards in films such as *Night of the Eagle* and *The Witches* (Cyril Frankel, 1966), there is no male expert figure to destroy the threat. Previously, in Tudor's definition of 'secure horror,' the importance of an expert in the field, if not a military-linked male, who had the knowledge and the means to remove the threat permanently from the narrative and restore the status quo is emphasised.[26] Hence, without an expert the threat cannot truly be extinguished as no one possesses the required knowledge, and those representing institutional order such as Norman (Peter

Wyngarde) in the former film and Gwen (Joan Fontaine) in the latter as educators are "often impotent in the face of impending apocalypse."[27] In *Night of the Eagle* Norman, who is an authoritative university lecturer and the main protagonist, discovers his wife is a witch and forbids her use of witchcraft as an irrational obsession he does not believe in. However, as the narrative progresses he discovers that she was in fact protecting him from the rival witch, Flora (Margaret Johnston), and forbidding the use of witchcraft has allowed Flora to attack him. Norman is chased by a giant eagle that is transformed from a stone statue by Flora in a climactic scene. He becomes the hunted victim who lacks the knowledge and understanding to protect himself, and loses his power as an authoritative lecturer in the process. It is not Norman that destroys Flora, instead she is accidentally crushed by a stone eagle falling from its position on the college walls.

In *The Witches*, Gwen has to accept witchcraft as a part of her reality, and find her own way to defeat it without any assistance. Starting with being attacked by a witchdoctor in Africa, Gwen moves to the safety of rural England wherein she becomes a schoolteacher in a village which she discovers is dominated by a coven. Gwen must seek to overcome the Grandwitch Stephanie by interrupting her ritual sacrifice of Linda (Ingrid Brett) which was intended to further Stephanie's power, but she is alone in her confrontations from the beginning of the film.

Both of the 'corrupt' users of witchcraft are females seeking to use magic to take the power and privilege that belong to the male in patriarchal society. Norman is under threat from Flora once he has forced his wife, Tansy (Janet Blair) to stop using witchcraft, whilst in *The Witches*, Gwen is surrounded by ineffective men in the shape of Alan (Alec McCowen), the doctors and the male villagers who allow Gwen to be preyed-upon by Stephanie until she accepts the existence of witchcraft and is able to defeat Stephanie as coven-leader. The notion of using witchcraft to threaten the status quo of patriarchal society aligns with Tudor and Pinedo, with Tudor arguing that in

paranoid horror "[g]one is the sense of an established social and moral order which is both worth defending and capable of defence"[28] and that there is a "denial of traditional authority structures."[29] To illustrate this, Norman is only maintaining his position and success in life because of Tansy's witchcraft, as when confronted about her witchcraft paraphernalia by Norman, Tansy informs him that it is her actions that have brought him success, and not his talent; Norman's achievements are a lie that corrupts his sense of order. This demonstrates that it is the more powerful witch who effectively controls the college and society, with patriarchy being a veneer that the witchcraft conceals itself beneath. Authority is challenged in an explicitly gendered manner, with *female* occult power attacking male authority figures, with the failure of male authority figures and patriarchal power structures a common and important theme in the occult horror film.

Similarly, in *The Witches*, Stephanie as the grand witch runs the village, not her brother, Alan who sits alone impersonating a vicar, and listens to recordings of church bells and organs all day, which can be viewed here as the sounds of a patriarchal but increasingly defunct Christianity, something that Tanya Krzywinska notes is symbolic of the death of Christianity in the film[30]. Alan is clinging to a veneer of patriarchal authority, a pretence of still having any authority in the village.

Both films therefore demonstrate the diminution of male authority in society which, as I established previously, Pinedo argues is an aspect of the postmodern horror film.[31] Common to both films, however, is the notion that although the use of witchcraft can end the lives of the protagonists, it is limited to the community of the protagonist affected by it. They are parochial in nature rather than possessing the apocalyptic nature of other paranoid films that came later in the 1970s, which were more destructive with grander aims of domination.

Within *Night of the Eagle* and *The Witches*, it is important to note that as argued at the beginning of this section, the use of witchcraft within the films presents the internal

threat of the paranoid/postmodern horror of Tudor and Pinedo in the early 1960s.[32] However, there is also the breakdown of the dichotomies of human/monstrous and good/evil that existed in secure/classical horror.[33] Both films present females using witchcraft for personal gain regardless of the consequences. Even Tansy (the 'good' witch) uses witchcraft to further her husband's career and maintain her lifestyle in *Night of the Eagle*, thus presenting witchcraft as a power that can be used for good or evil, depending entirely on the nature of its user.

Tansy's position as a witch also serves to internalise the threat further, for her secret use of witchcraft to further Norman's career reveals that his 'normality' is the result of witchcraft within his home without his knowledge as head of the household, indicating that it is deeply imbedded in society. In *The Witches*, the threat is already present in the societies that Gwen makes herself a part of. In the African school, the witchdoctor is a figure in the culture of the community who repels Gwen, and in the English village the coven is formed by virtually every villager. The threats of witchcraft come from within the local population. Which makes the threats local and human, and thus also conforming to the requirements of internal threats as found in paranoid horror.

The presence of these elements of the paranoid horror film discussed above are also evident in what might initially appear to be a much more traditional and old-fashioned Hammer horror film, *The Devil Rides Out*. At first glance, the film presents the Duc de Richleau (Christopher Lee) as a male authority figure of the kind found in earlier Hammer horrors. Richleau possesses a great amount of social power as an aristocrat, and also as an expert on the occult who acts an as authoritative leader of the group of protagonists against Mocata (Charles Gray) the warlock. As the authority figure through, his power is limited in being unable to ultimately save all members of the group, resulting in broken rituals, kidnapping, death, and therefore demonstrating that Richleau is out of his depth.

In reality it is the female characters who hold true power and further undermine his potency as expert. Female occult power is superior to the rational male authority that Richleau represents. This is because in the narrative, whoever has control over Tanith's (Nike Arrighi) body can use it as a weapon against the opposing force. This includes both the control of her mind and actions, her spirit, and the actual use of her physical body. Only Tanith's spirit possessing others can find a kidnapped child, and eventually defeat Mocata. This is achieved through the death of Tanith herself which enables her to demonstrate her true power in ensuring that the Angel of Death takes Mocata in her place; Tanith literally overcomes Death through her possession of a female, non-Christian, irrational force. This demonstrates that it is the females who hold power in the occult films of the 1960s, and not the male authority figures.

By the time that British horror arrives in the 1970s, further differences and changes have occurred in the occult horror film. Firstly, the complete loss of the expert figure and consequent diminution of male authority. Secondly, within the 1970s the use of violence differs in that it is far more explicit and sexualised than in the 1960s due to the more relaxed censorship of the decade. Finally, the nature of the occult itself is also changed from the 1960s. In the 1970s, the occult horror film demonstrates a proliferation of cults rather than using witchcraft, depicting some of these cults as a viable alternative to contemporary society, with more youthful protagonists.

This manifests in different ways across different kinds of occult horror, ranging from the folk horror of *The Blood on Satan's Claw* (Piers Haggard, 1971), and *The Wicker Man* to the German-British demonic possession thriller *To the Devil a Daughter* and the ultra-low budget *Terror*, a film self-consciously influenced by Italian horror and demonstrating the impact of the international on the national. These films appear to be very different but are connected by their use of the occult as the source of horror. By examining these films it will be possible to demonstrate the changes in the occult horror

film of the 1970s and show that there was a continuance of the shift to the paranoid/postmodern horror film genre.

For all the films in this time period the nature of the threat conforms to Tudor's paranoid and Pinedo's postmodern, in that it is internal and emerging from within a seemingly civilised society. The threats are humans or carried forth by humans from within society that can manipulate occult power to bend others to their will. For example, *The Blood on Satan's Claw* and *The Wicker Man* both present internal, autonomous, and human threats to the protagonists by featuring cults that engulf the entire community. The former is a cult surrounding a demon that spreads through the younger generation that is led by Angel (Linda Hayden), the seemingly 'perfect' girl, and the latter is an entire community dedicated to an old pagan religion that lures Sergeant Howie (Edward Woodward) in with the pretence of a missing girl requiring police investigation. In terms of *To the Devil a Daughter*, Catherine (Nastassja Kinski), the daughter of protagonist John Verney's (Richard Widmark) friend, is to have Astaroth reincarnated within her by a cult she was born into. Lastly, *Terror* presents Mad Dolly (L. E. Mack) as a human witch who curses a family line, rather than a cult threatening the protagonists, but in all of these cases, the threat is a human who must channel the supernatural, rather than an explicitly otherworldly threat figure.

The lack of effective expertise within the films similarly highlights their paranoid/postmodern qualities. In each of the films, the protagonists are left to confront the threat themselves, with only *The Blood on Satan's Claw* providing limited assistance whereby the Judge (Patrick Wymark) returns at the very end of the film with a sword to dispatch the demon (Behemoth). Problematically, at the end the Judge is spattered with blood and grinning as if corrupted by the demon itself, further damaging his status. He is not an expert so much as an authority figure who leaves the village to fester, actually muttering about letting the evil grow as he departs for London. The

notion of the Judge as corrupted by the demon at the end of *The Blood on Satan's Claw* raises the issue of the lack of closure in paranoid/postmodern horror films, whereby the destruction of the threat is in doubt, leaving the narrative unresolved. The very beginning of the film implies the ability of the demon to survive death, rebuilding itself from a skull by way of corrupting individuals. Likewise, *To the Devil a Daughter* and *Terror* leave their narratives open.

To illustrate this, *Terror* simply never confirms that Mad Dolly (L. E. Mack) is physically behind the killings, but the characters presume this is the case because of the party at the beginning wherein the story of the curse and the hypnotism experiments take place. Arguably, as the final sequence has only Ann left alive when she is killed by Mad Dolly's sword flying across the room, and her already being implicated in hypnotised attacks, there is doubt cast on whether Ann is witnessing Mad Dolly or if this is the effects of the hypnotism driving her to insanity. Ann (Carolyn Courage) is hypnotised by the other characters, then starts acting as if she is possessed by Mad Dolly and attacks them. In this opening scene James (John Nolan) was screening his film which depicts the curse being declared by the burning Mad Dolly; a film within a film depicting the curse afflicting its maker. Garrick not only makes the film about Mad Dolly at the beginning of the film, but he also visits the studios wherein softcore pornography is being made, something he has just as little enthusiasm for. This constant reference to film production within the text, films within films, and reminders of the artifice of what is presented to the audience prevents diegetic absorption and reminds the viewer that although witchcraft is accepted, the stories attached to it may very well not be, further casting doubt on the identity of the killer. For this reason both the protagonists and the audience presume that it is Mad Dolly killing the individuals. There is no concrete evidence to support the theory and the matter is never fully resolved. It is possible that Ann is possessed by Dolly, or still residually under hypnosis

and viewing the film about Dolly's curse has forced her hypnotised self to attempt to fulfil it.

To the Devil a Daughter arguably conforms to the paranoid and postmodern horror film criteria that are set by Tudor and Pinedo. It displays a self-consciously fractured narrative which renders it a very different viewing experience from Hammer's previous Dennis Wheatley horror adaptation, *The Devil Rides Out*. The film increasingly loses its narrative sense to the point where the climax of the film at the final set-piece lacks both cohesion and closure, with Dennis Wheatley disparaging the film that was an adaptation of his novel.[34] As stated earlier, Pinedo posits that "a postmodern work breaks down boundaries, transgresses genres, and is characterized by incoherence"[35] and as a result does not always have to make complete sense to the audience. Further to this, Pinedo later states that "[i]n postmodern horror, causal logic collapses even when the narrative entertains a logical explanation for the chaos."[36] Due to these two assertions, the lack of plausibility and coherence in the film allows it to be viewed as increasingly postmodern. To elaborate, this final sequence involves the rebirth of Astaroth as a demonic creature within a ritual that is halted by throwing a rock with a follower's blood on it at Father Michael Rainer (Christopher Lee). The antagonist is killed as a result although it appears to have been incidental and was not planned at the writing stage of pre-production. Problematically, a shot of Catherine (Nastassja Kinski) wiping drops of Astaroth's blood from her forehead and not answering to her name suggests that Rainer may have accidentally finished the ceremony and reincarnated Astaroth in Catherine's body after all. As a result, the film does not make narrative sense, refuses closure, and does not follow the three-part narrative structure required for the secure category of horror film that Tudor describes. Looser narratives, the collapse of causal logic, less exposition and lack of complete narrative closure demonstrate the postmodern qualities of the film.

Secure horror implies the need for order, which in western society is supported through patriarchal authority, and although there is a restoration of male authority in the 1970s, it is an ambivalent one. In both *To the Devil a Daughter* and *The Wicker Man*, Christopher Lee portrays an authority figure, but importantly, it is a negative one. In *The Blood on Satan's Claw*, patriarchal authority is restored at the end of the film, however, there is a strong implication that the Judge has been corrupted. These negative males played by Lee represent a strong patriarchal power which can exert control over and subjugate both women and other men, with no qualms over the use of violence. *The Wicker Man* features Lord Summerisle (Christopher Lee) who with the aid of his community burns a victim alive to appease pagan gods, whilst *To the Devil a Daughter* uses an excommunicated priest, Father Michael Rayner (Christopher Lee), who seeks to reincarnate an occult god in the body of a girl who was bred and indoctrinated for the purpose. Importantly, neither leader can achieve their ambitions without the use of women. Sergeant Howie (Edward Woodward) is lured to the island to investigate reports of a missing girl, and sexually-tempted repeatedly by Willow (Britt Ekland) to ensure he remains on the island and attends the festival in which he is burned alive. Sergeant Howie is himself an authority figure, and his failure to detect the threat to himself from the pagan islanders demonstrates that traditional patriarchal authority can be undermined and attacked by groups that do not conform to the dominant patriarchal society, which in this case is the island cult that refuses to adhere to the laws and behaviours of the dominant patriarchal society of the mainland..

To the Devil a Daughter similarly demonstrates that male authority figures require women as a source of their power, since Rainer can only reincarnate Astaroth through Catherine (Nastassja Kinski), who was only available for use by Rayner due to the indoctrination of her mother and unwilling cooperation of her father. Without Catherine, Rayner cannot realise his ambitions and gain power from Astaroth. As a result, Rayner

is forced to compete with occult novelist John Verney (Richard Widmark) for control of Catherine and the power she represents. Both Father Rainer and Lord Summerisle are figures of social power as a priest and Lord who controls a pagan community respectively, but they are also isolated from society as Rayner is excommunicated and Summerisle is on an island only accessible by boat. As such they have been cast out of conventional patriarchal society and attack it from new positions of power as the leaders of cults.

Nevertheless, without the females that serve them these negative authority figures cannot achieve their goals. As with the decline of male experts in the occult horror film, there is demonstrably a diminution of male authority and power in the figure of the threat who must now rely on females as a source of their power, which has been displayed to some extent already in *The Devil Rides Out*. This significance of the female as source of power here, and in other occult films is highlighted through a propensity to feature females as those who possess the power, with the male characters desiring to use, take, or at the very least share in it. This can be through resurrection of powerful female ancestors (*Curse of the Crimson Altar* (Vernon Sewell, 1968) and *Satan's Slave* (Norman J. Warren, 1976)), or through sacrifice to gain power (*Virgin Witch* (Ray Austin, 1972)). By using these figures of social authority, the films are also critiquing this kind of patriarchal authority. Both Rainer and Summerisle present an alternative to the Christian Church that communities have formed around, albeit highly questionable ones that are presented as cults. The logics behind these alternatives may be flawed and dangerous, but they are appealing to the groups that have formed around them, with their leaders and followers explaining them in an articulate and calm manner, thus undermining the attacks that are made on them by the male protagonists seeking to prevent them from achieving their goals.

Pinedo's necessity for bodily violence and destruction of the body is fulfilled completely in *To the Devil a Daughter*, since there are two birth scenes with one involving a glowing demonic child clawing its way out of a woman's stomach, a second gory scene of Catherine's birth, an orgy involving rape and sex with a statue, throat-slittings, stabbings, spontaneous combustions, and Rainer's (Christopher Lee) death at the end of the film. In Rainer's cult, the child's birth requires the destruction of the mother. For it is only through killing mothers that he will be able to create a lifeform that will grant him power. To illustrate this, the first birth scene involves Margaret (Isabella Telezynska) having her arms tied to the bedframe and her legs strapped together to prevent vaginal birth, forcing the demonic child to tear through her stomach and kill her. Rainer's only regard is only for the 'child,' and unlike everyone else present he does not turn away from the abject scene, but instead grins and gains pleasure from the suffering and brutal destruction of the female in this corruption of birth which is already abject. This destruction of the body is used in tandem with the contemporary, bleak, realist style of the film to create a sense of grim inevitability and the inescapability of suffering which afflicts all of the characters in the film to varying degrees.

Terror utilises brutal violence repeatedly, and especially against women. The violence itself is bloody, bodily, and graphic. Between the scenes of sex films being produced, the destruction of the human body is made into several dramatic set-pieces. These include characters being run over by seemingly sentient cars and decapitation with broken sheets of glass, all under the influence of Dario Argento's *Suspiria* (1977) in terms of camera shots and the coloured lighting.[37] One of the most significant deaths in terms of destruction of the human body and the female in particular, features Carol (Glynis Barber) being chased through the woods by an unseen assailant, then graphically stabbed with multiple knives against a tree, resulting in her being pinned to

said tree by the knives she is impaled with. Hers is the first and most brutal of the deaths within the film, conforming to Pinedo's requirement for postmodern horrors to present brutal bodily violence against the human body, especially that of the female. The female deaths, however, began with males burning the female witch, Dolly, alive at the stake. By doing so they are subjecting her to a long and painful death hundreds of years before the main narrative of the film, which witnesses her curse and potential return. This death is the first scene of the narrative and is revealed to be part of a new film which certain characters have made and are displaying to their friends.

Brutal violence is not limited to the late 1970s. In the earlier *The Blood on Satan's Claw*, there is a sexualised violent ritual to rebuild the demon that involves a game of blind man's bluff with Cathy blindfolded, Angel silently selecting a male, and the group removing Cathy's clothes and aiding her rape by the chosen boy. Placed on an altar-like stone in a ruined church in the isolated woods, the cult members caress her with branches, one speaks an 'incantation' that repeats and builds in pace with the rape, and at the climax Angel plunges a dagger into Cathy which substitutes for the climax of the rapist. A male teenager is blindfolded and killed ritualistically, but there is no onscreen depiction of rape, bodily violence, and group involvement to the extent that Cathy experiences. This demonstrates that it is the female nudity and experience of bodily violence that is of interest in the film. Pinedo argued that bodily violence against the female was a postmodern element of the horror film,[38] and *The Blood on Satan's Claw* certainly falls into this category where gender and violence is concerned. This is further emphasised as the violence which is presented to the audience, is enacted *by the female upon the female* and demonstrates that it is the matriarch of the group who possesses power over life, death, sexuality, and the body, and thus patriarchy is undermined by Angel.

This undermining of patriarchy by Angel is representative of the destabilisation of the existing social order within the paranoid/postmodern horror film.[39] Specifically, in *The Blood on Satan's Claw*, the cult leader, Angel (Linda Hayden), controls sexuality and violence in the film in order to obtain her desires for the cult and therefore undermine the existing patriarchal order in two key ways: to attempt to gain the allegiance of Reverend Fallowfield (Anthony Ainley) and therefore undermine patriarchy in the village, and the sacrificial stabbing of females being raped on an altar wherein she controls the blade and decides who dies. When she presents herself to the Reverend, she strips and remains static as a display for both the male within the film and the audience watching the film, making herself an offering in return for the support of both sets of males and their abandonment of societal systems which they follow; Angel wants the Reverend to give up his god, and his positions of power both in the patriarchal village and the church. However, the Reverend resists Angel's naked body and forces her to leave the church. This does not halt her progress to power, and she continues to remove body parts from her sacrifices in sexualised rituals in order to increase her control.

As has been demonstrated, the occult horror films of the 1960s and 1970s adhere to the concepts of the paranoid and postmodern horror that are put forth by Tudor and Pinedo. This was evident from the very beginning of the 1960s with *The City of the Dead*, which overturns preconceptions that the horror cinema of Britain was still emulating the 1950s Hammer gothics, and that the US was leading the way in terms of the development of the genre itself. The subgenre developed throughout the two decades, producing landmark films and altering its content to reflect a changing situation in the socio-cultural environment which produced it, especially in terms of the questioning of male authority which shall be examined in greater depth in a later chapter.

However, it is not only occult horror films that demonstrated the shift towards the paranoid/postmodern horror genre. The next section will argue that the psychological horror film also followed a similar trajectory and became paranoid/postmodern in nature earlier than previously thought.

The Paranoid and the Postmodern in the British Psychological Subgenre in the 1960s and 1970s

By virtue of the nature of its threat, the psychological horror film arguably presents itself as already belonging to the paranoid/postmodern category of horror film as defined by Tudor and Pinedo. The threat tends to take the form of an internal, autonomous, human monster, the likes of which are described by Tudor as

> victims of overpowering impulses that well up from within; monsters brought forth by the sleep of reason, not by its attractions. Horror-movie psychotics murder, terrorize, maim and rape because of some inner compulsion, because the psyche harbours the dangerous excesses of human passion.[40]

Tudor remarks that the 1960s is the decade when films of this nature began to flourish,[41] having previously been a marginal, although "essentially paranoid conception,"[42] and thus indicating the importance of the 1960s for examination of the psychological horror film. It is striking, as was the case with occult horror, that the films to be discussed here are often seen by critics as marginal to the development of a more gothic-centred model of British horror.

Hammer produced a series of films that sought to capitalise on the success of *Psycho*. This is clear from the single-word titles of the films as much as it is from the narrative content: *Paranoiac* (Freddie Francis, 1964), *Hysteria* (Freddie Francis, 1965), *Fanatic* (aka *Die! Die! My Darling!* Silvio Narizzano, 1965), *Nightmare* (Freddie Francis, 1964), and *Maniac* (Michael Carreras, 1963). However, Hammer could not risk

the condemnation and backlash that *Peeping Tom* received, and thus sought to emulate

something more akin to *Les Diaboliques* (Henri-Georges Clouzot, 1955) and *Psycho*.

The killers presented are wholly non-supernatural, less sympathetic, their psychologies

are less analysed, and the focus is more on the domestic setting. In this way, the films

are less strongly associated with *Peeping Tom*. The more 'lurid' films came towards the

end of the decade. This chapter section shall trace the psychological horror film in

Britain as it progresses through the two decades, beginning with *Peeping Tom*, the

emergence of what might be termed the proto-slasher, and through a more lurid

grouping of psychological horrors in the late 1960s and early 1970s, which all feature

young killers whose compulsion to kill is linked to the family that produced them.

    Peeping Tom is a significant and controversial film released in 1960, just as *Psycho*

and *The City of the Dead* were. *Psycho* signified a turning point in American horror

with a sympathetic killer, and a familial backstory providing an explanation for his

psychosis, just as *Peeping Tom* demonstrated that British horror had become paranoid

using this same kind of formula. The film focuses on Mark (Carl Boehm), a young man

obsessed with filming expressions of terror at the moment of death and whose mental

instability and obsessions were caused by his father performing psychological

experiments on him as a child.

    Peeping Tom is an example of Tudor's 'paranoid' and Pinedo's 'postmodern' in

British horror in 1960, yet neither of them examines this film in depth. To apply

Tudor's methodology, the 'monster' here is a secular, internal, and autonomous threat,

and also a sympathetic human monster protagonist, whose demise does not return the

narrative to the original status quo of the film's opening of Mark murdering women

because this is destroyed with his death. Therefore, Mark's death does not complete the

more traditional three-part narrative structure of the 'secure' horror, but instead

produces a new status quo of apparent order with the protagonist who is also the threat

removed from society. Mark himself, as the monster/threat, embodies Tudor's argument of the threat in paranoid horror wherein "[t]hreats emerge without warning from the disordered psyche or from disease, possessing us and destroying our very humanity. Lacking control of our inner selves, we have no means of resisting, and there is a certain inevitability to humanity's final defeat."[43] That this film uses a demonstrably sympathetic killer caused great contention with critics, and Sue Harper is scathing in her response even in 2000:

> The film is (as many male critics have suggested) powerful, compassionate and self-reflexive. But it needs to be said that, morally *Peeping Tom* is a loathsome film. It colludes with, and celebrates, men's physical power over women. Its compassion is reserved for the perpetrator of the sexual crime rather than for his victims, who are forced to watch their own faces as they are impaled on his spike.[44]

Problematically, Harper emphasises that it is *male* critics seeking to redeem the film, positioning herself as opposing the film on a gender basis and implying that women cannot support the film due to a misogynistic attitude within the text, and importantly for this piece she highlights that the film interpolates the viewer into emphasising and identifying with the killer. Writing later than Harper, is Bruce F. Kawin, who posits that the morality of the film is not flawed, but shows compassion for both Mark *and* his victims, demonstrating that Mark's father is ultimately responsible for torturing his son and turning him 'mad.'[45] This humanises Mark and presents scientific reasoning for his actions rather than employing him as a mindless killer to be removed from society. With a cause for his actions based on science, there is the possibility of rehabilitation and the implications that society produced a killer that has been failed by those who raised him; he is a sympathetic monster who was as much a victim as the women he murdered.

To use Pinedo's work on postmodern horror concerning brutal violence enacted upon women, *Peeping Tom* is an extremely self-reflexive film which positions the viewer as voyeur and implicates them in the scopophilic and violent murders. In the first

scene the prostitute breaks the fourth wall in addressing the camera and its unseen

operator, thus positioning the viewer as the camera-operator, the prostitute's customer,

and the killer. Presenting the prostitute as the first victim which the audience is aware of

further cements the connection between sex and violence, particularly bodily violence

against women through the brutal murder of the prostitute seen through Mark's camera

lens, which is another indicator of Pinedo's postmodern horror film. Mark's films of

violent murders present encapsulated episodes of horror narratives contained within an

overarching structure, generating a constant emphasis on self-reflexivity. They are

presented through Mark's camera lens and therefore incriminate the audience; on the

projector screen one step removed from involvement; from a subjective viewpoint as

Mark impales his victim. Similarly, the manner in which Mark repeatedly views his

films breaks the diegetic absorption of the viewing experience by reminding the

audience of the artifice of the film, and reminds the viewer of the nature of film as an

object for an audience.

Mark's destruction also ends his father's legacy, wherein the patriarchal order of

the father, an expert in the psychiatric field, created a monstrous son. However, it can

also be argued that patriarchy failed and matriarchy triumphed, for it is Helen's (Anna

Massey) blind mother, Mrs Stephens (Maxine Audley), who suspected Mark of wrong-

doing long before the authorities. However, it is possible to take a psychoanalytic view

of Mrs Stephens as a blind oracle figure; as one who possesses other abilities of

perception, with her power signified by the white cane she carries as a stand-in for the

phallus as the symbol of power within the patriarchal system that she resides in.

Lacking one physical ability of vision marks her as one who possesses other skills

which give her power within society. As we will later see, blind women are important in

other films. This links to the later *Hands of the Ripper* in which the blind Laura (Jane

Merrow) is the only woman to survive Anna's (Angharad Rees) urges to kill. A lack of

physical sight marks these women out by highlighting their difference, but also ensures the survival of these particular women. They have insight instead of physical sight, but it also results in the protagonists underestimating these women.

In the late 1960s and early 1970s, there was another cluster of more lurid psychological horrors with a focus on character studies and the inefficacy of masculinity as a source of authority. *Blind Terror* (Richard Fleischer, 1971), *Whoever Slew Auntie Roo?* (Curtis Harrington, 1972), *Fright* (Peter Collinson, 1971), *The Flesh and Blood Show* (Pete Walker, 1972), and *Twisted Nerve* are examples of these productions. In each case, the killer is psychologically compelled to act on their violent instincts, with the authorities struggling to discover and/or control the perpetrator.

One such example of this situation is *Twisted Nerve* which is claimed as both a thriller,[46] and a horror film.[47] It is considered here as one of three important psychological horror films along with *Peeping Tom* and *Hands of the Ripper* which will be examined in this chapter. This is because they conform to Tudor's assertion that paranoid horror films "can be seen as expressing a profound insecurity about ourselves, and accordingly the monsters of the period are increasingly represented as part of an everyday landscape."[48] All of them present ordinary individuals from society who became compelled to kill on impulse.

Twisted Nerve was controversial upon its release due to linking Down's Syndrome with criminality,[49] despite the opening disclaimer.[50] It is a film that is argued by Spicer to be part of a group of films that came after *Peeping Tom* which attempted to use the same themes of a sensitive hero with visceral horror visuals, the problem being that these "[s]ubsequent contemporary versions were less powerful."[51] Martin (Hywel Bennett) is infantilised by his mother (Phyllis Calvert) and refuses to become a useful member of society at his stepfather's (Frank Finlay) insistence that he get a job. His

stepfather tries to send him out of the country, literally 'exporting' an undesirable family member that has no use as a productive member of patriarchy.

Thus, Martin becomes a 'cuckoo' in Joan (Billie Whitelaw) and Susan's (Hayley Mills) matriarchal lodging house, with an alternate childlike personality called Georgie that he calls upon when needed. Martin is an internal threat, one which uses a different masquerade to Anna of *Hands of the Ripper*, in that his façade is childlike and prompts society to care for him as a helpless and harmless individual. In reality he acts out his patricidal desires and removes his father figure in a case of oedipal wish-fulfilment, leaving his mother free to return to without his stepfather getting in the way, almost achieving the perfect murder with his alibis and alter ego.

Problematically, there are 'experts' in the form of doctors and the police, but they are ineffective in identifying and arresting Martin. Instead Susan is the one to determine Martin is the killer and bring about the events leading to his arrest. The experts and male authority figures fail in their roles of safeguarding the protagonists. Martin still has his Georgie persona in place at the end of the film and is simply arrested instead of dead, which implies that there is a potential for the killer to return. Therefore, the audience is denied complete closure, allowing the film to conform more to the paranoid/postmodern category in that "*this* story is complete, but there still remains some possibility of a continued threat"[52]

Insanity is also behind the emergence of the proto-slasher, before the popularity of American slasher films, in both *The Flesh and Blood Show*, and *Fright*. Where *The Flesh and Blood Show* is concerned, the film contains no effective 'expert,' patriarchal order is disrupted and despite the beginnings of the final girl phenomenon in Walker's work, the main female protagonist is about to be killed as the credits roll allowing the monster to return again. The father-daughter team of killers manages to enact brutal violence upon their victims, as Pinedo's paranoid category requires, and arrange the

nude corpses like trophies for their next victims to find. As a horror film, this belongs to the slasher subgenre (which is a category that did not exist at the time), and like many slasher films the identity of the killer is unknown for the majority of the film. There is also a flashback sequence which, when the identity of the killer is revealed, gives explanation for the killings as vengeance for a past act, which is an accepted convention of the American slasher films including *Prom Night* (Paul Lynch, 1980), *Halloween* (John Carpenter, 1978) and *Friday the 13th* (Sean S. Cunningham, 1980) which Carol Clover writes of.[53] As a slasher film, the 'final girl', as it were, is stronger than her male counterparts, possesses the knowledge to stay alive, and is the least sexually active which is key to avoiding death in the film, for the characters are killed in order of partaking in sexual activity.

Similarly, *Fright* is an example of a proto-slasher one year prior to *The Flesh and Blood Show*. A killer who upon discovering that his wife, Helen (Honor Blackman) has just divorced him, escapes from a mental institution to confront her no matter the cost. The film adheres to the paranoid/postmodern categories by employing an internal, human monster with a propensity for violence against the protagonists, the experts are ineffective, and the status quo is not fully restored. The first half of the film revolves around him stalking and then terrorising Amanda (Susan George). In the process, the film uses the generic conventions of the slasher genre, with the ideas of the 'final girl' in Amanda, the sexually active character being killed first (Amanda's boyfriend Chris (Dennis Waterman)), the final girl possessing 'sight' and knowledge of the slasher's existence, and her killing the slasher after her continual confrontation with him.

These films are part of a key moment in the adaptation of the horror genre, especially where the psychological horror film is concerned, and not just for British horror but for the genre internationally by presenting the conventions of the slasher genre, which marks them as proto-slashers, as it were, as well as being prominent

examples of the paranoid/postmodern horror film. This is due to the lack of closure such as Amanda's screaming being the last images of *Fright*, permanent disruption of the status quo through the high body count and revelation of Arnold Gates' daughter in *The Flesh and Blood Show*, the internal human threats, brutal violence (especially against women), and ineffective males with no expertise. Another important element of the killers discussed in this piece, is that they emerge from within the family.

The use of killers emerging as internal threats produced by families continued throughout the decade. Where the films focusing on insanity and mentally-unstable killers are concerned, the popularity of psychologist R. D. Laing in the time period and his approach wherein the family is the cause of psychological breakdown[54] is arguably evident as an influence on both of Hammer's *Hands of the Ripper*, and the lesser known *Demons of the Mind* which will be discussed in the chapter concerning family in British horror. These two films continue the thread from the previous timeframe of films by their use of insanity as the reason for the murders, but importantly as a progression in the psychological horror post-*Peeping Tom* this is a state of mind in the young killer caused by the family. They are both Hammer gothic horrors, but differ from previous Hammer gothics in that they are psychological gothics, with a purely secular threat that emerges from within the family and kills on compulsion. In both films there is also a breakdown of traditional patriarchal authority and gender roles, with authority unable to contain the threat or maintain control over the female.

Hammer's *Hands of the Ripper* is an interesting development in the psychological horror subgenre of the period. The film revolves around Jack the Ripper's daughter, Anna (Angharad Rees) who is compelled to kill when exposed to flickering light after witnessing her father kill her mother in similar lighting in childhood. The use of Jack the Ripper is not insignificant at this point, as the figure was the subject of several films over the 1960s and 1970s, namely *Jack the Ripper* (Robert S. Baker and Monty

Berman, 1959), *A Study in Terror* (James Hill, 1965), *Hands of the Ripper*, and *Murder By Decree* (Bob Clark, 1979). This emphasises the longevity of the very British historical killer, and also that the potential of his threat will always return, much like Baron Frankenstein and Dracula. Therefore there is no true closure, which adds to the postmodern/paranoid quality of the film.

For both Anna and Mark of *Peeping Tom*, the killings are compulsive and due to the immoral actions of their fathers in their childhoods conditioning them into killing as young adults. Both are the internal threat of 'paranoid' horror, seemingly normal until their subconscious id is released and forces them to kill. The murders are both the means and the end. In the case of Anna, there is a case for Joan Rivière's theory of womanliness as masquerade,[55] which shall be discussed in more details below.

Anna is always acted upon by others, instructed in what to wear, how to behave, where to go and with whom, by both the fraudulent medium (Dora Bryan) and Dr. Pritchard (Eric Porter). She possesses no agency and therefore adheres to the subordinate position of female who lacks the phallus in the patriarchal order. However, when she is exposed to flickering light, she unleashes a form of overactive agency in her killings, specifically through stabbings and impalings. With the obvious use of psychoanalysis which the film covers in Pritchard's Freudian expertise, these weapons are indicative of possession of the phallus, and therefore the ownership of agency. Where masquerade theory is concerned, Anna's possession of agency is concealed beneath the face and behaviour – the masquerade – of femininity which allows her to avoid identification and punishment for possession of the phallus and agency which is a transgression of patriarchy.[56] Here, there is an expert in the form of Pritchard which would adhere to the 'secure' horror of Tudor, but his questionable attempts to control Anna via Freudian psychology result in an increasing bodycount that he conceals. His eventual failure to exert any control as the expert authority figure conforms to Tudor's

'paranoid' category of horror, wherein the failure of authority, especially patriarchal, is demonstrative of a shift from secure horror. The film presents the female masquerade that a male is aware of but cannot control, thus presenting a female with great power that she is oblivious to and cannot regulate. It is the danger of women who possess agency inside the patriarchal system of western society. This is a subject which will be dealt with in greater depth in the next chapter on the role of the female in British horror.

Conclusion

The psychological and occult horror films of the 1960s and 1970s demonstrate that British horror displayed paranoid/postmodern tendencies from the beginning of the 1960s and this increased progressively over the two decades. The two landmark films *Peeping Tom* and *The City of the Dead* use internal, human threats with no experts to protect the protagonists from violence and death, and allow authority to be successfully undermined. That they were both released in 1960 with such strong similarities in paranoid/postmodern qualities demonstrates that both the occult and psychological horror cycles are much more connected than would appear on the surface.

By using the work of Tudor and Pinedo it has been established that British horror cinema was paranoid/postmodern. This chapter has demonstrated that British horror was not staid and secure/classical, but able to progress and change in a comparable manner to that of other countries such as America. Importantly this progression was not limited to one subgenre and covered a wide range of filmic types and as such was not an isolated incident. Therefore, it has been possible to illustrate that the Hammer gothic horror was not the dominant form of British horror cinema, nor was its formula held up previously as emblematic of 'British horror' the singular form of the genre. British

horror was changing throughout the 1960s and 1970s in a manner previously thought to be the domain of American horror cinema.

As such, this chapter has acted as an overture, allowing the rest of this work to focus on specific areas of British horror cinema now that the complexity and progressiveness of the British horror genre has been established. There have been issues highlighted in this chapter that shall be explored fully in the next ones, including the undermining of male authority, the lack of credible experts, the threat emerging from within the family unit, and the increase in female power. This highlights the interconnectivity of the elements of the genre that would at first glance seem separate. The next chapter shall focus on the representation of the female in British horror of the 1960s and 1970s.

CHAPTER 3

Women and femininity in British Horror Cinema of the 1960s and 1970s

Introduction

This chapter discusses changes in the nature of female representation in British horror throughout the 1960s and 1970s. To a certain extent, the possibilities available to female characters in horror of this period might be seen as encompassed by the likes of Penny (Susan Strasberg) in Hammer's *A Taste of Fear* (Seth Holt, 1961) and Carol (Catherine Deneuve) in Roman Polanski's Compton production *Repulsion* (1965). The former, confined to a wheelchair and tormented by mysterious conspirators, is offered as the quintessential victim – helpless, fearful and isolated. The latter is the woman as dangerously insane, in effect a monster, who slashes two men to death in the course of the narrative. Yet in both cases, these apparently stereotypical characters turn out to be more complex and ambiguous than this account of them suggests. It turns out that Penny is not actually Penny at all but only pretending to be that person in order to uncover a criminal conspiracy; she is revealed as resourceful, courageous and far from physically handicapped. Carol, by contrast, is presented as exceptionally vulnerable and in many regards a victim herself.

Both *A Taste of Fear* and *Repulsion* stand outside the gothic mainstream represented by Hammer period horror and have sometimes been seen more as psychological thrillers than horror films (although *A Taste of Fear* was marketed alongside Hammer's gothic horrors and both films are replete with horror iconography). However, they are also frequently claimed as horror films in academia.[1] For all their apparent marginality in the genre, the uncertainties and instabilities that accumulate around the characters of Penny and Carol are indicative of wider shifts in the way that women are being represented in horror of this period. In particular, the sense of

femininity as something that is simultaneously performative and associated with insanity suggests an inability or unwillingness on the part of the films to locate these women in relation to traditional categories and identities.

It seems obvious that changes in the way that women are presented not just in British horror films but British culture in general connect in some way or other with contemporaneous societal shifts. However, as we will see, British horror film-makers inflect contextual material in quite distinctive ways in both the 1960s and the 1970s. It could be argued that many of the changes experienced by women during the 1960s and 1970s had their roots in the 1950s. As Caine argues:

> [i]n the period after the war, and more particularly in the late 1950s and 1960s, there was much attention paid to the woman question, on radio, in fiction, and in social, psychological, and sociological research. Indeed, by 1964, conservative weeklies like *The Spectator* were expressing fears at the signs "of the multitude of discussions."[2]

There was a growing acceptability of working wives supplementing household income[3] which undermined the male role as breadwinner, and the intervention of the state in the raising of children with the welfare state which for girls growing up in the 1950s "secured for them standards of nutrition, medical care and educational provision to an extent unknown in their mothers' generation, and provided the route from grammar school to university."[4] This altered the expectations that they had of life post-school so that motherhood was not the obvious option and careers were increasingly appealing for women.

The position of women in society was being questioned by a growth in consumerism aimed at women who were increasingly entering the workplace, and the steady rise of second wave feminism. This was combined with several pieces of legislation and important changes in the 1960s which decriminalised aspects of homosexuality, made divorce quicker and more accessible, and the distribution of the contraceptive pill. In this manner sex was increasingly separated from marriage and

from its purpose of procreation throughout the 1960s, with Zweiniger-Bargielowska arguing that until the 1960s the extramarital birth rate was quite stable and that there was an increase in sexual activity in the younger generations.[5]

On the surface, these changes would appear to increase sexual freedom for women, but there is a secondary argument possible here that the real benefit was for men as women were increasingly sexually available with fewer consequences, rendering the position of women in society as questionable. The issues of perceived freedoms for women actually benefiting men was recognised and highlighted in the rise of second wave feminism and the circulation of feminist writings from both America and Britain, with some being an

> antidote to the permissive 1960s, which in practice led to expectations that women be more sexually available to men who were to acknowledge less responsibility for their sexual activities. British culture in the 1960s has also been characterised by new or revived kinds of liberatory thinking and thus supplied both the modes of thought and the contradictions which nurtured a feminist resurgence.[6]

The movement gained momentum with the1970 Equal Pay Act linked to the media event surrounding women striking for equal pay at the Dagenham Ford factory in 1968,[7] the protests against the London Miss World competition, and the first British National Women's Liberation Conference in Oxford which united previously disparate groups and set the four demands of free contraception, abortions, equal pay, education and childcare.[8] Lovenduski claims that the roots of second wave feminism in Britain were numerous, including influences from American feminists, militancy among working-class women, the rise of the Student Left, Marxist groups, female activists with experience in the Vietnam Solidarity Campaign, and the Women's Peace Group commemorating fifty years of female suffrage in 1968.[9] This combined with the 1970 publication of Germaine Greer's *The Female Eunuch* and its media attention leading it to be widely read and used for discussion, misinterpretation and quotation in the popular

media regarding female sex and sexuality, followed by marches in Liverpool and London on International Women's Day in March 1971.

It is striking though that while British horror films might be seen as responding to and reacting against some of these changes, they rarely, if ever, do so in explicit terms. The only overt reference within the films to contemporaneous events and shifts in the role of women is 'votes for women' daubed across a wall in the street in *Hands of the Ripper* which is arguably a reference to the rise of second wave feminism when the film was produced. Through this process of mediation at play within the films, it will be possible within this thesis to trace the ways in which their representations of women filtered the changing situation for women in society.

Within this, one can identify particular strategies that operate across apparently disparate groups of horror films and which are evident in *A Taste of Fear* and *Repulsion*. One aspect is the association of the woman with abjection. Abjection is key to the horror film, with Barbara Creed building on the work of Julia Kristeva in giving historical conceptions of the abject which are key to constructing the monstrous in horror cinema as "sexual immorality and perversion; corporeal alteration, decay and death; human sacrifice; murder; the corpse; bodily wastes; the feminine body and incest."[10] The abject is the place where boundaries and meaning collapses, and thus poses a danger to the subject as that which must be avoided, a potential polluting influence, and must be "propelled away from the body and deposited on the other side of an imaginary border which separates the self from that which threatens the self."[11] The use of abjection is most obvious with *Repulsion* wherein Carol is increasingly surrounded by corpses from the skinned rabbit she leaves out in the room, to the bodies of the men whom she kills, but abjection is found more implicitly with *A Taste of Fear* through the manner in which Penny is associated with her father's corpse; she is the only one who can see the dead body and is driven to mental instability by it.

Carol is an abject female for several reasons. She fails to conform to the desires of the males in the diegesis, refuses to communicate with the rest of society, surrounds herself with decay in the apartment including the rotting skinned rabbit, and reacts violently by killing males in the final stages of the narrative. Her descent into catatonia makes her 'faulty' and therefore furthers her abject status. The eruption of violence is against those males who sought control over her mentally and physically, namely by murdering her boyfriend and landlord who were angered by being refused sexual favours.

The abject within horror cinema presents another way of binding British horror into the international development of the genre. This can be seen in early 1960s horror such as *Psycho* wherein the mother is a preserved corpse in the cellar connected to Norman Bates (Anthony Perkins) and his mental illness which consumes him. Insanity and death originate in the female in British horror.

Another aspect is the masquerade of womanliness. This is represented in the revelation that Penny is actually Maggie, which demonstrates that a strong, independent, and active female was hidden behind a pretence of a weak figure who is acted upon by others, in other words, the standard set for the female in patriarchy. For Carol in *Repulsion* she must keep this mask in place outside of her home and behave as an ideal woman for those in her daily life, and once it slips she becomes increasingly mentally unstable and violent. This is what has been termed the masquerade of womanliness by Joan Rivière, meaning that the female protects herself from reprisals by concealing her true nature behind a mask of ideal femininity.[12] By employing this mask, the woman is able to act out her desires under the cover of a deceit. By presenting womanliness as a disguise, there is a possibility that all females are employing this same pretence and it cannot be trusted. The masquerade of womanliness is a concept that can be found in British horror cinema, and will be explored in this chapter more fully as a

device for female concealment and subterfuge, especially in terms of the female as monster and threat.

Taste of Fear and *Repulsion* serve to demonstrate that women were emerging as protagonists within their own right in the early 1960s. Importantly, they illustrate two forms of female threat that need to be examined, namely the abject female, and the female who employs the masquerade of femininity. By interrogating these representations of the female in British horror cinema within this thesis and applying their concepts to case studies of individual films, the place of the female within the genre can be reassessed.

The abject female in British horror

To elaborate on the nature of the abject female first, she is threatening because of what she represents rather than what she does or says, owing to her often being a silent and seemingly passive figure whose form is the source of the horror. The concept of abjection can be applied to the female: the female body is already physically abject due to its maternal functions that betray its debt to nature; it is the physical difference to the male body with the role of child birth, the association with blood and bodily fluids which the male is not. There is a secondary form whereby the woman who refuses to adhere to the gender roles ascribed to the female in patriarchal society is marked as abject.[13] Another form of the abject is physical: blood, bodily fluids, the border of the human and inhuman being breached, abnormal sexual desire, the corpse.[14] Within the horror film the abject is commonly featured by blood, bodily wastes, the corpse, and "[w]ere-creatures, whose bodies signify a collapse of the boundaries between human and animal, also belong to this category."[15] In the case of the female monster, "the abject is placed on the side of the feminine: it exists in opposition to the paternalistic

symbolic, which is governed by rules and laws,"[16] and as a result this female must be destroyed in order to preserve the male subject.

For abject female threats, it is their physical form that threatens due to their appearance, with the threat of violence not far behind. Carla's (Barbara Shelley) monstrous form (Prudence Hyman) in *The Gorgon* (Terence Fisher, 1964), Anna (Jacqueline Pearce) in *The Reptile*, and Jacqueline Pearce as Alice in *The Plague of the Zombies* are female threats who are physically abject and use their gaze to terrify, and in some cases kill, the males, but despite this they are still defined by the male, which is an important aspect to explore in terms of the female threats of the 1960s. These monsters are all the results of women unwillingly and passively being transformed into a gorgon, a were-reptile, and a zombie respectively, and importantly they are also silent, acted upon by males, and lacking in agency. It is not their words or actions that give them their power as monstrous threats, but what they represent to the protagonists and the audience. They shall be examined using abject theory, as well as discussing their lack of agency and the silent gaze that they share.

The Gorgon was one of the first of many British horror films with a central female monster since just two in the 1950s, namely *Devil Girl from Mars* (David MacDonald, 1954) and *Catgirl* (Alfred Shaughnessy, 1957) followed by *The Snake Woman* (Sidney J. Furie,1961). Specifically, this film involves a female who conforms to societal constructions of ideal femininity and who uncontrollably transforms into an alternative monstrous form. Carla is isolated with her gorgon form (Prudence Hyman) only presenting itself in the castle ruins, her hair filled with snakes and her face fully transformed into the visage of another. She transgresses the border of myth and reality.

Importantly she possesses an active gaze that removes male power by symbolically castrating the male and objectifying him[17] by turning him into stone when he desires to objectify her. Patriarchal definitions of femininity do not allow the female to be active

or possess power, especially over the male, but the gorgon is, according to I. Q. Hunter "a signifier of inexplicable Otherness, independently malignant and, unusually for Hammer, a female outside of male control."[18] Thus, she is in defiance of the natural order. Problematically for the males within these narratives, dispatching female monsters requires a team of males, indicating that the male expert cannot thwart the threat single-handedly in confrontation or by leading an uninitiated group, with these two options previously used in Hammer's three *male* monster films *The Curse of Frankenstein*, *Dracula*, and *The Mummy*, in the late 1950s.

Just as the visual appearance of the isolated gorgon is key, so too is the reptile form of Anna in *The Reptile* who becomes a green humanoid snake-monster, with bulging eyes and poisonous fangs. Therefore she becomes abject in her transgression of human and animal, but also in terms of the incestuous bite she gives her father at the climax of the film. Anna transgresses and violates multiple boundaries by her very existence and in order to preserve the integrity of the village and cleanse society of her abject nature, she must be destroyed. The villagers fear the house in which she resides with Dr Franklyn (Noel Willman), with her reptilian form threatening those who witness it with death, requiring her father to lock her away to protect both her secret and the village.

However as far as the abject physical forms of these women are concerned, Alice in *Plague of the Zombies* is the "ultimate in abjection"[19] due to being an animated corpse. This is because "it signifies one of the most basic forms of pollution – the body without a soul. As a form of waste it represents the opposite of the spiritual, the religious symbolic."[20] The corpse is symbolic of the inability to avoid the abject permanently. For in order to survive a person must remove themselves from the site of the abject in terms of bodily waste, blood, and other pollutants, and the corpse represents the inevitability of death, and the transformation of the self into the abject that others must avoid. The other zombies within the film are expressionless male drones working in the mine and

kidnapping women on the orders of Squire Hamilton (John Carson), whilst Alice is a sexual threat and pollutant that Peter tries desperately to avoid in the graveyard. Alice approaches him with a lustful gaze during the scene in which she rises from her grave, steadily moving towards Peter who can only backpeddle to try and maintain distance until Sir James decapitates Alice with a spade. Such is the power of the abject that Alice possesses that Peter is trying to avoid Alice so much as touching him, and the encounter causes him nightmarish visions in which the dead rise from their graves to accost him. Alice is feared as a physical pollutant by Peter, but her effect is also to mentally traumatise even after her final death.

Whilst in their human forms the three women (Carla, Anna, and Alice) are subject to the desires of the males within the films, the requirements of their patriarchal societies and the authority figures within it. They are defined by the males in the films and controlled by their relationships to them. Once transformed, the women are able to act contrary to the desires of the males with whom they are associated. Carla in her human form is at the behest of Dr. Namaroff (Peter Cushing) who decides her fate, location, and even her history. Whilst transformed Carla is controlled by the female Gorgon that possesses her, but it is Namaroff who seeks to protect her in full knowledge of her true identity, and who wants to keep Carla under his control and out of Paul's (Richard Pasco) influence.

Anna of *The Reptile* is confined to the house by her father, is used to entertain his guests with her sitar playing, and is cursed by the snake-worshipping tribe because of her father's actions. However, Anna's violent attacks when in her reptile form indicate that she can act of her own volition. This is demonstrated by Anna killing her father at the end of the film after having demonstrated a deal of animosity towards his control over her during the narrative. For it is established that his male gaze and interference

was punished by a tribe cursing Anna and resulting in her turning into a reptilian creature with no control over her own form.

The Plague of the Zombies has a silent female transformation of Alice (Jacqueline Pearce) into a zombie due to the actions and desires of Squire Hamilton who intentionally turns her into a zombie that he can control. When Alice rises from the grave however, she actively approaches Peter (Brook Williams) with a desiring gaze that forces him to back-peddle away from her, until Sir James finally manages to halt the zombified Alice by decapitating her. Thus, although these women are controlled by men whilst in human form, the transformations turn the women from attractive young women who appear to adhere to patriarchal rules of female as subordinate to the male, into active monstrous forms.

Acting on curiosity and seeking to witness the abject can in itself lead to punishment. Anna in *The Reptile* was created as a result of her father Dr. Franklyn (Noel Willman) interfering in the affairs of exotic tribes, with her monstrous form via curse as his punishment. Similarly her reptile form is used to punish males who trespass and desire to look, or gaze, upon the private sphere that is the female domain, namely the house and those who live in it, as she kills men who trespass starting with the opening scene. Likewise in *The Gorgon*, the monstrous form of Carla lays waste to any male who gazes upon her as object/female without touching her victim. In this manner, abjection allows the female power in being objectified as it allows the female to return the gaze. Therefore the power in the look, or gaze, indicates that these women look with power just as the male sought to do. In Carla's case, the males seek to look upon the gorgon due to its abject nature and seek to mark it as object, and it is this which grants the gorgon power when she gazes back and reduces the male to object. The abject's gaze is more powerful than the male's gaze.

Laura Mulvey's concept of the male gaze from her much-quoted *Screen* article[21] is useful here when examining the abject females. In order to contain the female as threat to the viewer, it is necessary to present them in a sexualised manner for the male gaze, to focus on the body and present woman as object and not subject, which Mulvey would label voyeurism and scopophilia "the erotic basis for pleasure in looking at another person as object."[22] Thus, any negative traits can be imprinted upon the female as she is there to be inscribed upon, for as Mulvey argues "[w]oman stands then in patriarchal culture as signifier for the male other, bound by a symbolic order in which man can live out his phantasies and obsessions through linguistic command by imposing them on the silent image of woman still tied to her place as bearer of meaning, not maker of meaning."[23]

As a result of being positioned as a silent object, the female is assigned the qualities of that which is abject and is refused the ability to question her position or engage in dialogue with those who would look upon her as object. For the abject female who is objectified, returning the gaze gives her power. This is evident in that whenever these women are in their transformed state and threatening the males, the focus is on their eyes with the gorgon turning those who meet her gaze to stone, by Anna fixing those who would look upon her with her own intense stare before killing them with her poisonous fangs, and in Peter back-peddling in fear from the zombified Alice who has fixed him with her desirous gaze. Each of these women look directly at the camera during the attacks, but maintain a lack of speech. This silent gaze possesses power for the female over the male.

Arguably, the silent gaze can be seen as a pre-symbolic form of communication for the abject female threat, thereby rooting this female power in the semiotic, and therefore pre-symbolic and non-patriarchal, maternal realm. If the feminine semiotic realm is wherein the individual is denied access to the language, then non-verbal communication

dominates including gestures, body language, facial expressions, and eye contact. As the abject female threats being discussed are denied their subjectivity in silence, they are able to use a form of communication that can overpower and destroy the males they threaten. This is the silent female gaze. Mulvey's article does not discuss the potential for the female to employ a gaze and objectify the male. However, the abject females in the films discussed are doing this.

A powerful example of the female gaze in use is when Anna allows her father to believe that he is in control during the sitar scene in *The Reptile*, in which her father presents her as an object to be gazed upon and to be entertained by. However, Anna takes control during her performance which halts the narrative flow, arguably using a female gaze. She begins by looking between all those present, sees the man who serves as the manservant in the house, the Malay (Marne Maitland), and her behaviour changes. Cast in shadow with a strip of light across his eyes, much like when Bela Lugosi in *Dracula* is using the power of his gaze (Tod Browning, 1931) and thus making a connection that marks him as in possession of a controlling power over others, the Malay meets Anna's gaze. At this point she starts to defiantly stare at her father unblinkingly, as her sitar playing increases in speed as if building to a climax and draws her increasingly transfixed father forward in his seat. What would have happened when she reached the climax point is unknown as her father snaps out of Anna's gaze, shouts at her and smashes the sitar. Anna was silent for the duration of this scene, using only her eyes to acknowledge others who speak to her and emphasising the power of her gaze.

With these female monsters, the key is that whilst in their monstrous forms they are able to transgress the patriarchal order which controls their human forms and forces them to adhere to the subordinate position of the female in patriarchal society. These abject females would appear to be passive and objectified by their lack of speech, but

their silence grants them power to reject the male gaze and subject their victims to a destructive female gaze. They are threatening due to what they represent rather than what they speak of. The abject monstrous female continued into the 1970s, but was less dominant as a form of female monster as the more active and vocal female threats began to emerge in the latter part of the 1960s.

The masquerade of womanliness in British horror

The other kind of female that was present in the 1960s and 1970s is that which employed the masquerade of womanliness as posited by Joan Rivière in 1929.[24] Rivière's article was written after observations of professional women, including a lecturer who after her performances would adopt exaggeratedly feminine behaviours and gestures when speaking with male colleagues. She attributed this behaviour to the female unconsciously trying to avoid the anticipated retribution from her male counterparts for adopting the role of the male by giving these lectures.

According to this theory, patriarchy applies binary oppositions to the male and female as follows: male/female, active/passive, symbolic/semiotic, public sphere/private sphere, subject/object, patriarchal realm/matriarchal realm, order/abject, normal/Other, with the undesirable of each opposition assigned to the female and the desirable quality denied to the female and possessed by the male. This is because in patriarchy, the phallus is symbolic of power, agency, masculinity, and subjectivity, and the lack of the phallus denies the female power. Should the female be discovered to be in possession of power and agency she must be repositioned and punished. As a result, "women who wish for masculinity may put on a mask of womanliness to avert anxiety and the retribution feared from men"[25] if they should be discovered. 'Womanliness' is a

construct of ideal femininity according to patriarchy: submissive, passive, to be objectified for the male gaze, and subordinate to the male.

Importantly, Rivière posits that the masquerade of womanliness and authentic womanliness are one and the same, indicating that womanliness and therefore femininity itself is a construct used to control the female as 'other' and maintain the male as dominant in society:

> Womanliness therefore could be assumed and worn as a mask, both to hide the possession of masculinity and to avert the reprisals expected if she was found to possess it – much as a thief will turn out his pockets and ask to be searched to prove that he has not the stolen goods. The reader may now ask how I define womanliness and the "masquerade." My suggestion is not, however, that there is any such difference; whether radical or superficial, they are the same thing.[26]

This presents an issue with the very nature of womanliness and therefore femininity as a construct and performance with no true basis in reality. Likewise, Doane highlights this issue raised by Rivière's theory, namely that the masquerade "conceals only an absence of "pure" or "real" femininity,"[27] seeing the emphasis on a lack of authentic femininity. The lack of a real femininity thus establishes that the female is required to display a falsehood with no original for the male to compare it with and find hidden faults. With this argument that all femininity is a masquerade the male has much to fear about what is beneath the concealment, and all females that perform femininity are a potential threat to the male.

As Gwilliam argues, the masquerade is "for a woman, a dangerous tool that can be turned back on her in the form of accusations that she is duplicitous, hypocritical, or a usurper of masculine prerogative."[28] However, it is also dangerous for the discovery of the masquerade reveals the need for the perceived threat that is behind the masquerade to be contained by labelling it "as femininity's perverse "opposite," female masculinity."[29] Because the female is assigned her place based on sexual difference, the

connection of the female to masculine behaviours and traits must be condemned and marked as abnormal. The female must present the appearance of femininity because she is not permitted to show masculinity; she must construct a femininity that is believable to avoid being punished for presenting her true self which is forbidden due to her female status.

The constructed nature of femininity therefore allows for two versions of the masquerade of womanliness, the first being that it is the female submitting to the will of patriarchy, and the second that it is the female undermining and disrupting the patriarchal order in its deceptive nature.[30] The underlying fear with the masquerade of womanliness is that it can be used to conceal the abject nature of the woman using it, whether intentionally or not, for if womanliness and femininity is construct then there is an undesirable truth beneath it. There are examples of both interpretations of the masquerade within British horror cinema. The submitting female is represented by Anna (Angharad Rees) of *Hands of the Ripper*, who is taught to present herself as the ideal female, but is triggered into violence emulating her father Jack the Ripper. As such, Anna is abject for what she represents to Dr. Pritchard (Eric Porter) who knows the truth, but her abject nature is concealed by a masquerade of ideal womanliness. Anna adopts every aspect of femininity imposed on her by characters within the narrative in terms of both physical attributes and behaviours. Each person who tries to make Anna submit to the requirements of the femininity is attacked, with the majority killed in the process. Anna dies at the end of the film despite her attempts to conform to femininity, thus emphasising that the constructed nature of femininity makes adhering to it problematic. Those who cannot fully adopt femininity are deemed a danger to society and as a result need to be removed to protect it. The women who successfully submit by conforming to the requirements of the female in society continue to live, with

the blind Laura (Jane Merrow) being the ideal of femininity within the film who survives Anna's violence in the whispering gallery at St. Paul's cathedral.

The earliest forms of the female knowingly using the masquerade of femininity in the 1960s and 1970s British horror cinema to achieve her aims whilst undermining and disrupting the patriarchal order are Clare Mallinger (Wanda Ventham) in *The Blood Beast Terror*, Angel (Linda Hayden) in *The Blood on Satan's Claw*, and in *Frankenstein Created Woman* (Terence Fisher, 1967) the physical form of Christina which contains Han's soul - hereafter referred to as Christina/Hans, (Susan Denberg). These women use the masquerade to present a duality in the female: the passive and compliant female, and the active transgressive female hidden beneath it. Clare in *The Blood Beast Terror* lures males to their deaths by presenting the form of a woman willing to submit to male desires, kills them and feasts on the blood in her moth form, then returns to her attractive female human form that protects her from being suspected of having agency and masculine traits accorded to the male in patriarchy. As a creature that can transform from giant moth to attractive female human, Clare maintains the pretence that she is the dutiful and obedient daughter of Dr. Mallinger (Robert Flemyng) whilst she is in fact controlling him.

In the case of Christina/Hans, the issue of the masquerade is particularly perverse due its construction by Frankenstein (Peter Cushing) as one of his experiments. The physical form is the body of Christina who committed suicide, which is controlled by the soul of her hanged lover, Hans (Robert Morris), in a particularly cruel pairing. Frankenstein also 'fixes' Christina's body so that it is no longer her deformed original from before her death, but is instead the visually perfect female in patriarchy. To carry out the masquerade of womanliness, Christina/Hans presents herself as the perfect submissive female to the male populace, so is never suspected of killing the youths who framed Hans for murder. Christina/Hans lures each youth with her mask of

womanliness, murders them using the agency she possesses, then conceals her actions and possession of masculinity beneath the mask again to avoid being suspected and caught by the authorities. By gaining access to agency, these females are able to compete with and even overpower the males in their respective narratives whilst pursuing their goals, but this ultimately leads to their discovery, and being targeted for repositioning in society and/or their complete removal if they refuse. This is true of both women who dominated the men within their narratives as Clare is destroyed and Christina kills herself after achieving her aims.

Changes to the film ratings system in 1970[31] allowed filmmakers to increasingly and more graphically represent sex, violence, and horror on the screen[32] through out the 1970s. The 'X' certificate became a "badge of honour for some low-budget companies"[33] in what Newland terms the most politically incorrect film genre,[34] and some film makers felt pressured to add more (female) nudity as was the case reportedly for Roy Ward Baker with *The Vampire Lovers* (Roy Ward Baker, 1970).[35] This ties to Mulvey's argument that "[t]raditionally, the woman displayed has functioned on two levels: as erotic object for the characters within the screen story, and as erotic object for the spectator within the auditorium, with a shifting tension between the looks on either side of the screen,"[36] for the films demonstrate that as female threats became more powerful, they were also represented with greater nudity and sexual activity.

In turn, this allowed the female to control the narrative by stopping it in moments of erotic contemplation of the female form, such as Angel in *The Blood on Satan's Claw* when she strips and offers her naked and motionless body to Reverend Fallowfield (Anthony Ainley) in return for his allegiance. The camera lingers to mimic the Reverend's gaze, objectifying Angel but allowing her to pause the narrative flow. Only when Angel is rejected can the film progress, and Angel breaks from her pretence as the submissive female to the Reverend. Arguably this technique highlights the

female's power further by halting the narrative: "her visual presence tends to work against the development of a story line, to freeze the flow of action in moments of erotic contemplation."[37] This is of importance for the concept of the masquerade being used to disrupt the patriarchal order in allowing the female employing the masquerade to continue seeking her aims without interruption. By presenting a visually-appealing form to the male, the female can distract the male from her true purpose and intentions. Whilst the male is distracted and focused on the female feigning submission to patriarchal figures either sexually or within the social hierarchy, the camera lingers on her to mimic the response of the male. With the female allowing herself to be objectified so that the male thinks he is in control of her body by use of the male gaze, it is in fact the female who controls the actions of the male and protects her true nature from being punished due to her usurpation of the masculine position as possessor of agency.

It would appear at first glance that these two concepts of the abject and the masquerade are oppositional. However, they are often contained within the same individual woman. For instance, Clare Mallinger of *The Blood Beast Terror* conceals her true abject nature behind the disguise of ideal feminine behaviour. Importantly, Clare is able to transform at will, choosing when to kill those who would disrupt her plans. She overpowers men, acts on her desires, demands and achieves agency, and forces an educated male with a high status to submit to her will. In patriarchy this would not be permitted of a female, but Clare achieves this by presenting herself to the outside world as a daughter who submits to the will of her father, as a female who conforms to the demands of male-dominated society both visually and in her behaviour. This outward disguise hides a giant humanoid moth that controls Dr. Mallinger, murders, and is visually horrifying to all who witness it; it is the opposition of ideal femininity and is the epitome of abject. The manner in which she promises sex by silently luring the

gardener (Simon Cain) as a female human then transforms into her moth form to kill and consume him is illustrative of this.

Having now defined the concepts of the abject and the masquerade of womanliness with brief filmic examples, this thesis will explore them in far greater detail in the context of British horror cinema of the 1960s and 1970s. In this manner it will be possible to chart the changes taking place in the representation of femininity. Four films which make strong use of the constructed nature of the monstrous female threat in terms of the abject female and the masquerade of womanliness, are *Hands of the Ripper*, *Blood from the Mummy's Tomb*, *The Blood on Satan's Claw*, and *The Blood Beast Terror*, each of which shall be analysed in the following case studies.

Hands of the Ripper

As previously discussed, *The Hands of the Ripper* presents a female who is mentally altered to kill when triggered, with the construction of the female being significant as her masquerade is formed by her childhood. The film uses a character, Dr. Pritchard (Eric Porter) who seeks to cure Anna using psychoanalysis, thus enforcing the notion that the film lends itself well to a psychoanalytical reading. When she was an infant, Anna witnessed her father Jack the Ripper attack and murder her mother in the room she slept in within their home. The couple briefly embrace before he forces her to the ground below him as he stabs her, leaving the knife impaled in Anna's mother. Anna cries throughout until her father comforts her as her mother expires, and the audience sees her settling into motionless silence with the firelight flickering on her face. Whenever Anna sees a flickering light during the rest of the film, she kills by impulsively impaling her victim in a mimicry of this scene, reverting to motionless silence afterwards. This imitation of her father is a repetition of an incomplete

corruption of the primal scene, which results in an imbalanced Anna unable to move past it into the realm of the symbolic. Pedrick writes of the primal scene that it

> begins the child's trauma when it sees a moment of parental embrace. Later events in the child's psychosexual development activate this trauma, such that it longs to give up its position as simple witness and actually join in the embrace in complicated and perverse ways, but the process originates in observation. […] The primal scene displays paternal power over the mother, the object of the child's own desire, as well as her suffering. It is a mimicry of the child's greatest fear, castration at the hands of the father. Yet for all its trauma, the primal scene is a strangely comforting construction, because it dramatizes those actions that engendered the child. The primal scene puts to rest the question of a child's identity by allowing it to visualize its natal embrace.[38]

This highlights several issues which resulted in Anna's psychological situation. In the primal scene, the male impales the female with the phallus, which is symbolic of male power. In Anna's corrupted primal scene, her father displays power over the mother by impaling her with the knife as symbolic of the phallus and phallic power, removing the mother as object of desire from Anna's world. With the trauma which this engendered in Anna, she cannot progress past the primal scene, seeks to identify with the father instead of the symbolically castrated mother, and shuns observation in favour of participation in a re-enactment of the primal scene in what Pendrick would agree is a "complicated and perverse way"[39] by stabbing victims in the father's place. Thus, it is unsurprising that Anna's actions demonstrate a desire to identify with the violent male and re-enact his role, for she witnessed that women under patriarchy are violently acted-upon and destroyed when sexually desirable, for the primal scene begins with male desire for the female. She cannot find the primal scene to be a 'comforting construction' as Pendrick calls it, because the event which should give the child a sense of identity by witnessing how they were created shows Anna that it destroys the female.

Males that Anna encounters cannot position her in her proper place in patriarchal society because her sense of identity has been damaged irreparably. Washburn's argument about Freud's three-part structure of the psyche comes into play here,

> [t]he superego is not part of the original equipment of the psyche in the sense of being a genetically inherited structure needing only the proper developmental moment to unfold into actuality. […] The superego is created when the child, in order to resolve the Oedipal conflict, identifies with parental authority, and with the social prohibitions, norms, and values that the parental figures represent. […] And if the superego is deleted, then the structural model, as an id/ego duality, is indeed a type of bipolar structure.[40]

Anna's dual identity, however, is reactionary with the ego side as a submissive personality which seeks to please, lacking knowledge of her past as a 'lost soul' that risks being manipulated by others. Her id personality uncontrollably kills when triggered as a protection mechanism without Anna's knowledge. In this manner, her two personalities are representative of the extreme ends of the binary opposition of female and male in patriarchy, with the id protecting the ego with outbursts of violent agency, and the ego in turn protecting the id by concealing it and avoiding repercussions for its use.

As discussed earlier in this chapter, Anna employs the masquerade of femininity[41] to disguise her possession of agency within patriarchy, but it is the timings of these moments of violent agency that are key. When presented with her reflections that demonstrate her desirability to men, Anna destroys the individual objectifying her with the male gaze by stabbing them using the nearest sharp object. This always coincides with a glinting light that triggers Anna's id, for this connects her to memories of the primal scene trauma she experienced, and a threat of castration should she be aligned with the female position. Thus, the id reacts by taking the position of the male in her remembered primal scene and metaphorically castrating via killing by impaling to protect Anna. Arguably, she becomes catatonic after the killing because she aligns with the violent male in the scenario and as her primal scene was incomplete due to the police arriving and removing her father, she cannot conclude her re-enactments and move past them in order to form a complete identity.

The glinting light is also significant in that it is a *reflection* of light, and one instance occurs in front of a mirror which further highlights the fractured identity which Anna experiences. Here, not only does the identity-forming primal scene remain incomplete for Anna, but her murdering of Dolly (Marjie Lawrence) when presented with her mirror reflection indicates that she has not yet graduated past the Lacanian mirror phase which is essential for a formulation of the self and identity.[42] This can be seen in the triggering of her violent id which only manifests in a manner that results in a catatonic state which prevents Anna from recognising it as an aspect of herself. She has no knowledge of this part of her identity which is completely separate from the rest of her personality. Without the completion of this Lacanian phase, the relationship between ego and id cannot form, resulting in an uncoordinated being and an incomplete and fractured identity without a concept of 'self.'

This incomplete self, which rejects the male gaze and patriarchal constructions of femininity presents a female who is 'defective' and uncontrollable by male authority figures, therefore Anna has to be removed from patriarchal society. The masquerade is discovered to be a construct that undermines patriarchy and manipulates the male gaze. This notion of the male gaze as vital for patriarchal control of the female via objectification, and Anna's unwitting rebellion against it, is highlighted further by the fact that Anna kills women who try to make Anna conform to the desires of the male gaze and integrate her into her 'proper' place as female in patriarchy. These women acknowledge the position of the female in patriarchy, but will also gain financially should they succeed in repositioning Anna: Mrs Golding (Dora Bryan) uses her as a prostitute and to fake séances, Dolly (Marjie Lawrence) and Mrs. Bryant (Marjorie Rhodes) are instructed by Pritchard to prepare Anna to meet potential suitors, Long Liz (Lynda Baron) will profit from prostituting Anna. Most significant here is Mrs. Golding whose brothel customer buying sex with Anna triggers Anna's id and attacks her, but he

escapes whilst Anna murders Mrs. Golding. The only female who does not seek to present Anna for the male gaze, Laura, is blind and therefore incapable of assessing Anna's appearance and suitability for patriarchal desires. As a result, she survives the film which further highlights the use of the male gaze and objectification of women as vital for the dominance of patriarchy.

Blood from the Mummy's Tomb

Margaret and the deceased Egyptian Queen Tera (both played by Valerie Leon) are a fractured identity as mirror images of each other. Margaret struggles with her identity throughout the film, having several conversations with her boyfriend Tod (Mark Edwards) on the subject and seeking the truth about the ring she was gifted that links to her and Tera's identities. Homer states that prior to the recognition of its reflection in the mirror stage the infant does not have full motor control and therefore feels fragmented, and the mirror image "anticipates the mastery of the infant's own body and stands in contrast to the feelings of fragmentation the infant experiences."[43] This mirror image *must* be identified with, since

> [t]his identification is crucial, as without it – and without the anticipation of mastery that it establishes – the infant would never get to the stage of perceiving him/herself as a complete or whole being. At the same time, however, the image is *alienating* in the sense that it becomes confused with the self. Therefore, the sense of a unified self is acquired at the price of this self being an-other, that is, our mirror image.[44]

This has great significance for Margaret/Tera who are mirror images, as in order to become a complete 'self' one of these women/mirror images must be sacrificed. However, unlike Anna whose power as a female monster lay in her fractured identity, Tera is monstrous due to her abject nature and that her ascension to power will destroy Margaret in order to inhabit her body. She is abject in her very form (and her name

which sounds like 'terror,' and forms the beginning of 'teratology') without having to move or speak, for she is both living and dead which defies the boundaries of categorisation, and importantly she possesses a permanently bleeding wrist stump. This bleeding wound is an outward example of her gender, for "woman's desire is subjected to her image as bearer of the bleeding wound, she can exist only in relation to castration and cannot transcend it."[45] Tera is the personification of the silent bearer of the bleeding wound, but one who overcomes the symbolic castration of her missing hand in order to transcend it and defy patriarchy by using her agency to achieve her desires whilst leaving no evidence of her physical presence. She subverts the linguistic realm of the symbolic order and refuses to obey patriarchal law. Her bleeding wound is displayed as a demonstration of her power and defiance of both the patriarchal and natural laws that would seek to control her.

Further contributing to Tera's abject status is the manner in which she subverts patriarchy and linguistics being key to the possession of agency. Tera uses an invisible source of power in order to achieve her aims, which here is explained as magic and involves a black cat, razor winds, and the murdering of her victims via a large invisible cat which rips them apart with claws. Therefore, she does not require the use of language, or visibility, or even physical movement. She defies metaphorical and physical boundaries to reach all her victims which consist of both male and female characters, but, critically they are all individuals who sought to objectify her through 'the gaze' as the archaeological party who discovered her tomb.

The issue of the masquerade of womanliness is raised by *Blood from the Mummy's Tomb* due to the duality of Margaret and Tera. Margaret is the benign female who conforms to the demands of patriarchal definitions of femininity. She presents herself physically as feminine, makes herself subordinate to the whims of her father and boyfriend, and adopts feminine gestures and mannerisms. Likewise Tera is presented as

physically conforming to patriarchal definitions of femininity. However, as the living corpse by all appearances, she is abject by definition physically, and there is constant questioning about whether she will come to life, and how she is killing without physically acting to do so. This leads to her control over Margaret presenting the true nature of the two women. Margaret, who performs femininity, has memory and identity issues, and as the narrative progresses, it becomes clear that Tera is controlling Margaret and taking over her physical form in order to reincarnate herself. Tera acts violently to achieve her aims, displaying full agency in gathering all the necessary elements to reinstate her physical existence. In this manner, Tera is the masculinity hidden behind the masquerade of womanliness supplied by Margaret, this is masculinity in terms of the qualities ascribed to the male and denied the female, namely agency, subjectivity, active rather than passive, and power. There is another aspect to Tera, in that she is employing two masquerades, the first in the use of Margaret to disguise her true nature whilst she possesses her, the other being her existing physical form, which is displayed for the male to observe and therefore subjected to the male gaze. By using her body in this manner and allowing herself to be objectified, Tera is able to halt the narrative as the males remain focused on her still form, and in doing so disrupt attempts to discover her true purpose and astral existence.

Tera's manipulation of the male gaze allows her to even control the male and subvert patriarchy by using Margaret's father, Professor Fuchs (Andrew Keir). At the expense of his own life and his daughter's, he recreates Queen Tera's tomb in his basement and seeks to preserve and protect her whilst allowing the fulfilling of a prophecy whereby she will take over his daughter's body in a resurrection rite. Matriarchy has subjugated patriarchy without having to participate in patriarchy's linguistic construction of and requirements for agency. Tera is firmly implanted in the

abject semiotic realm, and by making Fuchs subservient to her will she has made him abject as a perversion of the patriarchal father figure within the film.

Thus, Tera manipulates the male gaze, rejects the symbolic realm, and succeeds in subverting patriarchal power. Even the collapse of the building and potential destruction of her body may have been subverted as the bandaged woman that is presented at the end of the film is silent, but recognisable as both Margaret and the identical Tera, refusing closure as to which woman is in control of the body.

The Blood on Satan's Claw

The Blood on Satan's Claw differs greatly from the Hammer films both narratively, visually, and in terms of the female 'monster.' It is set much further in the past, and is shot on location in a more realist style.[46] As a Tigon film, it was originally conceived as a portmanteau support feature before becoming a full-length single narrative,[47] in which "Wynne-Simmons really wanted to explore the idea of a primitive force of evil growing within a civilised society, having drawn partial inspiration from the horrific Manson cult murders of 1969,"[48] and also from the Mary Bell child murders, with Wynne-Simmons stating that "'she was only a child herself but she had such contempt, almost sneering I suppose, at her victims or at least their families. I wanted to capture that.'"[49] Originally intended to be set in the Victorian era, it was considered that "the Victorian Gothic had been done to death and furthermore that the seventeenth century had proved quite conducive to this sort of treatment in *Witchfinder General*"[50] which had been the company's previous hit, and demonstrates the determination to move away from Hammer's Victorian colour gothic films which were considered no longer viable for generating profit. The film does not only bear similarities visually with *Witchfinder General*, but also with *The Wicker Man* in its invocation of the interaction between old and new religions, between man and nature,[51] and with the representation of the female

form between all three films. Two key aspects of the film are that director Piers Haggard "'was determined not to make a camp Hammer-style horror film'"[52] and that Linda Hayden was chosen for Angel's part due to her reputation as both a sex symbol in the press and for her ability to portray a darker side. Importantly for the portrayal of the female in film and its evolution from the pre-censorship change was that "Haggard also sought to exploit the new-found freedoms in the realms of censorship, seeking to push the barriers by juxtaposing teenage sex with violence – strictly forbidden under Trevelyan's previous informal codes."[53]

The film revolves around sexuality, the invocation of the male gaze, the primal scene being re-enacted and corrupted, and the portrayal of ancient religions as using sex in order to control its members. In short, sex cult rituals resurrect a demonic beast whose gender is unconfirmable, but whose face resembles female genitalia. Thus, this demonic figure defies the categorisation which patriarchy requires, making it more monstrous. This silent figure is also swathed in robes and requires the female 'monster' of the film in order to complete it. Angel (Linda Hayden) is thus the 'mother' who resolves to complete the gestation of this monstrous demon via taking the growing pieces of its flesh from her murder victims

Angel enacts the masquerade in order to progress her agenda. She presents herself to the village as the perfect girl who adheres to patriarchy's demands of femininity. Her name is part of her disguise making her a devil with an angel's face that uses sex as a weapon. In this way, Angel is constructed as a threatening Lilith figure, not as a victim of circumstance like Margaret and Anna are. Instead she is a goal-oriented, dominating, active female who is not subject to the desires of the other characters, nor is she is made the main protagonist, and her father is unable to exert any control over her. Thus she is not subject to patriarchy in any way. By using her pretence of being the perfect girl, Angel is able to enact her plans and desires without interruption.

Angel offers her body to the Reverend Fallowfield (Anthony Ainley) in an attempt to convert him when he suspects that her masquerade of womanliness is a construction concealing masculine traits and agency. Angel finds him alone in the same room that their Bible classes take place and attempts to seduce him by resorting to stripping. Remaining motionless, she displays her naked body to him, informing him he can have her for all of his sexual desires in return for joining the cult and being subservient to it. Angel freezes the narrative at this point by manipulating the male gaze and allowing herself to be objectified by it. Angel does not move again until the Reverend's eventual rejection of her sexual offerings, which is when she starts issuing threats and rushes to leave. Her masquerade is back in place as soon as she has left the building, as her vengeance is to accuse him of rape and murder, undermining and abusing patriarchal law in order to attack the Reverend who is one of the leaders of this patriarchal society.

Angel embodies the abject in her society. She revels in the semiotic realm of blood, murder, and the repeated subversive recreation of the primal scene, in which she gleefully impales her victims. Angel controls the population in her own matriarchy of teenagers. This matriarchy is demonstrated by Angel being in control, and the physical appearance of the demon, who is a hairy figure with partially-concealed facial features that resemble female genitalia. A greater issue at stake is that the film had an original premise of an ancient evil corrupting civilised society, with the members of this society in denial about it and thus allowing it to infect and spread at speed.[54] With this primal evil using sex as a tool to spread itself, Angel becomes a disease determined to disseminate throughout the society she infects. Female sexuality is dangerous and corrupting here, with Angel's monstrousness demonstrative of the corrupting power of unchecked female sexuality and the danger sexuality in general poses when it is not controlled by patriarchy.

This corruption of sexuality is evident when Angel has her followers engage in sex on the altar in the woods before murdering one participant to combine sex and death which furthers her abject nature. In one instance Cathy (Wendy Padbury), who possesses the hairy demon skin patch, is unwilling, thus making it rape. With the cult looking on, the male would appear to be in control but it is Angel who is dominant for she stabs Cathy at the climax of the scene and releases her blood, with blood commonly being viewed as representative for semen in films which connect sex and violence such as the vampire film.[55] As long as Angel maintains her possession of the phallic blade and cult leader status, she is the literal and figurative possessor of the phallus and therefore of agency in patriarchy in general, and in the matriarchal cult specifically. Problematically, however, it is never made clear what Angel's motives are, with the only hint being that she touched the demon remains, claiming a claw as her own and licking her lips in a close up. How she progressed to powerful threat status only scenes later is not explained, with only hints of her defiant personality through her refusal to let others see her field discovery and her disruptions in Bible class. Building on this, is that her reward from the demon for her actions is undefined; whilst she enjoys the obvious power she is afforded in being cult leader and the demon's source of regeneration, the viewer is not informed of what position she will be in once it is completed and at the heights of its powers. With no clear long-term goal, it can be argued that Angel is merely enjoying the power, chaos, and destruction of the community in a similar manner to which the Manson cult operated. Thus, it is difficult to apply any kind of psychoanalysis to Angel and her motivations, differentiating her further from Hammer's two female threats discussed above.

The Blood Beast Terror

It is fitting to finish these case studies with one of the most dangerous female monsters who has been briefly discussed previously. Transformations afford Clare agency, power, access to violence, and a mask behind which to hide her identity in a 'masquerade of womanliness[56] which spans entire species, thus allowing her to remain undetected by patriarchal society which would punish such eruptions of transgressive behaviour. This intentional use of the masquerade by a female monster is demonstrated by a little-recognised film: *The Blood Beast Terror*. To the general populace, Clare Mallinger presents herself in the form of a woman and adopts the pretence of being Dr. Carl Mallinger's daughter, a subordinate female positioned under the male in patriarchy. In reality she identifies males who gaze upon and objectify her, implies that sex is on offer which transgresses patriarchal rules on female sexuality being controlled, then murders the male who accepted this invitation to objectify her by transforming into a giant moth and exsanguinating them. Here, death is punishment for the male gaze,[57] whilst also marking human males as inferior for mating and only useful for feeding upon. Her behaviour is akin to a praying mantis or black widow in that she kills her mate, but in this case, she is a giant vampiric moth, specifically a deaths head moth rather than a species with a less threatening name, with connections to horror mythology by being mentioned in both *Dracula*[58] and Edgar Allen Poe's writings[59] providing it with horror credentials. The deaths head species is also significant in its ability to invade bee hives undetected to feed on the honey by mimicking the scent of bees, just as Clare mimics the human form in order to feed on the blood of humans without detection. Clare is the more deadly of the three female transformation monsters examined thus far, as she actively employs Rivière's concept of the masquerade of femininity via transformation.[60]

The moth form is also significant due to its connections to the nocturnal

dependence on the moon controlling them, thus connecting to the female and the alleged

lunar influence on female behaviour and menstrual cycles, as noted by Verdon:

> Thus, the physiological and psychological aspects of the menstrual cycle can find powerful isomorphic parallels in the physical (*e.g.*, tides and phasic appearances) and symbolic (interpretive associations) aspects of the lunar cycle. The complex and multileveled possibilities of association between menstrual and lunar cycle provide further confirmation of the notion that female development occurs in a meta-context of identity with the environment.[61]

Clare taking a moth form and its connection to the moon, menstrual cycles, and the

female, is thus also a connection to the female werewolf as a figure of horror. The

female werewolf is considered to be symbolic of the dangers of uncontained female

sexuality,[62] whilst the female is often connected to the moon and lunar cycles in terms

of menstruation. Of great import here, is that the females who transform have reached

sexual maturity, with their monstrous transformations representative of the female

sexuality that must remain in check until they are positioned in patriarchy as belonging

to a male in marriage. Anna's final scenes demonstrate the inherent dangers of failure to

keep female sexuality in-check and find a suitable husband to contain Anna's sexuality

due to her rampages and finally killing her father with an incestuous bite when he

physically restrains her, whilst Clare transforms into a moth and kills the men whom she

lures with sex. This inherent danger of female sexuality is a repeated trait but not just in

females who transform.

Significantly Clare in moth form is silent and rejecting of language, demonstrating

that her non-human form is of the semiotic realm. She rejects society in order to satisfy

her animalist urges and desires, to reject surplus repression and remain non-human in

the pre-symbolic maternal realm by forging her own matriarchy. Clare demonstrates her

matriarchal society desires by possessing power over the older expert male, Mallinger

whom she forces to grow her mate, and establishes herself at the top of the foodchain.

Furthermore, her status as dwelling in the pre-symbolic maternal realm, that which is not yet subject to the law of the father, but unclean and of the abject, is evidenced by her constant returns to her moth form that defies societal rules and laws, her feasting on blood, luring victims to the forest, disavowal of the rules that would seek to govern her activities, and the many corpses that she creates by draining men of body fluids. This makes her what Creed categorises as a 'monstrous-feminine':

> The monstrous-feminine is constructed as an abject figure because she threatens the symbolic order. The monstrous-feminine draws attention to the 'frailty of the symbolic order' through her evocation of the natural, animal order and its terrifying associations with the passage all human beings must inevitably take from birth through life to death […] Woman is not, by her very nature, an abject being. Her representation in popular discourses as monstrous is a function of the ideological project of the horror film – a project designed to perpetuate the belief that woman's monstrous nature is inextricably bound up with her difference as man's sexual other.[63]

Clare is a monstrous feminine clearly threatening the symbolic order and killing its representatives in order to survive and propagate her own species as a matriarch, whilst her nature as a shape-shifting abject female using the masquerade of womanliness makes identifying her as the threat and destroying her extremely complicated for the representatives of patriarchal authority.

Conclusion

As has been demonstrated, there is a clear rebellion of the female against patriarchal constraints within the British horror cinema produced in the 1960s and 1970s, which indicates that the societal changes for the situation of women in Britain during the two decades and social anxieties surrounding this shift were feeding into the films. Although there is a dominance of abject females in the 1960s and those using the masquerade of womanliness are present more often in the 1970s, there is not a clear delineation and monstrous females can combine both aspects, such as Clare in *The*

Blood Beast Terror. This presents a multi-faceted threat from the female gender from which patriarchy must seek to defend itself. As such, male dominance is continually challenged throughout the two decades, demonstrating a dramatic shift in the nature of the female in British horror cinema, which reflects the changing role of women in British society at the time.

Further to this, the emergence of the strong female threat and monstrous female indicate an on-screen diminishing of patriarchal authority and its power to contain the female threat. There is a clear progression from female characters gaining prominence in the early 1960s, to the dominance of the abject female monster in the 1960s, to the active monstrous females who have clear goals and use the masquerade of womanliness in order to achieve their aims. Simultaneously, these female characters become increasingly difficult to destroy, demonstrating that patriarchal authority is declining much earlier than previously thought.

Exploration of the abject female has served to highlight a fear of what women represent and the danger of objectifying the female who may be able to return the gaze in a destructive manner, thus reclaiming the ability to look. In this manner, the male can no longer look without risking punishment. Likewise, the concept of the masquerade provides a secondary threat, one that indicates that no female is what she appears to be due to the constructed nature of femininity. Any female could be hiding her true nature as a threat to the male. These two types of female threat indicate that there is a rising anxiety in patriarchy about the role of the female and the threat that she poses to patriarchal dominance.

By way of analysis of the films, it is clear that the figure of the female as threat within British horror cinema of the 1960s and 1970s reaches new heights in 1970-1971. These female monsters/monstrous females use sex as a weapon, disrupt and subvert patriarchy, and render the individual male ineffective in his attempts to thwart them.

However, it also highlights the failure of patriarchy as a system for containing these women, with psychoanalytical approaches demonstrating that patriarchal structures and trajectories that ensure individuals can be properly assimilated into patriarchy actually create monstrous females who destroy patriarchy from within when they fail to progress according to these patriarchal trajectories. With the arrival of second-wave feminism at the very end of the 1960s, what can be seen here within the films is a clear reflection of the threat to the patriarchal status quo. This continues throughout the 1970s.

The next chapter will focus on the male in the British horror cinema of the 1960s and 1970s, but it is notable here that the female monster is differently monstrous to the male. Male threats are less inclined to transform or be visibly monstrous, instead there is a proliferation of male threats who are in positions of authority which they abuse, such as *Witchfinder General*, or are threats due to losing their grip on sanity including *The Asphyx*, but of course there are still the two legacies of the franchises focusing on the figures of Dracula and Frankenstein. As such, it can be seen that males are less fluid in terms of the nature of the threat than the monstrous females.

CHAPTER 4

The Broken Male: Representations of Masculinity

Introduction

The status of the British male in the 1960s and 1970s is in contrast to a key male figure in British horror films of the 1950s. These are the male authority figures of the 1950s, including the iconic Van Helsing (Peter Cushing) of *Horror of Dracula* (Terence Fisher, 1958), who are older celibate men of action and knowledge, leading the rest of the group of men who have no authority and whose survival is dependent on the male expert figure dispatching the parasitic and aristocratic threat figure. However, in the 1960s and 1970s British horror film, there is a marked change from this representation of male authority. As Robert Shail argues,

> [g]ender, like any other social phenomenon, can therefore be examined as being symptomatic of wider historical processes. This concept of gender construction is particularly helpful in relating representations of gender in the cinema back to the changing cultural and social context in which they were produced.[1]

Consequently, this chapter explores the representation of men and masculinity as it develops in British horror from the early 1960s onwards and will demonstrate that the male expert authority figure which was so important to 1950s British horror splinters into two forms during the 1960s. The first of these entails the figure's decline and irrelevance, while the second throws into question the authority of male expertise viewed increasingly as malevolent which shall be examined in the context of Britain itself in the 1960s and 1970s. As another aspect of what might be seen as a decline of trust in male authority, there is a new emphasis on male victimhood and male insanity throughout 1970s British horror.

Firstly, there is a pre-existing argument for the shifting status of the male position in the 1960s and 1970s British society. Claydon argues of the position of men in the 1970s that

> [t]hese are men struggling with their identities as sons to fathers idolized as war heroes of a just war, they are men coming to terms with the concept that their place in society is uncertain (especially if they do not conform to social expectations of 'the masculine' and perform another identity) and, perhaps most importantly for the 1970s, they are men existing in a society which, throughout the decade, can be argued to be in the process of deconstruction.[2]

This deconstruction which Claydon identifies is linked to an increase in divorce, political turmoil, energy supply shortages, drug culture, the male not necessarily being the sole breadwinner, and a perceived increase in permissiveness.[3]

Similarly, Girelli finds this same problematisation of masculinity, but states that its roots were in the 1950s

> where the reinstatement of civilian life and the demise of colonialism coupled, at least theoretically, with a reassessment of gender roles; in addition, the 1950s were also an age of unprecedented foreign immigration, often perceived as a threat and particularly resented by the industrial working class, whose wartime egalitarian illusion had been replaced by the drive towards middle-class consumerism.[4]

Arguably then, the status of the British male was in crisis in the early 1960s through the 1970s due to the social and historical changes of the time and their impact on both gender roles and the position of the male within society.

As a result of the pressures on the male and societal authority in Britain in the 1960s and 1970s, the films will be explored in both a historical and national context, before linking it to the wider international situation for film in the two decades. This will demonstrate that the films were not explicitly stating their views on the British situation in the 1960s and 1970s, but instead were revealing the pressures and changes faced by masculine authority and the position of the male in society.

In order to do this, the chapter will first focus on the changing role of the expert in 1960s British horror. Through a discussion of a range of British horror films – including the figure of Van Helsing in the *Dracula* franchise, *Frankenstein Created Woman* and the use of the changing character of Frankenstein himself – it will be established that the role of the male expert hero splits into a malevolent form and an alternative increasingly

obsolete version. This will culminate in a discussion of *Witchfinder General*, which epitomises the use of the malevolent male expert figure and the abuse of his position in society.

Andrew Tudor and Isabel Christina Pinedo's respective works on horror cinema will be referred to regarding this decline of the male authority, which Pinedo also highlights as an element of her postmodern horror definition. For Tudor's secure horror, a male authority figure who has the knowledge and expertise to remove the threat is a necessity. However, the malevolent expert of films such as *Witchfinder General* would classify as paranoid owing to their secular internal threat status. As such, this chapter will further demonstrate the manner in which British horror cinema was rapidly shifting into a paranoid form through the use of the male and his role.

The second half of this chapter will focus on the 1970s and identify that through an increasing instability of the male, a typology of new roles emerged of rebellious male protagonists as the threats, and males as victims of invasions. This shall be demonstrated by an examination of films including *Demons of the Mind*, *The Asphyx*, *The Flesh and Blood Show* which is an early incarnation of the slasher subgenre of horror, and the two *Phibes* films (*Abominable Dr Phibes*, *Dr Phibes Rises Again*).

The 1960s

The male authority/expert is a key figure which was established within British horror cinema in the 1950s. It was corrupted in the 1960s, and during the 1970s was changed dramatically from its origins, or in the case of Van Helsing (Peter Cushing) in *The Legend of the 7 Golden Vampires* was a demonstration of the figure's obsolescence. Robin Wood argues that Dracula also became irrelevant in the 1970s from his position as a representative of corrupt aristocratic authority, which was challenged by the benevolent male expert authority figure: "it is time for our culture to abandon Dracula

and pass beyond him, relinquishing him to social history. The limits of profitable reinterpretation have been reached."[5] Specifically, the male authority figure as expert was established fully through the years 1956-1964 which saw a series of Hammer films featuring a triumvirate of three key male personnel in each production: Peter Cushing, Christopher Lee, and Terence Fisher, which Peter Hutchings highlights in his aforementioned book *Hammer and Beyond: The British Horror Film.* [6]

These films present male experts with authority, 'professionals' specifically, with a middle-class aesthetic of professional authority as "[v]alorised authority in Hammer horror of this period is always the property of the professional, the man (and it is always a man) who knows exactly what he is doing and why."[7] These older males are either professional in the sense of their employment, or in "organising their obsessions in an ordered, methodical and altogether professional manner"[8] which is in stark contrast to the lack of female authority, with the female positioned as a source of sexual threat to the male professional, who instead avoids sex as a weakening and/or evil force.[9] These males are not only professionals, but as individuals they possess both the knowledge and the physicality to identify and destroy the threat. Hutchings also posits in an unpublished article that in Hammer films, the male characters are either strong authority figures or effectively powerless, with no middle ground, especially in Terence Fisher's films.[10] However, this does begin to break down as male authority weakens and/or becomes corrupt and threatening.

Male experts do exist outside of Hammer in the very late 1950s and the early 1960s, with army-related figures of authority in *Fiend Without a Face* (Arthur Crabtree, 1958) and *The Giant Behemoth/ Behemoth the Sea Monster* (Douglas Hickox and Eugène Lourié, 1959), but these two examples are not on a true par with the Hammer professional. This is due to their lack of expertise in the nature of the threat and previous personal experience with it, their attachment and dependence on state

resources, and that their authority comes from a connection to the army and not due to their class status.

One of the first films from Hammer to see the waning of the power of the male authority and the expert figure was *The Mummy* which displayed a sentiment that there is a danger in expertise, rather than a sole purpose of acting as a protective authority. To take John Banning (Peter Cushing) and the other experts in *The Mummy* specifically, Banning cripples himself by ignoring medical advice in order to be present at the opening of Ananka's (Yvonne Furneaux) tomb and increase his expertise in Egyptology. This damages his physical abilities as the male who would claim authority. His father Stephen (Felix Aylmer) is also an expert Egyptologist, but is driven to insanity for trying to increase his knowledge by removing items from Ananka's tomb which instigates Kharis (Christopher Lee) attacking him. This destroys his reputation alongside any patriarchal power he possessed. It is not a physical man of action which destroys the mummy (Christopher Lee), but Banning's wife Isobel (Yvonne Furneaux) being able to control him due to her resemblance to Ananka, whom Kharis is compelled to obey due to being compromised by his infatuation with Ananka. It is not insignificant that in both *The Gorgon* and *The Mummy*, male authority is undermined and attacked when males seek out and enter into the domain of females who possess/possessed power themselves. As can be seen, male authority was being questioned and undermined at the beginning of the 1960s, and this chapter will demonstrate that this continued throughout the 1960s and 1970s.

A significant male expert figure outside of Hammer, is Gordon Zellaby (George Sanders) in *Village of the Damned*. The narrative revolves around a village in which all the women were impregnated one night by an alien force, producing strange white-haired children with mental powers who are growing to become an uncontrollable threat to the human race. After the strange and powerful children are born to every woman

capable of child-bearing, and all other avenues of controlling the children are exhausted by official bodies connected to law and order, Zellaby takes on the task. He eventually discovers how to prevent them reading his mind's true intentions, and destroys them violently when he realises it is the only course of action left to protect the human race. This requires his own demise, as he smuggles a bomb into a building full of the children and blocks their mind reading powers until it is too late and the explosives detonate. Unlike the established Hammer experts, he does not survive, but his methodical approach and knowledge used to remove the threat mark him as a male expert who uses his authority on the subject to take responsibility for them from the government itself and thus undermines the credibility of the government as an ultimate authority. As a married man, albeit childless, it can be argued that his lack of celibacy has weakened him in comparison to the 'purer' Hammer experts.

The weakening and compromising of authority figures at the beginning of the 1960s is not an isolated incident for *Village of the Damned*, with other examples illustrating this. Norman (Peter Wyngarde) in *Night of the Eagle* has his authority undermined as a college professor who teaches that witchcraft is a nonsensical fabrication. He runs in fear as a stone eagle chases him through the college campus at the behest of a rival witch, rubbing off part of his earlier chalk writing on the black board 'I do not believe' to leave behind 'I believe.' Not only is he forced to admit his belief in witchcraft, but he must also admit that he was wrong to force his wife, Tansy (Janet Blair) to destroy all of her magical paraphernalia. His male authority as a college professor is also damaged as his earlier teachings are proven wrong, with his status overwhelmed by feminine power. This issue of the expert who is tainted is also found in *Kiss of the Vampire* (Don Sharp, 1963) wherein the 'expert' Professor Zimmer (Clifford Evans) who is on a personal vendetta due to his daughter being vampirised by the vampire cult that Dr. Ravna (Noel Willman) rules over. He is not an expert on

vampires, and is not acting out of a duty to the other characters as their leader. By the mid-1960s, films were actively lacking an expert figure, including *Dr. Terror's House of Horrors* (Freddie Francis, 1965) wherein all the male protagonists meet their death, there are no experts, and the authority figure in place is Dr. Terror (Peter Cushing) who presents himself as a fortune teller but is effectively a representative of death.

The compromised authority figure continued through Hammer, as demonstrated within *The Gorgon* which results in the destruction of almost every male, even the ones who claim expertise. Only Meister (Christopher Lee) is left alive by beheading the Gorgon while it is preoccupied by Paul (Richard Pasco). Elimination of the threat was not made possible through one male authority figure with the values of physicality and celibacy, it required the (unwilling) sacrifice of the patriarchal figures within the film, all of whom can claim expertise on the threat through their research of and experience with the Gorgon itself (Prudence Hyman). Specifically, Namaroff is compromised by his desires for the female, whilst Meister has to research gorgons on arrival and represents ageing expertise which is unable to protect the young individuals involved. Meister is also an earlier example of the ageing of the expert figure, because as the decade progresses, the experts presented are becoming increasingly older than those they try to lead, culminating in Van Helsing (Peter Cushing) in *The Legend of the 7 Golden Vampires* who is visible old and weary with an adult son (Robin Stewart). They are undone through their inability to act on the knowledge that they possess. That Namaroff is revealed to have known the truth about the Gorgon for a prolonged period of time but refused to act on it due to his infatuation demonstrates a lack of faith in the ability of male experts to protect the protagonists and destroy the threat effectively. This is a bleak presentation of male expertise and its ability to be undermined.

Despite the decline in male authority, there were still various forms of authority figures present within some of the films being produced, especially within Hammer,

including *Dracula: Prince of Darkness* (Terence Fisher, 1966), *The Plague of the Zombies*, and *The Devil Rides Out* (Terence Fisher, 1968). These were, however, different to the established male expert figure of the earlier films. *Dracula: Prince of Darkness* utilises Father Sandor (Andrew Keir) as a travelling monk who plays a major role in saving the remaining protagonists, and destroying the vampirised Helen (Barbara Shelley) and Dracula (Christopher Lee). He does not stake Dracula, however, as it is Charles (Francis Matthews) who attempts and fails to do so. Instead, shots fired by Diana (Suzan Farmer) that break the river ice prompt Sandor to remember that running water destroys vampires, leading the group to break the ice on the frozen river so that Dracula falls into the running water which dispatches him, which results in the female being instrumental in destroying the threat.

This variation on the male authority figure is also present with one of the last, and closest, examples of the last 'pure' expert figure of the variety that Hutchings writes of in *Hammer and Beyond*,[11] as the Duc de Richleau (Christopher Lee) in *The Devil Rides Out*. Both Richleau and Sandor are already experts on the threat to the protagonists, and guide the process for dispatching it. Both are apparently celibate and free of female influence, able to challenge both of the 'negative authority figures' who represent a dual-threat via Dracula being undead, and Mocata (Charles Gray) being human but summoning unnatural evil forces, namely the Goat of Mendes and Angel of Death. These are straightforward narratives of good versus evil.

Both Sandor and Richleau, however, do not dispatch the threat by physical means but *guide* the group whilst females play a key role. Dracula falls through ice broken by the gunshots of Sandor *and* Diana, with whose shot succeeds being unclear. For Richleau, Mocata is dispatched by the spirit of Tanith (Nike Arrighi) after the men have all failed to physically defeat Mocata. She even ensures that the Angel of Death trades her life for Mocata's and that she returns to the living. Because Sandor and Richleau do

not dispatch the threats themselves but attempt to advise the young protagonists on how to do so, there is a decline in male authority present even here.

Simultaneously, they feature examples of the rise in youthful protagonists caught between two rival male authority figures. This continued as a recurring motif, especially for Hammer, in films such as *Taste the Blood of Dracula* (Peter Sasdy, 1970), and *Hands of the Ripper* until their final horror film *To the Devil a Daughter*. If Richleau and Mocata were removed from *Devil Rides Out*, then the film would feature a narrative akin to *Witchfinder General* in which the two young protagonists are subjected to the will of one malevolent male authority figure, with Tanith and Simon (Patrick Mower) fighting against the devil himself. Similarly, Sandor is weakened as an expert, relying on his brethren monks to physically destroy vampires, as opposed to being a lone expert such as Van Helsing in most Dracula-related films. Sandor is thus tied to a large group of men who demonstrate more physicality than him in dispatching Helen, and as a group he is subject to rules that govern the group, maintain its organisation, control the interpretation of knowledge, and decide how to act. Van Helsing as a figure is a stronger expert in this regard, as he has no ties, and is not governed by an organised group, leaving him free to pursue vampires as he pleases, and in whatever manner he chooses. Both Sandor and Richleau are non-physical experts wherein the final confrontation with the malevolent male authority figures are conducted from a distance whilst the young protagonists directly battle them. Neither of the men demonstrate physical prowess against their threats.

To emphasize this further, when the group is being attacked by the forces of darkness in *The Devil Rides Out*, Richleau's tactic is not confrontation of any kind but 'waiting it out' in a protective circle that is ultimately broken because he has no control over the group members as Van Helsing previously did. Tanith's spirit results in Mocata being dispatched, and in Francis' film, Dracula is attacked by Charles with a stake and

Diana begins shooting him despite Sandor trying to stop her as bullets will not kill Dracula. Thus, it is the elder males who theorise, and the young protagonists who take action against a threat that they do not possess full knowledge of. This is a recurring theme, with other films demonstrating it, including *The Plague of the Zombies.*

Where *The Plague of the Zombies* is concerned, there is an argument to be made that it presents a narrative that is very similar to *The Devil Rides Out*, albeit as a 'lighter' version with weaker authority figures. The two rival authority figures are Squire Clive Hamilton, and Sir James Forbes (André Morell). Hamilton is the malevolent Squire who has become an expert in voodoo practice and uses it to make zombie workers for his unsafe tin mine; he abuses his power and position in an example of corrupt authority figures as threats to the protagonists. Forbes, on the other hand, is the benevolent authority figure who, when called upon, arrives to investigate the mysterious ailment in the village and pose a challenge to Hamilton. Forbes does not succeed through expertise, but rather through luck as he had no idea how to destroy the zombies and no authority on the nature of the threat. The zombies and Hamilton himself are dispatched accidentally, when during a fight between Forbes and the Squire's henchmen the room is set on fire. The fire spreads to the voodoo dolls representing the zombie workers, which causes the zombies in the mines to burst into flames. Chaos ensues and Hamilton is trapped in the burning mines with his zombie creations whilst the protagonists escape with their lives. The threat is dispatched through pure luck and not expertise.

Once again, it is the young protagonists who are most involved in the destruction of the threat, with Peter (Brook Williams) digging up graves, rescuing Sylvia (Diane Clare), and fighting the zombies in the mines. Just like the later Richleau, Forbes is an advisor who knew the young protagonists before the events which unfold and comes to their aid when requested, with a title that marks him as an authority figure, and his

daughter but lack of wife marking him as a widower. Forbes is marked as a more diminished authority figure than Richleau through his limited knowledge of the threat in comparison to the extensive expertise of Richleau, and the two rival authority figures not being as high-profile, due to it being a localised struggle of the Squire and Sir Forbes, rather than the ultimate evil versus the Duc de Richleau.

The Reptile and *The Plague of the Zombies* have many similarities due to being filmed using the same director, on the same sets, using back-to-back shooting methods, but *The Reptile* has no authority figure of a similar ilk to Sir John Forbes. The threat is destroyed, but only because Anna (Jacqueline Pearce), in her reptile form, ceases her attack on Valerie (Jennifer Daniel) in order to kill her own father, Dr. Franklyn (Noel Willman). This allows Valerie and Harry (Ray Barrett) to escape the burning house which claims the Franklyns. In both Gilling films, the threat and its creator are destroyed by a chance fire that spreads, cleansing the threatened community with flames instead of an expert male as it was established in the late 1950s and early 1960s. This marks the throwing into question of male authority, just as was evident in other films where the young protagonists are left to struggle against the threat unaided, including *Taste the Blood of Dracula*, *Dracula Has Risen From the Grave* (Freddie Francis, 1968), and *Witchfinder General*. Male authority no longer provides a sense of protection for the protagonists and their community; it cannot be relied upon as it was previously which suggests a lack of faith and trust in male authority. This can be read as a precursor to the male authority figure becoming increasingly presented as corrupted and a threat to the protagonists in the horror films produced in the 1960s and 1970s.

In *Taste the Blood of Dracula* the older father figures with authority in their society who are dabbling in the occult with Lord Courtley (Ralph Bates) effectively leave their offspring to fend for themselves in destroying Dracula (Christopher Lee) when he preys upon them. These men have authority within the narrative due to their class and station,

but are revealed as corrupt beneath the veneer they present to society, and ultimately cannot provide their children with protection from the threat of Dracula. The teenage protagonists are younger than in *The Reptile*, and seemingly more defenceless due to this youth. Dracula is able to manipulate them, turn them into weapons against their fathers, and vampirise them without any challenge from a male authority. They have no assistance from a knowledgeable expert or vampire hunter of any kind, and only a note left by one of the deceased fathers (John Carson) who had quickly consulted his library of books before expiring, to give any indication as to the nature of the threat. They do not stake Dracula but trick him into entering a church causes his demise. Importantly, it also leaves the protagonists open to greater and more prolonged danger, highlighting the predatory nature of the threats within the diegesis. Their only course of action is an inefficient 'reliance on oneselves' which is a mark of 1970s American horror, but present here in British horror cinema. The rise of the young protagonist and the throwing into question of the male authority figure, with his simultaneous decline and transformation into a corrupt and predatory figure, can be linked to an increase in younger directors, culminating in Michael Reeves and his *Witchfinder General*.

The final frozen image of *Witchfinder General* is of a young woman screaming hysterically as she becomes insane, driven mad by the torture she has endured, and by witnessing her young male partner butcher the very human monster who inflicted their suffering upon them. Both 'good' and 'evil' are destroyed, male authority is eliminated, and the film aligns itself with Tudors 'paranoid' horror category.[12] This grim depiction that lacks real closure, with everyone dead or insane could be mistaken for the closing scene of one of the American horror films of the late 1960s and 1970s, but is in fact the ending of the British *Witchfinder General* released in 1968. This seminal film presents a narrative of the downward spiral to this final scene of two young protagonists from their original happy stability, due to their being victimised repeatedly by a corrupt male

authority figure in the shape of a witchfinder and with no benevolent counterpart to protect them and restore order.

1968 is in itself significant, as it is widely regarded as a key year in the horror genre due to a definable shift in American horror cinema with the release of *Night of the Living Dead*, and those films which Pinedo states exemplify postmodern horror that closely followed, including *The Texas Chain Saw Massacre* (Tobe Hooper, 1974) and *Halloween*.[13] Pinedo treats this film as a turning point in the evolution of horror into its postmodern form[14] as previously documented within this work. The failure of patriarchal authority which had previously been assured in horror cinema is one of the significant features of the film, just as the corruption of the patriarchal authority figure within British horror cinema progresses through the 1960s to one of the most important examples in the character of Matthew Hopkins (Vincent Price) in *The Witchfinder General* in 1968. A shift to a grim realist aesthetic and distrust of authority or its outright failure is highlighted in both the British film and the works of the emerging Romero, John Carpenter, Wes Craven, and Tobe Hooper in American horror. This is demonstrative of a simultaneous decline of male authority, and the rise of youth protagonists in British horror cinema having American parallels, such as *Psycho*, *Rosemary's Baby* (Roman Polanski, 1968), and *Night of the Living Dead.* Increasingly in both American and British horror of the 1960s and 1970s, the younger protagonists are left to fight against a malevolent male force, without any aid as the benevolent male expert disappears from horror cinema.

The notion of the threat as predator links to an important concept. Hutchings[15] and Hunt[16] both cite Michael Frayn's article concerning 'herbivores' and 'carnivores' in the ruling classes,[17] indicating that in the post-war era, the herbivores were in control, that is the radical middle-classes "or gentle ruminants, who look out from the lush pastures which are their natural station in life with eyes full of sorrow for less fortunate

creatures, guiltily conscious of their advantages, though not usually ceasing to eat the grass,"[18] whilst the carnivores are the upper and middle classes who quite literally see it as their right to prey on the weak to their advantage.[19] The carnivores took over in the 1950s and Hutchings and Hunt see this evidenced in the films of the 1960s, particularly the horror genre where the herbivores are the innocent bystanders and/or victims, who unless they align themselves with a more powerful/knowledgeable counterpart in the form of an expert or male professional who is seen as a carnivore in this equation, will be quite literally consumed by a carnivore in the form of the threat within the horror film. Hutchings uses the set up of the *Dracula* franchise to illustrate, whereby Van Helsing as carnivore destroys Dracula as another carnivore, whilst any herbivorous 'innocent bystanders' who do not align with him quickly enough are destroyed, quite literally eaten, by the carnivorous Dracula.[20]

Hunt argues that in the 1960s and 1970s "British horror, however, largely stuck to its herbivores in recruiting its normative heroes and heroines. The villains in these films pick off the last remnants of the 1960s herbivores."[21] However, with the decline of the male authority in general, there is a case for a new 'omnivore' label which describes the herbivore that takes on some of the violent traits of the carnivore in order to survive, but realises the consequences of their actions and often cannot cope with them This is true of the protagonists of *Witchfinder General* and the final shot of Sarah screaming as she loses her mind at the realisation of their violent actions to survive. These characters are usually the protagonists, as illustrated by *Goodbye Gemini* (Alan Gibson, 1970), in which the inseparable twins, Jacki (Judy Geeson) and Julian (Martin Potter) kill the predatory Clive (Alexis Kanner) to protect themselves. Their guilt leads first to their separation as Jacki flees in panic at their actions, and then to their deaths by murder-suicide. The twins originated as herbivorous, acted-upon, 'innocents,' who are preyed upon by carnivores that intend to use them for their own purposes and damage Julian

both physically and psychologically. By the end of the film they have preyed upon Clive in retaliation, believing him to have forced their hand into killing, which they realise was disproportionate but cannot reverse their actions and return to their 'herbivore' state.

This notion of herbivores lashing out violently occurs increasingly through the 1960s and 1970s, but to be clear, they realise the consequences of their actions and are not the same as the carnivores who exploit others with no qualms about their behaviour. Examples include *Witchfinder General*, *Fright*, *Goodbye Gemini*, *Killer's Moon* (Alan Birkinshaw, 1978), *Taste the Blood of Dracula* and to a certain extent, *Repulsion*. This pattern also appeared in non-horror films such as *Straw Dogs* (Sam Peckinpah, 1971), which was met with outrage on its initial release. With authority unable to defend the protagonists, these individuals are forced to take action themselves and remain psychologically changed by the experience at the end of the film whatever the results, and visibly struggle to come to terms with the consequences of their actions.

Frankenstein Created Woman is an interesting example of this type of character and shall be discussed below, but in short, the two characters of Hans (Robert Morris) and Christina (Susan Denberg) are herbivores who die as a result of the actions of carnivores (the group of male upper-class bullies). They are resurrected by another carnivore (Frankenstein) as one entity and exact their revenge by preying on their tormentors. This requires the adoption of the violent and calculating traits of the carnivore in order to pursue their goals with no consideration for anyone else, and only when their ambitions are met do they realise the consequences and commit suicide.

Here the 'monster' in question is both male *and* female. A female body with a male soul/mind created by Frankenstein (Peter Cushing), with this unnatural creation seeking violent vengeance on the upper-class tormentors. The key here, is that Frankenstein does not seek to capture Hans' soul for Hans' benefit or out of a duty of care towards

his assistant, but in order to use him as an object in his latest experiment at cheating

death by abusing his status as a male authority figure within the diegesis. Similarly, he

does not wait for a male body in which to implant the soul, but uses Christina after her

suicide and therefore takes her choice to die away from her. Not only this, but he

transforms the female form beyond recognition as the original Christina, 'fixing' what

he deemed to be her flaws and exerting full control over her body in preparation for the

male mind to occupy it. Thus, he demonstrates his superiority over life, death, and

physical appearance. A brief discussion of the nature of the male professional expert

and its changing status is necessary to establish the trajectory of change in the British

horror cinema as a whole through the two decades before a more detailed exploration of

Frankenstein and his moral decline.

The figure of the professional as a force used to destroy the threat was not only in

decline and prone to failures such as in *Quatermass and the Pit* (Roy Ward Baker,

1967), but also became corrupted or replaced entirely with an 'evil' male, as

demonstrated by Hopkins in *Witchfinder General*, Edward (Alister Williamson) of *The

Oblong Box* (Gordon Hessler, 1969), and Frankenstein (Peter Cushing) in *Frankenstein

Must Be Destroyed* (Terence Fisher, 1969). This variety of male has occurred before in

the time period, such as Christopher Lee's Rasputin in *Rasputin the Mad Monk* (Don

Sharp, 1966), and the corrupting power of overreaching science in *Die Monster Die!*

(Daniel Haller, 1965) and *Frankenstein Created Woman* in which Frankenstein would

appear to be relatively benign but in actuality he forces the unnatural union of Hans and

Christina with no regard for the consequences. However, 1968-1969 sees the purest

forms of this corrupt male with power over others. Spicer argues that the change in

attitudes towards and decline in the success and admiration for the professional exhibits

the

increasing stresses and strains as the belief in the authority of the professional, based on Victorian philanthropic idealism, declined. Indeed, the overweening rational paternalism came to be seen as the source of the problems, a cover for monstrous desires that hinged on the fear of women.[22]

This indicates that in reality the professional as authority figure was in decline and hiding a source of threat, which mirrors the argument put forth in this chapter that the male expert was losing its benevolent power, whilst simultaneously there was a rise in the corrupt male authority figure. Professional authority could no longer be accepted at face value or relied upon. That the female was linked to the change as a figure of fear links to the previous chapter on the female and its discussion on the changing representation of women and the rise of the female threat figure.

Here, the 'expert' is no longer a figure of professional authority, but one who seeks to inflict himself and his desires on others for personal gain. Hopkins exploits the perception of others that he is an expert in finding and destroying witches by paying him for his 'work' as he terrorises young women for his own gain. Edward of *The Oblong Box* escapes the room his brother, Julian (Vincent Price), locks him in to live with the body-snatching Dr. Newhartt (Christopher Lee) and begins a murder spree with his upper-class identity concealed, whilst conducting sexual relationships with women who haven't seen his face. Frankenstein is more complex due to his previous films and the changes that he goes through as the films progress, using women for entertainment, but intentionally creating life without their involvement. Hutchings argued above that the professionals remain celibate and therefore unweakened by sexuality, whilst Robert Murphy says of the earlier Hammer *Frankenstein* films that "Cushing's Frankenstein, sexually active and almost Bond-like in his casual use (and disposal) of women, sets a tone altogether new to the horror film and to British cinema."[23] Together, this would indicate that Frankenstein cannot remain stable and efficient like other male professionals and what Spicer terms 'civilian professionals'[24] due to being weakened by

his involvement with women. This differs strongly from the Baron (Colin Clive) of Universal's *Frankenstein* (James Whale, 1931) who seemed to be avoiding his impending marriage through obsession over his male creation. Thus, Hammer's Frankenstein presents a man who descends into bitter nihilism, and even monstrousness to a certain extent.

Hammer made seven Frankenstein films between 1957 and 1974 as follows: *The Curse of Frankenstein*, *The Revenge of Frankenstein*, *The Evil of Frankenstein* (Freddie Francis, 1964), *Frankenstein Created Woman*, *Frankenstein Must be Destroyed*, *The Horror of Frankenstein* (Jimmy Sangster, 1969),and *Frankenstein and the Monster from Hell* (Terence Fisher, 1974). The figure of Frankenstein (Peter Cushing, except for *The Horror of Frankenstein* in which Ralph Bates played the part) at the beginning of the Frankenstein franchise is a very different personality to the one in the final film *Frankenstein and the Monster from Hell*, and his descent can be tracked throughout the series. In *Curse of Frankenstein*, the viewer is presented with a Frankenstein who is an overreaching scientist and seems to regret the consequences of his actions. *Frankenstein Created Woman*, on the other hands, marks a turning point from the previously 'benevolent' Frankenstein, in which he is resurrected from an experiment, and decides to place the soul of his dead assistant inside the body of a young woman who committed suicide, knowing full well that it is more immoral than his previous experiments.

Within the narrative of *Frankenstein Created Woman*, Frankenstein chose to manipulate the bodies, minds, and souls of two young people for the benefit of his own desires, not to 'save' Hans who was his assistant, but to see if his latest plan would work. He made no effort to prevent the execution of Hans, and the deaths of the young couple so close together are convenient rather than tragic to Frankenstein. This is demonstrative of his sense of superiority to other people and a decline in his sense of

humanity, with no personal connections of worth as he had in previous films. Problematically, he is no longer using just body parts but the essence of life: the soul and all of the associated properties that mark it as precious and personal, making it more transgressive than his previous exploits. His disregard for a former accomplice marks his descent into the pure destructive and amoral nihilism of the later Frankenstein films. His decline is notable even in the 1969 *Frankenstein Must Be Destroyed*, in which the contrast is markable "between the suave, cruel Frankenstein (who goes so far as to rape his reluctant assistant's fiancée) and the sad-eyed, wholly human monster,"[25] with Frankenstein's impatience for knowledge getting in the way of Brandt's (Freddie Jones) attempts to reconnect with his wife (Maxine Audley) who thought him dead. Frankenstein has become a malicious figure who blackmails, rapes, kidnaps, performs illegal operations on living unwilling victims, and even murders by the end of his filmic series.

Such is the destructive nature of Frankenstein's actions and attitudes within the film that the monster carries him into the flames to destroy them both in the 1969 film. In the swansong of the series, *Frankenstein and the Monster from Hell*, Frankenstein (Peter Cushing) is working in an asylum and is presented as scarred both physically and mentally by his past experiments. He is unable to perform the intricate surgeries that his work requires due to acquiring burns in *Frankenstein Must be Destroyed*, and in a joke about eyeball implants and 'seeing,' his laugh is hysterical and lasts a lot longer than necessary which Simon Helder (Shane Briant) notes under his breath for the benefit of the viewer. Significantly, Helder is sent to the asylum for performing similar activities to Frankenstein and is mistaken for the new asylum doctor for a brief period of time before being repositioned as a patient. This serves to imply that he is a younger mirror for Frankenstein himself, and that both belong in the asylum as patients and not scientists. Even at the end of the film, Frankenstein is still intending to pursue his

experiments, despite the fact that none of them have ever truly succeeded within the franchise and instead have seemingly caused his descent into a nihilistic and malevolent expert male professional with a questionable grip on sanity.

Although Frankenstein's progression is a steady one, the likes of Matthew Hopkins in *Witchfinder General* and Edward in *The Oblong Box* are two individuals whose descent into the corrupt status the audience is introduced to was completed prior to the films. All three, however, benefit from their actions and the consequences: Frankenstein's experiment succeeds and he remains untouched in *Frankenstein Created Woman*, Edward gains the benefit of anonymity under the red hood which hides his hideous face when the locals curse him for his crimes abroad, and Hopkins becomes wealthy and feared through his witch-hunting. These men are the 'carnivores,' [26] but they have become corrupt as a result and use their power to their advantage. Thus, the 'corrupt male' becomes a major figure in the British horror film, one which follows the rise of the female threat within the genre, and a further examination of *Witchfinder General* will illustrate its importance.

Witchfinder General is regarded as a ground-breaking film that introduced a sense of nihilism and inevitability of hopeless destruction to British horror cinema. It differs greatly from Hammer product of the time both stylistically and narratively, and is more aligned with Tigon's later *The Blood on Satan's Claw*, since Tigon sought to reproduce the mood and realism of Reeves' successful film in their later product. Key to the film itself, is the abuse of power that is embodied in Matthew Hopkins (Vincent Price), whom society considers to be an expert in identifying and destroying witches, but in actuality he creates 'false monsters' to destroy for payment. The expert as male authority figure is no longer the saviour of the protagonists, but the cause of their destruction as the monstrous male.

A change from the originally-established expert here, is that he has become one whom considers himself to be 'above society.' Hopkins is first seen watching a hanging from a distance on a hill in an extreme long shot with no clue as to his identity for the audience, quite literally elevated above the townspeople, and leaves once the execution is complete. This becomes a visual enforcement of the 'carnivore' allegory as well as the concept of superiority to the rest of society, for he acts as a predator by invading towns and identifying victims to kill in order to increase his wealth and notoriety. As soon as the job/kill is complete and he is satiated, he moves on. If he takes too many victims, then the town of herbivores, the 'herd' to his 'carnivore,' may become suspicious or run out of money to pay him. This is the only credit which he gives the villagers in terms of intelligence, for none are permitted to question his actions or challenge him, lest he identify them as witches. In this manner, he takes as much profit and other favours as he can and abandons the towns without actually solving their problems but letting them think that he has.

One of the main features of this corrupt male authority figure is that he is not condemned by society for the majority of the film, but instead is a sanctioned force whose guidance is sought and approved of. Whilst previously the male expert was called upon to identify a threat which had already displayed its power to the protagonists and audience, therefore marking itself as abnormal and supernatural, Hopkins has a different way of operating. He enters the narrative unbidden at times and selects individuals to imbue with characteristics that actually belong to him and create false (mainly) female monsters for the townspeople to watch him destroy. Since the vast majority of his victims are female, there is a case here for the concept of the female as a blank canvas upon which the male can imprint negative qualities to create witches[27] and that the society in which they live is allowing it and even approving of it. The credit sequence actually layers the credits over images of predominantly women's faces in

physical pain, mirroring the final scene of the film in which Sara is screaming in mental anguish, and thus the film is imparted with a cyclical nature concerning the suffering of women at the hands of male authority, specifically Hopkins.

The purpose of Hopkins is to profit from forcing others to be identified as monstrous instead of himself. Because his victims are generally female Hopkins asserts patriarchy as the dominant force within the film. These women are tortured, raped, hung, and burned at the stake in order to maintain Hopkins' power and the sanctioning of this by the populace indicates that the females are more expendable than the males. It is only the accusation and killing of Sara's (Hilary Dwyer) priest uncle (Beaufoy Milton) and not the women he is executed with that the narrative progresses. The last shot of the film of Sara's screaming face can thus be interpreted as the inability of the female to combat the patriarchal oppression herself within the film and the inability of her husband to protect her from the corrupted expert, being turned insane by the effect which it has on her both mentally and physically.

There is also a link to a fear of the abuse of power by higher authorities, since no one seeks to question the accusations and decisions of Hopkins when he offers them scapegoats for their problems. By being able to move freely through the landscape and claim the support of the majority of the people and their local leaders in his decisions, the film becomes a critique of granting individuals unquestioned power over the people and their lives. Due to the political turmoil in Britain in the 1960s and 1970s, and the manner in which a political and economic crisis was building to a head by 1968 involving the mismanagement of the fiscal crisis, a link can be found between the film and the situation in Britain at the time with a mistrust of authority and an inability for the general population to prevent the situation worsening themselves. This is demonstrated by Richard's (Ian Ogilvy) inability to heed the warnings of impending danger on return from war and throughout the film, and to keep Sara or himself safe.

Richard is in denial of the dangers and preferring to just maintain the status quo, doing nothing to try and protect himself or his beloved. Even his vow to hunt down Hopkins and Stearne (Robert Russell) goes badly with Stearne slipping through his fingers and the final confrontation destroying everyone mentally or physically. At the end of the film all the main characters are dead, dying, or driven insane. This demonstrates that the individual cannot stop the corrupt male authority figure whilst they have the support of the uneducated masses who believe what those in power tell them.

There are parallels here between *Witchfinder General* and *The Devil Rides Out*, which would at first glance appear to be two very different films representing 'traditional' Hammer horror and the 'new school' that Michael Reeves is associated with. In both films, there is a key young female that the two males effectively fight over possession of, with the role of young characters against a malevolent authority figure being paramount. It is the young characters that are required to destroy the threat, with the benevolent authority figure that they are associated with being revealed as powerless to act under the veneer of authority which they carry. In *Witchfinder General* this is Sara's uncle the priest who carries the authority of the Church but cannot resist the actions of Hopkins, whilst De Richleau in *The Devil Rides Out* is revealed to be powerless to personally take action to protect the group from the dark forces sent against them by Mocata and can only try (and fail) to keep them inside a protective circle.

Similarly, the aims of the malevolent authority figures are selfish and personal, using their authority to inflict suffering on others in order to amass personal wealth and increase their power by killing innocents as witches for payment in the case of Hopkins, and Mocata forcing young people into serving the devil to increase his own power by using kidnapping, mind control, and the Angel of Death itself to regain control over those who stray. With the two films thus presenting authority figures in this manner,

there is a link between the two that those who present themselves as benevolent do not possess any true power to resist those who abuse their authority and seek to profit from it. Those who are most at risk from corrupt authority are the youth and they have no one left to rely on to protect them apart from themselves. As such, this speaks of a duality in perceptions regarding authority in society. This first being a lack of faith in benevolent authority and its ability to protect society, and secondly a fear of authority as a force that uses its power to inflict suffering for its own gain. Because of this change in the presentation of male authority figures throughout the 1960s and 1970s, it is evident that authority was being questioned, and presented as an entity that was no longer beneficial to protagonists and society itself.

In America 1968 saw the release of *Night of the Living Dead* and *Rosemary's Baby* presenting similar themes surrounding authority as untrustworthy, corrupt, and weakened in its benevolent forms, but it is clear from the British horror films of the 1960s that British films had been doing this a lot longer and more quietly in the UK. The next section of this chapter will examine the representation of the male and male authority in the 1970s British horror films.

The 1970s

Elements of the 1960s films continued into the 1970s, such as the decline of benevolent male authority and a rise in corrupt male figures who possess power and/or authority. As a result, male authority figures could not be trusted or relied upon. The continued trajectory of this aspect of the representation of the male will form part of the examination of the male in this section on the 1970s.

In the early 1970s, the female threat was at the height of her powers as explored in the previous chapter. This coincided with both a sharp increase in the number of films in which the female is targeted, which have been previously labelled the 'women in

peril' films, and a rise in new representations of the male. Between 1971 and 1973, three forms of the male emerged in British horror: the immoral rebel protagonist whose motives are questionable but whom the audience is invoked to empathise with; the monstrous father figure whose mental stability is in question or lost; and the male targeting the female mentally and/or physically due to obsessive repetitive behaviour. This section shall explore these three forms of the male, before finally examining two areas: the weakened male authority figure that has continued from the 1960s, and the influx of invasion narratives which authority figures are not present in, or cannot defend effectively.

1971-1973 presented the emergence of the male 'rebel' protagonist who commits acts which are wholly immoral/illegal in the society in which he lives and/or the profession to which he belongs, but he has the ability to gain the support of the audience. Such examples are *Abominable Dr Phibes*, *Dr Phibes Rises Again*, *A Clockwork Orange* (Stanley Kubrick, 1971), *I, Monster* (Stephen Weeks, 1971), and *The Devils* (Ken Russell, 1971). The Russell and Kubrick films are arguably hybrids of the horror genre that utilise the generic conventions associated with horror cinema, and have been claimed as such by other academics.[28] These compromised males feature in highly stylised films, especially in terms of *mise-en-scène*, narrative, and acting style. Unlike many of the other 1971 films, these do not contain a major female monster/threat, but instead the 'monster' is the sympathised-with protagonist.

The most significant figure here is Dr. Phibes (Vincent Price) of the two *Phibes* films. Although at first his actions in seeking to kill anyone involved in the failed surgery performed on his wife, Victoria (Caroline Munro), would appear to be grossly disproportionate and unjustified, his frequent monologues and dedication to the wife he has preserved evoke the sympathies of the viewer. He becomes an individual who can outsmart all the opposition, especially the police, regardless of how flamboyant and

nefarious his strategies are, with the murders described by Harry Benshoff as "gruesome, but more importantly, flamboyantly stylish."[29] This in turn contributes to the image of 'excess' in the staging, acting, narrative, and *mise-en-scéne*, resulting in a camp and parodic aesthetic similar to that of the *Batman* (Oscar Rudolph et al, 1966-1968) television series starring Adam West that had aired a few years before, and of *The Avengers* (Don Leaver et al, 1961-1969) series which Robert Fuest had directed seven episodes of between 1968 and 1969. The connections between the two series and the films is especially evident in terms of the techniques used to kill Phibes's victims and the eccentricity of the films themselves. This becomes even more excessive in the second film, in which Phibes seeks the Egyptian underworld entrance to eternal life and dispatches anyone sent to stop him. Benshoff states that "quite significant to Phibes's appeal as a gothic homosexploitation figure is that he is triumphantly victorious in all his plans,"[30] and this continues to follow Price into other horrors. Such connections of excess and eccentricity continued to Vincent Price's next British horror *Theatre of Blood* in which Diana Rigg who starred as Emma Peel in *The Avengers* features as Edwina Lionheart, the assistant to and daughter of Vincent Price's Edward Lionheart. She aids her father in killing all the theatre critics who gave him bad reviews with each murder themed around one of his Shakespearean roles, with Edward Lionheart presented as a similar charismatic villain to Phibes.

Key to Phibes' success in gaining the support of the viewer is his charisma, and his determination to do as he pleases which he has justified to himself. This is also true of other 'rebels' such as Alex (Malcom McDowell) of *A Clockwork Orange* and Marlowe (Christopher Lee) in *I, Monster*. The films demonstrate that at this point in the horror genre, there is a shift away from clear definitions of good and evil, as the human 'monsters' justify their actions to the audience, which was not present in earlier British horror to the extent of the early 1970s onwards. This is not just genre-specific but time-

specific. All are able to justify their actions, evoke the sympathies of the audience, and represent a 'legitimate' rebellion against the morals and laws that society has sought to enforce upon its populace; a 'tragic' scientist seeking cures and the advancement of mankind, the scholar seeking vengeance and the restoration of his beloved, and the youth rebelling against a pseudo-dystopian society that experiments on its population to control it. This is one way of interpreting the protagonists, the other is that they are law-breakers with low morals that do as they please regardless of the consequences of their actions. However, they do represent the beginning of the breakdown of the male in horror cinema of the period, for all three become 'unhinged' mentally at some point in their narratives.

There is a question remaining as to why these male rebels who are able to gain the audience's support appeared at this point in the 1970s. Individualism rather than the greater good is emphasised as a goal, rule-breaking to achieve these goals, and the ultimate success of the individual is generally the end result. This links back to the rise of the carnivore over the herbivores. All three of the men noted (Phibes, Alex, and Marlowe) can be described as carnivores in the manner that they disregard the lives of others, inflicting suffering and death on anyone who gets in the way of their pursuits, most of whom cannot defend themselves from the protagonists.

Because the protagonist is the threat within the diegesis, there is an argument that the films speak of a failure of society at large and a need for individualism in order to achieve the desires that are repressed. In Britain during the 1970s, there was political, economic, and societal instability, marking the state as unable to maintain its status which can be found in the government switching between the two rival parties at almost every election, the devaluing of the currency as a result of economic crisis, countercultures emerging that questioned authority, international crises, unofficial strikes in manufacturing industries in the 1960s and the public sector strikes of the

1970s.[31] Thus there was arguably a lack of confidence in the state to provide for the needs of the individual, and also in the ability of the state to maintain repression of undesirable elements in society. Horror as a genre is often viewed as subversive[32] and able to present images and messages that other genres do not, or cannot, due to their "marginal and disreputable status"[33] and thus can critique society to a greater degree.[34] With the shift in portrayal of male authority figures in British horror film over the two decades, there is support for the argument that film is influenced to an extent by the societal climate in which they are produced, which in Britain contributes in part to the rise of the male rebel protagonist. However, Phibes, who is the most successful and unchanged by the end of the narrative, is also of highly questionable mental stability, which forms the basis of the second kind of male emerging in British horror cinema at this time.

The next stage of the breakdown of the male arrives in 1972-1973, with a cluster of films in which male mental stability is destroyed and/or called into question with a focus on monstrous father figures. *Demons of the Mind*, *The Asphyx*, *The Flesh and Blood Show*, *Tower of Evil* aka *Horror on Snape Island* (Jim O'Connolly, 1972), and *Straight on Till Morning* (Peter Collinson, 1972) all present males who are psychologically imbalanced from their first presentation to the viewer, or become so due to an event that is portrayed onscreen. In some cases, this is an incident that creates an obsession so extreme that it destroys the male's entire family including *Demons of the Mind* with Zorn (Robert Hardy) driving his wife to insanity and suicide, and then mentally destroying his children through obsessive fear that they will also become insane and incestuous.

Similarly destructive is *The Asphyx* wherein Sir Hugo (Robert Stephens) watches his wife drown and will stop at nothing to ensure that the rest of his family become immortal with him so that he never has to watch them die, even though he kills them all

in the desperate hunt for immortality by trapping the spirit of death (the asphyx). This notion of trauma as the cause of insanity and obsession is also applicable to Sir Arnold Gates in *The Flesh and Blood Show* wherein Gates witnesses his wife's infidelity when he discovers her in bed with another man, and literally turns insane at the sight of this. He murders her, her lover, and anyone else in the future who engages in sex within the walls of his theatre. As Gates was playing the part of Othello in the theatre at the time of his trauma and murders, the notion of infidelity driving men to become unhinged killers is reinforced.

To be explored in depth in the next chapter on the family unit in British horror of the 1960s and 1970s, but will be briefly examined here, is that all three men became insane after a disruption in the status quo of their patriarchal family unit. In particular these incidents involved their wives dying and therefore being lost from the family unit, just as Phibes seeks murderous justice after his wife is removed from his daily life. For these men, it is the female that is key to male mental stability, once the wife leaves her proscribed position in patriarchy, the male experiences a breakdown, yet does not seek to replace her with a new wife, which theoretically would repair this. There are other women in the lives of these men instead: daughters are key figures here, although they are quite literally pulled into the insanity of their fathers and trapped within it.

To illustrate this, Christina Cunningham (Jane Lapotaire) is blackmailed into the plan by her father, Sir Hugo, as he forbids her marriage until she is immortal, and Elizabeth (Gillian Hills), is locked away by Zorn until she descends towards madness. This results in Elizabeth being the only family member left at the end of the film, completely insane and screaming at the camera in the same vein as the final shots in *Witchfinder General*.

This reliance on the successful patriarchal unit is also demonstrated by *Straight on Till Morning* and *Tower of Evil*. In the case of the former, the unstable male, Peter

(Shane Briant) who does not have a family unit to keep him stable creates his own by taking in Brenda and renaming her Wendy (Rita Tushingham) then turning on her when she becomes pregnant and seeks to be beautiful for his benefit. In the latter film, a woman marries an unstable male and they leave for a remote island, with the end product being the unstable male turning animalistic after her death and their male offspring following suit, with the two seeking to kill all outsiders who step foot on their island territory. These two families are started by males that are damaged and defy patriarchal rules and standards. Although their 'wives' stabilise them for a while, they nevertheless return to their violent ways, with Peter killing anything that is beautiful by patriarchal standards, and the males in *Tower of Evil* quite literally becoming murderous beasts in their own isolated community away from patriarchal society after the wife's death. Thus, the female in the patriarchal family unit is essential for ensuring stability for the male who is already adhering to patriarchal desires, but she is also necessary for controlling the males who would break patriarchal laws and defy its proscriptions and rules of society.

The end of the professional experts effectively occurred in 1974, when the last of these character types are presented within the films. John Verney (Richard Widmark) in *To the Devil a Daughter* is not a true professional expert as his vocation is occult novelist lacking the expertise, leadership, and physicality of the Duc de Richleau (Christopher Lee) in the earlier adaptation of Dennis Wheatley's *The Devil Rides Out*. Arguably, Verney is an everyman with some knowledge of his enemy whom he struggles far more to destroy than the earlier Richleau, with the ending adding to his lack of expertise by refusing complete closure. This is in contrast to Van Helsing (Peter Cushing) in *The Legend of the 7 Golden Vampires*, Captain Kronos (Horst Janson) in *Captain Kronos: Vampire Hunter*, and Tom Newcliffe (Calvin Lockhart) the professional hunter with technology and an extra werewolf expert (Peter Cushing as Dr.

Christopher Lundgren) to aid him in *The Beast Must Die*. It is also the year of the last in the Hammer *Frankenstein* series with *Frankenstein and the Monster from Hell* featuring the professional man of science ending the same year as Van Helsing in Hammer films.

Notable for Cushing's Van Helsing, is the manner in which he destroys Dracula (John Forbes-Robertson instead of Christopher Lee). Van Helsing has lost the majority of his vampire-hunting group to the zombie army and is alone after the remaining group destroyed the thought-to-be last vampire. Dracula declares himself before slapping Van Helsing across the room, then leaps at him to attack, only to seemingly accidentally impale himself on the discarded spear which Van Helsing had quickly grasped. This action results in an anti-climax. The lengthy death and disintegration scene creates a sense of finality combined with Van Helsing's lack of physicality and obvious age compared to the previous films in the series, to demonstrate that Van Helsing is at the end of his vampire-hunting career, with his heir surviving to take his place.

After destroying Dracula for the last time, Van Helsing is visibly shaken, with hair and torn clothes in disarray which is in contrast to his previous outings. He stands and watches the disintegration of Dracula, flinching at the lightning and Dracula's skull being smashed as the loosened spear falls on it. This all adds to the impression that Van Helsing will not be in another Hammer *Dracula* film, especially since he is not seen leaving the building, and his party does not return for him. The viewer has quite literally seen him for the last time. Hunter registers this notion of the expert who has lost his position by arguing that

> Aside from providing moral support, he takes relatively little part in the action until he stakes Dracula in the perfunctory finale. He has little special knowledge to impart – he admits that he is unsure how to tackle Eastern vampires – and the seven vampires are defeated in bouts of martial arts to which he minimally contributes. But his presence underscores that the western threat of Dracula *needs* to be defeated by a Westerner.[35]

Thus, Van Helsing is an expert at the end of his usefulness and unable to destroy vampires in the modern era or outside of Europe. Once Dracula is defeated for the final time, he is no longer required as his knowledge solely applied to the one vampire in China that he could destroy.

With the final professional experts in 1974, the rest of the decade made use of the 'everyman,' the police investigator, or in the case of *The Medusa Touch* (Jack Gold, 1978) a doctor who is out of his depth with regard to the case presented. Importantly, all of these men struggle and are ineffective against the threat they face. These threats are increasingly invading/outsider males who do not fit in the society that they threaten, but equally the major (and monstrous) female threat has returned to the horror cinema. These female threats are either the main threat themselves or are the vessel for the reincarnation/return of an ancient being.

A cycle of films that require examination for male representation are those which utilise male invaders from *outside* of the society in which the protagonists exist, who present a threat that has not been used frequently in British horror of the 1960s and 1970s, but it does represent an anxiety about the ability of the male to protect patriarchy from threats outside of his sphere of knowledge and from outside of his homeland. In this manner, it is representative of a fear of British society under threat as an increasingly isolated island rather than an empire with support around the world from its dominions. The films in question are displacement by male invader narratives that form a cluster in the mid-to-late 1970s. These range from the alien predator in *Prey* aka *Alien Prey* (Norman J. Warren, 1978) who would replace humans as the dominant species on Earth, to the mysterious Crossley (Alan Bates) who uses aboriginal magic to replace Anthony (John Hurt) in his home and relationship in *The Shout* (Jerzy Skolimowski, 1978). *The Omen* is a cuckoo story where the son of the devil replaces a stillborn child and will eventually threaten civilisation unless stopped. Similarly, *The Devil's Men* aka

Land of the Minotaur (Kostas Karagiannis, 1975) presents a cult who seek enough power for world domination. All of these invaders are male and representing a different patriarchal power to the one that the protagonists are a part of, or in the case of *Prey* that the women have isolated themselves from. Importantly, the male expert is no longer present to aid the protagonists in the destruction of the threat, which results in a high success rate for the threat.

Hendershot argues that "[t]he violence, death, and eroticism at the core of the horror genre may appeal to us on a universal level because it allows a space for us to contemplate death"[36] and thus to experience personal and societal fears on-screen. In the case of these invasion narratives within British horror, they speak of a fear of displacement of the male from his position in the hierarchy in which he abides, of an *external* threat which he has to resist. As previously mentioned in the prior chapter regarding Tudor and Pinedo and their concepts of the paranoid and postmodern horror, these films are exceptions to the rule regarding horror's movement towards internal threats in the 1970s.[37] *The Omen* is a crossover of the internal and external, as Damien was brought into the family as an external threat but was 'internalised' by being made family, but the other films use a purely external threat for their invasion narratives. Put simply, the invasion narrative speaks of a fear of loss of power and control to another, of infiltration that threatens, paralleling Hendershot's argument that

> [h]orror films provide a guide to many of the sociological fears of the cold war era. Because of their frequently naïve approach to the fears of the time, they give the audience vivid metaphors for the monsters that plagued British and American society in the 1950s-1960s.[38]

This argument is able to be similarly applied to British invasion narratives of the 1970s, since by the mid-to-late 1970s, Britain had lost the vast majority of its Empire to independence, and its dominance in world politics rapidly declined as America and the U.S.S.R vied for influence as the new world superpowers. In addition, Britain

experienced political and economic turmoil, oil price rises, rising deficits, miners'

strikes, and three-day weeks in the 1970s progressing to the financial crisis and

borrowing from the International Monetary Fund in 1976.[39] Thus, there is little surprise

that this sense of threat, lack of control and threat of being dominated on the world stage

fed into British cinema, even on a subconscious level with the filmmakers.

Significantly, the American Cold War invasion narratives have been argued as

indicating that the American population should rely on the state and its military to save

its people and society from the invasive threat,[40] thus "engendering a passivity in the

population who were taught to defer unquestionably to authority."[41] But not only as

allegorical of the Soviet threat "but all potential opposition to central institutions and

authorities of American society"[42] which indicates that there was not one main threat to

American society in the 1950s but several threats to the American patriarchal power

structure.

Thus, it can be argued that the invasion narratives in British horror spoke of an

attack not only on the power of Britain as a whole in the 1970s, but as threats to the

structures that supported it. *Prey* and *The Shout* take place in rural isolation, attacking

patriarchy on a lower level within the home and familial structure, demonstrating that

patriarchal power is no longer guaranteed with a lesbian couple in *Prey* and the

complete displacement of the male by another in *The Shout*. Differing from the

American narratives of two decades earlier, however, is the lack of support from the

military and authorities since neither are brought in to challenge the invader, suggesting

a lack of protection for the populace and a rejection of patriarchal power as posited by

the protagonists of *Prey*. The rural locations of the protagonists in both films, however,

suggests that they have consciously removed themselves from patriarchal society at

large and it can be argued that they are now facing the consequences by not being able

to gain assistance when required. In other words, isolation renders the individual in

danger of defeat, whereas in a more populated area or group they could have been protected by the authorities. This links to the lack of Empire putting Britain at risk of loss of influence and power in the world stage, leaving a sense of vulnerability in its wake. *The Omen* as invasion narrative can be read as articulating this issue, for despite identifying the threat that his 'child' poses, Robert (Gregory Peck) as the American ambassador to Britain is not heeded despite his position and alleged authority, rendering him useless when he tries to destroy Damien. He is prevented from acting to protect his family, Britain, and himself from an entity that 'invaded' his society.

The splintering of the male in the 1970s demonstrates a lack of control by male authority and an effective breakdown in the role of the male within society. Male authority figures are no longer effective in defeating threats, as is demonstrated by their weakness and inability to prevent invasions of their family units and local societies. At the same time, there is a breakdown in the traditional role of the male during the 1970s, with family units under threat and the mental stability of the male in crisis. This is linked to the changing society in Britain in the 1970s, wherein traditional gender roles were breaking down more rapidly than in the 1960s and male had to come to terms with being repositioned in terms of authority in patriarchal society. What is most striking, is the lack of control of the male in film over both himself and his previous subordinates of family and community.

Conclusion

The British horror cinema of the 1960s and 1970s demonstrates that the male is increasingly metamorphosing and splintering from the established figure of the expert male in the late 1950s. Much like the female, the male alters as time progresses and especially in terms of the expert, from his established form in the early 1960s which is corrupted in the late 1960s and by the beginning of the 1970s what is left of the original

expert is changed dramatically before dying out completely. Just as the expert in changing, there is the emergence of two dominant forms of the male: the rebel protagonist with questionable motives who interpolates the audience into supporting them, and the mentally unstable male who destroys. This speaks of a shift in the nature of the British horror cinema, for the experts mutate and end, leaving the protagonists unable to resist male invaders without assistance, resulting in a lack of closure and often the success of the threat itself to various extents. Problematically, there is also a lack of successful experts who can contain the influx of rebellious male protagonists and the unstable males, leading to the descent of patriarchal institutions on film as well as in British society at large. In short, there is a sense that the male as it was known previously has splintered and broken.

CHAPTER 5

The family and generational conflict in the 1960s and 1970s British horror cinema

Introduction

As Johannes Schlegel states, "[h]orror film, like all Gothic narratives, is predominantly concerned with representations and negotiations of the family, its values, and ideologies."[1] Within horror cinema the family unit can function as the source of the threat, the victim, and as both producer of the threat and its victim. This chapter will examine the representation of inter-generational dynamics in British horror cinema in the 1960s and 1970s with a focus on the family as the entity that produces the threat. This is the internal threat of Andrew Tudor's work on the transition of horror from secure to paranoid horror which has been explored as a concept in previous chapters.[2] The family is the most internal of all sources for the threat, for it is traditionally thought of as an institution which is secular, known, and should be the bastion of safety and security for the individual. In British horror it becomes a secular, internal, paranoid threat source producing faulty individuals who inflict themselves on others to the detriment of society. If the family is no longer safe, then nowhere is.

There is already a tradition of American horror being linked to the family and shifting representations of it as an institution,[3] with the work of Robin Wood and Tony Williams being central here. Robin Wood's *Hollywood From Vietnam to Reagan* argues that

> the connection of The family to Horror has become overwhelmingly consistent: the psychotic/schizophrenic, the Antichrist and the child-monster are all shown as products of the family, whether the family itself is regarded as guilty (the "psychotic" films) or innocent (*The Omen*).[4]

Whilst naming *Psycho* as the beginning of family horror[5] he cites the emergence of horrific families such as those in *The Texas Chain Saw Massacre*, *Last House on the Left* (Wes Craven,1972), and *The Hills Have Eyes* (Wes Craven, 1977), and even the monstrous child in *Halloween*, as a reaction to the images coming from the Vietnam War, the shattering of the 'Age of Aquarius' counter culture, and a mistrust in authority, namely "a period of extreme cultural crisis and disintegration."[6] Tony Williams continues this emphasis of the family in *Hearths of Darkness*,[7] a seminal text on the issue which explores the nature of the American family in cinema as becoming corrupted and producing the horror threat, which builds on the ideas put forth by Wood. This continues through work on American horror and the family to Sarah Arnold arguing in her 2013 book that the family horror films from the 1960s through the 1980s "mirrored a general trend in familial representations in America cinema"[8] and that it "challenges the nuclear family and the maternal self-sacrifice motif by destroying it from within."[9] In this way, American horror is linked repeatedly to the social climate in which it was produced.

Whilst there are iconic texts which explore American horror cinema and its representations of the family due to the work done by Williams[10] and Wood,[11] there is no British counterpart at this time which addresses the family within horror cinema in the context of British society in the 1960s and 1970s, and as a result it has not received the attention that it deserves. There have been some attempts to discuss British horror of the 1960s and 1970s in terms of the family unit, such as I.Q. Hunter's work on *Mumsy, Nanny, Sonny and Girly* in his *British Trash Cinema* in which he highlights the lack of a patriarch within the family allowing it to fall into chaos.[12] However, there still remains a gap in the analysis of the family in British horror through the 1960s and 1970s in the context of British societal shifts.

These shifts and changes within society can be found in the youth counter-cultures emerging, the rise of feminism coinciding with the changing roles of women, and importantly the family itself as a structure which produces functioning members of society was increasingly under pressure. During the 1960s and 1970s, Britain was experiencing changes in the way that families were structured, with new ideas circulating about the nature of family within public discourse. Some of these concepts came from psychiatric fields which then moved into public discussion at large. One such set of these ideas was those put forth by R. D. Laing, establishing his approach that the family, and this includes the traditional patriarchal family unit, is the source of repression that causes mental disorders in individual members of the unit. In short: family causes insanity.[13] This is part of a larger argument that society itself is "oppressive and requires the distortion and repression of human potentialities for its effective functioning"[14] which the anti-psychiatrists of Britain rooted their work in. This in turn led to the 1967 "Dialectics of Liberation" which attracted radicals from various specialisms including Marxists, political activists, critical theorists, artists, and not just psychiatry, forming one of the major events of its era and allowing the anti-psychiatrists to consolidate their rebellion against psychiatric hegemony.

The theories of Laing and his associates had influence beyond the psychiatric realm according to Nick Crossley, extending into the liberal-arts and social-studies realms.[15] Arguably the Ken Loach film *Family Life* (1971), demonstrates that the influence of Laing and his approach to the family impacted on the world of British film production due to the narrative within which anti-psychiatry and not traditional psychiatry is shown to work for Janice (Sandy Ratcliff), whose family has caused her mental breakdown.[16] All of this took place during the emergence of the counter cultures of the 1960 and 1970s that rebelled against the status quo that was established in the post-war period. Arguably, "[t]he work of Laing and his colleagues gave the counter-culturalists a focus

and resonated with the zeitgeist in such a way that it enjoyed massive appeal and appropriation,"[17] and in this manner found its way into the cultural products of the time, including horror cinema.

According to Crossley the counter-culture, which arguably added to a disruption of the family unit, emerged in the period between 1964 and 1969 - a point when Laing's work was progressing to a strong anti-psychiatry standpoint.[18] This timing was important because as a result both the counter culture and Laing's work contributed to the complicated social context that was already highlighting and questioning the 'rightness' of the family as a structure. This context included the changing role of the female due to increased freedoms and second wave feminism that intensified through the two decades. Such freedoms included young women pursuing careers and not settling down with a husband in the role of wife and mother, and an increasing divorce rate wherein women could dissolve a patriarchal institution that positioned the male as the dominant figure. This is present in films where the family is missing a mother or a father, and is faulty or under threat as a result. The single mother as the threat herself is evident in horror cinema including *The Psychopath*, whilst non-horror productions also demonstrated the single parent family as in crisis in *The Amazing Mr. Blunden* (Lionel Jeffries, 1972) and *The Railway Children* (Lionel Jeffries, 1970), wherein the families that do not have father figures struggle financially and socially until a patriarchal figure is able to 'repair' and provide for the family, or until the original father returns.

Specifically in British horror cinema there is a shift within the family unit. In the 1950s the family in horror film was still capable of being restored and recuperated after the threat was destroyed, with a family structure that was functional, but in the 1960s this was increasingly impossible to achieve. The late 1950s Hammer films did make use of weak father figures such as Stephen Banning (Felix Aylmer) in *The Mummy*, but the use of celibate heroes could be brought in to protect the family and restore it. British

horror of the 1960s and 1970s, however, presents an evident breakdown between youth and older characters, especially within the family.

This chapter will answer the question of to what extent changing notions of family impacted on the development of British horror. This will be addressed by showing that relations between the generations in British horror cinema were in disarray, with older generations preying on the youth in a parasitic manner and using them to achieve their own aims. The family itself also became a source of the threat to the protagonists either by the production of an evil child, or via the family becoming destabilized and corrupted to an extent that it becomes a destructive unit threatening the survival of patriarchy and the protagonists. However, whilst iconic American horror films of the period feature a family with a missing father, including *Psycho* and *The Exorcist* (William Friedkin, 1973), the British films frequently have a missing mother, which destabilises the father such as *The Asphyx* and *Demons of the Mind*. The destabilised father is a key contributor to the family becoming the source of the threat and of insanity in the horror film.

In order to demonstrate these changes in the representation of inter-generational relations and the family unit, this chapter will address four key approaches from the films which share a sense of family dysfunction. They are the corrupted family unit as dysfunctional family, single fathers, generational conflict, and 'cuckoo children.' These approaches are demonstrable from groupings of films which present different strategies in taking issue with traditional familial structures and produce different consequences, however, they have a shared agenda in undermining the traditional family. By addressing these four areas, it will be possible to demonstrate the extent to which the family unit was corrupted and under threat in British horror cinema of the 1960s and 1970s, producing its own threats to destroy the protagonists and as a result highlighting the shift in British horror cinema towards Andrew Tudor's paranoid category of horror,

as the threat emerging from within the family itself demonstrates the use of an internal and secular horror, threatening patriarchal stability.

The first section will focus on *Demons of the Mind* and *Mumsy, Nanny, Sonny and Girly* in order to explore the issues at stake when the family unit becomes corrupted/faulty, the effects which it has on both society and the members of the unit, and the repercussions. These two films are emblematic of this broader horror trend, with other examples being *Straight on Till Morning*, *Goodbye Gemini*, and *Paranoiac*. In particular, it will focus on the youth involved in the family unit and the manner in which they become destabilised to the point that the narrative seeks their destruction along with the rest of the family. The need for the families to be removed to protect society at large will also be of consideration for further implications.

The Asphyx is the focus of the second section in order to highlight the manner in which the patriarch of the family becomes unstable by the loss of the female mother figure. There is a case for the lack of a female making the male psychologically damaged, and therefore unable to effectively maintain the family according to patriarchal doctrine and produce effective members of the society that contribute fully to patriarchy and its maintenance. This leads to the destruction of the family and/or the creation of 'faulty' offspring and a family unit that is destroyed as a result of the actions of the patriarchal male.

The Psychopath and *Frightmare* (Pete Walker, 1974) will be used in the third section on generational conflict, which will focus in particular on the older female targeting youth. This has links to a previous section in the chapter on female representation, and demonstrates the dangers of the matriarch without a strong patriarch to control her. However, it is important to examine the manner in which older females are featuring as threats who are enforcing their desires on the younger generation, negatively impacting on them, and even consuming them.

Evil children or 'cuckoos' will be the focus of the last section. This highlights issues of the fall of patriarchy with the crisis of a man raising another man's child, denying them true lineage, and also in producing a threat which has been nurtured within the family, thus indicating that patriarchal families produce defective offspring and threats to their own existence. The focus here, *Twisted Nerve*, is demonstrative of these issues, especially since the threat is explained medically and thus puts full blame on the family for creating their own threat. If patriarchy cannot produce children that continue their legacy or who become destructive, then patriarchy as a system will fail.

Dysfunctional families

In the 1960s and 1970s British horror was producing films in which the traditional family unit structure became faulty and destructive due to a corrupting element, either by the lack of a male father figure which is the case in *Mumsy, Nanny, Sonny and Girly*, or the male himself making the family a monstrous entity which is found in *Demons of the Mind*. In both cases, the monstrous family contains individuals who threaten those outside the family and society itself. *Mumsy, Nanny, Sonny and Girly* opens with Mumsy (Ursula Howells) and Nanny (Pat Heywood) non-diegetically discussing their 'darlings' who are revealed to be Sonny (Howard Trevor) and Girly (Vanessa Howard) wandering in their school uniforms with an implied incestuous relationship owing to the suggestive manner in which Girly sucks Sonny's thumb. The two proceed to take a tramp (Hugh Armstrong) home to fill an empty role of 'friend' in 'The Game' of playing happy families. It transpires that any of the new friends who are brought into the family and refuse to play the game to the satisfaction of the family are 'sent to the angels.' This is a euphemism for ritual murders based around playground games, with the latest friend being dispatched by decapitation to 'Oranges and Lemons.' As a result, Sonny and Girly need to find a replacement New Friend (Michael Bryant) in the

suburbs whose girlfriend (Imogen Hassall) they murder by pushing her off a slide in a playground then convince New Friend that he killed her whilst drunk. In this manner they convince New Friend to return to their mansion and force him to play their game using the murdered woman's body as blackmail.

New Friend is in a subordinate position within the family and seeks to gain control by creating sexual jealousy among the characters via acting on the sexual advances of first Mumsy, and then Girly. It is as a result of this that Sonny sees New Friend as a threat and wants him killed, causing Girly to panic that she will lose her new sexual partner and subsequently beat Sonny to death with a mirror. As New Friend is given the task of burying Sonny who is simply labelled 'naughty' in a dismissive manner by Mumsy, he finds the grave markers of the previous 'Friends' and realises exactly how precarious his position is. New Friend is just as disposable as all those who came before him. The sexual jealousy rises to the point at which Nanny tries unsuccessfully to murder Mumsy with acid-tipped needles, followed by Girly taking an axe to Nanny and cooking her severed head. New Friend has still not ensured his survival however, nor has he asserted his authority in this matriarchal family, as Mumsy and Girly call a truce and arrange a rota for which of them will get to have sex with New Friend. The film ends with New Friend overhearing Mumsy and Girly discussing the inevitability of becoming bored with New Friend, and what the result might be, prompting New Friend to retrieve Nanny's needles and hide them in readiness for either of the women deciding to kill him. New Friend is still trapped within the family and being controlled by the women who could dispose of him at any time, rather than being at the head of the family unit.

Demons of the Mind is a different situation in a less well-known Hammer gothic which is using an internal, secular and therefore paranoid/postmodern threat, differing from the previous gothics that Hammer produced. Here, the film revolves around the

widower Baron Zorn (Robert Hardy) and his two children Emil (Shane Briant) and Elizabeth (Gillian Hills), the latter of which is introduced in a carriage having been kidnapped from the woods. This is revealed to be at the behest of Zorn to return her to captivity in the family home, due to a fear that his incestuous children have inherited a family curse of insanity. This results in the murders of local peasant girls when Emil frequently escapes, and Zorn's children becoming increasingly mentally unstable through his attempts at finding cures. One such attempt is to invite the discredited doctor Falkenberg (Patrick Magee) to perform psychological experiments on the children in order to cure them of the family curse. Whilst under the influence of one of Falkenberg's procedures, Zorn reveals that he has dreams of being a demon of the forest like his ancestors, relishing an overwhelming bloodlust and desperation to kill, knowing that he will die a ritual death like his predecessors. He describes his other dreams of ivory, hair, flesh and blood, whilst the images on the screen show the corresponding parts of a naked woman who begins to caress her skin. Falkenberg informs him that Zorn has sexual fears suppressed by guilt that his children are now inheriting, that his children are the key to the problem. To purify his family's cursed blood Zorn had married a virgin peasant girl but was so disgusted by her virgin blood and sexual desire that he became impotent after the twins were born and could not continue a sexual relationship with her, driving her insane until she committed violent and bloody suicide in front of her children.

Whilst the level of insanity is increasing within the Zorn family, tensions and hysteria rise in the village as rituals are conducted and the population goes on a hunt for the demon in the forest that is killing their young women, not knowing that it is Emil who is committing the murders. Falkenberg organises an experiment to dress a peasant as Elizabeth and present her to Emil, during the process of which he realises that Zorn has an influential hold over Emil which has forced insanity upon him and makes him act

violently as a conduit for Zorn's desires. This experiment sends both Emil and Zorn over the edge and into impulsive killings. Emil chases the girl into the forest, kills her, returns home to find Elizabeth, kills his aunt (Yvonne Mitchell) and escapes with Elizabeth. Zorn discovers what Emil has done, kills Falkenberg and sets out into the forest to kill his children - the forest in which the peasants have decided that Zorn is responsible and are hunting for him. Zorn finds his children and kills Emil, but is found by the peasants who have formed a mob with flaming crosses before he can kill Elizabeth, and Zorn is subjected to the ritual killing he dreamt of by being impaled with the largest of the flaming crosses. The final image is of Elizabeth screaming hysterically as she has been pushed over the edge into insanity.

These two very different films show family units that are isolated and without a stable patriarchal figure. This issue of the corrupted family unit threatening patriarchy as a whole indicates that patriarchy is a system dependent on very strict structures of producing individuals who can successfully be integrated into it. That 'faulty families' begin appearing in the 1960s arguably shows that the nuclear family unit of father, mother, and children in strict individual roles within the family is shifting and unworkable when members either change role or are missing. The requirements of the patriarchal nuclear family are too specific with no room to manoeuvre or change, making them a threat when they do.

Mumsy, Nanny, Sonny and Girly presents a family that is wealthy but fatherless, and in the habit of kidnapping males in order to role-play being a perfect family. The family murder any who refuse or attempt escape. In this case, the family is 'broken' according to the patriarchal system but attempting to repair and reintegrate by replacing the missing male with a series of men that they lure in with Girly including New Friend (Michael Bryant). The lack of an individual name for New Friend designates that the men that are kidnapped are interchangeable and simply filling a role in this elaborate

role-play of 'family.' Tellingly, New Friend is not 'father' or 'husband' but 'friend.' Thus, it is suggested from the start that he will not be permanent and the attempt to make the family complete has repeatedly failed previously as he is 'new friend' and not just 'friend.' This is emphasised by the cluster of grave markers in the gardens for the previous 'friends,' and the numbering of the rooms in which they accommodate the men.

A similar repetition of finding new friends is demonstrated by Nanny and Mumsy leaping out of bed at night when Sonny and Girly bring home New Friend, rushing to the window to get a look and chattering excitedly about what he might be like in comparison to the previous ones. Another clue to the state of the family and the projected fates of the friends is the unkempt state of the isolated mansion house with its dark passageways, boarded up rooms, damaged hallway paint work, and all plant life in the orangery dead. Only the key rooms for family life are well-lit, specifically the kitchen, dinner table area, and the bedrooms which are overly lit with pastel colours being emphasised in the interiors. These are the interactive places where the game of happily families is played out in an exaggerated manner and the rest of the building is neglected. The house is a reflection of the family and its psychological health.

The issue of isolation is key here as these families exist outside of the patriarchal system from which they were produced. The physical separation from the rest of the fully functioning patriarchal society within the diegesis highlights that the family is not part of normal society; this family is faulty and segregated like a potential contagion. This separation also provides power, however. The individuals who enter into the homes of these families do not understand the rules by which they exist and are at a disadvantage that endangers them. This is most obvious in *Mumsy, Nanny, Sonny and Girly*, in which the 'friends' who do not play by the rules or fail to understand are murdered. Isolation allows the families to control their own space and develop different

hierarchies and societies to those of patriarchy. By doing so, patriarchy is being rejected and the families therefore need to be removed to protect the existing patriarchal systems.

Demons of the Mind presents a different form of corrupted family to *Mumsy, Nanny, Sonny and Girly*, in that not only is the patriarch still present, but this is a period drama from the larger Hammer studio. This film varies dramatically from previous Hammer productions in its treatment of authority figures, the use of psychoanalysis, and the presentation of the family unit as destructive rather than a restorative institution. Importantly, Zorn is also a Baron and thus has a responsibility for the local townspeople. By destabilising both his family and himself, he also threatens the entire town. As the patriarchal power in the area, he has to be the embodiment of patriarchal requirements for the male. Evidently, he is defective. Zorn has become insane due to his obsession in believing that there is a curse of hereditary insanity and incest in his family line that will afflict his children. The solution that Zorn has decided upon is to lock his two children away from the outside world in separate rooms so that they cannot interact with each other or society. A second part of his strategy is to hire the discredited doctor Falkenberg (Patrick Magee) to perform psychological experiments on the children. However, by his actions in attempting to prevent the curse from passing on to his children, he actually irreparably damages them. He produces defective children who are violent, incestuous, psychologically-imbalanced, and even murderous. By refusing to allow them to engage with the patriarchal society outside of the castle, his was the only influence on them and thus they have been psychologically-moulded in his image, so to speak. They are 'faulty' according to the requirements of patriarchy.

This destruction of the family is important. Emil, as a multiple-murderer, is killed since he has transgressed societal law. Zorn's death, however, is more dramatic and violent. The villagers have amassed with pitchforks and a giant flaming cross, with

which they impale Zorn. Elizabeth (Gillian Hills) is the only family member left alive. As the female within the patriarchal unit, she did not have any true power, and throughout the narrative was subject to the demands and desires of the males. The madness inflicted on the home and village in which she resides and of Zorn as its head becomes her insanity, overloading her mentally at the end of the film, so that she, like Sara (Hilary Dwyer) in *Witchfinder General* is left screaming in insanity at the destruction that rival patriarchal factions have wrought. She can no longer continue a patriarchal lineage or be a useful and productive member of society.

Destroying the family itself is necessary in order to protect patriarchy at-large because the Baron is ruler of the local area and his faulty family has produced males that will not be able to act in the best interests of the villagers. There are also consequences for the society in which they existed as Zorn's actions lead to the downfall of his family's power over the villagers, the physical destruction of the family, and the end of his legacy. By destroying his family and the power they represent, he has broken the patriarchal society as their will be no one left who can take power easily and rule the area in his family line, creating a power vacuum in the village.

As has been illustrated using the films, the psychological damage that is evident in the families within *Demons of the Mind* and *Mumsy, Nanny , Sonny and Girly* demonstrates the potential destructive capacity of the family as a unit on both its individual members and society itself. This produces a threat that is both internal and secular. These are faulty families that cannot function, cannot contribute to patriarchy, and need to be destroyed so that they cease damaging society at large, with one killing men and the other killing women. Despite their differences in setting and style the two films both articulate that the family can be a danger to itself and to outsiders instead of being what should be a safe space and support structure for the raising of children. The

specific figures that operate individually within the family will be explored in the next sections in terms of how they can become the threat within the family itself.

Single fathers

Whilst the American horror cinema of the same period highlighted families without fathers, the British horror focused more on the family without a mother. This is an important difference that needs to be examined in terms of how the corrupted family unit is parallel with the patriarch of the family unit being made unstable by the loss of the female mother figure. I will argue, using *The Asphyx*, that the single father in British horror becomes psychologically damaged and unable to effectively maintain the family in a manner that can produce offspring and therefore contribute fully to patriarchy and its maintenance. This leads to the destruction of the family and/or the creation of 'faulty' offspring and a family unit that is destroyed as a result of the actions of the patriarchal male.

Kord argues that the industrial revolution restructured the family with the emergence of the middle classes wherein the male worked outside the home, and the female was confined to devalued, unpaid work inside the home. [19] For the patriarch

> it became a sign of financial success and a point of social pride to be able to keep his wife at home (not "working"). It was at this point that ideology stepped in, casting women as the principal caretakers of children and children as fragile beings dependent on maternal care.[20]

In British horror cinema the wifeless male has his status called into question as he no longer has a wife to take care of the children; the male role breaks down because he will now have responsibility for the children and cannot solely be the breadwinner. Society had established a specific division between male and female 'work' and the male cannot fulfil the role assigned to the female without consequence as shall be demonstrated. As

noted in *Demons of the Mind*, the patriarch without a wife in his family unit becomes unstable. Only two years after the exploits of Baron Zorn (Robert Hardy) and his family came the release of *The Asphyx* which focuses on Sir Hugo Cunningham (Robert Stephens) trying to make his family immortal by capturing the spirit of death (the asphyx) after his wife and son die in front of him. This becomes his obsession which goes unchecked and leads to the destruction of his entire family. Sir Hugo captures the asphyx spirit in order to preserve the human in their original living form for eternity. As a result he loses everything, including the younger members of his family that he used his techniques on to defy the natural order.

Problematically, Sir Hugo interferes in the survival of patriarchal lineage by refusing to allow his daughter Christina (Jane Lapotaire) to marry until he has made her and her fiancé, Giles (Robert Powell) immortal. In this manner, he ends not only his own family line, but that of Giles as his experiments kill Christina. Thus, he disobeys patriarchal societal rules regarding the exchange of the female from a family to a new husband in order to procreate and extend patriarchal power and legacy. Claude Lévi-Strauss notes in *The Elementary Structures of Kinship* that women are reduced to goods that are passed between the males

> [t]he total relationship of exchange which constitutes marriage is not established between a man and a woman, where each owes and receives something, but between two groups of men, and the woman figures only as one of the objects in the exchange, not as one of the partners between whom the exchange takes place.[21]

It is the men who exchange women and not vice-versa which indicates that the power is held by the males and not females in society by establishing extra-familial relations and allegiances. By forcing Christina and Giles to obey his whims, he also prevents the passing of patriarchal power from the older to the younger generation. This refusal to obey the systems of patriarchy result in the deaths of everyone connected to Sir Hugo,

leaving him as an outsider with no family or lineage to maintain his connection to society.

With no wife to remain with him after his children leave to continue his line, Sir Hugo will have no one left to exert his influence over, rendering him a lone patriarch. Without a wife to control, Sir Hugo is instead replacing her subservient role with Christina as the only female left in the family unit. With only his daughter left, his need to control and have his will obeyed is focused on Christina, and by extension the future son-in-law who would take his place in control over his female offspring. Sir Hugo is avoiding having to fulfil the role of both male and female parent to his child by putting all of his efforts into his scientific research, by overcompensating for his lack of wife through male pursuits of technology. There is no guarantee that after Christina becomes immortal that he will ever relinquish his control of her to her new husband as promised.

However, with a rival for his daughter, Hugo enforces his will that they submit to him, despite both young people not wanting to take part in his experiments for achieving immortality. Ensuring the immortality of Christina becomes Sir Hugo's obsession. He cannot function effectively as a father in raising his children without his wife, which is demonstrated by the first scenes of the film in which the family is established as happy, successful, and well-rounded, with all the members playing the roles assigned to them by patriarchy. As soon as his wife dies, Sir Hugo becomes unstable by descending into an obsession that borderlines insanity. Only a desperate man would risk killing his loved ones in order to use a dangerous and risky technique that has been tested on a rodent and himself. This is the argument put forth by Christina and Giles to no avail.

Significantly, it is Sir Hugo who will 'own' their souls/asphyx by sealing them away in the family tomb behind an impenetrable door, so that even when the couple marry they will still be under his control and his name. By forcing the young couple to

obey his will, they suffer whilst he claims it is for their benefit. They will be granted the illusion of freedom only. In this manner, the older patriarch refuses to allow the younger generation any freedom, or choice, and prevents the transference of patriarchal power. Problematically, at the time of this experiment, there is no guarantee of the consequences of immortality via trapping the asphyx. Those who survive the experiments may still age but be unable to die and exist in pain forever, they may be unable to have children, or the containment could be breached leading to sudden death. Sir Hugo is willing to experiment on his family with no knowledge of the lasting effects. As is revealed at the film's end, the process leads to unending life without release from mental anguish for Sir Hugo who is now destitute and wandering England alone apart from an immortal hamster approximately a century after his experiments. That Sir Hugo decides to condemn himself to immortality alone is significant, for even hundreds of years later he has not been able to move on and is relegated from his prominent position to a homeless man with only an immortal rodent for company. He does nothing to advance the human race as he had planned to do after making his family immortal.

Thus, Sir Hugo illustrates that the patriarchal family unit cannot function correctly without a female to be subservient to the male. This is especially clear after Christina's death caused by the experiment failing, which leads Giles to commit suicide, and Sir Hugo destined to remain alone for eternity. This differs from the previous *Demons of the Mind*, in which the patriarch was destroyed as an unstable threat to both his family and patriarchal society. To take a psychoanalytical approach to the male who becomes an unstable threat through the lack of a wife presents an interesting argument. Without a female to be subservient to the male, there is no 'other' for patriarchy to imprint undesirable characteristics upon, and no female to raise the children through the semiotic realm to pass into the symbolic. Thus, the male is required to carry the burden

of both the symbolic and the semiotic in psychoanalytical terms. The male is not 'designed' to reside in the semiotic realm and this can be considered a regression from the symbolic realm into a 'female' space wherein the abject is positioned in patriarchal society.

The male through exposure to this becomes the abject figure and the threat, as in *Demons of the Mind*, *The Flesh and Blood Show*, and as illustrated as physically abject in *Tower of Evil*, and all of these males produce 'faulty' children as a result. In the case of Sir Hugo, it is after the death of his wife that he descends towards his deadly obsession that results in the extinction of his family at his hands. Sir Hugo becomes linked with death and its abject nature, desperate to master it and assert patriarchal authority over it. The change in Sir Hugo is from a happy male surrounded by a stable and functioning family unit, to a man who refuses to engage in the patriarchal practise of the exchange of women, who blackmails his remaining family into supporting his obsessions with experimenting with death. In order to cheat death and achieve immortality, Sir Hugo must invite it and experience imminent death with the risk of becoming a corpse which is the most extreme form of the abject. He then inflicts this upon his family and creates corpses, blood, and suffering instead of avoiding it and as a result the extremes of the abject and semiotic realm are brought to the fore in the previously balanced family.

However, not all of the wifeless males in British horror become an abject threat to society itself, produce faulty offspring, and/or destroy their family unit. There is a second type of wifeless male who is present in narratives in which an important feature of the motherless family unit is that fathers cannot protect their daughters from the threat. This is evident in *Blood from the Mummy's Tomb*, *The Asphyx* and even in *Dracula* (John Badham, 1979). Significantly, this indicates that the males could not prevent the deaths of their wives, and so are demonstrably less capable of ensuring the

survival of their family. Their daughters are a second chance for the male to prove his worth as a patriarch, or else the daughters are destined to mirror their wives.

Significantly in the three examples given, the males in question are all men of science, obsessive, and experts in their chosen fields. Problematically, the daughters die as a direct result of the subject in which these men are experts, indicating that if they had not been obsessed, that they would not have brought about the risks to their daughters. That they should have been paying more attention to protecting their families from harm in order to correctly raise them without a wife to aid them in the process, rather than obsessing with their scientific pursuits. To illustrate this, two primary examples of this are *Blood from the Mummy's Tomb which* sees Margaret threatened and almost certainly destroyed by Tera taking over her body due to Fuchs's (Andrew Keir) obsessions with Egyptology, and in *The Asphyx* Sir Hugo and his desperation to conquer death through science results in the death of his entire family one by one despite their insistence that he not conduct the experiments. The decapitation by guillotine of Christina is particularly evident of this, as the method of risking Christina's life to the point where death is imminent and her asphyx can be summoned and trapped does not allow any potential for her to be rescued or resuscitated. A slower method of death such as drowning or asphyxiation could have allowed Christina to be saved if something went wrong, but Sir Hugo does not allow for this as a potential issue in his technique for achieving Christina's immortality. It is a case of death by hubris. What these films show is that if both men had put their obsessions to one side then they would not have endangered their children and the survival of the family unit could have been ensured.

Ultimately, these films present a questioning of the role of the patriarchal father figure and his dependence on a female mother figure in order to retain its stability. Wifeless fathers cannot raise families successfully. This leads to a defective patriarch

and the destruction of the family unit itself as it no longer follows societal rules correctly. As a result, this highlights the importance of the role of the mother within the family unit, for without her the family is quite literally destroyed. With the changing role of women in British society in the 1960s and 1970s, the status of women was no longer restricted to only wife and mother in the traditional family unit. Once the woman in the film leaves this role, the male is unable to maintain the family. As a result, it is shown that the patriarchal institution of the family is reliant on the female to function.

Generational conflict

A key feature of the family unit in British horror cinema of the 1960s and 1970s, is inter-generational conflict. This takes several forms: past actions of the older generation damaging their younger counterparts in the present; mutual hatred resulting in patricide; youth being restricted by the demands of their elders; and the monstrous mother figure. Before a detailed examination of the use of older generations controlling and damaging the younger generations, it is necessary to briefly highlight the issue of the youth counterculture and its negative representation as a threat causing generational conflict. Youth countercultures emerging in the 1960s and progressing through the 1970s and the questioning of authority that this produced played a key part in inter-generational conflict, along with the repercussions of Britain's political, international and economic past having a direct impact on the present.

This last aspect will be explored in detail in the next chapter. *Psychomania* (Don Sharp, 1971), however, is a key example of youth countercultures undermining patriarchal authority. The film "follows a British biker gang […] from dissatisfaction to suicide to rebirth as an undead army spreading mayhem through the home counties."[22] After discovering the secret to resurrection as the undead, becoming the literal Living

Dead of their gang's name, they terrorise the local area and their elders to an even greater extent than their youth rebellion that took place when they were still alive. Their final 'death' involves being turned to stone as part of a megalithic arrangement like the stone circle where they met, which Mortimer argues is a "modern take on the old folktales suggesting that stone circles were revellers turned to stone for infringements of the Sabbath."[23] Thus, the youth are eventually punished for their disruption of patriarchal order by being made a permanent warning to others who would seek to undermine societal rules and expectations. The significance of their demise is thus not to be undervalued within the context of intergenerational conflict, demonstrating that it existed outside of a directly familial context.

There is a sense that the older generations do not wish to relinquish control to their younger counterparts - that they are trying to prevent the freedom of the youth, whilst simultaneously damaging them in an attempt to pursue their aims regardless of the consequences. This results in possessions including *Blood From the Mummy's Tomb*, enforced animalistic transformations (*The Reptile*), elders physically living through young men (*The Sorcerers* (Michael Reeves, 1967)), children being used as patricidal vengeance against parents by external threats (*Taste the Blood of Dracula*), and the older characters physically consuming young people with *Countess Dracula* featuring Ingrid Pitt bathing in the blood of virgins to absorb their youth into her skin and *Frightmare* with a cannibalistic mother. Importantly, all of these elders in question are concealing their true natures and intentions from society, as well as their past actions and the negative consequences. All of these elements combine to produce an older generation of questionable authority that cannot be trusted and damages the future for the younger generation.

The monstrous female as threat was explored in a previous chapter, but here the importance of the monstrous mother is key to an exploration of the inter-generational

conflict in British horror cinema. As a figure of threat to the protagonist, the monstrous

mother is a feature of films including *The Psychopath*, *Frightmare*, and even the earlier

Hammer *The Nanny* (Seth Holt, 1965) as a mother-figure in Bette Davis who refuses to

relinquish control of her children, or allow them to progress into patriarchal society

properly, due to an event in the past which has made her monstrous. Allowing greater

power over her children or the monstrous mother is the lack of a patriarch, either

physically missing or weak and ineffective which allows the mother to dominate.

Interestingly, the missing male here produces a monstrous mother, whilst in American

horror cinema the missing male produced a monstrous child, with *Carrie* (Brian De

Palma, 1976) and *The Exorcist*. Arguably, *Carrie* presents a mother (Piper Laurie) who

can be described as monstrous, but it is Carrie (Sissy Spacek) herself who is the

'sympathetic threat' figure and ravages the community through destruction of the school

and the youth it contained.[24] The monstrous mother creates a monstrous child in the

British film to be examined below, *Frightmare*, but remains the main and most

destructive threat within the diegesis of this Pete Walker film.

    Frightmare presents one of the strongest variations on the monstrous mother.

Chibnall states that "[i]ts themes are violence, insanity, fate and the matriarchal

family"[25] Sheila Keith as Dorothy has taken control of the family from Edmund (Rupert

Davies), forging a matriarchy that refuses to relinquish its hold on the younger

generation of the family. Jackie (Deborah Fairfax) is compelled to visit the farm

regularly to appease the cannibalistic appetites of her elders. She is compelled to hide

the shame of her stepmother's past actions and attempt to prevent their reoccurrence;

Jackie is unable to separate herself from her the older generation and make a life for

herself because their guilt is her guilt. As Chibnall argues, Dorothy represents a "malign

legacy of the past."[26] With the opening sequence in a deserted funfair, "[t]he film's

opening scenes contrast the imagery of an aged establishment with the pleasure-seeking

youths who are denied participation in the adult world."[27] Thus, from the outset, the film conveys a society which refuses to relinquish any power or influence to the youth. Dorothy is introduced as

> all the things a mother should not be – controlling, self-obsessed and, ultimately, psychopathic – yet she gives the appearance of a kindly beneficence which begins to undermine our faith in the beautification of motherhood and the essential goodness of family life.[28]

Once again, the influence of R. D. Laing on society and film can be found in the family presented onscreen, with the youth condemned from the very outset. This is an element that Chibnall also recognises, with his discussion of Laing and David Cooper within his work.[29] Wood, however, highlights the influence of the family as "a single unifying master figure"[30] that produces the threat in horror film from the 1960s onwards, and he marks out *Frightmare* as one of these films in relation to cannibalism by claiming it as American-derived. His note on the film is that Dorothy is "a sweet and gentle old mother who has the one unfortunate flaw of being unable to survive without eating human flesh, a craving guiltily indulged by her devoted husband."[31] Problematically, Wood oversimplifies the film and does not explore the true nature of Dorothy's cravings and influence.

Key to the film is that Dorothy *chooses* to consume the young; she sustains herself and her power over the family by destroying the youthful generation in a similar manner to the Countess (Ingrid Pitt) in *Countess Dracula*. However, the monstrous female has produced a monstrous female offspring in Debbie (Kim Butcher) and is set to butcher and devour Jackie, who is only her stepdaughter, at the film's close. This signifies that those who try to move on from the past and change the established order that they are set to inherit will find themselves at risk. Trying to limit the destruction of her stepmother is equally doomed to failure. Jackie kept Debbie away from her parents upon their release, leading to the mother and daughter plotting revenge when reunited.

Secretly taking parcels of raw animal brains to Dorothy in place of human ones does nothing to quell her cannibalistic appetite, with the result being Dorothy luring victims to her home to feast upon in secrecy. Seemingly nothing can stop Dorothy, not the establishment which is tricked into declaring her 'cured,' not replacing her destructive food source with an alternative, not even psychiatric assessments from Jackie's boyfriend Graham (Paul Greenwood). Thus, the older generation retain their power and continue on their destructive path with no regard for progress or opinions contrary to their own.

The film would appear to be arguing that trying to escape the actions of the established older generations is impossible and will literally consume the younger generations when they attempt to do so. Those who are successfully indoctrinated to continue the behaviours of their elders pose a secondary threat, one that will continue even after the older generation is gone. The future as infected by the past is a theme of Walker's work, a warning, as Chibnall puts it, "that the past can never be forgotten because it continually revisits the present.[32]"

Another variation on the monstrous mother is *The Psychopath*. As a German doll-obsessive, the wheelchair-bound Mrs. Von Sturm (Margaret Johnston) uses her son, Mark (John Standing), to assist in killing all those involved in investigating her husband after World War Two. In the climactic sequence, it is revealed that not only has she been pretending to need a wheelchair for decades, but she has physically made Mark into a puppet of her own after he breaks his back; another doll in her collection. Mrs. Von Sturm was so obsessed with her husband being wrongly accused that she failed to raise Mark as a successful member of patriarchal society, instead he is brought up as a weapon of vengeance, but his mother controls him as the biggest threat to patriarchy. She is possessive of Mark, in an obsessive and objectifying manner that speaks of a desire to solely own him, like a child refusing to share its toys.

The manner in which she creates a doll out of his crippled form is telling of his status as a possession, for his face is painted into a macabre doll an all he can do is say "Mama" over and over again when his mother's lifeless corpse falls below him. By having made him into a doll, he can never leave her. Throughout the film his mother had questioned his desire to leave the house of dolls and be independent, trying to prevent his normal life and keep him like one of her dolls. She trapped him as her carer in her home, but his mobility allows him to leave her temporarily alone with her dolls and desire for vengeance, but he is always obligated to return. It can be argued that Mark's killings were a very practical means to an end, that he thought if he achieved vengeance for his mother he could leave the past, and his mother, behind him. He became a threat to patriarchal society in his attempts to break free from his monstrous mother and her matriarchy that controlled him. Problematically for Mark, he is trapped forever in the form she desired to mould him in at the end of the film.

As has been shown, within British horror, the maternal figure can become monstrous and in some extremes form a monstrous matriarchy that overpowers. This female inflicts her influence on her own children and can form them into killers to enact her will on others, or feed off the youth literally and figuratively. Dorothy in *Frightmare* is emblematic of the manner in which the older generations are portrayed as inflicting themselves on the younger generations, feeding off them, enforcing their will and trapping them in a cycle of shame and obedience. Because of this, the younger generations are shown as unable to progress as they wish. Where the older maternal figure is still present in the family, her capacity for becoming a threat is substantial. It is necessary to next examine children who find their way into families through subterfuge and do not truly belong, as the fourth element of the family as the source of the threat.

Cuckoo children

The evil child, or cuckoo, is a figure who features throughout the 1960s and 1970s in both lower and higher budget films. The child in question threatens both the family, and society at large with their presence whether they are alien, demonic, or unstable in nature, and as Rebecca Brown argues of *The Nanny* and *The Damned* (Joseph Losey, 1962) "the non-normative child who represents an excessive social threat must be contained."[33] Key here is the fact that the majority of the evil children and cuckoos do not belong to one or both of the parents, including *Twisted Nerve*, the two '*Damned'* films based on *The Midwich Cuckoos* novel (John Wyndham, 1957)[34] namely *Village of the Damned* and *Children of the Damned* (Anton Leader, 1964), and *The Omen*.[35]

In a similar manner to the later American *The Godsend* (Gabrielle Beaumont, 1980) in which an abandoned baby is adopted by a couple and murders her way through the family members and sterilises the father,[36] within these British films the child is 'faulty' and a threat, often as a malevolent individual with the power to destroy patriarchal society. This fits with both Tudor and Pinedo's internal, secular threat as key to the paranoid/postmodern horror film, and none is more so than the threat which comes from within the family unit itself. The child, cuckoo or otherwise, that becomes a threat to other members of the family presents an intimate threat which knows the behaviours, habits, fears, and location of the protagonists.

On the surface, it would appear that the child does not belong to the family, which would indicate that this is a secure/classical horror element, but this child was raised as part of the family and so it has ties and relationships as a member of the family, and is a threat from within. However, the nature of the threat is that in order to destroy a child it must be subject to a process of disavowal, making it a threat *within* the family which is a paranoid/postmodern source of threat in horror cinema. As William Paul argues in *Laughing Screaming: Modern Hollywood Horror and Comedy*, the evil child needs to

be identified as being an unnatural individual, an outsider, and not of the family in order for the destruction to be justified. Once the evil child is 'deniable' and disavowed there is no longer any taboo about committing violence against this innocent-looking individual who previously had to be cared for and treated like the child it was presumed to be.[37] In the films, the child can only be destroyed once it has been marked as unnatural, just as Paul argues, thus making them outsiders and interlopers (secure threat) in the family which contains them (paranoid threat), resulting in a family that is no longer familiar.

The cuckoo child is an instance of the uncanny and *unheimlich*[38] which links to Dominic Lennard's argument that the nature of the evil child is such that "[c]inema's evil child we don't expect is one whose cunning, sadism, or menace implicitly references the child we *do*, the child we believe in."[39] The family unit should be one of the safest and most familiar places for the protagonist, with blood relatives assuring the individual of a sense of belonging and protection. However, the cuckoo child destroys this upon discovery of the truth of their origins. By invading the family, the home, and the day-to-day life of the protagonists for a prolonged period of time, sometimes years, the cuckoo shatters the illusion of the family as a stable and safe place.

The children in *Village of the Damned* are visually *unheimlich*, in that these white-haired children with strange eyes all look, dress, speak, and act in the same manner which appears alien to the way that the other children in the village do; they are human children in physical appearance only. Their glowing eyes when they act are also key, as Lennard argues that the adult gaze is constructed as dominant in cinema and society, but for the Midwich children and their constant fixed stares before they force people to act against their will, "[t]he staring draws alarming attention to the child as *spectator*, overturning the control presumed by the adult gaze."[40] He furthers this by arguing that "[i]t is of course the very strength of the literalization of the innocent child in film, the

pervasiveness of this cultural characterization, that allows the child villain's gaze to assume such supreme, destructive, and enduring force."[41] This use of the child that actively looks can be applied to other cuckoo children such as Damien (Harvey Stephens) in *The Omen*, and even *The Exorcist* when Regan (Linda Blair) is in the stages of possession (the 'demon' who replaces the 'normal' Regan acts as the cuckoo here). All of their stares lead to violence against the adults who receive them.

The cuckoo child differs from other invasion narrative threats such as Dracula, because it is able to 'invade' in a manner that older entities cannot; it is marked as *belonging* to parents, as an internal part of the society they exist within, and given the exterior of presumed innocence. It also differs from other invaders due to the depth to which it works its way into the very foundations of patriarchal society: the family. Invading the family unit provides protection for the cuckoo child, especially from the female and her maternal instincts, as typically it is the patriarch of the family who doubts his parentage. In a different case, in *The Omen*, the cuckoo enters the family because the patriarch chooses to replace his stillborn child with an orphaned boy in hospital without his wife's knowledge; Robert Thorn (Gregory Peck) has created his own downfall through accepting the cuckoo and the pretence that it is his natural son.[42] He is forced to keep his suspicions about Damien quiet or risk the revelation of his actions in the hospital damaging his reputation and career.

The subterfuge involved in cuckoos entering the family means that often the 'natural' members of the unit do not realise that they have been misled about the true nature of the cuckoo until it is too late to prevent their goals from being attained. This goal varies from world domination and vengeance, to murder. For *Village of the Damned*, a state of denial occurs in the village that prevents any action being taken about the mass pregnancies and births until it is too late. Once the children exist as individual beings, the taboo of infanticide and maternal instinct prevents the parents

from killing these cuckoo children. As Hogan argues of Barbara Shelly's Mrs. Zellaby being motherly with David (Martin Stephens), "[t]he woman must surely sense that the child was not sired by her husband, but cannot bear to forego the tender niceties of motherhood."[43] The children are protected by both denial and motherly attachment as demonstrated in just one scene. It is not until they are perceived as too much of a danger to society and global security, and only after Zellaby (George Sanders) deems it the only acceptable option remaining, that the children are destroyed.

This speaks of a fear of males raising children that do not belong to them and a break in their lineage. Their patriarchal line is threatened, and the films make visible that their fear about the child not being theirs is justified. In a manner, this notion is a fallout of the swinging sixties in which there was a marked rise in illegitimate births,[44] with Lynne Segal arguing that

> [u]ntil the mid-1970s, social stigma and discrimination against divorce, and against unmarried mothers and their children, meant that few women could choose to mother outside marriage. And men characteristically denied the paternity of illegitimate children.[45]

Pat Thane and Tanya Evans cite the 1950s as the period in which shame at unmarried mother hood was most intense, describing "the apogee of 'Family Britain', when the family headed by two parents, married to each other, was dominant, bolstered by influential theories."[46] A child being identified as illegitimate and especially if fatherless as a result was a mark of shame, and something to be avoided. The cuckoo children in the films are old enough to have been born in the 1950s and early 1960s, before illegitimacy became less shameful; when women were still faced with the dilemmas of lone motherhood, breaking families, and whether to have their children adopted, which Thane and Evans detail.[47] As a result, the mothers in the films need a husband just as women who were pregnant in the 1950s did. The teenager and the married woman whose husband is away when they both become pregnant in *Village of the Damned* are

178

examples of this, as both react badly, even hysterically, when given the news by the village doctor.[48] The 1960s and early 1970s can be seen as being interpreted by the films being produced in terms of societal attitudes to the family, questions of paternity, and the rise of female autonomy over reproduction.

In psychoanalytical terms, the child will not obey a father that is not his, and the mother remains under the sway of the child. Cuckoo children have a habit of directly and indirectly killing their host 'fathers,' and this patricidal tendency enforces the broken oedipal trajectory, for in the majority of these scenarios the child kills the father, and not the mother whom it seeks to retain dominance of. In the case of *The Omen*, Damien is the son of the devil and will overthrow not only his 'father,' but patriarchal society, and potentially the ultimate patriarch of God himself.

A key film here, is the controversial *Twisted Nerve*.[49] Martin (Hywel Bennett), who is infantilised by his mother (Phyllis Calvert), refuses to become part of the patriarchal system at his stepfather's (Frank Finlay) insistence that he get a job as he does not want to financially support a child that does not belong to him any longer. Martin has a brother with Down's Syndrome whom his mother has put into a residential care facility and his stepfather seems unaware of, and tellingly his mother seems afraid that Martin is not completely 'normal.' His mother is also unaware of Martin's alter ego Georgie who has the mental age of a young child which Martin uses to get away with stealing a toy duck in the local store. His stepfather goes as far as to try and send him out of the country, literally 'exporting' an undesirable family member that has no use as an unproductive member of patriarchal society. Instead, Martin acts as a cuckoo by working his way into a new matriarchal household headed by Joan (Billie Whitelaw), ingratiating himself by means of adopting the alter ego of Georgie who has the mental age of a six year old child and cannot look after himself. The film does not fully answer

the reason for why Martin behaves the way that he does, presenting his upbringing as one source and also his genetics, with I. Q. Hunter arguing that

> the evidence piles up that the culprit is Martin's warped upbringing. Ranged against it, however, are allusions to genetic determinism – an updated, pseudo-scientific reworking of original sin, with evil merely an accidental glitch of manufacture.[50]

The additional analogy of Down's syndrome with psychosis is used to demonstrate the random nature of genetic destiny, however, the backlash against the film and its connection of Down's syndrome with 'evil' and psychosis in siblings indicates that this is an unintentional interpretation of the reason for Martin's behaviour. Ultimately, the film does not provide the reason, unlike the novel which is more explicit as Hunter interprets it "Martin is monstrously "Other" not because he is evil, but because it is his nature to be unnatural. The point is almost a Calvinist one: Martin is damned by birth."[51]

It is not insignificant that his motive for disguising himself as Georgie after meeting Susan (Hayley Mills) is similar to that of Greek mythology when Zeus transformed into a *cuckoo* in order to seduce his sister Hera, whom his mother had forbidden him from marrying. Hera took pity on the rain-soaked bird and took him into her house as an act of kindness, whereupon Zeus shifted to his true form and raped her, therefore shaming her into marriage.[52] This is similar to the trajectory of Martin's advances towards Susan, with Georgie arriving in heavy rain on her doorstop to become a surrogate 'brother,' and only revealing his true nature when he attempts to rape her. It is only after becoming a cuckoo that Martin is a threat to others, beforehand he only engaged in petty theft and plotted against his parents.

Finding his way into his new home allows Martin to continue being cared for by a new mother figure whilst plotting his vengeance. He acts out his patricidal desires and

removes his father figure in a case of oedipal wish-fulfilment, leaving his mother free to return to without his stepfather getting in the way, almost achieving the perfect murder with his alibis and alter ego. This is achieved through a lengthy scheme by which he informs his mother that he has left the country to take a job in France, and as a result he will not be suspected in the murder of his stepfather. Once he is safely embedded in Joan's boarding house as Georgie, Martin has to bide his time before sneaking out of Joan's house unseen, returning to his old home and stabbing his stepfather with a large pair of scissors before sneaking back to Joan's house. Upon his return he must immediately replace his Georgie disguise when he is discovered downstairs after Georgie's bedtime by Joan. Without Joan's boarding house and his disguise as the helpless Georgie, Martin would not be able to kill his stepfather and remain hidden from the police who immediately suspect Martin.

Murdering his stepfather is a form of vengeance on both of his parents for abandoning his brother with Down's Syndrome to an institution. By killing his stepfather, Martin confirms that raising a child which is not biologically yours is a risk to the stepfather. This is a feature of the other 'cuckoo' films in which the patriarch is killed as a direct result of raising a child which is not theirs, including *The Omen* and *Village of the Damned*. The child that was not fathered by the family unit's patriarch is destructive, and a threat to both the family unit and society itself. In *Village of the Damned*, it is revealed that the Eskimo/Inuit people killed their strange children at birth and therefore protected themselves and their society, whilst the English raised theirs and suffered injury and death as a result. In Martin's (*Twisted Nerve*) case, he kills his stepfather, and as a result of being rejected by Susan (Hayley Mills) he attacks his adoptive matriarchal family unit.

The key to the cuckoo child, is that ultimately, the family's father figure cannot control the child in question. It leads to "the disintegration of the family"[53] which

Hogan argues was a concern of film from the post-war years onwards into the 1980s. With the family as a unit under threat, patriarchy was at risk of losing the very foundation that allowed it to maintain the status quo. Evil children and cuckoos demonstrate an ability to avoid detection, kill, and overpower in order to achieve their aims. The nature of the cuckoo is also that they need to be disavowed before they can be destroyed due to the taboo of enacting violence upon children in western society, making them a secure threat within a paranoid threat of the family itself. Because the child is traditionally a symbol of innocence, the true nature of the evil child is subject to denial before finally being confronted, but the source of the 'evil' can be nature, nurture, otherworldly, or a combination. With the evil child becoming increasingly present in British horror film, the ability for horror to come from any source including those that would be least suspected was increasing.

Conclusion

As is clear from the analysis of the films, and from the socio-historical context in which they were produced there were clear changes in the representation of inter-generational relations and the family unit in British horror cinema. In the 1950s the family was still capable of being restored and recuperated after the threat was destroyed, with a family structure that was functional, but in the 1960s this was increasingly impossible to achieve. These films express a conflict between the generations that present the older family members as a threat to the future and well-being of their offspring, as well as those who are unrelated to them, be it by direct action upon them or through their behaviours in the past.

The family itself can form a unit that no longer behaves according to the requirements of patriarchal society, becoming 'faulty' and threatening society at large

with its disruptive and destructive actions. Removing the family is necessary for a healthy society, This speaks of a breakdown in the functioning of the family within Britain in the 1960s and 1970s that is feeding into the films, and the connections to R. D. Laing and his work on the family as the root of mental health problems. However, there is also a collapse in the previous stability of the patriarchal family unit from the 1950s, with the individual members being responsible.

Exploring the nature of the father becoming unstable without a wife, the matriarch gaining control, and the child being shown to be evil and a cuckoo has provided an insight into the 1960s and 1970s producing horror films which demonstrate that the family, which should be the safest place for the protagonist, has itself become a threat capable of both psychologically and physically destroying outsiders and its own members. If the family unit is no longer a sanctuary, it indicates that there is a shift to the paranoid and postmodern horror cinema whereby the family is the source of the threat.

Simultaneously though, there is a fear of the child that does not belong, of an interloper in the patriarchal unit that threatens its stability further and society at large. A mistrust of the family members themselves is held within the films, namely that the child can threaten the parents, and the parents threaten the child in a state of conflict between the generations. Violence is being enacted, individuals subjugated by other family members, and even consumed by each other physically. As stated at the beginning of this chapter, American horror has been examined in-depth in terms of the family, and it is clear from this chapter that British horror is also worthy of examination. With links to the American horrors of the late 1960s and 1970s, the corruption of the family unit and inter-generational conflict can be seen on both sides of the Atlantic, demonstrating its importance as a theme in British horror cinema.

CHAPTER 6

Post-colonialism and British Horror

Introduction

Jonathan Rigby agrees that *The Reptile* is "a textbook case of the 'sins of the fathers' scenario."[1] However, he also asserts that although within *The Reptile*, and by extension *Blood from the Mummy's Tomb* (Seth Holt and uncredited Michael Carreras, 1971), along with *The Plague of the Zombies,* 'evil' infects England due to "the blundering presumption and interference of a Westerner […] [s]ome critics have gone so far as to suggest, somewhat fancifully, that both Hammer's Cornish horrors are violently anti-colonial."[2] This chapter will contend that the anti-colonial element is not as fanciful as Rigby alleges but instead that these themes form an important aspect of British horror cinema in the 1960s and 1970s. In this manner, it will also be argued that this makes British horror distinctive in comparison to its American counterpart. British horror comments on the nature of the colonial past, providing a discourse below the surface that other national cinemas are not able to articulate in the same manner. This unique characteristic is not discussed in British national cinema texts in relation to horror cinema, and as such it requires examination, not only as an element operating in its own right, but for the manner in which it connects to the inter-generational relations and notions of gender representation that have already been discussed in previous chapters.

The British Empire had collapsed by the 1960s and 1970s due to Britain's changing position impacting on its ability to deal with world events and political situations,[3] world attitudes to colonialism, economic problems, and anti-colonial nationalism in the wake of the Second World War.[4] As Gibbins argues, "the end of Empire produced feelings of national inadequacy and weakness."[5] The dates surrounding the actual end of the Empire are debatable however, with the partition of India, the Suez crisis,[6] or even

the American War of Independence all arguably markers of successful challenges that weakened the British Empire to start its decline. As a result, there is no single consensus as to when the British Empire actually ended. For all intents and purposes, the 1960s and 1970s saw the final days of the Empire as it turned into the Commonwealth through the independence of its previous territories.

Empire was key to defining the cultural and national identity of Britain, but with its collapse this no longer an option. Britain was severed from its status as a colonial power with an Empire to become a small island nation that could no longer claim British colonial privilege. As a result, Britain's previously strong and defining identity marker from previous generations was lost, with the younger generations seeking a new cultural and national identity. In the films of the 1960s and 1970s a reassessment of colonialism and a discourse on its consequences for the future of Britain can be identified, with Chapman arguing that

> *Lawrence of Arabia* was a watershed for the cinema of empire. Until *Lawrence* the dominant narrative was the projection of imperialism as a force for political and social stability. After *Lawrence*, however there was a pronounced shift away from this narrative towards a more critical representation of the imperial project in films such as *Zulu*, *Khartoum*, and *The Charge of the Light Brigade*. The trend thereafter would be for films debunking the heroic narrative of imperial expansion.[7]

War films such as *Zulu* (Cy Endfield, 1964) similarly focused on the expansive visuals of the Empire as spectacle, which continued into the Heritage cinema of the 1980s wherein the ex-colonies were shot as wondrous and beautiful locations, jewels in the crown of the Empire. This is the case for films such as *A Passage to India* (David Lean, 1984) and *The Deceivers* (Nicholas Meyer, 1988), wherein Empire itself is treated with ambivalence and at times critiqued. This highlights the issues of the colonial past, whilst framing the landscape and surroundings of the characters as the visual focus. The use of exotic locations to represent the colonies was not available to the British horror films of

the 1960s and 1970s due to lower budgets. However, the characters themselves serve to play into the popular imagination of the exoticism of the ex-colonies, with individual characters standing in as representatives for whole regions and not just specific countries, allowing the invocation of the colonial imagery through these figures. The majority of the horror films present narratives which take place predominantly in Britain with a direct threat to the British characters. Thus, it will be argued in this chapter that in the 1960s and 1970s, the colonial legacy is represented as a threat to British interests.

There is already an argument in place for the effects of Empire on the British horror films being produced, as expounded by Peter Hutchings with regards to *The Mummy*. In the argument put forth by Hutchings, the Suez crisis wherein Egypt successfully rejected British authority in the Suez region for the whole world to see, and in the process damaging Britain's standing in world affairs, is heavily connected to the production of *The Mummy* as a manifestation of concerns and fears surrounding the aftermath of the events.[8] This is due to the manner in which "[i]n the face of such a historical situation, *The Mummy* portrays a nationalistic Egyptian priest with surprising sympathy, permitting him to present a considered argument against the cultural imperialism represented by the institution of the British Museum."[9] It will be contended in this chapter that *The Mummy* was one of many films in which post-colonial sentiments are present, and that this continued through the 1960s and 1970s.

Many of the post-colonial films of the 1960s and 1970s derive their source material from the nineteenth century novels and stories of iconic writers. *Dracula* (Bram Stoker, 1897), *The Jewel of Seven Stars* (Bram Stoker, 1903) and even *She: A History of Adventure* (H. Rider Haggard, 1887) present fears of the British being colonised and made subordinate by representatives of their colonies and other foreign powers in a process of reverse colonisation, this is also true of other novels which were filmed and

then forgotten such as *The Beetle* (Richard Marsh, 1897).[10] These novels were written at the height of Empire by British and Irish writers, expressing anxieties about the potential for the coloniser to become the colonised, indicating that there is a tradition which the horror films focused on in this chapter are a part of. It will be argued that the films of the 1960s and 1970s are another cluster of cultural expressions of concern regarding the Empire, but rather than at the height of Empire, they are released as the Empire collapses and when Britain could be perceived as heavily weakened by its loss.

Pertinent to the examination of the films identified as displaying post-colonial concerns, will be the application of post-colonial theory which builds on Homi Bhabha, Frantz Fanon, and Edward Said as important theorists in this field. This will combine with socio-cultural and historical research in order to effectively demonstrate that concerns in society contemporary to the production of the films were being interpreted and incorporated into the narratives. As such, this chapter will address three main areas of post-colonialism in British horror of the 1960s and 1970s: ex-colonial entities inflicting themselves on British characters and fears of reverse colonisation; punishment inflicted on the younger generation for previous incursions by the older characters; and hostility towards the British by previously colonised peoples.

The films of Hammer will be included and feature as key examples to be analysed. This is due to the manner in which certain films, namely *The Reptile*, *The Plague of the Zombies*, *Blood from the Mummy's Tomb* and *The Legend of the 7 Golden Vampires* express attitudes and warnings about the post-colonial era, and the consequences of Britain's colonial past. This is an aspect of the films which has not been previously examined in depth, and is not canonically part of the Hammer master narrative. Thus, including Hammer productions prominently in this chapter alongside films from other companies will revise the current approach and open up new avenues for exploration in the Hammer discourse.

The first section will evidence concerns around Britain having lost its influence in world affairs. Films emerge that reflect a fear of the coloniser becoming the colonised, with *Quatermass and the Pit* presenting a Britain that has been previously colonised (chiming with the reality of British history). However, there are also ex-colonial entities and characters that vocalise their displeasure with the British characters, stating that the threats/vengeance being enacted on them is a direct result of past British behaviours within the film narrative. This idea of outsiders preying on British society and its people, even when abroad, recurs on a regular basis due to the Dracula franchise films that continue throughout the 1960s and 1970s. The aforementioned fears are of reverse colonisation and are manifested in the female and particularly the figure of the daughter in post-colonial horror films including *The Reptile*, *Blood from the Mummy's Tomb*, *The Plague of the Zombies*, and *The Blood Beast Terror* wherein female family members are the targets of reverse colonisation. This focus on daughters and a rise in female agency connects to the discussions in previous chapters, and as a result sets the time period apart from the 1950s.

The second section ties into the previous chapter on inter-generational conflict. Older males, particularly fathers, have previously meddled in the affairs of ex-colonies, and this has its repercussions in the present which threatens the survival of their offspring. The offspring in question are usually female, and their lives are permanently altered and endangered. Britain is often represented by the symbol of Britannia, which is analogous to the female British offspring in the film. This indicates that the daughters are representative of Britain and that its future is endangered by the colonial past. These patriarchs are also the end of their bloodlines with their daughters unsuitable for continuing the family lines, therefore ending the colonial ambitions of their imperial fathers.

Finally, the third section addresses issues concerning the perceived heavily reduced British influence as a world power resulting in numerous military and political crises (for instance, the Six Day War). As a result the previously colonised respond with hostility to British behaviours which are akin to that of colonial powers claiming superiority. Within the films characters vocalise negative attitudes to the British, that they wish to preserve their own culture from British interference, and view their presence as invasive and unwanted. This section will also address the thuggee films *Stranglers of Bombay* (Terence Fisher, 1959) and *The Deceivers* which demonstrate the same post-colonial issues in non-horror product, supporting the argument that the socio-cultural and political climate of Britain was feeding into the films. A key film to be examined in this section is *The Legend of the Golden Vampires* (Roy Ward Baker, 1974) which is the last film from Hammer's Dracula franchise. The film will be discussed in terms of the issues of declining male authority which is shown to be reaching a climax from the downward trajectory which started in the 1960s, the changing approach to British authority figures, and the end of older patriarchs who are arguably relics of the past in favour of youthful protagonists.

By examining the post-colonial themes in British horror cinema of the 1960s and 1970s it will be possible to demonstrate the uniqueness of this element of the films, and tie together the threads already examined of the changing representation of female characters, intergenerational conflict, and the decline of male authority in the socio-historical context specific to Britain.

Reverse colonisation

Invasion narratives are not uncommon in British cinema of the 1960s and 1970s, including horror titles with links to science fiction such as *Quatermass and the Pit*, *The Earth Dies Screaming* (Terence Fisher, 1964), *Unearthly Stranger* (John Krish, 1963), *Invasion* (Alan Bridges, 1966), *Village of the Damned* and *Prey*. Given the proximity of the Second World War and the threat which this had posed to British sovereignty over her possessions and Britain itself this is unsurprising but references an underlying pre-occupation and fear of invasion by other powers. There were also invasion narratives outside of the science fiction and horror genres, such as *The Devil Ship Pirates* (Don Sharp, 1964) which presents a Spanish privateer abandoning the Spanish Armada and taking control of a British village, albeit temporarily. What is of particular interest for this piece is the nature of the invasions within the horror films being produced during the period.

Within the horror films, there is a common theme in which it is British soil and British characters who are the subject of the invasion, rather than a global threat. In this manner the British are no longer the coloniser but the colonised, in a reversal of the previous role that Britain occupied. The term 'reverse colonisation' is one which describes the process whereby a previous coloniser finds itself to be under the influence culturally, politically, economically, or sometimes physically of a country/region that was once subject to colonisation. The coloniser is now weakened and no longer holds the power, allowing it to be at risk of invasion by a foreign force, whether this is from a previous colony or a new and unexpected threat such as Dracula the European invader only a few decades after the rise of Nazi Germany and the resulting Second World War threatening invasion of Britain. Darryl Jones states that in literature

> [a]s the British Empire and other empires of nineteenth-century Europe reached
> their zeniths, so appeared the 'reverse-colonization' narrative, a paranoid cultural

form in which conquered or oppressed colonial subjects return to the West (or to Western officials in the colonies) to wreak terrifying revenge.[11]

Stephen Arata who writes on the late nineteenth century novels that many British horror films are based on, argues that these narratives of reverse colonisation "are also responses to cultural guilt. In the marauding, invasive Other, British culture sees its own imperial practices mirrored back in monstrous forms"[12] and he posits that the roots of the H. G. Wells novel *War of the Worlds* is in the extermination of the indigenous Tasmanian people by British rule:

> Reverse colonization narratives thus contain the potential for powerful critiques of imperialist ideologies, even if that potential usually remains unrealized. As fantasies, these narratives provide an opportunity to atone for imperialist sins, since reverse colonization is often represented as deserved punishment.[13]

Patrick Brantlinger sees a similar theme in both the figure of Dracula and Wells' novel, stating that "[b]oth Stoker's and Wells' romances can be read, moreover, as fanciful versions of yet another popular literary form, invasion-scare stories, in which the outward movement of imperialist adventure is reversed."[14] As a result, the novels of the late nineteenth century at the peak of the British Empire express a fear of reverse colonisation by both ex-colonies and unexpected foreign powers, and this chapter will seek to uncover how far this is mirrored in the horror films of the 1960s and 1970s.

Two films that will be examined for reverse colonisation themes in most detail are *The Reptile* and *Blood from the Mummy's Tomb*. In the former film, Dr. Franklyn offended a snake worshipping tribe in the Borneo area, and his punishment was inflicted on his daughter, Anna (Jacqueline Pearce). Anna is forced to transform into a humanoid reptile against her will and attacks villagers who stray too close to the Franklyn home, whilst the Malay (Marne Maitland) who poses as Franklyn's manservant makes clear to Franklyn that he intends to remain in the Franklyn residence and watch him suffer the fate of his daughter in revenge for his imperialistic interference.[15] In the case of *Blood*

from the Mummy's Tomb, Professor Fuchs (Andrew Keir) sought out and opened the tomb of Queen Tera in Egypt and brought her back to London where he has recreated her tomb in his basement. Unwittingly, he has enabled Tera's spirit to be released and she sets out to reincarnate herself in her living double, Fuchs's daughter Margaret. In order to reincarnate, Tera possesses Margaret and sets about reclaiming her tomb items from the Egyptologists who now own them, killing them in the process. In this manner the snake tribe in *The Reptile* and Tera in the latter film are invading the lives, villages, and physical bodies of the British subjects who once invaded their homelands, forcing permanent change upon them.

A third film of importance is *The Blood Beast Terror* which differs from both *The Reptile* and *Blood from the Mummy's Tomb* in that it presents a giant death's head moth that can transform into a human, Clare, who forces Dr. Mallinger to make her a mate for his sins against her tropical homeland whilst masquerading as his daughter. She repeatedly informs Mallinger that he has brought this fate upon himself, and she is using him to get what she desires. Clare has turned Mallinger into her colonised subject, controlling him and his scientific resources for her own purposes. What's more, is that she also controls Meg (Vanessa Howard) by means of hypnotic summoning in order to have Mallinger take her blood to produce Clare's mate. Meg has no choice in the matter but to attend when summoned, and her blood is not given voluntarily.

At the end of the two decades, there was a final film featuring Dracula but this was not a Hammer production. In 1979 John Badham's film *Dracula* features a Dracula (Frank Langella) who has escaped the clutches of Van Helsing (Lawrence Olivier) at the end of the film. This can be seen in the final scene in which after Dracula is impaled with a hook and hoisted into the sunlight of a ship's sails, his lover Lucy (Kate Nelligan) who is now apparently free again, smiles up at Dracula's cape spread out on the wind flying away in the shape of a figure with its arms held out. This is not the only

important change in the narrative, with Lucy now the daughter of asylum owner Jack Seward (Donald Pleasance) and engaged to Jonathan Harker (Trevor Eve), and Mina (Jan Francis) is the daughter of Van Helsing. Both daughters are targeted by the foreign invader.

In a key scene, Van Helsing digs into his vampirised daughter's grave, intending to end her unnatural existence, and discovers her in the tunnels beneath. He almost becomes her victim, unable to resist her as she approaches in her partially-decomposed state, speaking Dutch to him in a childlike voice and with her arms outstretched for an embrace. Mina has become a creature that was infected by foreign vampirism, a new hybrid that takes her previous form and weaponises it against Van Helsing in order to weaken him and allow the foreign side which corrupted her purity to attack her own father.

It is only through the intervention of Seward as Mina is about to bite Van Helsing's neck that he can resist her and accidentally stake her. Mina falls onto Van Helsing's stake and moaning throughout gently collapses into a pseudo-embrace with her head on his shoulder. This Van Helsing differs from those featured in Hammer's films, as he is distraught at the final death of his child, openly weeping with her in his arms. Dracula is the demise of Mina, ending with her staked by her own father, and Van Helsing's death mirrors hers, with the Count staking Van Helsing with his own stake. In this manner, Dracula is able to destroy whole families starting with their daughters.

As can be seen from these film plots women, and daughters in particular, are key aspects in the narratives of these films, and this is a feature which will be examined in some depth within this chapter, with the female as both victim of the invasion and as the invader itself. This differs from the horror films of the 1950s such as *The Mummy*, in which the focus was on the males with the reverse colonisation being embodied in Kharis (Christopher Lee) who seeks out and attempts to destroy the male British

Egyptologists at the behest of Mehemet (George Pastell). In *The Mummy*, the threat and effects of reverse colonisation are a predominantly male experience, whereas the films of the 1960s and 1970s will be examined here for their use of the female owing to the manner in which the role of the female is inextricably tied to the plot, the threat, and the rise of female agency which was demonstrated in the third chapter of this thesis. The connection of the female to the post-colonial is a key aspect which will be explored in terms of victim and invader.

Margaret in *Blood from the Mummy's Tomb* is physically invaded by the spirit of Queen Tera, having been tied to her since she was born at the moment that Tera's tomb was opened by her father. Fuchs is under the control of Tera and assists her in taking over his daughter, having recreated her tomb as a shrine to Tera in his basement, preserving it for eighteen years when Margaret will come of age for the possession of his daughter to be completed. Fuchs continually aids in the reincarnation of the Egyptian Queen Tera via the colonisation of Margaret, to the point where he gifts Margaret the ring he found with Tera which strengthens her hold over Margaret. As the Egyptologists who were present at the opening of Tera's tomb are killed and Tera's power grows, Margaret finds herself increasingly losing her sense of self, which she discusses with her boyfriend Tod (Mark Edwards). In this manner, Margaret is being eroded from her natural state and moulded into a new form that her coloniser finds acceptable for occupation.

In the climactic scene, Margaret discovers the truth when she finds the tomb in her father's basement, and Tera opens her eyes as the house collapses around them. This leads to the final shot of a woman wrapped completely in bandages like a traditional mummy in the hospital, but her identity cannot be clarified as she stares wildly in silence and physically is either Tera or Margaret. The bandages, however, can be seen as suggesting that it is Tera who is in control of the body, having in the last scene been

brought back to life through the reassembling of her possessions by using her control over Margaret. This would indicate that the process of reverse colonisation was completed, with all opposition destroyed when the Fuchs residence collapsed.

The case of Anna in *The Reptile* functions differently, as Anna is both victim and threat within the narrative granting her hybridity in a film which Anna Powell argues is reflective of "tensions and phobias about Asian immigration in the mid-1960s in fantasy form."[16] From conversations between Franklyn and the Malay, it is revealed that due to Franklyn's causing the snake tribe great offense in his dealings with them, the tribe reacted by punishing Franklyn. This punishment is inflicted by permanently altering Anna to force her transformations into an uncontrollable reptilian form. As a result, Anna is physically colonised and altered into a hybrid form that the tribe are satisfied with, and which serves the purpose they desire to be enacted on their behalf. The form that Anna is forced to assume is a very visual symbol of the miscegenation and hybridity of Anna who is caught between the two cultures of Britain and the snake tribe, with a human body and reptilian head. The issue of hybridity is one raised by Rebecca Weaver-Hightower who argues that post-colonialists have traditionally written off hybrids as a positive status with potential for social change[17] by being "[a]ble to pass among cultures, blurring boundaries, taking the best from both worlds".[18] However, Weaver-Hightower also raises the issue which applies to Anna and horror film monsters, namely that "many cultures in the world find hybrids to be threatening because liminality jeopardizes the status quo and upsets fantasies of boundaries and control over the body."[19] In this manner, the hybrid is a danger to society rather than a benefit of cultural hybridity between coloniser and colonised.

She has also become a physical weapon unleashed in Britain that kills anyone who strays too close to the Franklyn residence whilst the flute music can be heard. This happens in one of the very first scenes of the film, wherein Charles Spalding (David

Baron) approaches and trespasses in the Franklyn manor when seeking the source of the music. Charles is attacked by an unseen threat, stumbling home as his face turns dark to an almost-black and he suffocates to death. The locals fear it was the result of a form of the Black Death when they quickly bury him. It is revealed through the narrative that Anna has a fatal poisonous bite in her reptile form, and that this is what actually killed Charles.

Anna is also the subject of reverse colonisation is respect of her adoption of Asian dress and music, as is demonstrated when Harry (Ray Barrett) and Valerie (Jennifer Daniel) visit the Franklyn residence for dinner. In this sequence Anna wears a sari and at her father's behest performs a sitar recital for the group. This indicates that Anna has been assimilated into the culture of the reverse coloniser with David Huckvale arguing that due to Don Banks' score in the film

> the music causes the reptilian side of his daughter's side to come to the fore. Banks indicates this unfortunate development by weaving the Reptile theme into the sinister Sitar improvisation as Anna looks imperiously at her father, watched over by the sinister Malay servant.[20]

Although Franklyn at first appears to value Anna's assimilation for its purposes in entertaining the Spaldings, he ends the scene by smashing Anna's sitar before the recital reaches a climax. Both Anna and Margaret in *Blood from the Mummy's Tomb* are internally invaded by the force of the society that used to be a colony. This demonstrates the notion of imperial colonisation, whereby the coloniser controls the colonised by taking elements of the colonised culture that it deems desirable or containable and incorporates it into its own culture, therefore rendering it safe. However, in the case of the horror narratives, it is undesirable qualities that are 'absorbed' into the daughters in an invasion of the body and/or mind, creating a negative assimilation for British society, and a stronghold for the coloniser.

That the fathers cannot remove this invasive force from their daughters

demonstrates the loss of power that the ex-colonial representative now possesses. When

a force seeks to colonise a people, there is a process of partial assimilation, whereby the

colonised population must adopt the coloniser's way of life and culture to a limited

extent in order to demonstrate it as superior. As the invasive force in the case of

Margaret and Anna is the old colony, it is elements of their culture being assimilated by

the two women, and establishing British culture as weaker than that of Egypt and the

snake tribe. Andrea Smith explains this in reference to Edward Said

> The colonized must seem to partially resemble the colonists in order to establish
> the ideology that the colonizers' way of life is the only way to exist. If the
> colonized group seems completely different from the colonists, the colonized
> implicitly challenge the supremacy of colonial rule. However, members of the
> colonized group can never be completely assimilated; otherwise, they would be
> the equals of the colonizers and there would be no reason to colonize them.[21]

In this case, the daughters are made Other and marked as inferior to the colonising force

that has invaded and altered them into partial assimilation.

These daughters are made especially Other, as they are deemed Other to both their

fathers and the ex-colony entity. As Gelder argues, "stable, imperialist nations can

evoke horror fantasies in which self-identities are invaded and absorbed into the

Other,"[22] including Margaret Fuchs who is deemed to be nothing more than a shell to

Tera who will remove Margaret's identity and take her body for her own self to occupy.

Similarly, Anna is one of the clearest examples of Gelder's argument due to her

adoption of Asian dress, music, her comfortableness around the Malay, and her

transformation. Both of these women are caught between two cultures and powers due

to the invasion of their identities, with Anna physically representing both western

culture in her human form and the snake tribe through her reptile form. As she has two

physical forms, she can never be truly western or eastern and will be Other to both

cultures. Similarly, Margaret is one body possessed by two souls/personalities, so she

cannot be purely Margaret the European or Tera the Egyptian until the inner battle for possession is complete and only one victorious personality will remain with the other expelled from occupation.

Further to the colonising of the female, is the end result in which the imperial male is destroyed at the end of the narrative. Franklyn is grappled by Anna in her reptile form and receives an incestuous poisonous bite as the manor burns around them, Fuchs is killed in the house collapse as Tera awakens and takes full control of Margaret, and in the case of *The Blood Beast Terror*, Dr Mallinger is killed by Clare in her moth form as punishment for destroying the mate he has been creating for her. In each instance, the British male who participated in imperialism finds himself experiencing reverse colonisation by the very culture he sought to exert his imperial influence over. When they attempt to resist after being subjected to non-violent colonisation, the colonising power uses force to eliminate them, or in the case of Anna the assimilated female is a tool to kill the resister. By destroying the male, the films are purging the representatives of the imperial colonial powers, effectively ending colonialism for the European figures within the narratives.

Importantly for all of these ex-colonial entities, is that they do not instigate physical violence themselves as a prolonged method of invasion and control, unlike the actions of the colonisers in history. Their techniques are psychological, mind control, and a threat of discovery. Mallinger and Franklyn do not want anyone to discover the truth of their 'daughters,' *Quatermass and the Pit* features aliens that control minds just as Clare does, and Tera's invasion of Margaret is via her mind before her body. Because there is no violence to counter physically, the ex-colonial entities are harder to repel by those they afflict and are undetected by the rest of society. Significantly, those they inflict themselves on are made complicit in disguising their presence, emphasising their status as suppressed as if colonised themselves. In the case of *Quatermass and the Pit* in

particular, there is an invocation of Britain's past as a colonised nation. Although the colonisations of Britain by the Romans, the Anglo-Saxons, and the Normans were thousands of years in the past there is an acknowledgement and coming to terms with the past status of being the colonised that is still in progress. In the terms used by Edward Said regarding Europe-Oriental relations and which apply here to the relationship between coloniser and colonised, "the essential relationship, on political, cultural, and even religious grounds, was seen – in the West, which is what concerns us here – to be one between a strong and weak partner"[23] with the European element being the dominant partner. With the loss of Empire, it is possible for the dynamic to be reversed so that the imperial coloniser becomes the colonised. This is a fear that is expressed within the film, when the previous alien coloniser acts to control the people of London and forces them to obey its command to destroy each other in the contemporary era.

Ex-colonial entities were not the only invaders of Britain in film during the 1960s and 1970s. Dracula as a figure is frequently interpreted as an invader, and the *Dracula*[24] novel narrative as reverse colonisation.[25] The coloniser has become the colonised in a form of reverse colonisation, wherein an outsider who is designated and coded as foreign infiltrates and establishes a hold over the presumed 'superior' and civilised ex-coloniser as "[i]n whatever guise, the narrative expresses both fear and guilt. The fear is that what has been represented as the 'civilized' world is on the point of being colonized by 'primitive' forces."[26] Dracula is more problematic in the films focusing on him, as he is clearly aristocratic and feeding off travellers to his homeland, but he does not arrive in Britain until 1970 with *Taste the Blood of Dracula*, and briefly returns to Europe in *Scars of Dracula* (Roy Ward Baker, 1970) before two more Britain-based films in *Dracula A.D 1972* (Alan Gibson, 1972) and *The Satanic Rites of Dracula* (Alan Gibson, 1973). Once in Britain, Dracula gathers British followers whom he assimilates and

converts to his cause voluntarily or via bites, rather than existing as an individual with one assistant as he did in his previous European-based films. In *Taste the Blood of Dracula* this is done by Dracula (Christopher Lee) turning both Lucy (Isla Blair) and Jeremy (Martin Jarvis) into vampires to do his bidding, as well as using the children to kill their fathers so that he is able to remain concealed from the authorities and those who would oppose him. He has colonised those who are less able to defend themselves first, using them to aid his further actions in eliminating his enemies. In this manner, he converts some of the British to form a stronghold before attempting to expand his control over the general populace, just as the invading forces did in the colonial era.

Nevertheless, the invasion narratives in question present invaders who are not of this earth, unlike the ex-colonial entities that inflict themselves on the British in the other horror films previously discussed. The end of *Quatermass and the Pit* involves a scene of destruction which Hutchings likens to both race riots[27] and a recreation of the Blitz,[28] with racial tensions in Britain at the time reminding Britain of its colonial legacy and the Blitz occurring during the last and recent war in which Britain had to fend off invasion; reminders of Britain as coloniser and being in danger of being colonised. With Britain weakened by its lack of Empire, there is an argument that British film was conveying a loss of power and structure in its producing nation,[29] displayed by the ability of others to invade it. Because these films rarely report events simultaneously occurring in other nations (with *Village of the Damned* being a notable exception), they present Britain as weak enough to allow a foothold for a full-scale invasion of the planet, or else the only victim of the invaders.

Thus, it is clear that British horror cinema of the 1960s and 1970s displayed a preoccupation with Britain as the colonised, and potential victim of the ex-colonies for its actions in the past. By taking into account the slew of science fiction-horror invasion narratives of the same period, it is possible to demonstrate that this extended beyond

what can be considered the 'pure' horror narratives and was not a minor occurrence in the cinema produced, but a wider issue of post-colonial influence on horror in its many forms and hybrids.

Imperialism and the family

As has been shown by the use of daughters, familial relationships are the manner in which reverse colonisation manifests within the films. Previously it has been demonstrated that families and inter-generational conflict are a source of the threat in British horror cinema, with one particular figure being the patriarchal father. Further to this is the notion of the father instigating the arrival of the threat within post-colonial horror in the 1960s and 1970s. Not only is there the issue of the fathers being unable to save their daughters, but within this chapter it is made clear that the fathers and their past mistakes are irreparably damaging their daughters. The families presented are dysfunctional and do not possess sons to continue the family line. Specifically, in these narratives, the patriarch of the family returns to Britain from what is now an ex-colony, bringing with them foreign threats which permanently damage their daughters in vengeance for offenses being caused, or as a direct result of the British interfering in their country of origin, with two of the strongest examples of this being *The Reptile* and *Blood from the Mummy's Tomb*. These two films, will be further explored in detail within this section for the impact of imperialism on the family itself, whereas above the focus was on reverse-colonisation, in addition, *The Creeping Flesh* (Freddie Francis, 1973) will be part of this examination for the same themes.

The male obsession with the colonies in these films is the cause of the downfall of the motherless families. All three patriarchs of Dr Hildern (Peter Cushing), Dr. Franklyn (Noel Willman) and Professor Fuchs (Andrew Keir) are highly educated men

with means, who return home from their imperial expeditions carrying a colonial threat. Because of their highly educated status within Britain, they presume superiority and 'study' other cultures as if they are inferior, interfering in the culture (Franklyn), breaking into tombs (Fuchs), and removing humanoid remains to experiment on (Hildern) which would be morally reprehensible and considered criminal acts if committed within their own society and borders.

In the case of Fuchs, breaking into Tera's tomb and taking both valuable property and the mummy from within it would be considered illegal grave-robbing if he had done this to a crypt in England, and punishable in a court of law. However, because his actions are performed in Egypt by an Egyptologist, they are considered to be valuable for uncovering the history and culture of Egypt and therefore they are justified and admired. For Franklyn, interfering in British culture and traditions would not have been tolerated in British society. His interference in the snake tribe is considered to be anthropological work, but the exact nature of how he caused offense to the tribe is not detailed. That the tribe chose to curse his daughter with uncontrollable transformations into a reptilian creature would infer that his actions were worthy of such a hefty punishment however. Hildern, on the other hand, removes humanoid remains from New Guinea which he experiments on back in England. The remains begin to regenerate flesh in the same manner that legendary beings of evil from native mythologies were predicted to. He uses the flesh to produce a serum, which he then injects into his daughter Penelope (Lorna Heilbron) whom he has told that her mother (his wife) has just died after lying to her for years that she was already dead, when in reality she was locked away in an asylum. The serum causes his daughter to become unnaturally strong and violent, attacking and killing as she makes her way through the city. Experimenting on humans both living and dead in England is scandalous and punishable behaviour within the diegetic world and within British society.

The use of British characters taking actions in foreign lands is a generic feature that goes back to horror films of the 1930s, and includes *The Mummy* produced by Hammer in the 1950s. That the younger generations in the narratives are having to deal with the imperialist actions of their parents arguably indicates that the films are highlighting the colonial legacy of Britain as having a potentially damaging effect on the future generations of Britain. This is evident in Dr. Franklyn having transgressed in the affairs of the snake tribe and that it is not Franklyn but his daughter who is cursed to transform into the reptile. Anna therefore loses control over her physical self instead of Franklyn enduring the same fate as the older imperial generation. Anna is the younger non-imperialist who is punished for the actions of her father. The Malay (Marne Maitland) goes so far as to inform Franklyn that he is there to observe the punishment that has been administered by the tribe, and to be a constant reminder that it is Franklyn's fault that his daughter has been cursed.

Within the narratives, the patriarchs are authority figures who have lost their authority, just as Britain lost its Empire. The lack of matriarchs in the post-colonial films also links to previous chapters wherein the males become unstable without a wife in the family structure, demonstrating the films are increasingly addressing gender roles in showing a world in which society is shifting and the roles of male and female are being questioned, for the daughters without mothers are afflicted and become monstrous then threaten the males within the narrative. Since the males no longer have wives and their daughters are destroyed before they can marry men whom their fathers deem suitable in the exchange of women,[30] the British males and their representation in the gene pool of future generations is finished. To put it another way, their lineage has come to an end, making them similar to Sir Henry Baskerville (Christopher Lee) in Hammer's *The Hound of the Baskervilles* as a dead bloodline. One of their punishments for colonial interference is therefore the death of their genepool as their afflicted

daughters are incapable of carrying their tainted genes into the next generations which is all the males could hope for without sons to continue the family name. The past imperial actions of the older male has endangered and destroyed the future for the younger generations, just as the imperial past of Britain had potentially compromised the future ability of Britain to successfully navigate in world affairs and relations with the ex-colonies.

In this manner the collapse of the male-centred family is a manifestation of the Empire itself collapsing, with no way to continue it. The males at the head of these families have no wife to produce a male heir and only a disobedient daughter left, further adding to the status of the male as ineffective as they cannot control their daughters which eventually leads to their own destruction. At the end of *The Reptile*, *Blood from the Mummy's Tomb*, and *The Blood Beast Terror* each family made up of the imperial male and his daughter is destroyed by itself, thus preventing the ineffective male bloodline from reproducing in any way. In the case of *The Creeping Flesh*, the ending presents Hildern locked in his brother's (Christopher Lee) asylum, his daughter driven mad and also an inmate. As a result the audience is left to decide if the narrative formed actual events or were the delusions of Hildern as an asylum inmate.

Before an in-depth examination of the films, it is important to acknowledge the importance of the timing of many of the films in order to show that they were influenced by world affairs further than originally thought. It is useful to look to Hammer for the most illustrative example of this across the two decades which is the 'Mummy' franchise, namely *The Mummy*, *Curse of the Mummy's Tomb* (Michael Carreras, 1964), *The Mummy's Shroud* (John Gilling, 1967), and *Blood From the Mummy's Tomb*. Each film was released just after a foreign affairs crisis in the Middle East involving Egypt on the opposing side to Britain, and most of these revolved around Israel which had formed due to the failed British Mandate in 1948.

As a result of this, Israel came into conflict with its neighbouring Arab states and Egypt in particular, including the Six Day War (1967), the War of Attrition (1967-70) when Egypt tried to take back Sinai, and the Yom Kippur War (1973). This added to the perceived crisis of anti-Western governments coming to power in Egypt (1954), Syria (1963), Iraq (1968), and Libya (1969), all of which came to power by promising to destroy Israel and rid the area of Western (especially European) influence. Additionally, the Aden Emergency 1963-67 with Egypt backing the republicans of North Yemen trying to gain control and absorb the state, which ended with Britain forced to evacuate earlier than their plans for Aden independence. After each conflict involving Egypt fighting on the opposing side to Britain, a 'mummy' film was made within a few short years. This film release pattern in context of the conflicts continues the widely acknowledged argument about the Suez crisis directly influencing the production of *The Mummy*.[31]

With Britain constantly opposing Egypt by supporting Israel, Egypt was perceived as the opposition and a threat to British influence in the Middle East. Secondly, the Egyptian mummy is arguably an iconic threat from the Middle East and not just Egypt, enabling it to represent the entire region as a form of 'short-hand.' With the constant failures and oppositions in the Middle East for British foreign affairs, there is little surprise that Hammer produced so many horror films using Egyptian mummies in the period, and so recently after each crisis. This supports Jeffrey Jerome Cohen's theory of the monster in horror films embodying the cultural moment and *zeitgeist* of the society in which it is produced,[32] with Tera in *Blood From the Mummy's Tomb* representing the anxieties of Britain concerning Egypt and its continual damage to Britain's influence and reputation in the world, as the ex-colonised returning time and again to 'punish' Britain for its colonial past and remind them that they will never again be a true world power. The franchise of mummy films that Hammer produced had previously been

focused on the male experience, with the films starting in Egypt and then moving to England, with the exploitation of Egypt for monetary gain being key in both *Curse of the Mummy's Tomb* and *The Mummy's Shroud*, before *Blood from the Mummy's Tomb* brought a change with a pronounced familial dynamic that emphasised the weakened male in a contemporary setting.

In *Blood from the Mummy's Tomb* Margaret Fuchs is made the victim of her father's interferences in colonial regions by his status as an eminent Egyptologist who breaks into the tomb of Queen Tera. Not only does he invade the inner sanctum of the Queen's chambers, but he steals her body and the entire contents of her tomb, recreating it in his basement in London. However, key to Fuchs' violation of Tera's tomb, is that Margaret's mother simultaneously went into labour with her, and died in childbirth, Margaret herself also died with her but came back to life. Had Fuchs not broken into the tomb, his daughter would not have been selected as the vessel into which Tera would seek to reincarnate herself and Fuchs would not have become the guardian of her new tomb in his basement. Margaret herself is the exact physical double of Tera, as Hogan points out, the film "was not strictly a mummy film at all, but a variation on the Jekyll and Hyde theme,"[33] rather than a simple repeat of the old mummy formula. Importantly though, Margaret is a physical reincarnation that Tera's spirit wants to inhabit, which would remove Margaret's own spirit so that she ceases to exist.

In order to take control of Margaret, Tera needs to reclaim her possessions. Each of the Egyptologists in the film possesses an object from Tera's tomb, and as each one is killed the object is reclaimed by Tera to be reunited with the rest of her reconstructed tomb in the Fuchs basement. Similarly, when Margaret's boyfriend, Tod (Mark Edwards), takes Tera's ring to the museum to get information about it, the Egyptologist he presents it to collapses and dies. That Tera is killing each individual involved in opening her tomb is confirmed by Fuchs when he confesses to Margaret that the actions

of the archaeologists in breaking open the tomb have resulted in the rising of the evil Queen Tera who is now seeking revenge and power. Fuchs confesses his guilt at his past imperial actions which he now views as a mistake that has endangered Margaret and her future. This sense of superiority in the British archaeologists opening tombs in the colonial lands results in the demise of Fuchs and his entire family; his wife dies, his daughter is invaded by the spirit of an evil Egyptian sorceress intent on stealing her body and evicting her mind, and Fuchs meets his own end. Every member of the Egyptology team is killed in order for Tera to reclaim all of her stolen possessions and resurrect herself by stealing Margaret' body.

Not only is Margaret at risk from the moment of her birth and the invasion of Tera's tomb, but Fuchs becomes obsessed with Tera. He recreates her tomb, protects her through secrecy, gives her ring to Margaret despite knowing the dangers, and spends hours staring at her body in his basement. In this manner, he facilitates Tera's invasion of his daughter. Arguably, Tera has converted Fuchs as a native of England, leading him to hold up Tera the coloniser as the ideal and desire that his daughter quite literally takes on her image and her qualities.

As the film progresses, Margaret's personality is altered, mirroring the increasing influence that Tera holds over her. This reflects that the conversion of the colonised to their full integration into the coloniser's way of life and established society is a steady process of indoctrination. That the film ends with the viewer unenlightened as to whether it is Tera or Margaret that survived the building collapse reflects that colonisation by force can have more unexpected results. However, the fact that the final image is of Margaret wrapped in bandages with her eyes staring out widely would indicate that it is in fact Tera, the mummy who would have been traditionally wrapped in bandages that is now in possession of Margaret's body, and that Margaret's mind and soul have been expelled – Tera's invasion has been completed.

Rigby also recognises that *The Reptile* is indeed "a textbook case of the 'sins of the fathers' scenario,"[34] but does not explore this aspect in the context of the post-colonial era of British horror to a sufficient extent since he labelled that approach as 'fanciful.'[35] Anna's father's past colonialist and imperialist actions have destroyed her future, with a representative of the tribe that transformed her there to ensure their continued suffering whilst posing as a servant. The nature of the relationship between the colonialist Franklyn and the colonial entity of the Malay would appear to be that of master and servant, but is revealed to be the opposite with Anna at the heart of the struggle. In a key scene demonstrating the Malay's control, he strikes Franklyn and demands that he kill Harry. That Franklyn does not retaliate in kind shows that the power in this relationship is with the Malay, that he is now in control and using Franklyn to do his bidding. What is also questionable is the hold that he Malay also has over Anna. She has taken on aspects of South Asian culture, through the way she is dressed when the Spaldings visit, and her accomplished sitar performance. In this manner, Anna has been indoctrinated into the ex-colonial entity's culture and traditions in place of her own. She has been colonised culturally rather than by military force. What is more, is that she has been converted into assuming the physical appearance that her colonisers desired.

To take a post-colonial interpretation of the Malay, he represents the newly independent ex-colonies seeking to establish their own power, influence and dominance in world affairs, with the Commonwealth aiding them in doing so. But it also invokes an apprehension that the colonised will act to influence the future of the coloniser or even punish them for the colonial past, with their actions leaving a lasting impression, for as Pirie states of *The Reptile* after the climax "a sense of shock prevails and the gloom remains unrelieved"[36]

The rival for control of the daughter is also present in *Blood from the Mummy's Tomb*, but here it is in the form of Corbeck (James Villiers), one of Fuchs's

archaeological associates who seeks to bring about the complete reincarnation of Tera and her return to full power in the hope that she will reward him for doing so and he can share her power to use it for his own advantage. In this case, the second male is not from a foreign land, let alone a now-ex-colony, and so he is not interpretable in the same manner as the Malay in *The Reptile*. However, he seeks to aid the transference of an evil power from limbo to possessing Margaret's body,[37] thereby risking his own country's safety, population and reputation so that he can obtain foreign power; he is still trying to maintain the colonial era and control an independent-member of the Commonwealth with disastrous consequences resulting in the demise of himself and others, mirroring Britain's disasters in foreign policy involving Egypt when a reflectionist approach is applied. Although Rigby would disagree about the films reflecting an attitude against colonialism as he does with the Cornish horrors,[38] the analysis of the films indicates otherwise.

As a punishment for Franklyn offending a snake cult in Borneo with his attitudes about their inferiority to Western culture, the cult turned Anna into one of their own. This forces her to transform from an 'English rose' to a poisonous reptilian-humanoid during the full moon. In this manner, Franklyn has no true control over her as despite his attempts to keep her locked away from the world she escapes and kills repeatedly, and the only true requirement she has left of her father is that he ensure she is kept warm enough in her altered physical state. The Malay is there to ensure that Franklyn continues to suffer.

The sitar scene depicts the struggle for power over Anna between Franklyn and the Malay, in which Anna's sitar recital grows increasingly improvisational and "overheated."[39] The scene also allows Anna to demonstrate her affinity for the snake cult, with her playing and stare mimicking a snake charming its prey into a trance before it strikes. The only way to end this was for Franklyn to smash Anna's sitar before the

recital was completed. This breaks her method of hypnotic trance and one 'weapon' of the snake cult that she can use against him, and by extension that the Malay can use against him through Anna. That Anna willingly uses the cultural signifiers that the Malay approves of designates that her allegiance has shifted to her 'colonisers' and made her a convert. Another interpretation is that Franklyn seems to be angered at the way in which the Malay, his manservant whom Paszylk sums up as "an enigmatic and seemingly menacing figure isolated from everyone else"[40] and has some kind of hold over Franklyn, stares at Anna as if controlling her, whilst she fixes her gaze on Franklyn with a look of almost sexual defiance and juts out her chin, an act which she repeats in reptile form after delivering the 'incestuous' bite that kills him. However, this gaze which Anna fixes on her father during the performance hints at the possibility that she is either already involved in some way with the Malayan, or that she seeks sexual freedom from her father. The fact that Franklyn becomes enraged by the combination of Anna's sexual and the Malayan's desirous and controlling looks combined would indicate that he sees his manservant as direct competition for his daughter in every way, including sexual domination, however, none of the interpretations are explored further within the film.[41] This would imply that these interpretations of the film as a competition for dominance and control of Anna, with the ultimate rejection of Franklyn has not been fully highlighted. That Anna destroys her father and dies in the process shows a rejection of his patriarchal imperialism, and the irreparable damage caused to the youth of Britain as a result of the imperial past.

Within the narratives of the two films there is evident a distinct loss of power of the patriarchal father figures, which increases as the film progresses and the daughters are increasingly affected by the foreign powers to become monstrous as a snake-woman and possessed by an evil deity respectively. By presenting the foreign threat in a female form, the narratives are 'othering' the threat to a greater extent, as 'normal' in patriarchal

western societies is white, male, heterosexual and normally Christian, the films can be seen as adhering to what Martin Clayton and Bennett Zon refer to as the "traditionally bifurcated topoi of East and West, such as evil/good, uncivilized/civilized, feminine/masculine, illogical/logical and sexually profligate/monogamous."[42] Here the threats are female, foreign, seemingly uncivilised in their actions and produced by different religions (Egyptian deity and snake cult tribe); they are that which the 'normal' seeks to repress in society in order to maintain its power and the status quo, which mirrors the situation in England at the time of their production when the status quo was being challenged by the collapsing Empire and socio-cultural changes.

This adds to the issue of orientalism at stake within the films and the foreign-borne threats creating female monsters rather than male. As Sheldon Pollock argues, "[p]ared to the bone, orientalism is disclosed as a species of a larger discourse of power that divides the world into "betters and lessers" and thus facilitates the domination (or "orientalization" or "colonization") of any group,"[43] which Meyda Yeğenoğlu supports by stating that "the representation of otherness is achieved simultaneously through sexual as well as cultural modes of differentiation."[44] Here it acts to divide the foreign Eastern threat from the British Western protagonists as far as possible, heavily relying on gender for the feminising of the East in comparison to a 'masculine' West. If the act of orientalism confers feminine attributes on the East, then the use of female monsters can be interpreted as a 'return of the repressed', since the now-independent states are no longer controlled in any way by Britain and are no longer the repressed, generating fears of repercussions and of any elements or tendencies that Britain had sought to keep repressed when attempting cultural hegemony during the imperial past.

Significantly in *The Reptile*, preceding each killing by Anna is the sound of eerie non-Western music, "a strange tune – not exactly loud or particularly unpleasant but decidedly eerie"[45] that would be very foreign to the Cornish villagers, as would the

sitar, and it is this music which attracts Charles to investigate its source in the Franklyn house, leading to his death as Anna attacks before Franklyn can stop her. This use of the music suggests Anna's mysterious connection to the deaths before the truth is known of her transformative curse, for she plays similar music in the previously-discussed performance scene which speaks of her sexuality, and during part of this performance the eerie non-diegetic music is heard over the top of it, therefore linking the music, sex and death in a kind of siren call connoting the exotic and orientalist attitudes to the East, but warning against Western involvement due to audience knowledge of the dangers. Anna's duality also speaks of the hidden dangers of the East that can be deadly to the colonising male and to the British citizens exposed to it, especially men, and can be interpreted as the feminised East retaliating against the 'masculine' West, presenting itself as desirable and acquiescent to those who have control over it (the coloniser) but harbouring resentment and desires to rebel and be free to seek its own allies. Anna's attacks can be interpreted as the feared uprisings, especially with the Malay seeming to have some kind of control over her and the snake cult turning her into their weapon of punishment against the imperial interferer of her father.

   Homi Bhabha states of hybridity that

   [t]his however, exacts a price, for the existence of two contradictory knowledges
   (multiple beliefs) splits the ego (or the discourse) into two physical attitudes, and
   forms of knowledge, towards the external world. The first of these takes reality
   into consideration while the second replaces it with a product of desire.[46]

This would indicate the split in Anna's personalities, and the irreconcilability of the two. The British side of Anna is articulate and able to express herself, acknowledging her father as the authority despite her rebellious nature. As the film progresses, however, Anna's other personality with an allegiance to the snake tribe emerges. This is displayed by her dress in traditional garb, her sitar performance, and her snake transformation. Importantly, this personality barely speaks, and is controlled by drives

and desires. Her propensity for violence against almost exclusively males, added to her defiance demonstrates the irreconcilability of her two personalities, as well as the inability of her British imperial father to control her colonised personality. This inevitably leads to the death of both father and daughter, with Anna delivering a poisonous bite to Franklyn before they perish in the flames that engulf their home.

The implications of the films as discussed, are that the imperial past of Britain is responsible for weakening British relations in the present, that Britain's future is in doubt, and that it is the youth who will suffer the consequences of the actions of their ancestors. The male authority figures in the films are solely responsible for the dangers that their daughters face, and for the punishment inflicted upon their daughters for the crimes that the males are perceived to have committed against other countries that were once controlled by imperial forces. These male authority figures witness their power and authority diminishing as their children suffer. That these films were released as the Empire was rapidly collapsing emphasises the connection between the concerns of the films and the situation of Britain at the time of their production.

Unwanted British abroad

Within the films is an element that requires further examination, namely the increasing obsolescence of the male authority figures who find themselves rejected by the old colonial territories and their representatives. The British characters featuring in many of the horror films with post-colonial undertones are presented as unwanted by the societies and people of the countries which they are involved in. This is made explicit in *The Witches*, *The Reptile*, and *The Legend of the 7 Golden Vampires*. In each of these films, the authority figure is explicitly rejected by the representatives of the land in which they seek to impart their authority. Gwen (Joan Fontaine) is forcibly

ejected from Africa by the witchdoctor when he confronts her, as previously discussed Franklyn is punished for his interference in the snake tribe in *The Reptile* with the curse placed upon his daughter, and the first indication that Van Helsing (Peter Cushing) is unwanted in China is the university refusing him access to the libraries he desperately wants the knowledge from in *The Legend of the 7 Golden Vampires*. In each instance, these characters who carry authority through their position and knowledge are rejected by the societies they seek to influence and repositioned as an undesirable outsider who is forced to leave.

In the case of *The Witches*, the scene that demonstrates how unwanted the British are in Africa is the opening of the film. Gwen (Joan Fontaine) is attempting to evacuate a school as the tribe native to the area approaches to attack the school. The local people who have become converted to the British ways, and are now her assistants, warn Gwen that the tribe wants to get rid of the British and their interference. After stating the consequences of resistance they flee unlike Gwen who stubbornly refuses to leave before everything is packed away. Her vocal dismissal of the threat to the locals as foolish, and criticism of their belief in a power she cannot understand allows her to be overcome and return to Britain. Local powers and beliefs in foreign lands become a weapon of sorts in *The Plague of the Zombies*, in which Squire Hamilton uses Haitian voodoo techniques to turn the local villagers into zombies to work in his unsafe tin mine. As a result, Hamilton is able to enslave the village in a reverse colonisation with himself as the archetypal benefactor with his status as a slave owner. Hamilton is destroyed by the fire in the mines, but all those who were colonised and assimilated as zombies also burn with him.

As already discussed, *The Reptile* uses the snake tribe and their powers to punish and control Franklyn for his unwanted interference, with the Malay regularly reminding him of this. The transformation of Anna via the curse asserts the superiority of the snake

tribe, followed by the return of Franklyn to Britain. In both *The Reptile* and *The Witches*, the British, namely Gwen and Franklyn, are forced out of the colony who assert themselves as more powerful than expected and sent back to Britain. However, the legacy of colonial interference leaves its mark on the British and they continue to suffer for their actions, mentally and physically.

This element of unwanted British authority figures abroad was not limited to Hammer productions by any means as evidenced by the British-Italian co-production *Holocaust 2000* (Alberto Di Martino, 1977). Robert Caine (Kirk Douglas) is a wealthy industrialist who against the protests of locals builds his nuclear power plant next to a sacred cave in the Middle East, unwittingly allowing his son Angel (Simon Ward) who happens to be the Antichrist (unbeknownst to his family) to use his father's project to bring about the apocalypse. The locals do not want Caine's project, and he receives multiple warnings against his actions. At a time of nuclear anxieties and tension in the Middle East, the character of Caine presses ahead with his desires in another country and sets off a chain of events with devastating consequences. The local population do not want him or his plans, with attempts on his life as well as political opposition trying to prevent him from being successful.

Before moving on to an in-depth examination of *The Legend of the 7 Golden Vampires*, it is important to note the manner in which the post-colonial themes of British horror in the period influenced later films in both Britain and America. Both *The Stranglers of Bombay* and *The Deceivers* focus on the Thuggee cult of Kali in India, and British representatives struggling to expose and defeat them. The cult is killing travellers in order to destroy the British East India Trading Company and remove British influence from their country. Both films feature a lead character out of his depth, but portray the destruction of the cult as a benefit to India as per a quote from Major General William Sleeman (who was heavily involved in suppressing the Thuggee)

displayed at the end of the 1959 film which states "[i]f we have done nothing else for India, we have done this one good thing." Both of the leading characters act against the advice of others whilst the British organisations which they represent act in error by either sending someone who does not understand India (*Stranglers of Bombay*) instead of a 'local expert' or by ignoring the threat. This results in a critique of British colonial practice, particularly when the East India Trading Company is only interested in protecting its trade and not the thousands of missing locals. Similarly, the British films of the 1960s and 1970s are able to present sustained critiques of colonialism and reflect the situation that Britain found itself in within the post-colonial era that Britain was entering.

It is important now to examine a key British film in greater depth for its representation of the post-colonial towards the end of the period being examined, especially in relation to authority figures. *The Legend of the 7 Golden Vampires* represents the last Hammer incarnation of the figures of Dracula and Van Helsing, with the treatment of Van Helsing being of particular interest. The film is more complex than it first appears, being a joint-project between the British Hammer and the Hong Kong Shaw Brothers and as a result this prevents the film from comprising only what Hammer desired for it, and blends gothic horror with kung fu films which were the current vogue.[47] The most obvious interpretation of the film and one cited by many critics, is that the East needs the West to protect it and even save it from itself, since here the Chinese need the English Van Helsing (Peter Cushing) in order to defeat Chinese vampires as noted by I. Q. Hunter[48] and Geoff Mayer,[49] whilst other critics argue that both Van Helsing and Dracula (John Forbes-Robertson) act as colonisers within the film.[50] This section will address these arguments whilst putting forth the interpretation of the British being irrelevant and unwanted by the locals.

It presents the British as unwanted and unnecessary in several ways. Firstly, Van Helsing (Peter Cushing) is admonished at his lecture on Chinese legends. The scholars criticise his work as trying to undermine China's reputation and label the country as simple and superstitious, with one retorting that "China has a sophistication that has blossomed and bloomed over 3000 years"; the implication being that they have no desire for Westerners to delve into their history and legends in order to decide what of their culture and history is correct or needs to be rewritten to suit the Western point of view. Denied access to the library resources he desires, Van Helsing plans to return to England, for he can only gain access with permission from the Chinese authorities at the University who deny that he had any actual experiences with vampires, despite his protestations of "I accept that I am an outsider" and claims to have "experienced the horror, and the aftermath." To the authorities and academics of the Chinese History Department he is insignificant, with no expertise or authority. Equally, Van Helsing's authority on vampires is diminished as his specialism is European vampires, with his being denied access to resources about Chinese vampires hampering his usefulness to the expedition. This incident demonstrates that Western influence and perceived authority in the world is waning. It also acts as a critique of colonialism, for here the perceived orientalist coloniser is experiencing the aftermath of the colonial experience, since those with authority choose to reject him and his designs upon their resources, an aspect which is noted by critics such as Geoff Mayer.[51]This reflects the problem in reality that Britain would encounter as it lost colonies, and with them the access to vital resources. The use of China as a stand-in for the exotic colonial-era East is significant, for the refusal of the Chinese to allow Van Helsing access to his desired resources and his subsequent alliance with an isolated group can be seen as a reference to the colonial era opium trade with China for Chinese resources, the following Opium Wars and the

Boxer Rebellion, which then led to British occupation of Hong Kong by arrangement with China.

The British Consul (Robert Hanna) is in a similarly precarious position in Chungking, which he explains to Leyland Van Helsing (Robin Stewart). His continued presence is only by the grace of the local authorities and influential figures and so he wants them to remain appeased and unoffended by himself and his companions. The consequences of these figures being displeased in any way that he or his associates are responsible for will result in them having him removed or killed. When the local gang boss Leung Hon (Han Chen Wang) offers to escort Vanessa (Julie Ege) home, Leyland rejects this and causes Leung Hon great offence as losing face is an unforgivable crime. This results in a fight wherein Leyland and Vanessa are ambushed by Leung Hon's men in the streets with the intentions of killing them both to regain Leung Hon's reputation. Although Ching (David Chiang) and his siblings rescue Leyland and Vanessa, the fate of the British Consul is never revealed, but it can be presumed as negative from the earlier conversation and Leung Hon sending his men to kill Leyland and Vanessa. This articulates that the British can no longer conduct their business as they please and act in a manner that may offend local traditions without any consequences due to the weakened position of Britain in the world.

Van Helsing only remains in China because his help is requested by villagers to aid in destroying vampires that have a hold over their village. This could be taken as an interpretation that the film conveys the idea that the East needs the West to save it as it cannot protect itself, and by extension the world requires Britain to protect it, with other instances in the film supporting such an argument. The most obvious instances are Ching (David Chiang), whose grandfather previously single-handedly defeated one of the golden vampires and started the legend, stating that he and his seven martial arts and warrior siblings cannot stop the vampires alone. He goes so far as to ask Van Helsing

218

"Did I find you, or were you sent to us?" and therefore implies that Van Helsing is a saviour sent by an omnipotent being.

However, this is a simplistic argument that ignores the motives of the Chinese siblings. Because Van Helsing defeated the arch-vampire, the siblings have sought him out for his expertise and authority, for it makes sense to gain specialist assistance in a difficult task. Therefore, another possible interpretation is that the siblings lack the knowledge to defeat six vampires who are martial arts experts, so instead of failing to defeat the vampires and dying in the process, they did the intelligent thing and sought expert help. There also exists a symbiotic relationship within the group whereby the Westerners rely on the Eastern faction to keep them alive, whilst the Easterners need the theoretical and physical experience of their Western counterparts. The siblings have, in a manner of speaking, 'imported' the Westerners into their ancestral village as a tool to ensure their own success, since Van Helsing was originally researching a legend and not planning on confronting any vampires.

It can be argued that the mutual respect between the East and West factions within the anti-vampire group connotes a successful cooperation and British desire to find itself on equal footing with other countries in the post-colonial age, to find its place and supportive allies to achieve common and mutually-beneficial goals that will help the world as a whole. Importantly, this is a collaborative mission using a team of locals and Europeans, and Van Helsing can only advise, which bears a similarity to the construction of the film itself as a British and Hong Kong co-production using cast and crew from both countries to achieve the shared aim of creating the film. This does, however, mark Van Helsing as having become weakened and increasingly irrelevant since his arrival in Hammer's *Dracula*. He is no longer the man of knowledge and physicality, he is rendered a man with most of the knowledge of the threat, and none of the physicality required to dispatch it. This is shown through the numerous fight scenes

in which he has to be saved from vampires and zombies by other members of the group, or is reduced to thrusting a flaming branch towards his enemy. He cannot protect the group which relies on his knowledge of vampires for this expedition. In the confrontation with the golden vampires and their zombie army, most of the expedition is killed, and Mei Kwei (Shih Szu) is kidnapped. In the battle to rescue her, Van Helsing does manage to stab a vampire in the back with a spear when it is trying to kill Leyland and not paying attention. He has been reduced to attacking distracted enemies from behind when they least suspect.

This weakened state of Van Helsing in the post-colonial era is emphasised further in his final confrontation against Dracula (John Forbes-Robertson), Van Helsing is attacked by being struck with enough force to throw him some distance twice and seemingly defenceless until Dracula leaps at him and accidentally impales himself upon the spear that broke off the other vampire which Van Helsing grabs at the last second. He is alone in this last fight, and remains alone afterwards, in a silent temple, in a foreign land that earlier rejected him, with his only expertise now unneeded. He is now completely irrelevant. No one comes back for Van Helsing, not even his son. The last image we see of Van Helsing is of an aged, dishevelled figure with his hair in disarray, and visibly shaken by the experience.

Dracula is a figure of much dispute amongst critics in relation to post-colonial readings. I.Q. Hunter argues that "[o]n the one hand, he is a symbol of the evils of colonialism and the depravity of the Western ruling class [...] [o]n the other hand, he symbolises the dangers of cultural hybridisation, of crossing over from the West to the East,"[52] symbolically he is a Western invader of the East but he also blends his identity with the Eastern Other in order to achieve his desires, just as Squire Hamilton adopted voodoo to create mine working zombies in *The Plague of the Zombies*. Hunter's arguments then suggest that the film demonstrates the Chinese need a Westerner to

defeat the Western threat for "the East is vulnerable and feminine" as demonstrated by the female victims taken by the vampires and the need for Van Helsing to accompany the warriors,[53] but Hunter then argues that ultimately the film conveys a message that effectively the white man must save the colonised from themselves as "[t]he evil of the Chinese vampires is not a sign of the irredeemable evil of Otherness […] but the result of their corruption by a Western overlord."[54]

Leon Hunt, on the other hand, chooses to critique Hunter's reading of the film and instead argues that "Dracula and Van Helsing seem to support not a critique of colonialism but rather the notion that colonialism can take 'bad' and 'good' forms', that it can be rapacious and cruel, but also beneficial and 'civilising'."[55] Dracula is clearly a colonial force within the film who refuses assistance to Kah (Shen Chan) to help maintain his power as high priest, and instead destroys Kah in a ceremony which allows Dracula to take his form and place himself as the holder of power in the temple over the other vampires. Here, the Western force perceives the Eastern power to be weak and ripe for the taking and acts on the impulse to colonise it. Dracula uses Kah as a resource in order to take control of the village to use its population as an unwilling food source. This is demonstrated fully by his raising of the zombie army to attack the village, remaining in the safety of the temple whilst he sends his Chinese vampires to do his bidding.

When the Hsi siblings desire to liberate their ancestral home from the forces controlling it and harvesting resources (people, blood, women) they seek the assistance and advice of a Western force who may have the knowledge to based on past events. Although Van Helsing could be read as a figure of benevolent colonialism, the case for his interpretation as a failed colonial power entering post-colonialism would be stronger as he lacks specific knowledge, is taken-on by the Hsi siblings instead of gathering his own group, he does not truly lead the group, faces refusal by the University to use their

facilities, and his presence (like that of the British Consul) is only permitted by the grace of the local officials.

Demonstrably, British horror displayed an acknowledgement of the new position of Britain in world affairs as a diminished one, and in many cases as an unwanted influence that could be removed if Britain stepped beyond its remit. However, it also showed that Britain would have to seek permission to be relevant in the future activities of the ex-colonies due to her weakened state, as is demonstrated by Van Helsing who is denied access to a resource he desires in the university archives. Britain will now have to combine its strengths with those of other powers in order to progress in partnerships that would benefit both nations, as the old imperial approaches are no longer appropriate behaviours with Dracula as a figure highlighting this. It is not insignificant that Van Helsing is still in the temple at the film's end, whilst his son has left with his new partner and love interest Mei Kwei, symbolising the new relationship of East and West that is necessary, and that the older imperial ways of automatically assuming the position of control with others as the subordinates who take orders are now defunct. Continuing its behaviour as a colonial power would only result in Britain being unwanted and irrelevant.

Conclusion

It is evident that British horror possessed a unique quality in the 1960s and 1970s as although America has a colonial past, it was not as long or as far-reaching as that of imperial Britain's historical Empire, and so could not present the same concerns during this period of horror film production. British horror displays a complexity in its attitude to the colonial past, including being part of a movement towards a critique of the colonial history in the national cinema, as evidenced by the changing representation of

Empire in the films discussed within the chapter. It is established repeatedly that Britain's imperial past was not an aspect to be celebrated and that it is an out-moded approach to world affairs with a lasting and damaging impact on both Britain and those countries that were colonised.

It is prudent to return at this point to Andrew Tudor and Isobel Cristina Pinedo. Within the post-colonial films of the 1960s and 1970s male authority is undermined, the males are ineffective, and the family unit that should support them is destroyed. Often the threats within many of the post-colonial horrors emerge within family members who have been irrevocably altered, such as Anna in *The Reptile* and Margaret in *Blood from the Mummy's Tomb*. In these cases, the films provide paranoid threats as the child destroys the family and the male at its head. However, there are still some elements of the secure horror present, such as the figure of Van Helsing in *The Legend of the 7 Golden Vampires*, although he requires the assistance of a much larger group and his expertise and physicality are very limited compared to the previous films within the franchise. The notion of closure is very much at issue as well, as although the threat is destroyed within many of the films by accident (*The Plague of the Zombies*) or as a result of its own actions (*The Reptile*), closure is missing in the case of *Blood from the Mummy's Tomb* wherein the identity of the woman in hospital bandages is not disclosed and the fate of Van Helsing alone in the temple at the end of *The Legend of the 7 Golden Vampires* is not secured. The films are more post-modern/paranoid than they may first appear to be.

However, there is an evident concern about Britain's weakened status without her Empire, and a fear of both repercussions for her colonial past, and from stronger powers that threaten to make the ex-coloniser the colonised. This recurring theme of reverse colonisation is expressed particularly in the daughters of the films, who are invaded by and assimilated into the cultures of the entities who represent the ex-colonies. Those

countries who were invaded by imperial powers and marked as inferior are returning to take control of British subjects, to make them subordinate to the rule of the old colonies. The British male authority figures are unable to prevent it, or to rescue their daughters, signifying the loss of power and influence that Britain has without its Empire. This fear for the future of Britain is rooted in the actions of the past, with the blame laid at the feet of the old imperialists who sought to create an Empire of subordinates and interfere in other cultures, as is evidenced repeatedly by the male authority figures in the films being responsible for bringing the curses and entities that will permanently damage the young characters back from their trips abroad.

The use of daughters as subjected to the invasion by ex-colonies expresses a fear of reverse-colonisation, which indicates that Britain may not have fully come to terms with the fact that it has been invaded successfully in the past and that it is not impervious to future invasions. Without its Empire to protect it, Britain is vulnerable and at risk not just from powers once considered to be on a par with Britain, such as the other colonial powers, but is now at risk from all potential invaders who were previously positioned as inferior. The nature of the invaders in the films as ex-colony, inhuman, and even alien demonstrates that the threats could strike at any time from any direction. The majority being ex-colonies and striking at those male authority figures (and their families) who sought to control them shows that the main fear is reprisals for the imperial past.

This also acts as a warning against future attempts at imperial behaviours, indicating that the ex-colonies are capable of resisting British attempts to interfere in affairs that do not concern them. Supporting this is the release pattern of the films involving Egyptian mummies coinciding with failed British attempts to involve itself in and to control conflicts in the Middle East involving Egypt. *Blood from the Mummy's Tomb* cements this concept with the death of every character except for Margaret, whose body wrapped in bandages is implied to now contain the spirit of Tera. This is a

clear indication that Britain involving itself in Middle Eastern affairs will not end positively. This cluster of cultural expressions of concern regarding the Empire are not released at the height of Empire, but instead when the Empire has collapsed and when Britain could be perceived as heavily weakened by its loss, with each foreign affairs disaster indicating Britain's lack of power and potential to be damaged by the ex-colonies.

There is clearly a fear of the dwindling power of Britain and repercussions from ex-colonies for the past imperial interference with potentially damaging consequences, but an acknowledgement that cooperation and diplomacy is the way forward as is evidenced in *The Legend of the 7 Golden Vampires* and trying to prevent it could also present negative outcomes, especially since the daughters signify that colonialism is quite literally a dead bloodline/lineage, but there is a fear for the effect on future generations emerging in the post-colonial age. The colonial past is presented as a barrier to Britain's success, with the repercussions damaging both Britain's future generations and relations with other nations, especially the ex-colonies.

By examining the role of the post-colonial within British horror cinema of the 1960s and 1970s it has been shown that three main areas are key to understanding this unique component of the films, namely ex-colony entities inflicting themselves on British characters and fears of reverse colonisation, punishment inflicted on the younger generation for previous incursions by the older characters, and hostility towards the British by previously colonised peoples. In this way, it has been demonstrated that the issues of intergenerational relations and gender representation play an important role in the expression of post-colonial themes which shifts as the socio-cultural environment in which the films were produced continues to evolve through the two decades.

CONCLUSION

This thesis has successfully demonstrated that British horror cinema of the 1960s and 1970s cannot be reduced to an era of film-making indebted to the 1950s Hammer gothics, but is, in fact, a complex twenty-year period which needs to be assessed as a nuanced and far more amorphous timeframe. What has been uncovered is a rich and diverse range of cinematic output that, at first, would appear to be disparate, but through analysis within thematic groupings has enabled a new history of horror to be developed through interconnectivity.

In brief, by answering the research questions posed in the introductory chapter, I have demonstrated that British horror cinema of the 1960s and 1970s was continually changing in a manner that shows the films themselves reflecting shifts in societal attitudes and concerns. The productions vary in style, content, budget, personnel, and subject matter, but also form cycles which demonstrate a connectivity of many of these elements. This was in contrast to the Hammer gothics of the 1950s which have been considered the established and dominant form of British horror cinema. With the dozens of small and single-film production companies setting up to make films using popular elements, cycles were formed in difficult economic circumstances. However, this has previously been marginalised in terms of academic attention due to being overshadowed by the dominance of Hammer. As can be seen, this more fluid nature of British horror, the films and their cycles, are reflective of the society which produced them, including the lesser-known films which have not been examined in depth by previous works on British horror cinema.

British horror adapted by reflecting cultural shifts and attitudes, and by changing the manner in which it was produced with the emergence of cycles and smaller production companies set up to make profits on single films. The ability of the British horror cinema to adapt is demonstrated by its increasingly paranoid and postmodern status through the two decades, separating it from other national cinemas, such as American horror which is seen as becoming paranoid/postmodern in 1968 with the release of *Night of the Living Dead*, followed by such films as *The Texas Chain Saw Massacre* and *Halloween*. British horror was the frontrunner in this regard, with films demonstrating their postmodern sensibilities in 1960. This is reflected in the changing attitude within the films to the roles of gender, the family unit, and the post-colonial world into which Britain had entered. Women were playing increasingly larger roles, and a mistrust of the female was built into British horror which intensified with the rise of feminism. Similarly, the male as benevolent authority figure was in crisis, shifting to becoming a threat to the protagonist or being of no use in protecting them, demonstrating the rising mistrust of authority which existed in the British socio-cultural climate. Finally, the post-colonial world can be found in the films, presenting Britain's colonial past as a threat to the present and the future, with a lasting effect on Britain. As a result, the British horror cinema was changing with societal attitudes, reflecting them in the narratives.

Through the research conducted in this thesis using an inclusive and reflectionist approach, the existing work on British horror cinema and the dominance of the master narrative focusing on Hammer film productions alone has been challenged. The films produced in the 1960s and 1970s have been demonstrated to be multi-faceted and presenting a cinema of change reflecting the society in which they were produced. In short: British horror cinema was not a static phenomenon.

This produces a new perspective on the genre - that it was not a simple continuation of the Hammer gothics of the 1950s. Whereas the 1950s horrors are demonstrably within the secure/classical category for the horror genre, the 1960s and 1970s horrors produced are increasingly paranoid/postmodern, showing a decline in male authority, family units which have become corrupted, and women who no longer remain on the side-lines for the male protagonists to return to and re-balance the status quo. Horror in these two decades has been shown to be multi-faceted, complex, and markedly different narratively and visually to the 1950s horrors. There is no longer a return to the status quo within narratives producing internal horrors in which the family has become a source of the threat, and the role of women increasingly presents a danger to the male through her concealed destructive capabilities. Humans are now a source of the threat, and the family unit which should be a stable and safe space for producing citizens to comply with the rules of patriarchal society is instead creating members afflicted by curses from the colonial past, psychological problems, and disfigurements, are destroying each other and threatening society. Nowhere is safe.

With an ability to continually alter and adapt to both the audience and the industry, the cycles of subgeneric films linked to the culture producing them, with British horror expressing societal concerns and providing different approaches to how they were addressed, but also differentiating itself from American horror. This can be found in the use of the missing mother figure rather than that of the father, and how it brought in elements of the slasher film before the series of films developed into the subgenre more commonly associated with American horror cinema. Families producing the threat is also a concern that was reflected in British society with the popular works of psychologists becoming mainstream and feeding

into the films. The missing mother is emblematic of the changing role of women and the rise of feminism during the 1960s and 1970s, which compounded the disruption of the family unit felt throughout this cinematic period. These family units without mothers lead to the patriarchs breaking down and destroying their children, themselves, and threatening the societies within which they exist, such as in *The Asphyx* and *Demons of the Mind*.

The post-colonial subgeneric cycle films are particularly evident of the horror genre reflecting societal concerns. They present Britain's colonial past as a threat to its future, with the younger protagonists suffering the consequences of the older generations meddling and imperialist actions. Britain's position as a world power was under threat, and much like Van Helsing (Peter Cushing) in *The Legend of the 7 Golden Vampires*, Britain is no longer welcome as an authority in other countries and has become obsolete in its previous claimed role as benevolent authority figure. This was a subgenre very specific to the Britain in the 1960s and 1970s due to the collapse of the Empire, and set it apart from American horror.

In terms of what light can be shed on the period of horror by marginalised films which had not been examined in depth, my research has found that British horror cinema was in fact leading the way in terms of changing towards a paranoid and postmodern horror genre, and that it was not in fact America that was first making these adjustments. Films from the beginning of the period such *The City of the Dead* and *Night of the Eagle* have shown that British horror was already demonstrating itself to be postmodern/paranoid and questioning male authority figures. *The Blood Beast Terror* is a key example of the female threat in terms of the use of both the masquerade of femininity and the abject within the character of Clare. Clare is in

control of her transformations, is able to subject men to her whims, and uses her female sexuality to deadly effect in attracting men with the promise of sex then feeding off them instead. In this manner Clare is demonstrative of a fear of the rise of feminism, and of what is truly behind the construct of femininity which women have been made to comply with in society but which was now coming loose as the role of women changed. By also looking at Hammer films from new approaches, it has been possible to reassess the studio, and show that it had shared concerns with the rest of British horror, including its treatment of female threats such as Anna (Angharad Rees) in *Hands of the Ripper*, and Margaret/Tera in *Blood from the Mummy's Tomb*. Similarly, the controversial and often maligned films such as *Peeping Tom* and *Twisted Nerve* bring up the psychological damage that can be done to children by their parents and create threats, reflecting the anti-psychiatry movement which built through the 1960s and entered into social discourse.

Jonathan Rigby criticised reflectionist approaches to *The Reptile* and *The Plague of the Zombies*,[1] however, the use of this approach has done a great service in bettering the understanding of the films within this thesis. By using a reflectionist approach to the films produced, it has been possible to show that the films were developing a response to the society which produced them, not always overtly but in the use of characters and their roles within then narratives. By managing the films using themes to group and examine them, this has produced a trajectory of change in the genre. An overarching theme in British horror in the two decades is an increasing mistrust of authority figures with those who are benign males failing to protect the protagonists, a breakdown of the family unit which now produces threats to society, and women becoming more powerful and concealing their true nature behind a masquerade which provides a pretence of compliance to male definitions of

femininity. The genre was paranoid and postmodern from the beginning of the 1960s and continued in this vein throughout the two decades, adapting and evolving in a complex socio-cultural environment that can be clearly seen to have fed into the films.

The implications of this new inclusive and reflectionist approach to British horror serves to highlight the diversity of British horror and the rich depth of meaning that can be uncovered through textual analysis. This serves to highlight the manner in which horror film production reflected British social anxieties, and provided a commentary on these as they shifted with cultural changes. Previously this has not been explored as part of the existing master narrative and indicates that British horror of the 1960s and 1970s needs to continue to be fully analysed as a time period in its own right, and to be removed from a reliance on Hammer productions for a sense of identity. It is clear that there is scope for further research and analysis, due to the constraints imposed by the size of this thesis. With 200 British horror films released in the 1960s and 1970s, the use of groupings and subgenres allowed the organisation and analysis of rarely-examined films alongside some of those that have previously been the subject of academic works. This has allowed the development of a cohesive narrative of change in British horror. However, due to the aforementioned limitations of size, it has not been possible to cover all areas and themes within this thesis.

During the completion of this research, there has been a renewed interest in the field which further demonstrates a need to re-examine this time period of British horror. Ian Coopers' *Frightmares: A History of British Horror Cinema*[2] seeks to cover the history of the genre in a chronological manner from the beginning of the

1900s to the 2010s. He acknowledges the concentration on Hammer previously but due to covering the entire production period of the horror genre in Britain is unable to fully address the issue. Scott Palmer's *British Horror Films of the 1960s*[3] and *British Horror Films of the 1970s*[4] pick up where Jonathan Rigby left off, providing a list of British horror films in the period, but provides no criticism or commentary on the films, rather it is a list of the films with plot summaries and images. In terms of niche subgenres, 2017 saw the release of Adam Scovell's *Folk Horror: Hours Dreadful and Things Strange*,[5] which addresses the folk horror subgenre including *The Wicker Man* and *The Blood on Satan's Claw*, along with more modern films. This demonstrates that the 1960s and 1970s British horror cinema is still a lively and developing field that is worthy of further examination.

<u>APPENDIX – FILM GROUPINGS</u>

Groupings visible to audiences at the time

Films featuring Dracula and Frankenstein are the obvious choices, but there are many other groups perceptible to audiences at the time.

Karnstein trilogy

    Lust for a Vampire (Jimmy Sangster, 1971)

    The Vampire Lovers (Roy Ward Baker, 1970)

    Twins of Evil (John Hough, 1971)

Portmanteaus

    Asylum (Roy Ward Baker, 1972)

    Tales from the Crypt (Freddie Francis, 1972)

    Dr. Terror's House of Horror (Freddie Francis, 1965)

    The House that Dripped Blood (Peter Duffell, 1971)

    The Vault of Horror (Roy Ward Baker, 1973)

Mummy Films

    The Mummy's Shroud (John Gilling, 1967)

    Blood from the Mummy's Tomb (Seth Holt and uncredited Michael Carreras, 1971)

Retrospective groupings

Theatre types, especially Shakespearean, trying to kill off a group

    Theatre of Blood (Douglas Hickox, 1973)

    Theatre of Death (Samuel Gallu, 1967) Pennea Productions Ltd.

    The Flesh and Blood Show (Pete Walker, 1972)

'Final Girl'

    The Flesh and Blood Show (Pete Walker, 1972)

    Frightmare (Pete Walker, 1974)

Blood from the Mummy's Tomb (Seth Holt and uncredited Michael Carreras, 1971)

Tower of Evil (Jim O'Connolly, 1972)

Twins of Evil (John Hough, 1971)

Alien (Ridley Scott, 1979)

Children following in the footsteps of horrific parents

Tower of Evil (Jim O'Connolly, 1972)

Hands of the Ripper (Peter Sasdy, 1971)

Frightmare (Pete Walker, 1974)

Karnstein trilogy- *Lust for a Vampire* (Jimmy Sangster, 1971), *The Vampire Lovers* (Roy Ward Baker, 1970), *Twins of Evil* (John Hough, 1971)

The Omen (Richard Donner, 1976)

Demons of the Mind (Peter Sykes, 1972)

Theatre of Blood (Douglas Hickox, 1973)

Post-colonial

The Reptile (John Gilling, 1966)

The Plague of the Zombies (John Gilling, 1966)

The Witches (Cyril Frankel, 1966)

Blood from the Mummy's Tomb (Seth Holt and uncredited Michael Carreras, 1971)

The Legend of the 7 Golden Vampires (Roy Ward Baker and uncredited Cheh Chang, 1974)

Occult/Devil Worship

To the Devil a Daughter (Peter Sykes, 1976)

The Devil Rides Out (Terence Fisher, 1968)

The Blood on Satan's Claw (Piers Haggard, 1971)

Taste the Blood of Dracula (Peter Sasdy, 1970)

Witchcraft

Virgin Witch (Ray Austin, 1972)

Satan's Slave (Norman J. Warren, 1976)

Terror (Norman J. Warren, 1978)

The Witches (Cyril Frankel, 1966)

Resurrected evil – non-vampire

The Blood on Satan's Claw (Piers Haggard, 1971)

Blood from the Mummy's Tomb (Seth Holt and uncredited Michael Carreras, 1971)

The Gorgon (Terence Fisher, 1964)

The Creeping Flesh (Freddie Francis, 1973)

Serial killer

10 Rillington Place (Richard Fleischer, 1970)

Hands of the Ripper (Peter Sasdy, 1971)

Theatre of Blood (Douglas Hickox, 1973)

The Flesh and Blood Show (Pete Walker, 1972)

Immortality-seekers

Abominable Dr Phibes (Robert Fuest, 1971)

Dr Phibes Rises Again (Robert Fuest, 1972)

The Asphyx (Peter Newbrook, 1973)

Sadian cycle

Horrors of the Black Museum (Arthur Crabtree, 1959)

Circus of Horrors (Sidney Hayers, 1960)

Peeping Tom (Michael Powell, 1960)

Witchfinder

Twins of Evil (John Hough, 1971)

The Witchfinder General (Michael Reeves, 1968)

The Blood on Satan's Claw (Piers Haggard, 1971)

Reincarnating evil, usually by possession of main character

Curse of the Crimson Altar (Vernon Sewell, 1968)

Blood from the Mummy's Tomb (Seth Holt and uncredited Michael Carreras, 1971)

To the Devil a Daughter (Peter Sykes, 1976)

The Gorgon (Terence Fisher, 1964)

The Skull (Freddie Francis, 1965)

The Sorcerers (Michael Reeves, 1967)

The Devil Rides Out (Terence Fisher, 1968)

The Omen (Richard Donner, 1976)

Satan's Slave (Norman J. Warren, 1976)

From Beyond the Grave (Kevin Connor, 1973)

Frankenstein Created Woman (Terence Fisher, 1967)

Cursed families

And Now the Screaming Starts! (Roy Ward Baker, 1973)

Terror (Norman J. Warren, 1978)

Dr. Terror's House of Horror (Freddie Francis, 1965) – werewolf story

The Oblong Box (Gordon Hessler, 1969)

Women in peril

Straight on Till Morning (Peter Collinson, 1972)

Fear in the Night (Jimmy Sangster, 1972)

Frenzy (Alfred Hitchcock, 1972)

Corrupted family

Frightmare (Pete Walker, 1974)

Mumsy, Nanny, Sonny and Girly

Hands of the Ripper (Peter Sasdy, 1971)

Demons of the Mind (Peter Sykes, 1972)

The Oblong Box (Gordon Hessler, 1969)

Age abusing youth

Taste the Blood of Dracula (Peter Sasdy, 1970)

Demons of the Mind (Peter Sykes, 1972)

House of Whipcord (Pete Walker, 1974)

From Beyond the Grave (Kevin Connor, 1973)

House of Mortal Sin (Pete Walker, 1976)

Evil child

Children of the Damned (Anton Leader, 1964)

The Omen (Richard Donner, 1976)

The Godsend (Gabrielle Beaumont, 1979)

The Beast in the Cellar (James Kelley, 1970)

Tower of Evil (Jim O'Connolly, 1972)

The Oblong Box (Gordon Hessler, 1969)

Village

The Reptile (John Gilling, 1966)

The Plague of the Zombies (John Gilling, 1966)

The Witches (Cyril Frankel, 1966)

The Blood on Satan's Claw (Piers Haggard, 1971)

The Wicker Man (Robin Hardy, 1973)

Hybrids

The Beast Must Die (Paul Annett, 1974)

The Legend of the 7 Golden Vampires (Roy Ward Baker and uncredited Cheh Chang, 1974)

The Rocky Horror Picture Show (Jim Sharman, 1974)

The House in Nightmare Park (Peter Sykes, 1973)

Crazy/mentally ill women

The Nanny (Seth Holt, 1965)

Repulsion (Roman Polanski, 1965)

Frightmare (Pete Walker, 1974)

Hands of the Ripper (Peter Sasdy, 1971)

Cannibalism

Frightmare (Pete Walker, 1974)

Mumsy, Nanny, Sonny and Girly (Freddie Francis, 1970)
The Beast in the Cellar (James Kelley, 1970)

Evil women (main female threat)

The Sorcerers (Michael Reeves, 1967)

Blood from the Mummy's Tomb (Seth Holt and uncredited Michael Carreras, 1971)

Twins of Evil (John Hough, 1971)

Vampyres (José Larraz, 1974)

House of Whipcord (Pete Walker, 1974)

Frightmare (Pete Walker, 1974)

Dr Jekyll and Sister Hyde (Roy Ward Baker, 1971)

The Blood on Satan's Claw (Piers Haggard, 1971)

The Vampire Lovers (Roy Ward Baker, 1970)

Lust for a Vampire (Jimmy Sangster, 1971)

Science gone wrong (non-Frankenstein)

I, Monster (Stephen Weeks, 1971)

Dr Jekyll and Sister Hyde (Roy Ward Baker, 1971)

The Asphyx (Peter Newbrook, 1973)

Evil House/ House as locus of evil

The Legend of Hell House (John Hough, 1973)

The House that Dripped Blood (Peter Duffell, 1971)

'Doomed in isolation'

Vampyres (José Larraz, 1974)

Prey aka *Alien Prey* (Norman J. Warren, 1978)

Satan's Slave (Norman J. Warren, 1976)

Alien (Ridley Scott, 1979)

The Wicker Man (Robin Hardy, 1973)

The Witches (Cyril Frankel, 1966)

Fear in the Night (Jimmy Sangster, 1972)

Asylum (Roy Ward Baker, 1972)

Tower of Evil (Jim O'Connolly, 1972)

And Now the Screaming Starts! (Roy Ward Baker, 1973)

Self-reflexivity e.g. characters are involved in filmmaking or shows characters reading texts which other films of the era are based on

Terror (Norman J. Warren, 1978)

The House that Dripped Blood (Peter Duffell, 1971)

The Vault of Horror (Roy Ward Baker, 1973)

From Beyond the Grave (Kevin Connor, 1973)

Torture Garden (Freddie Francis, 1967)

Urban terror

Blood from the Mummy's Tomb (Seth Holt and uncredited Michael Carreras, 1971)

Straight on Till Morning (Peter Collinson, 1972)

The Nanny (Seth Holt, 1965)

Quatermass and the Pit (Roy Ward Baker, 1967)

The Sorcerers (Michael Reeves, 1967)

Taste the Blood of Dracula (Peter Sasdy, 1970)

10 Rillington Place (Richard Fleischer, 1970)

A Clockwork Orange (Stanley Kubrick, 1971)

Hands of the Ripper (Peter Sasdy, 1971)

Dr Jekyll and Sister Hyde (Roy Ward Baker, 1971)

I, Monster (Stephen Weeks, 1971)

Dracula A.D, 1972 (Alan Gibson, 1972)

Don't Look Now (Nicholas Roeg, 1973)

Ghost, spirit, possession, soul beyond death

And Now the Screaming Starts! (Roy Ward Baker, 1973)

The Legend of Hell House (John Hough, 1973)

Blood from the Mummy's Tomb (Seth Holt and uncredited Michael Carreras, 1971)

Frankenstein Created Woman (Terence Fisher, 1967)

From Beyond the Grave (Kevin Connor, 1973

Werewolf

Dr. Terror's House of Horror (Freddie Francis, 1965)

The Beast Must Die (Paul Annett, 1974)

Legend of the Werewolf (Freddie Francis, 1975)

The Beast in the Cellar (James Kelley, 1970)

The Reptile (John Gilling, 1966)

Disinterment films

Burke and Hare (Vernon Sewell, 1971)

The Plague of the Zombies (John Gilling, 1966)

The Frankenstein franchise

Asylum (Roy Ward Baker, 1972)

Human transformation

I, Monster (Stephen Weeks, 1971)

Dr Jekyll and Sister Hyde (Roy Ward Baker, 1971)

The Plague of the Zombies (John Gilling, 1966)

Legend of the Werewolf (Freddie Francis, 1975)

The Beast Must Die (Paul Annett, 1974)

The Beast in the Cellar (James Kelley, 1970)

Tower of Evil (Jim O'Connolly, 1972)

The Blood on Satan's Claw (Piers Haggard, 1971)

The Reptile (John Gilling, 1966)

Torture Garden (Freddie Francis, 1967)

Dr. Terror's House of Horror (Freddie Francis, 1965)

The Rocky Horror Picture Show (Jim Sharman, 1974)

Notes

Notes to Introduction

1 Sarah Street, *British National Cinema*, 2ⁿᵈ ed. (New York: Routledge, 2009), 1.
Philip Schlesinger, "The Sociological Scope of 'National Cinema,'" in *Cinema and Nation*, ed. Mette Hjort and Scott MacKenzie (London and New York: Routledge, 2000), 19-31.
Andrew Higson, *Waving the Flag: Constructing a National Cinema in Britain* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995).
Adam Lowenstein, *Shocking Representation: Historical Trauma, National Cinema, and the Modern Horror Film* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2005).

2 David Pirie, *A Heritage of Horror: The English Gothic Cinema* (London: Gordon Fraser, 1973).
Peter Hutchings, *Hammer and Beyond: The British Horror Film* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1993).
Gary A. Smith, *Uneasy Dreams: The Golden Age of British Horror Films, 1956-1976* (Jefferson and London: McFarland and Company Inc, 2000).
Steve Chibnall and Julian Petley, eds., *British Horror Cinema.* (New York: Routledge, 2002).
David Pirie, *A New Heritage of Horror: The English Gothic Cinema* (London: I.B. Tauris, 2008).
Jonathan Rigby, *English Gothic: A Century of Horror Cinema* (Richmond: Reynolds and Hearn, 2000)

3 Ian Conrich, "Horrific films and the 1930s," in *British Horror Cinema*, ed. Steve Chibnall and Julian Petley (London and New York: Routledge, 2002), 58.

4 Hutchings, *Hammer and Beyond*.

5 Smith, *Uneasy Dreams*.

6 Pirie, David. *A Heritage of Horror*.

7 Hutchings, *Hammer and Beyond*, 62.

8 Ibid., 57.

9 Pirie, *A Heritage of Horror*.

10 Street, *British National Cinema*, 105-108.
Sue Harper and Justin Smith, eds., *British Film Culture of the 1970s: The Boundaries of Pleasure* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2011).
Andrew Higson, "A Diversity of Film Practices: Renewing British Cinema in the 1970s," in *The Arts in the 1970s: Cultural Closure?*, ed. B. J. Moore-Gilbert (London: Routledge, 1994).

11 Hutchings, *Hammer and Beyond*.
Pirie, *A Heritage of Horror*.

12 Marcelle Perks, "A descent into the underworld: *Death Line*," in *British Horror Cinema*, ed. Steve Chibnall and Julian Petley (London: Routledge, 2002).
I.Q. Hunter, "Hammer Goes East: A Second Glance at *The Legend of the 7 Golden Vampires*," in *Necronomicon Presents Shocking Cinema of the Seventies*, ed. Xavier Mendik (London: Noir Publishing, 2002).

13 Mark Betz, "High and Low and In Between." *Screen* 54, no.4 (Winter 2013): 495-513.

14 Amanda Ann Klein, *American Film Cycles: Reframing Genres, Screening Social Problems, and Defining Subcultures* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 2011).

15 Betz, "High and Low and In Between," 512-513.

16 Klein, *American Film Cycles*, p.6.

17 Ibid., p.4.

18 Ibid., p.4.

19 Andrew Higson, "A Diversity of Film Practices: Renewing British Cinema in the 1970s," in *The Arts in the 1970s: Cultural Closure?*, ed. B. J. Moore-Gilbert (London: Routledge, 1994), 216- 239.
    Laurie, N Ede, "British Film Design in the 1970s," in *British Film Culture of the 1970s: The Boundaries of Pleasure,* eds. Sue Harper and Justin Smith, (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2011), 50
    Pirie, *A Heritage of Horror*.

[20] Mark Jancovich, "General Introduction," in *Horror, The Film Reader*, ed. Mark Jancovich, (London and New York: Routledge, 2002), 1.

21 Pirie, *A New Heritage of Horror*, 114.

22 Smith, *Uneasy Dreams*, 98.

23 Klein, *American Film* Cycles, 4.

24 Sue Harper and Justin Smith, "Introduction," in *British Film Culture of the 1970s: The Boundaries of Pleasure*, ed. Sue Harper and Justin Smith (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2011), 3.

25 Ibid., 6.

26 Rigby, *English* Gothic, 134.

27 Catherine Fowler "Introduction to Part Three" in *The European Cinema Reader*. London and New York: Routledge. (2002). pp.87-93. pp.91-92.

28 Sian Barber, *Using Film as a Source* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2015), 63.

29 Ibid.

30 Sian Barber. *Using Film as a Source*. p.63

31 Steve Chibnall, *Making Mischief: The Cult Films of Pete Walker* (Surrey: FAB Press, 1998)

32 Hutchings, *Hammer and Beyond*, 70.

33 Paul Wells "On the side of the demons: Clive Barker's pleasures and pains: Interviews with Clive Barker and Doug Bradley" in Steve Chibnall and Julian Petley. (eds.) *British Horror Cinema*. (2002). pp.172-182. p.172

34 Sue Harper and Justin Smith. "The Key Players" in Sue Harper and Justin Smith. (eds.) *British Film Culture in the 1970s: The Boundaries of Pleasure*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press. (2012). pp.115-137. p.125

35 Leon Hunt, "Necromancy in the UK: witchcraft and the occult in British horror," in *British Horror Cinema*, ed. Steve Chibnall and Julian Petley (New York: Routledge, 2002).

36 R. D. Laing, *The Politics of the Family and Other Essays* (London: Tavistock Publications, 1971).

37 Claude Lévi-Strauss, *The Elementary Structures of Kinship* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1969), 115.

38 Joni Lovenduski, *Women and European Politics: Contemporary Feminism and Public Policy* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1986).

39 Barbara Caine, *English Feminism, 1780-1980* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997).

40 Pirie, *A Heritage of Horror*.

41 Hutchings, *Hammer and Beyond*.

42 Rigby, *English Gothic*.

43 Andrew Tudor, *Monsters and Mad Scientists: A Cultural History of the Horror Film* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1989).

44 Isabel Cristina Pinedo, "Postmodern Elements of the Contemporary Horror Film," in *The Horror Film*, ed. Stephen Prince (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 2004).

Notes to Chapter 1

1   Paul Kane, *The Hellraiser Films and their Legacy* (Jefferson and London: McFarland, 2006), 51.

2   Peter Hutchings, *Hammer and Beyond: The British Horror Film* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1993), 60-82.

3   Ibid., 62.

4   Ibid., 88.

5   Ibid., 67.

6   Ibid., 65.

7   Ibid.

8   Ibid., 9.

9   Steve Chibnall and Julian Petley, eds., *British Horror Cinema* (London: Routledge, 2002).
Leon Hunt, *British Low Culture: From Safari Suits to Sexploitation* (London and New York: Routledge, 1998).
Gary A. Smith, *Uneasy Dreams: The Golden Age of British Horror Films, 1956-1976* (Jefferson and London: McFarland and Company Inc, 2006).
Wheeler Winston Dixon, ed., *Re-Viewing British Cinema. 1900-1992: Essays and Interviews* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1994).
John Hamilton, *Beasts in the Cellar: The Exploitation Film Career of Tony Tenser* (Godalming, Surrey: FAB Press, 2005).

10 Steve Chibnall and Julian Petley, "The return of the repressed? British horror's heritage and future," in *British Horror Cinema*, ed. Steve Chibnall and Julian Petley (London and New York: Routledge, 2002), 1.

11 Hunt, *British Low Culture*, 30.

12 Hutchings, *Hammer and Beyond*, 54.

13 Ibid., 60.

14 Smith, *Uneasy Dreams*.

15 Ibid., 5.

16 David Pirie, *A Heritage of Horror: The English Gothic Cinema, 1946-1972* (London: Gordon Fraser, 1973), 164.

17 Ibid.

18 Jonathan Rigby, *English Gothic: A Century of Horror Cinema* (Reynolds and Hearn,2000), 134.

19 Pirie, *A Heritage of Horror*, 123.

20 I. Q. Hunter, "Hammer Goes East: A Second Glance at *The Legend of the 7 Golden Vampires*," in *Necronomicon Presents Shocking Cinema of the Seventies*, ed. Xavier Mendik (London: Noir Publishing, 2002), 145.

21 Sue Harper, *Women in British Cinema: Mad, Bad and Dangerous to Know* (London and New York: Continuum, 2000).

22 Ibid., 94.

23 Ibid., 114-115.

24 Ibid., 116.

25 Sue Harper and Justin Smith, "Boundaries and Taboos," in *British Film Culture in the 1970s: The Boundaries of Pleasure*, ed. Sue Harper and Justin Smith (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press 2012), 142.

26 Pirie, *A Heritage of Horror*.

27 Ibid., 8-10.

28 Ibid., 9-10.

29 Ibid., 9.

30 Ibid., 114-130.

31 Ibid., 111.

32 Peter Hutchings, "The Amicus House of Horror," in *British Horror Cinema*, ed. Steve Chibnall and Julian Petley (London: Routledge, 2002), 131-144.

33 Pirie, *A Heritage of Horror*, 110-113.

34 Ibid., 113.

35 Ibid., 145.

36 Ibid., 155.

37 Ibid.

38 Ibid., 165

39 Ibid.

40 Ibid., 167.

41 Ibid., 165.

42 David Pirie, *A New Heritage of Horror: The English Gothic Cinema*. (London: I.B. Tauris, 2008), 227-228.

43 Ibid., 97.

44 Hutchings, *Hammer and Beyond*.

45 Peter Hutchings, "The Problem of British Horror," in *Horror, The Film Reader*, ed. Mark Jancovich (London and New York: Routledge, 2002), 116.

46 Hutchings, *Hammer and Beyond*, 186.

47 Rigby, Jonathan. *English Gothic*.

48 Smith, *Uneasy Dreams*.

49 Marcus Hearn and Alan Barnes, *The Hammer Story: The Authorised History of Hammer Films* (London: Titan Books, 2007).

50 Denis Meikle, *A History of Horrors: The Rise and Fall of the House of Hammer*, revised ed. (Lanham: The Scarecrow Press, 2009).

51 David Sanjek, "Twilight of the Monsters: The English Horror Film 1968-1975," in *Re-Viewing British Cinema, 1900-1992: Essays and interviews*, ed. Wheeler W. Dixon (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1994), 197.

52 Pirie, *A New Heritage of Horror*,193.

53 Ian Conrich, "Traditions of the British Horror Film," in *The British Cinema Book*, 3rd ed., ed. Robert Murphy (London: British Film Institute, 2009), p102.

54 Andrew Spicer, *Typical Men: The Representation of Masculinity in Popular British Cinema* (London: I.B. Tauris, 2003).

55 Steve Chibnall, *Making Mischief: The Cult Films of Pete Walker* (Surrey: FAB Press, 1998).

56 James Chapman, "From Amicus to Atlantis: The Lost Worlds of 1970s British Cinema," in *Seventies British Cinema*, ed. Robert Shail (London: British Film Institute, 2008). pp.56-64.

57 Hunt, *British Low Culture*.

58 Ibid., 153.

59 Justine Ashby and Andrew Higson, eds., *British Cinema: Past and Present* (London and New York: Routledge, 2013).

60 Peter Hutchings, "Authorship and British Cinema: The Case of Roy Ward Baker," in *British Cinema: Past and Present*, ed. Justine Ashby and Andrew Higson (London: Routledge, 2013), 179-189.

61 Sue Harper and Justin Smith, eds., *British Film Culture of the 1970s: The Boundaries of Pleasure* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2011).

62 Ian Conrich, "The Divergence and Mutation of British Horror Cinema," in *Seventies British Cinema*, ed. Robert Shail (New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2008), 33.

63 Sian Barber, "British Film Censorship and the BBFC in the 1970s," in *British Film Culture of the 1970s: The Boundaries of Pleasure*, ed. Sue Harper and Justin Smith (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2011), 22-33.

64 Sarah Street, *British National Cinema*, 2nd ed. (New York: Routledge, 2009), 105-108.

65 Benjamin Halligan, *Michael Reeves* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2003).
Steve Chibnall, *Making Mischief: The Cult Films of Pete Walker* (Surrey: FAB Press, 1998).

66 David Sanjek, "Twilight of the Monsters: The English Horror Film, 1968-1975," *Film Criticism* 16, no.1-2/Fall-Winter (1991-1992): 111-126.
Later re-printed as David Sanjek, "Twilight of the Monsters: The English Horror Film, 1968-1975," in *Re-Viewing British Cinema. 1900-1992: Essays and Interviews*, ed. Wheeler Winston Dixon (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1994), 195-210.

67 Spicer, *Typical Men*.

68 Cynthia Hendershot, *I Was a Cold War Monster: Horror Films, Eroticism, and the Cold War Imagination* (Bowling Green: Bowling Green State University Popular Press, 2001).

69 Ibid., 129

70 Robert Shail, *British Film Directors: A Critical Guide*. (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2007), 6.

71 Chibnall, *Making Mischief*.

72 Halligan, *Michael Reeves*.

73 Peri Bradley, "Hideous Sexy: The Eroticized Body and Deformity in 1970s British Horror Films," in *Don't Look Now: British Cinema in the 1970s*, ed. Paul Newland (Chicago: Intellect, University of Chicago Press, 2010), 119-130.

74 Ibid., 121.

75 Pirie, *A Heritage of Horror*, 103.

76 Steven Jay Schneider, "Barbara, Julia, Carol, Myra, and Nell: diagnosing female madness in British horror cinema," in *British Horror Cinema*, ed. Steve Chibnall and Julian Petley (London: Routledge, 2002), 117-130.

77 Leon Hunt, "Witchfinder General: Michael Reeves' Visceral Classic," in *Necronomicon Book One*, ed. Andy Black (London: Creation Books, 1996), 123.

78 John Hamilton. *X-Cert: The British Independent Horror Film, 1951-1970*. (Hailsham: Hemlock Books, 2012).
John Hamilton. *X-Cert 2: The British Independent Horror Film, 1971-1983*. (Hailsham: Hemlock Books, 2014).

79 Leon Hunt, *Kung Fu Cult Masters: From Bruce Lee to Crouching Tiger* (London: Wallflower Press, 2003).

80 Hunter, *Hammer Goes East: A Second Glance at The Legend of the 7 Golden Vampires*, 138-146.

81 Nick Freeman, "London Kills Me: The English Metropolis in British Horror Films of the 1970s," in *Necronomicon Presents Shocking Cinema of the Seventies*, ed. Xavier Mendik (London: Noir Publishing, 2002), 193-210.

82 Marcelle Perks, "A descent into the underworld: *Death Line,*" in *British Horror Cinema*, ed. Steve Chibnall and Julian Petley (London: Routledge, 2002), 145-155.

83 Patrick Allmer, Emily Brick, and David Huxley, eds., *European Nightmares: Horror Cinema in Europe Since 1945* (London and New York: Wallflower Press, 2012).

84 John Sears, "The Boundaries of Horror in Wolf Rilla's *Village of the Damned*," in *European Nightmares: Horror Cinema in Europe Since 1945*, ed. Patrick Allmer, Emily Brick, and David Huxley (London and New York: Wallflower Press, 2012), 65-75.

85 Linnie Blake, "New Labour, New Horrors: Genetic Mutation, Generic Hybridity and Gender Crisis in British Horror of the New Millennium," in *European Nightmares: Horror Cinema in Europe Since 1945*, ed. Patrick Allmer, Emily Brick, and David Huxley (London and New York: Wallflower Press, 2012), 77-87.

86 Patrick Allmer, Emily Brick, and David Huxley "British Horror Cinema," in *European Nightmares: Horror Cinema in Europe Since 1945*, ed. Patrick Allmer, Emily Brick, and David Huxley (London and New York: Wallflower Press, 2012), 61-64.

87 Ibid., 61.

88 Ibid., 62.

89 *Little Shoppe of Horrors.* 1. (June 1972).

90 Harvey Fenton and David Flint, *Ten Years of Terror: British Horror Films of the 1970s* (London: FAB Press Ltd, 2001).

91 Xavier Mendik and Graeme Harper, eds., *Unruly Pleasures: The Cult Film and its Critics.* (London: FAB Press Ltd, 2000).

92 Chibnall, *Making Mischief*.

93 *The Dark Side*. 1. (1990)

94 Fenton, Harvey and David Flint. *Ten Years of Terror: British Horror Films of the 1970s*. London: FAB Press Ltd. (2001)

95 Chibnall, *Making Mischief*, 15-17.

96 Ibid., 9.

97 Pirie, *A New Heritage of Horror*, 200.

98 Wheeler Dixon, *The Films of Freddie Francis* (Metuchen: Scarecrow Press, 1991).

99 Geoff Mayer, *Roy Ward Baker* (Manchester: The Manchester University Press, 2004).
    Hutchings, *Authorship and British Cinema: The Case of Roy Ward Baker*, 179-189.

100 Peter Hutchings, *Terence Fisher* (Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press, 2001).

101 Halligan, *Michael Reeves*.

102 Hamilton, *Beasts in the Cellar*.

103 Chibnall, *Making Mischief*, 25.
104 Andrew Higson, "A Diversity of Film Practices: Renewing British Cinema in the 1970s," in *The Arts in the 1970s: Cultural Closure?*, ed. B. J. Moore-Gilbert (London: Routledge, 1994), 216- 239.
105 Conrich, *The Divergence and Mutation of British Horror Cinema*, 25-35.
106 Ibid., 34.
107 James Chapman, "From Amicus to Atlantis: The Lost Worlds of 1970s British Cinema," in *Seventies British Cinema*, ed. Robert Shail (New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2008), 57.

Notes to Chapter 2

1 Andrew Tudor, *Monsters and Mad Scientists: The Cultural History of the Horror Film* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1989).
   Isabel Cristina Pinedo, "Postmodern Elements of the Contemporary Horror Film," in *The Horror Film*, ed. Stephen Prince (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 2004), 85-117.
2 Tudor, *Monsters and Mad Scientists*, 102-104.
3 Pinedo, *Postmodern Elements of the Contemporary Horror Film*, 85-117.
4 Tudor, *Monsters and Mad Scientists*, 102-103.
5 Ibid., 103.
6 Ibid.
7 Ibid., 18.
8 Ibid., 218.
9 Ibid., 104.
10 Pinedo, *Postmodern Elements of the Contemporary Horror Film*, 85.
11 Ibid., 89.
12 Ibid.
13 Ibid., 88.
14 Ibid., 89.
15 Ibid., 91.
16 Tudor, *Monsters and Mad Scientists*, 102-103.
17 Pinedo, *Postmodern Elements of the Contemporary Horror Film*, 89.
18 Tudor, *Monsters and Mad Scientists*, 190.
19 Paul Wells, *The Horror Genre: From Beelzebub to Blair Witch* (London and New York: Wallflower Press, 2000), 76.
20 Tudor, *Monsters and Mad Scientists*, 215.
21 Ibid., 216-217.
22 Ibid., 214.
23 Ibid.
24 Carol Clover, *Men, Women, and Chainsaws: Gender in the Modern Horror Film* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993), 66.
25 Ibid.
26 Ibid., 215.
27 Ibid., 103.
28 Ibid., 222.
29 Ibid.
30 Tanya Krzywinska, *A Skin for Dancing In: Possession, Witchcraft and Voodoo in Film* (Trowbridge: Flick books, 2000), 86

31 Pinedo, *Postmodern Elements of the Contemporary Horror Film*, 85-117.

32 Tudor, *Monsters and Mad Scientists*, 214.

33 Pinedo, *Postmodern Elements of the Contemporary Horror Film*, 89.

34 Denis Meikle, *A History of Horrors: The Rise and Fall of the House of Hammer*, revised ed. (Lanham: Scarecrow Press, 2009), 219.

35 Pinedo, *Postmodern Elements of the Contemporary Horror Film*, 88.

36 Ibid.

37 Adam Locks, "Anglo Argento: A Critical Reassessment of the Films of Norman J. Warren," in *British Culture and Society in the 1970s: The Lost Decade*, ed. Laurel Forster and Sue Harper (Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2010), 222.

38 Pinedo, *Postmodern Elements of the Contemporary Horror Film*, 90.

39 Ibid., 94.

40 Tudor, *Monsters and Mad Scientists*, 185.

41 Ibid., 186.

42 Ibid.

43 Ibid., 103.

44 Sue Harper, *Women in British Cinema: Mad, Bad and Dangerous to Know* (London: Continuum, 2000), 107.

45 Bruce, F. Kawin, *Horror and the Horror Film* (London and New York: Anthem Press, 2012), 43.

46 Robert Shail, *British Film Directors: A Critical Guide*. (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2007), 31.

47 Gary A. Smith, *Uneasy Dreams: The Golden Age of British Horror Films, 1956-1976* (Jefferson and London: McFarland, 2000), 220.
Barbara Creed, *The Monstrous-Feminine: Film, Feminism, Psychoanalysis* (London and New York: Routledge, 1993), 139.

48 Tudor, *Monsters and Mad Scientists*, 48.

49 Barry Forshaw, *British Gothic Cinema* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013), 148.

50 Ibid., 177.

51 Andrew Spicer, *Typical Men: The Representation of Masculinity in Popular British Cinema* (New York and London: I. B. Tauris, 2001), 180-181.

52 Tudor, *Monsters and Mad Scientists*, 19.

53 Carol Clover, *Men, Women, and Chainsaws: Gender in the Modern Horror Film* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993).

54 Nick Crossley, "R. D. Laing and the British anti-psychiatry movement: a socio–historical analysis," Social Science & Medicine 47, no. 7, (1998): 885.

55 Joan Rivière, "Womanliness as Masquerade," in *Formations of Fantasy*, ed. Victor Burgin, James Donald and Cora Kaplan (London: Methuen, 1986), 35-44.

56 Ibid.

Notes to Chapter 3

1 Gary A. Smith, *Uneasy Dreams: The Golden Age of British Horror Films, 1956-1976* (Jefferson and London: McFarland & Company, 2006), 173.

Wheeler Winston Dixon, *A History of Horror* (New Brunswick and London: Rutgers University Press, 2010), 99.

Yoram Allon, Del Cullen and Hannah Patterson, ed., *Contemporary British and Irish Film Directors: A Wallflower Critical Guide* (London: Wallflower Press, 2001), 100-101.

2 Barbara Caine, *English Feminism, 1780-19* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997), 240.

3 Wendy Webster, *Imagining Home: Gender, 'Race' and National Identity, 1945-1964* (London: UCL Press, 1998), xiv.

4 Ibid., 125.

5 Ina Zweiniger-Bargielowska, *Women in Twentieth-Century Britain: Social, Cultural and Political Change* (Abingdon and New York: Routledge, 2001), 74.

6 Joni Lovenduski, *Women and European Politics: Contemporary Feminism and Public Policy* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1986), 74.

7 Ibid., 73-74.

8 K. A. Kunjakkan, *Feminism and Indian Realities* (New Delhi: Mittal Publications, 2002), 103.

9 Lovenduski, *Women and European Politics*, 73.

10 Barbara Creed, *The Monstrous-Feminine: Film, Feminism, Psychoanalysis* (London and New York: Routledge, 1993), 9.

11 Ibid.

12 Joan Rivière, "Womanliness as a Masquerade," in *Formations of Fantasy*, ed. Victor Burgin, James Donald, and Cora Kaplan (London: Methuen, 1986), 35-44.

13 Creed, *The Monstrous-Feminine*, 11.

14 Ibid.

15 Ibid., 10.

16 Ibid., 37.

17 I.Q. Hunter, "*The Gorgon*: adapting classical myth as Gothic romance," in *Monstrous Adaptations: Generic and Thematic Mutations in Horror Film*, ed. Richard J. Hand and Jay McRoy (Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press, 2007), 137.

18 Ibid., 128.

19 Creed, *The Monstrous-Feminine*, 9.

20 Ibid., 10.

21 Laura Mulvey, "Visual Pleasure and Narrative Cinema," *Screen* 16.3, (Autumn 1975): 6-18.

22 Ibid., 8.

23 Ibid., 6.

24 Rivière, *Womanliness as a Masquerade*, 35-44.

25 Ibid., 35.

26 Ibid., 38.

27 Mary Ann Doane, "Masquerade Reconsidered: Further Thoughts on the Female Spectator," in *Femmes Fatales: Feminism, Film Theory, Psychoanalysis*, ed. Mary Ann Doane (New York and London: Routledge, 1991), 37.

28 Tassie Gwilliam, *Samuel Richardson's Fictions of Gender* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1993), 25.

29 Ibid.

30 Kathleen Woodward, "Youthfulness as Masquerade," *Discourse* 11. 1 (Fall-Winter 1988-1989): 125.

31 Peri Bradley, "Hideous Sexy: The Eroticized Body and Deformity in 1970s British Horror Films," in *Don't Look Now: British Cinema in the 1970s*, ed. Paul Newland (Bristol and Chicago: Intellect, 2010), 123.

32 Ibid.

33 Sian Barber, "British Film Censorship and the BBFC in the 1970s," in *British Film Culture in the 1970s: The Boundaries of Pleasure*, ed. Sue Harper and Justin Smith (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2012), 27.

34 Bradley, *Hideous Sexy: The Eroticized Body and Deformity in 1970s British Horror Films*, 123.

35 Geoff Mayer, *Roy Ward Baker* (Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press, 2004), 163.

36 Mulvey, "Visual Pleasure and Narrative Cinema," 10.

37 Ibid.

38 Victoria Pedrick, *Euripides, Freud, and the Romance of Belonging* (Baltimore: The John Hopkins University Press, 2007), 34.

39 Ibid.

40 Michael Washburn, *The Ego and the Dynamic Ground: A Transpersonal Theory of Human Development* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1988), 12.

41 Rivière, *Womanliness as a Masquerade*, 35-44.

42 Jean Laplanche and Jean-Bertrand Pontalis, *The Language of Psychoanalysis* (London: Karnac, 1988), 251.

43 Sean Homer, *Jacques Lacan.* (Abingdon and New York: Routledge, 2005), 25.

44 Ibid.

45 Mulvey, "Visual Pleasure and Narrative Cinema," 6.

46 John Hamilton, *Beasts in the Cellar: The Exploitation Film Career of Tony Tenser.* (Godalming: FAB Press, 2005), 184-185.

47 Ibid. 181.

48 Ibid.

49 Ibid.

50 Ibid.

51 Ibid., 185.

52 Ibid., 183.

53 Ibid., 184.

54 Ibid., 181.

55 Creed, *The Monstrous Feminine: Film, Feminism, Psychoanalysis*, 69-70.

56 Rivière, *Womanliness as a Masquerade*, 35-44.

57 Paul Meehan, *The Vampire in Science Fiction Film and Literature* (Jefferson: Macfarland, 2014), 115.

58 Bram, Stoker, *Dracula* (London: Penguin Popular Classics, 1994), 333.

59 Edgar Allan Poe, *The Complete Works of Edgar Allan Poe* (London: Forgotten Books, 2017), 338.

60 Rivière, *Womanliness as a Masquerade*, 35-44.

61 John Verdon, "Towards an Epistemology of Gender," in *Gender and Narrativity*, ed. Barry Rutland (Ottawa: Carleton University Press, 1997), 33.

62 Bradley, *Hideous Sexy: The Eroticized Body and Deformity in 1970s British Horror Films*, 125.

63 Creed, *The Monstrous-Feminine*, 83.

Notes to Chapter 4

1   Robert Shail, "Masculinity and Class: Michael Caine as "Working-Class Hero,"
    in *The Trouble With Men: Masculinities in European and Hollywood Cinema*, ed.
    Phil Powrie, Ann Davies and Bruce Babington (London and New York:
    Wallflower Press, 2004), 66.
2   Anna E. Claydon, "Masculinity and Deviance in British Cinema of the 1970s:
    Sex, Drugs and Rock 'n' Roll in *The Wicker Man*, *Tommy* and *The Rocky Horror
    Picture Show*," in *Don't Look Now: British Cinema in the 1970s*, ed. Paul
    Newland (Bristol and Chicago: Intellect, 2010), 136.
3   Ibid.
4   Elisabetta Girelli, *Beauty and the Beast: Italianness in British Cinema* (Bristol
    and Chicago: Intellect, 2009), 95.
5   Robin Wood, "Burying the Undead: The Use and Obsolescence of Count
    Dracula," in *The Dread of Difference: Gender and the Horror Film*, ed. Barry
    Keith Grant (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1996), 378.
6   Peter Hutchings, *Hammer and Beyond: The British Horror Film* (Manchester:
    Manchester University Press, 1993). 54.
7   Peter Hutchings, *Hammer and Beyond: The British Horror Film* (Manchester:
    Manchester University Press, 1993). 66.
8   Ibid., 67.
9   Ibid.
10 Peter Hutchings, "Metamorphisis, Masculinity and Masochism: *The Two Faces
    of Dr. Jekyll* and *The Curse of the Werewolf.*" Unpublished article.
11 Hutchings, *Hammer and Beyond*.
12 Andrew Tudor, *Monsters and Mad Scientists: The Cultural History of the Horror
    Film* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1989).
13 Isabel Cristina Pinedo, "Postmodern Elements of the Contemporary Horror
    Film," in *The Horror Film*, ed. Stephen Prince (New Brunswick: Rutgers
    University Press, 2004), 89.
14 Ibid., 89.
15 Hutchings, *Hammer and Beyond.*
16 Leon Hunt, *British Low Culture: From Safari Suits to Sexploitation* (London and
    New York: Routledge, 1998).
17 Michael Frayn, *Travels with a Typewriter: A Reporter at Large* (London: Faber
    and Faber Limited, 2009), 253.
18 Ibid.
19 Ibid., 253-254
20 Hutchings, *Hammer and Beyond*, 63.
21 Hunt, *British Low Culture*, 149.
22 Andrew Spicer, *Typical Men: The Representation of Masculinity in Popular
    British Cinema*. (London: I.B. Tauris, 2003), 64.
23 Robert Murphy, *Sixties British Cinema* (London: BFI Publishing, 1992), 164.
24 Spicer, *Typical Men*, 64.
25 Robert Murphy, *Sixties British Cinema*. (London: BFI Publishing, 1992), 177.
26 Frayn, *Travels with a Typewriter*, 253.
27 Barbara Creed, *The Monstrous-Feminine: Film, Feminism, Psychoanalysis*
    (London and New York: Routledge, 1993), 75.

28 John Kenneth Muir, *Horror Films of the 1980s* (Jefferson and London: McFarland and Co, 2007), 5.
Paul Wells, *The Horror Genre: From Beelzebub to Blair Witch* (London: Wallflower Press, 2000), 40.

29 Harry M. Benshoff, *Monsters in the Closet: Homosexuality and the Horror Film* (Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press, 1997), 210.

30 Ibid., 212-213

31 Chris Howell, *Trade Unions and the State: The Construction of Industrial Relations Institutions in Britain 1890-2000* (Princeton and Woodstock: Princeton University Press, 2005), 37.

32 Novotny Lawrence, *Blaxploitation Films of the 1970s: Blackness and Genre* (New York and Abingdon: Routledge, 2008), 45.

33 Barbara Klinger, ""Cinema/Ideology/Criticism" Revisited: The Progressive Genre," in *Film Genre Reader IV*, ed. Barry Keith Grant (Austin: University of Texas Press, 2012), 98.

34 Robin Wood, *Hollywood From Vietnam to Reagan* (New York and Oxford: Columbia University Press, 1986), 77-78.

35 I. Q. Hunter, "Hammer Goes East: A Second Glance at *The Legend of the 7 Golden Vampires*," in *Necronomicon Presents: Shocking Cinema of the Seventies*, ed. Xavier Mendik (London: Noir Publishing, 2002), 145.

36 Cynthia Hendershot, *I Was a Cold War Monster: Horror Films, Eroticism, and the Cold War Imagination* (Bowling Green: Bowling Green State University Popular Press, 2001), 129.

37 Tudor, *Monsters and Mad Scientists*.
Pinedo, *Postmodern Elements of the Contemporary Horror Film*, 85-117.

38 Hendershot, *I Was a Cold War Monster*, 129.

39 Kathleen Burk and Alec Cairncross, *'Goodbye, Great Britain' The 1976 IMF Crisis* (Avon: The Bath Press, 1992), xi.

40 Mark Jancovich, *Rational Fears: American Horror in the 1950s* (Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press, 1996), 16.

41 Ibid.

42 Ibid.

Notes to Chapter 5

1   Johannes Schlegel, "'They fuck you up' – revaluations of the family in contemporary British horror film: Steven Sheil's *Mum & Dad*," in *Gothic Kinship*, ed. Agnes Andeweg and Sue Zlosnik (Manchester, New York and Vancouver: Manchester University Press, 2013), 211.

2   Andrew Tudor, *Monsters and Mad Scientists: A Cultural History of the Horror Movie* (Oxford and Cambridge: Basil Blackwell Ltd, 1989), 217.

3   Paul Kane, *The Hellraiser Films and Their Legacy* (Jefferson: McFarland & Company Inc, 2006), 34.

4   Robin Wood, *Hollywood From Vietnam to Reagan* (New York and Chichester: Columbia University Press, 1986), 84.

5   Ibid.

6   Ibid.

7   Tony Williams, *Hearths of Darkness: The Family in the American Horror Film* (Cranbury and London: Associated University Presses, 1996).

8   Sarah Arnold, *Maternal Horror Film: Melodrama and Motherhood* (Basingstoke and New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2013), 44.

9   Ibid.

10 Williams, *Hearths of Darkness*.

11 Wood, *Hollywood From Vietnam to Reagan*.

12 I.Q. Hunter, *British Trash Cinema* (Basingstoke and New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013), 43-44.

13 R. D. Laing, *The Politics of the Family and Other Essays* (London: Tavistock Publications, 1971).

14 Nick Crossley, "R. D. Laing and the British anti-psychiatry movement: a socio–historical analysis," Social Science & Medicine 47, no. 7, (1998): 879.

15 Ibid., 880.

16 Ibid.

17 Ibid., 886.

18 Ibid., 885.

19 T. S. Kord, *Little Horrors: How Cinema's Evil Children Play on Our Guilt* (Jefferson: McFarland & Company Inc, 2016), 34.

20 Ibid.

21 Claude Lévi-Strauss, *The Elementary Structures of Kinship* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1969), 115.

22 Yoram Allon, Del Cullen and Hannah Patterson, eds. *Contemporary British and Irish Film Directors: A Wallflower Critical Guide* (London: Wallflower Press, 2001), 311.

23 Neil Mortimer, "Pulp Archaeology: Megaliths in Popular Culture," in *Written on Stone: The Cultural Reception of British Prehistoric Monuments*, ed. Joanne Parker (Newcastle Upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2009), 96.

24 Barbara Creed, *The Monstrous-Feminine: Film, Feminism, Psychoanalysis* (Abingdon and New York: Routledge, 1993), 81.

25 Steve Chibnall, *Making Mischief: The Cult Films of Pete Walker* (Guildford: FAB Press, 1998), 143.

26 Ibid.

27 Ibid.

28 Ibid.

29 Ibid., 145.

30 Wood, *Hollywood From Vietnam to Reagan*, 84.

31 Ibid., 85.

32 Chibnall, *Making Mischief*, 146.

33 Rebecca A. Brown, "Of Radioactive Sprites and Diminutive Tyrants: Hammer's Monstrous Children," in *Monstrous Children and Childish Monsters: Essays on Cinema's Holy Terrors*, ed. Markus P. J. Bohlmann, and Sean Moreland (Jefferson: McFarland & Company Inc, 2015), 114.

34 John Wyndham, *The Midwich Cuckoos* (London: Penguin Books, 1960).

35 I have included *The Omen* as a British film due to the predominantly British locations for filming, a significant portion of the cast were British, the British setting, and reliance on a sense of 'Britishness. For further information see Peter Hutchings, "The Power to Create Catastrophe: The Idea of Apocalypse in the 1970s*,"* in *Don't Look Now: British Cinema of the 1970s*, ed. Paul Newland (Bristol and Chicago: Intellect, 2010), 113.

36 Carol J. Clover, *Men, Women, and Chainsaws: Gender in the Modern Horror Film* (Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2015), 75.

37 William Paul, *Laughing Screaming: Modern Hollywood Horror and Comedy* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1994), 255-286.

38 Siegbert Saloman Prawer, *Caligari's Children: The Film as Tale of Terror* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1980), 111.

39 Dominic Lennard, *Bad Seeds and Holy Terrors: The Child Villains of Horror Film*. (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2014), 10.

40 Ibid., 63.

41 Ibid., 66.

42 Ibid., 98.

43 David J. Hogan, *Dark Romance: Sexuality in the Horror Film* (Jefferson: McFarland & Company Inc, 1986), 24.

44 Virginia Berridge, *Health and Society in Britain Since 1939* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 9.

45 Lynne Segal, "Feminism and the Family," in *Gender, Power and Relationships*, ed. Charlotte Burck and Bebe Speed (London: Routledge, 1995), 257.

46 Pat Thane and Tanya Evans, *Sinners? Scroungers? Saints?: Unmarried Motherhood in Twentieth-Century England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), 1.

47 Ibid., 97

48 Andy Sawyer, "'A stiff upper lift and a trembling lower one': John Wyndham on screen," in *British Science Fiction Cinema*, ed. I. Q. Hunter (London and New York: Routledge, 1999), 77.

49 Barry Forshaw, *British Gothic Cinema* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013), 148.
    Barry Forshaw, *British Crime Film: Subverting the Social Order* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012), 177.

50 I. Q. Hunter, "Twisted Nerve: "a good dose of S and V,"" in *The Family Way: The Boulting Brothers and British Film Culture*, ed. Alan Burton, Tim O'Sullivan and Paul Wells (Trowbridge: Flicks, 2000), 230.

51 Ibid., 231.

52 Jane Ellen Harrison, *Themis: A Study of the Social Origins of Greek Religion* (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 1927 and digitised 2010), 180.
    David Leeming and Jake Page, *Goddess: Myths of the Female Divine* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994), 98-100.

53 Hogan, *Dark Romance*, 24.

Notes to Chapter 6

1 Jonathan Rigby, *English Gothic: A Century of Horror Cinema* (Richmond: Reynolds and Hearn, 2000), 133.

2 Ibid., 134.

3 For example, the division of Pakistan and India was condemned as badly handled and rushed, with the partition resulting in the First India-Pakistan War of 1947-1948 and wars between the two nations during the 1960s and 1970s, the Suez Crisis, the Six Day War, the escalation of the Cold War between America and the USSR, and numerous conflicts in the Middle East

4 Philippa Levine, *The British Empire: Sunrise to Sunset* (Harlow: Pearson Education Ltd, 2007), 191.

5   Justin Gibbins, *Britain, Europe and National Identity: Self and Other in International Relations* (Basingstoke and New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014).

6   Cynthia Hendershot, *I Was a Cold War Monster: Horror Films, Eroticism, and the Cold War Imagination* (Bowling Green: Bowling Green State University Popular Press, 2001), 62.

7   James Chapman and Nicholas J. Cull, *Projecting Empire: Imperialism and Popular Cinema* (London and New York: I. B. Tauris, 2009), 87.

8   Peter Hutchings, *Hammer and Beyond: The British Horror Film* (Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press, 1993), 70.

9   Ibid.

10   Bram Stoker, *Dracula* (London: Penguin Popular Classics, 1994). Originally published in 1987.
     Bram Stoker, *The Jewel of Seven Stars* (London and New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers, 1904).
     H. Rider Haggard, *She: A History of Adventure* (London: Longmans, Green, and Co, 1887).
     Richard Marsh, *The Beetle: A Mystery* (Ware: Wordsworth Editions Ltd, 2007). Originally published in 1897.

11   Darryl Jones, "Introduction," in *Horror Stories: Classic Tales from Hoffman to Hodgson*, ed. Darryl Jones, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014), xi-xii.

12   Stephen D. Arata, "The Occidental Tourist: *Dracula* and the Anxiety of Reverse Colonization," in *The Horror Reader*, ed. Ken Gelder (London and New York: Routledge, 2000), 162.

13   Ibid.

14   Patrick Brantlinger, *Rule of Darkness: British Literature and Imperialism, 1830-1914* (Ithaca, New York and London: Cornell University Press, 1988), 233.

15   David Huckvale, *Touchstones of Gothic Horror: A Film Genealogy of Eleven Motifs and Images* (Jefferson: McFarland, 2010), 104.

16   Anna Powell, "Becoming-Monster: Deleuze and the Anomalies of Horror," in *Necronomicon Book Five*, ed. Andy Black (Hereford: Noir Publishing, 2007), 56.

17   Rebecca Weaver-Hightower, "The Postcolonial Hybrid: Neill Blomkamp's *District 9* (2009)," in *Postcolonial Film: History, Empire, Resistance*, ed. Rebecca Weaver-Hightower and Peter Hulme (New York and London: Routledge, 2014), 255.

18   Ibid.

19   Ibid.

20   David Huckvale, *Hammer Film Scores and the Musical Avant-Garde* (Jefferson and London: McFarland and Company Inc, 2008), 151.

21   Andrea Smith, *Native Americans and the Christian Right: The Gendered Politics of Unlikely Alliances* (London and Durham: Duke University Press, 2008), 110.

22   Ken Gelder, *Reading the Vampire* (London and New York: Routledge, 1994), 12.

23   Edward W. Said, *Orientalism* (New York: Vintage Books, 1979), 40.

24   Bram Stoker, *Dracula* (London: Penguin Popular Classics, 1994).

25   Gelder, *Reading the Vampire*, 12.

26   Arata, *The Occidental Tourist: Dracula and the Anxiety of Reverse Colonization*, 162.

27   Peter Hutchings, "'We're the Martians now': British sf fantasies of the 1950s and 1960s," in *British Science Fiction Cinema*, ed. I. Q. Hunter, (London: Routledge, 1999), 40.

28   Ibid., 38.

29 Ibid., 43.

30 Christopher Johnson, *Claude Lévi-Strauss: The Formative Years* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 40.

31 Hutchings, *Hammer and Beyond*, 70-71.

32 Jeffrey Jerome Cohen, "Monster Culture (Seven Theses)," in *Monster Theory: Reading Culture*, ed. Jeffrey Jerome Cohen (Minneapolis and London: University of Minnesota Press, 1996), 4.

33 David J. Hogan, *Dark Romance: Sexuality in the Horror Film* (London: McFarland, 1986), 103.

34 Rigby, *English Gothic*, 133.

35 Rigby, *English Gothic*, 134.

36 David Pirie, *A New Heritage of Horror: The English Gothic Cinema.* (London: I.B. Tauris, 2008), 144.

37 Geoff Mayer, *Guide to British Cinema* (Westport: Greenwood Press, 2003), 30.

38 Rigby, *English Gothic*, 134.

39 Sinclair McKay, *A Thing of Unspeakable Horror: The History of Hammer Films.* (London: Aurum, 2007), 83.

40 Bartlomiej Paszylk, *The Pleasure and Pain of Cult Horror Films: An Historical Survey* (Jefferson: McFarland, 2009), 99.

41 Rigby, *English Gothic*, 134.

42 Martin Clayton and Bennett Zon, "Introduction," in *Music and Orientalism in the British Empire, 1780s-1940s: Portrayal of the East*, ed. Martin Clayton and Bennett Zon (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2007), 8.

43 Sheldon Pollock, "Deep Orientalism? Notes on Sanskrit and Power Beyond the Raj," in *Orientalism and the Postcolonial Predicament: Perspectives on South Asia*, ed. Carol A. Breckenridge and Peter van der Veer (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1993), 77.

44 Meyda Yeğenoğlu, *Colonial Fantasies: Towards a Feminist Reading of Orientalism.* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 26.

45 Paszylk, *The Pleasure and Pain of Cult Horror Films*, 97.

46 Homi K. Bhabha, *The Location of Culture*, (London and New York: Routledge, 1994), 164.

47 David Huckvale, *James Bernard, Composer to Count Dracula: A Critical Biography*. (Jefferson: McFarland & Company, Inc, 2006), 233.

48 I.Q. Hunter, "Hammer Goes East: A Second Glance at *The Legend of the 7 Golden Vampires*," in *Necronomicon Presents Shocking Cinema of the Seventies*, ed. Xavier Mendik (London: Noir Publishing, 2002), 145.

49 Geoff Mayer, *Roy Ward Baker* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2004), 60.

50 Leon Hunt, *Kung Fu Cult Masters: From Bruce Lee to Crouching Tiger* (London: Wallflower Press, 2003), 165.

51 Mayer, *Roy Ward Baker,* 60.

52 Hunter, *Hammer Goes East: A Second Glance at The Legend of the 7 Golden Vampires*, 143.

53 Ibid, 145.

54 Ibid.

55 Hunt, *Kung Fu Cult Masters*, 165.

Notes to Conclusion

1   Jonathan Rigby, *English Gothic: A Century of Horror Cinema* (Richmond: Reynolds and Hearn, 2000), 134.
2   Ian Coopers, *Frightmares: A History of British Horror Cinema* (Leighton Buzzard: Auteur Publishing, 2016).
3   Scott Palmer, *British Horror Films of the 1960s* (Scott V. Palmer, 2017).
4   Scott Palmer, *British Horror Films of the 1970s*. (Cyprus Hills Press, 2017).
5   Adam Scovell, *Folk Horror: Hours Dreadful and Things Strange* (Leighton Buzzard: Auteur Publishing, 2017).

<div style="text-align:center">Bibliography</div>

Allmer, Patrick, Emily Brick, and David Huxley, eds. *European Nightmares: Horror Cinema in Europe Since 1945*. London and New York: Wallflower Press, 2012.

Allmer, Patrick, Emily Brick, and David Huxley. "British Horror Cinema." In *European Nightmares: Horror Cinema in Europe Since 1945*, edited by Patrick Allmer, Emily Brick, and David Huxley, 61-64. London and New York: Wallflower Press, 2012.

Allon, Yoram, Del Cullen and Hannah Patterson, eds. *Contemporary British and Irish Film Directors: A Wallflower Critical Guide*. London: Wallflower Press, 2001.

Arata, Stephen D. "The Occidental Tourist: *Dracula* and the Anxiety of Reverse Colonization." In *The Horror Reader*, edited by Ken Gelder, 161-171. London and New York: Routledge, 2000.

Arnold. Sarah. *Maternal Horror Film: Melodrama and Motherhood*. Basingstoke and New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2013.

Ashby, Justine and Andrew Higson, eds. *British Cinema: Past and Present*. London and New York: Routledge, 2013.

Barber, Sian. "British Film Censorship and the BBFC in the 1970s." In *British Film Culture of the 1970s: The Boundaries of Pleasure*, edited by Sue Harper and Justin Smith, 22-33. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2011.

Barber, Sian. *Using Film as a Source*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2015.

Benshoff, Harry M. *Monsters in the Closet: Homosexuality and the Horror Film*. Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press, 1997.

Berridge, Virginia. *Health and Society in Britain Since 1939*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.

Betz, Mark. "High and Low and In Between." *Screen* 54, no.4 (Winter 2013): 495-513

Bhabha, Homi K. *The Location of Culture*. London and New York: Routledge, 1994.

Blake, Linnie. "New Labour, New Horrors: Genetic Mutation, Generic Hybridity and Gender Crisis in British Horror of the New Millennium." In *European Nightmares: Horror Cinema in Europe Since 1945*. Edited by Patrick Allmer,

Emily Brick, and David Huxley, 77-87. London and New York: Wallflower Press, 2012.

Bradley, Peri. "Hideous Sexy: The Eroticized Body and Deformity in 1970s British Horror Films." In *Don't Look Now: British Cinema in the 1970s*, edited by Paul Newland, 119-130. Chicago: Intellect, University of Chicago Press, 2010.

Brantlinger, Patrick. *Rule of Darkness: British Literature and Imperialism, 1830-1914*. Ithaca, New York and London: Cornell University Press, 1988.

Brown, Rebecca A. "Of Radioactive Sprites and Diminutive Tyrants: Hammer's Monstrous Children." In *Monstrous Children and Childish Monsters: Essays on Cinema's Holy Terrors*, edited by Markus P. J. Bohlmann, and Sean Moreland, 107-124. Jefferson: McFarland & Company Inc, 2015.

Burk, Kathleen and Alec Cairncross. *'Goodbye, Great Britain' The 1976 IMF Crisis*. Avon: The Bath Press, 1992.

Caine, Barbara. *English Feminism, 1780-1980*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997.

Chapman, James. "From Amicus to Atlantis: The Lost Worlds of 1970s British Cinema." In *Seventies British Cinema*, edited by Robert Shail, 56-64. London: British Film Institute, 2008.

Chapman, James and Nicholas J. Cull. *Projecting Empire: Imperialism and Popular Cinema*. London and New York: I. B. Tauris, 2009.

Chibnall, Steve. *Making Mischief: The Cult Films of Pete Walker*. Surrey: FAB Press, 1998.

Chibnall, Steve and Julian Petley, eds. *British Horror Cinema.* New York: Routledge, 2002.

Chibnall, Steve and Julian Petley "The return of the repressed? British horror's heritage and future." In *British Horror Cinema*, edited by Steve Chibnall and Julian Petley, 1-9. London and New York: Routledge, 2002.

Claydon, Anna E. "Masculinity and Deviance in British Cinema of the 1970s: Sex, Drugs and Rock 'n' Roll in *The Wicker Man*, *Tommy* and *The Rocky Horror Picture Show*." In *Don't Look Now: British Cinema in the 1970s*, edited by Paul Newland, 131-142. Bristol and Chicago: Intellect, 2010.

Clayton, Martin and Bennett Zon, "Introduction." In *Music and Orientalism in the British Empire, 1780s-1940s: Portrayal of the East*, edited by Martin Clayton and Bennett Zon, 1-10. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2007.

Clover, Carol J. *Men, Women, and Chainsaws: Gender in the Modern Horror Film*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993.

Cohen, Jeffrey Jerome. "Monster Culture (Seven Theses)." In *Monster Theory: Reading Culture*, edited by Jeffrey Jerome Cohen, 3-25. Minneapolis and London: University of Minnesota Press, 1996.

Conrich, Ian. "Horrific films and the 1930s." In *British Horror Cinema*, edited by Steve Chibnall and Julian Petley, 58-70. London and New York: Routledge, 2002.

Conrich, Ian. "The Divergence and Mutation of British Horror Cinema." In *Seventies British Cinema*, edited by Robert Shail, 24-35. New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2008.

Conrich, Ian. "Traditions of the British Horror Film." In *The British Cinema Book*, 3rd ed, edited by Robert Murphy, 96-105. London: British Film Institute, 2009.

Coopers, Ian. *Frightmares: A History of British Horror Cinema*. Leighton Buzzard: Auteur Publishing, 2016.

Creed, Barbara. *The Monstrous-Feminine: Film, Feminism, Psychoanalysis*. London and New York: Routledge, 1993.

Crossley, Nick. "R. D. Laing and the British anti-psychiatry movement: a socio–historical analysis." Social Science & Medicine 47, no. 7, (1998): 877-889.

Dixon, Wheeler. *The Films of Freddie Francis*. Metuchen: Scarecrow Press, 1991.

Dixon, Wheeler Winston, ed. *Re-Viewing British Cinema. 1900-1992: Essays and Interviews*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1994.

Dixon, Wheeler Winston. *A History of Horror*. New Brunswick and London: Rutgers University Press, 2010.

Doane, Mary Ann. "Masquerade Reconsidered: Further Thoughts on the Female Spectator." In *Femmes Fatales: Feminism, Film Theory, Psychoanalysis*, edited by Mary Ann Doane, 33-43. New York and London: Routledge, 1991.

Ede, Laurie, N. "British Film Design in the 1970s." In *British Film Culture of the 1970s: The Boundaries of Pleasure,* edited by Sue Harper and Justin Smith, 50-61. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2011.

Fenton, Harvey and David Flint. *Ten Years of Terror: British Horror Films of the 1970s*. London: FAB Press Ltd, 2001.

Forshaw, Barry. *British Crime Film: Subverting the Social Order.* New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012.

Forshaw, Barry. *British Gothic Cinema*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013.

Frayn, Michael *Travels with a Typewriter: A Reporter at Large*. London: Faber and Faber Limited, 2009.

Freeman, Nick. "London Kills Me: The English Metropolis in British Horror Films of the 1970s." In *Necronomicon Presents Shocking Cinema of the Seventies*, edited by Xavier Mendik, 193-210. London: Noir Publishing, 2002.

Gelder, Ken. *Reading the Vampire*. London and New York: Routledge, 1994.

Gibbins, Justin. *Britain, Europe and National Identity: Self and Other in International Relations*. Basingstoke and New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014.

Girelli, Elisabetta. *Beauty and the Beast: Italianness in British Cinema*. Bristol and Chicago: Intellect, 2009).

Gwilliam, Tassie, *Samuel Richardson's Fictions of Gender*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1993.

Haggard, H. Rider. *She: A History of Adventure*. London: Longmans, Green, and Co, 1887.

Halligan, Benjamin. *Michael Reeves*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2003.

Hamilton, John. *Beasts in the Cellar: The Exploitation Film Career of Tony Tenser*. Godalming: FAB Press, 2005.

Hamilton, John. *X-Cert: The British Independent Horror Film, 1951-1970*. Hailsham: Hemlock Books, 2012.

Hamilton, John. *X-Cert 2: The British Independent Horror Film, 1971-1983*. Hailsham: Hemlock Books, 2014.

Harper, Sue. *Women in British Cinema: Mad, Bad and Dangerous to Know*. London and New York: Continuum, 2000.

Harper, Sue and Justin Smith. *British Film Culture of the 1970s: The Boundaries of Pleasure*. Edinburgh, Edinburgh University Press, 2011.

Harper, Sue and Justin Smith. "Introduction." In *British Film Culture of the 1970s: The Boundaries of Pleasure*, edited by Sue Harper and Justin Smith, 1-8. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2011.

Harper, Sue and Justin Smith. "Boundaries and Taboos" In *British Film Culture of the 1970s: The Boundaries of Pleasure*, edited by Sue Harper and Justin Smith, 138-154. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2012.

Harrison, Jane Ellen. *Themis: A Study of the Social Origins of Greek Religion.* Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 1927 and digitised 2010.

Hendershot, Cynthia. *I Was a Cold War Monster: Horror Films, Eroticism, and the Cold War Imagination*. Bowling Green: Bowling Green State University Popular Press, 2001.

Hearn, Marcus and Alan Barnes. *The Hammer Story: The Authorised History of Hammer Films*. London: Titan Books, 2007.

Higson, Andrew. "A Diversity of Film Practices: Renewing British Cinema in the 1970s." In *The Arts in the 1970s: Cultural Closure?*, edited by B. J. Moore-Gilbert, 216-239. London: Routledge, 1994.

Higson, Andrew. *Waving the Flag: Constructing a National Cinema in Britain*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995.

Hogan, David J. *Dark Romance: Sexuality in the Horror Film*. London: McFarland, 1986.

Homer, Sean. *Jacques Lacan.* Abingdon and New York: Routledge, 2005.

Howell, Chris. *Trade Unions and the State: The Construction of Industrial Relations Institutions in Britain 1890-2000*. Princeton and Woodstock: Princeton University Press, 2005.

Huckvale, David. *James Bernard, Composer to Count Dracula: A Critical Biography*. Jefferson: McFarland & Company Inc., 2006.

Huckvale, David. *Hammer Film Scores and the Musical Avant-Garde*. Jefferson and London: McFarland and Company Inc., 2008.

Huckvale, David. *Touchstones of Gothic Horror: A Film Genealogy of Eleven Motifs and Images*. Jefferson: McFarland, 2010.

Hunt, Leon. "Witchfinder General: Michael Reeves' Visceral Classic." In *Necronomicon Book One* edited by Andy Black, 123-130. London: Creation Books, 1996.

Hunt Leon. *British Low Culture: From Safari Suits to Sexploitation*. London and New York: Routledge, 1998.

Hunt, Leon "Necromancy in the UK: witchcraft and the occult in British horror." In *British Horror Cinema*, edited by Steve Chibnall and Julian Petley, 82-98. New York: Routledge, 2002.

Hunt, Leon. *Kung Fu Cult Masters: From Bruce Lee to Crouching Tiger.* London: Wallflower Press, 2003.

Hunter, I. Q. "Twisted Nerve: "a good dose of S and V."" In *The Family Way: The Boulting Brothers and British Film Culture*, edited by Alan Burton, Tim O'Sullivan and Paul Wells, 227-237. Trowbridge: Flicks, 2000.

Hunter, I. Q. "Hammer Goes East: A Second Glance at *The Legend of the 7 Golden Vampires*." In *Necronomicon Presents Shocking Cinema of the Seventies*, edited by Xavier Mendik, 138-147. London: Noir Publishing, 2002.

Hunter, I.Q. "*The Gorgon*: adapting classical myth as Gothic romance." In *Monstrous Adaptations: Generic and Thematic Mutations in Horror Film*, edited by Richard J. Hand and Jay McRoy, 127-139. Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press, 2007.

Hunter, I.Q. *British Trash Cinema*. Basingstoke and New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013.

Hutchings, Peter. *Hammer and Beyond: The British Horror Film*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1993.

Hutchings, Peter. "'We're the Martians now': British sf fantasies of the 1950s and 1960s." In *British Science Fiction Cinema*, edited by I. Q. Hunter, 33-47. London: Routledge, 1999.

Hutchings, Peter. *Terence Fisher*. Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press, 2001.

Hutchings, Peter. "The Problem of British Horror." In *Horror, The Film Reader*, edited by Mark Jancovich, 115-124. London and New York: Routledge, 2002.

Hutchings, Peter. "The Power to Create Catastrophe: The Idea of Apocalypse in the 1970s." In *Don't Look Now: British Cinema of the 1970s*, edited by Paul Newland, 107-119. Bristol and Chicago: Intellect, 2010.

Hutchings, Peter. "Authorship and British Cinema: The Case of Roy Ward Baker." In *British Cinema: Past and Present*, edited by Justine Ashby and Andrew Higson, 179-189. London: Routledge, 2013.

Hutchings, Peter. "Metamorphisis, Masculinity and Masochism: *The Two Faces of Dr. Jekyll* and *The Curse of the Werewolf*" unpublished article.

Jancovich, Mark. *Rational Fears: American Horror in the 1950s*. Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press, 1996.

Jancovich, Mark. "General Introduction." In *Horror, The Film Reader*, edited by Mark Jancovich, 1-20. London and New York: Routledge, 2002

Johnson, Christopher. *Claude Lévi-Strauss: The Formative Years*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.

Jones, Darryl. "Introduction." In *Horror Stories: Classic Tales from Hoffman to Hodgson*, edited by Darryl Jones, xi-xxx. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014.

Kane, Paul. *The Hellraiser Films and their Legacy*. Jefferson and London: McFarland, 2006.

Kawin, Bruce, F. *Horror and the Horror Film*. London and New York: Anthem Press, 2012.

Klein, Amanda Ann. *American Film Cycles: Reframing Genres, Screening Social Problems, and Defining Subcultures*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 2011.

Klinger, Barbara. ""Cinema/Ideology/Criticism" Revisited: The Progressive Genre." In *Film Genre Reader IV*, edited by Barry Keith Grant, 93-109. Austin: University of Texas Press, 2012.

Kord, T. S. *Little Horrors: How Cinema's Evil Children Play on Our Guilt*. Jefferson: McFarland & Company Inc., 2016.

Krzywinska, Tanya. *A Skin for Dancing In: Possession, Witchcraft and Voodoo in Film.* Trowbridge: Flicks Books:, 2000.

Kunjakkan, K. A. *Feminism and Indian Realities*. New Delhi: Mittal Publications, 2002.

Laing, R. D. *The Politics of the Family and Other Essays*. London: Tavistock Publications, 1971.

Laplanche, Jean, and Pontalis, Jean-Bertrand. *The Language of Psychoanalysis*. London: Karnac, 1988.

Lawrence, Novotny. *Blaxploitation Films of the 1970s: Blackness and Genre*. New York and Abingdon: Routledge, 2008.

Leeming, David and Jake Page. *Goddess: Myths of the Female Divine*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994.

Lennard, Dominic. *Bad Seeds and Holy Terrors: The Child Villains of Horror Film*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 2014.

Lévi-Strauss, Claude. *The Elementary Structures of Kinship*. Boston: Beacon Press, 1969.

Levine, Philippa. *The British Empire: Sunrise to Sunset*. Harlow: Pearson Education Ltd, 2007.

Little Shoppe of Horrors. 1. (June 1972)

Locks, Adam. "Anglo Argento: A Critical Reassessment of the Films of Norman J. Warren." In *British Culture and Society in the 1970s: The Lost Decade*, edited by Laurel Forster and Sue Harper, 213-224. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2010.

Lovenduski, Joni. *Women and European Politics: Contemporary Feminism and Public Policy*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1986.

Lowenstein, Adam. *Shocking Representation: Historical Trauma, National Cinema, and the Modern Horror Film*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2005.

Marsh, Richard. *The Beetle: A Mystery*. Ware: Wordsworth Editions Ltd, 2007.

Mayer, Geoff. *Guide to British Cinema*. Westport: Greenwood Press, 2003.

Mayer, Geoff. *Roy Ward Baker*. Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press, 2004.

McKay, Sinclair. *A Thing of Unspeakable Horror: The History of Hammer Films*. London: Aurum, 2007.

Meehan, Paul. *The Vampire in Science Fiction Film and Literature*. Jefferson: Macfarland, 2014.

Meikle, Denis. *A History of Horrors: The Rise and Fall of the House of Hammer*, revised edition. Lanham: The Scarecrow Press, 2009.

Mendik, Xavier and Graeme Harper, eds. *Unruly Pleasures: The Cult Film and its Critics*. London: FAB Press Ltd, 2000.

Mortimer, Neil. "Pulp Archaeology: Megaliths in Popular Culture." In *Written on Stone: The Cultural Reception of British Prehistoric Monuments*, edited by Joanne Parker, 93-99. Newcastle Upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2009.

Muir, John Kenneth. *Horror Films of the 1980s*. Jefferson and London: McFarland and Co., 2007.

Mulvey, Laura. "Visual Pleasure and Narrative Cinema." *Screen* 16.3 (Autumn 1975): 6-18.

Murphy, Robert. *Sixties British Cinema*. London: BFI Publishing, 1992.

Newland, Paul, ed. *Don't Look Now: British Cinema in the 1970s*. Bristol and Chicago: Intellect, 2010.

Palmer, Scott. *British Horror Films of the 1960s*. Scott V. Palmer, 2017.

Paszylk, Bartlomiej. *The Pleasure and Pain of Cult Horror Films: An Historical Survey*. Jefferson: McFarland, 2009.

Paul, William. *Laughing Screaming: Modern Hollywood Horror and Comedy*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1994.

Pedrick, Victoria. *Euripides, Freud, and the Romance of Belonging*. Baltimore: The John Hopkins University Press, 2007.

Perks, Marcelle. "A descent into the underworld: *Death Line*." In *British Horror Cinema*, edited by Chibnall, Steve Chibnall and Julian Petley, 145-155. London: Routledge, 2002.

Pinedo, Isabel Cristina. "Postmodern Elements of the Contemporary Horror Film." In *The Horror Film*, edited by Stephen Prince, 85-117. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 2004.

Pirie, David. *A Heritage of Horror: The English Gothic Cinema*. London: Gordon Fraser, 1973.

Pirie, David. *A New Heritage of Horror: The English Gothic Cinema.* London: I.B. Tauris, 2008.

Poe, Edgar Allan. *The Complete Works of Edgar Allan Poe*. London: Forgotten Books, 2017.

Pollock, Sheldon. "Deep Orientalism? Notes on Sanskrit and Power Beyond the Raj." In *Orientalism and the Postcolonial Predicament: Perspectives on South Asia*, edited by Carol A. Breckenridge, and Peter van der Veer, 76-133. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1993.

Powell, Anna. "Becoming-Monster: Deleuze and the Anomalies of Horror." In *Necronomicon Book Five*, edited by Andy Black, 39-63. Hereford: Noir Publishing, 2007.

Prawer, Siegbert Saloman. *Caligari's Children: The Film as Tale of Terror*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1980.

Rigby, Jonathan. *English Gothic: A Century of Horror Cinema*. Richmond: Reynolds and Hearn, 2000.

Rivière, Joan. "Womanliness as Masquerade." In *Formations of Fantasy*, edited by Victor Burgin, James Donald and Cora Kaplan, 35-44. London: Methuen, 1986.

Said, Edward W. *Orientalism*. New York: Vintage Books, 1979.

Sanjek, David. "Twilight of the Monsters: The English Horror Film, 1968-1975." *Film Criticism* 16, no.1-2/Fall-Winter (1991-1992): 111-126. Later re-printed as Sanjek, David. "Twilight of the Monsters: The English Horror Film, 1968-1975." In *Re-Viewing British Cinema. 1900-1992: Essays and Interviews*, edited by Wheeler Winston Dixon, 195-210. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1994.

Sawyer, Andy. *"'A stiff upper lift and a trembling lower one': John Wyndham on screen."* In *British Science Fiction Cinema*, edited by I. Q. Hunter, 75-87. London and New York: Routledge, 1999.

Schlegel, Johannes. "'They fuck you up' – revaluations of the family in contemporary British horror film: Steven Sheil's *Mum & Dad*." In *Gothic Kinship*, edited by Agnes Andeweg and Sue Zlosnik, 211-230. Manchester, New York and Vancouver: Manchester University Press, 2013.

Schlesinger, Philip. "The Sociological Scope of 'National Cinema.'" In *Cinema and Nation*, edited by Mette Hjort and Scott MacKenzie, 19-31. London and New York: Routledge, 2000.

Schneider, Steven Jay. "Barbara, Julia, Carol, Myra, and Nell: diagnosing female madness in British horror cinema." In *British Horror Cinema*, edited by Steve Chibnall and Julian Petley, 117-130. London: Routledge, 2002.

Scovell. Adam. *Folk Horror: Hours Dreadful and Things Strange*. Leighton Buzzard: Auteur Publishing, 2017.

Sears, John. "The Boundaries of Horror in Wolf Rilla's *Village of the Damned.*" In *European Nightmares: Horror Cinema in Europe Since 1945*, edited by Patrick Allmer, Emily Brick, and David Huxley, 65-75. London and New York: Wallflower Press, 2012.

Segal, Lynne. "Feminism and the Family." In *Gender, Power and Relationships*, edited by Charlotte Burck and Bebe Speed, 248-265. London: Routledge, 1995.

Shail, Robert. "Masculinity and Class: Michael Caine as "Working-Class Hero."" In *The Trouble With Men: Masculinities in European and Hollywood Cinema*. Edited by Phil Powrie, Ann Davies, and Bruce Babington, 66-76. London and New York: Wallflower Press, 2004.

Shail, Robert. *British Film Directors: A Critical Guide*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2007.

Smith, Andrea. *Native Americans and the Christian Right: The Gendered Politics of Unlikely Alliances*. London and Durham: Duke University Press, 2008.

Smith, Gary A. *Uneasy Dreams: The Golden Age of British Horror Films, 1956-1976*. Jefferson and London: McFarland and Company Inc, 2006.

Spicer, Andrew. *Typical Men: The Representation of Masculinity in Popular British Cinema*. London: I.B. Tauris, 2003.

Stoker, Bram. *Dracula*. London: Penguin Popular Classics, 1994.

Stoker, Bram. *The Jewel of Seven Stars*. London and New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers, 1904.

Street, Sarah. *British National* Cinema, 2nd ed. New York: Routledge, 2009.

The Dark Side. 1. 1990

Thane, Pat and Tanya Evans. *Sinners? Scroungers? Saints?: Unmarried Motherhood in Twentieth-Century England*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012.

Tudor, Andrew. *Monsters and Mad Scientists: A Cultural History of the Horror Film*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1989.

Verdon, John. "Towards an Epistemology of Gender." In *Gender and Narrativity*, edited by Barry Rutland, 19-47. Ottawa: Carleton University Press, 1997.

Washburn, Michael. *The Ego and the Dynamic Ground: A Transpersonal Theory of Human Development*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1988.

Weaver-Hightower, Rebecca. "The Postcolonial Hybrid: Neill Blomkamp's *District 9* (2009)." In *Postcolonial Film: History, Empire, Resistance*, edited by Rebecca Weaver-Hightower and Peter Hulme, 247-266. New York and London: Routledge, 2014.

Webster, Wendy. *Imagining Home: Gender, 'Race' and National Identity, 1945-1964*. London: UCL Press, 1998.

Wells, Paul. *The Horror Genre: From Beelzebub to Blair Witch*. London and New York: Wallflower Press, 2000.

Williams, Tony. *Hearths of Darkness: The Family in the American Horror Film*. Cranbury and London: Associated University Presses, 1996.

Wood, Robin. *Hollywood From Vietnam to Reagan*. New York and Oxford: Columbia University Press, 1986.

Wood, Robin. "Burying the Undead: The Use and Obsolescence of Count Dracula." In *The Dread of Difference: Gender and the Horror Film*, edited by Barry Keith Grant, 364-378. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1996.

Woodward, Kathleen. "Youthfulness as Masquerade." *Discourse* 11. 1 (Fall-Winter 1988-1989): 119-142.

Wyndham, John. *The Midwich Cuckoos*. London: Penguin Books, 1960.

Yeğenoğlu, Meyda. *Colonial Fantasies: Towards a Feminist Reading of Orientalism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.

Zweiniger-Bargielowska, Ina. *Women in Twentieth-Century Britain: Social, Cultural and Political Change*. Abingdon and New York: Routledge, 2001.

Filmography

Abominable Dr Phibes (Robert Fuest, 1971)

Amazing Mr. Blunden, The (Lionel Jeffries, 1972)

And Now the Screaming Starts! (Roy Ward Baker, 1973)

Asphyx, The (Peter Newbrook, 1972)

Avengers, The (Don Leaver et al, 1961-1969)

Batman (Oscar Rudolph et al, 1966-1968)

Beast Must Die, The (Paul Annett, 1974)

Blind Terror (Richard Fleischer, 1971)

Blood Beast Terror, The (Vernon Sewell, 1968)

Blood from the Mummy's Tomb (Seth Holt, 1971)

Blood on Satan's Claw, The (Piers Haggard, 1971)

Captain Kronos: Vampire Hunter (Brian Clemens, 1974)

Carrie (Brian De Palma, 1976)

Catgirl (Alfred Shaughnessy, 1957)

Children of the Damned (Anton Leader, 1964)

Circus of Horrors (Sidney Hayers, 1960)

City of the Dead, The (John Llewellyn Moxy, 1960)

Clockwork Orange, A (Stanley Kubrick, 1971)

Countess Dracula (Peter Sasdy, 1970)

Creeping Flesh, The (Freddie Francis, 1973)

Curse of Frankenstein, The (Terence Fisher, 1957)

Curse of the Crimson Altar (Vernon Sewell, 1968)

Curse of the Mummy's Tomb (Michael Carreras, 1964)

Damned, The (Joseph Losey, 1962)

Deadly Bees, The (Freddie Francis, 1966)

Death Line (aka *Raw Meat* Gary Sherman, 1972)

Deceivers, The (Nicholas Meyer, 1988)

Demons of the Mind (Peter Sykes, 1972)

Devil Girl from Mars (David MacDonald, 1954)

Devil Rides Out, The (Terence Fisher, 1968)

Devil Ship Pirates, The (Don Sharp, 1964)

Devils, The (Ken Russell, 1971)

Devil's Men, The aka Land of the Minotaur (Kostas Karagiannis, 1975)

Die Monster Die! (Daniel Haller, 1965)

Don't Look Now (Nicholas Roeg, 1973)

Dracula (Tod Browning, 1931)

Dracula (Terence Fisher, 1958)

Dracula (John Badham, 1979)

Dracula A.D. 1972 (Alan Gibson, 1972)

Dracula Has Risen From the Grave (Freddie Francis, 1968)

Dracula: Prince of Darkness (Terence Fisher, 1966)

Dr Jekyll and Sister Hyde (Roy Ward Baker, 1971)

Dr Phibes Rises Again (Robert Fuest, 1972)

Dr. Terror's House of Horrors (Freddie Francis, 1965)

Earth Dies Screaming, The (Terence Fisher, 1964)

Evil of Frankenstein, The (Freddie Francis, 1964)

Exorcist, The (William Friedkin, 1973)

Family Life (Ken Loach, 1971)

Fanatic aka *Die! Die! My Darling!* (Silvio Narizzano, 1965)

Fiend Without a Face (Arthur Crabtree, 1958)

Flesh and Blood Show, The (Pete Walker, 1972)

Frankenstein and the Monster from Hell (Terence Fisher, 1974)

Frankenstein Created Woman (Terence Fisher, 1967)

Frankenstein Must be Destroyed (Terence Fisher, 1969)

Friday the 13th (Sean S. Cunningham, 1980)

Fright (Peter Collinson, 1971)

Frightmare (Pete Walker, 1974)

Giant Behemoth, The/ Behemoth the Sea Monster (Douglas Hickox, Eugène Lourié, 1959)

Godsend, The (Gabrielle Beaumont, 1980)

Goodbye Gemini (Alan Gibson, 1970)

Gorgon, The (Terence Fisher, 1964)

Halloween (John Carpenter, 1978)

Hands of the Ripper (Peter Sasdy, 1971)

Haunting, The (Robert Wise, 1963)

Hellraiser (Clive Barker, 1987)

Hills Have Eyes, The (Wes Craven, 1977)

Holocaust 2000 (Alberto Di Martino, 1977)

Horrors of the Black Museum (Arthur Crabtree, 1959)

Horror of Frankenstein, The (Jimmy Sangster, 1969)

Hound of the Baskervilles, The (Terence Fisher, 1959)

House of Whipcord (Pete Walker, 1974)

*Hysteria (*Freddie Francis, 1965)

I, Monster (Stephen Weeks, 1971)

Invasion (Alan Bridges, 1966)

Invasion of the Body Snatchers (Don Siegel, 1956)

Jack the Ripper (Robert S. Baker and Monty Berman, 1959)

Journey to the Unknown (Alan Gibson et al, 1968-1969)

Killer's Moon (Alan Birkinshaw, 1978)

Kiss of the Vampire (Don Sharp, 1963)

Lady Vanishes, The (Anthony Page, 1979)

Last House on the Left (Wes Craven,1972)

Legend of the 7 Golden Vampires, The (Roy Ward Baker, 1974)

Les Diaboliques (Henri-Georges Clouzot, 1955)

Medusa Touch, The (Jack Gold, 1978)

Maniac (Michael Carreras, 1963)

Mummy, The (Terence Fisher, 1959)

Mummy's Shroud, The (John Gilling, 1967)

Mumsy, Nanny, Sonny and Girly (Freddie Francis, 1970)

Murder By Decree (Bob Clark, 1979)

Nanny, The (Seth Holt, 1965)

Night of the Demon (Jacques Tourneur, 1957)

Night of the Eagle (Sidney Hayers, 1962)

Night of the Living Dead (George A. Romero, 1968)

Nightmare (Freddie Francis, 1964)

Oblong Box, The (Gordon Hessler, 1969)

Omen, The (Richard Donner, 1976)

Paranoiac (Freddie Francis, 1964)

Passage to India, A (David Lean, 1984)

Peeping Tom (Michael Powell, 1960)

Plague of the Zombies, The (John Gilling, 1966)

Prey aka *Alien Prey* (Norman J. Warren, 1978)

Prom Night (Paul Lynch, 1980)

Psycho (Alfred Hitchcock, 1960)

Psychomania (Don Sharp, 1971)

Psychopath, The (Freddie Francis,1966)

Quatermass and the Pit (Roy Ward Baker, 1967)

Quatermass Xperiment, The (Val Guest, 1955)

Railway Children, The (Lionel Jeffries, 1970)

Rasputin the Mad Monk (Don Sharp, 1966)

Rosemary's Baby (Roman Polanski, 1968)

Reptile, The (John Gilling, 1966)

Repulsion (Roman Polanski, 1965)

Revenge of Frankenstein, The (Terence Fisher, 1958)

Satanic Rites of Dracula, The (Alan Gibson, 1973)

Satan's Slave (Norman J. Warren, 1976)

Scars of Dracula (Roy Ward Baker, 1970)

She (Robert Day, 1965)

Shout, The (Jerzy Skolimowski, 1978)

Skull, The (Freddie Francis, 1965)

Snake Woman, The (Sidney J. Furie,1961)

Sorcerers, The (Michael Reeves, 1967)

Straight on Till Morning (Peter Collinson, 1972)

Stranglers of Bombay, The (Terence Fisher, 1959)

Straw Dogs (Sam Peckinpah, 1971)

Study in Terror, A (James Hill, 1965)

Suspiria (Dario Argento, 1977)

Taste of Fear, A (Seth Holt, 1961)

Taste the Blood of Dracula (Peter Sasdy, 1970)

Terror (Norman J. Warren, 1978)

Texas Chain Saw Massacre, The (Tobe Hooper, 1974)

Theatre of Blood (Douglas Hickox, 1973)

To the Devil a Daughter (Peter Sykes, 1976)

Tower of Evil aka *Horror on Snape Island* (Jim O'Connolly, 1972)

Twins of Evil (John Hough, 1971)

Twisted Nerve (Roy Boulting, 1968)

Unearthly Stranger (John Krish, 1963)

Vampire Lovers, The (Roy Ward Baker, 1970)

Viking Queen, The (Don Chaffey, 1967)

Village of the Damned (Wolf Rilla, 1960)

Virgin Witch (Ray Austin, 1972)

Whoever Slew Auntie Roo? (Curtis Harrington, 1972)

Wicker Man, The (Robin Hardy, 1973)

Witches, The (Cyril Frankel, 1966)

Witchfinder General (Michael Reeves, 1968)

X The Unknown (Leslie Norman, 1956)

Zulu (Cy Endfield, 1964)