The Lexicon of Offense: The meanings of Torture, Porn, and 'Torture Porn'

Steve Jones

Coined by David Edelstein in 2006, the term Torture Porn described the sub-genre of horror films characterised by the *Saw* and *Hostel* series, and has since been adopted widely: the press referred to nearly seventy horror films between 2003 and 2010 as exemplifying the cycle. The discourse surrounding Torture Porn - also dubbed 'blood porn', 'carnography', and 'gorno' – mostly suggests that it is 'possibly the worst movement in the history of cinema' (Aftab 2009: 12). My aim here is to challenge the simplistic and dismissive assumptions underpinning Torture Porn discourse. The images that fall under this rubric are evidently contentious, yet reaction to them rarely considers what values the films apparently contravene, and why, if the films are offensive, they are simultaneously so popular.

It is typically claimed that Torture Porn began either with the release of *Saw* (James Wan, 2004) (Cunin 2007; Floyd, 2007; Cashmore 2010), or *Hostel* (Eli Roth, 2005) (Maher 2010). Others argue that its true origins are the 'grand guignol of late-19th-century French street theater' (Brottman cited in Anderson 2007: 8, and Johnson 2007). Torture is certainly nothing new in horror: Edgar Allen Poe's *The Pit and the Pendulum* (1850) is a bona-fide 'torture classic', while *Saw*'s megalomaniacal entrapments strikingly recall *The Abominable Dr Phibes* (Robert Fuest, 1971). The lineage of Torture Porn also includes the splatter films of the 1970s (Blake 2008: 139; Fletcher 2009: 81; McEachen 2010) and thus it is unsurprising that Torture Porn flourished at a time when 'remakes of landmark seventies horror films have now become routine' (Hays 2010).[1] Torture Porn's kinship with 1970s horror appears to be a conscious move away from the 'jokey self-consciousness that had taken root in the genre via the *Scream* franchise [(Wes Craven, 1996-)]' and the PG-rated horror comedies that dominated horror till the early 2000s (Prince 2008: 288; Lockwood 2008: 41): by comparison Torture Porn seemed 'grindingly humourless' (Leith 2010: 22).

Although critics and scholars have singled out *Hostel*, *Saw*, *Captivity* (Roland Joffe, 2007), *The Devil's Rejects* (Rob Zombie, 2005), *The Hills have Eyes* (Alexandre Aja, 2006), and *Wolf Creek* (Greg Mclean, 2005) as definitive examples of the sub-genre, it is remarkably difficult to pin-point precisely what the characteristics of Torture Porn films *are*. It is not enough to say that they are horror films that dwell upon acts of torture and 'emphasis[e] confinement, traps and mutilation' (Murray 2008: 2; Newman 2009: 38): we must also apprehend who is being tortured and why. Motives for torture range from teaching victims a moral or spiritual lesson (*Saw*; *Penance* (Jake Kennedy, 2009)), causing suffering for personal gratification (*Hostel*; *Captivity*), using the victims as food (*Texas Chainsaw Massacre: The Beginning* (Jonathan Liebesman, 2006); *High Lane* (Abel Ferry, 2009)) or as sexual surrogates to propagate a closed community (*Hills have Eyes 2* (Martin Weisz, 2007); *Timber Falls* (Tony Giglio, 2007); *Dying Breed* (Jody Dwyer, 2008)), exacting personal revenge (*Steel Trap* (Luis Camara, 2007); *Untraceable* (Gregory Hoblit, 2008); *The Horseman* (Steven Kastrissios, 2008)), turning a profit (*Turistas* (John Stockwell, 2006); *Vacancy* (Nimrod Antal, 2007); *Caged* (Yann Gozlan, 2010)), torturing for political purposes (*Torture Room* (Eric Forsberg, 2007); *Senseless* (Simon Hynd, 2008)), or for no clear reason at all (*The Strangers* (Brian Bertino, 2008); *The Collector* (Marcus Dunstan, 2009)). It is therefore obvious that Hicks' assertion that Torture Porn is driven by 'sadists thriving off extreme physical and psychological torture' (Hicks 2009) is inadequate to encompass the range of films in the sub-genre, since torture cannot serve as a trope by which to satisfactorily categorise them. Moreover, as Morris observes, torture itself 'is by no means the exclusive province

of horror' (Morris 2010: 45). My aim, then, is to make sense of what Torture Porn is and the terms according to which it has been critically reviled, beginning with the combination of 'Torture' and 'Porn' itself.

'Torture' plus 'Porn': Pushing Boundaries and Fuelling Fires

One reason for the confusion over 'Torture Porn' stems from the conflicting ways in which the term has been applied to such a wide variety of films. On the one hand, the films are said to juxtapose violence with nudity, or emphasize sexual violence such as acts of rape and castration. On the other, they allegedly present non-sexual violence in such gory, close-up detail that their aesthetic is akin to pornography. It is implied too that the films are consumed as a kind of violent fetish pornography by viewers who are sexually aroused by displays of torture. These definitions do not necessarily concur. In coining the term, Edelstein coupled 'Torture' with 'Porn' as a metaphor implying that contemporary horror is gratuitous to the point of obscenity. The spectacle of violence – the pornographication of torture, in other words – exceeds what is necessary to convey the meaning of the action in the narrative context. Critics thus allege that Torture Porn includes 'gratuitous violence-*for-the-sake-of-violence*' (Cunin 2007, my emphasis), and that violence *constitutes* the content (Aftab 2009: 12). These accusations emphasise comparisons between the uses of violence in contemporary horror and the narrative structures of pornography, in which (it is generally assumed) the storyline is only a veiled excuse to show sex. In Torture Porn, according to its detractors, visceral images of suffering are 'the point'.

Using 'porn' to describe horror implies something not just about the content of the images, but also about viewers' interaction with them. When critics describe Torture Porn as presenting violence 'for titillation' (Kirkland 2008: 43), they insinuate that audiences are sexually stimulated by the gore and suffering. One reviewer of the film *Turistas* went as far as to suggest that 'sex criminals should find it inspirational' due to its 'fascination with the mutilation and murder of nubile young women' (N. a. 2007). The leap from portrayal to audience intention here is, as Hutchings observes, a typical strategy employed in 'denigrating the horror genre' and 'arguing that the only people who could actually enjoy this sort of thing are either sick or stupid' (Hutchings 2004: 83). Matters are not helped by the filmmakers themselves discussing the images of violence in terms associated with pornography. Roth referred to the pus-laden removal of Kana's eye in *Hostel* as an 'eyegasm', while Shankland used the term 'money shot' – the depiction of male ejaculation in hardcore pornography – in reference to the torture set-pieces of *wΔz* (Tom Shankland, 2007).[2]

Following this train of thought, reviewers predictably accuse the filmmakers of misogyny and assert that the films' violence is 'directed primarily against women' (Riegler 2010: 27; see also Cochrane 2007: 4; Floyd 2007: 64; Orange 2009: 7). Again, this is rooted in a discursive history surrounding the horror genre: slasher films were mistakenly accused of misogyny in precisely the same terms (Cowan and Obrien 1990: 187; Saponsky and Moilitor 1996: 46). Allegations of misogyny equally misrepresent the content of Torture Porn. In the 42 films referred to as Torture Porn by three or more major International English language publications, 228 men and 108 women are killed and 275 men and 136 women injured. As more than twice as many men than women are victims of injury and death, it is clear that simple accusations of misogyny require deeper consideration.

In fact, the 'misogyny' controversy can be traced to two central points in the Torture Porn cycle. The first was *Hostel*'s contrast between nudity in its first half and murder in its latter sequences, which is

both uncommon in the cycle and is the point the film critically explores. The second was the poster campaign for *Captivity*, which depicted a woman undergoing a four stage execution ritual labelled 'Abduction. Confinement. Torture. Termination' (Hill 2007: 8; Leydon 2007: 37; McCartney 2007: 19). It is telling that in these articles, the poster is the focus of negative attention, and virtually nothing is said about the somewhat tame content of the film itself. These high-profile incidents were pivotal in the labelling of *all* Torture Porn films as misogynistic, further confirmed by citing the sole nude female in *Saw III* as evidence that the series of seven *Saw* films is pornographic.

What needs accounting for here is what is at stake in using the term 'porn' so explicitly. As Bernstein observed prior to Edelstein's article, '[t]o say that the depiction of horror can be pornographic is not a novel claim; the problem has been that this criticism has been employed without attempting to distinguish what in the pornographic requires acknowledgement and what denunciation' (Bernstein 2004: 10). The term Torture Porn is remarkably evocative because of the cultural power imbued in the word 'porn', a term that is inextricable from feminist debates that forged a connection between pornography and misogyny. In those debates, long before Torture Porn, asexual horror films such as *Texas Chainsaw Massacre* (Tobe Hooper, 1974) and rape-revenge films such as *I Spit on your Grave* (Meir Zarchi, 1978) were explicitly labelled 'porn' (Everywoman 1988: 19). Indeed, Jane Caputi (1992) used the term 'Gorenography' in reference to mainstream horror films 14 years prior to Edelstein's coining of 'Torture Porn'.

This explains why the term Torture *Porn* gained so much ground in the mid-to-late 2000s. It articulated much more than a complaint about a particularly gory cycle of horror films. The term connects these films with an important set of contemporary debates about the politics of representation. These debates include Robert Jensen (2007) expressing concern over an apparent increase in cruel and humiliating depictions in the pornography being produced by major studios, as well as Levy (2005) and Paasonen et al. (2007) discussing what they perceive to be an increased tolerance of sexual depictions in culture generally. These arguments uncannily echo the public debates raised by feminism in the 1970s at a moment when, in the era of *Deep Throat* (Gerard Damiano, 1972), explicit sexual representations became popular in a mainstream context.

Here lies the crux of the matter. Horror, like pornography, is a popular genre, yet one that is thought to properly belong on the peripheries of culture since its focus on the body is considered 'low-brow' (Hawkins 2007). However, the very nature of these genres is to push boundaries of acceptability. This necessarily involves a complex series of shifts and negotiations, played out via producers, audiences, fans, censors and critics. Indeed the very notion of what is deemed acceptable at any one time is reflected in such contestations. Through this process of boundary pushing and argumentation, what was once peripheral may move towards the centre over time. This movement is marked (usually in retrospect) by the visibility of key texts such as *Hostel*. At some point, the limits of acceptability are deemed (by consensus) to have been breached, and those genres are again pushed out of the mainstream. The boundary-challenging horror of Torture Porn, for example, rapidly moved from occupying a position of box office success (*Hostel*'s $19,556,099 domestic opening weekend gross in 2005 (boxofficemojo.com)) to direct-to-DVD ghettoization. As films have increasingly sought to push boundaries, they have been subjected to increased censorship, or even outright banning. The British Board of Film Classification recently required cuts to be made to *A Serbian Film* (Srdjan Spasojevic, 2010) and *I Spit on Your Grave* (Steven Monroe, 2010), and rejected *Grotesque* (Koji Shirashi, 2009) and *The Human Centipede 2: Full Sequence* (Tom Six, 2011). In each case, the combination of sex and violence was cited as the reason for censoring.

The use of 'porn' as a label works to illegitimate Torture Porn and demand that body-horror retreat to its more 'fitting' position on the outskirts of the cultural radar. Hill, for example, declares that 'the most worrying aspect of this recent slew of films is the fact that they are accepted as the norm' (Hill 2007: 8), while Aftab states that 'at least [splatter] films knew their place in B-movie theatres' (Aftab 2009: 12; see also Cochrane 2007: 4; Skenazy 2007: 13). In highlighting – and scapegoating – Torture Porn as contravening standards of acceptability, the popular press is picking on a highly visible and culturally vulnerable proxy: Torture Porn is a symptom. Its narratives frequently reflect and discuss the role violence plays in culture, even if they simultaneously contribute to that culture. It is unsurprising then that the era in which Torture Porn flourished is also one in which other forms of violent imagery have thrived.

A Crisis of Meaning: 'Porn' in a Time of War

As Alan Sinfield proposes, 'labeling a practice pornographic reflects a decision to regard it as bad', designating what cultural products or practice 'are worthwhile and which are not' (Sinfield 2004). While some of the confusion surrounding Torture Porn arises from a mistaken emphasis on 'porn' as implying sexual depictions, it may be more fruitful to adopt this approach to 'porn' as signifying what offends the moral majority at any given moment. In blurring two categories of representation by combining Torture and Porn, it is connoted that body-horror taps into the worst of our culture's fears. In fact, the representations on offer in the multiplex are not the most vivid public images of body-horror in the last decade. While those other forms of imagery drive this section, I am foremost interested in the tensions that arise from using 'porn' so loosely as a pejorative term. The apparent shifting of Torture Porn from the multiplex to the DVD market and an increased censoriousness might seem to signal a victory for the moral majority. However, if it *is* a victory, it is surely a hollow one – first, because such imagery still exists and *has* a market, and second, because given the wealth of uncertificated imagery made available via the Internet, it is unlikely that fictional horror film really does significantly contravene normative standards of acceptability.

The porn metaphor is shorthand designed to signal that the violent imagery offered in Torture Porn is offensive. Since Americans are typically 'more offended by sex than violence' (Sandler 2002: 211), using 'porn' to describe violence is particularly evocative. Yet, this approach is too busy pointing at the violence, and fails to deal with the fact that sex is displaced. If violence is now pornographic, it is unclear what position sexual portrayals occupy, or whether they are still perceived as more offensive than violent representations. Furthermore, it is uncertain how we are to describe sexual images if that is the case, since the lexicon of offense has been waylaid. This use of 'porn' problematically implies that sexual depictions (which are commonly grouped under that generic heading) are simplistic, ignoring how complex and multifarious such representations are. It equally fails to account for the new context of 'porn plus horror', and what that combination says about visual representation and its limits.

Indeed, 'porn' has been employed to explain a number of visual representations, being used to describe, for example, some portrayals of poverty, food or architecture during this same period (Lovece 2010; Yong 2010). The term 'porn' clearly signals less about the apparent content of these representations then, and more about the nature of representation itself in this era. If any depictions can be deemed distasteful – and this is the implication of applying 'porn' so liberally – then indecency loses its meaning: positing that anything can be graphic to the point of obscenity is one step away from declaring that nothing is graphic to the point of obscenity. Ultimately, the use of

'porn' in these contexts suggests either that representation is a gratuitous mode, or that a consensus on what is offensive cannot be reached.

One reason this difficulty may have arisen in this era is that the Internet provides greater access to a broader range of visual materials than previously available to domestic users. It has facilitated the distribution of images more befitting of the term 'Torture Porn' than the certificated fictional films labelled as such. One example that coincided with the Torture Porn cycle was the dissemination of 'war porn': images of dead Iraqis distributed by US soldiers, and exchanged on a now defunct subscription website (nowthatsfuckedup.com) which usually traded in images of partially clothed or fully nude women (Harkin 2006; see also Baudrillard 2006, and Ramirez 2010). In this instance, images of death were placed in an otherwise pornographic context, resulting in some confusion over how these images should be classified; Andén-Papadopoulos has noted, for instance, that 'these images show aggressive fighting by troops who take what appears to be a near-sexual pleasure in violently destroying the enemy' (2009: 923). This politically invested celebration of death in a user generated forum parallels a broader movement in some channels towards exploring freedom of expression: Ogrish.com – which operated until 2006 – offered internet users unprecedented access to images of dead bodies taken from crime scenes, for example, under the slogans 'can you handle life?' and 'uncover reality'.

Part of that exposure involves circulating gruesome imagery that is politically motivated, including the hanging of Saddam Hussein in 2006 and al-Qaeda beheading videos such as that depicting the death of Daniel Pearl in 2002. But it was the series of photographs taken by US soldiers in the Abu Ghraib prison facility in 2004 that gripped the cultural consciousness more than these peripheral examples. Subjected to public scrutiny as evidence of war crimes, the photographs portrayed prisoners being tortured – seemingly without purpose – for the evident delight of the guards in charge of the facility. Many of the poses prisoners were made to adopt were sexually degrading. Again, these photographs are more appropriately labelled 'Torture Porn' than anything offered in the horror cycle.

Representations born of war are inescapably tied into the political circumstances out of which that imagery arose, in a way that the fictional representations of Torture Porn are not. Yet, these images of real-life horror have clearly influenced a number of the directors of Torture Porn films. Eli Roth, Joe Lynch, Zev Berman and Rob Zombie, are among the directors who overtly cite images of the War on Terror as influencing the horror films they made in the mid-2000s.[3] Films such as *Torture Room* and *Senseless* explicitly address American-Middle Eastern relations within their narratives. The 'War on Terror' has clearly inspired a number of Torture Porn directors and may have contributed to the popularity of their films.

Scholarly discussion of Torture Porn films predominantly seeks correlate the cycle of films with these events (see Fletcher 2009: 81; Kattelman 2010; Kellner 2010: 6; Middleton 2010: 3; Prince 2008: 282-283). This is unsurprising given how explicit some Torture Porn directors are in making the same comparison, but I am concerned by this correlation because it has the cumulative effect of closing off meaning. It is so regularly posited that the contentious prevalence of 'War on Terror' discourse explains the significance of the Torture Porn boom that instead of being '*an* answer', it appears to be '*the* answer' to why these films came into being. Moreover, there has been little discussion of what it means to translate these images of real violence into a fictional-generic context. In fact, such discussion of Torture Porn scapegoats the cycle in the same way as the pejorative press response, since it points away from the reality that the horror is reflecting and towards the films without dealing with what the real images themselves mean. To correlate Torture Porn with Abu Ghraib

images, for instance, inadvertently contributes to the notion that Torture Porn callously translates the reality of war porn into entertainment.

Torture Porn is not simply a means of working through the trauma associated with those real war images, but is itself part of a broader cultural 'trend toward the celebration of cruelty, hurt and humiliation' (Presdee 2000). What needs addressing in these accounts of Torture Porn as reflection or critique of the War on Terror is why those images of real life violence came to cultural prominence during this period, and how they were being engaged with. The economic success of Torture Porn was born out of the same value system that deemed the images of Abu Ghraib to be offensive yet morbidly fascinating. When *Untraceable* depicts a website entitled www.killwithme.com in which the increasing number of active viewers facilitates the death of a bound victim, whose murder is streamed for the spectacle, it is commenting on the culture of viewership that surrounds such material, not simply the origin material itself. *Hostel Part 2* may depict people paying to torture and kill others, but in doing so it comments on American cultural attitudes towards foreign nations and the neo-liberal ideology that money buys inalienable rights and freedoms. That these freedoms in the film include permission to inflict suffering on others for one's own amusement is indicative of the horror underpinning American values, which is the target of Roth's satire. What is needed in Torture Porn criticism is broader analysis that deals not with correlations to the historical moment, but with the culture that situates Torture Porn: the kind of analysis Andén-Papadopoulos (2009), Dauphinée (2007), Chouliaraki (2006) and Juvin (2010) offer regarding imagery of real suffering.

The kind of 'humilitainment' present in American culture (Swartz 2006; see also Paasonen et al. 2007) – including the increase in degradation pornography and Reality TV shows such as *Fear Factor* (2001-2006) as much as images of Abu Ghraib and Torture Porn – is recognisable and of concern to a number of nations. Far from being simply 'one-note expose[s] created to shock' (Holden 2009: 11), Torture Porn is a reflection of, not simply a reaction to, a host of broader philosophical issues concerning the nature of morality. While Lockwood suggests that '[t]hese films can be understood as part of a paradigm shift, a 'turn to the extreme' across media and cultural forms' (Lockwood 2008: 41), more needs to be done to investigate precisely what value system is being affronted by the presence of 'extreme' imagery: those values by which standards of acceptability are established. After all, imagined evils presented in the safety of a multiplex pale in comparison with the realities of 'war porn'. Since those images of reality-horror are available to us, I am doubtful that Torture Porn is sought out just because of its supposed extremity. In fact, to suggest as much leads to the conclusion that using 'porn' in relation to the certificated (sanctioned/controlled) and immensely popular images of Torture Porn is to empty the term 'porn' of meaning. If anything, the obscenity of the 'porn' aspect of Torture Porn is the cruelty one human being is willing to inflict on another, and this is a more universal theme than the majority of War on Terror readings of Torture Porn account for.

Conclusion: Opening the Torture Porn Debate

My aim is not to close off meaning, but to open debate as to the nature and significance of Torture Porn, a cycle of films that instigated a boom in horror production. I opened with Aftab's declaration that Torture Porn is 'possibly the worst movement in the history of cinema' (Aftab 2009: 12), yet I wish to conclude by fundamentally disagreeing with that assertion. Torture Porn has been vilified on grounds that are at best unconvincing and at worst incoherent. More importantly, critics of the cycle

too often ignore the content of the films themselves, and fail to make sufficiently detailed connections between the cycle and the cultural sphere.

In fact, the Torture Porn cycle includes some of the richest and most challenging films in the horror genre, which ar3e notable for their exploration of morality, social interdependency, and witnessing violence. These films should be approached from a range of theoretical positions, not only focusing on torture itself, or the apparent correlation between this sub-genre and the War on Terror. I have, for instance, sought to investigate the complexities of narrative construction and manipulations of time and space in the *Saw* series (Jones, 2011). As a fan of the horror genre, I am surprised by how reticent many critics and scholars have been to engage with the wealth of material offered by this horror boom. In the spirit of encouraging discussion, I wish to close with some suggestions for avenues of future study.

In so persistently positing that the Torture Porn boom can be explained via the correlation with the War on Terror, scholars and the popular press have presented Torture Porn as if it is an American sub-genre, ignoring that images of torture and humiliation have also flourished in horror cinema from France, the UK, Australia, Korea, Japan and Thailand (to name but a few countries) in the last decade. The transnational nature of the genre needs accounting for, since the correlation between American political concerns and this sub-genre implicitly presents America as the normative world-centre. It suggests the specific political concerns raised around the Bush administration are echoed in the cultural products of various nations. Even if that were the case, more needs to be done to work through Torture Porn as a globalised genre. If Roth made *Hostel* as an American response to Abu Ghraib (as he has stated), and his film then influenced filmmakers in other nations – for example Pascal Laugier proposes that *Martyrs* is a response to *Hostel*[4] – then some account needs to be made of the patterns of affect *internationally* that emerged from these events. Moreover, some account needs to be made of the development of these horror motifs *preceding* the War on Terror, particularly the influence of Japanese body-horror filmmakers on American Torture Porn (evinced by, for instance, the reverential cameo appearance of Takashi Miike in *Hostel*).

Many of the films referred to as Torture Porn do not fit neatly into the genre, or problematise the notion that Torture Porn is a low-brow, popular, multiplex phenomenon. I suggest that another aspect of Torture Porn discourse worth exploring is the way in which some non-English language films such as *The Passion of the Christ* (Mel Gibson, 2004) and *The Stoning of Soraya M.* (Cyrus Nowrasteh, 2008), or violent films made by European auteurs such as Lars von Trier (*Antichrist*), and Michael Haneke (*Funny Games*) are treated differently from American genre pictures such as *Hostel*, even when referred to as Torture Porn. These films frequently inspire debate about artistic merit or directorial intention rather than being outright dismissed. This line between 'art' and 'trash' is tied into broader debates regarding the cultural values attached to the horror genre, to non-English language film, and to transnational cinemas, all of which are exposed by the double-standard operating within Torture Porn discourse whereby 'world cinema' is defensible while horror movies – despite being comparable in content – are not.

There is scope for detailed discussion of how this sub-genre fits into a lineage of horror, accounting for the horror fandom Torture Porn filmmakers so frequently and openly express. Moreover, a detailed study of how horror fan communities have responded to the term would be fruitful since there seems to be a general distaste for the label manifested in discussions on the online horror forums of Bloodydisgusting.com, Dreadcentral.com, Fear.net, IMDB.com, and so forth. Some horror fans seek to distance themselves from these films on the basis of the press discourse that situates Torture Porn fans as 'perverse'. Direct comparisons to previous horror sub-generic category labels

7

such as 'slasher' or 'video nasty' in terms of the pejorative connotations and patterns of horror fans co-opting such generic labels would be worth exploring.

Critics who dismiss Torture Porn as 'garbage' (Robey 2007b: 31), 'celluloid trash' (Phillips 2010), and 'dumbed-down… junk' (Conner 2009), miss the richness of the films themselves (and the discourse they are contributing to). While that is in some senses a role critics are expected to play, I hope these films will receive more detailed and sustained attention than they have to date from scholars and fans of the genre.

Bibliography:

N. a. (2007) 'Charming Fly Boys Pull Out of a Nosedive', *Daily Mail*, June 1.

Aftab, K. (2009) 'Don't Lose Your Head', *Arts & Book Review*, June 5.

Andén-Papadopoulos, K. (2009) 'Body Horror on the Internet: US soldiers recording the war in Iraq and Afghanistan', *Media Culture Society*, 31, no.6, 921–938.

Anderson, J. (2007) 'Subtly Terrifying, Just Like Real Life', *The New York Times*, December 30.

Baudrillard, J. (2006) 'War Porn', in *Journal of Visual Culture*, 5, no.1, 86–88.

Bernstein, J. M. (2004) 'Bare Life, Bearing Witness: Auschwitz and the Pornography of Horror', *Parallax*, 10, no.1, 2–16.

Blake, L. (2008) *The Wounds of Nations: Horror Cinema, Historical Trauma and National Identity* (Manchester: Manchester University Press).

Caputi, J. (1992) 'Advertising Femicide: Lethal Violence Against Women in Pornography and Gorenography' in J. Radford and D. E. H. Russell (eds.) *Femicide: The Politics of Woman Killing* (Buckingham: Open University Press).

Cashmore, P. (2010) 'The Worst Film Movement Ever has Hit Rock Bottom', *The Guardian*, August 28.

Chouliaraki, L. (2006) *Spectatorship of Suffering* (London: Sage).

Cochrane, K. (2007) 'For your Entertainment', *The Guardian*, May 1.

Conner, S. (2009) 'Oh, the Horror', *St. Joseph News-Press* (Missouri), October 30.

Cowan, G. and O'Brien, M. (1990) 'Gender and Survival vs Death in Slasher Films', *Sex Roles*, 23, nos.3/4, 187–196.

Cunin, M. (2007) 'Slasher Movies Depart from Creative Classics, Desensitize Audiences', *The Daily Gamecock,* October 29.

Dauphinée E. (2007) 'The Politics of the Body in Pain: Reading the Ethics of Imagery'. *Security Dialogue*, 38, no.2, 139–155.

Di Fonzo, C. (2007) 'Gross cinema: Waiting for the gore fad to pass', *Intelligencer Journal*, October 26.

Dworkin, A. and MacKinnon, C. (1988) *Pornography and Civil Rights: A New Day for Women's Equality* (Minneapolis, MN: Organizing Against Pornography).

Edelstein, D. (2006) 'Now Playing at your Local Multiplex: Torture Porn', *New York*, http://nymag.com/movies/features/15622/, accessed December 2 2008:

Egan, K. (2007) *Trash or Treasure? Censorship and the Changing Meanings of the Video Nasties* (Manchester: Manchester University Press).

Everywoman (1988) *Pornography and Sexual Violence: Evidence of the Links* (London: Everywoman).

Fletcher, P. (2009) 'Apocalyptic Machines: Terror and Anti-Production in the Post-9/11 Splatter Film' in L. Franklin and R. Richardson (eds.) *The Many Forms of Fear, Horror and Terror* (Oxford: Inter-Disciplinary Press).

Floyd, N. (2007) 'Close up – Could critics of 'torture porn' at least watch the movies?', *Time Out*, June 20.

Gordon, B. (2009) 'Torture porn should have no place in a theme park', *The Daily Telegraph,* April 16.

Harkin, J. (2006) 'War Porn', *The Guardian,* August 12.

Hawkins, J. (2007) 'Sleaze Mania, Euro-Trash and High Art' in M. Jancovich (ed.) *Horror: The Film Reader* (London: Routledge).

Hays, M. (2010) 'Rape-revenge Remake Cranks up the Volume', *The Globe and Mail*, July 10.

Hicks, T. (2009) 'Horror Films Reflect the Times', *San Jose Mercury News,* October 21.

Hill, C. (2007) 'Welcome to the Meat Factory', *The Western Mail*, June 22.

Holden, S. (2009) 'Cultures and Sexes Clash in the Aftermath of a Rape in Turkey', *The New York Times*, August 7.

Hutchings, P. (2004) *The Horror Film* (Harlow: Pearson).

Jensen, R. (2007) *Getting Off: Pornography and the End of Masculinity* (Cambridge, MA: South End Press).

Johnson, K. C. (2007) 'Dissecting torture Brutal horror movies arouse viewers, but filmmakers reject the 'porn' moniker', *St. Louis Post-Dispatch*, October 26.

Jones, S. (2011) 'Time is Wasting': Con/sequence and S/pace in the *Saw* Series' *Horror Studies*, 1, no. 2, 225–239.

Juvin, H. (2010) *The Coming of the Body*. (London: Verso).

Kattelman, B. (2010) 'Carnographic Culture: Maerica and the Rise of the Torture Porn Film' in M. Canini (ed.) *Domination of Fear* (New York: Rodopi).

Kellner, D. (2010) *Cinema Wars: Hollywood Film and Politics in the Bush-Cheny Era* (Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell).

Kirkland, B. (2008) 'Something about The Girl Next Door', *The Toronto Sun*, January 21.

Kohm, S. A. (2009) 'Naming, Shaming and Criminal Justice: Mass-Mediated Humiliation as Entertainment and Punishment' *Crime Media Culture,* 5, no.2, 188–205.

Lehman, P. (2007) 'You and Voyeurweb: Illustrating the Shifting Representations of the Penis on the Internet with User-Generated Content', *Cinema Journal,* 46, no.4, 108–116.

Leith, S. (2010) 'Freddy Krueger had the third-best melty face in film. It's nice to see him thriving', *The Guardian*, May 3.

Levy, A. (2005) *Female Chauvinist Pigs: Women and the rise of Raunch Culture* (New York: Free Press).

Leydon, J. (2007) 'Captivity', *Variety*, July 23.

Lockwood, D. (2008) 'All Stripped Down: The Spectacle of Torture Porn', *Popular Communication,* 7, no.1, 40–48.

Lovece, F. (2010) 'A Final Cut?', *Newsday*, October 24.

Maher, K. (2010) 'Gloom Raiders', *The Times*, October 2.

McCartney, J. (2007) 'Cut it Out', *The Sunday Telegraph*, July 1.

McEachen, B. (2010) 'Plenty of Guts but no Glory', *Sunday Herald Sun*, October 31.

Middleton, J. (2010) 'The Subject of Torture: Regarding the Pain of Americans in Hostel', *Cinema Journal*, 49, no.4, 1–24.

Morris, J. (2010) 'The Justification of Torture Horror: Retribution and Sadism in *Saw*, *Hostel* and *The Devil's Reject's*' in T. Fahy (ed.) *The Philosophy of Horror* (Lexington: University Press of Kentucky).

Murray, G. (2008) '*Hostel II*: Representations of the Body in Pain and the Cinema Experience in Torture Porn', *Jump Cut*, 50, http://www.ejumpcut.org/archive/jc50.2008/ TortureHostel2/index.html, date accessed June 22 2011.

Newman, K. (2009) 'Horror Will Eat Itself', *Sight and Sound*, 19, no.5, 36–39.

Orange, M. (2009) 'Taking Back the Knife: Girls Gone Gory', *The New York Times*, September 6.

Paasonen, S., Nikunen, K. and Saarenmaa, L. (eds.) (2007) *Pornification: Sex and Sexuality in Media Culture* (London: Berg).

Patterson, J. (2007) 'If only... horror directors wouldn't use dodgy subtexts to justify their gore', *The Guardian*, June 23.

Phillips, M. (2010) 'BAFTA Fawns over Tarantino, but his Stomach-Churning Film is Still Giving me Nightmares', *Daily Mail,* February 22.

Presdee, M. (2000) *Cultural Criminology and the Carnival of Crime* (New York: Routledge).

Prince, S. (2008) *Firestorm: American Film in the Age of Terrorism* (New York: Columbia University Press).

Radford, J. and Russell, D. E.H. (eds.) (1992) *Femicide: The Politics of Woman Killing* (Buckingham: Open University Press).

Ramirez, J. (2010) 'Carnage.com', *Newsweek*, 155, no. 19.

Riegler, T. (2010) 'We're All Dirty Harry Now: Violent Movies for Violent Times' in M. Canini (ed.) *Domination of Fear* (New York: Rodopi).

Robey, T. (2007) 'It's not scary – just revolting', *The Daily Telegraph,* June 27.

Robey, T. (2007b) 'Film on Friday', *The Daily Telegraph*, June 22.

Sandler, K. R. (2002) 'Movie Ratings as Genre: The Incontestable R' in S. Neale (ed.) *Genre and Contemporary Hollywood* (London: BFI).

Saplonsky, B. S. and Molitor, F. (1996) 'Content Trends in Contemporary Horror Films' in J. B. Weaver and R. Tamorini (eds.) *Horror Films: Current Research on Audience Preferences and Reactions* (New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum).

Schiesel, S. (2009) 'No Mercy and Ample Ways to Die', *The New York Times*, October 12.

Sinfield, A. (2004) *On Sexuality and Power* (Columbia: Columbia University Press).

Skenazy, L. (2007) 'It's torture! It's porn! What's not to like? Plenty, actually', *Advertising Age*, May 28.

Slaymaker, G. (2008) 'Film reviews; The movies', *The Western Mail*, May 23.

Smith, Anna Marie (1993) 'What Is Pornography? An Analysis of the Policy Statement of the Campaign against Pornography and Censorship', *Feminist Review,* 43, no.1, 71–43.

Swartz, S. (2006) 'XXX Offender: Reality Porn and the Rise of Humilitainment' in L. Jervis and A. Zeisler (eds.) *Bitchfest* (New York: Farrar).

Tait, S. (2008) 'Pornographies of Violence? Internet Spectatorship on Body Horror', *Critical Studies in Media Communication*, 25, no.1, 91–111.

Yong, S. H. (2010) 'Many sides of porn', *The Straits Times* (Singapore), October 21.

---

[1] The following directors explicitly discuss this desire to evoke 1970s horror in their DVD commentaries: Steven Shiel (*Mum and Dad* 2008 Revolver Entertainment release), Eli Roth (*Hostel Part 2* 2007 Sony Pictures release), Alexandre Aja (*Haute Tension* 2005 Optimum Releasing release), Chris Smith (*Creep* 2005 Pathé Distribution release).

[2] Roth's commentary on the 2006 Sony Pictures DVD release of *Hostel*, and Shankland's commentary on the 2008 Entertainment One DVD release of *wΔz.*

[3] Cited in the respective DVD commentaries for *Hostel 2*, *Wrong Turn 2* (2007 20th Century Fox release), and *Borderland* (2010 Momentum Pictures DVD release), and the documentary *30 Days in Hell: The Making of* The Devil's Rejects (included on the 2005 Momentum Pictures DVD release of *The Devil's Rejects*).

[4] Director interview on the 2009 Optimum Releasing DVD release of *Martyrs*.