

4328405_CULT3024_2021

by Amelia Thompson

Submission date: 12-May-2021 12:27AM (UTC+0100)

Submission ID: 152787337

File name: 221740_Amelia_Thompson_4328405_CULT3024_2021_4640967_83166954.docx (69.29K)

Word count: 12989

Character count: 72897

University of Nottingham

Department of Cultural, Media and Visual Studies

‘Temperamental, demanding, uncompromising and brilliant’:
An Analysis of the Occurrence and Acceptance of Auteur
Misconduct

Student ID: 4328405

Year 3: Film and Television Studies

Abstract

This dissertation examines the factors that have led to the occurrence and acceptance of misconduct inflicted upon actresses by auteur filmmakers. The study commences with an exploration of the history of women's position in the film industry through feminist film theory and details the origin and developments of auteurism. In subsequent chapters, the analysis dissects three notions that have led to the occurrence and acceptance of auteur misconduct: irreplaceable genius, worthwhile abuse, and the philosophy of separating the art from the artist.

The aim of the dissertation is to assess how these notions have been perpetuated and to demonstrate their inadequacy as justification for acts of misconduct by exploring incidents involving Alfred Hitchcock and Tippi Hedren, Stanley Kubrick and Shelley Duvall, and Bernardo Bertolucci and Maria Schneider. The assessment concludes that in order to avert the mistreatment of actresses by auteur filmmakers we must reject these notions and demystify the image of the auteur.

Word Count: 10,434

Contents

| | |
|--|----|
| 1. Introduction | 1 |
| 2. Literature Review | 5 |
| 3. Chapter 1: The Irreplaceable Genius | 14 |
| 4. Chapter 2: The Abuse is Worthwhile | 20 |
| 5. Chapter 3: Separating the Art from the Artist | 26 |
| 6. Conclusion | 31 |
| 7. Appendix | 34 |
| 8. Bibliography | 38 |

Introduction

On October 5th, 2017, a *New York Times* story broke that shook the entertainment industry by uncovering years of sexual misconduct and harassment inflicted by Hollywood elites; with the cardinal accusations being against Hollywood mogul, Harvey Weinstein. Following the initial accusations, more victims began to come forward with their own stories of misconduct and soon after, the MeToo movement was born. Though the movement was not the first of its kind, it gained a profound cultural resonance by providing ‘an umbrella of solidarity for millions of people to come forward with their stories’ (Zacharek, Dockterman, Edwards, 2017) and prompted an ‘unprecedented cultural acknowledgement and conversation about sexual assault and harassment in Hollywood’ (Cobb, Horeck, 2018, p. 489). As a result, ‘sexism within the film and television industries is increasingly visible’ (Sedgwick, 2019, p. 916.) and thus far, productive changes have been implemented to ensure the safety of individuals against acts of misconduct. However, there continues to be a form of injustice that is largely tolerated by people both in and out of the film industry, and it is the mistreatment of actresses by male film directors; particularly those regarded as auteurs.

The term *auteur* refers to filmmakers that are not limited to their directorial role, and instead, seize control over each aspect of a collaborative creative work (Wollen, 1969); and typically, these filmmakers favour unconventional and controversial storytelling as they are given the creative freedom to experiment. However, oftentimes, they can cross the line from provocative to abusive as they are not afraid to exceed boundaries for the sake of their art, and in consequence, many of the actresses that they work with become collateral damage. Although this disregard for women has been displayed by traditional directors, their behaviour is frequently condemned rather than celebrated. Conversely, the wrongful behaviour of auteurs is not just overlooked, but it is often ‘romanticized as temperamental, demanding, uncompromising and brilliant’ (VanDerWerff, 2017); thus, mystifying their

behaviour as a reflection of genius and creating ‘the notion that they [are] somehow inviolate and close to divine’ (Brooks, 2013). While the MeToo movement has brought to light issues regarding pay equity, representation, and gender parity, it has seemingly struggled to change this perception concerning the misconduct of auteurs, even in cases where their actions resemble those of the most prolific perpetrators. In fact, it can be argued that auteurism reflects the patriarchal structure of the film industry as it ‘both fosters and excuses a culture of toxic masculinity’ (Kini, 2018); a culture that greatly contributed to the creation of the MeToo movement in the first place. Moreover, despite the purpose of the MeToo movement being ‘to expose the systemic blaming of women for their victimization’ (Loney-Howes, 2019, .p. 27.), individuals continue to defend the abusive actions of auteurs while treating the actresses that suffer as though they are disposable. This is merely another example of the gender inequality in the film industry that has plagued women since its inception. However, what makes this particularly enraging is the fact that the misconduct inflicted by auteurs often takes place on camera; they are not merely incidents that are alleged to have occurred behind-the-scenes, they are occurring before one’s very eyes. Worse still, at times the auteurs themselves will openly discuss the mistreatment that they have inflicted, as though they should be commended for their behaviour. Consider William Friedkin’s gruelling direction for *The Exorcist* (1973) that caused Ellen Burstyn to suffer a permanent spinal injury; or David O’Russell’s emotional torment of Amy Adams on the set of *American Hustle* (2013). These incidents have been well-documented and publicly discussed by the individuals that experienced said misconduct as well as the directors that inflicted it. Nevertheless, people remain blissfully ignorant towards the severity of their behaviour, and as a result, they are able to continue as though nothing had happened. Perhaps their reputations remain unscathed due to the belief that being an auteur somehow justifies their behaviour, as though performing abusive acts is a requirement to actualising their creative genius. Or perhaps their evasion of

consequence is due to the perception that holding them accountable will result in an irreparable loss of talent. And to some extent, it would. The loss of William Friedkin, David O’Russell and other auteurs alike would certainly be an unfortunate loss of talent. But what about the loss of female talent? There are several actresses that have left their profession due to the mistreatment that they have endured by auteurs; and lest we forgot those ‘whose work we’ll never see at all, because abuse, trauma and exploitation derailed their carts before they even made it on the tracks’ (Ford, 2018). How much longer can we surrender to the notion that these women are disposable? In the age of MeToo, actions must be taken against the misconduct of auteurs in order to affect genuine change, and this can only be accomplished by understanding the circumstances that have allowed it to occur. Therefore, I will be dissecting various factors that have arguably led to the acceptance of auteur misconduct, while utilising specific case studies to support my arguments.

For my first chapter, I will be examining the concept of the *irreplaceable genius* while detailing how its acceptance has contributed to the occurrence of auteur misconduct. The chapter will aim to critique the concept by identifying its limitations in reference to auteur filmmaking and will argue the necessity of its removal from filmic discourse. As a case study, I will be discussing the perception of Alfred Hitchcock’s genius, as well as how he weaponised his prestige to enact misconduct towards Tippi Hedren during the production of *The Birds* (1963) and *Marnie* (1964). In my second chapter, I will be dissecting the notion that the abuse of actresses can be *worthwhile* for the betterment of an auteur’s work. In terms of analysis, I will be examining the factors that have led to the prevalence of this belief and will seek to demonstrate how it has become detrimental to the wellbeing of actresses in the film industry. These themes will be explored through the relationship between Stanley Kubrick and Shelley Duvall on the set of *The Shining* (1980). For my final chapter, I will be exploring the philosophy of *separating the art from the artist*, and how it has been misused to

absolve auteurs of consequence. The chapter will discuss the intended exertion of the philosophy and will provide arguments regarding its inapplicability in relation to the works of auteurs. For my case study, I will be detailing the misconduct inflicted upon Maria Schneider by Bernardo Bertolucci on the set of *The Last Tango in Paris* (1972).

Literature Review

The representation of women in mass media has remained prevalent within feminist scholarship for decades, particularly due to the notion that ‘film, and the other products of the culture industries provide the models of what it means to be male or female, successful or a failure, powerful and powerless’ (Kellner, 1995, p. 1.); and unfortunately, feminist theory has revealed that women in film are often powerless. Moreover, considerable feminist theorists have determined that ‘the experience of cinematic art [...] is developed to cater to a man’s pursuit of women as objects, as playthings’ (Anderson, 2018, p. 16.), and therefore, women suffer from a ‘lack of access to cultural and artistic power’ (Dekel, 2013, p. 2.). As a result, women in Hollywood, especially actresses, ‘have been subject to abuses of power virtually since the invention of cinema’ (Hornaday, 2018).

One of the most notable contributions to feminist film theory derives from Laura Mulvey’s essay, *Visual Pleasure and Narrative Cinema* (1975). In the essay, Mulvey infers that because filmic texts exist within a patriarchal society, they are made to satisfy the male viewer through scopophilia, or voyeurism. Women are presented in a way that not only satisfies the male protagonist, but also satisfies the male viewer as he identifies with the protagonist; and by means of identification with him, the male viewer can indirectly possess the woman on screen. According to Mulvey, the purpose of women in film is to adopt an exhibitionist role as they are constantly ‘displayed for the gaze and enjoyment of men, the active controllers of the look’ (p. 64.). As a result, women in Hollywood films ‘are ultimately refused a voice, a discourse, and their desire is subjected to a male desire’ (Brooks, 1997, p. 85.). This suggestion is rather indisputable, as there are countless instances of women being presented as erotic objects with limited purpose besides eliciting excitement from the male viewer. Consider the traditional Bond girls who appear scantily clad while serving as props for their male counterparts; or Mikaela Banes in *Transformers* (2007), whose knowledge of

mechanics should prove useful in a film about automobiles but is instead used to reflect the male fantasy of beautiful women partaking in masculine activities. This concept of women being admired based on their proximity to men is 'illustrating the issue of what a woman's capabilities are' (Basinger, 1993, p. 10.) in film as they are seemingly only capable of doing that which men want to see them doing.

These gender power relations are underlined in John Berger's *Ways of Seeing* (1972), where he details the cultural differences between men and women in art. He suggests that 'a man's presence is dependent upon the promise of power which he embodies' (p. 45.), 'a power which he exercises on others' (p. 46.). Comparatively, a woman's presence is 'manifest in her gestures, voice, opinions, expressions, clothes' (p. 46.) and so on, and these traits are surveyed by men to determine how she will be treated; in summary, 'to be born a woman has been to be born, within an allotted and confined space, into the keeping of men' (p. 46.). He continues by describing women as self-conscious as they must exist in a constant state of self-awareness due to the potential implications of their actions; suggesting that if a man were to throw a glass to the floor it would be perceived merely as an expression of anger, however, if a woman were to do the same it would be an indication of how she treats her emotions and how she wishes her emotions to be treated by others. In essence, a woman's every action offers an insight into her personality, nothing she does can be without deeper meaning. Through assessing the texts of Mulvey and Berger, the issue of women's liberation in film becomes apparent: men are able to act without constraint as they are offered complete autonomy due to their position within the patriarchy, a position that grants them the power to control the perceptions of women.

This power over women is intensified through the relationship between male film directors and actresses. Elia Kazan, 'one of the most honored and influential directors in Broadway and Hollywood' (Rothstein, 2003), offered an insight into this relationship in his 1973 speech,

What Makes a Director. In the speech, he described how male directors take advantage of their authoritative position to express their desires through the women that they work with:

“Of course, the film director must be an authority, even an expert on the various attitudes of lovemaking, the postures and intertwining of the parts of the body, the expressive parts and those generally considered less expressive. He may well have, like Bunuel with feet, special fetishes. He is not concerned to hide these, rather he will probably express his inclinations with relish” (p. 5.).

This develops the discourse provided by Mulvey and Berger by suggesting that it is not just female characters that are objects of male pleasure, it is also the actresses themselves. He suggests that directors possess “an unwavering refusal to take less than he thinks right out of a scene [or] a performer” (p. 7.), and as a result, he is able to exert his will over others to “express his inclinations with relish” (p.5.). It is apparent that Kazan regards this as a gendered issue, as he describes the qualities of a director to be “the authority and sternness of her husband, the father, who forgives nothing [and] expects obedience without question” (p. 6.). In addition, there are sexual implications as he insists that the director must be “an expert on the various attitudes of lovemaking, the postures and intertwining’s of the parts of the body” and refers to the exhibition of their “special fetishes” (p.5.). Kazan’s speech exemplifies the gender imbalance in the film industry by demonstrating the promotion of male dominance. Due to the expectation that “the film director must be an authority” (p. 5.), accompanied by the fact that the majority of directors are male, women are compelled to enact male desires in order to maintain a position within the industry. Of course, this does not always result in serious consequences, however, there are several examples of male directors using this to their advantage, leading to instances of misconduct. Again, due to the patriarchal structure of the industry, men are oftentimes able to evade repercussions for their misconduct

as it is regarded as artistic expression, while women are chastised for overtly displaying their emotions. Ultimately, the industry's gender imbalance suggests men should be able to express their vision even at the expense of women; and people's accordance with this belief has greatly contributed to the allowance of misconduct within the industry. Furthermore, Kazan implies that the director's domineering control is warranted because in the wake of failure, "the other people who work on a film can hide" while "the director must accept blame for everything" (p. 7.). He remarks how this reflects the sentiments of the auteur theory, a concept that 'asserts that directors are the primary creative agents in the production of films' (Allen and Lincoln, 2004, p. 877.). If male directors are already regarded as superior by the patriarchy, the auteur theory certainly reinforces their superiority.

The notion of auteurism was originally conceptualised during the French New Wave of the 1950s by film critic François Truffaut. In his 1954 essay, *A Certain Tendency in French Cinema*, he displayed a disdain for the conventions of contemporary cinema and proposed that directors needed to combat the monotonous methods of filmmaking by implementing techniques that reflected their own artistic vision. Preceding the popularisation of auteurism, filmmaking was somewhat mundane as directors had limited authority regarding shot composition and editing, with these artistic decisions being primarily made by studios and producers. Consequently, there was a significant emphasis on the quality of a director's craft as they had minimal contributions besides 'sophisticated framing, complicated lighting and sleek photography' (Truffaut, 1954, p. 226.). This emphasis on quality created a potent trend in French cinema known as the *Tradition of Quality* which favoured directors that upheld traditional filmmaking and rejected experimentation, leading to a notable lack of innovation. This was exacerbated by the popularisation of literature adaptations which confined directors to remaining faithful to pre-existing material. Truffaut inferred that while many of these adaptations deserved acclaim, 'the success or failure of such film-makers [was] governed by

the scripts' (p. 227.) as opposed to their technical ability. As a result, he regarded these directors as *metteur-en-scenes*, or stage setters, as they merely added the image to an already completed production. In fact, he suggested that directors that rely on literature adaptations 'are no more than caricatures' (p. 230.) of those that devise their own narratives, noting that 'the talent they put into making them [is] not enough to set them apart from [...] those with no talent' (p. 230.). Though this uniformity had taken precedence, there were several directors that had managed to overcome these restrictive trends and practices such as Henri-Georges Clouzot, Jacques Becker, Jean Cocteau and Alfred Hitchcock; and Truffaut championed these filmmakers for being able to imprint their personal style in an environment that he believed to be artistically stagnant. In particular, he expressed gratitude that these directors would 'write their own dialogue and in some cases think up the stories they direct' (p. 231.), a rare occurrence for a period defined by its banality. Furthermore, they were 'able to transcend the commercial limitations imposed by the film industry and impart their own unique and personal artistic visions in their films' (Allen and Lincoln, 2004, p. 877.) leading Truffaut to characterise them as *auteurs*. In brief, 'a true author is someone who expresses him/herself visually through mise en scene, rather than employing literary, writerly tricks and gimmicks' (Grosoli, 2018, p. 13.). Contrary to the Tradition of Quality, auteurism is achieved when a filmmaker displays discernible visual and narrative patterns that are notably personal to themselves and no one else; and this discernability grants them sole authority over a production to ensure that they are able to execute their vision. According to Truffaut, there could be no peaceful coexistence between auteurism and the Tradition of Quality as, by his judgment, the best film of a stage setter would always be less successful than the worst film of an auteur. Therefore, in his subsequent writing, he continued to encourage auteurism in hopes that it would shift the uninspired contributions to French cinema. Eventually, due to increased funding for upcoming talent the occurrence of auteurism rose establishing the

groundwork for the French New Wave of cinema. This ultimately revolutionised cinema and became 'one of the most important phenomena in movie history, regarded by many as the catalyst for cinematic modernity' (Grosoli, 2018, p. 13.).

Eventually, Truffaut's notion of auteurism was translated for American audience's by Andrew Sarris in his 1962 essay, *Notes on the Auteur Theory*. In the essay, Sarris reconstructs the concept of auteurism by proposing that specific criteria can be used to determine authorship, with these criteria comprising the renowned 'auteur theory'. The criteria, which Sarris labels 'the three premises of the auteur', are largely in alignment with Truffaut's ideas, however, 'the auteur theory emphasizes the body of a director's work rather than isolated masterpieces' (p. 563.). These three premises are best explored through the works of Alfred Hitchcock as he is often regarded as 'the quintessential auteur' (Spoto, 1983, p. 524.) and 'like his French counterparts, Sarris pointed to Hitchcock's work as compelling proof that artistic achievement was possible in Hollywood.' (Kapsis, 1992, p. 72). According to Sarris, 'the first premise of the auteur theory is the technical competence of a director as a criterion of value', asserting that 'if a director has no technical competence, no elementary flair for the cinema, he is automatically cast out from the pantheon of directors' (p. 562.). Hitchcock consistently displayed exemplary technical competence, particularly through his use of subjective realism, 'a device wherein the camera performs the visions and the psychological emotions of a character's mind' (Sonbert, 2015, p. 201.). In his 1958 classic *Vertigo*, Hitchcock expertly uses subjective realism to portray the protagonist's fear of heights by using an in-camera effect to accentuate his distance to the ground, thus imparting his nausea onto the audience. This technique came to be known as the Vertigo Effect and is one of many examples of Hitchcock aligning with Sarris' criterion of technical competence. Moreover, 'the second premise of the auteur theory is the distinguishable personality of the director as a criterion of value'. This premise echoes the sentiments of Truffaut but adds that instead of

merely displaying personality in a singular production, 'a director must exhibit certain recurrent characteristics of style' (p. 562.) across multiple films in order to form a recognisable body of work. With regard to Hitchcock, his filmmaking exhibited a thematic consistency that made him 'the master of suspense [whose] name has become synonymous with the thriller genre' (Kapsis, 1986, p. 32.). It is well known that 'a Hitchcock thriller is suspenseful from beginning to end' (Kapsis, 1992, p. 75.) as he does not focus on the narrative, instead, 'he is after excitement and elevating the anxiety of the audience' (Falsafi, Khorashad, Khorashad, 2011, p. 2521.). Though he explored various themes such as guilt, misogyny, sexuality, and voyeurism, he consistently did so through means of suspense. This uniformity of thematic exploration distinguished Hitchcock from other acclaimed directors such as Billy Wilder whose work would frequently shift between intense melodramas to quick-witted comedies. Finally, the third premise of the auteur theory focuses on interior meaning, the artistic spirit that 'is extrapolated from the tension between a director's personality and his material' (p. 562.). This criterion is rather abstract, nonetheless, it essentially describes an artistry that cannot be seen, but rather can be felt; it 'is more than the director's world view, more than his attitude towards his character. It is an utterly cinematic element which cannot be translated into words' (Grumbacher, 1976, p. 15.). While the director's personality can be identified through visual motifs, the tension created by their personality and the material can only be discovered by understanding the director on a deeper level. In Hitchcock's films, 'ideas on subjectivity, female objectification and the male gaze frequently ballast themselves' (Samadder, 2012), but there are also interior meanings that require multiple viewings in order to appreciate their nuances (Ross, 2020). In Donald Spoto's biography of Hitchcock (1983), he inferred that Hitchcock's pathological urges such as sadistic tendencies, fantasies of rape and mother fixation consistently seeped into his work; causing part of his psychology to be deeply embedded into his material. In Spoto's view,

without recognising the presence of Hitchcock's pathological urges, it is not possible to comprehend the source of his genius. This bond between the director's psychology and their material forms the interior meaning and is the defining feature that signifies their authorship. By Sarris' judgement, if a director conforms to each of these three premises, they are a true auteur of cinema.

Despite the popularisation of Sarris' auteur theory and authorship, several critics have rebutted his characterisation due to the belief that creating a formula for film may lead people to believe a director is praiseworthy merely due to their conformity to the criteria. Most notably, Pauline Kael's, *Circles and Squares* (1963) refutes Sarris' three premises of the auteur by suggesting that 'a critic who follows rules will fail in one of the most important functions: perceiving what is original and important in new work and helping others to see it' (p. 14.). It is important to note that Kael does not take umbrage at the concept of a director possessing sole authorship, but rather contests the rhetoric and principles that have made this concept absurdly elitist. With regard to Sarris' first premise, technical competence, Kael suggests that 'the greatness of a director [...] has nothing to do with mere technical competence: his greatness is in being able to achieve his own personal expression and style' (p. 14.). She explains that an artist who is not an astounding technician still possesses the ability to make good films as long as their greatness shines through in other places; inferring that there are great writers who have triumphed over their technical incompetence in filmmaking by writing extraordinary scripts. Essentially, to Kael, the use of technical competence as a criterion of judgement is fruitless as when a director makes a great film, it becomes inconsequential whether that director meets a specified standard of proficiency. Moreover, Kael disparages the second premise regarding the distinguishability of the director's personality because she believes that it 'confuses normal judgement' (p. 15.). More specifically, this premise induces the belief that when a film possesses a recognisable style it

must be laudable, leading people to rationalise their instincts if they dislike said film. In addition, she perceives this premise to be fundamentally flawed because in actuality recognising the director's personality connotes indifference towards the film, arguing that: 'when a famous director makes a good movie, we look at the movie, we don't think about the director's personality; when he makes a stinker we notice his familiar touches because there's not much else to watch' (p. 15.). Finally, according to Kael, Sarris' third premise infers that a director must 'try to make something out of a rag-bag of worn-out bits of material' to be considered brilliant, while 'the director who fights to do something he cares about is a square' (p. 18.). Consequently, the auteur theory glorifies 'trash' because all that is required for a film to be lauded is conflict between the director and his material. While Sarris celebrates this conflict, Kael believes that a director that cannot adequately unify their form and content should not be considered a great artist. These critiques are summarised in a concluding statement where Kael claims the auteur theory to be *dangerous* due to its implication that certain directors are above criticism. She maintains that the auteur theory causes people to believe that they must 'faithfully follow everything a valuable director makes (even patently bad films)' (Grosoli, 2018, p. 13.); and if they are not enamoured with the art of an auteur then they must be culturally dislocated, leading them to criticise themselves rather the director; she compares this sentiment to common perceptions regarding fashion brands, 'this is Dior, so it's good' (p. 16.). Nonetheless, despite Kael's objection to the auteur theory, it has remained prevalent within filmic discourse and directors continue to be deemed superior when they are regarded as auteurs. However, her criticisms are arguably more relevant now than ever as her concerns regarding the danger of auteurs being above criticism have since been validated.

Chapter 1

The Irreplaceable Genius

The evolution of auteurism is rather compelling, as the notion that was once ‘merely a polemical weapon’ (Sarris, 1962, p. 561.) gradually developed into a rigid ‘auteurist doctrine’ (Menne, 2011, p. 36.) that established a directorial hierarchy; and it is evident that this has encouraged an elitist dichotomy that enables auteurs to evade the repercussions of their questionable behaviour. Though directors and auteurs both receive praise for being the arbiter of their productions, auteurs are held in higher regard for possessing an individualised style that makes the film unequivocally theirs; leading people to view them as irreplaceable creative geniuses. Consequently, any discourse regarding their wrongdoing ultimately develops into a discussion concerning their contributions to the industry and mourning that which would be lost in their absence. Though this may appear to be insignificant, in actuality, it rewards these irreplaceable directors with unwavering authority and influence that enables them to partake in misconduct without consequence. Again, this is largely ascribed to ‘the idea that a film can be attributed to an individual creator’ (Silverman, 2011, p. 525.) which infers that some of the greatest works of filmic art would cease to exist without them. Of course, there is some truth to this claim. For instance, Guillermo Del Toro, a modern-day auteur, possesses an individuality that predominantly stems from his ‘opulent vision of monsters’ (Zalewski, 2011), a signature that has made him a household name within the horror fantasy genre. The unorthodox design of his creations makes them immediately recognisable as his own and would presumably not appear the way that they do without his unique vision. However, to conclude that these creations are entirely a result of one individual is simply untrue as Del Toro, and other auteurs alike, are supported by hundreds of people that enable them to actualise their art. While directors may dictate the images that unfold on screen, ‘the cinematographers, editors, and animators create the world that we perceive as the work [...] therefore the perceived world of a film is a collaborative whole that

is authored by multiple artists and craftsmen' (Tredge, 2013, p. 10.). But alas, as an auteur, the contributions of those around them are regarded as trivial, perpetuating the notion that their absence would culminate in an irreparable loss that could never be replicated. Considering this, acts of misconduct by auteurs seem somewhat inevitable as they are idolised to such an extent that it stands to reason that they believe themselves to be invincible; and perhaps the most prolific example to demonstrate the invincibility bestowed upon irreplaceable geniuses is the relationship between Alfred Hitchcock and his muse, Tippi Hedren.

In her autobiography, *Tippi: A Memoir* (2016), Hedren details her experience starring in the Hitchcock's classics, *The Birds* (1963) and *Marnie* (1964) and recounts several incidents involving his obsessive behaviour and sexual harassment. In 1961, Tippi Hedren, who previously worked as a fashion model, was discovered by Alfred Hitchcock when she appeared in a television commercial. Immediately infatuated, Hitchcock invited Hedren to meet with him with the intent to discuss potential collaborations on upcoming projects, and eventually she was cast in the starring role in *The Birds*. During production, Hedren's experience was rather peculiar as the distress that plagued her character began to seep into her real life as her relationship with Hitchcock took a dark turn. In her book, she describes the progressive obsession and jealousy that Hitchcock displayed during her interactions with male colleagues and details an incident in which he forcefully attempted to kiss her while they were travelling in his limousine. Her rejection towards his advances eventually developed into a resentment that led to frequent intentional negligence. Most notably, prior to filming a scene in which Hedren's character is attacked by a flock of birds, she was informed that the birds would be mechanical just as they had been in previous scenes. However, upon filming she discovered that 'there had never been any intention to use mechanical birds' (p. 145.) and instead 'there were boxes of ravens, gulls and pigeons that bird trainers wearing

gauntlets up to their shoulders hurled at me' (p. 145.). This resulted in Hedren being subject to a week of torture as she was repeatedly attacked by the birds until Hitchcock was satisfied with the scene, culminating in Hedren requiring medical attention. She described the incident as 'brutal and ugly and relentless' (p. 146) but maintained that she refused to allow Hitchcock to break her. Unfortunately, his mistreatment only intensified in their subsequent collaboration, *Marnie*. Though Hitchcock had already expressed his admiration for Hedren, his infatuation became rather concerning as he began to overtly display his obsession to others; for instance, he once scorned Sean Connery, Hedren's co-star, and warned him to not touch her. In addition, according to her autobiography, Hitchcock pleaded, "you're everything I ever dreamed of, Tippi, you must know that" (p. 152.) and recalled a dream in which she promised to love him forever. Despite Hedren's determination to remain composed, she eventually reached a breaking point when Hitchcock allegedly sexually assaulted her:

'He suddenly grabbed me and put his hands on me. It was sexual, it was perverse, and it was ugly, and I couldn't have been more shocked and repulsed. The harder I fought him, the more aggressive he became. Then he started adding threats, as if he could do anything to me that was worse than what he was trying to do at that moment.' (p. 155)

Following this incident, Hitchcock reportedly warned Hedren, "I'll ruin your career" (Hedren, 2017), and subsequently prevented Universal Pictures from submitting her for an Oscar nomination. Furthermore, due to her long-standing contract with Hitchcock, he was able to prevent her from working with other directors, 'this, combined with studios' reluctance to antagonise Hitchcock, meant her career never recovered' (Evans, 2016). These horrific experiences endured by Tippi Hedren echo the reports of abuse that have emerged since the MeToo movement, and Hedren has acknowledged these similarities herself:

“This is nothing new. [...] These things have been going on since man and woman were first put on our planet. It’s just very disconcerting to constantly have men believe they can just do whatever they want with women.”

Time and time again women have suffered abuse due to this belief that men “can just do whatever they want with women”, and this is only made worse when the person that is inflicting the abuse is lauded as a creative genius that can do no wrong. As previously mentioned, Hitchcock was commended by critics such as François Truffaut for breaking the mould with his unique filmmaking, and because of this, many of his questionable acts were interpreted as being part of his creative process; even when they involved harming others. It is widely recognised that Hitchcock had a strange view on women as he frequently presented them through ‘a range of awful experiences and deceitful pathologies’ (Mamata, 2010). In fact, Laura Mulvey directly references Hitchcock in her renowned essay, *Visual Pleasure and Narrative Cinema* (1975), where she suggests that his work emphasises the male gaze through ‘voyeurism and fetishistic fascination’ (p. 65.). In particular, she describes how ‘the audience is absorbed into a voyeuristic situation’ (p. 66.) where they are forced to view women through Hitchcock’s ‘perverse’ gaze; and through his gaze, women are not only sexualised, but they are also presented as villainous beings for the male protagonist to overcome. This is evidenced by *Marnie*, whose title character is shown to be a ‘liar, thief and all-round uptight frigid piece of trouble [whose] pathology is entirely the fault of another woman, her mother’ (Mamata, 2010). In addition, his gaze repeatedly depicts women in distress, such as *Frenzy* (1972) which follows ‘a savage rapist-strangler who compulsively snuffs out the lives of women by day or night’ (Johnson, 1972, p. 59.). Upon exploring the severity of his female representations, as well as his relationship with Tippi Hedren, it can be argued that Hitchcock possessed a disdain for women and used his artistic prowess as justification to abuse them.

Due to his reputation as an auteur, the hostile environment that he created for women continues to be regarded as a method to actualise his genius, ignoring the reality that his behaviour was extremely inappropriate. Moreover, though Hitchcock was certainly a great filmmaker, the notion of his genius is rather questionable considering his dependence on the work of others. In particular, unbeknownst to many, several of Hitchcock's films were adaptations of novels that were transformed by screenwriters who 'did much of the work [...] for which he was increasingly ready to take credit' (Leitch, 2011, .p. 17.). For example, *Psycho* (1960), arguably Hitchcock's most famous film, was written by Joseph Stefano and was adapted from Robert Bloch's original novel. Additionally, *Strangers on a Train* (1951) was originally written by Patricia Highsmith and was adapted for the screen by Raymond Chandler. Therefore, despite his "Hitchcockian" style, there are numerous individuals that contributed to the success of Hitchcock's career who have not been remembered for their genius. Perhaps this is due to the perception that the director 'imposes full, deliberate control over the work' (Hadas, 2020, p.1.) and is thus deserving of the glory; or perhaps they are forgotten because auteurism demands it. The auteur theory 'encourages film critics and scholars [...] to frame their discourse about a film in terms of the contributions of its director' (Allen and Lincoln, 2004, .p. 878.); and therefore, acknowledging the contributions of others 'starts to look like a threat to the director's authority' (Menne, 2011, p. 36.). As a result, the perception of the irreplaceable genius is created as the director is framed as the sole purpose for the film's success.

Ultimately, Hitchcock's assertion of authorship 'can be seen as an unattractive egoism or as an astute marketing ploy, or as a mixture of both, but there is no reason for critics to continue to go along with it unquestioningly' (Barr, 1999, .p. 8.). Of course, he was a masterful filmmaker who greatly contributed to the plethora of filmic art, but his craftsmanship does not justify the distressing and dangerous situations that he perpetuated, and it certainly does

not justify sexual harassment. However, it is important to note that this sentiment exceeds the actions of Hitchcock, as the MeToo allegations have revealed that this abusive culture has continued to be ignored within the film industry; and it is hard to dispute that this culture has been enabled by people's unwillingness to acknowledge the wrongdoings of auteurs due to their prestige as creative geniuses. Therefore, we must 'reject the customary neoromantic construction of [the] self-sufficient genius' (Boyd and Plamer, 2011, p. 5.) in order to put an end to the behaviour that has repeatedly made actresses the subject of abuse.

Chapter 2

The Abuse is Worthwhile

As well as rejecting the concept of the irreplaceable genius, it is vital to reject the notion that the abuse endured by actresses can be worthwhile. While the misconduct enacted by Hitchcock was largely ignored due to the studio's fear of losing his talent, abusive circumstances can also be encouraged and even celebrated as a means of obtaining the best performance from an actor. One of the most prolific examples to demonstrate this concept is the treatment of Shelley Duvall by Stanley Kubrick on the set of the 1980s classic, *The Shining*. Though Duvall had received acclaim for her performances in *3 Women* (1977), *Annie Hall* (1977) and a stint of *Saturday Night Live* (1977), her role as Wendy Torrance in *The Shining* would eventually come to be her most recognised performance, for better or worse.

Adapted from Stephen King's novel, Stanley Kubrick's *The Shining* is regarded by many as one of the greatest horror films of all time; however, a portion of the film's success unfortunately stems from the suffering inflicted upon the performers as a result of Kubrick's rigorous methods. In particular, Shelley Duvall endured intense emotional anguish that was engineered by Kubrick in an attempt to produce a lasting performance. In *The Shining*, Wendy Torrance is a character that experiences overwhelming distress and anxiety, and in order to extract these emotions from Duvall, Kubrick seemingly believed that he should treat them as one in the same. During production, Duvall encountered absurd requests from Kubrick that created a needlessly abusive dynamic between the two; most notably, she was forced to suffer through 127 takes of the infamous baseball bat scene that saw her dehydrated, wounded, and exhausted from continuous crying. In fact, in an interview with Roger Ebert (1980), she stated that the incident was so traumatic that she gradually began to lose her hair and described the experience to be "almost unbearable". This sentiment is demonstrated in

Vivian Kubrick's documentary, *Making 'The Shining'* (1980), in which Duvall's vulnerability and trauma can be witnessed first-hand as audiences are given an insight into Kubrick's questionable methods and demands. This involved refusing to print anything until at least the 35th take, causing Duvall to personally experience the constant state of fatigue and panic of her character, and this was exacerbated by Kubrick's warning to crew members, "don't sympathise with Shelley". Interestingly, the extent of Kubrick's mistreatment didn't go unnoticed as Anjelica Huston, who was present at the time of filming, told *The Hollywood Reporter* (2021), "it seemed to be a little bit like the boys were ganging up [...] she seemed generally a bit tortured". Furthermore, in an interview with *Rolling Stone* (2014) Stephen King openly criticised Kubrick's portrayal of Wendy Torrance for being "so misogynistic" and likened her characterisation to that of a "screaming dishrag". Nonetheless, despite the knowledge of Kubrick's severe mistreatment, his actions are viewed as nothing more than those of an 'obsessive genius' (Pulver, 2019), and *The Shining* continues to be regarded as one of the best of its kind. While the film may be praiseworthy for its visceral depiction of psychological horror, its mystique is certainly lessened upon discovering that one of its stars was coerced into enduring needless emotional torment; and 'the implication of [its] acclaim is that there was a "method" to Kubrick tormenting Duvall, and that even if it hurt her, the ends justified the means' (Siddiquee, 2017).

However, this incident occurred decades ago, and thus, it is possible that misconduct to this degree may have ceased to occur. However, in the wake of allegations against Harvey Weinstein, it is evident that the exploitation of actresses has remained common practice as several directors were accused of enacting similar behaviour. Amongst the alleged perpetrators was Quentin Tarantino, who was accused of endangering Uma Thurman by persuading her to drive an unsafe car on the set of *Kill Bill: Volume 1* (2003) that eventually crashed; an incident that Thurman has described as "dehumanisation to the point of death"

(2018). From the accident, Thurman suffered a concussion and damaged her knees, and though Tarantino has insisted that the accident was not intentional, it speaks to a wider issue regarding the careless treatment that actresses continually encounter when working with auteurs. It seems as though their status leads them to either forget or simply cease to care for the people that they work with, especially women; and even when severe harm is caused, such as Duvall's mental health or Thurman's knee and brain injuries, it does not matter.

One may presume that incidents likened to those inflicted by Kubrick and Tarantino would be condemned for being undeniably abusive and neglectful, however, they have oftentimes been framed as a necessity as opposed to an adversity. For example, an article by *Vox* (2017) infers that a 'terrible temper' should be excused because 'at the end of the day, that uncompromising vision results in something bold and ground-breaking — a movie unlike any other'. Furthermore, an article by *The Telegraph* (2013) proposes the possibility that 'if directors had been nicer to their actors we wouldn't have *The Birds*, *Apocalypse Now* or *The Shining*'; and this sentiment is shared in an article by *IndieWire* (2014) which suggests that perhaps 'torturous professional relationships exist for the sake of a shimmering work of art, and when in the end the actress gives the greatest performance in her life [...] maybe torture has its purpose'. The manner in which these incidents have been reported suggests that actresses are incapable of providing memorable performances without the suffering inflicted by men, and because their suffering arguably aided their performance, the abuse was worthwhile. These gender dynamics are representative of Laura Mulvey's (1975) claim that women in the film industry exist 'in patriarchal culture as signifier for the male other, bound by a symbolic order in which man can live out his fantasies and obsessions through linguistic command' (p. 58.). In other words, the structure of the industry has ensured the maintenance of men's control by positioning women in a role of subordination. Worse still, when women submit control, they often cease to receive praise for their work as their male counterparts are

seen to be the reason for their success. In fact, in her interview with Roger Ebert, Duvall recalled how "after I made 'The Shining,' all that work, hardly anyone even criticised my performance in it [...] the reviews were all about Kubrick, like I wasn't there". This can be seen in a review from *Empire* that, while specifying the torment that Kubrick inflicted upon Duvall, praises him for his 'obsessive quest for perfection' that made the film 'gloriously precision-made' (Nathan, 2012); completely failing to acknowledge the work of Duvall herself. Similarly, despite all that Thurman endured on the set of *Kill Bill*, Tarantino receives the majority of the praise for 'the extravagant power of his infantile genius' (Bradshaw, 2003). Again, as is often the case, though a woman suffered for the betterment of her work, a man received all of the glory.

The causes of the belief that the abuse of actresses can be worthwhile are rather thought-provoking. Seemingly, the belief not only stems from the prestige of auteurs themselves, but also from the notion that actresses are incapable of giving a memorable performance without some degree of struggle. Comparatively, male actors are trusted to provide their best performance on their own terms, such as through method acting. Consider Leonardo DiCaprio's role in *The Revenant* (2015), where he reportedly 'ate wild bison liver despite being vegetarian, put his life on the line wading into freezing rivers, and even slept in an animal carcass' (Bastián, 2016). Though these acts may seem extreme, it is important to note that he chose to do them on his own accord, setting his own boundaries and limitations because he, and other male actors, are trusted to perform to the best of their ability. On the other hand, actresses are seemingly untrusted to provide a satisfactory performance without guidance, and therefore, auteurs often feel compelled to take matters into their own hands. As a result, they are often coerced into becoming a literal embodiment of their character as opposed to being granted the freedom of simply acting as them; and even in cases where this leads to misconduct, the reputations of the auteurs involved remained unaffected. In fact, the

incidents involving Duvall and Thurman have generally been received in a manner that abides by the overwhelming reverence that surrounds auteurs and their films. For instance, with regard to Kubrick, director Saul Metzstein (2014) once stated that:

“His films are amazing, and there’s something in them which you couldn’t get unless you were being unbelievably particular and methodical. You need some sort of obsessiveness to make that stuff” (cited in Barber, 2014).

The implications of auteurism cause people to disregard the unsettling acts that unfold on screen as they are led to believe that they are viewing the works of an artist; thus, becoming blind to the reality that they are merely witnessing men inflicting unnecessary distress upon women for their own personal gain. Whether the auteur explicitly abuses the actress through emotional and physical harm, or coerces them into endangering themselves, their behaviour ultimately demonstrates a desire for power and control. These auteurs have been able to enact their power and control over others because ‘we’ve helped build up the image of the unimpeachable, godlike male auteur’ (Loughrey, 2018) and have accepted the notion that their abusive behaviour can be justified by a well-crafted film and memorable performance. And through the justification of their behaviour, we are suggesting that films such as *The Shining* and *Kill Bill* would not be as good were it not for someone’s suffering. But this establishes an absurd logic: surely if auteurs possess the inherent superiority that has been ascribed to them, they should be able to extract the best performance from an actress without subjecting them to literal abuse. Nonetheless, their cruel acts are often viewed as a contributing factor concerning their authorship as they are believed to reflect the dominance that originally established them as an auteur. With the existence of this notion, it is understandable how the occurrence and acceptance of violence towards actresses has prevailed as it creates the belief that provocativeness is something to be celebrated. This echoes the concerns of Pauline Kael where she inferred that auteurism has created a situation

in which anything an auteur does becomes hailed as a method of genius, even when that arguably isn't the case. Ultimately, as long as the act of abusing women through fear, isolation, and negligence proceeds to be celebrated as a means of creating art, 'the environment on film sets will continue to encourage the pain inflicted on women, and the "provocative" acts of men' (Siddiquee, 2017).

Chapter 3

Separating the Art from the Artist

Perhaps the most prolific notion that has enabled the occurrence of auteur misconduct is the philosophy of *separating the art from the artist*. This concept has been debated time and time again, as the discovery of an artist's wrongdoing frequently prompts a discussion regarding whether art can be appreciated despite the morality of its creator. This debate is somewhat straightforward when discussing the works of writers, actors or even traditional filmmakers as their art can be consumed without engaging with incidents that may have occurred in their personal lives. However, the same cannot be said when discussing the art of an auteur.

The idea of art existing as a separate entity from its creator stems from a 'vein of criticism that likes to imagine art in a vacuum, ignoring authorial intent and historical context' (VanArendonk, 2017). Specifically, the philosophy was conceived within the New Criticism of the early 20th century, where literary critics argued that art should be exempt from extraneous factors because they have no bearing on the art itself, particularly when those factors cannot be identified within said art. This notion was headed by T.S. Elliot who, in reference to poetry, insisted that 'a creation, a work of art, is autonomous' (Eliot, 1923, p. 38.), as he believed impersonality to be an ideal order that determined the quality of artistic work. By his judgement, the finest poetry was created by the severance of art and personality as it enabled 'readers to evaluate the poem at hand — not by looking for traces of the author's life, [...] but instead seeing it as self-contained and self-referential and separate from the world' (Swift, 2019, cited in Grady, 2019).

'There is a great deal, in the writing of poetry, which must be conscious and deliberate. In fact, the bad poet is usually unconscious where he ought to be conscious, and conscious where he ought to be unconscious. Both errors tend to make him "personal". Poetry is not a turning loose of emotion, but an

escape from emotion; it is not the expression of personality, but an escape from personality' (Elliot, 1919, p. 4.).

Elliot's sentiments have been supported by the likes of Ronald Barthes who, in his 1967 essay *The Death of the Author*, stated that 'to give a text an Author is to impose a limit on that text' (p. 147.). In addition, the concept has been echoed by Jay Parini (2016, cited in Hess, 2017) who believes that 'being an artist has absolutely nothing — nothing — to do with one's personal behavior'; as well as Mark Anthony (2014, cited in Hess, 2017.) who infers that we ought to 'let the art stand for itself, and these men stand in judgment, and never the twain shall meet'. These standpoints are further enforced by concerns that judging art in relation to its creator may lead to censorship, with some questioning, 'once we start removing paintings from walls, where do we stop?' (Wilson, 2019, p. 4.). Of course, these concerns have some legitimacy as there is no such thing as a perfect artist, and therefore, if we were to judge art based on the actions of its creator there may not be much art to enjoy at all. But what can be said for art that is a product of its creator's wrongdoing? While it may be possible for poetry to exist in immunity of its creators personality, the art of an auteur is quite the opposite. Needless to say, when we consume an auteur's film, we are inadvertently consuming their personality alongside it as it is their individualised artistry that shapes the film; and therefore, 'it becomes that much harder to argue that extracurricular misjudgements – and even crimes – can be expunged from what is on screen' (Gilbey, 2018). Consider the previously discussed abuse inflicted by Alfred Hitchcock, Stanley Kubrick or Quentin Tarantino, these men have coerced women into endangering themselves, purposely humiliated them and disregarded their wellbeing for the sake of their artistic vision; and ultimately, the images that unfold on screen are a direct result of these actions. In other words, the abuse *is* the art. With this in mind, how can one argue for the separation of the two? By doing so, auteurs become absolved of consequence and are granted the power to

overtly enact misconduct. One of the most horrific examples of this is Bernardo Bertolucci's mistreatment of Maria Schneider in his 1972 film, *The Last Tango in Paris*.

In *Last Tango*, Schneider plays a young woman who begins an affair with an older widower played by Marlon Brando. Upon its release, the film gained notoriety for its graphic depictions of sex and rape, particularly due to a scene in which Brando's character sexually assaults Schneider using a stick of butter as lubricant. For a long time, Bertolucci received overwhelming praise for the authenticity of such explicit scenes and was even nominated for an Academy Award along with Brando. However, in an interview with the *Daily Mail* (2007), Schneider revealed that Bertolucci and Brando deliberately withheld information concerning the infamous rape scene:

'That scene wasn't in the original script. The truth is it was Marlon who came up with the idea. They only told me about it before we had to film the scene and I was so angry. [...] I felt humiliated and to be honest, I felt a little raped.'

The disturbing nature of this incident is worsened by the knowledge that at the time of filming, Brando was forty-eight, Bertolucci was in his early thirties, and Schneider was only nineteen; and yet, this harrowing event was largely overlooked. That was until an interview with *The Hollywood Reporter* in 2013, where Bertolucci explained that he "didn't tell her that there was that detail of the butter used as lubricant," because he "wanted her reaction as a girl, not an actress". In addition, he stated that he withheld the information in order to remain in complete control: "I didn't want Maria to act her humiliation, her rage, I wanted her to feel the rage and humiliation". As one would expect, Bertolucci's admission to Schneider's claims not only sparked outrage, but also prompted the debate regarding whether his art could be spared from his misconduct.

In instances of auteur misconduct, the philosophy of separating the art from the artist is often manipulated to protect individuals from the consequences of their behaviour. In response to allegations likened to those against Woody Allen, Louis C.K, Roman Polanski and Bernardo Bertolucci, the distinction between their personality and their art is often emphasised in an attempt to preserve their position in the industry. However, it appears as though this distinction may be one of the factors that is enabling the misconduct to occur. The persistent advocacy to emphasise the distinction between a filmmaker's art and their wrongdoings has created a scenario in which auteurs are seemingly able to utilise this notion as an excuse to enact misconduct. Martin Jay (1992) has labelled this as *the aesthetic alibi*, where an artist's 'pursuit of aesthetic perfection could [...] lead to a chilling indifference to more conventionally human concerns' (p. 17.); and this is because they are 'often constructed as unbound by non-aesthetic considerations, cognitive, ethical, or whatever' (p. 17.). Essentially, they are given such freedom that they ultimately become 'a figure of unconstrained power, who [produce] art by breaking rather than following rules' (p. 17.). It is rather interesting how Jay's description of the aesthetic alibi resembles the actions of auteurs: the indifference to human concerns, defiance of rules and unconstrained power are all traits that have been identified through this analysis of auteurism. As consequence, it is difficult to deny the link between the philosophy of separating the art from the artist and auteur misconduct as there is a notable correlation between the two.

Furthermore, it is of note that the industry frequently relies on the name of auteurs when promoting their films, and yet, in the wake of allegations made against them there is a sudden call for separation. But given that one of the criteria of authorship proposed by Andrew Sarris is the auteur's distinctive personality, it is impossible to ignore their presence in their film. In these instances, it is apparent that the philosophy is being used to convey their misconduct as fictitious, merely a part of their art that exists within its own realm; but in

doing so, we are suggesting that the images on screen are merely works of their artistry. But in reality, they are one in the same. For some, it may be possible to continue to ‘view Last Tango and other films in Bertolucci’s canon as extraordinary achievements in the realm of cinema’ (Phillis, 2018), but it is impossible to separate his mistreatment of Maria Schneider from the film because it is synonymous with the art itself; as she explains, ‘even though what Marlon was doing wasn’t real, I was crying real tears’. In these instances, how can one justify the separation of the art and the artist? Of course, the debate can be worthwhile as there are certainly circumstances where art can exist independently from wrongdoing; however, ‘once it’s clear that an artist’s art is utterly, inextricably intertwined with predatory behavior, surely separating art from artist becomes an unconscionable and critically unethical distinction’ (VanArendonk, 2017). Therefore, we must reject this philosophy when discussing incidents likened to those inflicted by Bertolucci in order to prevent the acceptance of auteur misconduct. And ultimately, we must acknowledge that ‘if a piece of art is truly spoiled by an understanding of the conditions under which it is made, then perhaps the artist was not quite as exceptional as we had thought’ (Hess, 2017, p. 4.).

Conclusion

It is difficult to deny the correlation between auteurism and the misconduct inflicted upon actresses. Perhaps they are synonymous. Perhaps auteurs not only create the misconduct, but the misconduct creates the auteur, as provocative behaviour is regarded as a reflection of their prestige. But why is this the behaviour that we associate with high art? Well, after close examination, it is somewhat indisputable that the acceptance of auteur misconduct is a by-product of the industry's structural and cultural disregard for women. As demonstrated by Laura Mulvey (1975) and John Berger (1972), the gender dynamics of the film industry position women as mere vessels for the male fantasy, forcing them to assume a role of subordination. This, combined with their unconstrained power, means that harmful acts towards women are almost inevitable. Of course, auteur filmmakers are not the sole perpetrators of misconduct in the industry, as the fallout from MeToo demonstrated that abuse can be inflicted by anyone; however, the manner in which auteurs are perceived by individuals both in and out of the industry is certainly cause for concern. By enforcing notions of irreplaceable genius, worthwhile abuse, and the separation of the art from the artist, we are creating an environment that mystifies an auteur's every action; and thus, they are able to elude the consequences of their misconduct.

One may argue that nothing can be done to prevent the mistreatment of women in Hollywood as the systemic power imbalance is so intrinsically ingrained into the industry that attempting to enact change seems hopeless. However, by changing the perception of the auteur, we can potentially stop these behaviours from being normalised and celebrated as a means of creating great art.

First, it would be of great value to discard the concept of irreplaceable genius. Although François Truffaut and Andrew Sarris emphasise the director as the primary force behind a film's production, the dismissal of the countless individuals that work to actualise their vision

leads to the misconception that they are irreplaceable. In actuality, while they are of great importance, the director would not be able to succeed in their creative expression without the assistance of cinematographers, editors, costume designers, sound designers and so on. Therefore, we must acknowledge the contributions of these individuals when discussing the films of auteurs in order to promote the collaborative nature of filmmaking. In addition, it is important to demystify the notion of genius that has enabled auteurs to abuse their position of power. As demonstrated by Alfred Hitchcock, correlating abusive behaviour as a display of genius allows auteurs to overly mistreat the women that they work with under the guise of creative expression; and the idea that the industry will suffer a great loss in their absence reaffirms their ability to enact this behaviour. Consequently, if we cease to refer to this behaviour as that of a genius and instead label it as an act of abuse, perhaps we can discourage others from doing the same.

Furthermore, the notion that abuse can be worthwhile for a praiseworthy film needs to be discarded in order to combat the normalisation of auteur misconduct. In response to the allegations from the MeToo movement, a discourse regarding incidents of misconduct within film began to arise as people reassessed the treatment of actresses in some of Hollywood's most famous films. While some acknowledged the severity of the incidents, others dismissed the misconduct as a necessity to achieve the film's success; and the relationship between Stanley Kubrick and Shelley Duvall demonstrates the consequences of this notion, as Duvall suffered immense trauma to give a performance that led to relentless ridicule. This behaviour has been justified as a means to an end, but in doing so we are inferring that the wellbeing of Duvall, and other actresses alike, are secondary to the creation of a laudable film. Therefore, instead of accepting this harmful rhetoric, we should trust actresses to perform on their own accord as opposed to encouraging abusive behaviour.

And finally, we must retire the philosophy that the art can be separated from the artist when debating the work of an auteur, as this philosophy is in direct opposition to the requirements of auteurism. Though the criterions of auteurism have evolved over time, one principle that remains the same is the presence of a discernible personality that can immediately be associated with a particular director. Therefore, following revelations likened to those of Bernardo Bertolucci's mistreatment of Maria Schneider, this philosophy is no longer applicable because, as an auteur, his presence cannot be severed from the film. But regardless, these are merely semantics to demonstrate the illegitimacy of the argument that an auteur can be separated from their art. In reality, the knowledge that Bertolucci encouraged the sexual assault of a young actress should be enough to demonstrate the impotence of the philosophy as justification.

Ultimately, whether a filmmaker has been granted the status as an auteur or not, the notion that the mistreatment of women can be justified in any capacity is unacceptable, and to say otherwise is to uphold the gender imbalances that have led to the film industry's allowance of misconduct.

Appendix – Research Diary

Entry 1: Discussing Dissertation Topic

10.11.20

Prior to my first supervisor meeting, I had already decided that I wanted my dissertation to focus on the relationship between auteur filmmakers and actresses in Hollywood. In addition, I had formulated a research question that I believed would be interesting to explore: ‘what does the news coverage regarding the mistreatment of actresses by auteur filmmakers reveal about gender inequality in the film industry?’. In the meeting, I shared my initial ideas and research question with Nuno, and we had a discussion that led me to rethink my approach. Although Nuno agreed that exploring the relationship between auteurs and actresses would be a compelling research topic, he was sceptical about my idea to focus on the news coverage. More specifically, he believed that it would be limiting in terms of analysis because there are only a few perspectives that they are likely to offer: supporting the director, supporting the actress, or remaining impartial.

I found Nuno’s advice to be very valuable because it made me realise that although the research question may be intriguing, in reality it would be difficult to maintain the reader’s interest throughout the entire dissertation due to the predictability of the analysis. As a result, I have decided to reconsider my point of focus.

Presently, I’m considering changing my analysis to the factors that have allowed auteurs to evade lasting repercussions for their misconduct. I feel as though this will not only make for a thought-provoking dissertation but will also be enjoyable for me to write as I have always found the dynamic between auteurs and actresses to be quite unusual. Furthermore, I think it would be interesting to discuss due to the prevalence of the MeToo movement.

I now plan to research:

- The origins of auteurism.
- Incidents of misconduct inflicted by auteurs.
- Potential reasons for their ability to evade repercussions.

Entry 2: Literature Review Advice

09.12.20

In this meeting, Nuno gave me advice on how to approach my literature review and suggested some areas of research. Most notably, he suggested that I should research feminist film theory to support my analysis of the dynamic between auteurs and actresses. This was a great suggestion because there is an extensive history regarding gender in the film industry that has likely influenced some of the behaviours that I am going to discuss throughout my dissertation.

Thus far, I have read a text by Laura Mulvey that delves into the representation of women in film. The text does not directly relate to auteurs, but some of her observations certainly apply to their behaviour; for instance, her concept of the male gaze can be discussed in relation to the way in which actresses are seemingly used for the pleasure of auteurs. This is an argument that I hadn't previously considered so I'm appreciative that Nuno suggested to delve into feminist film theory.

I now plan to:

- Continue my research into feminist film theory.
- Explore the ways in which feminist film theory relates to auteurism.
- Plan the structure of my literature review.
- Complete a draft of my literature review.

Entry 3: Chapter Structure

17.02.21

After multiple drafts of my literature review, I've finally completed it to a standard that I'm satisfied with. In writing the literature review, the structure of the remainder of my dissertation is starting to become clear. The analysis is going to be written across three chapters that dissect the notions of irreplaceable creative genius, worthwhile abuse, and the philosophy of separating the art from the artist. I had been struggling to devise the structure of my dissertation but following the completion of my literature review I feel as though I'm more prepared. I'm going to share my plan with Nuno and begin a draft of my first chapter.

Entry 4: Adapting the Introduction

15.04.21

Before this meeting I had sent Nuno a draft of my dissertation and had informed him of some areas that I particularly needed advice on. For example, I had been contemplating removing the sections of my literature review that explore the criterions of auteurism through the works of Alfred Hitchcock as I was concerned that it may have detracted focus. However, Nuno advised me against removing these sections as he believed that they help the reader to understand the criterions more thoroughly.

Furthermore, Nuno expressed that before reading my dissertation he didn't agree with my belief that there is a correlation between auteurism and acts of misconduct; but was ultimately convinced once he read my arguments. However, he criticised my introduction for being too simplistic and failing to meet the standard of the rest of my dissertation. In order to improve this, he told me to be more in depth regarding my reasoning for wanting to discuss auteurs as opposed to regular filmmakers.

I now plan to:

- Ensure that I have made it clear as to why I have chosen to discuss auteurs rather than regular filmmakers.
- Emphasise the reasons as to why this is a topic that is worthy of discussion.

Nuno did not have any suggestions for the rest of my dissertation so I'm presuming that everything else is to a good standard; however, there are still some minor changes that I would like to make. In particular, I would like to improve my conclusion because currently I'm unconfident about whether it leaves a strong enough impression. I asked for Nuno's opinion regarding my worries, but he didn't agree that I needed to make any changes.

Overall, I found this meeting to be somewhat beneficial as Nuno's praise has given me more confidence in my dissertation; however, I'm concerned that his lack of suggestions for the rest may have limited my ability to make significant improvements.

Bibliography

- Allen, Michael P. and Lincoln, Anne E. (2004). 'Critical Discourse and the Cultural Consecration of American Films'. *Social forces*, Vol 82 (3): pp. 871-893.
- Anderson, Dianna E. (2018). *Problematic: How Toxic Callout Culture is Destroying Feminism*. Lincoln : Potomac Books.
- Barber, Nicholas (2014). 'Are the best directors tyrants?'. *BBC Culture* [online] Available: <https://www.bbc.com/culture/article/20141001-are-the-best-directors-tyrants#:~:text=%E2%80%9CBut%20his%20films%20are%20amazing,agree%20%E2%80%93%20up%20to%20a%20point>. [Accessed 5th April 2021].
- Barr, Charles (1999). *English Hitchcock*. Moffat: Cameron & Hollis.
- Barthes, Ronald (1967). 'The Death of the Author'. *Image, Music, Text*, Vol 1(1): pp. 142-148.
- Basinger, Jeanine (1993). *A Woman's View How Hollywood Spoke to Women*. London: Chatto.
- Bastián, Angelica J. (2016). 'Hollywood Has Ruined Method Acting'. *The Atlantic* [online] Available: <https://www.theatlantic.com/entertainment/archive/2016/08/hollywood-has-ruined-method-acting/494777/> [Accessed 10th February 2021].
- Berger, John (1972). *Ways of Seeing*. London: Penguin.
- Bertolucci, Bernardo (2013) Interviewed by Scott Feinberg for *The Hollywood Reporter*, 11th November. [online] Available: <https://www.hollywoodreporter.com/movies/movie-news/2013-interview-bernardo-bertolucci-denies-forced-sex-took-place-last-tango-rape-scene-952694/> [Accessed 15th March 2021].
- Billson, Anne (2013). 'Why do some film directors abuse their actors?'. *The Telegraph* [online] Available: <https://www.telegraph.co.uk/culture/film/10411273/Why-do-some-film-directors-abuse-their-actors.html?fb> [Accessed 10th March 2021].
- Boyd, David and Plamer, R. Barton (2011). 'Introduction: Recontextualizing Hitchcock's Authorship'. In R. Barton Plamer and David Boyd (Eds). *Hitchcock at the Source: The Auteur as Adaptor*, pp. 1-10. Albany: SUNY Press.
- Bradshaw, Peter (2003). 'Kill Bill: Volume 1'. *The Guardian* [online] Available: <https://www.theguardian.com/film/2003/oct/10/quentin-tarantino> [Accessed 8th March 2021].
- Brooks, Ann (1997). *Postfeminisms: Feminism, Cultural Theory and Cultural Forms*. London: Routledge.
- Brooks, Xan (2013). 'William Friedkin: "I got fired five times from The Exorcist!"'. *The Guardian* [online] Available: <https://www.theguardian.com/film/2013/sep/05/william-friedkin-the-exorcist-sorcerer-interview> [Accessed 3rd April 2021].
- Cobb, Shelley; and Horeck, Tanya (2018). 'Post Weinstein: gendered power and harassment in the media industries'. *Commentary and Criticism*, Vol 18(3): pp. 489-491.

Dekel, Tal (2014). *Gendered: Art and Feminist Theory*. Newcastle Upon Tyne, England: Cambridge Scholars Publishing

Duvall, Shelley (2018). Interviewed by Roger Ebert for *RogerEbert*, 14th December. [online] Available: <https://www.rogerebert.com/interviews/interview-with-shelley-duvall> [Accessed 8th February 2021].

Eliot, T.S (1919). 'Tradition and the Individual Talent'. *Egoist*, Vol 5(1): pp. 1-3.

Eliot, T.S (1923). 'The Function of Criticism'. *Criterion*, Vol 2(5): pp. 38.

Evans, Alan (2016). 'Tippi Hedren: Alfred Hitchcock sexually assaulted me'. *The Guardian* [online] Available: <https://www.theguardian.com/film/2016/oct/31/tippi-hedren-alfred-hitchcock-sexually-assaulted-me> [Accessed 8th February 2021].

Falsafi, Parinaz; Khorashad, Somayeh K and Khorashad Larousse K (2011). 'Psychological Analysis of Alfred Hitchcock's Movies'. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, Vol 30: pp. 2520-2524.

Ford, Clementine (2018). 'We let 'male genius' excuse bad behaviour – but what about the loss of female genius?'. *The Guardian* [online] Available: <https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2018/nov/06/we-let-male-genius-excuse-bad-behaviour-but-what-about-the-loss-of-female-genius> [Accessed 4th April 2021].

Gilbey, Ryan (2018). 'The end of the auteur?'. *The Guardian* [online] Available: <https://www.theguardian.com/film/2018/mar/23/the-end-of-the-auteur> [Accessed 19th February 2021]

Grady, Constance (2019). 'What do we do when the art we love was created by a monster?'. *Vox* [online] Available: <https://www.vox.com/culture/2018/10/11/17933686/me-too-separating-artist-art-johnny-depp-woody-allen-michael-jackson-louis-ck> [Accessed 12th April 2021].

Grosoli, Marco (2018). *Eric Rohmer's Film Theory: From "Ecole Scherer" to "Politique des Auteurs"*. Amsterdam : Amsterdam University Press.

Grumbacher, Steven (1976). 'Andrew Sarris and the Politique des Auteurs (1962-1974): An Assessment and an Analysis'. *Masters Thesis & Specialist Projects* [online] Available: <https://digitalcommons.wku.edu/theses/1558/> [Accessed 2nd January 2021].

Hadas, Leora (2020). *Authorship as Promotional Discourse in the Screen Industries: Selling Genius*. Abingdon, Oxon ; New York: Routledge.

Hedren, Tippi (2016). *Tippi: A Memoir*. New York: Harper Collins Publishers.

Hedren, Tippi (2017). 'I'll ruin your career'. Interviewed for *BBC News*, 20th October. [online] Available: <https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/av/entertainment-arts-41691293> [Accessed 3rd January 2021].

Hess, Amanda (2017). 'How the Myth of the Artistic Genius Excuses the Abuse of Women'. *The New York Times* [online] Available: <https://www.nytimes.com/2017/11/10/arts/sexual-harassment-art-hollywood.html> [Accessed 7th January 2021].

- Hornaday, Ann (2018). 'Uma Thurman, Quentin Tarantino and the Costs of Auteur Worship'. *The Washington Post* [online] Available: https://www.washingtonpost.com/lifestyle/style/uma-thurman-quentin-tarantino-and-the-costs-of-auteur-worship/2018/02/04/d54da4f8-09e7-11e8-8b0d-891602206fb7_story.html [Accessed 9th March 2021]
- Houston, Anjelica (2021). Interviewed by Seth Abramovitch for *The Hollywood Report*, 11th February. [online] Available: <https://www.hollywoodreporter.com/movies/movie-news/searching-for-shelley-duvall-the-reclusive-icon-on-fleeing-hollywood-and-the-scars-of-making-the-shining-4130256/> [Accessed 8th February 2021].
- Johnson, Albert (1972). 'Reviewed Work: Frenzy by Alfred Hitchcock'. *Film Quarterly*, Vol 26(1): pp. 58-60.
- Kael, Pauline (1963). 'Circles and Squares'. *Film Quarterly*, Vol 16(3): pp. 12-26.
- Kantor, Jodi and Twohey, Megan (2017). 'Harvey Weinstein Paid Off Sexual Harassment Accusers for Decades'. *The New York Times* [online] Available: <https://www.nytimes.com/2017/10/05/us/harvey-weinstein-harassment-allegations.html> [Accessed 2nd December 2020].
- Kapsis, Robert E. (1986). 'Reputation Building and the Film Art World: The Case of Alfred Hitchcock'. *The Sociological Quarterly*, Vol 30(1): pp. 15-35.
- Kapsis, Robert E. (1992). *Hitchcock: The Making of a Reputation*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Kazan, Eli (1973) 'What Makes a Director'. Transcript in *Action Magazine* (1973) [online] Available: <https://www.dga.org/~media/Files/TheGuild/Committees/Kazan.ashx> [Accessed 2nd January 2021].
- Kellner, Douglas (1995). *Media Culture: Cultural studies, Identity, and Politics Between the Modern and the Postmodern*. London; New York: Routledge.
- King, Stephen (2014). Interviewed by Andy Greene for *Rolling Stone*, 11th February. Available: <https://www.rollingstone.com/culture/culture-features/stephen-king-the-rolling-stone-interview-191529/> [Accessed 8th February 2021].
- Kini, Aditi N. (2018). 'The Myth of the Male Genius'. *BitchMedia* [online] Available: <https://www.bitchmedia.org/article/myth-male-genius> [Accessed 4th April 2021].
- Lattanzio, Ryan (2014). 'Four Directors Who Torture Their Actors, from Hitch to Trier (CLIPS)'. *IndieWire* [online] Available: <https://www.indiewire.com/2014/03/four-directors-who-torture-their-actors-from-hitch-to-trier-clips-193030/> [Accessed 10th March 2021].
- Leitch, Thomas (2011). 'Hitchcock from Stage to Page'. In R. Barton Plamer and David Boyd (Eds). *Hitchcock at the Source: The Auteur as Adaptor*, pp. 11-32. Albany: SUNY Press
- Loney-Howes, Rachel E. (2019) '#MeToo and the politics of social change'. In Bianca Fileborn and Rachel E. Loney-Howes (Eds.), *The Politics of the Personal: The Evolution of*

Anti-rape Activism from Second-Wave Feminism to #MeToo, pp. 21-35. Switzerland: Palgrave Macmillan.

Loughrey, Clarisse (2018). 'Why do we excuse male directors like Quentin Tarantino for making women suffer 'for the sake of art'?'. *The Telegraph* [online] Available: <https://www.independent.co.uk/arts-entertainment/films/features/quentin-tarantino-male-directors-abusive-women-uma-thurman-timesup-excuse-celebrate-metoo-a8196986.html> [Accessed 6th February 2021].

Mamata, Bidisha (2010). 'What's wrong with Hitchcock's women'. *The Guardian* [online] Available: <https://www.theguardian.com/film/2010/oct/21/alfred-hitchcock-women-psycho-the-birds-bidisha> [Accessed 8th February 2021].

Martin, Jay (1992). 'The Aesthetic Alibi'. *Salmagundi*, Vol 93: pp. 13-25.

Menne, Jeff (2011). 'The Cinema of Defection: Auteur Theory and Institutional Life'. *Representations*, Vol 114(1) pp: 36-64.

Mulvey, Laura (1975). 'Visual Pleasure and Narrative Cinema'. *Screen*, Volume 16(3): pp. 6–18.

Nathan, Ian (2012). 'The Shining Review'. *Empire* [online] Available: <https://www.empireonline.com/movies/reviews/shining-2-review/> [Accessed 10th March 2021].

Phillis, David (2018). 'Bernardo Bertolucci and Separating the Art from the Artist'. *Awards Daily* [online] Available: <https://www.awardsdaily.com/2018/11/28/bernardo-bertolucci-and-separating-the-art-from-the-artist/> [Accessed 9th April 2021].

Pulver, Andrew (2019). 'Stanley Kubrick: film's obsessive genius rendered more human'. *The Guardian* [online] Available: <https://www.theguardian.com/film/2019/apr/26/stanley-kubrick-films-obsessive-genius-rendered-more-human> [Accessed 9th February 2021].

Ross, Graeme (2020). 'Alfred Hitchcock's 20 greatest films, from Rebecca to The Birds'. *Independent* [online] Available: <https://www.independent.co.uk/arts-entertainment/films/features/hitchcock-best-films-rebecca-the-birds-oscars-b421113.html> [Accessed 4th January 2021].

Rothstein, Mervyn (2003). 'Elia Kazan, Influential Director, Is Dead at 94'. *The New York Times* [online] Available: <https://www.nytimes.com/2003/09/29/movies/elia-kazan-influential-director-is-dead-at-94.html> [Accessed 3rd March 2021].

Samadder, Rhik (2012). 'My favourite Hitchcock: Vertigo'. *The Guardian* [online] Available: <https://www.theguardian.com/film/filmblog/2012/aug/10/my-favourite-hitchcock-vertigo> [Accessed 2nd January 2021].

Sarris, Andrew (1962). 'Notes on the Auteur Theory'. *Film Culture*, Vol 27, pp. 1–8.

Schneider, Maria (2007). Interviewed by Lina Das for *The Daily Mail*, 19th July. Available: <https://www.dailymail.co.uk/tvshowbiz/article-469646/I-felt-raped-Brando.html> [Accessed 10th April 2021].

- Sedgwick, Claire (2019). 'Reclaiming the Screen: Addressing Overlooked Women in Film and Television'. *Feminist Media Studies*, Vol 19(6): pp. 916-918.
- Siddiquee, Imran (2017). 'Why Do We Let "Genius" Directors Get Away With Abusive Behavior?'. *Buzzfeed* [online] Available: <https://www.buzzfeednews.com/article/imransiddiquee/hollywood-abusive-auteur-problem> [Accessed 7th March 2021].
- Silverman, Jason M. (2011). 'Pseudepigraphy, Anonymity, and Auteur Theory'. *Religion and the Arts*, Vol 15(4): pp. 520-555.
- Sonbert, Warren (2015). 'Alfred Hitchcock, Master of Morality'. *Framework: The Journal of Cinema and Media*, Vol. 56(1): pp. 200-203.
- Spoto, Donald (1983). *The Dark Side of Genius: The Life of Alfred Hitchcock*. London: Collins.
- Thurman, Uma (2018) Interviewed by Maureen Dowd for *The New York Times* [online] Available: <https://www.nytimes.com/2018/02/03/opinion/sunday/this-is-why-uma-thurman-is-angry.html> [Accessed 6th March 2021].
- Tredge, David (2013). 'A Case Study on Film Authorship: Exploring the Theoretical and Practical Sides in Film Production'. *Elon Journal of Undergraduate Research in Communications*, Vol 4(2): pp. 2-4.
- Truffaut, François (1954). 'A Certain Tendency in French Cinema'. Reprinted in *Movies and Methods*. Vol 1: pp. 224-237.
- VanArendonk, Kathryn (2017). 'Why Some Artists Are Never Separated From Their Work (and Why Louis C.K. Was)'. *Vulture* [online] Available: <https://www.vulture.com/2017/11/louis-c-k-and-separating-artists-from-their-work.html> [Accessed 8th March 2021].
- VanDerWerff, Emily (2017). 'Hollywood coddles abusers of all types in the name of making "great art"'. *Vox* [online] Available: <https://www.vox.com/culture/2017/10/27/16552834/hollywood-assholes> [Accessed 5th February 2021].
- Wilson, Ashleigh (2019). *On Artists*. Melbourne University Publishing.
- Wollen, Peter (1969). 'The auteur theory'. In Peter Wollen (Eds.), *Signs and Meaning in the Cinema*, pp. 74 – 115. London: Secker & Warburg in association with the British Film Institute.
- Zacharek, Stephanie; Dockterman, Eliana; and Edwards Haley S. (2017). 'The Silence Breakers'. *Time* [online] Available: <https://time.com/time-person-of-the-year-2017-silence-breakers/> [Accessed 2nd December 2020].
- Zalewski, Daniel (2011). 'Show the Monster'. *The New Yorker* [online] Available: <https://www.newyorker.com/magazine/2011/02/07/show-the-monster> [Accessed 9th January 2021].

Filmography

3 Women (Robert Altman, 1977, US)
American Hustle (David O’Russell, 2013, US)
Annie Hall (Woody Allen, 1977, US)
Frenzy (Alfred Hitchcock, 1972, UK)
Kill Bill: Volume 1 (Quentin Tarantino, 2003, US)
Making ‘The Shining’ (Vivian Kubrick, 1980, UK)
Marnie (Alfred Hitchcock, 1964, US)
Psycho (Alfred Hitchcock, 1960, US)
Shelley Duvall/Joan Armatrading ([Saturday Night Live], NBC, 1977)
Strangers on a Train (Alfred Hitchcock, 1951, US)
The Birds (Alfred Hitchcock, 1963, US)
The Exorcist (William Friedkin, 1973, US)
The Last Tango in Paris (Bernardo Bertolucci, 1972, ITL)
The Revenant (Alejandro G. Iñárritu, 2015, US)
The Shining (Stanley Kubrick, 1980, UK)
Transformers (Michael Bay, 2007, US)
Vertigo (Alfred Hitchcock, 1958, US)