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Pornography reappropriated by feminist and queer pornographers is being reimagined as a site of activist productions, be it through the reshaping of desire or engaging with wider discussions of representational politics. Here, I take up Shine Louise Houston’s feature length film, *The Wild Search*, as a unique case study for addressing the relationship between debates of identity politics and queer activist practice. Houston has prioritized gender diversity and racial diversity across her career as a pornographer. This dedication to diversity and representational politics has been highlighted by the Feminist Porn Awards, winning her awards for ‘dyke’ and ‘trans’ representation, and the film in question won Best Trans Sex Scene in 2007. What is of interest regarding the role of trans, genderqueer, and bisexual sexual performers who participate in the sex scenes of *The Wild Search*, is that the mockumentary’s narrative is dependent upon labelling these performers as ‘lesbians’, meaning that internal to the narrative structure, the sexual and gender diversity that the film seeks to place on screen is actively denied.

The mockumentary follows the allegedly heterosexual documentary film-maker and researcher, Georgia Mann, into the San Francisco wild to discover the truth behind lesbian sexuality. What follows is an exploration of how queer pornography can simultaneously work with and against identity politics.

A decade after two academic journals’ special issues – *New Literary History: Is There Life After Identity Politics?* (2000) and *Journal of Gay, Lesbian, and Bisexual Identity: Queer Values, Beyond Identity* (1999) – declared the death of identity politics, it might seem anachronistic to be writing about the relevance of identity politics to contemporary and theoretically informed queer activism. I propose that *The Wild Search* addresses identity politics as a redux. ‘Redux’ refers not only to the untimeliness of an object, but also to the transformation of an object as it is pulled from a previous situated moment. Redux is about reintroducing, revisiting, and remembering. It does not quite make the old new. It makes the old newly relevant. It brings the forgotten into the foreground. For in the twenty-first century, *The Wild Search*...
Search is a reflection on divisive debates within feminist movements, from identity politics of women’s rights and lesbian separatism, to what Butler described as ‘an embarrassed “etc.”’, to internal turns in queer cultures of increasing identity specificity. In casting bisexual cis women, genderqueer, and trans performers in this pornographic mockumentary of ‘lesbian sex’ Houston revisits debates characteristic of Anglo-America’s queer theory’s nascence, throwing them on screen for erotic consumption for both margin and centre.

To situate my reading of Houston’s porno as an intervention into queer theory, I will return to a debate that might seem to be already over – the role of identity politics in contemporary queer activism. This requires situating debates in identity politics across sociology, queer studies, and personal storytelling; through this process I hope to evince that the proselytizers for and iconoclasts against ‘identity politics’ have little in common when it comes to the term’s definition, but much more in common when it comes to political strategies and concerns. There is not the space in this paper to do a complete genealogy of identity politics as they relate to queer theory; rather, I am introducing key aspects of the debates of identity politics, which I believe Houston’s mockumentary is engaging with. From here, I argue that The Wild Search manoeuvres Houston’s audiences into indeterminate and mutable relationships with the subjects they consume by implementing strategies of misappellation (marking bisexual and gender variant bodies as lesbians) and strategic silences (refusal of self-identification and colour blindness). In so doing, Houston has created a piece of pornography that can feed audiences a serving of identity politics, or a rejection of the same.

IDENTITY POLITICS IN (ANGLOPHONE) QUEER STUDIES

Whether it is being clung to redemptively or discredited with an eye roll, at its very evocation ‘identity politics’ has the potential to foment controversy in feminist circles. In a threefold process, I seek to describe the debates between identity politics and coalition politics; elucidate how identity politics have been framed in relationship to language, the body, and materialist perspectives; and conclude by returning to queer theory’s distinction between identity and identification. What I hope to show is circularity in the framing of the investments, benefits, and limitations of identity politics and anti-identity politics.
In her review of the identity politics debates in the social sciences, Mary Bernstein documents that the term first appeared in academic literature in 1979 in an article addressing activism among persons with disabilities. Bernstein notes that throughout the 1980s the term ‘identity politics’ only appeared in the abstracts of three scholarly journals. From this approach, Bernstein argues that identity politics only became a contentious site of academic debate in the mid-1990s. However, scholars such as Grant Farred and Marlon Ross are not so quick to limit identity politics to a history that starts with its pronouncement in academic publications. Ross argues that this kind of reading lends itself to treating identity politics as though it were nothing more than an ephemeral academic tryst, only to be later ignored, if not ejected in the harsh light of the morning after. Rather, Ross would have scholars and activists alike recognize that ‘it makes a difference that there was a politics of identity before the “identity politics” that we are supposedly about to lose forever’. The argument goes: an identity politics of any other name would smell as (bitter)sweet. Ross believes that, regardless of what scholars have called it, contemporary debates on identity politics must be located in a long history where ‘identity’ is at the ‘heart’ of political debate. Farred, alternatively, offers a more contemporary contextualization of the conditions of possibility for what scholars presently recognize as identity politics. Farred locates identity politics as a direct outcome of particular approaches to class struggles of the 1960s–80s in the United Kingdom, which emphasized the struggles of white, able-bodied, heterosexual men. That is, the particularization of the supposedly ‘universal struggle’. Farred argues it was the shifts in the American and British New Left politics that gave rise to minority constituencies who could show themselves to be more fluid than the fixed categories they were confined to, while also banding together in the name of shared struggle.

In tracing the debates of identity versus coalition politics, I hope to show that arguments against identity politics collectively appear as fragmented, contradictory, and blurred. Authors argue that identity politics may force people to pigeonhole their identities into a single coherent narrative, one that is not only static over time, but also denies intersecting identities. This denies any wholeness to a person, and reduces marginalized populations to the very identity that dominant discourses mark and emphasize as other. They assert that political action mobilized under an identity label risks falling prey to the loathed four-sylla-
ble word ‘essentialist’.\textsuperscript{19} There is concern that working with an identity category will reimagine that very identity in terms of rigid boundaries, creating not only exclusions, but also hierarchies of experience.\textsuperscript{20} For those who perceive lesbian and gay identity politics as following from a civil rights model of normalizing the marginalized population under dominant discourses, identity politics may lead activism toward aims of accessing heterosexual privilege, rather than critiquing normative structures and expectations.\textsuperscript{21} This means that bodies and identities that might not read as ‘normal enough’ for the normalizing process are often left behind and asked to sacrifice their unique needs for the ‘greater good’. This is not a problem unique to queer issues, as women of colour and indigenous women have been long problematizing false divisions between decolonialization/anti-racism and feminist/women’s issues.\textsuperscript{22}

Taking a different spin on the same problem, some scholars have faulted identity politics as exclusionary.\textsuperscript{23} Farred historicizes this aspect of identity politics debates in the United Kingdom among activists who perceive their struggles as outside identity politics. Farred takes up the example of those Marxists that viewed the shift to identity politics as creating both dissent and distraction. If the only true struggle is class struggle – and class is imagined outside the purview of identity – and if it is accepted that with the elimination of class imbalances all other inequities will cease to exist (the anti-oppression will trickle down), then focusing on identity-based activism is a distraction from the most important activist goals.\textsuperscript{24} This is only a more precise – and notably structural – version of an increasing preference for coalitional politics above identity politics.\textsuperscript{25}

Coalition politics are supposed to unite people based upon an issue, rather than upon a shared identity or experience. This strategy is appealing to those who believe it will take a critical mass to create change. Sometimes this takes the form of an anti-identity and universalist critique, whereby the coalition is supposed to become a global force. In other cases, smaller coalitions are built between groups of people who are perceived to have similar (enough) aims. However, people who experience multiple marginalizations have problematized coalitional organizing. For example, Bernice Reagon writes, ‘we [referring to women of colour] have built too many coalitions with people who don’t understand our work, we have collaborated too much with our enemies’.\textsuperscript{26} Thus the costs of compromise in coalition building might outweigh the gains from a critical mass of participants. Reagon continues:
‘The only reason you would consider trying to team up with somebody who could possibly kill you, is because that’s the only way you can figure you can stay alive.’

Reagon’s statement is not presented as a critique of coalitional politics, but as a reflection upon the dangers that accompany collaboration on issues of prejudice and oppression with those who benefit from a group’s subordination. It is a meditation, not a rebuttal. For Reagon, the issue of community building – the creation of safe (or safer) spaces for marginalized groups – is one tactic, and working for a revolution is another. Strategies of inclusion and exclusion cannot be used identically for both.

Returning to discussions of coalition building specific to queer issues, Robert Broookkey, Diane Miller, and Warren Blumenfeld problematize coalition politics within queer circles. They argue that there is a value in recognizing specificity. Even if one is exclusively discussing the cultural differences between monosexual gay men and lesbians in the United States, there is little reason to assume that the groups should have enough in common to easily build a coalition, that they will feel they need the same things, or that they will assign similar priorities to particular struggles. Stepping outside the monosexual, cisgender parameter, romham gallacher writes, ‘But my and their beautiful selves are not necessarily interconnected through the fact of our trans-ness, and we don’t need to consider each other in all our decisions about our own bodies’, reminding readers that a shared identity marker does not make for similar experiences or needs. However, Jewelle Gomez posits that even where shared experiences might not be captured, a radical individualism that rejects utilizing identity compromises the ability to discuss structure, and one is left instead with isolated incidents. Advocates of identity politics have used similar arguments to demonstrate that anti-identity positions may border on the ahistorical and apolitical. Thus, both identity politics and coalition politics experience censure for being too exclusionary, collapsing difference, uniting people under a false pretence of similarity, participating in the oppression they seek to eradicate, and fractioning off fragments of the self.

Though Homi Bhabha argued fifteen years ago that scholars in the humanities are in a period of ‘sobriety to semiotic and post-structuralist celebrations’, critics of postmodernism, post-structuralism, and deconstruction perceive the consequences of theorizing identity to the point of its repudiation as a threat to bodily materiality. In response to critiques against the exclusionary practices of identity politics (uniting as a spe-
specific demographic of people, excludes allies), some feminists in the sex wars of the 1970s–80s declared a need for those exclusionary practices to exist.\textsuperscript{34} Take, for example, Jacquelyn Zita’s vehement censure of queer theory’s postmodernism as bifurcating the sexed body from gender and sexual identity:

The ‘male lesbian’ is perhaps right in challenging the commonplace criteria of sex attribution but wrong in his conclusion. His failure to become a lesbian in all her fullness – dare I say ‘a real lesbian’ – is not a failure of postmodernist tools but a lacuna in postmodernist ontology and a failure to recognize the individual’s real powerlessness against the imposition of other-extending attributions that ‘sex’ the flesh. In this failure is a discovery of the historically located body – a discovery of the historical gravity of a culturally constructed ‘sexed’ body. Against the intellectual anorexia of postmodernism, this body stubbornly returns with a weight that defies the promises of postmodernist fantasy and its idealist denial.\textsuperscript{35}

Zita frames postmodernism as antagonistic to the body, capturing some of the feelings expressed by Reagon on coalitions.\textsuperscript{36} Zita’s argument is familiar to anyone who followed the controversy sparked by Gender Trouble. Butler argues, ‘the body is not a “being,” but a variable boundary, a surface whose permeability is politically regulated, a signifying practice within a cultural field of gender hierarchy and compulsory heterosexuality.’ Therefore, theorists have a dearth of language ‘for understanding this corporeal enactment, gender, that constitutes its “interior” signification on its surface’.\textsuperscript{37} From these and similar claims, many feminists inferred – sometimes vehemently critiquing this position, other times adopting it – that Butler has argued that bodies are irrelevant, mutable, or unimportant.\textsuperscript{38} Taking up the side of vehement repudiation, Zita conceives of feminist deconstruction practices as antithetical to emotional investment in matter, bodies, flesh. Zita wants to challenge postmodernist and post-structuralist approaches to the body, for fear that from such positions solidarity born of sameness will be made impossible. While Zita’s focus on the emotional attachment to a historically located discourse is different from other types of essentialist rejections of feminist postmodernisms, Zita’s privileging of a single narrative of need and injury – those Zita imagines as the ‘real lesbians’ who do not want their women-only spaces penetrated by trans women – undoes the weight of the argument. Zita’s diagnosis of postmodernism’s ‘intellectual anorexia’ may work for the converted, but it is also unconvincing for the unconverted. Anyone who is injured by identity politics,
injured by the rigorous policing of gender and sexual boundaries may find themselves in cross-identification with Zita’s intended cisgender reader. The critiques and debates encircling identity politics, coalition politics, and solidarity were both fuelled by and continue to fuel post-structuralist and postmodern conversations with identity, anti-identity, and queerness.

Where one lands on the oversimplified dichotomy of pro-/anti-identity (politics) is often informed by where one has drawn the line between politicizing identity or identification. Queer theorists have long been invested in the labelling process as a mechanism of regulation and injury, and some scholars have taken this as a means of rejecting those labels created to define and limit bodies on the margins. However, others who draw more carefully on Michel Foucault believe these labels are not purely repressive; this language does not stop at facilitating one’s ability to speak about another, but rather gives a language for that very other to speak with. Susan Bickford highlights ‘the experience of identity as noncategorical, as multiple’. She does not perceive identity politics to be at odds with postmodernism’s privileging of a bricolage model of the self. Rather, she hopes that by dwelling on both particularity and commonality, identity can be politicized without becoming reductive. Similarly, Cheryl Dobinson discusses the pleasurable and celebratory dimensions of incorporating a multiplicity of identities ‘previously claimed as mine, even those that seem contradictory, or broad enough to encompass all others’. For some, identity politics becomes a mechanism of politicizing identities, acknowledging and recognizing those that are fractious and fluid. This is the very comfort with contradiction that Rosi Braidotti has been calling for in her reconciliation of essentialism and postmodern feminisms. And, whether one is fighting for or against a politics of identity, the boundaries between author, theory, and experience become porous.

Joshua Gamson decides that the problem with trying to draw any conclusions about the usefulness and validity of identity politics ‘is that both the boundary-strippers and the boundary-defenders are right’. The distinction between singular-coherent and multiple-fractious identity politics can come down to the distinction between taking identity as a given ontological object, and viewing identity as that which can only be accessed through processes of identification. For Butler (at least once upon a time), identification is ‘phantasmatic’ and ‘imaginary’; it makes an unachievable end goal of a coherent and actualized ‘I’ that is
instead ‘incessantly reconstituted’.\textsuperscript{46} Drawing on similar language, Stuart Hall locates identification as a means of negotiating lack and excess.\textsuperscript{47} Positions that take up an identity politics of this ilk – though they might reject the term itself – locate the potential of ‘identity politics’ in the ways it creates politics of a different kind of identity, one that self-reflexively recognizes its own unattainability. Identification becomes a project imagined in motion, hence the emphasis on the project of ‘becoming’ rather than ‘being’.\textsuperscript{48} Thus, whether we consider the result of such conclusions to be one of ‘identity politics’ or ‘anti-identity politics’ might turn out to be all in a name.

\textsc{Representing Anti-Identity}

Moving to \textit{The Wild Search}, I will explore how iterations and silences alter the reception of bodies and identities projected on screen, and how this affects (extra-)diegetic representations. Between scenes of bodies in the throes of sensual ecstasy, Shine Louise Houston’s \textit{The Wild Search}, self-described as a ‘pomo-homo-docu-mockumentary’, offers a critique of identity categorization, ethnography, and exoticizing approaches to studying otherness. The film’s epigraph cites Nietzsche and reads: ‘To become what one is, one must not have the faintest notion of what one is’, which is embodied through the untrustworthy narrator of the mockumentary, Georgia Mann. Georgia is an assertively self-declared, though discursively questionable, ‘heterosexual’, white, documentary film-maker, who is on a quest to discover the truth about cisgender heterosexuality and herself via the study of her perceived other, lesbians. In the opening scene, a camera operator jumps on porn star Bo Flexxx\textsuperscript{49} to tag them with a tracking device that allows the crew to follow them within the natural habitat of the streets of San Francisco. Georgia Mann explains her project:

\begin{quote}
If we are ever going to know the true inner nature of ourselves, then we must move past our clear understanding of heterosexuality and into the darkness of homosexuality. Lesbians are obviously different from women like myself. I’m straight. I like men, no doubt about it. But, what I want to know is what makes them so different from me. I mean sex between two women must be completely different from normal heterosexual sex. By tracking their sexual behaviour, I hope to get the answers I want. There’s something so fascinating about them.
\end{quote}
Houston’s critique of the externally applied ‘lesbian’ label is not subtle. On the one hand, Georgia’s language clearly locates privileges and power structures that come into play, not only through the creation of category, but also through the stabilization and reinforcement of categories via ‘naming’ and ‘recording’, the authority to claim her own first person, and the definition in reference to the other who is marked by that very process of naming. This claiming of the ‘name’ is all the more pronounced, as Georgia is the only character in the mockumentary with a proper name. The porn stars are only assigned names in the closing credits, some of which act as ethnographic pseudonyms, different from the other names they have performed under; and the queer camera crew employed by Georgia are listed as Camera A and Camera B. As the speaking subject, Georgia has the agency to name others. Explicit in Houston’s critique of the academy is Georgia’s role as a heterosexual researcher, wherein her belief in truth and empiricism is bound up in her feelings of entitlement to access and label the bodies of those whom she inaccurately perceives to be lesbians, and in so doing leads the audience to believe this as well. Georgia’s monologues about her project are unmistakably othering. Her averring that ‘heterosexuality’ is already well understood and normal in contrast to lesbian difference, and that the value of studying lesbianism comes from the potential it has to reveal knowledge of value to heterosexuals, elicits laughter at her naiveté facilitated through privilege and outsider status. The act of labelling becomes tantamount to the creation of hierarchy out of difference. At the same time, from her first elocutions – as a declared heterosexual woman longing to track lesbians in their natural habitat and film them having sex – the audience gets their first hint that perhaps Georgia doth protest too much. And as the opening quote by Nietzsche implies, it is the secret she keeps from herself that propels Georgia on this journey of her own sexual becoming.

Georgia’s documentary is problematized not only by the exoticizing language she uses to describe her subjects, but also through a mislabeling and misrecognition of her subjects. For none of the sexual performers in the film, caught on tape in the San Francisco wild to explain lesbian sexuality, actually identify as lesbians. Rather, the actors in this docu-mockumentary sexually identify as bisexuals, pansexuals, queers, and gay men – identities that are not mutually exclusive. Arguably, the scene that draws most attention to the trope of ‘capturing real lesbian sex’ is in a brief cutaway to a piece of hetero-lezbo porno, which Geor-
gia introduces into her own narrative as though it were also a piece of documentary footage. The cutaway to *Lezbo Luv. #1* portrays two thin, white, big-breasted, blond women tapping one another on their clitorises and whispering the sweet nothings, ‘Oh, yeah’ and ‘I think your hair is pretty too.’ By referring to this piece of hetero-lezbo porno, Georgia references the genre of pornography involving multiple women that caters to the desires of heterosexual men. One might conclude that, by mislabelling *Lezbo Luv. #1* as a documentary itself, Georgia considers visual representation to capture truth. Georgia quips that the only flaw with accessing knowledge about lesbian sexuality from such a source is that the subjects were all too aware of the process of observation, and thus tainted the data with observer bias. If this moment is read as pure confusion on Georgia’s part, it may just be laughed off as another example of Georgia’s ignorance about her objects of study.

However, such a mislabelling opens itself to further complications, given that the mockumentary plays with insider and outsider cultural literacies of queerness. The cutaway to hetero-lezbo porno can remind queer-feminist audience members of the critiques of such representations of lesbian sexuality, perhaps most obviously including the declarations that actresses in these films ‘are not real lesbians’ or ‘that’s not what real lesbian sex looks like’. This works to reaffirm the idea that the San Francisco subjects of Georgia’s documentary – queers with short, if not asymmetric hair; of various body sizes; and of racial diversity – are the real lesbians, in contrast to the fake lesbians of *Lezbo Luv. #1*. However, the humour of the clip builds momentum by revealing the problematic essentialism behind such a critique, given that in Georgia’s documentary, which is also Houston’s mockumentary, none of these actors identify as lesbians either. The veracity of a docu-mockumentary becomes the butt of the joke. Though Georgia’s narrative works to hide it, Houston’s audience watches bisexuals, genderqueers, bad bois, and trans entities. By such juxtaposition, Houston’s mockumentary hints that the lesbian labels in Georgia’s documentary might be as problematically applied and criticized in *The Wild Search* as they are in *Lezbo Luv. #1*. Although Georgia cites *Lezbo Luv. #1* as an inspiration for her own project – which can be read as referring to both her documentary and the exploration of her own sexuality – this cutaway reminds audiences of the long history of queer reappropriations of mainstream representations, wherein one is still able to find material for erotic and emotional investment. Meaning that, as the critique of veracity via visual
media is implied, what is produced from affective identifications and longings is not placed under attack. Georgia does so in her relationship with *Lezbo Luv. #1*, which is framed as humorous, but parallels the reactions of those viewers of Houston’s mockumentary who leave the film discussing the performers using feminine pronouns, whereas for the genderqueer and trans entities performers, neutral and masculine pronouns are preferred. Audience members are permitted to leave *The Wild Search* championing the successful portrayal of lesbian sexuality – a portrayal that does not reflect the identities of the bodies and subjectivities it uses to make such a representation. And like the fluid shift of one sexual position to another, authenticity is turned on its head in the name of discovering new pleasures. Houston thus interrogates the feeling of community and identification in cases of misrecognition. *The Wild Search* contrasts Georgia’s assignment of the lesbian label with depictions of sexuality that either fail to conform to – or hostilely reject – heteronormative and homonormative assumptions of what lesbian sexuality is supposed to be. In the process, Houston critiques externally imposed value structures on ‘lesbian politics’, and demonstrates through manipulating an emotional relationship between audience and characters/porn stars the inaccuracy of self-imposed group definitions. In this respect, Houston accomplishes the task for mimicry set out by Akiko Shimizu by presenting ‘the image as suspicious of deception, of not corresponding to the “truth” to which it is supposed to refer’.\(^5\)

However, within the structure of the critique that *The Wild Search* makes of the imposition of the ‘lesbian’ label, there are two other forms of identity that are linguistically ignored within the narrative. Shine Louise Houston sets up her critique of the lesbian label by aggressively marking her subjects as lesbians to be studied by heterosexuals. The mockumentary’s humour is contingent upon the labelling in itself, regardless of the audience’s awareness that the actors do not identify as lesbians. The narrative works more subtly with gender and race as marked signifiers outside Georgia’s single-issue ‘lesbian’ identity fetish. Houston could be said to be balancing tensions between the dialogues of visibility and oppression in her use of the aggressive marking of her subjects as ‘lesbians’. ‘Lesbian’ then tacitly pulls the performers in the category of women, while race goes unmentioned within the narrative. The debates surrounding the comparability of ‘visibility’ and oppression across sexual, gendered, sexed, and raced lines are outside of the scope of this paper. However, it is clear that Houston designs a narrator and
narrative that accepts that these are not interchangeable categories when it comes to description and attention within the mockumentary. Drawing on Sedgwick’s argument that silence too can function as performance, and Butler’s belief that it might be a strategic speech act, I want to contrast the aggressive verbal marking of the subjects as lesbians with the silence around them as gendered and raced subjects.

The questions of sex and gender are inextricably entangled with the lesbian label. Sedgwick explicates that among the few qualifiers of having a monosexual identity – that is, heterosexual, lesbian, or gay – is to have one’s own gender and/or sex. For words like ‘lesbian’ or ‘heterosexual’ are about relational attraction, that is, attraction not only through the gender of object choice, but also through one’s own gender, and through the way the desiring subject longs to be recognized and desired in return. Had Houston been exclusively interested in critiquing the ‘lesbian’ label, she could have cast her mockumentary complete with cis women actresses who fall outside monosexuality, be they bisexual, queer, or pansexual. However, Houston chose to include genderqueer and trans performers beside cisgender bisexual women. The play on gender here foregrounds not only that one might not be able to tell whether or not one is watching lesbian sex, but also whether or not one is watching women, while seeing naked bodies on screen. The collapsing of ‘lesbian’ as a term reserved for cis women, as seen in Zita’s argument, is tied into the transphobia of American lesbian separatism and women-only spaces, which often become cis women-only spaces. One might be tempted to read Houston’s inclusion of assigned female at birth trans and genderqueer performers who have not undergone hormones or surgery, as a transphobic inclusion that perpetuates the prejudices of organizations like the Michigan Women’s Music festival, where such bodies are included contingent on their capacity to pass as women-identified women; trans persons who have received hormones and surgery, and all trans women regardless of their interaction with medicalized corporeal transformations are rejected for not being ‘real women’, and are refused participation. But rather, I think Houston’s sophisticated critique of the lesbian label warrants a reparative reading of how sex and gender play into her project. Houston invites audiences to experience these bodies, which they might otherwise not find in a ‘lesbian’ project or ‘space’, and in so doing, uses arousal and (mis)recognition to gesture toward how flawed the processes of deciding whose sex is like
‘our’/‘lesbian’ sex, whose bodies are like ‘our own’, and whose experiences can be imagined as similar, are in the first place.

Lastly, though the visual field of the medium captures signifiers of race, and Georgia’s exoticizing language reads like that of a contemporary Sir Richard Burton, Georgia neglects the topic of race throughout the narrative. The film now struggles against its core deconstruction of identity politics, which in this case was dependent on lesbianism being an ‘invisible’ form of identity, in contrast to the marginalization of visibly racialized subjects. It is characteristic of contemporary feminist porn to try to balance fourth-wave feminist politics of post-identity, with third-wave feminist politics of inclusion and diversity. The film’s interracial cast consists of black, hapa, and white porn stars. Is the audience to interpret Georgia’s silence upon the issue of race as Houston’s critique of sexuality research that takes a post-racial and post-racism perspective, and thus refuses to acknowledge its research as participating within a ‘situated knowledge’ of a colour-blind America? Or, do we read this as Houston’s silence, one that uncritically reproduces the discourses around it?

A feature-length, pornographic documentary starring two of the performers of colour from The Wild Search was released the following year. Trans Entities tells the story of the polyamorous couple, Papi and Wil. Unlike the silence – but for the moans and grunts – between partners in The Wild Search, Trans Entities opens each of the three sex scenes with a discussion between sexual partners about the relationships between identity and desire. Prior to an interracial threesome with their white partner, Chris, Papi discusses that they do not often form relationships with white partners, in part because they often find themselves being exoticized, but also because at the other end of exoticization is a silence, which is experienced as similarly destructive. In The Wild Search, Papi and Wil also have an interracial threesome with Bo Flexxx, also a person of colour, and this is followed by a twosome with the primary couple. How might audiences read the politics of interracial sex that go uncommented on by a white narrator in The Wild Search?

The Wild Search uses the visual field of the camera to capture racially marked bodies that are met with a silent refusal. Perhaps we might read Georgia’s silence about race as reflecting what Ian Barnard has described as a culture of whiteness in queer theory and activism, that is, it is only white subjects who can afford to believe that colour blindness will prevent racism. Georgia’s obsession with sexuality – to
the exclusion of all other variables – is related to her misrecognition of
her subjects of study as ‘lesbian’. Houston’s critique of othering lesbian
sex functions regardless of the audience’s extradiegetic knowledge of the
identities of the performers. If the audience believe they are watching
‘lesbians’, they can still critique Georgia’s reductive research premise. If
this observation leaves us with more questions than answers, then it
lands on the back of a history of queer theory located in cultures of
whiteness that seeks to locate identity and recognition in naming, and
that has struggled to address the queer of colour critiques, which
repeatedly problematize hierarchy between the verbal and the visual.
The opening passage I quoted where Georgia explains her project is
pointedly entrenched in a history of racist description of European ethnographers documenting their subaltern subjects. Queer theorists might
also view Houston’s refusal to have Georgia comment on the race of her
lesbian subject as a comment on the difference between the re-enactment of orientalist elocutions of ‘us and them’, which, while parodic
when applied to sexuality, are just ‘too soon’ applied to the skin of the
hapa and black performers. Should viewers take Houston’s evocation of
the phrase ‘pomo-homo-docu-mockumentary’ as an allusion to the San
Francisco black gay theatre troop of the 1990s, ‘The Pomo Afro Homos’, this might add yet another layer to the insider-outsider speak
of the film. The Pomo Afro Homos, invested in their own representational politics, were dedicated to addressing the intersections of racism
and AIDS phobia that was internal to white gay communities. In Hou-
ston’s citational reference to their project, perhaps Georgia’s othering
elocutions become a double critique of her homophobia and the culture
of whiteness that is unabashedly unaware of the history behind such
syntax.

**Aspect Shifts**

In five years of thinking about *The Wild Search*, this piece of pornography has demonstrated a quite specific form of malleability when it
comes to being advertised. Take this description from the 2008 Calgary
Fairytale’s Film Festival Brochure:

Follow ‘straight’ documentary filmmaker Georgia Mann and her crew
through the streets of San Francisco as they capture some of the most raw
and compelling sex to date. One woman’s quest to find, film, and under-
stand ‘real lesbian sex’ makes this tongue-in-cheek documentary a must-salivate. Georgia treats lesbians as if they were animals in the wild, infiltrating the Lexington Club in San Francisco with a ‘lesbian decoy’ and following lesbians into their natural habitat … namely, a bedroom!

The use of the word ‘lesbian’ four times in a description fewer than a hundred words, self-consciously overplays the lesbian label, reproducing the film’s narrator’s mistake. And thus, at the film’s seXrated Saturday screening, it encouraged audience misreadings of the performers’ identities. Conversely, the DVD’s description highlights the gender diversity of the cast, boasting ‘Femme-on-femme, one stud boi, and hot transguy action’. It explicitly marks a division between lesbian sex and queer sex: ‘One woman’s quest to find, film, and understand “real lesbian sex” leads her into the depths of queer sexuality.’ Meanwhile the description of the DVD on the Good For Her retail website – a feminist sex store that also runs the annual Feminist Porn Awards, which awarded the film Best Trans Scene – reads:

A hilariously happening mockumentary from red-hot porn director Shine Louise Houston – of Crash Pad fame! Georgia Mann is an unscrupulous documentary director with a highly dysfunctional crew who has set out on a mission to find out what makes lesbian sex so deliciously different. To accomplish this she sends her small crew to break into the bedrooms of smokin’ San Francisco dykes and film their enthusiastic exploits. Georgia (who swears that she is unswervingly straight) discovers, of course, that hot sex is simply hot sex no matter who is having it and that one can only stretch an independent film crew so far. This wonderfully made film features a culturally diverse cast of femmes, bois and trannies [sic] who employ toys, hands, tongues and wild imaginations to bring authentic queer sex to us very lucky viewers.

If ‘authentic queer sex’ sounds oxymoronic, it should. Collectively, these three descriptions capture the thematics of the narrative, which trouble authenticity and materiality. The performers are represented, but their bodies are shadow and light and pixels, not skin to touch.

Furthermore, the ability to reread The Wild Search’s politics of identity after the film was awarded Best Trans Sex Scene, the release of a pornographic documentary discussing in detail the trans and racial identities of two of the film’s sexual performers, Jiz Lee’s (referred to as Bo Flexxx in The Wild Search) rise to queer porn stardom with public discussions of their gender and racial identities, and the mainstreaming
of queer feminist pornography, means that any reading must negotiate both what the film was, but also how it functions in new forms of feminist pornography consumer practice. I have taken up the example of *The Wild Search* to explore what happens to a commentary on ‘identity politics’ when the viewers are actively encouraged to see something other than what is represented. I wonder if the performers find safety, prophylaxis against the violence of othering by taking up lesbian space filtered through a narrative that plays tricks on an audience invested in ‘real lesbians’. Bisexuals are still treated as vectors of disease, fence sitters, and traitors.\(^59\) On the one side, trans people continue to experience exclusion under narratives of being traitors to be shunned.\(^60\) And on the other side of this exclusion lies fetishization, where trans people are celebrated as magical post-gender creatures to be exoticized or co-opted as metaphor.\(^61\) Instead, I think *The Wild Search* emphasizes the process of filtering information from both the linguistic and visual fields. The film rejects the typical trope of contemporary trans cinematography that concludes with a revelatory body shot of a trans person, exposing some contradiction between gendered presentation and the sexed body: a moment where the audience learn they cannot trust what they see.

As the film cuts into different moments in time in the feminist debates, sex wars over pornography, identity politics debates, coalition politics, queer of colour and anti-racist queer critique, and discussions of trans inclusion and exclusion, it becomes a snapshot of, not a moment, but a series of cross sections and interventions. Though genealogies of feminist critique might be able to geographically and temporally compartmentalize these issues, the narrative plays with its audience’s enduring emotional investments in such conversations. The moving image medium holds the identity markers and conversations of the film in a series of events. However, those performers continue to exist in space and time with public lives, blogs, and interviews that allow for renegotiations and refigurations of what one representation in 2007 meant. The extradiegetic life of *The Wild Search* continues, and alongside its narrative compounds the possibilities of reimaginations and reappropriations of desire in queer feminist pornography.
NOTES

2 The Wild Search, dir. Shine Louise Houston (Pink and White Productions, 2007) [on DVD]. NB: The Wild Search was originally released under the longer title In Search of the Wild Kingdom.
5 The diversity of genderqueer, cisgender women, and trans porn stars in a film about ‘lesbian’ sexuality has posed some interesting problems in the writing of this paper. Does one treat the characters as they are described in the narrative, even when the narrator is untrustworthy? With feminist pornography’s practice of not over scripting the sex captured on screen, borderlines between character, actor, and performer are already messy. From the beginning of this project I have engaged with interviews, autobiographical writings, and award ceremony speeches to access the preferred gendered pronouns of the performers. However, at every stage of the editing process editors have been uncomfortable with gender neutral pronouns. This essay has attempted to use the gendered pronouns of the performers as they have self-described in other bodies of work.
8 This can be found in the shift from gay rights to a process of specific addition (i.e. gay and lesbian rights, GLB, LGBT, to LGBTQI2-S, and here I end with my own embarrassed etc.).
12 Ibid., p. 828.
13 Ibid., p. 833.
14 Ibid.
16 Ibid., p. 630.
17 Eli Clare, ‘Preface to the 2009 edition’, Exile and Pride: Disability, Queerness and Liberation (Brooklyn: South End Press, 2009), pp. ix–xiv; Cheryl Dobinson,


31 Ibid.


36 Reagon notes: ‘We’ve pretty much come to the end of a time when you can have a space that is “yours only” – just for the people you want to be there. Even when we have our “women-only” festivals there is no such thing’ (‘Coalition Politics’, p. 344).

37 Butler, Gender Trouble, p. 139.


49. Also known as Jiz Lee in the majority of their pornographic appearances.


51. Sedgwick, *Epistemology*, p. 89. NB: The categories and qualifiers of whether or not it is gender or sex that is the dependent marker of desire in categories of sexual attraction remain in the eye of the beholder.
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