

PROOF COVER SHEET

Author(s): FORUM

Article Title: 'The Erotics of Injury: Remembering Operation Spanner Workshops', 10–11 September 2015, University of Essex and Royal Holloway, University of London

Article No: RPRN1148334

Enclosures: 1) Query sheet
2) Article proofs

Dear Author,

1. Please check these proofs carefully. It is the responsibility of the corresponding author to check these and approve or amend them. A second proof is not normally provided. Taylor & Francis cannot be held responsible for uncorrected errors, even if introduced during the production process. Once your corrections have been added to the article, it will be considered ready for publication.

Please limit changes at this stage to the correction of errors. You should not make trivial changes, improve prose style, add new material, or delete existing material at this stage. You may be charged if your corrections are excessive (we would not expect corrections to exceed 30 changes).

For detailed guidance on how to check your proofs, please paste this address into a new browser window: <http://journalauthors.tandf.co.uk/production/checkingproofs.asp>

Your PDF proof file has been enabled so that you can comment on the proof directly using Adobe Acrobat. If you wish to do this, please save the file to your hard disk first. For further information on marking corrections using Acrobat, please paste this address into a new browser window: <http://journalauthors.tandf.co.uk/production/acrobat.asp>

2. Please review the table of contributors below and confirm that the first and last names are structured correctly and that the authors are listed in the correct order of contribution. This check is to ensure that your name will appear correctly online and when the article is indexed.

Sequence	Prefix	Given name(s)	Surname	Suffix
----------	--------	---------------	---------	--------

Queries are marked in the margins of the proofs, and you can also click the hyperlinks below. Content changes made during copy-editing are shown as tracked changes. Inserted text is in **red font** and revisions have a red indicator **▲**. Changes can also be viewed using the list comments function. To correct the proofs, you should insert or delete text following the instructions below, but **do not add comments to the existing tracked changes**.

AUTHOR QUERIES

General points:

1. **Permissions:** You have warranted that you have secured the necessary written permission from the appropriate copyright owner for the reproduction of any text, illustration, or other material in your article. Please see <http://journalauthors.tandf.co.uk/permissions/usingThirdPartyMaterial.asp>.
2. **Third-party content:** If there is third-party content in your article, please check that the rightsholder details for re-use are shown correctly.
3. **Affiliation:** The corresponding author is responsible for ensuring that address and email details are correct for all the co-authors. Affiliations given in the article should be the affiliation at the time the research was conducted. Please see <http://journalauthors.tandf.co.uk/preparation/writing.asp>.
4. **Funding:** Was your research for this article funded by a funding agency? If so, please insert 'This work was supported by <insert the name of the funding agency in full>', followed by the grant number in square brackets '[grant number xxxx]'.
5. **Supplemental data and underlying research materials:** Do you wish to include the location of the underlying research materials (e.g. data, samples or models) for your article? If so, please insert this sentence before the reference section: 'The underlying research materials for this article can be accessed at <full link>/ description of location [author to complete]'. If your article includes supplemental data, the link will also be provided in this paragraph. See <http://journalauthors.tandf.co.uk/preparation/multimedia.asp> for further explanation of supplemental data and underlying research materials.
6. The **CrossRef database** (www.crossref.org/) has been used to validate the references. Changes resulting from mismatches are tracked in **red font**.

QUERY NO.	QUERY DETAILS
AQ1	The title has been modified to make it clearer and more effective. Please correct if this is inaccurate
AQ2	Please spell out "ICA" in full at first mention

FORUM

'The Erotics of Injury: Remembering Operation Spanner Workshops', 10–11 September 2015, University of Essex and Royal Holloway, University of London

AQ1

February 2017 will mark the 20th anniversary of the 1997 European Court of Human Rights' judgment in the case of *Colin Laskey, Roland Jaggard and Tony Brown v United Kingdom*, ending the legal appeals for the defendants in *R v Brown* (1994). A group of men were convicted of assault occasioning actual bodily harm for engaging in 'extreme' sadomasochistic sex acts. None of the 'victims' of the 'assaults' were themselves the complainants, and in fact gave evidence of their consent to the acts. Moreover, the activities were undertaken in private without causing any lasting injury. An undercover Manchester Metropolitan police investigation of 1987 called Operation Spanner uncovered video evidence of the incident and the CPS made the decision to prosecute the assailants. ('An internal rumour', explains Michael Hames [2000, 160] of the Vice Squad in a style all too typical of his profession, 'claimed the job was called Spanner because when you looked at the evidence, your nuts tightened').

While legal scholars have interrogated the judgement in exhaustive detail, focusing on the deployment of consent, recklessness and the legality of sexual pleasure, a major interdisciplinary project that examines the wider and longstanding impacts of Spanner and the judgments has not yet been undertaken. The ruling was affected by and had wide-ranging impacts on culture, LGBTQ history and the relationship between sexuality and criminal justice more broadly, and its shockwaves continue to be felt today.

As scholars working at the intersection of visual cultural studies, the histories of sexuality and subcultures, as well as criminology and law, we felt that a timely, collaborative intervention to examine the broader impacts of Spanner, and to commemorate its landmark importance for LGBTQ history, was long overdue. To commence this research, we staged two one-day workshops in September 2015 at the University of Essex and Royal Holloway, University of London (funded by a University of Essex Humanities Research Seedcorn Award) to mark the beginning of this major project. The convenors intended that these intensive one-day workshops would facilitate discussion to determine the direction of a series of fundable research projects and outputs, and bring together an interdisciplinary cohort from the arts, humanities and social sciences working on these topics in order to lead to published and other material outcomes (of which this is the first) and establish a landscape for future research.

Operation Spanner and 'ars erotica'

The workshop opened with an impassioned account of the historic contexts of the Spanner arrests and the response from within the leather and BDSM communities from Kellan Farshea, activist and founder of the Spanner Campaign in 1992 and the SM Pride marches that took place in London every year up to 2000. These oral histories and activist accounts are entirely missing from the current literature on Spanner. Yet, as Farshea articulated, taking them into account is vitally necessary to fully understand the cultural contexts to the

case and its consequences. Farshea's story was one primarily of, at least initially, a group perceived as (as he put it) 'dangerous, politically suspect ... pervers and maladjusted monsters', alienated from mainstream LGBTQ activist communities. As he made clear, it was felt that the actions and desires of SM practitioners were detrimental to their wider causes to, for example, normalize same-sex relationships in the contexts of legal and civil discourse. Nevertheless, Farshea and others would go on to rally a broad base of support from across the activist spectrum, and stage a campaign for justice which continues to the present day in the form of the Spanner Trust.

These historical dichotomies between duelling conceptions of political strategies, sexual norms, freedom and desire in the contexts of power relations have come to shape the entire project, as we seek to place Spanner and its legal and cultural dimensions (as well as our sense of the case's relevance for historic and contemporary problems of autonomy, consent, sexuality, bodily integrity, etc.) into a larger project tentatively entitled 'The Erotics of Injury'.

Framed by the Foucauldian dichotomy of 'ars erotica' (where 'truth is drawn from pleasure itself, understood as a practice and accumulated as experience') as opposed to 'scientia sexualis' ('procedures for telling the truth of sex which are geared to a form of knowledge-power' [Foucault 1978, 57–58]), and inspired in part by Romana Byrne's concepts of 'aesthetic sexuality' and sadomasochism as 'anti-aesthetic theatre', we will seek to analyse the 'problem' of Spanner and its turbulent legacies in ways which take into account, as Byrne has it, via Baudrillard, 'language, sex, and affect' (Byrne 2013, 136), and the fact that 'incorporated into ritual, the body assumes an aesthetic, decorative character, becoming a means of signification but not of resemblance, representation or revelation'. Crucially, the project will also puncture current debates in cultural criminology concerning the 'criminalisation of culture' (see, for example, Presdee 2000), and the extent to which criminal law in England and Wales can accommodate bodily practices and expression that fail to conform to current perceptions of 'truths' surrounding their meaning for participants.

The ars/scientia dichotomies are neatly illustrated in the very logic of the case: Lord Templeton declared in his dismissal of the *Brown* appeals that 'pleasure derived from the infliction of pain is an evil thing. Cruelty is uncivilised'. Nevertheless, employing the concept of 'ars erotica' is not new to the study of sadomasochism. Andrea Beckmann's (2009) ethnographic study of sadomasochistic subcultures in London, published under the title, *The Social Construction of Sexuality and Perversion: Deconstructing Sadomasochism*, grapples with the oppositional relationship between 'sexual technologies' and 'ars erotica' and how this dichotomy maps onto broader questions of leisure, labour and political economy. Beckmann's urgent paper at the workshop demanded that we further interrogate how leisure, 'work' and temporality are constructed in the context of sadomasochism, drawing on the discourses of her participants. Other presentations on this theme, such as Sara Mohammadzadeh's paper on 'dirty research', demonstrated the complexities and vulnerabilities associated with working in this field, while Itziar Bilbao Urrutia presented as an artist-practitioner on the resonances of Spanner for artistic labour in performance, and how gender impacts cultural fears surrounding the dangerousness of artistic and sexual labour even several decades after the ICA was cancelling performances in the wake of the *Brown* ruling. Drawing on the experiences of Alan Oversby, a professional tattooer and piercer who worked under the pseudonym Mr Sebastian and who was one of the Spanner arrestees to face charges, Matt Lodder's paper accentuated these themes, presenting the problem erotic and commercial body piercing poses for the logics of the case, where stark divisions between private and public, work and pleasure, break down. Ken Plummer's illuminating historiographically-inclined keynote address at University of Essex, to cement this line of argument, mounted the provocation that in the contexts

of the sexual subcultures that birthed the Spannermen, SM might be conceived of as ‘serious leisure’. He suggested that, rather than drawing simply on queer and feminist theory, as SM studies is wont to do, we look back to the work of interactionists and social theorists such as Goffman to make sense of the sexual stories participants tell.

A second crucial theme emerging from the workshops on the ‘criminalisation of culture’ **was** interventions on current definitions of obscenity, extremity **and** pornography, and the impact of Spanner on these definitions. Gary Needham took on these issues as they apply to the criminalization in the 1980s through to the present day of particular forms of images in Britain, particularly in terms of the central tinderbox of the Spanner investigation: so-called ‘obscene’ videotapes. Kitty Stryker and Myles Jackman presented practitioner-based papers from the perspective, respectively, of porn director and obscenity lawyer, while Clarissa Smith’s paper ruminated on questions of authenticity in pornography and how cultural illiteracy impacts on current obscenity law. Tanya Palmer’s work also spoke to this theme, examining questions of authenticity in so-called ‘rape pornography’ and the implications of this for the new extension of Section 63 of the Criminal Justice and Immigration Act 2008, which criminalizes images of non-consensual sexual activity. The keynote at Royal Holloway, delivered by Carl Stychin, grappled with an eternal question **that** lawyers face: how to teach *R v Brown* to undergraduates? His paper examined how the judgment is ubiquitously encountered by law students as itself a pornographic text, serving as both a cautionary tale and prurient source of titillation. Furthermore, he questioned to what extent legal theorists also project such affects onto the judgment, no matter their perspective on the convictions.

Thirdly, and most foundationally for the future dichotomous framework of the project, speakers addressed moments of friction in legal, cultural and regulatory accounts of sexualized injury, and in areas where normative accounts of consent become complicated in their interrelations between the sensual and the legal. Paul Reynolds considered the practical and conceptual limits of squaring a just account of consent with a legal framework which supports vulnerable individuals. Michael Perlin and Alison Lynch illustrated how the models of consent assumed and enforced by *Brown* and by similar legal frameworks abroad underpin and continue to inform regulatory and even moral/ethical accounts of sexuality amongst individuals with mental disabilities. Elsie Whittington applied similar logics to the sexual education and support of children and young people; **and** David Gurnham discussed the cultural polarization of conceptualizing consent in legal scholarship on rape.

Specifically addressing the tensions posed by the Spanner ruling on sexual violence and activism, Alex Dymock and Alex Fanghanel presented contrasting papers on subculture and criminal justice, specifically examining how SM communities negotiate the policing of sexuality in the present day. Dymock’s intervention drew on the failures in criminal justice to adequately make space for victims’ experience of sexual violence in BDSM relationships, while Fanghanel presented empirical data detailing how BDSM communities mount their own self-policing strategies as an alternative to this failure.

While the workshop proved particularly illuminating for researchers working on the themes outlined, **it** also demonstrated that some core questions and dichotomies surrounding Spanner remain substantially unresolved. For example, the question of ‘pleasure vs danger’ and its relationship with sexuality and culture, articulated so many years ago by scholars such as Carol Vance (1984) and Gayle Rubin (1984), surfaced many times in ongoing discussion, as did the question of the extent to which, in late modernity, we can fully determine distinctions between labour and leisure in contemporary representations of sexuality.

For the project leaders, the workshop reiterated that a new research agenda centred on ‘The Erotics of Injury’, broadly conceived, is a vital intervention for interdisciplinary sexualities scholarship in the **twenty-first** century. Spanner provides the starting point for this analysis,

reflecting wider social and cultural currents surrounding the regulation of 'risk', bodily integrity and authenticity.

References

- Beckmann, Andrea. 2009. *The Social Construction of Sexuality and Perversion: Deconstructing Sadoomasochism*, Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Byrne, Romana. 2013. *Aesthetic Sexuality: A Literary History of Sadoomasochism*. London: Bloomsbury.
- Foucault, Michel. 1978. *The history of sexuality, Vol. 1: The will to knowledge*. Translated by R. Hurley. London: Penguin.
- Hames, Michael. 2000. *The Dirty Squad*. London: Little Brown.
- Presdee, Mike. 2000. *Cultural Criminology and the Carnival of Crime*. London: Routledge.
- Rubin, Gayle, 1984, 'Thinking Sex: Notes for a Radical Theory of the Politics of Sexuality.' In *Pleasure and Danger: Exploring Female Sexuality*, edited by Carol Vance, 267–319. London: Routledge.
- Vance, Carol. 1984. *Pleasure and Danger: Exploring Female Sexuality*. London: Routledge.

Alex Dymock
Royal Holloway, University of London, UK

Matt Lodder
University of Essex, UK

© 2016 Taylor & Francis
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/23268743.2016.1148334>