

Bibliotekarstudentens nettleksikon om litteratur og medier

Av Helge Ridderstrøm (førsteamanuensis ved OsloMet – storbyuniversitetet)

Sist oppdatert 04.12.20

Camp

(_estetikk) Ordet “camp” stammer fra “the French *se camper* (to posture or to flaunt)” (Andrew Ross i Mathijs og Mendik 2008 s. 55). Ordet “camp” kommer ifølge en annen kilde av at det var på universitetene (“campus”) at denne smaken utviklet seg (Krohn og Strank 2012 s. 212).

Camp er en estetikk som kjennetegnes av sans for det unaturlige, kunstighet og overdrivelse. Et annet kjennetegn er ironisk nytelse av det en selv oppfatter som kvalitativt dårlig; ironisk framelsking av dårlig smak (dvs. av noe en egentlig er eller føler at en bør være frastøtt av). Camp er ifølge den amerikanske forfatteren Susan Sontag smaken for det unaturlige, overdrivelser og åpenbare tricks (f.eks. lett synlige filmtricks).

“Camp is a strategy for makers as well as for reception. It draws on and transforms mass culture. In this it critiques the dominant culture, but in the dominant culture’s own terms; it seldom rests on any coherent or sustained analysis of society or history. Camp always uses parody but, more importantly, it embodies parody as a general mode of discourse. As a mode of discourse, parody typically operates within the dominant ideology, but with an internal tension. Since Camp is an especially acute ideological form containing active contradictions it can, in certain social and historical contexts, challenge dominant culture.” (Chuck Kleinhans sitert fra Coto-Rivel 2014 s. 403).

“Jack Babuscio, in his treatment of the relation between camp and what he calls “gay sensibility,” identifies four characteristics of camp style: irony (“any incongruous contrast between an individual or thing and its context or association,” particularly contrasts between “masculine/feminine”); aestheticism (attentiveness to style, arrangement, timing, tone, etc.); theatricality (role-playing, impersonation, and performance, particularly with respect to gender, that results in a blurring of “real” and “artificial”); and humor (deployed as a “means of dealing with a hostile environment and, in the process, of defining a positive identity”).” (Kochhar-Lindgren, Schneiderman og Denlinger 2009 s. 156)

Camp kjennetegnes av kunstighet, overdrivelser og ironi. Et produkt som oppleves som kvalitativt dårlig, gjøres gjennom en ironisk innstilling til en estetisk nytelse. Camp er dermed basert på et paradoks: Noe er så dårlig at det er bra. Camp kan

oppfattes som intendert, bevisst og “selv-reflekterende” eller ironisk kitsch. Kitsch blir ofte med tiden til camp.

Sosiologen Ketil Rollness “er spesialist på feltet Camp, der man bruker alle de dølle tingene som betegnes som kitsch i en slags ironisk 2. grad, samtidig som man påstår seg å ha innsikt nok til selv å se at det er dumt. [...] Mens Camp er en form for kjærlighet, er ironien en slags intelligens som viser at man er verdensvant og matlei.” (<http://www.kulturkanalen.no/mb/960913/11159.html>; lesedato 02.04.99)

I camp “the artist seeks to regain power from the critic by embracing and enacting the negative image forced upon him (or her), while at the same time mocking the gestures of power.” (Julian Hanna i <http://theses.gla.ac.uk/4521/1/2005HannaPhD.pdf>; lesedato 07.12.15) Fenomenet inngår i “a “camp” aesthetic – understood at the most basic level as over-the-top, playful, and parodic” (Helene Shugart og Catherine Waggoner sitert fra <http://www.cambridgescholars.com/download/sample/61815>; lesedato 19.09.16)

“[I]t is possible to attend to a work in such a way that you only see that it is imitating, so that you yourself in effect pastiche the work; camp is probably now the most familiar form of this.” (Dyer 2007 s. 3)

“In 1954, Christopher Isherwood published, what is now seen as an iconic novel in the camp canons of literature, *The World in the Evening*, the story of which revolves around an Englishman named Stephen Monk, who after the sudden end of his second marriage, embarks upon a journey of “soul-searching and sexual self-discovery... in various glamorous locales”. This major “self-discovery” is the awakening of what had been his dormant bisexuality. The issue of camp is broached during a conversation that takes place between Stephen and another character, Charles. When Charles asks Stephen if he has ever overheard the word “camp” used in conversation in his “voyages au bout de la nuit,” Stephen admits that he has heard the word used on several occasions in nightclubs. Charles retorts, “you thought it meant a swishy little boy with peroxided hair, dressed in a picture hat and a feather boa, pretending to be Marlene Dietrich? Yes, in queer circles they call *that* camping. It’s all very well in its place, but it’s an utterly debased form.” It is here we see the first instance of the attachment of camp to the “queer” or homosexual sensibility that will become a widely disputed theme within later, more theoretical arguments concerning camps origins and classification. Charles comments that this “camping” within “queer” circles is only one type of camp, “Low Camp.” However, Charles is concerned with what he dubs “High Camp,” which is, in his view, more fundamental than the latter. He goes on to describe this far more important form of “High Camp,” as: “the whole emotional basis of the ballet, for example, and of course of Baroque art. You see, true High Camp always has an underlying seriousness. You can’t camp about something you don’t take seriously. You’re not making fun of it; you’re making fun out of it. You’re expressing what’s basically serious to you in terms of fun and artifice and

elegance.” Although Isherwood’s definition, posited through a fictional conversation, seems archaic in contrast to later more critical analyses of camp, it is important to include it within the canon of camp, not only because it remains one of the first literary definitions of camp, but also because the very definition of camp is dichotomized from its inception into literature. Camp’s segregation into “High” and “Low” forms, creates two distinct sensibilities, one which is “gay” or “queer,” and the other which is obviously akin to a realm, that if not implicitly aristocratic in nature is, nonetheless, intrinsically bound to the continuing elitism of the “fine arts.” ” (Lauren Alexandra Ross i https://slidelegend.com/camp-in-the-portrait-photography-of-daniela-rossell-_5a0279cc1723dde10ae8c087.html; lesedato 31.10.18)

I Susan Sontags essay “Notes on Camp” (1964) defineres camp som “love of the unnatural: of artifice and exaggeration”. Sontags essay “is an attempt to tackle a very visible but nevertheless ignored fascination for forms of art that by all standards would be considered failures (sometimes close to achievement but never quite), but are nevertheless championed by patrons. Sontag claims that camp is an aesthetic sensibility that is characterized by a high degree of, and attention for stylization, artifice, travesty, *double entendre*, extravagance and unintentional badness. [...] the appraisal of camp has taken the form of a cult, of a dedication that aims to challenge the distinctions between good and bad taste. Camp is ‘good because it’s awful’.” (Mathijs og Mendik 2008 s. 41) En camp-liste kan ha en tittel som “The 10 Best Bad Movies I Have Seen” (Mathijs og Mendik 2008 s. 43).

I “Notes on ‘camp’ ” skriver Sontag: “Taste has no system and no proofs. But there is something like a logic of taste: the consistent sensibility which underlies and gives rise to a certain taste. [...] Not only is there a Camp vision, a Camp way of looking at things. [...] Camp art is often decorative art, emphasizing texture, sensuous surface, and style at the expense of content. [...] a contrast between silly or extravagant content and rich form. ... Sometimes whole art forms become saturated with Camp. [...] Many examples of Camp are things which, from a “serious” point of view, are either bad art or kitsch. [...] the love of the exaggerated, the “off,” of things-being-what-they-are-not. [...] Camp sees everything in quotation marks. It’s not a lamp, but a “lamp”; not a woman, but a “woman.” ” (Sontag i Mathijs og Mendik 2008 s. 42-44) Camp setter alt i hermetegn (s. 44).

“The dividing line seems to fall in the 18th century; there the origins of Camp taste are to be found (Gothic novels, Chinoiserie, caricature, artificial ruins, and so forth). [...] The pure examples of Camp are unintentional; they are dead serious. [...] Of course, not all seriousness that fails can be redeemed as Camp. Only that which has the proper mixture of the exaggerated, the fantastic, the passionate, and the naïve. [...] The hallmark of Camp is the spirit of extravagance. [...] Camp is the outrageous aestheticism of Sternberg’s six American movies with Dietrich, all six, but especially the last, *The Devil Is a Woman*. [...] The reason a movie like *On the Beach*, books like *Winesburg, Ohio* and *For Whom the Bell Tolls* are bad to the

point of being laughable, but not bad to the point of being enjoyable, is that they are too dogged and pretentious. They lack fantasy.” (Sontag i Mathijs og Mendik 2008 s. 45-48)

“[M]any of the objects prized by Camp taste are old-fashioned, out-of-date, *démodé*. It’s not a love of the old as such. It’s simply that the process of aging or deterioration provides the necessary detachment – or arouses a necessary sympathy. When the theme is important, and contemporary, the failure of a work of art may make us indignant. Time can change that. Time liberates the work of art from moral relevance, delivering it over to the Camp sensibility.” (Sontag i Mathijs og Mendik 2008 s. 48)

“Camp asserts that good taste is not simply good taste; that there exists, indeed, a good taste of bad taste. [...] What it does is to find the success in certain passionate failures. [...] The ultimate Camp statement: it’s good *because* it’s awful.” (Sontag i Mathijs og Mendik 2008 s. 52)

“Camp taste turns its back on the good-bad axis of ordinary aesthetic judgment. Camp doesn’t reverse things. It doesn’t argue that the good is bad, or the bad is good. What it does is to offer for art (and life) a different – a supplementary – set of standards. [...] Camp: the sensibility of failed seriousness, of the theatricalization of experience. Camp refuses both the harmonies of traditional seriousness, and the risks of fully identifying with extreme states of feeling. [...] Camp is the consistently aesthetic experience of the world. It incarnates a victory of “style” over “content,” “aesthetics” over “morality,” of irony over tragedy.” (Sontag i Mathijs og Mendik 2008 s. 49) Camp er en “betydningsforskyvning” der form og innhold faller fra hverandre (Krohn og Strank 2012 s. 212). Sontag hevder at camp er stilens seier over innholdet, estetikkens seier over det moralske, og ironiens seier over det tragiske i tilværelsen.

“Style is everything. [...] The whole point of Camp is to dethrone the serious. Camp is playful, anti-serious. More precisely, Camp involves a new, more complex relation to “the serious.” ” (Sontag i Mathijs og Mendik 2008 s. 50) Ideene i et verk blir i camp oppfattet “in a special playful way” (s. 50) som kan gå på tvers av forfatterens eller en annen opphavspersons intensjon. Det er en “anførselstegnenes estetikk” med hang til overdrivelser og kunstighet (Krohn og Strank 2012 s. 212), f.eks. “hysterical glamour” (Birgit Richard i Hitzler og Pfadenhauer 2001 s. 291).

“[C]amp er et historisk fenomen, og et begrep, som ble slynget ut i verden [av] Susan Sontag [...] Gjennom 58 punkter beskriver hun et fenomen som gikk inn i The Oxford English Dictionary allerede i 1909. Da betød camp “prangende, overdreven, affektert, teatralisk; feminin eller homoseksuell”, og var stort sett myntet på *mannlig* oppførsel. [...] En alternativ estetisk *sensibilitet* – eller et *estetisk filter* – som definerer noe sentralt ved den nye tiden, sansen for stil over innhold, estetikk over moral, ironi over tragedie og for alt som er altfor mye. Hun

skriver: “Campens essens er kjærligheten til det unaturlige: til det kunstige og overdrevne. Og camp er esoterisk – det er en slags privat kode, en identitetsmarkør, til og med, blant små urbane klikker.” [...] Opera og ballett er fremragende eksempler per se, sier hun, og dessuten kunst – og kultursjangre som fremmer “karakterer uten utvikling”. Camp er dessuten art nouveauens utuktige omgang med naturen – Hector Guimards franske Metro (orkidé)-skilt og de funknlende Tiffany-lampene som ville fått Ali Baba og de 40 røverne til å gråte av misunnelse. Camp er Greta Garbos flate spillestil og “slette talent”, det er “den korny, flamboyante kvinneligheten til [den amerikanske skuespilleren, sangerinnen og modellen] Jayne Mansfield” [...] “camp er *kjærligheten* til det unaturlige”, skriver hun. Med det skjønner vi at camp ikke har slått leir hos naboen kitsch – kulturuttrykket som nettopp betegnes som en sjelløs, ukjærlig omgang med kunstens klisjeer og stereotyper – men at det dreier seg om å ha kapitalen – den kulturelle, den visuelle eller den sosioøkonomiske – til å utøve utstudert dårlig skjønn. Altså handler camp om å være *god til å ha dårlig smak*, det å være i stand til å velge det andre – *på ordentlig* – vil oppfatte som vulgært, obscønt eller redselsfullt, og å gjøre det med glede, standhaftighet og humor. Derfor er den urovekkende brunfargede, ubehagelig veltrente og slående slagferdige Jan Thomas camp, mens den veldanderte, MGP-tradisjonalisten Per Sundnes ikke er det. Altså må det være en estetikk, og en estetisert livsform som genuint evner å trække oss på tærne. [...] oppskriften på å bli kultur-kul er å skaffe seg såkalt “avvikende preferanser”. (motekulturhistorikeren Ragnhild Brochmann i *Morgenbladet* 10.–16. mai 2019 s. 50)

“Camp creates a fringe *off* aesthetics, whose *offness* stands for its artistic character and for the manner in which it uses strategies shared by many forms of art and entertainment. Although often mistaken for other styles, it produces unique versions and interpretations of universally employed themes and techniques. A good example here may be the *Hairspray* movies: the 1988 one by John Waters, and the more recent 2007 production by Adam Shankman. The films are almost identical: their plots remain almost unchanged, and, according to critics, the director Adam Shankman managed to “preserve the inclusive, celebratory spirit of John Waters’s movie” (Scott). But despite a seemingly general affinity, these two productions differ in almost every respect. They differ to a degree that enabled several reviews to describe Shankman’s *Hairspray* as “the sickening concentration of sweetness” (Salwa, Mossakowski), dancing over the remains of camp, and Waters’s film – “one of the best camp movies in the history of cinema” (Salwa, Mossakowski). The case of the *Hairspray* movies proves that camp is an inimitable style. It confirms that “when (self-)parody lacks ebullience but instead reveals (even sporadically) a contempt for one’s themes and one’s material [...] the results are forced and heavy-handed, rarely Camp” (Sontag). Adam Shankman is not John Waters, which mean he is not “The Pope of Trash,” “The Baron of Bad Taste,” “The Duke of Dirt,” “The Sultan of Sleaze” or “The Anal Ambassador.” And even if *Hairspray* is Waters’s “most wholesome, least naughty film” (Scott), it proposes a combination of all the essential camp features, which are scarce (if not totally

missing) in Shankman's production." (Anna Malinowska i <http://www.cambridge-scholars.com/download/sample/61815>; lesedato 19.09.16)

"Camp proposes a comic vision of the world. But not a bitter or polemical comedy. If tragedy is an experience of hyperinvolvement, comedy is an experience of underinvolvement, of detachment. [...] Detachment is the prerogative of an elite; and as the dandy is the 19th century's surrogate for the aristocrat in matters of culture, so Camp is the modern dandyism. Camp is the answer to the problem: how to be a dandy in the age of mass culture. [...] The dandy was overbred. His posture was disdain, or else *ennui*. He sought rare sensations, undefiled by mass appreciation. (Models: Des Esseintes in Huysmans' *À Rebours*, [Walter Paters roman] *Marius the Epicurean*, Valéry's *Monsieur Teste*.) He was dedicated to "good taste." The connoisseur of Camp has found more ingenious pleasures. Not in Latin poetry and rare wines and velvet jackets, but in the coarsest, commonest pleasure, in the arts of the masses. Mere use does not defile the objects of his pleasure, since he learns to possess them in a rare way. Camp – Dandyism in the age of mass culture – makes no distinction between the unique object and the mass-produced object. [...] The old-style dandy hated vulgarity. The new-style dandy, the lover of Camp, appreciates vulgarity. Where the dandy would be continually offended or bored, the connoisseur of Camp is continually amused, delighted. The dandy held a perfumed handkerchief to his nostrils and was liable to swoon; the connoisseur of Camp sniffs the stink and prides himself on his strong nerves." (Sontag i Mathijs og Mendik 2008 s. 50-51) Camp ligner på dandyisme ved vektleggingen av stil og framtoning, kunstighet og tvil på etablerte sannheter (Boltanski 2013 s. 35).

Caryl Flinn skriver i antologien *Camp: Queer Aesthetics and the Performing Subject* (1999) "that the body of camp fails or refuses to maintain its boundaries, just as in the Bakhtinian carnivalesque. "Like the disunified grotesque, camp also works to violate the standards of 'good taste,' allying itself with filth, the profane, and an overall sense of disreputability" (p. 447), operating like the abject and interstitial disabled body." (Church 2006)

"Philip Core's *Camp: The Lie That Tells the Truth* published in 1984 is a brief introduction to an encyclopedic survey of camp "sites" and personalities throughout not only the modern, but also, the classical world. The essay begins with a cheeky list – with cunning word play – entitled "Camp Rules" (there are 25 in total) of which the more memorable are: "CAMP depends on where you pitch it," "CAMP is in the eyes of the beholder, especially if the beholder is camp," "CAMP is a disguise that fails," "CAMP is gender without genitals," and "CAMP is a lie that tells the truth." Core suggests that historically there has existed a "significant minority" whose fringe and objectionable characteristics – be it a talent, physical unconventionality or sexual deviation – made them susceptible to the public's ridicule. Disguising their "otherness" behind a masquerade of acts almost as deviant as those that they mask becomes the means through which camp

is enacted, or, as Core defines it, the “mainspring of camp.” The often bizarre behavior demonstrated through the act of subterfuge – that is the desire to *conceal* while at the same time *revealing* a core aspect of the self – becomes the crux of Core’s definition of camp: “a lie that tells the truth.” ” (Lauren Alexandra Ross i https://slidelegend.com/camp-in-the-portrait-photography-of-daniela-rossell-_5a0279cc1723dde10ae8c087.html; lesedato 31.10.18)

Esther Newtons bok *Mother Camp* (1972) “suggests that the camp ideology is one that works to undermine the negative connotations and marginality of being othered by society, through a specific brand of humor. Camp humor is, Newton maintains, “a system of laughing at one’s incongruous position instead of crying. That is, the humor does not cover up, it transforms.” By this logic, camp becomes a “strategy for a situation.” Newton defines camp as having three recurrent characteristics: “incongruity, theatricality, and humor. All three are intimately related to the homosexual situation and strategy. Incongruity is the subject matter of camp, theatricality its style, and humor is strategy.” By localizing camp within not only the drag culture, but also as a permanent “subcultural ideology” among the gay community, Newton restores camp to its posited origins among those who truly appreciate its tawdry glamour, and as feature of “authentic” homosexual culture.” (Lauren Alexandra Ross i https://slidelegend.com/camp-in-the-portrait-photography-of-daniela-rossell-_5a0279cc1723dde10ae8c087.html; lesedato 31.10.18)

“ “Camp and the Gay Sensibility,” (1977) by Jack Babuscio first published in *Gays and Film*, 1977, examines the way in which what he describes as the “gay sensibility’ is manifested in the films of Fassbinder, Sternberg and the film versions of Tennessee Williams plays. Babuscio suggests that camp is one of the ways in which the gay population deals with being ‘othered’ vis-à-vis culture’s polarized perception of natural and normal behavior (heterosexual) as opposed to its binary the abnormal and unnatural, which Babuscio utilizes as a metaphor for the homosexual lifestyle. [...] Babuscio views camp as most importantly a relationship, or a dialogue that exists between the viewer and the object, film, literature, visual art – it is “never a thing or person per se, but, rather, a relationship between activities, individuals, situations and gayness”. It is important to note that those stars who are affiliated with camp, or who embody a camp screen personality, do not have to be gay. One’s conflation with “gayness,” is established when “the camp aspect of an individual thing is identified as such by a gay sensibility”. Babuscio defines camp by what he feels are its four inherent features: irony, aestheticism, theatricality and humor. The relationship between these four elements; the way they tend to play off of one another to create “incongruous contrasts,” odd and sometimes uncomfortable situations, heightened awareness of surface and artificial accoutrements, including exaggerated gender play, which are part of the intrinsic make-up of the camp sensibility. Irony becomes a metaphor for the incongruous act of either loving or having sexual intercourse with someone of the same sex. Within the hierarchy of sexual relationships, heterosexuality is presented as the norm while

homosexuality is seen as a moral deviation. It is the irony of the incongruity of camp, which appeals to the “gay sensibility,” that some of the consistently used contrasts in camp include: masculine/feminine, youth/old (age), spirit/flesh and high/low (social status). Aestheticism is the second inherent feature of camp, the most vital aspect of which is Camp’s “opposition to puritan morality.” Most importantly, camp invokes its aesthetic nature in three ways: “as a view of art, as a view of life; and as a practical tendency in things or persons.” Essentially, the camp person sees the world through a kind of camp lens; a lens that makes of the incongruous an aesthetic experience. It is the aesthetic way of being in the world with a kind of detachment that laughs at the unfavorable odds of residing in society’s margins.” (Lauren Alexandra Ross i https://slidelegend.com/camp-in-the-portrait-photography-of-daniela-rossell-_5a0279cc1723dde10ae8c087.html; lesedato 31.10.18)

“Theatricality, the third feature of camp, is related to the belief in living life-as-theatre, or “being versus role-playing, reality and appearance.” Camp sees everything as a kind of performance. Babuscio suggests that a “role” is the societal norm we are expected to play on a daily basis, our appropriate behavior depending on the place we occupy in society. Babuscio believes that the roles that are assigned to us are also based on the hierarchy of normal (heterosexual) relationships. Therefore, the homosexual who is left out of this structure does not conform to sex-role expectations. The very theatricality of “passing for straight,” is also inherent to camp’s love of the being-what-it-is-not. It is camp’s mimicry of such gender stereotypes that draws attention to their very social construction. Humor, the last feature of camp, is also the result of a strong incongruity between an “object, person, or situation and its context.” This means that camp humor is often based on a kind of comic irony, one that can be identified as almost painful, but not so uncomfortable as to reduce the effect of the humor. Sarcasm and “bitter-wit” are means of dealing with the often-hostile environment faced by the gay population. So the camp humor is a metaphor for the humor that homosexuals employ in life. Babuscio’s approach to defining camp is grounded in film criticism, and although he presents his analysis of camp’s properties within the context of cinema through readings of Rainer Werner Fassbinder’s *The Bitter Tears of Petra von Kant*, Sternberg’s film’s – especially those which starred Marlene Dietrich (a camp icon) – and the film versions of Tennessee Williams canonic plays, Babuscio’s real interest is the social implications of these films and what they say specifically about gender performance. Babuscio foreshadows the work of such feminist theorists as Carole-Anne Tyler and Luce Irigaray both of whom theorize gender mimicry and masquerade.” (Lauren Alexandra Ross i https://slidelegend.com/camp-in-the-portrait-photography-of-daniela-rossell-_5a0279cc1723dde10ae8c087.html; lesedato 31.10.18)

Joanne Hollows’ artikkel “The masculinity of cult” (2003) “observes how camp and cult are two categories of film that often overlap based upon similar reading and consumption strategies; for example, cult films are often consumed because of

their campy qualities. She notes that cult is often based on “connoisseurship” in defiance of “mass taste,” stressing the selection of object choices, while camp is more about playfully and subversively reinterpreting any text, including mass culture texts, against the (dominant) grain (p. 38-9).” (Church 2006).

Den amerikanske regissøren John Waters “stortrives i sin status som provokatør, og blir gjerne kalt både “Kongen av dårlig smak” og “Paven av søppelfilm”. Han har også mye av fortjenesten for at “trash cinema” har blitt anerkjent som en egen sjanger. Forskjellen mellom SBIG [forkortelse for “So bad it’s good”] og trash cinema vil nok alltid være litt flytende, [...] den første er ufrivillig underholdende, mens den andre er underveldende [sic] med overlegg. I søppelfilmenes fantastiske verden finner vi også flere banebrytende sjangre. I hvert fall hvis vi skal tro James Nguyen, som hardnakket mener han er oppfinneren av den “romantiske thrilleren”. Og han har absolutt laget en utpreget smørje, kalt *Birdemic: Shock and Terror* (2010). Dette er en slags nullbudsjettspinnspilling av Hitchcocks *The Birds* (1963), blandet med en god dose klissete melodrama, og dataanimerte fugler som tilsynelatende har blitt tegnet i Microsoft Paint.” (Torgeir Blok i *Cinema* nr. 6 i 2017 s. 37)

“[M]ed internettets ankomst fikk de frynsete filmene også en egen subsjanger kalt “SBIG” – forkortet fra “So bad it’s good”. Det finnes i dag en rekke nyhetssider, youtube-kanaler, facebookgrupper, blogger og forum, som bare fokuserer på SBIG-filmer. [...] En av filmene som har kjempet om SBIG-tronen, er det italienske vrøvlet med tittelen *Troll 2* (1990). Handlingen spinner rundt en rase vegetariske troll, som forvandler stakkars mennesker til planter, for å kunne spise dem. [...] filmen er likevel såpass latterlig at det er umulig å ta den alvorlig. Faktisk er skuespillet såpass forråtnet, at en av filmens hovedroller ble berømt bare på grunn av sine manglende evner. Det tok riktignok sin tid, og mannen livnærte seg som tannlege da han plutselig ble oppdaget som håpløs superstjerne 20 år etter at han hadde lagt vekk skuespillerambisjonene. Han tok derimot æren med et bredt smil, og proppfull av selvironi reiste han rundt på filmmesser for å signere autografer. Historien ble også foreviget i dokumentaren *Best Worst Movie* (2009), hvor man får se at regissør Claudio Fragasso ikke tok det med et like stort smil.” (Torgeir Blok i *Cinema* nr. 6 i 2017 s. 36)

“Camp shares similarities with literary tropes such as parody, irony, satire, and black comedy, as well as aesthetically pejorative terms such as schlock or kitsch. John Waters (b. 1946), one of the most well-known camp filmmakers, defined camp [...] as the “tragically ludicrous” or the “ludicrously tragic” – something so seriously sad, bad, or inept, that the only response one can make is to laugh at it. Such a double or conflicted response is key to understanding the phenomenon of camp. Camp (as a reception paradigm) might thus be described as a negotiated reading strategy that ironically calls into question certain aspects of mainstream taste, and especially how those aspects of taste relate to issues of gender and sexuality. As a style of production, camp texts are those that encode a self-aware

irony into their very fabric, assuring that audiences will find them (deliberately) “over-the-top” or “bad”.” (<http://www.filmreference.com/encyclopedia/Academy-Awards-Crime-Films/Camp.html>; lesedato 01.11.12)

“Laughing at failed seriousness [...] is one of this sensibility’s chief attributes. [...] Many who have written on Camp have rightly pointed out its essential duality – that it blends satire and, at times, mockery, with admiration and love. It would be a mistake, then to pursue simplistic concepts of Camp and to treat it as purely a mode of satire or parody. [...] Camp discourse homogenizes the works it enshrines, rendering them free of their particularities, idiosyncrasies, discordances. [...] In his essay “Uses of Camp,” Andrew Ross provided a notable rebuttal to Sontag in which he makes a case for the value of Camp. Ross specifically valorizes Camp as a resistant queer mode. There are some inherent frustrations in this valuation, however, chiefly that his surprisingly celebratory essay institutionalizes a view of gay/queer appropriation of Classical Hollywood and other related archives as consistently, irreducibly Camp gestures. Moreover, Camp becomes an exchange object, a queer exoticism readily appropriable by mainstream and heterosexual audiences. [...] Camp was once a way for an oppressed minority to read against the grain of popular, heterosexist culture, employing an array of cultivated defenses – wit, sophistication, taste, irony, et al – as a form of counterattack. Inseparable from Camp discourse has always been the sense of marginalization – it is the self-consciously minoritizing stance of a minoritized group.” (David Greven i <http://www.ejumpcut.org/archive/jc53.2011/grevenBetteDavis/index.html>; lesedato 05.12.14)

“There are at least four overlapping (and possibly many more) types of camp that theorists have identified. The first is *naïve camp*, in which audiences decode mainstream “serious” texts as campy; thus cliché-ridden, badly acted Hollywood films like *Showgirls* (1995) – or any number of older melodramas from *Cobra Woman* (1944) to *Valley of the Dolls* (1967) – have been called camp. *Deliberate camp* is created by the producers of the text (and not the spectators, as is the case with naïve camp). *The Batman TV show* (ABC, 1966-1968), *Pink Flamingos* (1972), and *The Rocky Horror Picture Show* (1975), are all self-conscious, deliberate camp: they invite audiences to laugh at their deliberately wooden acting, bad dialogue, and cheap sets. *Queer camp* is camp that forthrightly calls into question dominant notions of gender and sexuality, and queer camp can be both naïve or deliberate. For example, Ed Wood Jr. (1924-1978) made the sex-change exploitation film *Glen or Glenda* (1953) in all seriousness, yet it is extremely queer and thus might best be classified as naïve queer camp. *Pop camp* is the mainstream appropriation of camp into styles or texts less challenging to dominant notions of gender and sexuality. Pop camp often verges on simple parody, in that it wants audiences to laugh at its stylistic or textual excess, without necessarily thinking about issues related to normative gender and sexuality. For example, the movie *Barbarella* (1968) might be best understood as deliberate pop camp: it is trying to be “cheesy” and “over-the-top” – but not to the point of deconstructing traditional

concepts of gender and sexuality (as does the deliberate queer camp of *Rocky Horror*). Nonetheless, some theorists have suggested that all camp should be considered queer-at-heart, as it always skews or distorts mainstream film practice (if not always gender and sexuality) in provocative ways.” (<http://www.filmreference.com/encyclopedia/Academy-Awards-Crime-Films/Camp.html>; lesedato 01.11.12)

Den dansk-tyske regissøren Douglas Sirks film-melodramaer, bl.a. *All that Heaven Allows* (1955), *Written on the Wind* (1956) og *Imitation of Life* (1959), har blitt sett som camp noen tiår etter at de ble produsert. Den amerikanske forfatteren Alfred Chesters roman *The Exquisite Corpse* (1967) har blitt kalt “a specimen of hysterical camp [...] it pushes the trappings of camp, homosexuality, fancy dress, and inflated language into the frenzy of nightmare.” (Kochhar-Lindgren, Schneiderman og Denlinger 2009 s. 155) Chester skal ha inspirert Susan Sontag til hennes teorier om camp (s. 156).

Little Me er “Patrick Dennis’ bitende ironiske og ustyrtelig morsomme roman fra 1961, en parodi på den klassiske stjernebiografien, full av “intime betroelser”. Boka har undertittelen “The Intimate Memoirs of that Great Star of Stage, Screen and Television, Belle Poitrine (as told to Patrick Dennis)” og handler om den fattige jenta Maybelle Schlumpfert, som var mer beryktet enn berømt, en høyst middelmådig stjerne uten talent eller skrupler av noe slag. Boka ble en internasjonal bestselger da den kom ut og regnes i dag som det litterære kron-eksemplet på camp-litteratur.” (Eirik Alver i *Dagbladet* 23. august 2008) Det er “the bawdy, bestselling, bountifully illustrated autobiography of an imaginary diva whose life is one hilarious mishap after another. For Belle Poitrine, née Mayble Schlumpfert, all the world’s a stage and she’s the most important player on it. At once coy and coercive, with a name that means “beautiful bosom” in French, she claws her way from Striver’s Row to the silver screen. Recalling Belle’s career, which ranged from portraying Anne Boleyn in *Oh, Henry* to roles in both *Sodom* and its sequel *Gomorrah* (not to mention the classic *Papaya Paradise*), *Little Me* serves up copious quantities of husbands, couture, and Pink Lady cocktails, with international adventures and a murder trial to boot. A runaway bestseller that made its way to Broadway, starring Sid Caesar in 1962 and Martin Short in 1998 [...] the 150 historic, hysterical photographs depicting the funniest scenes from Belle’s sordid life, including cameo appearances by the author and Rosalind Russell. Considered a collector’s item, the first edition of *Little Me* was like a performance in book form. Now this glittering spoof of celebrity is gloriously reincarnated for connoisseurs of all things chick and cheeky.” (<https://www.penguinrandomhouse.ca/books/39556/little-me-by-patrick-dennis/9780307419101>; lesedato 22.05.20)

Den amerikanske såpeserien *Dynasty* (fra 1981; skapt av Richard og Esther Shapiro m.fl.) var camp for noen seere. “At first, in Season 2, Alexis seemed outrageous because she was occurring in an environment of relative reality. But once the entire show went increasingly “camp” beginning with the third year, Alexis’

outrageousness somehow seemed less effective because everyone else was acting just as bizarrely.” (<http://www.soapchat.net/threads/modulating-the-camp-on-dynasty.1573/>; lesedato 06.05.20) Å delta på “camp-kvelder” som ble organisert når en episode av *Dynasty* ble vist på fjernsyn, fungerte som bekræftelse på en homoseksuell legning (Esquenazi 2007 s. 92). Jostein Gripsrud beskriver i *The Dynasty Years: Hollywood Television and Critical Media Studies* (1995) hvordan noen homoseksuelle miljøer i USA gjorde *Dynasty* til en kultserie.

Den australske regissøren Baz Luhrmanns film *Romeo + Juliet* (1996) “bevarer Shakespeares uforliknelige språk intakt, men plasserer det dødsdømte kjærlighetsparet ved en moderne kalifornisk strand. Der danner lysende plastikkmadonnaer og annen katolsk kitsch sammen med enorme Coca-Cola-skilt og annen merkevare-romantikk et maksimalistisk og forførende bakgrunnsteppe for den skjøre kjærlighetshistorien. Luhrmann nekter seg ingenting og bruker fast-forward, bratte, skrå kameravinkler og en jungel av pynt og symboler og klarer å skape en verden som konstant vakler på, og iblant snubler over, grensen til camp.” (Inger Merete Hobbeldstad i *Dagbladet* 21. september 2009 s. 48)

Det er ifølge Sontag en “delicate relation between parody and self-parody in Camp” (Sontag i Mathijs og Mendik 2008 s. 46).

Sontag hevder også at “[t]he two pioneering forces of modern sensibility are Jewish moral seriousness and homosexual aestheticism and irony”. Camp har blitt oppfattet som et dekadent kulturuttrykk nært knyttet til homoseksuelle intellektuelle miljøer i USA. “Camp taste is by its nature possible only in affluent societies, in societies or circles capable of experiencing the psychopathology of affluence. [...] The peculiar relation between Camp taste and homosexuality has to be explained. While it’s not true that Camp taste *is* homosexual taste, there is no doubt a peculiar affinity and overlap. [...] Camp is a solvent of morality. It neutralizes moral indignation, sponsors playfulness.” (Sontag i Mathijs og Mendik 2008 s. 51)

“Camp is everything everyone says it is: irony, humour, theatricality, artifice, grandiosity, incongruity, contrasts; but it is not only those things. Camp is a noun, an identity, a persona, an intrinsic self. [...] Camp is political, even if inadvertently so; even if its surface is docile, the undercurrents of the wide camp sea are marginality, resistance, survival. Camp is relational; it is the economy of discoverer and discovered, adulator and adulated. Camp is a process; it is a verb as well as a noun. It is a means, rather than merely an end, whose inner workings are visible only to its practitioners. The uninitiated can never see camp in action; they see camp’s symptoms, rather than its cause. Camp is the colonizing project of the marginal; in subsuming and translating the outside world, in investing the immaterial with transcendent meaning and grandiosity, it lays claim to its surroundings, it makes vocations of fantasy and interpretation. Camp is the pole vault of the invert; it leaps across hierarchies, buttressing the pedestrian with the

iconic, allowing the commonplace to converse with the magnificent. It acts as the translator between the spheres of the banal and the grandiose, it allows travel between those two realms; camp is the means by which the mundane achieves the sublime.” (Sholem Krishtalka i <http://forum.llc.ed.ac.uk/archive/04/krishtalka.pdf>; lesedato 18.04.11)

Camp er “a reading for the bawdy underneath the everyday surface. In a camp interpretive strategy, almost all the time, the constructed countermeaning relates to sexuality.” (Staiger 2005 s. 128)

Gamle filmer som det ikke lenger er mulig å ta “seriøst”, kan kalles camp (Neumann-Braun 1999 s. 220). Gene Fowler Jr.s film *I was a teenage werewolf* (1957) førte til camp-produksjoner som bl.a. Herbert L. Strocks *I was a teenage Frankenstein* (1957), Jacques R. Marquettes *Teenage monster* (1958) og John Elias Michalakis' *I was a teenage zombie* (1987). Den amerikanske regissøren Ed Woods film *Plan 9 from Outer Space* (1959) “is formally less extreme than *Glen or Glenda* [1953], but is perhaps the classic Wood film, the apotheosis of 1950s exploitation camp. It’s amusing crudities include startling continuity gaps, hubcaps doubling for spaceships, tombstones made of paper, and actors clearly reading their lines from cue cards in front of them.” (Gary Morris i http://www.glbtc.com/arts/wood_e.html; lesedato 09.08.12) Den engelske regissøren Ken Russells spillefilmer har blitt kalt camp (Krohn og Strank 2012 s. 212).

Som eksempler på camp oppgir Susan Sontag bl.a. Joseph L. Mankiewicz’ film *All About Eve* (1950), John Hustons film *Beat the Devil* (1953), Ernest B. Schoedsacks film *King Kong* (1933), Aubrey Beardsleys tegninger, balletten *Svanesjøen*, Vincenzo Bellinis operaer, gamle *Flash Gordon*-tegniserier, “the film performances of Mae West and Edward Everett Horton”, Noel Cowards skuespill, samt romaner av Ronald Firbank og Ivy Compton-Burnett (Sontag i Mathijs og Mendik 2008 s. 42 og 46). Om Charles Dickens’ roman *The Old Curiosity Shop* (1841) siterer Susan Sontag følgende camp-uttalelse: “One must have a heart of stone to read the death of Little Nell without laughing.” (Sontag i Mathijs og Mendik 2008 s. 52) Sontag hevder også at skuespilleren Greta Garbos rolleprestasjoner er camp: “the great serious idol of Camp taste, Greta Garbo. Garbo’s incompetence (at the least, lack of depth) as an actress enhances her beauty. She’s always herself. [...] Wherever there is development of character, Camp is reduced.” (Sontag i Mathijs og Mendik 2008 s. 48)

“Compare a typical 19th century opera with Samuel Barber’s *Vanessa*, a piece of manufactured, calculated Camp, and the difference is clear.” (Sontag i Mathijs og Mendik 2008 s. 46) “Like many American operas, Samuel Barber’s “*Vanessa*” started strong and then faded. Its initial reception at the Metropolitan Opera in 1958 was wildly enthusiastic; Dimitri Mitropoulos, who conducted the first performance, exclaimed, “At last, an American grand opera!” [...] The principal reason for the opera’s neglect is probably Gian Carlo Menotti’s soggy libretto, which aims for the

Gothic passions of Isak Dinesen and the subtle epiphanies of Chekhov but instead achieves a kind of uneventful, unpoetic melodrama. Vanessa, the melancholy aristocrat, falls for the young, caddish Anatol, the son of her former lover. Erika, her no less melancholy niece, also sleeps with Anatol, becomes pregnant and aborts her child to avoid compromising her aunt. Vanessa goes off with Anatol, unaware of his worthlessness, while Erika stays home and withdraws from the world. What this ponderous material does supremely well is play to the composer's strengths, particularly his penchant for melancholy rumination. Strangely, Barber felt the need to interrupt his rapt lyric passages with formulaic semi-dissonant exclamations that now sound a bit too close to 1950's film music. He overused the augmented triad, where major thirds are piled one on the other (this was also a favorite device of Bernard Herrmann, whose "Vertigo" score appeared the same year) and lapsed into Puccinisms at several passionate climaxes." (Alex Ross i <http://www.nytimes.com/1995/01/16/arts/opera-review-barber-s-vanessa-long-neglected-is-revived.html>; lesedato 14.08.12)

"If the pleasure generated by bad taste presents a challenge to the mechanisms of control and containment that operate in the name of good taste, it is often to be enjoyed *only* at the expense of others, and this is largely because camp's excess of pleasure has very little, finally, to do with the (un)controlled hedonism of a consumer; it is the result of the (hard) *work* of a producer of taste, and "taste" is only possible through exclusion *and* depreciation." (Andrew Ross i Mathijs og Mendik 2008 s. 58)

"Perhaps the most extreme example of resistive reading involves what Jeff Sconce (1989) has described as "the cult of 'Bad' cinema," fans who celebrate the most dubious aspects of the Hollywood cinema and who are drawn toward low-budget exploitation films such as *Glen or Glenda*, *Robot Monster*, and *Blood-Orgy of the She-Devils*. Sconce documents this movement's aesthetics ("It isn't enough that a movie be campy and mediocre. It must show incomparably flawed craftsmanship in every detail. It must be so stupefyingly [sic] artless that it IS ART, albeit of the most accidental kind" [...] and social mission ["The search for BADTRUTH. To resist temptations of REFINEMENT, TASTE, and ESCAPISM"]). These fans celebrate the technical incompetence and flawed conceptions of what they identify as some of the worst movies ever made, finding there a repudiation of respectable taste and middle-class values. The directors of "BAD-FILMS" are treated as undiscovered stylists in a travesty of conventional auteurism and fans read with perverse pleasure accounts of the filmmakers' failed careers and struggles against spartan production circumstances." (Jenkins 1992 s. 63)

Jeff Sconce kalte "*paracinematic* fans [people who] privilege films normally viewed as awful or bad or "trash." [...] Paracinematic viewing is not a *camp* (the other) viewing practice. Both paracinematic and camp viewers read parodically. They refuse to read the text as its makers intended. (Intent is, of course, a major philosophical problem; here, I am just asserting that traditional historical evidence

would provide the evidence for a commonsensical decision about intent.) Both paracinematic and camp viewers exaggerate portions of the text as more significant than originally intended; they create double entendres; they focus on stylistic excess. A paracinematic viewer, however, does not exercise this viewing strategy on standard-quality Hollywood movies, as does a camp viewer. The object of cultivation is the obscure B movie or the off-off-Hollywood exploitation film. Moreover, beyond the traditional parodic attacks, paracinematic viewers often use academic discourse to create their ironic commentary about these low-culture objects. Referencing auteur theory or specialized theoretical language, paracinematic viewers assert their intelligence and education.” (Staiger 2005 s. 126-127)

“Camp is, and was, perhaps a discourse of the closet, a sensibility for survival produced in an era when one's homosexuality had to be kept secret. British film critic Jack Babuscio explored those ties (even as they were fading away) in his essay “Camp and the Gay Sensibility” (1977). For Babuscio, the camp sensibility was dependent on queers' alienation from the mainstream. Such alienation produced irony (between the straight and gay worlds), performative role-playing (the need to pass as straight), aestheticization (desire to find beauty and truth wherever one could), and bittersweet humor (needed in order to survive in a hostile world). While those four traits still describe the camp sensibility, they no longer necessarily describe a specifically gay sensibility. Many gay and lesbian people now see themselves as part of mainstream America, and one does not have to be gay or lesbian in order to understand and appreciate camp.” (<http://www.filmreference.com/encyclopedia/>; lesedato 01.11.12)

“To a certain extent, historical camp style and taste have been subsumed by a more generalized sense of postmodern irony and pastiche, a stance that approaches life (and media texts) as always and already “within quotes.” Within film culture, the originally queer cult of camp has evolved into a larger, straighter, cult of fans who enjoy watching “bad movies” – B movies, low-budget genre films, exploitation cinema, and so forth. While this is consistent with camp's historical function (the revaluation of artifacts that dominant culture has already sloughed off) much of the “bad movie” cultism in the early twenty-first century perhaps lacks the critical context or political grounding that queer camp cultists embodied. Bad movies may be funny, and fun to laugh at (as the cult popularity of a show like *Mystery Science Theater 3000* (1988-1999) attests to), but if and when more political critiques those films give rise to are heard, they are only one voice in an otherwise cacophonous semiotic excess. True to the polemics of the postmodern economy, the camp sensibility, born out of genuine political struggle and discrimination, has perhaps become just another hip stance or lifestyle practice available for purchase.” (<http://www.filmreference.com/encyclopedia/>; lesedato 01.11.12)

Den amerikanske regissøren Bill Condon's film *The Twilight Saga: Breaking Dawn, Part 2* (2012) ble av anmelderen Inger Merete Hobbestad oppfattet som delvis

camp: Det er “helt klart en viss campy moro ved å se oversminkede udødelige rive hoder og lemmer av hverandre, og følge Michael Sheens psykopatiske og fistelfnisende glamrocker av en vampyrhersker mens han bestemmer over liv og død med utstuderte håndleddbevegelser.” (*Dagbladet* 15. november 2012 s. 45)

Alle artiklene og litteraturlista til hele leksikonet er tilgjengelig på <https://www.litteraturogmedieleksikon.no>