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In 1966 David McGillivray contacted *Films and Filming* editor Peter Baker asking for the opportunity to write for the magazine. He wanted to be a film critic. McGillivray was just eighteen years old and had no idea that besides being an established and respected film publication, *Films and Filming* was also well known among queer men for its homosexually themed articles, advertising and contact ads. According to McGillivray, ‘It was my friends who knew all about it because they said things like “Well, there’s always men on the cover”. And I hadn’t noticed. I was very, very green.’[[1]](#endnote-1) McGillivray’s confusion, however, illuminates *Films and Filming*’s strength. The magazine in fact succeeded as a mainstream and internationally respected film title for decades because its queer content remained unnoticed by many. But among those who knew and could decode the magazine’s multiple voices, *Films and Filming* acknowledged Britain’s pre-decriminalisation homosexual community and actively courted a nascent queer male market segment.

Long before homosexual activity between consenting men was partially decriminalised in Britain in 1967, *Films and Filming* included articles and images, erotically charged commercial advertisements and same-sex contact ads that established its queer leanings. Published and edited by homosexual men and assembled by a largely queer staff, *Films and Filming*’s producers deliberately coded the magazine for men like themselves, with little or no interest in lesbians. Throughout its life, *Films and Filming*’s articles on censorship of homosexual themes in film, references to sexually ambiguous male actors like Rock Hudson and Dirk Bogarde, humour, sexual innuendo and homoerotic photo spreads all reinforced for many that *Films and Filming* was queer. From its initial issues in 1954, *Films and Filming* sought what we would today call the pink pound, or Britain’s queer market segment. Commercial advertisements promoted queer-friendly and queer-owned businesses; the first issues included ads for *Vince Man’s Shop*, the notorious Soho men’s boutique. Discreet ‘bachelor’ ads from men looking for same-sex partners began appearing in the mid 1950s. These were soon a key feature of the publication’s pre-decriminalisation years, later becoming more explicit adverts for sexual partners and queer prostitutes. By the 1960s, some readers were so sure of the magazine’s queer audience, they even sought to buy or sell homoerotic magazines and films through its classified ads. Advertisers and readers both recognised that the tone and focus of much of the magazine’s visual, editorial and feature content spoke directly to queer men as one of the magazine’s intended audiences. Readers too actively participated in the magazine’s queer project, submitting and responding to personal contact ads that confirmed their place among *Films and Filming*’s growing and lucrative readership.

But *Films and Filming* was also an important mainstream film publication, widely respected and universally available. Barry Pattison, who worked at *Films and Filming* from 1961 to 1963, was drawn to the magazine first as a reader and then as a contributor because of its importance as a film journal. It was, he recalls, ‘the first [film magazine] in English where fifties and sixties films were discussed by their intended audience, who had a different take on cinema to the prevailing views put forward by older press critics.’[[2]](#endnote-2) He was struck so strongly by the magazine, in fact, that more than fifty years later he even remembers the film appearing on the cover of the first issue he bought upon arriving in London from Australia in 1959 - *The Letter that was Never Sent*. Despite its camp innuendo and queer references, throughout the 1950s and 1960s *Films and Filming* remained an internationally respected and successful film journal.

 This commercial double life was key to both the magazine’s financial success and its appeal to many queer men. Editor Robin Bean once explained his motivation to *Films and Filming* contributor Michael Armstrong: ‘Gay men who were in the closet, especially those who still lived at home with their parents or were married, could openly sit on the tube or a bus or in school or the office and be viewed reading the magazine without fear of anyone suspecting they were gay.’[[3]](#endnote-3) This strategy allowed *Films and Filming* to successfully appeal to both mainstream and queer markets without alienating either.Queer codes and innuendo were subtle enough to be overlooked or misread by mainstream readers, while at the same time they offered validation and expression of homosexual interests and desires. *Films and Filming* successfully navigated this line for almost two decades.

 *Films and Filming*, then, is significant for at least two reasons. First, it was the only mainstream, pre-decriminalisation, mass circulation publication in Britain to remain successful while actively courting a queer market segment. There were, to be sure, underground titles that explicitly targeted queer consumers throughout the twentieth century. And there were pre-decriminalisation mainstream titles that temporarily explored the opportunities offered by appealing to a queer market segment. The former never achieved success on the scale or international scope of *Films and Filming*; this wasn’t their goal. And the latter were only temporary anomalies in an otherwise orthodox market-positioning strategy. Publications that dabbled in the queer market eventually folded, returned to an exclusively mainstream appeal, or chose to pursue another target market instead. Second, *Films and Filming* is important because it affords us the opportunity to discuss the role and significance of mass-circulation publications to queer history. Not only was the magazine itself a consumer good, which could only survive with sufficient sales and support from several groups of consumers, but it was also a venue through which advertisers seeking the pink pound could be sure to access this nascent target market. Why and how did *Films and Filming* seek the marginalised queer consumer? What appeal or utility would homosexuals find in a film magazine? And why did this strategy finally collapse after two decades?

Though it was among the best known and longest running pre-decriminalisation publications to engage actively with the queer male market, *Films and Filming* was not the first publication to court the pink pound, garner a significant homosexual readership, or print homosexually coded commercial or contact ads. While not yet extensive, there is a growing literature both on pre-gay-liberation homophile publications and also on mainstream publications that cultivated queer audiences. Julian Jackson’s study of *Arcadie* (1954-82) in France and Hubert Kennedy’s study of trilingual Swiss journal *Der Kreis* (1932-67) both illuminate the histories of these important homophile publications.[[4]](#endnote-4) In the US, numerous scholars, including Martin Meeker, Rodger Streitmatter and Manuela Soares, have identified the significance of *One Magazine* (1953-72), *The Mattachine Review* (1955-66), *The Ladder* (1956-70) and other publications to twentieth-century American queer communities.[[5]](#endnote-5) And in Britain, Rebecca Jennings’s work on *Arena Three* (1963-72) traces the history of this UK lesbian publication and the women who founded it.[[6]](#endnote-6)

But underground or marginal social and activist publications were not the only materials that pre-liberation homosexuals read. Nor were they the only publications that actively sought queer readers. Some mainstream publications sought queer consumers for other reasons, namely as a potential market. Laurel Brake and Matt Cook have uncovered this as early as the late nineteenth century in arts publications like *The Artist and Journal of Home Culture* (1880-1902) and *The Studio: An Illustrated Magazine of Fine and Applied Arts* (1893-94) whose coded text and imagery emphasising male beauty and classical allusions appear directed at what Brake calls a ‘pink market niche’.[[7]](#endnote-7) And through the Edwardian and interwar periods, some early men’s magazines such as *The Modern Man* (1908-15)and *Men Only* (est. 1935) also walked a fine line, seeking homosexual consumers without alienating mainstream readers.[[8]](#endnote-8) But in each of these cases, the publication’s appeal to queer consumers was only temporary. The magazine folded, new editors redirected priorities, or wartime economic conditions shifted interests to other more lucrative markets. More typically, however, magazines’ treatments of homosexuality mirror what Kenon Breazeale finds in the US men’s magazine *Esquire* (est. 1933). Elements of the magazine all worked together, according to Breazeale, to reinforce a heteronormative male reader, unblemished by what editor Arnold Gingrich called any ‘whiff of lavender’.[[9]](#endnote-9)

In tandem with some publishers’ and editors’ courting of homosexual readers, and in spite of others’ desires to eschew them, queer men long used the classified columns of magazines and newspapers to make contact with one another. Advertisements offered privacy and anonymity to men who chose not to disclose their names. But, appearing in even national newspapers, they were also highly public and accessible. They advertised men’s interest in same-sex companionship when other opportunities for contact among queer men were largely restricted to urban centres and actively discouraged by laws and policing that continued to proscribe homosexual activity. Historian Harry Cocks, for example, has uncovered a remarkable history of same-sex personal advertisements appearing in mainstream magazines and newspapers including *Link* and even the *Daily Express* from the first decades of the twentieth century.[[10]](#endnote-10) In the second half of the twentieth century, anxiety over the content of queer ads extended still further. With their suspect codes and transgressive sexuality, queer personal ads appearing in even mainstream publications now met the ire of government officials and parliamentarians. In a letter to Sir John Wolfenden, Chair of the Department Committee on Homosexual Offences and Prostitution, one committee member wondered in 1956 whether legal reform might actually encourage ‘More adverts for male “companions”’ and cited the appearance of such ads in *Filmgoers Weekly, New Statesman*, ‘and even *The* *Times* (and the *Church Times*!).’[[11]](#endnote-11)

To what extent producers of the *New Statesman* (or the *Church Times*) realised the uses for which queer men employed their publications is difficult to determine. Too often historians can only speculate as to the explicit intentions of producers who left little or no record of magazines’ consumer acquisition strategies. And rarely if ever do readers leave behind detailed records to illuminate their reception of publications. Analysis of *Films and Filming*, however, is supported by first-hand testimony from both producers and consumers, unique among pre-decriminalisation publications. Ample oral histories and reminiscences from *Films and Filming*’seditors and contributors leave no doubt as to producers’ market strategies and awareness of their consequences. Further, evidence from readers testifies to the magazine’s reception by queer men. *Films and Filming*, then, which included not only content and imagery, but also advertising and contact ads directed at queer consumers, is likely unique, certainly remarkable and undoubtedly a powerful source for uncovering the entwined history of homosexuality and consumerism.

Publisher Philip Dosse’s series of seven arts titles put out by his firm Hansom Books began in January 1950 with the publication of *Dance and Dancers*.[[12]](#endnote-12) The series then grew to include *Music and Musicians* (1952) and *Plays and Players* (1953). *Films and Filming* appeared next in October 1954. This was followed by *Books and Bookmen* (1955), *Records and Recording* (1957) and finally *Art and Artists* (1966)*.*[[13]](#endnote-13) Positioned upmarket of fan magazines, but more intellectually accessible than the British Film Institute’s *Sight and Sound*, *Films and Filming* was widely available in mainstream bookshops and newsagents in Britain and abroad. Priced at two shillings in the late 1950s and only three shillings a decade later, it remained affordable to a broad range of readers.

The dance expert Peter Brinson was first to edit *Films and Filming*, but was soon replaced by Peter Baker, who would remain at its helm throughout much of the 1950s and 1960s.[[14]](#endnote-14) Baker’s assistant, Robin Bean, played a pivotal role in the magazine as its last editor under publisher Philip Dosse from 1968, though his influence on the magazine extended further back into its 1960s heyday. Described as a ‘cheeseparing eccentric’, Dosse himself remained an enigmatic figure throughout his tenure as publisher, largely unknown even to some editors and most contributors to his magazines.[[15]](#endnote-15) Many contributors worked from home, interacting only with editorial staff in the final days before going to print. And even among the core staff, interactions with Dosse were few, with day-to-day operations being undertaken by senior editors. But it was Dosse, most contributors agree, whose vision guided *Films and Filming* to seek a queer audience.

While *Films and Filming* was respected and well known throughout the 1950s and 1960s, and remained among the most successful of Dosse’s titles (reportedly covering the costs of his other magazines), Hansom Books was always in a precarious financial position. Stanley Stewart, personal assistant to Dosse in 1959, experienced the already uncertain finances of Hansom Books in those early days. In the short time he worked for Dosse, the operation moved three times in two years, presumably to lower overheads.[[16]](#endnote-16) Barry Pattison, who wrote for *Films and Filming* from 1961 to 1963, describes the operation as being run on a shoestring out of a Belgravia basement a few years later. He even heard of staff members having to buy their own paper clips. And when he parted ways from Dosse’s empire in 1963, his last cheque was for only half the agreed upon amount.[[17]](#endnote-17)

In response to Philip Dosse’s financial straits, editorial decisions were consciously based in part on accessing a potential homosexual market. Dosse recognised that a nascent market of culturally literate and cosmopolitan queer men with disposable incomes was appearing in Britain and abroad. Titles like *Films and Filming* addressed these oversights and spoke specifically to this market, even while maintaining mainstream credibility and availability. Although Dosse did not take an active role in the day-to-day running of all his magazines - David McGillivray describes him as more *éminence grise* - he nonetheless exerted influence over each, especially *Films and Filming*, by recommending specific editorial decisions. Contributors remember him being responsible for encouraging the magazine’s most explicit homoerotic content precisely to court queer consumers. Dosse would suggest particular articles, remembered McGillivray, to allow editors to ‘get more dolly boys on the cover.’[[18]](#endnote-18) This made good financial sense, ensuring that *Films and Filming* remained Dosse’s most popular and successful title. Likely part of this same strategy, Barry Pattison remembers, ‘Having Alain Delon (*Plein Soleil*) on the cover with his shirt off was said to have produced an increase in sales and having Charlton Heston taking his pants off (*Big Country*) sent them soaring.’[[19]](#endnote-19) But this strategy to appeal to queer men was not supported by Dosse’s last *Films and Filming* editor. Michael Armstrong recalls conflict between Dosse, who sought bolder homosexual content, and editor Robin Bean, who preferred initially to keep both the magazine’s and his own homosexual inclinations less pronounced.[[20]](#endnote-20)

 *Films and Filming* nonetheless longremained among the most respected English language film publications. Its significance and market penetration by the 1960s are hard to exaggerate. On staff were leading critics like Raymond Durgnat and Gordon Gow, and articles appeared from world-famous critics, directors and actors like Ingmar Bergman and Kenneth Tynan, Boris Karloff and even Lillian Gish.[[21]](#endnote-21) It even penetrated popular consciousness and was referenced in films and theatre in its own right. In *The Swimmer* (1968) starring Burt Lancaster, Janet Rule’s character Shirley Abbot is seen lounging by the pool reading a copy. And in the British stage production of Woody Allen’s *Play it Again Sam* (1969), Dudley Moore’s character Allan Felix is a reviewer for *Films and Filming*.[[22]](#endnote-22)

By the 1970s, however, the decline had begun, but the magazine still managed to maintain relevance by gaining exclusive access to film sets and printing stills that appeared nowhere else. Its photo spreads at this time were, remembers David McGillivray, internationally renowned. And the magazine’s leading critics still secured interviews with cinema’s most influential personalities.[[23]](#endnote-23) A secretive man, editor Robin Bean it seems was remarkably well connected. Though by this time he had little interest in the magazine’s written content, he regularly secured unique set photos for the magazine and exclusive interviews and write-ups with emerging, and handsome, actors. It was under the later years of Bean’s editorship that the magazine’s queer focus became strongest and least coded. While queer personal ads disappeared shortly before decriminalisation, the 1970s saw *Films and Filming* break more taboos than ever before, but at the cost of alienating key audiences.

How did readers identify *Films and Filming* as a potentially queer publication? Ostensibly reporting on the world of actors and cinema, *Films and Filming* deliberately appealed to its queer male market through its editorials, features and strategically selected film stills. Besides reviews and editorials that appealed to interests in queer film and law reform, editors and producers also used articles to discuss handsome rising actors and thereby justify a healthy dose of male flesh as well. In May 1955, for instance, Clayton Cole spent an entire article evaluating the recent crop of actors to appear in film.[[24]](#endnote-24) So dedicated was Cole that he even developed a taxonomy to categorise the flood of young men in Hollywood. On the one hand, he relayed to readers, was the ‘Wilson group’, discoveries of beefcake talent agent Henry Wilson, including Tab Hunter, Rock Hudson, Robert Wagner and others. These were ‘glamour boys moulded from prime quality beef-cake with no nonsense about Art and Cause.’ Then there were the ‘Brando boys’, men like Montgomery Clift, James Dean and Paul Newman, influenced by the style and success of Marlon Brando. These blue-jean clad, bare-chested men were ‘ardent, sensitive and dedicated … loathe[d] glamour as artificial’ and sought films with messages. In the competition between ‘Beauty and Blue-Jeans’ among film’s young leading men, only one thing was certain, according to Cole: the man who makes us forget Brando will come out the winner. But something else was certain too. Amid film stills of James Dean and Tab Hunter, references to sexually ambiguous actors and an extensive even excessive discussion of emerging Hollywood heartthrobs, the article was rife with information, coded references and subcultural cues that would appeal to *Film and Filming*’s queer audiences without alienating mainstream film enthusiasts. Throughout the magazine’s run, this kind of fixation on male actors, bordering on salivation, would only become less circumspect.

Rarely missing the opportunity to de-contextualise film stills and print a naked torso or steamy glance between two men, producers offered mild homoerotica even in the 1950s and 1960s when such material remained largely inaccessible. Editors, for example, used a photo spread on Michael Cacoyannis’s *Our Last Spring* (1960) to exhibit a queer sensibility through image selection. Amid other stills that inevitably displayed chiseled, brooding Greek youths, some are more suggestive, including images of covert glances among men, a bevy of bare-chested youths at the beach and one image that seems to fulfil no other purpose than to highlight the bottom of one young man pulling himself up after stumbling into a creek.[[25]](#endnote-25) In the same issue, one article stands out in particular. ‘The Money in Muscles’ described at length a ‘Beefcake Invasion’ among recent Italian-made films.[[26]](#endnote-26) The article alerted readers to the production and expected release of a range of historical films that emphasised the male body. These ‘Italian spectacles’, referring to both the film epics themselves and their historical ‘musclemen’, were ‘fabulous - as at least one American “muscle boy” has discovered.’ The so-called ‘muscle boy’ was heartthrob bodybuilder and actor Steve Reeves, whose break-out role as Hercules was featured in the article and accompanied by a loin-cloth-clad photo still. This so-called invasion of beefcake described and pictured in the article would have immediately resonated with many of *Films and Filming*’s homosexual readers, particularly those already familiar with the language of beefcake in underground and homoerotic physique publications.

*Films and Filming*’s queer market strategy did not rely only on homoerotic spectacle - the money in muscles - to speak to queer men. Articles featured political and social concerns as well. Articles on censorship and homosexuality in film appeared regularly, further signaling to other readers the magazine’s position on a divisive issue. In 1958, the same year that the Lord Chamberlain relaxed his ban on homosexuality on the British stage, Denis Duperley and Geoff Donaldson asked in *Films and Filming* whether, in the era of the Wolfenden Report of 1957, which had suggested that the government decriminalise homosexuality, the British Board of Film Censors (BBFC) was ready to finally approve ‘films making an honest drama of homosexuality.’[[27]](#endnote-27) Highlighting what they saw as the board’s taboo of the subject ‘unless … cloaked with the delicacy of Minnelli’s *Tea and Sympathy*, or the obscurity of Hitchcock’s *Rope* or Ray’s *Rebel Without a Cause*’, neither was optimistic. They further wondered whether progressive and homosexually themed films like the Danish *Bundfald* (*The Dregs*) or the German *Anders als du und ich* (released in English as *The Third Sex*) would even be permitted in the UK. Articles such as this opened dialogue on the subject of homosexuality in film at a key moment in Britain and also signaled to queer readers the magazine’s own progressive stance on the subject.

Perhaps Duperley’s and Donaldson’s concerns were not so far off the mark. While there is no record of *Bundfald* being submitted to the BBFC for certification, *The Third Sex* was. Neither Duperley nor Donaldson realised that it had already been rejected for public exhibition almost six months before their call for it to be shown.[[28]](#endnote-28) The BBFC found fault not just with the theme of homosexuality, too openly presented for its standards, but also with its visual representation in the film, noting especially ‘scenes in which boys are shown wrestling in scanty clothing … and elderly men dressed as women.’ The board, however, was less concerned with expressions of explicit homosexuality: ‘The seduction scene is frank but probably would not have been unacceptable for an “X” certificate.’ Claiming it would have considered passing a film that treated the subject of homosexuality seriously and with decency, the board concluded that *The Third Sex* had done neither.[[29]](#endnote-29) And when the board viewed the film a second time, it reiterated these points, demanding that homosexuality ‘should be conveyed by inference rather than by direct observation or dialogue.’[[30]](#endnote-30) In 1958 the BBFC was not yet ready for the kind of open treatment of homosexuality that Duperley and Donaldson advocated in *Films and Filming.* A full year later, referencing the May 1958 article, a *Films and Filming* review of *The Third Sex* further berated the BBFC for its attitude to the film, suggesting that the real reason for the board’s refusal to certify the film was ‘that the film does not *condemn* or pity homosexuality.’[[31]](#endnote-31) The reviewer then condemned the BBFC, concluding that *The Third Sex*, though flawed and perhaps soon forgotten as a film, ‘will be long remembered as a piece of British censorship bigotry’.

With a queer market segment having been identified by *Films and Filming*’s publisher and editors, advertisers soon cottoned on to the potential of this group. From its very first issues, the magazine also included ads from *Vince Man’s Shop*, whichappealed to homosexual men with coded language and suggestive images that many would have readily recognised.[[32]](#endnote-32) Unsurprisingly, the aesthetic of these ads - male models posed in revealing swimwear and tight garments - bore a striking resemblance to the physique photography Bill Green (aka Vince) had produced during his period as a beefcake photographer in the late 1940s and early 1950s. It was also not unlike other images of men selected from film stills that appeared in *Films and Filming*. This aesthetic, already coded as queer by virtue of its appearance in physique magazines and erotic photo prints, immediately spoke to homosexual consumers of both *Films and Filming* and Vince’s menswear lines with a familiar visual and erotic language. Over time, his ads promoted a range of queer-coded styles while becoming increasingly charged and homoerotic.

Like Vince’s earlier erotic physique photography, his ad images were to be looked upon, desired and then instigate the purchase of more images. In April 1955, Vince’s ad for ‘Capri style jeans’ focused as much on the model as the product. The model was posed looking away from the viewer, inviting unselfconscious gazes at his bum, which was deliberately placed at the very centre of the advertisement.[[33]](#endnote-33) Besides the jeans, the ad also advertised the new 1955 leisurewear catalogue, sent on request, presumably showing more of the model in less. Queer journalist and playwright Peter Burton even claimed that Vince’s ‘catalogue of swim- and underwear could *almost* be classified as an early gay magazine.’[[34]](#endnote-34) The next month’s ad showed the catalogue itself, which indeed offered more flesh than earlier images, displaying the model in ‘2-way stretch swim briefs’.[[35]](#endnote-35) Again looking away, and dressed only in the zebra-print briefs, the model’s body is the attraction in the ad. Well-built and muscular, he showed remarkable resemblance to the physical culture enthusiasts Vince had photographed only a few years earlier.

By June of 1958, subtlety was gone. Again advertising the ‘famous Vince 2-way stretch brief’, the ad was now almost entirely taken up by two pictures cropped to show only the models.[[36]](#endnote-36) Displaying the carefully cultivated bodies of physical culture, the men wore only the small briefs Vince was known for. The images were also positioned to have the two models looking at each other, now the objects of each other’s gazes, offering potential sexual tension between the men within the ad itself. Another year later, Vince’s ad for the ‘New Striped Swimbrief’ showed a model more like a homoerotic physique print than ever before. Here Vince’s brief left none of the model’s anatomy to the imagination, his genitals easily discernable beneath the fabric of the brief swimming costume.[[37]](#endnote-37)

In addition to retail advertisements like Vince’s, other businesses catering to homosexuals could be found advertising among the classifieds in *Films and Filming*, further reinforcing recognition of the magazine as an access point for queer consumers. On several occasions adverts ran for a bed and breakfast in Brighton. The bachelor apartment was in Hove just two minutes from the seafront and cost one guinea a night.[[38]](#endnote-38) Nothing in the text of the ad immediately divulged any queer associations. But those interested were asked to write to Filk’n Casuals or 31 Bond Street, Brighton. Filk’n Casuals, named for Phil and Ken, known to clients and friends as Auntie Rose and Auntie Esmé, was the most notorious men’s outfitters outside of London. Catering, like Vince, especially to homosexual men, Rose and Esmé designed shirts, swimming trunks, briefs and other articles of clothing whose flamboyance, cut and colour often cast into suspicion the sexuality of those who wore them. Brighton couple Bob and Harry even recalled Rose and Esmé’s B&B ads appearing across Hansom Books’ other titles. Auntie Rose ‘advertised in the gay books you know which was very rare then’, Harry remembered. ‘Plays, Players and Theatre, Players and, Players and Theatregoers or something’, added Bob helpfully.[[39]](#endnote-39) But Filk’n’s was not the only ad directed at queer customers of the holiday trade. In the same column, ‘a charming country house, near sea, Lisbon’ was offered for ten guineas a week ‘For the Unconventionals’.[[40]](#endnote-40) Suggesting unconventional clients with unconventional lifestyles, and placed within the context of a magazine with a known and established homosexual audience, the Lisbon accommodation was very likely a queer-friendly business, perhaps queer-owned, but certainly tapping into the market in international leisure and travel among homosexuals.

In addition to bricks and mortar businesses, individuals used *Films and Filming*’s classified ads to sell products and advertise casual employment. These ads too extended beyond widespread appeals to a general audience, and some, again, focused specifically on the queer audience they knew could be found there. Even if in the 1960s erotic and queer beefcake magazines existed largely underground, tellingly, homoerotica could also be bought in the classified ads of *Films and Filming.* In one issue, an ad requested ‘A. M. G. 8mm Films new or used’.[[41]](#endnote-41) Likely referring to materials produced by the Athletic Model Guild, Bob Mizer’s California beefcake production company, the client was in luck: conveniently, just a few ads below, C. Baxter offered a ‘Large Quantity of A. M. G. and similar material for disposal’. *Films and Filming*’s small ads were in some issues a veritable queer marketplace - one that extended beyond consumer goods.

The back pages of *Films and Filming* were used for more than the sales of homoerotic goods, rental of vacation properties and advertisements for queer-friendly businesses. The Market Place section became most renowned among queer men for its personal contact ads.[[42]](#endnote-42) Advertisements offered privacy and anonymity to men who chose not to disclose their identities. But, appearing even in national newspapers and magazines, they exploited the distribution channels that mass circulation publications relied upon. Liverpool-born Frank Birkhill, who later worked at London’s Toynbee Hall, remembered such adverts in the personal columns of London newspapers in the 1930s and 1940s. Widely available in mainstream publications, he remembered ads codedly seeking a ‘secretary, or … traveling companion’, but which were nonetheless still clear to men looking for other homosexual men. Related Birkhill, ‘I found a few people like that.’[[43]](#endnote-43)

*Films and Filming* offered another generation of men like Birkhill similar opportunities in the 1950s as it became the best-known publication among queer consumers for personal ads. Throughout the 1950s and 1960s an increasing number of same-sex personal ads suggests the stability, even the growth, of the magazine’s queer market segment. In these personal ads we find the voices of that audience using the magazine for its own purposes. The earliest ads, in which men indicated ‘special interests’ of art, ballet and music in their search for like-minded male companions, were soon replaced by terms like ‘bachelor’, and references to interest in ‘physiques’. By May 1958, ads were becoming increasingly suggestive: ‘Young man, 28, seeks position that is “different.” Anything interesting considered.’[[44]](#endnote-44) Indeed, by the late 1950s and throughout the 1960s most of the magazine’s Market Place section comprised ads from men, carefully coded to suggest homosexual desires, seeking same-sex companionship. Commenting on *Films and Filming*, John Stamford of Brighton, founder of the physique magazine *Spartacus* and ultimately the international *Spartacus Gay Guide*, remembered the classified section growing from just a few adverts to one and a half pages of them by the mid 1960s.[[45]](#endnote-45) Over the course of these two decades, *Films and Filming* became a feature of mid-century queer commercial and social life.

Michael O’Sullivan, who would later work for *Films and Filming* managing subscriptions in the mid 1970s, remembers getting his first copies of the magazineaged sixteen in 1962. He made sure to get copies monthly after that, soon recognising the magazine’s queer slant and opportunities to make contact with other men. O’Sullivan even sent in an ad himself at seventeen while still living with his parents in Ireland. Replies arrived from all over the world including Hollywood, Malta, Australia and England. He even made a few lifelong friends from the experience. And when O’Sullivan moved to London in 1965 aged eighteen, as a young gay man he again turned to the correspondence ads of *Films and Filming*, knowing he could use its contact ads to find friends and shared accommodation in the city. ‘It did have a considerable influence on my life’, he remembers.[[46]](#endnote-46)

The magazine’s queer network even extended internationally. In May 1965 Peter Bonsall-Boone, who would gain notoriety with his partner seven years later for Australia’s first homosexual TV kiss, was already familiar enough with the British magazine *Films and Filming* to place a personal ad knowing it would reach its intended audience.[[47]](#endnote-47) His ad described himself as an ‘active young bachelor’ from Victoria, Australia, ‘interested in most things’. This included finding similar young men. Two ‘bachelors’ living in Ealing placed an ad in the same issue*.* Not surprisingly their interests included cinema - and also wrestling. They sought ‘male friends’, aged 25 to 30, who were encouraged to respond with photos. This last condition was declared ‘essential’. A ‘Young, Versatile Ex-Matelot’, a ‘Presentable young designer’, an ‘Unconventional Bachelor’ and ‘A Nice warm, sensitive male’, among others, all sought the same thing in the back pages of *Films and Filming*. Indeed, most of the magazine’s Market Place section by this time comprised ads from men, carefully coded and suggestive of homosexual inclinations, seeking same-sex companionship. Still others, like that of a ‘gay and versatile’ young man who sought ‘interesting, remunerative’ work, were less circumspect - ‘anything legal considered’, he added.[[48]](#endnote-48)

 The language used by men in *Films and Filming*’s contact ads is also significant. Besides giving insights into the desires of Britain’s pre-decriminalisation queer community, ad posters’ use of particular vocabulary charts a linguistic history of British homosexuality. Terms like ‘sensitive’, ‘artistic’, and ‘unconventional’ had held queer associations since the early decades of the twentieth century, particularly when used to describe a ‘bachelor’. It is remarkable that they continued to hold currency for British homosexuals even after the Second World War. More remarkable, however, was the appearance of new terms of identification that appeared in *Films and Filming*.

 The term ‘gay’, for instance, imported from the United States, was largely unknown in mainstream British English until the late 1960s with the Stonewall Riots in 1969. Sociologist and historian Jeffrey Weeks has written, in fact, that ‘gay’ was only widely adopted in Britain with the organisation of the Gay Liberation Front in 1970.[[49]](#endnote-49) Among queer men and others in the know, however, it was used to reference homosexuality even in the UK for at least the previous two decades.[[50]](#endnote-50) *Films and Filming* editors and readers appear to have known and exploited the word’s ambiguities. A still from the 1958 film *Bachelor of Hearts* showing Hardy Kruger on the ground appearing to peer up the shorts of a fellow rugby player is suggestively captioned, ‘Gay Time’. And among many others to use the term, ‘2 gay bachelors, early 20s’ posted a contact ad in 1964 seeking other males between 18 and 30. Their special interests: ‘physiques’.[[51]](#endnote-51)

Terminologies for sexual preference also appear in the contact ads. Even though ‘passive’ had long been used to identify the receiving partner in homosexual penetrative sex, it is unclear exactly when the term ‘active’ came to be used as a term of self-designation identifying the penetrating partner.[[52]](#endnote-52) Still, men like Peter Bonsall-Boone regularly identified themselves as ‘active’ in their ads, suggesting an understanding of this term’s use, and a particular sexual preference to be advertised. Similarly, ‘versatile’ offers several interesting sexual connotations in the magazine. It may be unclear today how either the ‘versatile ex-Matelot’ or the ‘gay and versatile’ young man who advertised in *Films and Filming* in May 1965 intended readers to understand the term, but it was suggestive. They may have intended it in its current usage, which describes homosexual men who perform either the active or passive sexual role. Or they could have meant to identify themselves as being interested in both male and female sexual partners, a more bisexual use of the term that was in use by the late 1950s.[[53]](#endnote-53) Either way, the term held definite sexual connotations that made clear the posters’ interest in homosexual activity.

By the December 1966 issue, published just months before the new Sexual Offences Act legalised consensual homosexual acts between men aged 21 and over conducted in private, the contact ads were gone but the magazine’s other queer elements all remained.[[54]](#endnote-54) The Filk’ns were still advertising their Brighton bachelor rental apartment, now costing two guineas.[[55]](#endnote-55) Also appearing was a far less subtle advertisement. A small business card-sized advert promoted the drag artist Mr Jean Fredericks, diva/satirist. The two advertised LPs - ‘recitals are a drag’ and ‘cum camp-us’ - highlighted the camp, and potentially queer, performance. The first was described as ‘Castratically funny with super “high camp”’, while the second was from an ‘outrageous cabaret in a West End camp site’. Label Eyemark Records no doubt expected that its placement of this ad in *Films and Filming* would find a market with the magazine’s queer readers, who continued to be attracted to other elements in *Films and Filming*. Amid ample male flesh on display in this issue’s film stills - George (Jerzy) Zelnik as Rameses XIII in *The Pharaoh*, Jacques Perrin as Daniel in *The Sleeping Car Murders* and Guy Stockwell with other cast members of *Beau Geste* - *Films and Filming* kept queer interest high. Images of Lawrence Harvey and Lionel Jeffries appeared in camp splendour as Francis and Farquhar listening to the Bolshoi Ballet in a still from *The Spy With the Cold Nose*. And amid films being shown at the National Film Theatre following screenings at the Venice Film Festival, *Films and Filming*’s recommendation of one stands out. A still from *Winter Kept Us Warm* (1965) showing two young men in a tender, and possibly naked, embrace, appears directly alongside the article’s title, ‘The Best of the Fest’.[[56]](#endnote-56) The homoerotic subtext went beyond the selection of the suggestive image. The film itself - in 1966 the first English-language Canadian film to go to Cannes - was itself a story of a romantic friendship with homosexual undertones between two University of Toronto students.

After the passage of the 1967 Sexual Offences Act, *Films and Filming*’s open engagement with the politics of queer film and the censorship of homosexuality continued unabated. Looking forward to a ‘Homo breakthrough’ after the partial decriminalisation of homosexuality, the journal opined, ‘Maybe at last homosexuality is going to be given genuine adult treatment in the cinema.’[[57]](#endnote-57) Contemporary films were in fact starting to normalise homosexuality as a natural part of society, ‘accepting that homosexuality is no more of a disease than greed or generosity and maybe far less socially disruptive than adultery.’ And with word of potential productions in the works for films about teenage homosexuals, an elderly queer couple and homosexually themed plays, *Films and Filming*’s writers were confident that matters were finally improving.

Through the 1950s and 1960s, *Film and Filming*’s homosexual readers could unselfconsciously buy the magazine for both accurate and engaging film commentary but also coded erotic possibilities. It would not remain so veiled, however, and after the 1967 decriminalisation of homosexuality when Robin Bean took over the reins as editor in 1968, the magazine changed substantially. He had little concern with the magazine’s articles; as a photographer he was most interested in its visual content. Through his contacts, Bean had exclusive access to film sets, and secured stills and photos that appeared nowhere else. And *Films and Filming*’s critics continued to secure interviews with major film personalities.[[58]](#endnote-58) But under Robin Bean’s editorship, and the influence of inexperienced sub-editors and contributors, the magazine also became infamous for more explicit homoerotic imagery. Many film enthusiasts began to lose interest, and the publication’s sales sagged through the 1970s. No longer satisfied with bare chests, decontextualised gazes and suggestive poses, the magazine now included increasing amounts of nudity, including full-frontal male nudity on some covers. Film buffs, like Barry Pattison, stopped buying the publication because it was no longer relevant to their interests. ‘This was not a deliberate choice or a discussed decision’, he recalled. ‘There was just no longer anything of interest to us in it.’[[59]](#endnote-59) And David McGillivray remembers colleagues at *Films and Filming* who would no longer even be seen reading the magazine in public. They would hide it in the *Guardian*.[[60]](#endnote-60) One even grumbled, ‘I don’t know why they don’t call it *Queers and Queering* and have done with it.’[[61]](#endnote-61)

*Films and Filming* may also have been a victim of the liberalisation that followed legal reform. Men seeking specifically queer or erotic magazines found them increasingly available elsewhere in the 1970s with the emergence of titles like *Jeremy* and *Gay News*. At the same time, as male nudity abounded and reviews of pornography appeared in *Films and Filming*, the quality of its film content diminished precipitously. In its final years the magazine alienated three key markets that had made it both respected and successful. Film buffs lost interest as the strength of its cinema commentary waned. Gay men interested in *Film and Filming*’s erotic content no longer needed the magazine. Finally, its readership of discreet or closeted gay men who had been a mainstay of the magazine’s readership in the 1950s and 1960s could no longer read *Films and Filming* at the office or on the tube, as Robin Bean had once claimed. It was simply too compromising. So, in its final decade the magazine became increasingly irrelevant.

Debt also plagued Hansom Books throughout the 1970s. Philip Dosse had managed to keep the entire operation going for years on the back of *Films and Filming* and his own determination, but in the end it proved impossible even for him. He had founded Hansom Books with only £100 of initial capital. Later, the entire enterprise was increasingly financed with his own bank overdraft. Beginning at some £4,000 during Hansom Book’s early operations in the 1950s, his debt grew to £20,311 by 1966, and then £206,722 by 1979.[[62]](#endnote-62) By August 1980 he was forced to close the magazines. In tears he told his staff, ‘I can’t pay you. The company is finished.’ With mounting debts, Philip Dosse killed himself aged 56 in September.[[63]](#endnote-63) Hansom Books and the magazines he founded soon folded. *Films and Filming*, the most successful of his titles, was resurrected in 1981, but never resembled its former self. It was neither an important publication nor a queer one, positioned instead as a glossy magazine reporting on popular films and celebrities. It too finally collapsed in March 1990.

*Films and Filming* illuminates an important intersection between homosexuality and commerce that appeared in the post-war period. The film magazine attracted a queer audience segment and in so doing also cultivated a space where advertisers and consumers could interact based on the shared knowledge of queer codes, subcultural experiences and desires. The appearance of queer commercial and personal adverts in *Films and Filming* reflects an integral relationship between the experience of pre-decriminalisation homosexuality and the semi-private but also public world of mass consumerism. *Films and Filming* was widely circulated, affordable, available internationally and accessible to virtually anyone. These were important characteristics in a time when few homosexual publications existed, and those that did were often banned, confiscated, or, if imported from abroad, withheld at customs. Even those published domestically might still be largely inaccessible, or only available at small booksellers, behind-the-counter at some Soho bookshops, or traded among like-minded friends. At a time when queer publications were suppressed, it was precisely because of the widespread and public accessibility of commercially available publications like *Films and Filming* that homosexuals used them to encode ads for specialised services and private desires. And *Films and Filming*, though not entirely unique, was the most accessible and successful of these titles with the longest running campaign to court queer consumers alongside its mainstream audience.

 Mainstream publications often sought multiple audiences, including homosexuals, as part of deliberate marketing and distribution strategies.[[64]](#endnote-64) Titles could also be co-opted and utilised by homosexuals to give voice to a range of commercial endeavours and personal desires. In some cases these illustrate an active subversion of the tenor of the publication, while in others, producers and editors were complicit in this venture. In each case, however, the relationship between public media and private experience is significant. It demonstrates the important and dynamic symbiosis between homosexuality and commercial enterprise that was a feature of queer experience, social history and sexual opportunity through the entirety of the twentieth century.

Across three decades, *Films and Filming* offered discussions and reflections of desires and experiences available almost nowhere else, and became a key feature in the sexual development of many queer men. Director Ron Peck identified *Films and Filming* as one ‘signal’ from the outside world that entered his childhood home in Merton Park, London. Long before meeting a girlfriend who finally encouraged him to experiment sexually with other men, Peck’s desires were aroused by *Films and Filming*:

I can remember questions being asked at home when one particular issue came through the letterbox, wrapped up in the *Merton and Morden Borough News*. ‘It was a serious film magazine’, I said, though it very soon became a magazine I couldn't take to school. It directed my attention to films of special interest that never hit the review column of the *Daily Express* or the round up of new films on the BBC.[[65]](#endnote-65)

In *Films and Filming* Peck encountered Warhol’s *Flesh* (1968) and Joe Dallesandro’s body. ‘I never had any sex education at school’, Peck continues. Everything he learned about sex came from that girlfriend, cinema and *Films and Filming*.
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