**The Lonely Crowd: Dwoskin, Durgnat, and the London Film-Makers Co-operative**

Stephen Dwoskin and Raymond Durgnat first met in 1966. Both taught in art schools, Dwoskin at the London College of Printing, Durgnat at St Martin’s, and both were early members of the London Film-Makers Co-operative (LFMC), founded that autumn. Durgnat first saw Dwoskin’s films during the Co-op’s inaugural ‘Spontaneous Festival of Underground Movies’, which was staged at the Jeanetta Cochrane Theatre – attached to another art school, Central – and promoted by Durgnat in the newly launched underground paper *IT*. The following summer Durgnat published the first substantial article on Dwoskin, ‘Dwoskin’s Dream-Films’, in the second issue of the LFMC’s journal *Cinim*, which Dwoskin designed. The moment is freighted with counter-cultural mystique. But the encounter of Dwoskin and Durgnat took place in the margins of, or in unfamiliar incarnations of, these much attended-to sites and institutions, and their friendship developed apart from them.

While Dwoskin’s relationship with the LFMC and with the funding bodies which began to support artists’ films in the 1970s was never easy, he had the support of some of the writers grouped around *Screen*, including Laura Mulvey and Paul Willemen. Durgnat, however, was persona non grata: ‘They’re very possessive about me now, though, Ray,’ Dwoskin told him in an interview published in 1984, when they were both teaching at the Royal College of Art. ‘They don’t want heretics like you writing about me.’[[1]](#endnote-1) Nonetheless, Durgnat’s perspective on his work was one that Dwoskin to some extent endorsed, and the two of them collaborated on a film project whose theme may have been inspired by the LFMC’s chaotic early years. Though Durgnat had more in common with his critics than might be supposed, his was indeed a dissenting perspective, rendered in the same confessional spirit in which Dwoskin made his films, and there is no attempt in what follows to mitigate what is properly troubling.

Durgnat had been a regular presence at Better Books, situated opposite St Martin’s on Charing Cross Road, for some years before it became the LFMC’s first home. Dwoskin, who had arrived in London in 1964, began to frequent the venue during the brief life of the Co-op’s precursor, Cinema 65, an avant-garde film society run by one of the shop’s managers, Bob Cobbing. Ron Geesin, one of Dwoskin’s composers, recalls recording a soundtrack for *Chinese Checkers* (1963), which Dwoskin had shot in New York, in March 1966, before the LFMC was founded, and presenting it at Better Books with a roughly synchronized tape recording, ‘before it was “married” to the film’ later that year.[[2]](#endnote-2) Durgnat, then in his mid-thirties, was already an heretical figure in British film culture, for reasons which help illuminate what he responded to in Dwoskin and wanted to tease out in his writings about him.

Durgnat had alienated himself from the critical establishment early in his career by attacking *Sight and Sound* in the pages of the little magazine *Motion*, and made matters worse by publishing extensively on eroticism in the semi-respectable magazine *Films and Filming*, where he often reviewed pseudo-sex education films, ‘Mondo’ compilations, and films, as he put it in 1961, adapting Lionel Trilling’s famous phrase, at ‘the dark and bloody crossroads where Art and Pornography meet’, some of them shown at specialist cinemas like the Jacey, next door to St Martin’s.[[3]](#endnote-3) ‘At BFI parties,’ he wrote in 1968, ‘minor officials still tend to corner me and snicker descriptions of violent or erotic scenes, muttering, “You’ll love this”’.[[4]](#endnote-4) Dwoskin described him as an ‘often elusive man’, a slightly incongruous figure on the underground scene, who appeared at Better Books screenings carrying a briefcase.[[5]](#endnote-5) His articles for *IT* contain reminiscences of the old Soho before the Street Offences Act of 1959 and the – in his view – drab and hypocritical world it ushered in.

Thus when Durgnat, in ‘Dwoskin’s Dream-Films’, wrote of *Chinese Checkers* that ‘It is never a peeping tom film; the point of it being that we are drawn into it; we become both girls,’ he knew whereof he spoke.[[6]](#endnote-6) Actual peeping-tom films were part of his critical repertoire, and his attitude towards them was not simply one of dismissal: they belonged to a continuum which included some of the films he prized. The truly erotic film, according to Durgnat, ‘while it may or may not be pornographic, never engages the personality exclusively at the point of sexual excitement’ – the important word being ‘exclusively’.[[7]](#endnote-7) In two films about peeping toms, *Psycho* (Alfred Hitchcock, 1960), and *Peeping Tom* (Michael Powell, 1960), which Durgnat and *Motion* editor Ian Johnson were almost alone in defending in the early 1960s, ‘the whole pattern of guilt, terror, suspicion, pity, hope-against-hope and so on is brought into play’, he wrote; and one would ‘completely misunderstand the way *Psycho* orchestrates the audience’s feelings if one tried to make a distinction between the “sexual” elements and the others’, he went on.[[8]](#endnote-8) Here as in Dwoskin’s film the point was to identify, to be drawn in.

Few of the exploitation films Durgnat reviewed for *Films and Filming* lived up to these standards; most were indeed exclusively sexual. In November 1967 he described the bad ones as ‘another nail in the coffin of the cinemagoing habit. Worse than that, among the “lonely” audience, word-of-mouth is very slow and even a dreary film can, on poster appeal alone, keep good movies’ – he used the phrase ‘genuinely sexy movies’ in the same review – ‘out of foreign-language cinemas for weeks.’[[9]](#endnote-9) Elsewhere he lamented that the effect of the increasingly sexualized mass media ‘is to transform permissive sexuality into compulsive, to substitute for the *l’amour fou* triad (sexuality-suicide-love) that of sexuality-status-ambition’.[[10]](#endnote-10)

However, even while he was serving as chairman of the LFMC during 1967, and showing and writing about Dwoskin’s films, Durgnat found halfway encouraging examples amid the dross – hence his reputation among BFI officials. As Dwoskin said, he operated ‘in the elusive range’ – that word again – ‘between the concrete narrative and the subtle, oblique meaning of a filmed gesture; the elusive range between mainstream and experimental cinema language’.[[11]](#endnote-11) Durgnat was interested in the possibilities of low-budget personal films rather than the underground or avant-garde as such. In the *Cinim* essay he wrote that Dwoskin’s *Alone* (1963), also shot in New York and scored in London, is ‘a well-made film with the old-fashioned virtues which are newer than new’.[[12]](#endnote-12) Conversely, some of the X-certificate films, he wrote in the same year, revealed the ‘possibility of setting up freewheeling, extra-studio, screwball, vulgar, nonconformist movies [...] which could combine many of the best features of the underground, the arthouses and the circuits’.[[13]](#endnote-13)

What particularly interested Durgnat wherever he found it, as suggested by his invocation of ‘the “lonely” audience’, was shyness, anomie, and alienation, sexual and otherwise. One of the X-certificate films he praised in 1967, *Mini Weekend* (Georges Robin, 1967), was the tale of a suburban lad who ventures into supposedly Swinging London and finds only frustration. ‘A study of shyness in this sex-crazy era’, wrote Durgnat in his review, five years before he published *Sexual Alienation in the Cinema*, ‘might lead to the roots of many modern tensions.’[[14]](#endnote-14) Explicitly or otherwise, David Riesman’s *The Lonely Crowd*, first published in 1950, was a touchstone book – though he consistently misspelled its author’s name – from his first years as a published critic. In discussing alienation Durgnat often used Riesman’s concepts of inner- and outer-direction, the former associated by Durgnat with the waning Protestant conscience, the latter with the waxing ‘concern with popularity and conformity to the consensus’, and the linked concept of ‘false personalization’, a paradoxical feature of modern, depersonalized, managerial capitalism.[[15]](#endnote-15)

For Durgnat *Psycho* and *Peeping Tom* were, among other things, quintessential ‘lonely crowd’ films. In his book on the former, published forty years after he first tackled it in *Films and Filming*, he used Riesman’s framework to explore Marion Crane’s decision to steal the money.[[16]](#endnote-16) *Repulsion* (Roman Polanski, 1965), which Durgnat reviewed on release, was brought into the same lineage, having ‘the same storyform as *Psycho*’, but told from within, and describing a withdrawal ‘into a kind of isolation and timelessness in which, steadily, hideous dreams acquired greater reality than reality and devoured your mind until time, place, life itself broke up into an incoherent succession of extreme states’.[[17]](#endnote-17) Though all three films are about murderers, Durgnat emphasized *Repulsion*’s quotidian observation of ‘all the little failures of contact’.[[18]](#endnote-18)

It was with these concerns to the fore that Durgnat approached Dwoskin’s films in late 1966, and, perhaps, with this lineage in mind that he characterized *Alone* as a ‘rendezvous of a physiology with its own loneliness’.[[19]](#endnote-19)

The extent to which Durgnat’s concerns were shared by Dwoskin may be judged from Dwoskin’s own contribution to the second issue of *Cinim*, published immediately after Durgnat’s, in which he lamented that ‘people look at films in the same way that they look at each other – very distant from it all. In other words they “look at” but are seldom involved in’.[[20]](#endnote-20) In Dwoskin’s view, however, film, in part because it encouraged absorption over time, was better suited than any other expressive medium to bridge ‘the barrier between looking at life and experiencing life’, and to ‘by-pass the barriers and intellectual filters enough so that it can seep into the instinctive self to allow experience and therefore involvement’.[[21]](#endnote-21) Durgnat would not have assented to all of this, and was in two minds about what he called the ‘metaphysicalising in which the Underground’s movie-makers and its house-organ *Film Culture*, often indulge’, but the parallels with his own thinking are striking.[[22]](#endnote-22)

Also published in the summer of 1967, Durgnat’s book *Films and Feelings*, whose third section, titled ‘The Aesthetics of Human Interest’, concluded with his close reading of *Psycho*, was taken up with similar questions of identification and involvement, privileging ‘sensuous, even sensual, experience’ over plot, character, theme, evidence of authorship, and other critical commonplaces.[[23]](#endnote-23) ‘The film’s job’, he wrote, ‘is not so much to provide “information” about the characters’ minds as to communicate their “experience”, whether intellectual, emotional, physical, or a blend of all three.’[[24]](#endnote-24) Well before Brechtian ideas permeated British film culture, Durgnat had developed an elementary critique of them akin to Jean Mitry’s in *Esthétique et psychologie du cinéma*, rejecting the Brechtian binary of absorption and alienation. In his first ‘book’ *Nouvelle Vague* (really a special issue of *Motion*) he wrote that the ‘traditional aesthetic [...] accommodates both participation (viz. “identification”) and detachment (the spectator is in a cinema watching and thinking)’;[[25]](#endnote-25) twenty years later that ‘bourgeois aesthetic theories presuppose that the spectator’s attitude is normally a mixture of sympathy, criticism, and contemplative detachment, that is to say, that spectatorship is an alienated state to begin with’.[[26]](#endnote-26) In an essay on Brecht’s sometime collaborator Joseph Losey, published the year before *Films and Feelings*, he claimed that ‘awareness lies on the other side of participation’.[[27]](#endnote-27)

In short, though Durgnat did not believe that ‘intellectual filters’ could be bypassed altogether, nor did he believe that emotional absorption was inherently to be suspected. He was thus disposed to see Dwoskin’s films less as distancing critiques of sadistic scopophilia, more as attempts to communicate the experience of ‘little failures of contact’, or of ‘socio-sexual desolation’, as he put it in his second major article on Dwoskin, published in 1982, serving a ‘bedrock/baseline/tragic humanism’.[[28]](#endnote-28) In *Sexual Alienation in the Cinema*, which contains an expanded version of the *Repulsion* review, Durgnat writes of *Alone* as concerning ‘a human confrontation with a nothingness which an anomic society cannot even for a second conceal’, in the same paragraph using the phrase ‘ignominy of anomie’.[[29]](#endnote-29)

Ignominy, or ‘ignominism’, was a recurring topic in Durgnat’s criticism, chiefly associated with Jean-Pierre Mocky and Jean-Luc Godard. ‘The fact that the basic cell of European society is the couple, i.e., an erotic unit,’ he wrote in his *Nouvelle Vague* entry on Mocky, ‘would, one would have thought, endowed eroticism with a certain dignity’; yet the desacralized reality was ‘erotic boredom’ and disillusionment – ignominy. In an interview on underground film published in 1968, but given while he was still chairman of the LFMC, Durgnat said that

If somebody shows me all his pimples, physical or spiritual, I’m quite prepared to look at them. In fact, this is one thing I like about Underground movies; in Overground movies you can have tragedy, you can have melodrama, you can have comedy, but you can’t have pimples. Or else they’re treated in a very tactful style. There is a place in art for pimples and this is something I positively like about Underground movies, a sort of ignominy.[[30]](#endnote-30)

Durgnat’s vision of the underground, a ‘small, limited edition, poetic set-up’, ‘not concertedly political’, was really a continuation of the 1950s beat culture in which he had grown up, and had relatively little to do with UFO, *Oz* (though he wrote for it), or with the structural film which began to make an impact on underground filmmakers in Europe at the turn of 1967–8.[[31]](#endnote-31) By the time his remarks appeared he was no longer chairman of the LFMC, and Dwoskin had begun to drift away too. At the end of the interview, Durgnat, who before becoming a critic had worked as a screenwriter, said that he harboured ambitions as a film-maker, ‘but for years I haven’t liked any of the ideas I’ve had. Now I suppose I’d like to say a few more things that I’d like to say, for people to take up or not.’[[32]](#endnote-32) It is likely that behind this slightly cryptic comment lies the fact that he and Dwoskin had begun, or were soon to begin, to work together.

Anomie, ignominy, and repression loomed large in the film Durgnat wrote and tried to persuade Dwoskin to direct. In the 1984 interview, Dwoskin, discussing his *Central Bazaar* (1976), recounted that:

The idea of a bazaar was that it’s a place where it seems that you will have everything you could desire, but you never do. This is a sort of Fantasies Bazaar. It developed out of that ‘doctor’s surgery’ idea we had, remember? *Attack of the Puppet People*?

 [Durgnat:] The one about strangers in a doctor’s surgery, eyeing one another up, speculating about one another, fantasising the other person in bed, or whatever. On the loo. Only, at the end we realise they never even spoke to one another. And never will. All too British.

 [Dwoskin:] In *Bazaar*, they do.[[33]](#endnote-33)

The origins of the *Attack of the Puppet People* script are hard to trace, but in January 1970 Durgnat sent a copy to Bob Cobbing, describing it as a ‘play for mental production’ and seeking Cobbing’s comments.[[34]](#endnote-34) ‘I wrote it menny menny years ago – the reference to Flower People predates Flower Power – but recently revived it and got it properly typed out at vast expense as you see. [...] Steve tells me he likes it and would like to film it, but some other friends get so noncommittal and uncomfortable about it so I suspect he’s conning me for old friends’ sake. I like it myself while admitting it’s weird.’ Previously Durgnat had used ‘Attack of the Crab Monsters’, as the subtitle for a poem he had published in the one-off underground publication *Long Hair* in the wake of the 1965 ‘International Poetry Incarnation’ at the Albert Hall; like most of his poems it is intensely ignominist, but not obviously connected to *Puppet People*. One of the uncomfortable friends to whom he showed it seems to have been Peter Whitehead, another of the Better Books crowd, who recalls Durgnat and his preferred actress acting out a script for him in his Soho flat, and later giving a ‘polite no’.[[35]](#endnote-35)

In the 1982 essay Durgnat described *Central Bazaar*, as one of Dwoskin’s ‘Essays in “happening” aesthetic’ alongside the earlier *Me, Myself and I* (1968), which takes place in a bathroom (rather than a doctor’s surgery), and attempted to sum up its theme – perhaps capturing Durgnat’s idea of the *Puppet People* film more than Dwoskin’s realization of it – with the sentence: ‘Personae exasper-evapor-ated in fantasy-block-fantasy no-win truth-game.’[[36]](#endnote-36) For this and other reasons, it seems possible that the *Puppet People*/*Central Bazaar* scenario had roots in their shared experience of the original LFMC’s demise.

The early Co-op had never been stable: Durgnat was brought in as chairman to replace the disreputable Harvey Matusow, and during his tenure it was not particularly co-operative, by his own admission.[[37]](#endnote-37) A major cause of division, according to Dwoskin, was the magazine they were both closely involved in producing. Whereas their LFMC focused on promoting and distributing films, made independently, other members thought that the small amount of pooled money available would be better spent on filmmaking equipment.[[38]](#endnote-38) The latter tendency prevailed after the Co-op was forced out of Better Books by puritanical new management, and relocated to the Arts Lab. Dwoskin reflected on the break-up in a text written with another original Co-op member, Simon Hartog, in 1969, which makes the situation sound much like Durgnat’s synopsis of *Central Bazaar*:

As co-operatives are run by a kind of film-makers’ democracy, there is within them the chance for many ambiguities and vague situations. This often allows for paranoiacs to run quite rampant, for vendettas to occur and for subgroups to divide themselves off, politically and socially, from the others. The open structure also allows many people to enter, some who are doing so for their own gain, not for film, but for the association or the potential of personal identity.[[39]](#endnote-39)

Clinchingly, however, the resemblance between this unhappy situation and the scenario which Dwoskin eventually filmed comes through clearly in the successful application which he made to the BFI Production Board to finance the project, still titled *Puppet People*, in 1972. The first sentence of this stated, without preamble, a ‘Theme of egoism and ego-ideal; the use of others for identity and depending on others for self-realisation.’[[40]](#endnote-40) The film’s ‘situation’ (rather than narrative), Dwoskin’s proposal continued, was ‘for displaying social and personal “usage” of others’, and the consequences of this ‘“usage”’ were ‘basically destructive and consumptive’. Whether or not Dwoskin had read Riesman, *The Lonely Crowd* would have been an apt third title.

Durgnat had departed for the US by the time *Central Bazaar* appeared, and when he returned to Dwoskin’s films in the 1980s it was as the heretic Dwoskin described, sceptical towards the Lacanian framework into which Dwoskin had since been accommodated, principally by Paul Willemen. Durgnat’s differences from the dominant tendency are encapsulated in his barb, ‘They think it’s Lacan but actually it’s Sartre’;[[41]](#endnote-41) his similarities may be suggested by the fact that Willemen, though relying on Lacanian propositions, actually referred to both thinkers.[[42]](#endnote-42) In *Sexual Alienation in the Cinema* Durgnat had described the returned gaze in Dwoskin’s *Moment* (1969) as an ‘utterly resigned accusation of film-maker and spectator alike’, much as Mulvey and Willemen would do later.[[43]](#endnote-43) Willemen, however, while using such concepts as ‘shame’, and describing Dwoskin’s audiences as having ‘exhibitionistically indulged our scopic drives’, claimed that Dwoskin’s ‘strategies do not pose “moral” problems of any kind, but raise fundamental theoretical questions relating to cinema itself as a signifying process’.[[44]](#endnote-44) Durgnat saw the films as having a wider existential significance, and without being moralistic made no attempt to excise moral problems, writing that the accusatory gaze was levelled not for the film-maker’s or spectator’s ‘curiosity, which may after all be far from devoid of reverence for the human mystery, but for a wilful self-withholding which is the standard human relationship’.[[45]](#endnote-45)

Dwoskin, in a tribute to Durgnat published in the month of his death, wrote that his friend ‘seems to write as a person wandering through the films as if he is one of the characters in them [...] not only scrutinising and assessing the films themselves, but also the film’s author, the film’s spectators and the film’s critics’ – not least himself, Dwoskin went on.[[46]](#endnote-46) In that respect, perhaps, we might see in his critical practice – the ‘fifth gaze’ of critic at director – a curious reflection of Dwoskin’s filmic practice, even a non-destructive ‘“usage” of others’. Durgnat’s writings emerged from the uncompleted transition which Riesman described, from inner- to outer-direction, and with special urgency since the ‘waning Protestant conscience’ was not merely an abstraction on his part but, so far as can be told, a biographical experience. His willingness figuratively to abandon ‘self-withholding’ and be absorbed, and perhaps to confess afterwards, was not done without inner conflict or risk. With this in mind, his and Dwoskin’s relationship can be seen as a rare *successful* contact, a by-passing of the barriers (however restricted), a non-figurative *involvement*.

Henry K. Miller
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