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Introduction

Homosexuality is a phenomenon present in this world for millennia. Over the course of history, it was “practiced” by various rulers, monarchs as well as ordinary people and written and talked about by poets and artists. Nevertheless, as modern society started to form, so did the traditional notion of normality, which placed heterosexuality in the position of a superior and often the only sexual orientation of a human being accepted by the rest of society. The reason of this may be rooted in the realization of human civilization that two individuals of opposite sexes are required in order to preserve the humanity, which was, historically, a more important role of sexual intercourse than possible pleasure and a feeling of intimacy. Since the historical development of America was greatly influenced by the conservative and religious English nation, the role of heterosexuality was further strengthened, conversely to homosexuality, which, in spite of having no proper name, became a sin as well as a criminal act. Homosexuality was still present in the world, but it became a taboo which “good, moral people” did not talk about. Gradually, human society started to develop in terms of technology, philosophy, politics and other spheres. Nevertheless, the notion of homosexuality remained the same as in the past and it can be said that events causing certain changes of this situation did not occur until the second half of the twentieth century. Then, homosexuality became a topic discussed in science as well as in public life and the attitudes of ordinary people towards homosexuality also started to change. In 2015, homosexual people are granted the right to marry in every state of the United States of America, to join the army or to hold various pride parades. Moreover, some Presidential candidates have started to include the LGBT minority rights into their election campaigns, which may be considered a significant step
towards recognizing the LGBT (lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgendered) people as equals to the heterosexual majority. Nevertheless, older generations as well as some conservative and believing people still tend to maintain the historical notion of homosexuality, preventing the LGBT community from reaching the goal it has been aiming for several decades.

As this introductory part suggests, attitudes towards the LGBT community have been changing and certain improvement of conditions of non-heterosexual minorities has been reached. The aim of this Bachelor’s thesis is, therefore, to examine how this controversial topic has been depicted in American cinematography in the period from 2000 to 2015. The research required for this thesis will be divided into four parts. In the first part, included in the first chapter, history of homosexuality and also certain terms and concepts required for better understanding of this issue such as queer theory or homosexuality itself will be described. The second chapter will discuss the main issues and stereotypes connected to depiction of homosexuality in American motion pictures produced since the late nineteenth century, which marks the origin of motion pictures, till the end of the twentieth century. The main source for this part will be *The Celluloid Closet* (1995), a documentary film by Rob Epstein and Jeffrey Friedman, suggesting that portrayals of homosexuality have varied over the course of history of cinema, from negative to neutral or positive but also to their complete absence, reflecting the controversy of this topic. The third chapter, which focuses on the history of American cinematography, will then follow by examining the concrete examples of films and endeavoring to trace the stereotypes described in Chapter 2. Since the portrayals of homosexuality in films might have been influenced by the real political situation and events in the USA, these will be also described in this part of this Bachelor’s thesis.
Chapter 4 will then conclude by using the results of the research conducted in the previous chapters as a basis for study of the motion pictures produced in the period in question - that is, from 2000 to 2015. The already mentioned stereotypes and issues will be endeavored to be traced also in the contemporary film production in order to compare the historical and recent films and study the possible shifts of depiction of the LGBT minority. It is expected that not a complete, but a certain change will be detected. The basis of this assumption lies in the fact that motion pictures are produced mainly by heterosexual filmmakers who, therefore, approach this topic from the point of heterosexual people who were often raised by the old generation considering homosexuality a taboo or “immoral way of living.” Therefore, they may transfer the opinions formed by their upbringing and education into their films and distort the information concerning the LGBT characters.

As has already been suggested, the documentary film The Celluloid Closet will serve as the inspiration for conducting the research and writing this Bachelor’s thesis since it focuses directly on this topic. Nevertheless, other sources are also considered essential for writing of this thesis, such as the historical and current films as well as books and articles published in academic journals by various film critics. As they review the plots of motion pictures and their credibility, their work is considered useful for Chapter 4 in particular, since it examines the current films as well. For the purpose of this chapter, biographies of LGBT people in question will also be used in order to compare the facts with the data provided in the motion pictures.
1. **History of Homosexuality**

The exploring and notion of homosexuality, defined by the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* as “sexual interest in and attraction to members of one’s own sex,” have been changing over the course of history, depending on various factors such as religion, political situation, social attitudes, etc. Homosexuality was considered common in ancient Rome and Greece; nevertheless, countries with a high percentage of Christian and Muslim believers considered this “behavior” sinful and punishable. The beginning of recent research and categorization is marked by the coinage of the term homosexual in 1869 by the Austrian-born Hungarian journalist Karl-Maria Kertbeny in his anonymously published pamphlet called *Paragraph 143 of the Prussian Penal Code of 14 April 1851 and Its Reaffirmation as Paragraph 152 in the Proposed Penal Code for the Norddeutscher Bund. An Open and Professional Correspondence to His Excellency Dr. Leonhardt, Royal Prussian Minister of Justice*. This and also his other works covering the topic of homosexual orientation were a result of a friend’s suicide, which he committed after he was blackmailed because of his homosexual orientation. Before 1869, no neutral designations were known for homosexual people, only some with negative connotation, such as “sodomite” or “bugger.”

Since the medical science prior to the end of the twentieth century saw homosexuality predominantly as a mental illness, sexual perversion and/or deviation, some scientists conducted various studies regarding its origin in order to “cure” it. The *Encyclopaedia Britannica* mentions one of the authors who conducted this research - Richard von Krafft-Ebing, a 19-century psychologist who considered homosexuality hereditary (this theory is known as “essentialism”). Conversely, other scientists and doctors brought theories suggesting that homosexuality was influenced by society,
which became to be known as “social constructionism.” The twentieth century also marked the establishment of the “sex research” in the United States, including scientists such as Alfred Kinsey, a biologist who conducted a variety of interviews and tests and came to the conclusion that thirty-seven percent of his male subjects confirmed involvement in some form of homosexual conduct. His work can be considered groundbreaking also because of the fact that he did not use the standard bilateral heterosexual–homosexual categorization but introduced a spectrum of sexual orientations.

The year 1990 is frequently associated with the origin of the “queer theory,” a tool of reconstruction of gay and lesbian identity. In queer theory, the dominance of normativity and the picture of gays and lesbians as deviant to these norms produced by the non-homosexual individuals were replaced by constructs created by gays and lesbians themselves. As Eve Kosofsky Sedwick - one of the originators of the queer theory - suggests, this effort to change the public view of homosexuality also helped to prevent homosexuality from vanishing completely: “...given the historical and contemporary force of the prohibitions against every same-sex sexual expression, for anyone to disavow those meanings, or to displace them from the term’s definitional center, would be to dematerialize any possibility of queerness itself” (8). Contrary to what is frequently mistakenly believed, the queer theory does not focus exclusively on issues connected to gay and lesbian community; it also analyses topics such as bisexuality, cross-dressing and gender ambiguity. As Noreen Giffney states in Ashgate Research Companion: "Queer is more often embraced to point to fluidity in identity, recognizing identity as a historically-contingent and socially-constructed fiction that prescribes and proscribes against certain feelings and actions” (2).
This chapter discussed the historical development of notion and research of homosexuality. In the course of history, its notion has been changing from one of many possible ways of life, to a sin or an illness to be studied and also possibly cured. Not until a gay man committed a suicide as a result of facing oppression by heterosexual majority, homosexuality gained its proper name which did not have negative connotations. Furthermore, one hundred years passed between the coinage of this term and the origin of the queer theory, which meant opposition to normativity and distorted information created by the heterosexual people.
2. The Issue of Homosexuality in American Cinema

From the beginnings of American cinematography, homosexual audiences had to face two fundamental problems when they came to the cinema: either the homosexual characters could not be seen in the motion pictures, or they were depicted in various stereotypical ways. Despite the fact that the lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgendered (LGBT) characters have become more visible in the recent films than in the earlier works, many of them still have not defied the stereotypes and prejudice.

Early Hollywood filmmakers, influenced by conservative society and notions of normality, avoided including the explicit representation of homosexuality in their films:

> The most expressions of homosexuality in most of movies are indirect. And what's interesting about that is that of course, what it was like to express homosexuality in life, that we could only express ourselves indirectly, just as people on the screen could only express themselves indirectly. And the sense in which the characters are in the closet, the movie is in the closet and we are in the closet. (*The Celluloid Closet,* 00:33:39)

Based on the traditional understanding of gender,1 women were usually depicted as weak creatures dependent on men, who were, conversely, supposed to be masculine and powerful. If Hollywood allowed homosexual characters to appear in a film, directors usually broke these “gender expectations” and created characters of effeminate, weak men (“sissies”) and men-like women (“dykes”). As the already mentioned documentary film *The Celluloid Closet* (1995) based on a book written by

---

1 Gender is social role assigned to males or females. Not to be confused with sex, a term used in connection with biological elements such as chromosomes, determining the human “maleness” or “femaleness”.
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Vito Russo suggests, the sissy character usually served as a source of humor. As a result, sissies were not perceived for their sexuality, but for their “harmless,” funny appearance and behavior, which was not necessary to be feared of or detested, conversely to homosexuality. In *The Celluloid Closet*, Quentin Crisp, an English writer and actor, explains these negative reactions to seeing homosexual characters and behavior by claiming that it is a phenomenon unknown to the majority of society. Homosexuality is not mentioned in textbooks at schools or discussed in families because it is considered a taboo. When they see displays of homosexual intimacy, the human nature often forces heterosexual people to think about “how these things work” and, as Crisp suggests, to imagine themselves copying this behavior, which they do not feel comfortable about, especially in society considering homosexuality a mental illness or deviation. Nevertheless, the film directors appearing in later decades - often identifying themselves as homosexual - managed to include characters with homosexual traits in their films. This was frequently accomplished by means of hidden clues, which the audiences were expected to find and decipher, provided that they were willing to do so. In the same documentary film, actress Susie Bright describes this effort to decipher hidden hints as follows: “It's amazing how... if you're a gay audience and you're accustomed to crumbs, how you will watch an entire movie just to see somebody wear an outfit that you think means that they are homosexual. The whole movie can be a dud, but you're just sitting there waiting for Joan Crawford to put on her black cowboy shirt again” (00:31:53).

From its beginnings, Hollywood film production can be distinguished by one characteristic – it endeavors to include “happy ending” in its films. Nevertheless, this element does not seem to apply to homosexual characters. In his collection of critical
essays on queer cinema called *The Fruit Machine: Twenty Years of Writings on Queer Cinema*, Thomas Waugh, a film critic, activist and Professor of Film Studies, describes the issue as follows: “The happy ending is a convention that Hollywood and its foreign competitors have traditionally reserved for films about straight people. Gay characters traditionally drop off like flies, with clockwork predictability, at the service of dramatic expediency and the sexual anxiety of the dominant culture” (19).

Gradually, homosexuality became visible in American films. Nevertheless, this change was not usually for the better, but for the worse since the LGBT community began to be portrayed as depressed, desperate individuals desiring to be “normal.” When their sexual orientation alias “deviation” was revealed in these stories, it customarily meant that these people were blackmailed or otherwise disadvantaged by the rest of society. Their situation was frequently unbearable for them, thus they either chose suicide as a solution for their “problem,” or the homophobic and prejudicial characters “solved” it instead of them by killing them. Many methods to kill homosexuals were provided by Hollywood, varying from shooting, strangling, beating to death or cutting into a tree that would later fall on them and ended their lives. These and also other possibilities of “dealing” with LGBT characters will be further discussed in the next chapter, covering the particular decades of history of American cinematography.

Another approach of Hollywood directors towards homosexuality was the opposite of the one discussed in the paragraph above. Film directors of the later decades provided their audiences with murderous and/or perverse LGBT characters, who frequently reveled in sadist and masochist sexual practices. This approach raised another wave of hatred and oppression of the LGBT minority, which forced these
people either to found or join various civil rights organizations or further hide their sexual orientation. This did not apply only to “ordinary” LGBT people, but also to individuals in the film industry since their “coming out” – that is, revealing their sexuality to other people - often meant that they were forced to leave their employment.

This chapter dealt with various forms of the portrayal of homosexuality in American cinematography, as suggested by the documentary film *The Celluloid Closet*. The fact that the majority of society did not have access to unbiased information about homosexuality caused that it reaffirmed the traditional notions of normality and felt threatened by anything that diverged from this normality – in reality as well as in the cinema. It can be said that heterosexual people were offered two possibilities of dealing with their fear in the cinema. One of them was mocking their “enemy” and relieving their tension by laughter. Nonetheless, the opposite situation was also possible; that is, watching the source of their anxiety suffer and die.
3. History of American Cinema

It can be said that the American film industry and Hollywood film production\(^2\) in particular holds the position of the world’s leader of cinematography, determining the contemporary trends, style and structure of motion pictures. Nevertheless, Hollywood did not always have this role since it did not exist when film was invented, that is approximately the end of the nineteenth century. Conversely, Hollywood as the center of American film production was not formed until 1911 and even then it was only beginning its journey to grow and become influential. As the authors of *America On Film: Representing Race, Class, Gender, and Sexuality at the Movies*, Harry M. Benshoff and Sean Griffin suggest, the inventor of motion pictures is a question open to debate. Two groups of possible candidates discussed in this book are French brothers Auguste and Louis Lumière, projecting their motion pictures on screen in 1895, or Thomas Edison and William Dickson, using their “kinetoscope” as a projector in order to show the moving images in 1894. Edison’s laboratory is also credited by Vito Russo with the first depiction of homosexuality in the motion pictures: it produced a film called *Dickson Experimental Sound Film* (1895), portraying two men dancing together to the sound of a violin played by another man. Nevertheless, this statement can be misleading as is the question of the inventor of the motion pictures itself, since several film historians claim that this dance was merely a manifestation of the two men’s friendship. Uncertainty accompanies not only this film, but also the issue of depiction of homosexuality in this period in general. As already mentioned, film directors

---

\(^2\) Hollywood film production refers to motion pictures produced by filmmaking companies which can be located in Hollywood, California, as well as in its environs. It includes companies such as Universal, 20\(^{th}\) Century-Fox or Paramount.
avoided explicit portrayals of homosexuality or homosexual behavior. Instead, they started to use the deep-rooted gender roles and by switching them, they created the sissy character. This figure was a man of effeminate traits and behavior, which demonstrated his failure to fulfill the requirements for being the “proper” man, i.e. masculinity, power and success. The sissy character became popular among audiences because of its funny appearance and behavior, which caused that popular comedians such as Charlie Chaplin or Fatty Arbuckle started to use it in their films and “helped” to create a public image of a gay as a man behaving as a woman, a figure to deride. The film producers did not use only the already mentioned man-to-woman conversion, but also the opposite one. For example, in A Florida Enchantment (1914), two women eat seeds that change their sexual orientation – they terminate their heterosexual relationships because they become attracted to women. Assuming that a woman cannot be attracted to another female and thus denying the possibility of existence of homosexuality, they start to wear men’s clothes. Later in the film, a man eats the same seed and begins to feel attracted to men and starts to wear a dress as a sign that he believes that he has changed into a woman.

An actual act indicating homosexuality, such as two men embracing or kissing, could appear in the cinema, provided they were obviously depicted as heterosexual men (strong, masculine) or feminine women (weak, subordinate to men), fulfilling their patriarchal gender roles in question. The audience, accustomed to the picture of a homosexual as an effeminate and ridiculous figure, did not perceive these men embracing each other as an act of homosexuality, but rather as an act of friendship, which can also relate to the already mentioned Dickson Experimental Film. An example of this can be seen in Wings (1927), where a dying man is being kissed by another man,
who is crying. In the contemporary films, this behavior would probably be considered homosexual, but the fact that both the men were World War I pilots caused that the heterosexual audience did not perceive it as an indication of homosexuality.

By the 1920s, the film industry in America was growing and attracted a large number of actors as well as film directors. The public belief was that occupations in film, theatre and art in general were not typically masculine and therefore, they were considered suitable for homosexuals. As homosexuality was considered a violation of the usual gender roles and morals, homosexual people were forced to live “in the closet,” that is, to hide their sexual orientation from other people. Some also chose to enter into heterosexual marriages in order to indicate that they did not “pose threat” to the rest of society - these marriages became to be known as “marriages of convenience.” Nevertheless, their “effort not to provoke heterosexual majority” led to the opposite situation since it was believed that homosexual people secretly gathered in the film industry in order to transform the rest of society into homosexuals. Nevertheless, this fear of what became to be known as “Pink Mafia” proved to be unsubstantiated since the early films rarely showed a homosexual in a different way than as a failed, funny figure, supporting the superiority of heterosexuality. Another phenomenon connected with the rising popularity of American cinema in this period was loosening of morals. Films continued to end by reaffirming the traditional values such as heterosexual monogamy and faithfulness, but frequently only after presenting the audiences with seducers, sexual intercourses outside marriage and risky sexual practices, even orgies, which appear for instance in The Sign of the Cross (1932).

Moral depravity and excessive violence of films produced during 1920s and the beginning of 1930s concerned Catholic Church as well as some members of American
conservative society. This resulted in perhaps the most influential event of the era of Classical Hollywood (1930s to 1950s) - introduction of “Hays Code” (this name is based on the name of the head of the censorship board, former postmaster general Will Hays). The Hays Code, also known as the Motion Picture Production Code meant self-censorship of American films. It explicitly restricted the following aspects, which were frequently present in previous films: “open-mouth kissing, lustful embraces, sex perversion (including homosexuality), seduction, rape, abortion, prostitution and white slavery, nudity, obscenity and profanity” (*The Celluloid Closet*, 00:15:31). Nevertheless, these rules and restrictions were seldom observed and conversely, as Benshoff and Griffin argue, “until the Code was enforced (...), Hollywood films actually became more violent and sexual, in order to woo customers back into theaters during the darkest years of the Great Depression” (314). When the Catholic Church realized this, it created its own scheme called the Legion of Decency, which rated films based on their contents, varying in Acceptable, Morally objectionable, and Condemned. It also threatened the Hollywood production with boycotts, which resulted in the Seal of Approval provision enforcing the Production Code in 1934 and in more strict censorship by the Production Code Administration, which had the authorization to inspect every film script and erase and/or alter every character, plot or costume that it considered immoral. As described by Gore Vidal, a screenwriter interviewed in *The Celluloid Closet*, the censorship and cuts caused that the stories lost their original meaning. Therefore, some film directors began to encode the controversial topics into symbols and hints, leaving the decoding up to their audiences (if they were willing to do so). Fireworks or a train going through a tunnel then became indications that some “immoral” act was happening in the film. Regarding homosexuality in the films
produced in the Hays Code era, the sissy character remained in comedy films as a source of laughter, but the encoded character of a homosexual entered also another genre of motion picture - horror film. LGBT characters started to be depicted as devil worshippers, murderers and individuals reveling in sadomasochism and necrophilia. Examples of films supporting this idea are *Dracula* (1931) or *Frankenstein* (1931), where this insane scientist and his assistants endeavor to create life without heterosexual intercourse, which refers to inability of homosexual people to procreate children. Death and/or other forms of punishment of these evil characters were regarded with applause among audiences, which also mirrored the real situation – in the 1930s, LGBT people lacked organized civil rights movements and thus frequently faced beatings, harassment, arrests or unemployment.

During the Second World War, sex (or perhaps the lack of it) became a more frequently discussed topic. When it was discovered that working in the military strengthened bonds among individuals of the same sex, the military authorities began to cooperate with psychologists in order to produce a system to detect the “deviant” individuals, especially gay men who were considered weak and therefore not able to protect their country. These individuals were not allowed to enter the military service or, if they already were part of the military, they would be given the “Blue Discharge,” a dismissal from the military service. After their revelation and dismissal, homosexual people were reluctant to return to their homes and face humiliation and derision. Therefore, they began to gather in cities such as San Francisco, Los Angeles or New York City in order to start new lives and form various LGBT movements and subcultures. When Alfred Kinsey’s report was published in 1948, it altered the public notion of homosexuality. Since the report suggested that thirty-seven percent of men
interviewed had experienced homosexual practices, the public assumed that there were homosexuals who “tricked” them by not being clearly effeminate and acting as heterosexuals but secretly, they engaged in the same-sex practices. At that moment, even the masculine men started to fear that they would show any kind of behavior that would cause them to be considered homosexual, such as hugging or sitting next to another man in the movie theatre.

An example of American cinematography of the 1940s is Rope (1948), directed by Alfred Hitchcock. It reinforces the already discussed stereotype of homosexuals as individuals with homicidal tendencies. The two main characters, Brandon and Phillip, strangle David, a former classmate, to death. Nevertheless, each of the men proves to be an example of a different stereotype - while Brandon’s behavior reveals his dominating personality with traits typical of criminals such as coldness and no remorse, Phillip appears to be his opposite – a sissy-reminding, weak, submissive individual admiring his stronger partner. He seems to regret committing the crime almost immediately, but he endeavors to hide it from Brandon, whose actions continue to be bold and also provocative. He ties the books which he intends to give to David’s father with the rope they strangled David with and also starts a passionate discussion with Rupert about Nietzsche’s theory of a superman and also about murdering as a form of art, which only the supermen are allowed to produce. Rupert’s open discussion of murdering suggests that he suspects Phillip and Brandon of committing a crime, which causes that Phillip adapts another type of stereotypical behavior of LGBT characters, i.e. insanity and paranoia. He gradually becomes certain that Rupert has already found out their secret and is ready to reveal it to other guests of their party. Initially, he tries to avoid any contact with him, but at the end of the story, he
completely loses control over his behavior (partly also because of the fact that he is inebriated) and he even manages to oppose Brandon:

Brandon: Determined to get drunk, aren’t you?
Phillip: I am drunk.
Brandon: And just as childish as you were before when you called me a liar.
Phillip: You had no business telling that story.
Brandon: Why did you lie anyway?
Phillip: I had to! Have you ever bothered for just one minute to understand how someone else might feel?
Brandon: I’m not sentimental if that’s what you...
Phillip: No, that’s not what I mean; but it doesn’t matter. Nothing matters... except that Mr. Brandon liked the party. Mr. Brandon gave the party. Mr. Brandon had a delightful evening. Well, I had a rotten evening!
Brandon: Keep drinking, and you’ll have a worse morning.
Phillip: At least if I have a hangover, it’ll be all mine! (00:57:59)

This film was allowed by the Production Code Administration to be released because it does not show homosexuality explicitly, nor does it use the term itself. Nevertheless, the fact that two men share an apartment and they also intend to spend some time on a ranch after their party ends, provides further evidence for the idea that Brandon and Phillip are encoded homosexuals.

In reaction to the fear of the heterosexual majority of being labelled as homosexual in the 1940s, Hollywood cinematography abandoned the depictions of men proving their friendship to each other by embracing, kissing and other behavior which could suggest that the individuals in question were homosexuals. In addition, Hollywood film production had to face problems caused by the foreign as well as
American independent filmmaking and television, which attracted wide audiences by topics connected to sex and sexuality. Recognizing it as a successful business strategy, Hollywood filmmakers started to produce films covering topics such as desire, rape and impotency. Nevertheless, these efforts were often violated by the Production Code Administration, still censoring any sign of immorality. On a few occasions, film producers decided not to follow the Administration’s rules and released a film without further alterations, as was in the case of *The Moon is Blue* (1953), where the creators refused to censor the word “virgin.” Despite the fact that this film was released without the Seal of Approval, it became a hit and proved to the Administration that the Code was becoming outdated. Nevertheless, the position of homosexuality did not change and it remained a taboo or a topic ridiculed by means of sissy characters.

An example of the film production of the 1950s touching upon the topic of homosexuality is a comedy *Some Like it Hot* (1959), which tells the story of two musicians, Joe and Jerry, who cross-dress in order to escape death at the hands of the mafia. They get into this situation after they witness the gang slaughtering a group of men who told the police about the gang’s involvement in alcohol selling, which was illegal during Prohibition. Joe and Jerry accept the position of musicians in a female band, rename themselves as Josephine and Daphne and escape to Miami. Despite the fact that they both fall in love with Sugar Kane - one of the band’s members - and initially vie with each other for her affection, Jerry leaves this “battle” because his disguise alias Daphne attracts a hotel guest, a millionaire Osgood Fielding the Third. In spite of the fact that he initially feels disgusted by Osgood’s effort to court him (and therefore shows his negative attitude towards same-sex relationships), Jerry gradually becomes ready to accept the millionaire’s marriage proposal. This idea shocks Joe,
who, conversely, hastens to become “a proper man” again in order to win Sugar’s heart by assuming the role of the heir to Shell Oil and thus demonstrating the Hollywood’s ideal of powerful heterosexual men who chase beautiful women subordinate to their power and wealth. He explains to Jerry that their marriage cannot function because of the fact that they are both men, but Jerry has an answer prepared, which is his intention to divorce Osgood immediately after their wedding, which would allow him to claim Osgood’s fortune. Nevertheless, when the mafia gang arrives at the hotel where the band dwells, Jerry alias Daphne decides to explain to the millionaire that they cannot marry each other but Osgood proves to be more tolerant than expected:

Jerry: Osgood, I’m gonna level with you. We can’t get married at all.

Osgood: Why not?

Jerry: Well, in the first place, I’m not a natural blonde.

Osgood: Ooh, doesn’t matter.

Jerry: I smoke! I smoke all the time!

Osgood: I don’t care.

Jerry: Well, I have a terrible past. For three years now, I’ve been living with a saxophone player.

Osgood: I forgive you.

Jerry: I can never have children!

Osgood: We can adopt some.

Jerry: But you don’t understand, Osgood! Ohh... I’m a man!

Osgood: Well, nobody’s perfect! (02:00:13)

This scene includes various factors that could be considered a reason for censorship or not releasing the film - Osgood accepts the fact that Daphne has been in another relationship and also the fact that she cannot conceive a child, which is
considered the main purpose of marriage and marital sex by conservative society. He also seems to be willing to marry another man, which may be considered the most shocking and unacceptable aspect of Osgood’s behavior. Nevertheless, as this film was clearly intended to be a comedy and therefore something not to be taken seriously or lived according to, it can be said that all the controversial and challenging ideas were not taken seriously also by the Production Code Administration, which therefore allowed the film to be released.

In 1961, the Production Code eased its attitude towards homosexuality and allowed its depiction in motion pictures provided that it was discussed conservatively and discretely. The films produced after this decision, nonetheless, did not seem to show any change to the previous system and continued to depict homosexuality in a stereotypical way – in connection to crime, disgrace, etc. An instance of this is Advise and Consent (1962), featuring a young politician who commits suicide by cutting his throat after he is blackmailed because of his former homosexual relationship. In 1968, nevertheless, the Production Code was replaced by the Motion Picture Association of America’s film rating system and various explicit sexual images were offered to the audiences, causing that the era of the 1960s and 1970s is often called “Sex Revolution.” Another change of situation came after the “Stonewall Riots,” which are considered a landmark in the history of homosexuality. On June 28, 1969, the New York Police Department was attacked by the LGBT customers of a New York bar called Stonewall Inn. The reason of their hostile behavior was the fact that the police had previously frequently raided bars which tended to attract people of various sexual orientations and races. This event was then followed by three nights of demonstrations and discussions about civil rights for LGBT people. Craig A. Rimmerman, Professor of
Political Science at Hobart and William Smith Colleges, describes the significance of these demonstrations by quoting William Eskridge, a Yale Law School Professor and a supporter of rights for sexual minorities: “Literally overnight, the Stonewall riots transformed the homophile reform movement of several dozen homosexuals into a gay liberation movement populated by thousands of lesbians, gay men, and bisexuals who formed hundreds of organizations demanding radical changes in the way gay people were treated by the state” (27). One of the results of this event is for example the fact that gay parades started to be held in urban areas, commemorating the anniversary of the Riots. A certain success was accomplished also in 1973, when the American Psychiatric Association (APA) declassified homosexuality as a mental disorder. In its “Resolution on Appropriate Affirmative Responses to Sexual Orientation Distress and Change Efforts,” APA states: “The longstanding consensus of the behavioral and social sciences and the health and mental health professions is that homosexuality per se is a normal and positive variation of human sexual orientation.” Further in this statement, APA also proclaims that it opposes depictions of members of sexual minorities as mentally ill since homosexuality is not a mental disorder.

The 1970s meant continuation of the Sexual Revolution. Some filmmakers attempted to provide their audiences with presentations of homosexuality, sometimes also endeavoring to create more realistic views of the lives of gay men and lesbians. Nonetheless, American conservative society once again intervened by condemning films which included “immorality” and the Hollywood production inclined to return to the filmmaking methods from the previous decades. An example of films produced in this era and covering the topic of homosexuality is The Boys in the Band (1970), a motion picture based on the 1968 play of the same name. Despite the fact that this film
was produced by the independent filmmakers endeavoring for fidelity to the original script, the plot was altered so that it would be acceptable for the majority audience, heterosexuals. This process of alteration resulted in reinforcing of various stereotypes which frequently occurred in previous motion pictures, such as the depiction of gay men as creatures of depression and failure, unable to embrace their sexuality, considering it a reason for sense of guilt. Michael, the main character who organizes a birthday party for Harold, another character, suffers a nervous breakdown while the latter character is described in Joe Carrithers's article called “The Audience of the Boys in the Band” as “a guilt-ridden, unattractive Jew who must get stoned before appearing at his own birthday party” (64). The third gay man appearing in this film is Bernard, an African American who has to face both racism and homophobia. Other gay characters to be discussed are Larry and Hank, living in a relationship which does not seem to be functional, based on frequency of arguments the two men have during the party. One of the reasons for these arguments is the opposite natures of these partners – while Larry is a promiscuous man reaffirming the ideal of the gay rights movements of free love, Hank may be interpreted as an embodiment of the heterosexual idea of a relationship – monogamous and faithful. The latter idea is later reaffirmed during the game which all the men play, whose principle is to call people who each man loves and confess it to them. The last participant in this party to be discussed is Alan, one of the two victors of the game, partially as a result of the fact that he is a married heterosexual (nevertheless, his sexuality is a subject of disputes). The authors of this film suggest that Alan is “different” from the rest of the group by assigning different gestures and positions to him. For example, when Michael is sitting, Alan is standing and thus possibly suggesting that he can look down to Michael and prove his
superiority over a homosexual. When Larry and Hank reconcile after the game, the aspect of invisibility is applied to them – they go into a bedroom and have sexual intercourse, which is not depicted in the film, probably as a result of the already mentioned effort to provide the heterosexual audience with an acceptable form of portrayal of homosexuality.

The anti-gay mood from the previous decades continued also in the 1980s. As the AIDS (Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome) epidemic broke out in 1981, lesbians, gays, bisexual and transgendered people lost much of their previously gained power because of the public theory that AIDS was caused and suffered from exclusively by gay men and drug users. Therefore, this illness was often called the “gay plague” and used as a reason for further oppression and hate crimes against homosexuals. In case that heterosexuals were infected, they were considered victims of a disease caused by the promiscuous way of life of gay men. American cinematography followed this shift in attitudes towards homosexuality by producing various films which included the previously successful stereotypical depictions of homosexual characters as insane killers. An example of this film production is a thriller Dressed to Kill (1980), covering the topic of transsexuality and identity. The main character of this story - Robert Elliott - is a psychiatrist, but also a person in need of medical assistance. He has a secret and murderous second identity known as Bobbi, a transgendered “patient of Elliot’s,” who “asks” Elliott for a sex change operation but Elliott decides to reject it. After Elliott’s denial, Bobbi finds another doctor, Mr. Levy, to persuade him that she is a proper candidate for the operation. Nevertheless, Elliott comes to Levy, suggesting that Bobbi is dangerous to herself as well as to other people, describing the situation to him: “Doctor, I am not paranoid. Bobbi has threatened me over the phone, she said she
was going to hurt me, my patient was slashed to death, and my razor’s gone. Now you don’t have to be a detective to figure it out, do you?” (01:14:30). When Elliott is shot in his office after he attacks Mrs. Blake (a witness of Bobbi murdering Kate Miller with Elliott’s razor), he is placed into a mental hospital. After the initial enthusiasm caused by the fact that a transgendered person was given the role of a successful and recognized psychiatrist, the audience realizes that this film merely follows the tradition of depicting homosexuals as murderers and insane individuals. The authors of *Dressed to Kill* seem to have chosen the split personality disorder as a means of showing two possible ways of life of one person. The first one is the life of a heterosexual man with a promising career, good reputation and women willing to have sexual intercourse with him. Conversely, his second identity offers a life of a transgendered man detested by other people, who has homicidal tendencies which provide him with two possible prospects: death sentence or life in the mental hospital, provided that he is found mentally ill.

In the 1990s, society’s attitudes towards homosexuality improved after the initial shock caused by the AIDS crisis. Non-heterosexual orientations began to be seen as alternatives, not purely deviations to the heterosexual way of life. The mainstream cinema started to address the sexual minorities in its films in order to attract larger audiences and raise its profits. Nevertheless, it began to be challenged by the newly formed film movement called “New Queer Cinema,” a product of the independent gay and lesbian filmmaking. Despite the fact that B. Ruby Rich - associated with coinage of this term - used it only in connection with films directed by Todd Hayness (*Poison*, 1991), Tom Kalin (*Swoon*, 1991), Gregg Araki (*The Living End*, 1992) and Christopher Munch (*The Hours and Times*, 1991) projected at Sundance Film Festivals, it began to
be used to describe independent films that include gay and lesbian issues. In his article called “New Queer Cinema,” Daryl Chin claims that:

The New Queer Cinema may, ultimately, be described in terms of a number of talented filmmakers who self-identified as queer. A number of these individuals were associated with ACT UP and its artistic ancillary, Gran Fury. Taking the self-proclaimed gay aesthetic found in European directors such as Pier Paolo Pasolini, Rainer Werner Fassbinder, and Werner Shroeter during the 1970s, these young Americans shared a post-Stonewall openness to questions of gay politics and identity. (2)

From the mainstream film production of the 1990s, it is important to discuss *Philadelphia* (1993). The main character, Andrew Beckett, is (contrary to the fact that he is gay) an ambitious, hard-working and successful lawyer, dismissed from his job because of the fact that he is HIV positive. When he decides to sue his former employer, he is not able to find any lawyer willing to represent him, probably because of the fact that the majority of counsellors is heterosexual and homophobic. Eventually, a homophobic lawyer Joe Miller decides to help him when he sees that he is discriminated against in the public library - the librarian suggests him to go to the study room because the symptoms of his disease – lesions - distract some readers in the library. Miller does not stop being homophobic, but he begins to see the injustice made on Beckett on legal level when Andrew provides him with the evidence he gathered, supporting the idea that his former employer acted in contradiction to the law. Together, they build Andrew’s case and manage to win the trial and receive financial compensation. The main character dies at the end of this film, which means that it follows the idea of the motion pictures created in previous decades, i.e. that
homosexuals do not have a right to their happy ending. Furthermore, there is another AIDS patient testifying at the court, who is not dismissed from her work and also does not die in this film, a heterosexual woman who got infected after a blood transfusion which she received during childbirth. This scene mirrors the already discussed reality of the 1980s, when it was believed that AIDS was caused by gays and the heterosexual AIDS patients were seen as victims. Nevertheless, a certain shift in the attitude of society towards homosexuality occurs in this film - the fact that a member of a sexual minority is supported by the court jury, which acknowledges the harm done to him.

This chapter discussed depictions of homosexuality occurring in the films produced from the beginning of American cinematography to the end of the twentieth century. Philadelphia, the last film discussed, can serve as an example of the first motion pictures which approached the topic of homosexuality in a more sympathetic way. Its authors did not avoid stereotypes completely (the main character is an AIDS patient who dies at the end of the film); nevertheless, they did not create the most frequent portrayals of LGBT people. Andrew is not a mentally ill creature with homicidal tendencies, which could be seen for example in Rope or in Dressed to Kill, nor does he suffer from depressions caused by his homosexuality, which could be traced in The Boys in the Band. Together with the New Queer Cinema, it suggests a more optimistic future for cinematic portrayals of homosexuality.
4. Films Produced in the Period from 2000 to 2015

As far as the media representation of homosexuality is concerned, it can be said that the LGBT community has been more visible in recent years than ever before. The fact that homosexuality is no longer considered a mental illness by the majority of society and also that in 2003, the still existing sodomy laws in the United States were ruled to be unconstitutional caused that American society has become more relaxed about human sexuality. This improvement of attitudes towards homosexuality has also improved the situation of LGBT people in the American film industry. Some actors and filmmakers are now open about their homosexuality and their audiences judge them according to their artistic skills and not merely to their sexuality. Instances of openly gay actors are Jim Parsons, known as Sheldon from the TV series called *The Big Bang Theory* or Neil Patrick Harris alias Barney from another TV series, *How I Met Your Mother*. Nevertheless, it is important to mention that both Parsons and Harris do not play the roles of homosexual characters – Sheldon is a heterosexual, but he deals with problems similar to homosexual people. For instance, he seems not to be accepted by the rest of society since he is considered “weird” because of his reputation of a brilliant scientist who only focuses on his work and has issues with touching people and becoming intimate with them, even his girlfriend. Barney, conversely, can be considered Sheldon’s opposite since he seems to fulfill the traditional role given to males in American cinema and television – he is a sociable heterosexual man who revels in seducing attractive ladies.

The relaxation of attitudes towards human sexuality has brought a relatively new trend into the film industry – making of films based on real LGBT people. It should not be considered a completely new phenomenon since this kind of films was
occasionally made in the history of American cinematography, for example *Night and Day* (1946), based on life of Cole Porter, an American songwriter and composer (the title of this film then refers to one of the songs written by Porter). Nevertheless, this type of film production has become more popular in the period in question, i.e. from 2000 to 2015. The scriptwriters usually choose a significant person from the LGBT history and endeavor to provide their audiences with sympathetic stories of people who were persecuted and as a rule, they died in spite of their contribution to science, culture and other spheres that improved human lives. In order to make these stories attractive to a wide range of audiences, the scriptwriters tend to alter some events and character traits. Furthermore, the characters are frequently portrayed by popular (and heterosexual) actors, which guarantees also the presence of a heterosexual audience in the movie theatre.

**Monster (2003)**

This drama tells the story of a real life lesbian and serial killer, Aileen Wuornos (Charlize Theron). Aileen is depicted as a woman of failures accompanying her during her whole life, which can be considered an example of the stereotypical portrayal of homosexuality. Since she was raped repeatedly from the age of eight by one of her father’s friends, she detests men, but tries to behave like them at the same time. This may be caused by two reasons: firstly, she may feel weak because she did not report the rape to the police and thus she was not able to stop it for several years. Secondly, her “manly” appearance and behavior can be seen as intention of the authors of this film since she resembles the traditional “dyke” characters – men-like, seeking fights and alcohol. She does not see her crimes as sins (conversely to Selby, who was raised in a religious family) but she vindicates them as her revenge for raping:
Aileen: I’m good with the Lord. I’m fine with him. And I know how you were raised, alright? And I know how people fuckin’ think out there, and fuck, it’s gotta be that way. They’ve gotta tell you that ‘Thou shall not kill’ shit and all of that. But that’s not the way the world works, Selby. Cause I’m out there every fuckin’ day living it. Who the fuck knows what God wants? People kill each other every day and for what? Hm? For politics, for religion, and they’re heroes! No, no... there’s a lot of shit I can’t do anymore, but killing’s not one of them. And letting those fucking bastards out there going rape somebody else isn’t either! (01:15:38)

Furthermore, Aileen specifically calls herself “a real good person” (01:16:39). She regrets her actions only at the end of the film, specifically in the scene where Selby calls her in the prison after she was arrested and held by the police. Realizing that she will probably never see Selby again and also that Selby could be punished for her mistakes, Aileen confesses to the crimes she committed and also adds: “I wish there was a way that people could forgive you for something like this, you know? But they can’t. They can’t, man. So I’m gonna die, Sel...” (01:40:37). Other instances of stereotypical depiction of homosexuality can also be traced in this film. For example, Donna and other people sharing their house with Selby seem to perceive homosexuality as a sin, her “bad choice” (01:18:28). Selby’s father also shows his homophobic character when he refuses to live in the same house with her. Later, he offers her the chance of returning home, provided that she sees a doctor who is supposed to “save her soul” (00:16:29). Also the fact that Aileen owns no university degree nor résumé and is forced to work as a prostitute contributes to the list of negative and stereotypical depictions of homosexuality included in this film. When Aileen kills her first victim, she fears that she will be caught by the police and decides
to live a more decent life with a more decent occupation. Nevertheless, the already mentioned factors combined with the fact that she has had a criminal record because of the prostitution do not allow her to be employed. Nevertheless, Aileen seems determined to change her life and be happy with Selby so she sets high goals impossible to become reality such as to become a lawyer. During this interview, the lawyer interviewing her condemns her boldness:

I see you’re from Daytona Beach, all of that looks great, it must be wonderful. But can I tell you something? When the beach party is over, you don't get to say, "You know what? I think now I’d like to have what everybody else has worked their entire life for." It doesn’t work that way. (00:42:07)

To further contribute to her misery, she meets a policeman that charged her with prostitution and he abuses his power and forces Aileen to provide him with oral sex. She seems desperate and disgusted, but she is fully aware of the fact that she cannot prevent the following event from happening because of her reputation which she describes as follows: “People always look down their noses at hookers. Never give you a chance, because they think you took the easy way out, when no one could imagine the willpower it took to do what we do. Walking the streets, night after night, taking the hits and still getting back up” (01:33:41). The final scene of this motion picture then shows another stereotype common among films including homosexuality, that is, no right to a happy ending: she is sentenced to death for the murders she committed. She desperately reacts to the sentence by wishing the judge to “rot in hell” (01:41:47) for imposing the death sentence and leaving the rapes, which she had to suffer, without punishment.
This film describes the story of the real life American homosexual writer Truman Capote. Concretely, the process of research and writing of his non-fiction novel called *In Cold Blood*, based on his investigation of slaughtering the Clutter family in Holcomb, Kansas. Despite the fact that Capote originally intends to write only a short article on how the killings influenced the citizens of Holcomb, his research becomes more extensive as he meets the two murderers, Perry Smith and Dick Hickock. Capote gradually becomes obsessed with finding the truth, the process which he is helped with by Nelle Harper Lee, the author of *To Kill a Mockingbird* and also one of Capote's friends. Harper - friendly and “normal” – seems to represent Truman’s opposite since Capote has an unpleasant high voice, he does not hide his sexual orientation and he is also arrogant and wishes to be seen and appreciated. Capote’s arrogance and self-confidence are visible in the scene when Capote visits Perry Smith in the penitentiary. During their conversation, Smith endeavors to impress him by discussing words from the books which Capote brought to him. Nevertheless, Capote responds by: “Perry, I know what “exacerbate” means. [...] There is not a word or a sentence or a concept that you can illuminate for me” (01:17:20). An example of Capote’s desire to be distinguished can be seen at the moment of his journey to Kansas. Before two African American porters come into his and Harper’s compartment bringing him his luggage, Truman pays one of them to praise his last book in front of Harper, which can also suggest that Truman is jealous of the woman’s success with *To Kill a Mockingbird*. This is confirmed later in the film when Lee asks Capote about his opinion on the film adaptation of her book. When she leaves him because he does not seem willing to respond, he says: “Frankly, I don’t see what all the fuss is about”
(01:34:24). In spite of his arrogance and also ambitions to introduce a new literary genre that will change the way other authors write, Capote unexpectedly becomes closer to the murderers and endeavors to help them and also find the truth about the night of the killings because he seems to believe in their innocence. When Smith provides Capote with his personal diaries and the writer ascertains that the homicides were committed by people who called him a friend, he seems shaken. This may be a result of what Capote’s partner, Jack Dunphy, suspects, and that is that Truman and Perry developed a love affair in the penitentiary. When Harper asks Capote whether it is true, he does not reject Jack’s premonition convincingly: “It's as if Perry and I grew up in the same house. And one day, he stood up and went out the back door, while I went out the front” (01:06:53). When this suspicion of Jack’s starts to influence their relationship, Capote decides to give preference to his partner. He moves to Spain with him and stops visiting Perry and Hickock. Nevertheless, changing his residence does not prevent him from thinking about them and he seems devastated by the fact that he cannot help them since they committed a quadruple murder. The picture of Capote as a sympathetic and “human” person can probably be seen most notably before and after the two men’s executions. Before they are killed by hanging, he visits them and talks to them, crying and hesitating to leave. When he arrives at the hotel, he has a telephone conversation with Harper and says: “It was a terrible experience... and I will never get over it” (01:46:46). This experience causes that his ambition and satisfaction with the success of In Cold Blood give way to alcohol and despair, which later results in his death. According to Tison Pugh, the author of Truman Capote: A Literary Life at the Movies, Capote’s death comes as a punishment for his narcissism, which can be seen, for example, in the scene where he is talking to Harper on the phone, excited about his
genius: “Sometimes when I... when I think how good my book can be, I can hardly breathe” (00:54:22).

Despite the fact that the authors of this film endeavored for accuracy, they altered some facts, probably in order to make the film more attractive for audiences. For instance, Capote writes his book with a typewriter despite the fact that in reality, he wrote his work in longhand. Also, he was present only at Hickock’s execution because he left before Smith was hanged, probably because Perry was closer to him than he was willing to admit and therefore, he was not able to witness his execution.

Milk (2008)

Milk is the third film based on the life of a real person of homosexual orientation to be discussed in this Bachelor's thesis. It describes the story of Harvey Milk (portrayed by a popular actor Sean Penn), an American gay rights activist and first gay man openly embracing his sexuality in California, elected to the San Francisco Board of Supervisors. In a sympathetic way, the authors of this film provide their audiences with an image of an ambitious person who believes that love and hope can change the world. Initially, he lives a closeted life of an investment banker, but he gradually starts to accept his sexuality when he meets his partner, Scott Smith, who encourages him to revise his attitude towards his life and sexual orientation. When they move to San Francisco, a shy creature disappointed with his life turns into a man ready to fight the injustice and hatred that all members of the LGBT community are forced to face every day. The fact that his speeches are effective and cause other members of the LGBT minority to follow him is achieved by the fact that he attacks normality and the traditional morals and values of heterosexual majority. For example, he mentions the American Declaration of Independence to create a simple argument
known to every American citizen but strong at the same time, which supports his idea that homosexuality should equate to heterosexuality: “All men are created equal. No matter how hard you try, you can never erase those words” (01:31:35). In another scene, he uses the then-popular idea that homosexuality is a behavior that can be taught and mocks it, which brings him support from LGBT people and irritation of his heterosexual opponents: “And how do you teach homosexuality? Is it like French?” (01:35:05). In addition, he uses another myth created by heterosexuals (by Anita Bryant and other conservative Christians in particular) to start his speeches, causing applause among his audiences. His “My name is Harvey Milk and I wanna recruit you!” (00:02:57) refers to Bryant’s idea that homosexuals recruit heterosexual children in order to molest them, which served as a basis for her anti-gay campaign promoting hatred and oppression of LGBT people. In his article called “Milk,” Michael Bronski stresses the uniqueness of this film, which lies for example in the fact that it is narrated exclusively by Seann Penn alias Harvey Milk, that is, from the perspective of a homosexual person. This causes that the narration is not distorted by potential homophobia and/or prejudice of a heterosexual person. Homophobic people also occur in the film, but firstly, Milk is given a chance to describe his political opinions as well as the real situation of the LGBT community in San Francisco. Furthermore, Milk’s accomplishments may also serve as encouragement for LGBT people considering their coming out, joining civil rights movements or communities, but also for adolescents living in the hostile environment of homophobic or conservative people who regard homosexuality as a defect or a taboo, which causes that they feel insecure and disadvantaged, perhaps also in danger of their lives. In spite of the fact that he was assassinated, Milk’s struggle for civil rights of LGBT people improved their conditions
and even his death did not end this fight. Milk’s assassination united LGBT people in a march in Milk’s honor and when his murderer, Dan White, received only the minimum charge, their fury caused some of them to participate in “The White Night Riots,” described by this film as “the most violent uprising in the history of the gay movement” (02:00:40).

**The Imitation Game (2014)**

*The Imitation Game* is based on a biography called *Alan Turing, the Enigma* by Andrew Hodges. As the name of the film suggests, it describes the life of Alan Turing (portrayed by Benedict Cumberbatch, popular for his depiction of another eccentric person, Sherlock Holmes in the BBC TV series called *Sherlock*), a British mathematician and computer scientist recognized for his work on breaking the settings of the German Enigma machine and thus enabling the Allies to reveal the German war strategy and presumably shorten the Second World War. In this film, Turing is depicted as an overly self-confident figure unable to work in a team and receive orders or even communicate with other members of his team. This can be seen, for example, in the scene in Bletchley Park, where John, one of his colleagues, suggests having lunch but he does not form it as a question. Alan, who is used to analyzing almost every aspect of his life, misinterprets his suggestion for a statement and only confirms his co-workers’ idea that he is a “peculiar” person:

John: The boys... we’re going to get some lunch.

Alan: (silence)

John: Alan?

Alan: Yes?

John: I said we’re going to get some lunch.
Alan: (silence)

John: Alan?

Alan: Yes?

John: Can you hear me?

Alan: Yes.

John: I said we're off to get some lun... This is starting to get a little bit repetitive.

Alan: What is?

John: I had asked, if you wanted to come have lunch with us.

Alan: No, you didn't, you said you were going to get some lunch.

In this film, it is suggested that Alan's mother has a similar opinion of her son – Alan mentions that she calls him “odd duck” (00:26:11). Nevertheless, she is probably not homophobic or is not aware of his sexual orientation since she seems to appreciate his knowledge. During a conversation with Commander Denniston, Turing tells him that his mother considers him “one of the best mathematicians in the world” (00:09:56). Turing's inability to communicate with other people may be caused by his childhood experience of being bullied and not accepted in society, which can be seen a price for his genius. Nevertheless, it is debatable whether Turing calls this inability an advantage or disadvantage since it allows him to focus more on his education and later also on his work, which frequently proves useful in Bletchley Park. Turing seems so focused on completing his task that he does not suffer from depressions after the initial failures as much as his co-workers. Nevertheless, the same focus and passion for work eventually cause his death – when he is arrested and charged with gross indecency, he chooses chemical castration over imprisonment because he could not continue to work in the penitentiary. The side effects of this operation cause,
nevertheless, that he loses concentration, suffers from depressions and eventually commits suicide.

In an effort to give a good account of Turing and acknowledge his contribution to science, the authors of this motion picture altered certain facts concerning Turing’s life. For instance, the scriptwriters of this motion picture decided not to include a scene depicting Turing’s suicide, leaving Turing’s ending to audience and replacing it with subtitles acknowledging his significance. These claim that Turing’s machines are now called computers (01:49:51), which is not correct since concepts of other authors were also used in the process of creating a computer. The film also suggests that Turing was the only author of the decryption machine, whereas in reality, another scientist collaborated with him, which is not mentioned in this motion picture. The authors of *The Imitation Game* also created a fictional scene where Turing’s ex-fiancée - Joan Clarke - visits him. When she sees the effects of the chemical castration, she acknowledges his work and suggests that she and other people can live because he managed to break the Enigma settings. The character of Joan is, similarly to the character of Alan, portrayed by an actor that could attract a wider audience to the cinema, Keira Knightley, popular for her role of Elizabeth Swann in *The Pirates of the Caribbean*. Richard Alleva, the author of the article “Hidden Heroes: 'Unbroken & The Imitation Game','” criticizes the scriptwriters of this film also for approaching Turing’s story as a confession to a policeman, arguing that it is highly improbable that a person forced to work in complete secrecy would share his story with “an ordinary London cop” (20).

The motion pictures which tend to aim for sympathetic portrayals of real life LGBT people and therefore suggest a better future for the LGBT characters occurring
in cinematography are not the only type of films including homosexuality that can be seen in the cinema. Film studios have commenced production of fictional motion pictures with more homosexual characters occurring in the leading as well as the supporting roles. Nevertheless, these characters frequently reaffirm the historical stereotypes of lesbians, gays, bisexuals and transgendered people as violent and/or depressed people who commit suicides as a result of oppression from the rest of society, etc. This phenomenon can be explained by the already mentioned idea that the cinematography tends to mirror reality. Apart from the visibility discussed in the beginning of this chapter, the LGBT community has reached changes also in another sphere, law. Since 2010, American homosexuals have been allowed to join the military and on 26 June 2015, the Supreme Court ruled that same-sex marriage was legal across the whole United States of America. Nevertheless, this process of decision-making was accompanied by protests by various groups of religious and conservative individuals. The protesters argued that homosexuality broke the core of marriage by not fulfilling its main purpose – procreation. Another reason for attacking the same-sex marriage was for example some protesters’ idea that homosexuality was a sinful behavior not approved by God. This suggests that while the attitude of the majority of American society towards sexual minorities has been changing in recent years, some people still are not ready and/or willing to perceive LGBT people as their equals who have the same right to be satisfied with their lives. When the filmmakers learn this truth, they realize that these people may also not be ready and/or willing to see the pictures of happy homosexuals in their films. Therefore, in order to satisfy the largest number of clients possible, they combine two factors. They place the LGBT characters in their films. Nevertheless, these figures are often reduced to their sexuality, conversely to
their heterosexual counterparts, who are described in terms of their social status and accomplishments.

**Brokeback Mountain (2005)**

This film describes a fictional story of Ennis Del Mar (Heath Ledger) and Jack Twist (Jake Gyllenhaal), two men who meet while applying for a position of a shepherd. From the beginning of the film, Jack shows signs of being attracted to Ennis, who, conversely, seems to ignore him. This can be noted in the scene where both the men are waiting for Joe Aguirre, the owner of the sheep. Jack is shaving and watching Ennis in the rear-view mirror of his car at the same time. Other signs of Jack’s interest in Ennis can be the fact that he suggests to Ennis that they can work together instead of working separately for the whole day. After an evening spent drinking, Jack uses the cold weather as a pretext to make Ennis sleep in his tent. He is not able to hide his desire for Ennis anymore and he takes Ennis’s hand. Despite the fact that Ennis appears to be shocked, he later stops hiding his emotions and attraction and they have sexual intercourse. Nevertheless, Ennis endeavors to avoid Jack in the morning and leaves the campsite as soon as possible. When he returns to the sheep, he finds one of them killed by a coyote, which can be interpreted as a punishment for their “sin” alias sex. In the evening, Ennis tells Jack that they are not going to become intimately close again because he is going to marry his fiancée when he returns from the Brokeback Mountain and most importantly, that he is not gay. Jack seems to be ashamed and possibly disappointed so he also denies being homosexual:

Ennis: This is a one-shot thing we got going on here.

Jack: It’s nobody’s business but ours.

Ennis: You know I ain’t queer.
Jack: Me neither. (00:32:02)

Contrary to this conversation, they violate their agreement and start to touch each other even outside their tent, where they both start to sleep. This brings them another problem since Aguirre ascertains their relationship after watching them through binoculars. As a sign of his intolerance towards homosexuality, he dismisses the men – he chooses a snowstorm as a pretext for his decision instead of acknowledging that he does not approve of their relationship:

Jack: Aguirre came by again. (...) Says bring them down.
Ennis: Bring them down? Why? It's the middle of August.
Jack: Says there's a storm coming from within the Pacific, worse than this one.
Ennis: Well, that snow barely stuck an hour. Huh? Besides, that son-of-a-bitch, he's cutting us outta a whole month's pay. That ain't right. (00:37:42)

Aguirre's act hastens the moment of their separation, which both of them do not seem to cope well with. The difference between Jack and Ennis is, nevertheless, that Jack is not afraid to express his emotions, whereas Ennis gives the impression of being ashamed of his sexual orientation and feelings for Jack. He chooses an option more acceptable for the rest of society and marries his fiancée Alma when he returns from the Brokeback Mountain. Since both the men have not been in contact with each other for four years, Jack also chooses to live a closeted life with a heterosexual woman in hopes of having a more satisfying life as a husband of a wealthy woman than as a gay openly embracing his sexuality. Both Jack and Ennis endeavor to be satisfactory husbands and fathers, but when Ennis receives a letter from Jack, he fails to hide his high expectations. They decide to lie to their wives and begin to spend time together. During one of these meetings, Jack expresses his dissatisfaction with his life as a
closeted homosexual and suggests to Ennis that they can live together, but Ennis rejects this idea by telling him his childhood story. He describes that his father forced him and his brother to look at the corpse of a man who was brutally killed because he had presumably been gay. This experience of his and also the fact that Ennis admits that his father was probably responsible for this act explain Ennis’s desperate behavior such as his decision to live in the closet or accusing Jack of the fact that he is a divorced man without money nor respect. He also chooses to spend time with his daughters instead of being with Jack, who handles this situation with significant difficulties.

Another reason why this film can be considered stereotypical in terms of depiction of homosexual characters is homophobia of Ennis’s wife, Alma. When she discovers her husband’s sexual orientation, she begins to cause arguments and later also divorces Ennis. Nevertheless, she shows her homophobic character by revealing that she knows the truth about Ennis’s relationship with Jack even when they do not share their household anymore: “Don’t try and fool me no more, Ennis; I know what it means! Jack Twist. Jack Nasty! You didn’t go up there to fish!” (01:28:11). Jack’s marriage also does not appear satisfying, which can be seen, for example, in his relationship with his wife’s parents who seem to mock his authority as a father and also as a husband, probably suspecting that Jack is not a heterosexual.

The last stereotype to be discussed is Jack’s death, which also means vanishing of a chance that Jack and Ennis could have their happy ending. During their telephone conversation, Jack’s wife tells Ennis that Jack died after his tire had exploded, but the scene appearing during her speech suggests that Jack was beaten to death by a group of homophobic people. Only at this moment Ennis, mourning for Jack, realizes his
mistake, i.e. his decision not to provoke heterosexual people by living with Jack and to live as a closeted homosexual instead.

**Pariah (2011)**

*Pariah* is a fictional story of a seventeen-year-old Alike who belongs to two minorities at the same time since she is an African American lesbian. She seems to struggle with her sexuality and her shy nature slows the process of her accepting the fact that she is a lesbian. Alike’s best friend, Laura, can be considered her opposite – when these two women enter a lesbian bar, Laura enjoys the company of other females and collects their telephone numbers, while Alike – dressed as a man - watches women pole dancing. One of the reasons of Alike’s inability to embrace the fact that she is a lesbian and also to become a part of this community is her family background. Her mother Audrey seems desperate to be accepted by high society. She longs for fashionable clothes and modern house equipment and forces her family to go to church in order to “look good.” The possibility that her older daughter could be homosexual does not fit into this pattern of hers and she endeavors to change her. For instance, she reproaches her for wearing men’s clothes and for her friendship with Laura: “I don’t like that young lady that you run around with” (00:07:05). Before they go to church, Audrey forces Alike to wear a pink blouse despite the fact that Alike explicitly tells her that she does not feel comfortable wearing it. After the service, she introduces Alike to Bina, a daughter of one of the doctors who work with her at the health clinic. Since Bina is typically feminine and from “better society,” Audrey considers her a more appropriate candidate for Alike’s best friend than Laura, who does not hide her sexuality, which causes that her family renounces her. Gradually, Audrey’s plan begins to work and Alike starts to spend time with Bina rather than with
Laura, which Audrey uses to harm Laura’s feelings. It can be seen, for example, in the scene where Laura comes to visit Alike and Audrey tells her that her daughter will be with Bina for the rest of the night. When Laura wants to ask her more questions, she closes the door as a sign of her homophobia. Eventually, Alike succumbs to her feelings and has sexual intercourse with Bina. Nonetheless, Bina, presumably Alike’s first sexual partner, acts in a stereotypical way by claiming that their sex was meaningless for her and that she is not ready for a serious lesbian relationship. Before Alike manages to leave her apartment, broken-hearted and upset, Bina asks her to keep their sexual experience a secret. When Alike returns home, endeavoring to deal with her grief and disappointment, her parents start one of their several arguments. She comes to them in hopes of solving the problem, but Audrey forces her to tell her father that she is a lesbian: “Tell him that you’re a nasty ass dyke!” (01:10:57). When Alike does so, she is forced to face her parents’ shock and disapproval – Audrey begins to scream at her husband: “You see, you should have done something!” (01:11:18), suggesting that homosexuality is a defect that can be prevented. Her father works as a security guard in a shop, where a homophobic man works who mocks the women coming into the same club as Alike does. Arthur, Alike’s father, seems to fear that his daughter belongs to the people who this employee degrades every day. When he hears Alike’s confirmation that she is a homosexual, his fear becomes reality, but he is aware of the fact that Alike is his daughter and he does not take any drastic actions, which is not the case of his wife. When Audrey hears Alike’s confession, she starts to beat her, screaming and crying. When these two women meet later again, she does not respond when her daughter says: “I love you, mom” (01:19:30). When she repeats it, crying, Audrey only says that she is praying for her and leaves. Alike is not granted her right to
have a “happy ending” in terms of intimacy and relationship. Nonetheless, the fact that she leaves her homophobic family and decides to develop her writing talent can be seen as a diversion from the stereotypical endings of LGBT characters in films.

The third type of films covering the topic of homosexuality is films based on semi-autobiographical works by real life LGBT authors, which provides the film directors with the opportunity to adapt the techniques used by both the biographical and fictional motion pictures. Similarly to the biographical films, they also aim for sympathetic depiction of lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgendered people in question. Nevertheless, as the fictional motion pictures aim primarily for action as well as for the interests of their audiences, they also tend to alter the events described in the original works, which may result in reaffirming various stereotypes in their stories.

**The Hours (2002)**

The plot of this motion picture is built on Virginia Woolf’s semi-autobiographical novel *Mrs. Dalloway* and deals with a stereotypical aspect involved in films including homosexuality, suicide. All the three main female characters as well as Richard Brown, a writer, are described as bisexual and dissatisfied with their lives. The reason for Virginia Woolf’s suicide seems to be based on historical facts – depressions and mental illness, and the connection between her sexual orientation and death does not seem relevant. Nevertheless, this is not the case of the rest of the characters. Laura Brown is a closeted lesbian living with her husband and son in New York. She pretends to enjoy living their “American Dream,” but in reality, she endeavors to flee from it. As a reader of *Mrs. Dalloway*, she finds encouragement in her decision to commit suicide and leaves her son, heading to a hotel where she intends to overdose herself with medications. She lies on the bed and imagines that she has the same destiny as Clarissa
Dalloway, drowning. Nonetheless, another image appears in her mind - the cake she and her son made for her husband - and decides to live. When she returns into her ordinary life, she endeavors to be a loving wife and mother in spite of the fact that she seems interested in her neighbor, Kitty. As the end of this film reveals, she is not able to live in the closet for the rest of her life and leaves her family when her second child is born; she describes this decision of hers as a decision between death (staying in the closet with her family) or life (leaving for Canada): “It would be wonderful to say you regretted it. It would be easy. But what does it mean? What does it mean to regret when you have no choice? It’s what you can bear. There it is. No one’s going to forgive me. It was death. I chose life” (01:41:03). This film is stereotypical also because her previously mentioned son, Richard Brown, is dying of AIDS. He is going to receive a prestigious prize for poetry, but he does not manage to actually receive it, partially because he thinks this that the prize is not for his writing skills but for “surviving” (00:19:53). He considers his life a failure because he wished to become a successful writer, but the reality is that he does not even manage to dress himself properly and he also suffers from the side-effects of the HIV treatment such as hallucinations. His suicide comes expectedly after his conversations with Clarissa, which have the form of discussing death and their history as lovers. He asks her: “Would you be angry if I died?” (00:23:55) and he also suggests that he has been staying alive merely to satisfy Clarissa. Richard’s and his mother’s destiny are connected in a way that they both try to end their lives with the help of medications; whereas Laura eventually rejects this “solution,” it serves to Richard as a means of completing his task, suicide by jumping from the window. As has been already suggested, his life is connected to the last main female heroine in question, Clarissa. During the film, details concerning her and
Richard’s former relationship are gradually revealed. For example, the fact that both the characters started to live in homosexual relationships after their relationship was determined. Whereas Richard’s partner abandoned him in order to become “free” (00:55:34), Clarissa has had a stable relationship with Sally for ten years despite the fact that she admitted that her life was trivial compared to the moments when she lived with Richard:

I remember one morning getting up at dawn, there was such a sense of possibility. You know, that feeling? And I, I remember thinking to myself: So, this is the beginning of happiness. This is where it starts. And of course, there will always be more. It never occurred to me it wasn’t the beginning. It was happiness. It was the moment. Right then. (01:12:50)

**A Single Man (2009)**

This motion picture is based on the semi-autobiographical novel of the same name written by Christopher Isherwood, a British writer and gay man. It reinforces the stereotype which has been frequently used in American motion pictures, death of a homosexual. George Falconer (Colin Firth) is an English professor in Los Angeles, whose lover Jim died in a car accident eight months ago, after a sixteen-year-long relationship with George. When he is told the information about Jim’s death, he seems to have a nervous breakdown. He suffers from depressions and loses concentration while working at school or talking with other people, having flashbacks from the moments with Jim. Even after eight months, Jim’s death is so devastating for him that he decides for a solution typical of films produced in the twentieth century, suicide. Nevertheless, as he tries to shoot himself, he realizes that it is more difficult than he initially thought and his trials fail. The reason of this may be the fact that people such
as Charley or Kenny prove George’s theory wrong, which is that after Jim’s death, nobody else is capable of loving him. Charley is a woman living in George’s neighborhood and also his best friend and former lover. Nevertheless, their friendship is complicated because of their different views of their past – whereas George considers having sex with women an experiment which every gay man conducts when he is young and he does not seem willing to resume their romantic relationship, Charley blames George for the fact that she is a divorced woman without a man who would love her and also that she does not have a good relationship with her children. She kisses George and suggests that his relationship with Jim was merely a substitution for a “real,” heterosexual relationship which he could have had with her. This statement causes that George becomes angry and strictly opposes this idea. It also indicates Charley’s negative view of homosexuality and her unwillingness to admit the possibility of two gay men being capable of true love. The fact that Jim is not depicted as a living person in the film may also suggest another stereotype common to the films discussed in Chapter 2, invisibility. Whereas Jim appears only in the form of memories in this film, Charlotte and her heterosexual relationship with George become the center of the plot. The aspect of invisibility is also directly mentioned in the film – in one of George’s flashbacks, Jim mentions that George told him that they were invisible and he uses it to touch George despite the fact that they live in a house with walls made of glass so there is a risk that their neighbors will notice their intimacy. Another scene where invisibility of homosexual people is mentioned is built on the same principle - Kenny strips off his clothes so that he could swim in the sea, but George seems reluctant to do the same thing because somebody could see them. Seeing George hesitating, Kenny asks: “We’re invisible, don’t you know that?” (01:17:28).
spite of his effort not to provoke other people with his homosexuality and remain hidden in the closet, George does not receive his happy ending. When Kenny manages to befriend George, it seems that George realizes that he is not alone in the world even without Jim and stops considering suicide. Nevertheless, he dies from heart attack, ironically, shortly after burning his goodbye letters.

The films studied in this chapter confirm the assumption made in the introductory part of this Bachelor’s thesis. In the last fifteen years, homosexual characters have become more frequently included in American cinematography than in its beginnings. It can be said that the sissy stereotype was rarely traced in recent films, for example Jack in *Brokeback Mountain*. Nevertheless, the other stereotypical portrayals traced in the historical films were frequently visible also in the recent works. For example, depictions of LGBT characters as depressed individuals committing or attempting suicides were traced in *The Hours*, where all the major characters’ lives are influenced by this phenomenon. Virginia Woolf succeeds in her attempt to drown, which inspires Laura Brown to also attempt suicide because she is not able to continue her dissatisfying life in the closet. Her son, an AIDS patient, succeeds in killing himself, which is a result of his depressions and feeling that his life has been a failure. His death influences the life of Clarissa, his former lover, who has lived in a long-term homosexual relationship, but she feels that her life was more fulfilling when she lived in a heterosexual relationship with Richard. The aspect of death of LGBT people occurs also in *A Single Man*, where the partner of the major character dies in a car accident, or in *Brokeback Mountain*, which suggests that Jack was killed by a group of homophobic people. The stereotype of a lesbian as an insane person combined with the stereotype of “no happy ending for homosexuals” can be seen in *Monster*, where the serial killer is
sentenced to death as a punishment for her crimes committed as a result of her childhood trauma – years of being raped by a man close to her family. The last stereotype discussed in Chapter 2, invisibility of an LGBT character, then can be seen in already mentioned A Single Man.
Conclusion

Based on the motion pictures studied in this Bachelor's thesis, it can be said that the American film industry has altered its approach towards homosexuality. As the majority of society ceased to consider homosexuality a mental disorder or a sexual deviation, it also began to accept the members of sexual minorities, which supported their coming out and becoming visible to the outer world. American cinema responded to this fact by producing various films which included LGBT characters in order to attract wider audiences. As was discovered during the process of examination of the films produced in the period from 2000 to 2015, the directors of these films usually create visible LGBT characters in their films (an exception is Jim in A Single Man). Nonetheless, they seem to be aware of the fact that not the whole society perceives homosexual people as their equals and that homophobia remains a present phenomenon in America. Therefore, the directors’ vision of increasing profits brings them to their decision to satisfy both types of their audiences, which frequently results in creating films where the LGBT characters are present but they reaffirm the stereotypes that could be traced in the twentieth-century motion pictures. While the creators of the fictional motion pictures are not restricted by any rules considering credibility and are thus enabled to use any stereotypes in their films, the screen writers of the autobiographical as well as the semi-autobiographical motion pictures tend to follow the basic line of the original story, whether it is a story of a real life LGBT person (as is the case of the autobiographical films) or a story provided by a real life LGBT author (as is the case of the semi-autobiographical works). Nonetheless, even these works include various stereotypes connected to LGBT people's appearance in American cinematography, either created by the author of the original story and by the events in
the lives of the real life LGBT people, or added by the screenwriters with the aim to present both their heterosexual and non-heterosexual audiences with attractive and/or sympathetic pictures of members of sexual minorities. This is also frequently achieved by placing popular heterosexual actors in the roles of LGBT characters. This happens for example in the autobiographical film *The Imitation Game*, in the semi-autobiographical film *A Single Man*, and also in the fictional *Brokeback Mountain*. Considering depiction of homosexuality, the first stereotype studied in this Bachelor's thesis, the sissy character, could be traced in *Brokeback Mountain*. Its female counterpart, the dyke character, was then seen in the autobiographical *Monster*. Jack's feminine traits and behavior cause that society reveals his sexual orientation, even without his coming out, and causes that he is killed in the end of *Brokeback Mountain*. Conversely, the fact that Aileen looks and endeavors to behave like a strong man does not provide her with any advantage either, since she is also killed at the end of *Monster*. These two films use not only the sissy and dyke characters, but, as suggested, also the stereotype of unhappy ending (usually death of an LGBT character). Another example of motion pictures which reaffirm this historical stereotype is the autobiographical *Capote*, where the main character dies after he becomes addicted to alcohol as a result of his traumatic experience, witnessing a person being executed. The fact that this person was one of the murderers whom he earlier considered his friends and endeavored to prove their innocence, could also have contributed to his alcoholism. In order to complete the group of the three genres of films studied in this Bachelor's thesis, semi-autobiographical *A Single Man* and *The Hours* should be mentioned. In the first motion picture, George's life partner dies in a car accident and in *The Hours*, the bisexual writer Richard Brown commits suicide because he is not
able to deal with his failure to become a successful writer. Another reason for his suicide is also the fact that he is an AIDS patient, which can also be considered a reason for calling this film stereotypical since it refers to the 1980s situation when it was believed that only gay men were infected with this virus. The reasons for LGBT people’s suicides mentioned above are also linked with another type of stereotypical depiction of members of sexual minorities; that is, a homosexual as a depressed and unhappy person. This stereotype could also be traced in all three genres of films studied. The reasons for depressions of non-heterosexual characters in the semi-autobiographical motion pictures were already mentioned (Jim's death causes that George suffers from depressions and intends to commit suicide and for Richard’s reasons, see above). In the case of autobiographical films, it may be for instance Aileen’s failure to live a more decent life with her partner as a result of prejudice and homophobia of the people she deals with in order to gain a respectful employment in Monster. As already mentioned, the authors of fictional films have the biggest opportunity to create stereotypes, which results, for example, in Jack’s depressions after Ennis refuses to live in a homosexual relationship and decides for a life in the closet in Brokeback Mountain. In Pariah, Alike’s life collapses when her first sexual partner refuses to embrace her homosexuality and live with Alike, or when her mother condemns her after she comes out. The last stereotype studied was then a homosexual depicted as a murderous person, which could be seen in the already mentioned Monster, where Aileen becomes a serial killer as a result of her traumatic childhood experience of rape, which also repeats later in her life and triggers her homicidal tendencies. In spite of the fact that their sexuality is not explicitly mentioned, the two murderers in Capote can also be considered an example of this stereotype since an
intimate relationship between Truman Capote and Perry Smith is suggested in the film.

The results of the research confirmed the assumption made at the beginning of this Bachelor’s thesis. A certain change in depiction of homosexuality was traced and LGBT characters were frequently visible in the films produced in the period from 2000 to 2015. Nonetheless, these characters did not tend to live in harmony with the rest of society. Instead, their sexual orientation was the defining aspect of their character and the rest of their qualities was frequently suppressed. All the stereotypes traced in the films produced in earlier periods were also traced in the recent motion pictures and it can be said that this trend will continue also in the future provided that American society does not accept non-heterosexual people as their equals, both in reality and in cinematography.
Works Cited


Summary

This Bachelor's thesis discusses depiction of homosexuality in American cinematography in the period from 2000 to 2015. The first chapter provides the outline of the historical development of homosexuality, its research and the coinage of the term homosexuality itself. Clarification of some terms and concepts related to this issue, which can serve as a means of better understanding of this matter, is also a part of this chapter. The second chapter deals with the general historical development of depiction of the LGBT community in American cinematography and introduces the most common stereotypes which could be seen in American motion pictures. The next chapter is dedicated to more detailed development of portrayals of homosexuality in historical context, that is, from the beginnings of film to the end of the twentieth century. It includes concrete examples of films and stereotypes which can be found in them, as well as possible reasons which led the authors of the films to these stereotypes. The fourth chapter then deals with the main issue of this Bachelor's thesis alias depiction of homosexuality in films produced in the last fifteen years. It divides the films into three groups which are later compared with regards to their approach towards depiction of the LGBT community and describes differences as well as positive and negative aspects of each category.

This work explains that society and institutions such as courts, medicine or religion influence the final portrayal of lesbians, gays, bisexuals and transgendered people in motion pictures. Therefore, unless the complete tolerance of sexual minorities by majority society is reached, it can be expected that the cinema visitors will continue to see the stereotypes examined in this Bachelor's thesis.
Resumé

Tato bakalářská práce se zabývá vyobrazováním homosexuality v americké kinematografii v období let 2000 až 2015. První kapitola poskytuje nástin historického vývoje homosexuality, dále pak jejího výzkumu a vzniku samotného termínu homosexualita. Součástí této kapitoly je i vysvětlení některých termínů a konceptů vztahujících se k této problematice, jež mohou posloužit jako nástroj k lepšímu porozumění celé záležitosti. Druhá kapitola se zabývá obecným historickým vývojem vyobrazování LGBT komunity v americké kinematografii a představuje nejčastější stereotypy, které bylo možné spatřit v amerických filmech. Další kapitola je věnována podrobnějšímu vývoji vyobrazování homosexuality v historickém kontextu, tj. od počátku filmu do konce dvacátého století. Tato kapitola obsahuje konkrétní příklady filmů a stereotypy, které v nich lze nalezout, a také možné důvody, které autory filmů k těmto stereotypům vedly. Čtvrtá kapitola se pak věnuje hlavní problematice této bakalářské práce neboli vyobrazování homosexuality ve filmech vytvořených v posledních patnácti letech. Rozděluje tyto filmy do tří skupin, které pak srovnává z hlediska jejich přístupu k vyobrazování LGBT komunity a popisuje rozdíly a pozitivní i negativní aspekty každé kategorie.

Práce vysvětluje, že společnost a instituce jako např. soudy, medicína nebo náboženství ovlivňují konečnou podobu leseb, gayů, bisexuálů a transgender lidí ve filmu. Není-li tudíž dosaženo stoprocentní tolerance sexuálních menšin majoritní společnosti, dá se předpokládat, že stereotypy zkoumané v této bakalářské práci budou vidat návštěvníci amerických kin i nadále.