



ARTICLE

Bordering the Future? The 'Male Gaze' in the *Blade Runner* Films and Originating Novel *

Kathleen Staudt **

Philip K. Dick (1928-1982), author of numerous science fiction narratives from the 1950s-1980s, some of which Hollywood made into films, grappled with the nature of reality, the meaning of humanness, and border crossing between humans and androids (called 'replicants' in the films). The socially constructed female and male protagonists in these narratives have yet to be analyzed with a gender gaze that draws on border studies. This paper analyzes two Blade Runner films, compares them to the Philip K. Dick (PKD) narrative, and applies gender, feminist, and border concepts, particularly border crossings from human to sentient beings and androids. In this paper, I argue that the men who wrote and directed the films established and crossed multiple metaphoric borders, but wore gender blinders that thereby reinforced gendered borders as visualized and viewed in the U.S. and global film markets yet never addressed the profoundly radical border crossing notions from PKD.

Introduction

Directors Ridley Scott and Denis Villeneuve directed the *Blade Runner* films, herein labeled BR-I and BR-II, each with strong, central male protagonists, aimed at largely male audiences with lots of high-tech features, violence, and noise. In the films, humans and androids live in a monopoly capitalist authoritarian world of extensive police security that seeks to control or to "border" the line between humans and androids—a line invisible to the eye, given advances in technology that make androids look human on the outside. Female replicant protagonists, sidelined as sexual objects, robotic and even hologram beauties (with the exception of the ruthless "Luv" in BR-II) occasionally exhibit sentiments and behaviors that show their cross-over into humanity, such as the expression of feelings and, in the thematic obsession of BR-II, of reproductive capability. It is sometimes unclear whether the chief male protagonists are humans or replicants.

In Philip K. Dick's (PKD) science fiction novel, *Do Androids Dream of Electric Sheep?*, characters performed as gendered beings, even in stereotyped ways, but they displayed androgynous behaviors;¹ female protagonists played markedly different and stronger roles, unlike in the films.² PKD's not-so-cool-sounding central male 'bounty hunter' was renamed 'blade runner' in the Hollywood films. And for PKD's novel, empathy is the key characteristic separating human from android, whatever and whomever designed or birthed these creatures in their hybridized worlds. In the novel, empathy with living and sentient beings, including animals,³ is the essence of humanness. Real animals are celebrated and valued, in contrast to the less valued android (electronic) animals. The common thread in the novel and films involves answers to a foundational question long asked in spiritual, anthropological, and philosophic deliberations: What does it mean to

* Revised Paper, Association for Borderlands Studies, San Antonio, Texas, USA, April 5-7, 2018.

** Kathleen Staudt, PhD, is Professor Emerita, University of Texas at El Paso, and Film Review Editor for *BIG_Review*. Contact: kstaudt@utep.edu

be human? To clarify even more, we also need to ask whether humanness is gendered. The use of literary and graphic metaphors in alternative universes permits us to engage in "thought experiments," as science fiction pacifist-anarchist-feminist Ursula LeGuin would call them (LeGuin 2017). This paper does not cover the enormous ground possible—the field of science fiction and film is huge—in analyses of science fiction, gender, and borders, but rather examines this fertile soil in two visually startling high-profile films and a novel.

Feminist theorist and critic of binary dualisms, Donna Haraway wrote in "A Cyborg Manifesto" that we are all "chimeras, theorized and fabricated as hybrids of machine and organism.... the relation of which has been a border war" (1991: 292). She draws from Taylorism to the integrated circuits of women who work in global factories. Haraway asks whether we should view the cyborg world as planetary control, in the name of defense, of "male appropriation of women's bodies in a masculinist orgy of war" (1991: 295) or as fearless human kinship with machines, animals, multiple identities, and contradictions. Her position is the latter, but she gave the first *Blade Runner* film a "pass" in a lone sentence perhaps not recognizing the power of film visual imagery to reinforce the former, the "masculinist orgy of war." In *Practices of Looking*, now in its third edition, Marita Sturken and Lisa Cartwright offer an expansive text on the increasing importance of the visual compared to the narrative, including popular culture such as films and television series. Indeed, feminist and film theorists and their readers probably exercise minuscule impacts on sizeable global audiences compared to blockbuster films like iterations of *Blade Runner*.

The paper is divided in three sections. The first provides conceptual and theoretical perspectives. In the second, I recap the films, focusing on gender and exaggerated femininity and sexuality among somewhat minor female characters. After that, I contrast PDK's novel with the films, but more pointedly in the third section on the novel and films. The concluding section ties ideas and the argument together, with reference to theorists and foundational science fiction.

I. Conceptual and theoretical perspectives

Here, I make brief reference to concepts as I use them in my recap the various borders that are crossed or maintained in the films and novel: bordering, rebordering, debordering, co-mingling, mental maps, and hybridized societies along with the beings who move back and forth from the categorical borderlands including alienated, co-existent, interdependent, and integrated.⁴ Territorial and

identity lines (bordering) range from hardening or increasing, often with surveillance and controls, to softening or lessening (de-bordering) and re-bordering in response to threat and/or new identities. With the contact that comes with interdependence and integration, co-mingling can occur in ways not immediately clear to viewers and readers. Readers, film directors, writers and viewers, just like many geographically minded border scholars, engage in mental mapping of these powerful visual images that may or may not coincide with territorial or physical maps.⁵

Gender is a social construct that manifests itself differently in historical time and place. Among the earliest to challenge the near-ubiquitous gendered borders was prolific science fiction writer, the late Ursula Le Guin (1929-2018) (with whom PKD communicated) who wrote *The Left Hand of Darkness* in the same era as PKD wrote *Do Androids... In Left Hand...*, confusion sets in during a male galactic diplomat's long-term visit to a planet where ambi-sexual non-gendered people enter a fertile "kemmering" period in monthly cycles, in just one-fifth of each month. The visitor always brought assumptions to encounters with his stereotyped perceptions of men and women.⁶ Thus, both PKG and Le Guin employed gender themes and Le Guin transcended gender, although she used male pronouns and regretted that as she wrote later in her *Redux* to "Is Gender Necessary?" yet planted some surprising phrases, such as "the king was pregnant" (2017). BR-I and II not only imposed firm, heavily controlled bordered gender constructs on characters, but sexualized most of the women; and in BR II, deviated from the foundation to make male impregnation and female reproduction the *sine qua non* of the defining feature of humanness. These directors reinforced and exaggerated gender constructs.

The body of the paper culminates in my contrast of the films with PDK's book, raising questions about those who direct and script-write films in the way they respect, fantasize, and/or even reinforce hardened gendered borders as they cross borders from novels to films. As British feminist film theorist Laura Mulvey wrote in her 1975 "Visual Pleasure and Narrative Cinema," later in her book (1989), those who direct, write, and fund representations of historic large-scale Hollywood film productions often brought a "male gaze" of voyeurism and narcissism to the process for an assumed predominantly male audience, and I would add, heteronormative (Mulvey 1989). With their particular gaze, and whether intentional or not, the effect of these powerful directors, script-writers, and producer-funders shaped the minds of millions of viewers, not only in the United States but in exports to a global film audience. While BR-I initially flopped in

1982, it grew to gain a cult status reputation and was reissued in 2007 and subtitled *The Final Cut*. BR-II cost \$150 million to make, and from www.the-numbers.com, we learn that domestic (US) and international sales generated \$258 million, the majority of it outside the U.S., thus reinforcing the global impact. While DVD and rental sales are unknown, those additional sales surely magnify the impact. Countless numbers of global Netflix viewers can instantly stream the films in their homes.

In film studies, Auteur (author) Theory focuses on the directors, their backgrounds, and the baggage they bring to their powerful role. Even now, over 80% of major generously financed film directors are white men.⁷ despite the recent acclaim given to directors like Ava DuVerney, Guillermo del Toro, Patty Jenkins, Alejandro González Iñárritu, and Alfonso Cuarón.

Let us reflect momentarily on these white men who directed BR films. Ridley Scott, an Englishman born in 1937, is a generation older than the French-Canadian Denis Villeneuve, born in 1967. Although Scott pays homage to PKD in film credits, he thought the novel too complex: On the Independent Movie Data Base site for BR-I, Scott is quoted as saying that he couldn't get through it (www.imdb.com). I find this shocking and amazing, given the continual reference to PKD in the credits. Both Scott and Villeneuve directed multiple films, including those with women protagonists (who did more than talk to other women about men, the so-called Bechdel Test⁸). Scott directed *Alien* (1979) and its sequels with a strong, sexualized woman at the center who led a corporate-run space ship named Ripley (similar to Ridley). After a male officer, attacked (raped [?] in his chest) by an alien monster, another monster painfully emerges. Was that birth? It was not border-crossing to create a hybrid human-alien. Villeneuve directed *Arrival* (2016), a complex film with a gifted woman linguist at the center; the loss of a child figures into border crossing time and space. Villeneuve also directed the sensationalist *Sicario* (2015), yet one more movie about US-Mexico borderland chaos and violence that also featured misogynous, sexualized behavior in some scenes.

II. Bordering, Rebordering, Debordering in Ridley- and Villeneuve-directed Blade Runner Worlds

Borders are threaded throughout both *Blade Runner* films. The central male character in both films was a Blade Runner, a police officer charged with executing (the euphemism is "retiring") super replicants, initially designed as strong beings sent as slaves to develop harsh "off-planet" spaces after ecological disasters left the earth bleak and sunless.

Several Nexus 6 replicants, gendered in appearance as male and female and designed to last four years, rebelled and returned to earth. They looked like humans and worked to respond to bio-metric tests of their quick response to cultural/linguistic contextual questions. They were androids, yes, but they were crossing, became hybridized, and developed feelings about exploitation, love, and anger.

Set in both 2019 and 2049, the monopoly Tyrell Corporation ruled the world; its CEO and staff constantly sought to advance android technology while simultaneously to pursue harsh re-bordering strategies to control populations with drones, blade runners, and technology. In the analytic descriptions below, we can see some contrasts, deviations and perhaps advances, from one film and one director to the next film and director, namely in the re-bordering and hybridization occurring between humans and androids. The contrasts with PKD and the absence of animals as sentient beings, following the film critique below, are more striking.

Blade Runner-I

In BR-I, only a 117-minute film, we view few female parts (10 talking men, 3 talking women). At its core, the film is *Blade Runner's* adventure; he is loner individual Deckard tracking down remaining super-strong replicants (2 men and 2 women), but a love story is born. Corporate giant Tyrell introduces Deckard to Rachael, a beautiful and intelligent replicant longing to be human. She is dressed and coiffed in non-sexualized 1940s style, complete with shoulder pads and furs. Like other replicants, she had memories implanted in her brain to make her think she was human. After she saves Deckard's life (a Nexus 6 was beating him to death), he not only "owes her one," as he said so won't gun her down, but also seems to fall in love with her. However, the two-minute scene (minutes 102-4) to consummate sex looks like rape (although she lets her hair down; perhaps this was a cue that she was "asking for it"). Deckard kisses her, but she initially walks away perhaps trying to escape; he then grabs her and pushes her against the wall. Is she crying? It looks like it. He says, "now you kiss me," and she replies "I can't." He says "I want you" and "say you want me." And the rest is history.

In the DVD's special features, four production-process narrators comment on the beauty of the scene, as sexy saxophone music plays in the background. One of the men narrators said that Kate (associated with production) thought the scene lacked tenderness, but the consensus was that Harrison Ford (who played Deckard) "played it rough" and so they went with it. The scene exemplifies the male gaze in filmmaking, designed by mostly men for what

was assumed to be a mostly male audience. In BR-I, women are white except for brightly lit sexualized Asian female images on the walls of skyscrapers.

Blade Runner-II

In the longer (164 minutes) BR-II, viewers learn of technological advances that the new Tyrell Corporation CEO Niander Wallace developed with this more gender-balanced cast of characters (7 women, 7 men). Several, but not all women are sexualized including, in intersectional terms, a responsive hologram with a Spanish accent played by the only actress with a Spanish surname. Set 30 years after the first film, viewers learn of an even bleaker world: no vegetation, slug farming for protein, mass devastation, and child-labor slaves at a factory-orphanage. More advanced replicants now populate the earth—signifying perhaps rebordered, integrated borders—with some professionals, technicians, and even a major assistant to corporate mogul Wallace, the ruthless Luv, stronger and smarter than Nexus 6 models from the past. She kills an equally ruthless human female, Lt. Joshi the police chief to whom K, the Blade Runner (actor Ryan Gosling), reported, played by Robin Wright. As Chief Joshi orders K to find replicants, she says in border metaphors “The world is built on a wall.... It separates kinds... Tell either side there’s no wall and you bought a war or a slaughter.” K is reluctant to kill (remember the euphemism ‘retire’) “something born before, [evoking the human-android reproductive border trope] because to be born is to have a soul.” Religious and reproductive imagery pervades BR-II: a “child is born,” leading to a surprising climax, (which I will not spoil for readers), perhaps a savior (to androids) reminiscent of other films *Children of Men* (2006) (a book originally written by P.D. James in 1992) and of *Matrix* (2006).

The *sine qua non* of BR-II is the search for a female replicant who may have given birth; her skeletal remains show her replicant serial number. Police Chief Joshi wants the evidence destroyed, but at Tyrell, Wallace and his agent Luv want to find the offspring to further develop the procreative technology to make cheap disposable replicant labor. Was Rachael the mother and Deckard the father? Is K the offspring? Is the offspring even male? Does the cameo appearance of Harrison Ford as Deckard really matter? No spoiler alerts here! However, several interesting features of BR-II involve the male-gaze advances in sexualizing women and the use of gendered intersectional constructs. K’s live-in partner, Joi, is a devoted Spanish-accented hologram who can cook dinner, change clothes within seconds, and respond to K’s every whim. In a most unusual pre-sex scene, she invites Mariette, a white sex-worker, to blend with in order for K to experience embodied sex. Once he is on the run

from law enforcement, Joi’s parting gift of love is to invite him to “delete her” and their memories so that he can escape without detection.

Viewers may be in for a sequel, as a hopeful pre-closure emerges with the visibility of a revolutionary force, led by Freysa, played by Palestinian actress Hiam Abbass. She urges K (now called Joe) to join revolutionaries because a replicant “baby means we are more than slaves. More human than humans.”

III. Philip K. Dick, author, *Do Androids dream of Electric Sheep?*⁹

PKD’s novel is an almost-androgynous portrayal of a post-environmental disaster society which made most animals extinct and intellectually deteriorated humans (a hybrid of their former selves?). The story line and themes portray a far-different version of the male-gazed Hollywood fantasies of BR-I and II.

Set in 2021, (not 2019 like Ridley’s film), the book begins with Rick Deckard, an underpaid bounty hunter who retires/kills androids to supplement his income. He is married to Iran who chides him for his killing work, but apparently she brings in no income in this still-gender-bordered household world. Their goal is to get enough bounty money to buy a highly valued authentic and real sheep, traded in for the electric (android) sheep that grazes on the roof of their apartment building. Their seemingly contented life is modulated by the mood-altering device in which they can dial up feelings, such as Dial 594 which a wife dials to display “pleased acknowledgement of husband’s superior wisdom in all matters,” PKD’s clever critique of patriarchal props. PKD sets the grim, post-war (WWT, i.e. World War Terminus), stage in Chapter 1, a society in which people dread war and its damaging environmental consequences: much animal extinction, foul odors, sunlessness, and dust that gradually destroys people, making them “biologically unacceptable.”

Reverence for animals appears in all twenty chapters, an absence in the BR films with no concern for animals or their extinction, though cooked slugs served as protein in BR II. Occasionally, viewers see an owl in BR-I. In an open-air market, I thought I saw a sheep (android or real?) for 10 seconds, (perhaps an editing mistake?). When K meets up with Deckard in the last part of BR-II, Deckard throws liquor on the floor for his dog, but when K asks about the dog, Deckard says he doesn’t know if the dog is real or android.

Both bleak films differ from the world described in the novel, *Do Androids Dream of Electric Sheep?*. In PKD’s Chapter 2, we learn more about earth society—one in which there IS community in the San

Francisco, CA, Nob Hill apartment complex where neighborly connections exist. Nevertheless, people live in a dark and dying planet from which they leave for colony planets, incentivized by U.N.-managed provisions of "android servants." PKD introduces readers to the "theological and moral structure of Mercerism," which shapes the meaning of humanness: the capacity for empathy.

In Chapter 2, we are introduced to John Isidore for whom the poisonous pollution gradually destroyed him biologically; he is unfit for reproduction, so much so he is nicknamed a waste product (chicken head). Isidore uses the "black empathy box" (television) to watch a prophet-like Wilbur Mercer struggle to get up a hill only to fall back. Isidore felt the struggle and experienced the pain in this empathetic fusion process. Later in another chapter, a populist figure on the television raises questions about whether Mercer is fake. Is Mercer a hoax? An opiate of the masses? Mercer's existence is open to interpretation. Border crossing language might offer insights on human-to-semi-human biological deterioration or technology to acquire human essence—empathy—and fuse (co-mingle) with the spiritual being. In the films, Mercer and Mercerism go unmentioned, as does empathy.

On his way to work, the novel begins with Deckard passing a pet shop, longing for a real animal with a price he could afford and making a down payment based on the contract money he will receive from retiring replicants. In his office we read dialogue from male bosses and women secretaries, titled by gendered statuses of Miss and Mrs. We hear more on the true test of humanness: empathy, not intelligence, as measured in the Voigt-Kampff Empathy Test, an instrument shaped by Mercerism. "Empathy evidently existed only within the human community," whereas intelligence is found in everything including plants. "The empathetic gift blurred the **boundaries** [my emphasis] between hunter and victim, between the successful and the defeated." Totally contrasting with the book, the BR-I and BR-II films portray a high-tech, violent world of radical individualism; empathy is nowhere to be found.

Only 75% into the novel (I have a Kindle!) does the intimate, but instrumental scene emerge between Deckard and Rachael Rosen (Chapters 16 and 17). She had offered to help him 'retire' three remaining replicants, (Roy and 'his wife'—a gendered possessive status)—plus Pris, whom Rachael thought she resembled), an offer Deckard initially refused. Gradually, he realized he needed her help. They arranged to meet in a hotel. Wearing a fish-scale coat and underwear, she brought a valuable pre-war bourbon bottle and seduced him, neither vice versa nor a rape, as in the voyeuristic BR-I gaze/fantasy. Part of Rosen Associates, Rachael was sent on the

mission (an intimate mission she had embarked on nine times before with others), but she claimed love for Deckard and wondered if and what childbearing would be like for an android. Rachael, characterized as intelligent and proactive, neither succumbed to Deckard nor longed to be with him. Her outer appearance was gendered; her behavior, androgynous.

By the novel's end, we learn of Deckard's remarkable achievement in killing six replicants in one day and thus acquiring the money necessary to pay off the real goat that he longed to care for, grazing on his roof. Yet we are horrified to learn that a woman in a fish-scaled coat (remember Rachael) pushed the goat off the roof. Deckard traveled to the Oregon wasteland, struggled like Mercer to climb a hill, and found what he thought was a real toad (considered extinct), but upon return to San Francisco, Iran found the electric system in the toad's belly: still better than nothing, but in capitalist calculation, worth less than half the price of a real toad.

So Rachael was not the sweet and clinging love as characterized in BR-I, but behaved in a non-empathetic way, as did replicants who stayed in Isidore's apartment who wantonly pulled off four of a spider's eight legs (to Isidore's horror). Thus, the end of PKD's novel is sad and wistful, still emphasizing empathy with living beings, including animals, but why not androids? How human can Deckard be? Readers do not know if androids dream of electric sheep, but those few in the book did not dream, unless PDK wrote Deckard as an android all along.

Reflection and closure

In this paper I have compared two visually powerful blockbuster films with the novel from which they are based, using border, feminist, and gender concepts. While the writers and directors constantly engage with border and boundary themes, they did not transcend the limitations of contemporary gender constructions but rather fostered the spectacle: "masculinist orgy of war" of men who appropriated women's bodies (to use Haraway's previously cited words).

My point in this paper was to emphasize both the gendered worlds in film and book and the difference between the films with their "male gazes" compared to Philip K. Dick, certainly a writer trapped by his own gendered time and space, but one who shared the following key understandings. He:

- was obsessed with human *and* animal life;
- saw empathy as key to humanness in a spirituality called Mercerism;
- highlighted community, neighborliness, and family;

- abhorred violence and wrote no gratuitous violence in the narrative (though 'retirement' exists); and
- gendered his characters, but allowed the fusion of stereotypically masculine and feminine in androgynous or perhaps better called human behavior. However, androids are sometimes referred to as "it" in official reports (pronouns matter!).

In contrast, the directors and script-writers of BR-I and II, Ridley Scott and Denis Villeneuve

- gave no reverence or attention to animal life or extinction, except as undermining the food supply;
- highlighted no overarching moral code or spirituality, Mercerism or otherwise;
- emphasized radical individualism and sexualized both androids and holograms (with one exception in BR-II), using technology and gratuitous violence, such as Wallace slitting the uterine sack, then stabbing and bleeding out a beautifully bodied adult female replicant who had been birthed whole; and
- gendered their characters, but turned males and females into hegemonic masculine figures and a biological human female (one exception: the possible conception of a hybrid human-replicant).

Clearly, thirty years later, director Villeneuve made some advances compared to Scott, such as an integrated human-android borderland, co-mingled behaviors, and possible conception between androids or humans and androids—a reproduction trope to de-border and hybridize formerly bordered lines. Yet the gratuitous violence and the sexual playmates for K were nowhere to be found in PKD. No doubt a BR-III sequel will eventually be made, given the profitable enterprises thus far with even more fully developed border crossings between humans and androids. Will reproductive issues be resolved? Will gender disappear? Will men give birth to hybridized beings? Will new directors use different mental maps? What would that world look like?

Directors have taken many liberties with PDK to use their own "mental maps." Recently, Amazon Prime produced an instant-stream ten-part series titled *Electric Dreams* (2017) each a different story line, different director and script-writer. Supposedly, PDK's novels and short stories inspired each one. One of PDK's daughters authorized the title of the series, but seemed to exercise little control over the adaptations, just as Hollywood filmmakers took liberties with their adaptations with BR-I and BR-II. Two of the ten in the series stand out for me as reflecting a gender-balanced nuanced quality: *Human Is* and *Kill the Others*. Not knowing the

directors and screen writers in advance, I checked their names to find that they were the only two productions with both women at the helm of the direction and the script.

As far back as the 1970s, various types of feminist authors wrote dazzling science fiction, a genre that has grown to embrace all the complexities of the intersections among class, race/ethnicity, and language. One might point to Charlotte Perkins Gilman, who wrote *Herland* (1915) about three hopelessly stereotyped men who traveled to an idealized women's world, or even to pioneering science-fiction writer Mary Wollstonecraft Godwin Shelley who wrote *Frankenstein* (1818) and the warped multiple adaptations of her novel on Hollywood films. On the century anniversary since Shelley's death, Muriel Spark criticized "stripping out nearly all the sex and birth, everything female" from the films.¹⁰ While Haraway views cyborgs as "creatures of a post-gender world," her one-sentence reference to the first *Blade Runner* film seems to give it a pass, for in my view, as analyzed in this article, his film reinforces masculinist control imagery.¹¹ The films use powerful visuals to reach an exponentially larger audience than specialized feminist and film theorists.

In this paper, I am not pursuing an essentialist biological dead end, as most feminists rightly critique, but rather an interest in complex visual productions that have the potential to engage and unpack the gendered borders in our world—a world in which women's experiences—whether in reproduction or non-reproduction—become part of the story rather than some Alpha Male version of humanness that glorifies violence or a biological incubator for hybrid offspring. Border studies allow us to think outside the "territorial traps" of the nation-state (as political geographer John Agnew so eloquently analyzed). So also do science fiction stories and their metaphoric societies allow us to imagine and think outside the boundaries of gender and our contemporary world. To join border studies with the analysis of a science fiction novel and its imperfect (gendered, even violently warped) adaptation into films allows us to interrogate mental maps and male gazes in the world ahead.

Notes

- 1 Androgyny is a dated concept from the 1970s and 1980s which refers to combined masculine and feminine behaviors that reflect time and spatial stereotypes. A spate of studies by Sandra Bem reported on the Bem Sex-Role Inventory, a survey instrument based on identification with multiple adjectives, most of them obviously stereotyped, that coded respondents from feminine and near feminine to androgynous to near

- masculine and masculine <<http://www.feministvoices.com/sandra-bem/>>. At the time, my score put me at 'near-masculine,' a not surprising identifier given my socialization in a heavily male-dominated discipline like political science.
- 2 I am not celebrating or psychologizing author PKD who underwent numerous stages in his paranoid and troubled life, (over)use of amphetamines, visions, and religious delusions in several years before death. The 2008 documentary repeats several times that he dwelt on the death of his female twin, who died less than two months after his birth and that it put him in touch with what friends called his 'feminine side.'
 - 3 In PKD pictures posted on the Internet, he often positions a cat next to his face.
 - 4 Oscar Martinez developed these categories in *Border People*, University of Arizona Press, 1994. Films have rarely been analyzed with a borderlands gaze, but see Staudt, 2014.
 - 5 For a discussion of bordering, de-bordering, and re-bordering, see the introduction by Kathleen Staudt and David Spener in the Spener and Staudt, ed *The U.S.-Mexico Border: Transcending Divisions and Contesting Identities* and the later, updated border studies concepts and theories in Staudt, 2017. The concept 'co-mingling' comes from Herzog and Sohn in their analysis of the San Diego-Tijuana borderlands, moving from an interdependent and integrated borderland.
 - 6 When love partners enter kemmer, hormonal changes occur that allow them to either impregnate or conceive and give birth. If pregnant, the person's hormonal production is prolonged through lactation. Nevertheless, Le Guin used male pronouns for people, regretted later (p. 1043).
 - 7 See Christine Etherington-Wright and Ruth Doughty, *Understanding Film Theory* (NY: Palgrave Macmillan 2011), Chapter 9 and 11; Harry M. Benshoff and Sean Griffin, *America on Film: Representing Race, Class, Gender, and Sexuality at the Movies* (London: Blackwell-Wiley 2009, second edition) with the running theme throughout the book that the U.S. was "founded on and still adheres to the dominant ideology of white patriarchal capitalism" p. 9; and <<https://womeninfilm.org/ffi/>> (with contrasting percentages of women directors in 2002 and 2014: 1.9% (top 100 films) to 26.9% (Sundance, consisting of more experimental, innovative films).
 - 8 For the Bechdel Test: <<http://bechdeltest.com/>>
 - 9 In the documentary, *Philip K. Dick: The Penultimate Truth* (Kultur 2008), the 89 minute film featuring interviews with PKD's friends, psychiatrist, co-authors, and several of his five wives, viewers learn that PDK friend Kevin Wayne Jeter published several sequels to *Blade Runner*, including *Blade Runner 3: Replicant Night* (1996) which developed the idea of a replicant giving birth (see later section of this paper on the reproduction theme in BR-II), yet Jeter was not credited as one of screen writers <www.imdb.com> in that or the earlier film.
 - 10 Muriel Spark is quoted in Lepore 2018, p. 88, who draws parallels between the nameless "monster" once conscious of his construction and the injustice—ie like the autobiography of a slave—and the writing of Frederick Douglass.
 - 11 Haraway has one line on BR-I, referring to Rachel (sic) and the cyborg culture's image of "fear, love, and confusion" (1991, p. 313). I believe Haraway missed the opportunity to critique Scott's construction of female cyborgs. I thank Asha Dane'el for alerting me to Haraway's relevance for this paper.

Works Cited

- Agnew, John. 1994. "Still Trapped in Territory?" *Geopolitics* 15/4: 779-84. <http://doi.org/b83prt>
- Haraway, Donna. 1991. *Simians, Cyborgs, and Women: The Reinvention of Nature*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Le Guin, Ursula. 2017. "Is Gender Necessary? Redux." In *LeGuin: Hainish Novels & Stories, Volume One*, edited by Brian Atteberry. New York, NY: Library of America: 1033-1043.
- Lepore, Jill. 2018. "It's Still Alive: Two hundred years of "Frankenstein." *The New Yorker* (February 12 & 19): 86-91.
- Mulvey, Laura. 1989. *Visual and Other Pleasures*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Staudt, Kathleen. 2014. "The Border, Performed in Films: Produced in both Mexico and the US to "Bring Out the Worst in a Country," *Journal of Borderlands Studies*, 29/4: 465-479. <http://doi.org/ddkk>
- . 2017. *Border Politics in a Global Era: Comparative Perspectives*. Rowman & Littlefield.
- Sturken, Marita and Lisa Cartwright. 2001. *Practices of Looking: An Introduction to Visual Culture*. New York: New York University Press, first edition.