

"NO LYNCH, NO PEAKS!": AUTEURISM, FAN/ACTOR CAMPAIGNS AND THE CHALLENGES OF *TWIN PEAKS'* RETURN(S)

REBECCA WILLIAMS

Name Rebecca Williams

Academic centre University of South Wales, UK

E-mail address rebecca.williams@southwales.ac.uk

KEYWORDS

Fandom; authorship; celebrity; David Lynch; Twin Peaks; fan campaigns.

ABSTRACT

This article explores the return of *Twin Peaks* in 2017, exploring how the series' revival may threaten fans' sense of trust in the text and their own fan identity (Williams, 2015). Many fans welcome the return of beloved shows such as *Twin Peaks* and the involvement of original creators Mark Frost and David Lynch offers a 'guarantee' of authenticity, whilst the return of cast members

presents the opportunity to re-visit favourite characters. This paper firstly explores how *Twin Peaks'* resurrection allows consideration of fan responses to the continuation of an assumed dormant textual world by exploring the potential impact of the return of original actors and the series' creators. Secondly, the paper considers the impact of Lynch's temporary departure from the series in April 2015 and the subsequent actor-led campaign to encourage his return. The "No Lynch, No Peaks" campaign allows exploration of how the actors involved positioned themselves as both fans and potential employees. The paper thus analyses David Lynch's enduring position as the auteur of *Twin Peaks* and how the campaign allows consideration of the actors as media professionals, fans of Lynch, and figures who display forms of cultural and symbolic capital (Bourdieu, 1984).

This article explores *Twin Peaks*’ return on the American cable network Showtime in 2017 in terms of debates around returning television series, potential fan reactions to these and the possible threat they pose to fans sense of self-identity and trust in the fan object, and the blurring of boundaries between actors/celebrities and fans. It argues that fandom allows fans to maintain a sense of connection to the series, their associated self-identity as a fan, and a sense of “ontological security” (Giddens, 1990). It thus explores how the return of the series may threaten this sense of trust in the text and one’s own fan identity. Henry Jenkins argues that *Twin Peaks* was one of the first TV shows to attract a dedicated online fan audience who developed specific “reading practices and interpretive strategies (their fixation on resolving narrative enigmas, their development of multiple alternative restagings of the core plotline, their complex relationship to Lynch as author, their appeal to extratextual discourse and intertextual linkages)” (1995: 53). Since the programme first aired in 1990 and 1991 the online presence surrounding the show has not abated and, with the advent of social media, has actually proliferated (see Williams, 2016). More widely the series has enjoyed “a high level of cultural penetration several decades after its release” (Howe, 2013: 41) and continued to infiltrate and influence popular culture (see Jowett, 2015).

Furthermore, as the series is now to return in 2017, its fandom has seen radically different periods in its history since the series was first cancelled. This period between its original ending in 1991 and its return can be viewed as a form of “interim fandom”, a period where fans assume that their fan object is dormant without knowing when – or if – it will return. Many fans welcome the return of beloved shows such as *Twin Peaks* and the involvement of original creators Mark Frost and David Lynch offers a ‘guarantee’ of authenticity whilst the return of cast members such as Kyle MacLachlan presents the opportunity to re-visit favourite characters. However, some fans remain ambivalent about accepting such resurrections and reject such texts as commercial and inferior. What fans construct or perceive as second-rate versions of beloved fan objects can undermine their self-identities since they threaten to dilute aspects of the series that the fan was originally attracted to. Inauthentic or inferior copies of a fan object can endanger fan attachments both by highlighting the commercial nature of fandom, and threatening to ‘betray’ the original characters and narrative worlds. Considering this moment in *Twin Peaks*’ history allows consideration of potential fan responses (both positive and negative) to the continuation of an assumed dormant textual world. The article explores how

these resurrections can allow fans to maintain or renegotiate their fandom, and their often complex responses to the revival of *Twin Peaks*, by focusing on returning actors and the roles of creators David Lynch and Mark Frost. As the revival of TV texts becomes more common, consideration of how fans may respond to these – and how they may try to reassure themselves that the returning text will be ‘good’ – is crucial for scholars of television and audiences/fans.

Secondly, and related to the importance of the return of author figures, the article will consider debates around celebrities-as-fans, seeking to challenge “the otherwise “restrictive categories” of pure celebrity and fan, where media production and consumption are neatly carved apart” (Hills, 2006:103). Whilst much work in Fan and Television Studies has focussed on the tensions between fans/audiences and creators or producers (see Hadas and Shifman, 2013, Johnson, 2007, Williams, 2010), this article explores the triad of fans/actors/showrunners to consider how those involved in making media texts can be viewed as, or position themselves as, fans (see Jones 2016). The article thus considers the (temporary) departure of series creator David Lynch from *Twin Peaks* in April 2015 and the subsequent “No Lynch, No Peaks” campaign to encourage his return. Featuring stars from the original series such as Sherilyn Fenn, Sheryl Lee and Dana Ashbrook, the campaign relied heavily on the “subcultural celebrity” (Hills, 2003) of these figures who functioned as guarantors of authenticity for those who recognised them. The paper argues that this campaign allows exploration of how the actors involved positioned *themselves* as fans of the series and Lynch to appeal to fans and inspire them to join the cause. However, this necessitates a dual position-taking since the *Twin Peaks* actors occupy insider positions and possess levels of authenticity that everyday fans cannot (e.g. having direct access to Lynch himself). Thus, the paper argues that the campaign makes visible the work of the celebrity since the actors operated as potential employees of the revived show who displayed “deference or respect which reflects professional necessity and [their] place within the production hierarchy” (Hills and Williams, 2005: 357).

FANDOM, ONTOLOGICAL SECURITY AND TELEVISUAL RESURRECTIONS

Media texts are often crucial to helping fans formulate a sense of self-identity and security or “trust” (see Williams, 2015). Such objects can provide fans with a sense of what

sociologist Anthony Giddens calls “ontological security” which refers to “a comfortable mental state in which actors engage in taken for granted activities in familiar surroundings and in the company of unthreatening others” (Cohen, 2008: 328). Ontological security is closely linked to the “basic trust” in the world established in early childhood (see Winnicott, 1964). Those who fail to develop such basic trust are inherently “ontologically insecure” (Laing, 1960:39) and do not properly develop a sense of self-identity (Layder, 1997:67). Ontological security also presupposes a “shared – but unproven and unprovable – framework of reality” (Giddens, 1991:36) and when unforeseen events suggest that this “framework of reality” is not universal our ontological security is undermined. This is linked to the fact that “the routinisation of day-to-day life [...] is the single most important source of ontological security” (Giddens, 1981:37), enabling development of a “basic sense of “confidence” in the “continuity” of self-identity and the “constancy” of the surrounding, everyday social world” (Giddens, 1990:92). Such routine can come, in part, from the media; for example, “fixed [television] schedules, in which the same programme is put on at the same time of the day [...] mean that audiences can come to find the overall shape of output to be ordered and predictable” (Moore, 2005:20). Similarly, fandom of specific objects may provide individuals with a sense of ontological security which derives from the fan’s devotion to his/her fan object and also from the resultant fan community (Williams, 2015). For example, ontological security may develop from the constancy of a fan object, for example television programmes which are screened regularly and which return with each new “season” of television (Moore, 2005:20).

However, individuals may experience threats to their ontological security through the demise of, or loss of interest in, a fan object or through the failure of fan community (for example, if a favourite message board shuts down). When this occurs, trust in the text can be destabilised and the fan’s sense of self must be reworked in order to cope with this disruption. When objects such as television shows come to a close, fans employ a range of discourses to deal with this including grief and sadness or, in rarer cases, “expressing relief at their demise and critically evaluating their final episodes” (Williams, 2015: 197). They also participate in various practices to maintain their fandom such as re-watching favourite episodes of a television show, writing fanfiction, or discussing the text with fellow fans. This allows them to cope with the consequences when the end of “a favourite program creates an emotional void and forced detachment from the program narrative”

(Costello and Moore, 2007: 135). However, in a contemporary media landscape littered with remakes, reboots, and resurrections, fan reactions to these returns are also worthy of study.

Indeed, the return of television programmes across a range of genres is becoming increasingly common. As Harrington notes, the television “industry itself aims for the profit potential of narrative immortality and/ or resurrection (in syndication, in another medium, etc.)” (2013: 584) and “wish[es] for the profitability of immortality (or resurrection/afterlife in syndication or other platforms)” (2013: 588). Examples include the return of science-fiction series *Doctor Who*, the various incarnations of *Star Trek*, the return of soap opera *Dallas*, and recent revivals of cult shows such as *The X-Files*, *24*, and *Heroes*. Jason Mittell refers to these as examples of TV resurrections where “an already concluded series returns, either on television or in another medium” (2015: 321). Such resurrections are often motivated by “having more stories left to tell” (Mittell, 2015: 321) whilst others are driven by “commercial imperatives” (ibid.) although, clearly, all resurrections are linked to the economic drives of the media industry. As Harrington notes, such resurrection of shows has the potential to generate a range of emotions in fans of the series and “fans are hesitant about industry vs. creative imperatives regarding narrative endings. A textual death that leaves open the possibility of an afterlife or re-boot can be ‘good’ from a fan perspective insofar as that possibility is realized and well-handled” (2013: 590-1) but, in many cases, such reboots are not well received.

Prior research indicates that fans may feel both excited and apprehensive at the prospect of a revival or reboot, especially when considering a show such as *Twin Peaks* that had a prolonged gap between its second and third seasons. In this case, *Twin Peaks* offers us a relatively unusual example of a fan object which has been cancelled and then resurrected a-quarter-of-a-century later, rewriting its surrounding fandom from “post-object fandom” into a form of “interim fandom” (Williams, 2015: 168) in the twenty-six year gap. Rather, given “Lynch and Frost’s categorical denial of any intentions to return to the series” (Weinstock, 2015: 1), fan connection was predicated on the assumption that the show was “over” and that their fandom was concerned with a finite text. Thus, fans of *Twin Peaks* assumed that their fan object was dormant and had to readjust or negotiate their responses when the object became active again.

For many fans a return can be welcome, offering an opportunity for closure for a narrative that ended abruptly with the possession of heroic lead character Dale Cooper (Kyle MacLachlan) by the evil spirit BOB (Frank Silva), and to return

to the town and characters that they loved. However, such resurrections can also provoke anxiety in fans that have been used to a complete and bounded text. In discussion of *Doctor Who* fandom Matt Hills notes the anxiety felt by many when “the idealized fan object is potentially threatened (in a way in which tie-ins, spin-offs and unofficial material cannot pose a threat)” (2012:114). This article explores these anxieties by first focusing on the two main discourses that can be employed by fans to cope with any potential anxiety or threats to ontological security generated by news of *Twin Peaks*’ return; the emphasis on the return of actors from the show and the return of its original creators Mark Frost and David Lynch. It then examines the potential threat to this sense of security caused when Lynch temporally left the revived series and the emergence of the ensuing campaign to encourage his return. This actor-led campaign offers an example of how figures such as Sherilyn Fenn, Sheryl Lee and Kimmy Robertson positioned themselves as fans of the series and Lynch – and, thus, similar to ‘ordinary’ fans - whilst also negotiating their own roles within systems of television production.

ACTORS, AGING & COLLECTIVE MOURNING

There are various strategies available to the fan whose ontological security is threatened by the resurrection of a series. For example, such threats can be warded off by drawing on the involvement of the original cast members (including Kyle MacLachlan as Agent Dale Cooper) and the centrality of original creators David Lynch and Mark Frost to the resurrection of the show. Kyle MacLachlan quickly confirmed his involvement, tweeting “Better fire up that percolator and find my black suit :-) #Twinpeaks” on October 6, 2014 (MacLachlan, cited in Weinstock, 2015: 2). The return of the actors “provides a parallel return for the characters who fans are attached to, functioning as literal reminders-in-the-present of the narrative world” (Williams, 2015: 179). However, in the case of *Twin Peaks* – which is diegetically set at least 25 years after the original series – the actors look markedly different and in some cases are almost unrecognisable. Alongside the natural changes brought about by aging, for instance, actress Lara Flynn-Boyle who played Donna Hayward in the series (but was replaced by Moira Kelly in the movie *Fire Walk With Me*) has undergone extensive plastic surgery whilst James Marshall who played biker James Hurley looks considerably different due to a prolonged period of illness.

For some fans the fact that actors look older works to reiterate the sense that a narrative universe, and the characters within it, have continued in the period that a world has been off-screen and that the “hyperdiegesis” of a series – its “vast and detailed narrative space” - has endured (Hills, 2002: 137). David Lynch himself made such a comment when he noted that “I sort of assume that *Twin Peaks* is still there, it’s just that no one is pointing a camera at it now” (Lynch cited in Rodley, 1997:181). However, other fans may resist the return of the embodiment of a character because they would not look “the same”. The physical appearance of actors can provide a sense of continuity or ontological security via the notion of co-presence. As Ross Garner argues in his discussion of the return of *Doctor Who* actress Elisabeth Sladen to the series, such “embodied presence” works to provide ontological security via familiarity and a sense of reassurance (Garner, 2013:203). However, the fact that actors can provide “co-temporality” by functioning as “age cohorts” may also be relevant when they return to play particular roles (Turnock, 2000: 48). Changes in the physical appearance of a favourite character may threaten fans’ sense of ontological security, highlighting both their own co-presence with aging characters and undermining their original views of what characters look like. This was especially linked to those actors who had not remained in the public eye after the cancellation of *Twin Peaks* such as Dana Ashbrook and James Marshall (Garner, 2015).

In contrast, actors such as Ray Wise and Kyle MacLachlan had continued to work in film and television steadily over the twenty-five years between the second and third seasons of the show. MacLachlan had relatively high profile roles on television shows *Sex and the City*, *Desperate Housewives* and *Agents of SHIELD* which allowed audiences to witness his aging process as he moved from playing younger, more risky, roles to more mature characters who were often married with children, mirroring his own aging process and that of the original *Twin Peaks* audience. MacLachlan thus remained recognisable to a wider audience and retained “culturally ubiquitous and mass-mediated recognition” (Hills, 2006: 103). His return to *Twin Peaks* is thus reassuring for viewers of the original series since he has aged alongside them, functioning as a secure “embodied presence” (Garner, 2013:203) of the original series.

Another potential source of anxiety is related to the fact that several of the actors who originally appeared in *Twin Peaks* have passed away in the years between the second and third seasons of the show. These include Don S. Davis who played Major Garland Briggs, Jack Nance who portrayed Pete Martell and, perhaps most crucially, Frank Silva who played the

evil spirit BOB. Closer to the return of the series, Catherine Coulson who played the enigmatic and iconic Log Lady passed away on September 28 2015. Her character was widely reported to be appearing in the revived series and the outpouring of grief on Twitter after her death (Parkinson, 2015) indicates her status as a beloved character in the world of *Twin Peaks* and a sense of collective mourning for one element of the series that cannot, unless some scenes have already been filmed, return. Death is extremely disruptive to our sense of ontological security since it is “the ultimate abject, the ‘great extrinsic factor of human existence’, the ‘fateful moment’ (of dis-order) which is ultimately resistant to human containment and control” (Ritchie, 2003: 2) and, when favourite actors die, this can work to “remind [fans] of [their] own mortality” (Garde-Hansen, 2011: 131). Thus, whilst the deaths of on-screen characters can be a source of grief and sadness, the passing away of the actors who play those characters also causes a “traumatic loss and ... subsequent collective mourning” (Wang, 2007: 335). Whilst the aging of actors can threaten fan ontological security and their idealised image of what a character looks like, the death of an actor presents the definitive end of that character, preventing the fan from seeing further development of their on-screen narrative and irrevocably altering one aspect of a beloved fan text such as *Twin Peaks*.

In addition to discussion of the actors, fans were also able to draw on the involvement of the show’s co-creators and auteur figures David Lynch and Mark Frost as a potential source of ontological security. However, as discussed below, the return was, as with the series’ original two seasons, largely viewed as “a Lynch auteur-work” (Williams, 2005:42) with Frost’s contribution discussed in fairly narrow ways. Lynch functioned as the show’s auteur figure from the outset in 1990, offering the promise of quality and being perceived by fans as “a trickster who consistently anticipates and undermines audience expectations” (Jenkins, 1995: 61). The next section thus explores Lynch’s status as the show’s creator, his reputation for the unexpected, and the subsequent interplay between fans, producers/creators and actors when he temporarily left the revived series in 2015.

SUBCULTURAL CELEBRITY AND THE ACTOR-AS-FAN IN THE NO LYNCH, NO PEAKS CAMPAIGN

Matt Hills notes that auteur figures often act “as a point of coherence and continuity in relation to the world of the

media cult” and “fans continue to recuperate trusted auteur figures” (2002: 132-133). The involvement of original creators in resurrections and returns therefore functions as an important signifier of trust and “quality” for fans:

Their previous involvement, their presumed knowledge of and their love for a text suggests that the revived series is in good hands, allowing fans to attempt to avoid any anxiety or threats to fan ontological security that may be caused by news of a resurrection (Williams, 2015: 179).

However, Lynch’s presence on the new series of *Twin Peaks* does not unproblematically offer fans a sense of security since his authorial brand connotes ambiguity, uncertainty and a sense of the ontologically insecure (see Todd, 2012). Even in early fan discussion of the series in the early 1990s fans were aware of Lynch’s status as a “trickster” against whom they could “match [...] wits” (Jenkins, 1995:63) and this common view of Lynch endures to this day.

In the case of the revived *Twin Peaks*, Lynch’s involvement does not necessarily provide the reassurance and security that we may expect; given his authorial status as someone who provides shock and surprise, as a creator of forms of cinematic ontological insecurity, fans cannot necessarily expect anything certain. As Williams notes, Lynch’s “marketing catchphrase is Expect the Unexpected” (2005: 40). *Twin Peaks*’ predilection for mystery and uncertainty – for representing the uncanny and often attempting to shock and disorient the viewer – is well-known. For example, Kyle McLachlan may well be returning to the series as Dale Cooper but there is no clear sense of his role in the show – he may be killed off in the first episode, for example. Equally, given that his character was shown to have been possessed by the murderous spirit BOB in the final scenes of the show’s second season, we do not yet know what ‘version’ of Cooper we may encounter in the revived series. Hills has noted this expectation of the unexpected for fans of the series, suggesting that “New *Twin Peaks* almost needs to kill or betray old *Twin Peaks* in order to really be *Twin Peaks*-ish; cosy recreations of cult could ossify into audience-pleasing sameness instead of something truly unexpected and thrillingly unforeseen” (Hills, cited in Halskov, 2015: 219). The uncertainty engendered by Lynch’s authorial reputation highlights how ontological security cannot provide “an emotional inoculation which protects against [...] ontological anxieties” (Giddens, 1990:94) but rather ensures that one can deal with the unexpected and adjust to changes

in routine (Craib, 1997:357). Giddens himself notes that the “protective barrier [that ontological security] offers may be pierced, temporarily or more permanently” (1992:40). In the case of *Twin Peaks*’ return this became clear when Lynch’s status as an ontologically insecure or unreliable auteur appeared to be well-founded.

Actress Kimmy Robertson (who played Lucy in the series) posted the following message on her Facebook page on Easter Sunday – April 5th 2015 –: “Dear Showtime....I hope you’re happy. P.S. you really really suck”. After several hours of debate, David Lynch posted a message on his Facebook and Twitter profiles, announcing his exit from the *Twin Peaks* revival:

Dear Facebook Friends, Showtime did not pull the plug on *Twin Peaks*. After 1 year and 4 months of negotiations, I left because not enough money was offered to do the script the way I felt it needed to be done. This weekend I started to call actors to let them know I would not be directing. *Twin Peaks* may still be very much alive at Showtime. I love the world of *Twin Peaks* and wish things could have worked out differently (cited in Brown, 2015).

Lynch’s statement here must be read as performative, as a display of honesty and open-ness that must be treated as a text. However for fans of the series, Lynch’s announcement about his departure appears to violate the “sense of the reliability of persons and things” that Giddens argues is “so central to the notion of trust, is basic to feelings of ontological security” (1990: 92) since his commitment to the revived *Twin Peaks* becomes uncertain. Fulfilling here his role as unreliable auteur, Lynch’s claim that he was leaving Showtime’s reboot was greeted by emotional outpourings by fans, many of whom spent the Sunday evening posting angry (and often abusive) messages on Showtime’s social media pages. However, alongside efforts by fans of the show (Halskov, 2015: 214), the actors themselves picked up the mantle of campaigning, launching the “official *Twin Peaks* cast run site” group on Facebook and posting a video of various cast members including the Log Lady (Catherine Coulson), Sherilyn Fenn, Dana Ashbrook and Laura Palmer herself – actress Sheryl Lee – all proclaiming that *Twin Peaks* without David Lynch was unthinkable. The actors compared *Twin Peaks* without Lynch to a variety of examples, many of which were linked to the series or the characters they played; for example actress Peggy Lipton stated that the series without

Lynch was “like a pie without cherries” and Sheryl Lee that it was “like a girl without secrets”. Notable by his absence was Kyle MacLachlan who, according to actress Sherilyn Fenn who was one of the driving forces behind the campaign. However MacLachlan was apparently the only star locked into a contract at the point of Lynch’s departure which may explain his public silence on the matter (Marino, 2015).

Fan-led campaigns are not unusual; fans of shows including *Angel*, *Firefly*, and *Chuck* instigated campaigns to protest when they were cancelled by networks (see Abbott, 2005, 2008; Barton, 2014, Paproth, 2013). However, actor-led campaigns are less common and, in the case of the “official *Twin Peaks* cast run site”, the lines between actors and fans became blurred; the actors were both appealing for the show to return with Lynch at the helm and positioning themselves as fans of the series. This situated and “active agency” allows actors to “reflect upon [their] role within hierarchies of production and reflect [their] imagined and embodied relationships with fandom” (Hills and Williams, 2005: 347). In analysis of *Buffy the Vampire Slayer* star James Marsters, Matt Hills and Rebecca Williams discuss his manoeuvres to align himself with fans and to position himself as close to them. They argue that Marsters “participates in industry processes that appear to blur character and actor, while also seeking to partly position himself as ‘ordinary’ and thus as a potential figure for (fan) audience identification” (2005: 350). They note that “TV actors can participate in, and discursively appropriate, industry forms of promotion within their function as subcultural celebrities” and that “elements of character and actor ‘identity’ can be activated extra-textually in order to position the celebrity as semiotically ‘close’ to a fan subculture” (2005: 350).

In the case of the No Lynch/No Peaks campaign such manoeuvres are necessary to appeal to fans and to inspire them to join the cause. However, the actors did not solely function as fan-surrogates or stand-ins and, like Marsters, occupied a range of roles. Indeed, there was a clear sense of many of the actors as both fans and as potential employees of the Showtime network who would benefit financially from appearing in the series. Actress Sherilyn Fenn, who was one of the driving forces behind the cast campaign, made this point explicitly on the Facebook Cast Group:

Been thinking a lot.....and I now know that for me, if DKL is NOT directing than Showtime can RECAST AUDREY HORNE.....or say she DIED in the explosion,” Fenn wrote. “The blood will be on their hands” [...] “It makes me sad and scared”, she

admitted. “I need to work but just could never disrespect DKL [David Keith Lynch] like that” (Fenn, quoted in Jacobsen, 2015b).

As well as being employees of the TV industry and fans of the series, the actors involved in the No Lynch/No Peaks campaign position themselves as fans of David Lynch himself, highlighting how “fan and celebrity cultural identities can overlap and interact rather than belonging to wholly separable domains” (Hills, 2006: 103). However, their proximity to the director allows them to display forms of cultural and symbolic capital which most fans cannot attain. This was further displayed as figures such as Sherilyn Fenn posted updates on the situation based on their personal friendships and closeness to Lynch. For example, she posted on the Facebook cast site, “Hi, it’s Sherilyn.... Happy Monday. We have nothing solid to share with all.....I was in touch with DKL [David K Lynch] yesterday.....[...]Again, all this outpouring has been so heartfelt. It means more than you all can know.Yours, Audrey” (Fenn, cited in Jacobsen, 2015a).

Several of the actors including Madchen Amick, Fenn and Sheryl Lee also posted a photograph of themselves with Lynch which had been taken on 30 April 2015 (Harp, 2015). The cast video, the associated online campaigning by the actors, as well as Fenn’s ongoing displays of familiarity by referring to Lynch by his initials DKL, allow fans to align themselves with those close to the production of the series. Furthermore, Lynch’s apparent refusal to work within Showtime’s limited budget is not articulated as a financial decision within a discourse of economics or consumption. Rather, it is, as with much of the discussion that surrounds Lynch, subsumed into notions of art and auteurism. In discussions of the apparent failure of the second series of *Twin Peaks* in 1991, fans valued the fact that “he remained true to what they perceived as his ‘vision’: that he kept the [narrative] problem complex despite pressure to simplify it for mass consumption, and that he did so at the expense [...] of commercial success” (Jenkins, 1995:64). There is thus a long-held view that *Twin Peaks* cannot exist without the vision of its creator and the reboot should not – according to the Official *Twin Peaks* cast campaign – occur without his presence. Some of the actors involved in the 2015 campaign thus continued to position themselves as fans/employees and as deferent to Lynch-as-auteur. They thus subordinate themselves to Lynch as the creator of the series and display “a mark of deference or respect which reflects professional necessity and [their] place within the production hierarchy” (Hills and Williams, 2005: 357).

However, whilst Lynch was solely positioned as the author of *Twin Peaks*, series co-creator Mark Frost was publicly silent on the matter of Lynch’s departure and the subsequent campaign. There was never any reported dissatisfaction from Frost nor any sense that he, too, was leaving the project. However, in a Q&A that took place on the Cast-run Facebook site Sherilyn Fenn noted that “Silence can speak volumes. Let’s pray it all comes back together” (Marino, 2015), suggesting that Frost, too, had his own views on Lynch’s departure. Thus, whilst Sherilyn Fenn’s overt mention of her need to work makes visible the labour of the celebrity-actor, Mark Frost’s work on *Twin Peaks* is often rendered absent. Frost has long been the overlooked author behind the series since, when the show first aired, “The TV critics [...] made Lynch the centre of their attentions [...] They gushed on about the show, finding it different from regular TV and therefore excellent, and they became fascinated by the quirky oddness of its creator” (Thompson, 1996: 154). When Frost has been discussed, scholars have tended to focus on his role in apparently taming the worst of Lynch’s cinematic excesses and marshalling him to complete episodes on budget and to schedule. *Twin Peaks* has thus been “often read as the perfect hybrid of Lynch’s cinematic strangeness and Frost’s respectable televisual pedigree” (Williams, 2005:38) with Frost offering respectability to the series as a televisual text even as the series was “pre-sold on the basis of Lynch’s reputation as an internationally renowned maverick” (Williams, 2005:41). Furthermore, when the show began to lose audiences in its second season, this was popularly attributed to Lynch’s absence as he directed the film *Wild At Heart*. Frost has thus been rather narrowly viewed as the stabilising and mundane sidekick to Lynch’s wild artistry and as the figure who led to the series’ downfall and its journey towards what Lynch himself referred to as “the trite invasion of the banal into *Twin Peaks*” (cited in Nochimson, 1997:94). This emphasis on Lynch also neglects the fact that *Twin Peaks* had numerous other collaborators including a range of both well-established and novice directors (see Abbott, 2015). The No Lynch/No Peaks campaign thus offers an example of an actor-led campaign which works within the established readings of the series, continuing the widely-held view of *Twin Peaks* as a Lynch auteur-work and the director as the crucial creative figure behind it.

The campaign to save *Twin Peaks* appeared to have succeeded when Lynch and Frost posted on social media sites on Friday 15th May. They posted simultaneously on Facebook and Twitter:

Dear Twitter/Facebook friends, the rumors are not what they seem ... It is !!!

Happening again. #TwinPeaks returns on @SHO_Network (cited in Brown, 2015).

This announcement was quickly followed by statements from the Showtime network President David Nevins who stated that “This damn fine cup of coffee from Mark and David tastes more delicious than ever. Totally worth the extra brewing time and the cup is even bigger than we expected. David will direct the whole thing which will total more than the originally announced nine hours. Preproduction starts now!” (cited in Brown, 2015). The news was thus sanctified both by the authors of the series (Lynch/Frost) and those who were responsible for the stalling in the first place (the economically driven network). This art vs commerce discourse was warded off in Showtime’s statement which avoided any direct mention of money or contracts and, instead, drew on metaphors relevant to the content and themes of the series via the invocation of the brewing of coffee and by emphasizing the benefits to fans who would now have more episodes to watch and an apparent guarantee that Lynch would direct all of these. The promise of imminent pre-production also works to ensure that the network appears committed to the series and appears to want to draw a line under the ontological uncertainty that had preceded it. Similarly, after Lynch’s return was confirmed, the subcultural celebrities involved in the campaign acknowledged the importance of the fan support whilst downplaying their own involvement as celebrity figures and media workers. As Halskov points out, “a mythology was now being created around the fans themselves, as active participants in the resurrection of *Twin Peaks*’ (2015: 215). Here, fans and (once again) Lynch are valorized whilst the campaigning work of the (largely female) *Twin Peaks* cast members is rendered invisible.

CONCLUSION

In addition to allowing exploration of possible fan reactions and the operations of celebrity/fans, the case of *Twin Peaks* also highlights many of the challenges of studying returning texts – whether we conceive of these as reboots, resurrections or revivals – pose to television studies scholars. Academic work on endings within television is currently thriving

with attention being paid to the aesthetics of the finales of shows such as *The Sopranos*, *Seinfeld*, and *Lost* (Corrigan and Corrigan, 2012; Morreale, 2003, 2010), the economic importance of endings to the television industry (Harrington, 2013:584; Todd, 2011: 856) and fan reactions to these endings (Williams, 2015). However, part of this agenda needs to centre on how returns are theorised and studied since this poses its own unique challenges. Indeed, *Twin Peaks* offers a case of a problematic return that was littered with false starts and uncertainty. The confusion over Lynch’s role, as well as the fan/actor campaign, means that this was a relatively messy road to return. In contrast, for example, we can consider the trajectory of FOX’s revival of *The X-Files* series which followed a more linear and secure pathway with a more formal and organised PR campaign which began with the FOX network upfront presentation in May 2015 where the confirmed air dates of January 2016 was announced. However, *Twin Peaks*’ fragmented and uncertain route to return offers more of an opportunity to need to excavate and follow the lines of interest. Much like its “dispersed 25th anniversary” (Garner, 2015), the early stages of its return were equally dispersed and rickety, beset by false starts and ambiguity. Since Lynch’s return and the start of filming, however, there has been a more coherent strategy for promoting the new series with an enigmatic trailer released by Showtime on 4 October 2015 and a tendency for the production to fall in line with contemporary media practices to retain secrecy and avoid spoilers being posted by fans watching filming in North Bend in Washington State. (Fitzpatrick, 2015).

As television resurrections become more common, TV studies’ researchers need to consider how best we can understand, archive and analyse returning objects that are not stable and whose resurrection is open to threat or alteration. We need to develop how we trace the often disparate lines of enquiry to fully understand the genesis and lineage of some of these returns, as well as fan reactions to these. As argued here, fans may highlight the importance of the return of original cast members and creators to reassure themselves that a resurrection will succeed and to ward off any threat to their fandom or self-identities. Whilst the return of cast members offers a sense of co-presence and reassurance, “functioning as literal reminders-in-the-present of the narrative world”. (Williams, 2015: 179), fans who emphasize “the necessity of the presence of original producers or auteur figures draw on this as a potential reassurance against such anxiety, discursively suggesting that such figures work as a ‘guarantee of quality’” (Williams, 2015: 178). For many fans, “the desire for character

continuity, loyalty to long-term fans and the involvement of the original creative teams suggests that what fans fear more than a complete lack of continuation of a narrative is that the narrative will be revived but that it will disappoint" (Williams, 2015:171). Furthermore, when resurrections are derailed (albeit temporarily) it is also crucial to consider the responses via fan campaigns or, in the case of *Twin Peaks*, the role of stars and actors in these campaigns. The No Lynch/No Peaks campaign offers a relatively unusual opportunity to consider the celebrity/actors that often power such movements and to explore *Twin Peaks*' stars as subcultural celebrities, media workers and fans of *Twin Peaks*/David Lynch. Thus, much as "observation of the way we react to the expiration of a television show offers us another chance to understand the complexities involved in the institution of television as a portion of our social fabric" (Anderson, 2005: online) so, too, does observation of how fans react to returns and resurrections of their favourite shows.

REFERENCES

- Abbott, Stacey (2005). 'We'll Follow *Angel* to Hell...Or Another Network: Fan Response to the End of *Angel*', pp. 230-33 in S. Abbott (ed.) *Reading Angel: The TV Spin-Off With A Soul*. London: I.B. Tauris.
- Abbott, Stacey (2008). 'Can't Stop the Signal': The Resurrection/regeneration of *Serenity*', pp. 227-38 in R.V. Wilcox and T. R. Cochran (eds.) *Investigating Firefly and Serenity: Science Fiction on the Frontier*. London: I.B. Tauris.
- Abbott, Stacey (2015). "Doing Weird Things for the Sake of Being Weird": Directing *Twin Peaks*', pp. 175-192 in Jeffrey Andrew Weinstock and Catherine Spooner (eds.) *Return to Twin Peaks: New Approaches to Materiality, Theory, and Genre on Television*. Basingstoke, Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Anderson, Tim (2005). *Television and the Work of Mourning. Flow TV*. (<http://flowtv.org/2005/11/television-and-the-work-of-mourning/>) (20-10-15).
- Barton, Kristin M. (2014). 'Chuck Versus the Advertiser: How Fan Activism and Footlong Subway Sandwiches Saved a Television Series', pp. 159-72 in K. M. Barton and J. M. Lampley (eds.) *Fan Culture: Essays on Participatory Fandom in the 21st Century*. Jefferson, NC: McFarland.
- Brown, Kat (2015). *How David Lynch Won His Battle over Twin Peaks*. *The Telegraph* 16 May 2015 (<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/culture/tvandradio/11610052/How-David-Lynch-won-his-battle-over-Twin-Peaks.html>) (30-10-15).
- Cohen, Ira J. (2008) 'Anthony Giddens', pp. 323-337 in R. Stone (ed.) *Key Sociological Thinkers: Second Edition*. Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Corrigan, John Michael and Maria Corrigan (2012). 'Disrupting Flow: *Seinfeld*, *Sopranos* Series Finale and the Aesthetic of Anxiety'. *Television & New Media* 13(2): 91-102. (DOI:10.1177/1527476410392804).
- Costello, Victor and Barbara Moore (2007). 'Cultural Outlaws: An Examination of Audience Activity and Online Television Fandom'. *Television and New Media* 8(2): 124-43. (DOI: 10.1177/1527476406299112).
- Craib, Ian (1997). 'The problem with people', pp. 349-58 in C.G.A. Bryant and D. Jary (eds.) *Anthony Giddens: Critical Assessments: Volume II*. London: Routledge.
- Fitzpatrick, Kevin (2015). *David Lynch Would Like You Not to Spoil Twin Peaks Filming, Please*. *Screen Crush* 14 September 2015 (<http://screencrush.com/twin-peaks-david-lynch-filming-spoilers/>) (30-10-15).
- Garde-Hansen, Joanne (2011). *Media and Memory*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Garner, Ross P. (2013) 'Remembering Sarah Jane: Intradiegetic Allusions, Embodied Presence/Absence and Nostalgia', pp. 192-215 in M. Hills (ed.) *New Dimensions of Doctor Who: Exploring Space, Time and Television*. London: I. B. Tauris.
- Garner, Ross. P. (2015). 'It Is Happening Again?: *Twin Peaks*, Staged Anniversaries and Authorial Meanings', Paper presented at SCMS: Society for Cinema and Media Studies Conference, Montreal March 2015.
- Giddens, Anthony (1981). *A Contemporary Critique of Historical Materialism – Vol. 1, Power, Property and the State*. Basingstoke: Macmillan.
- Giddens, Anthony (1990). *The Consequences of Modernity*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Giddens, Anthony (1991). *Modernity and Self-Identity: Self and Society in the Late Modern Age*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Giddens, Anthony (1992). *The Transformation of Intimacy: Sexuality, Love, and Eroticism in Modern Societies*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Hadas, Leora and Limor Shifman (2013). 'Keeping the Elite Powerless: Fan-Producer Relations in the "Nu Who" (and New YOU) Era'. *Critical Studies in Media Communication* 30(4): 275-91. (DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/15295036.2012.676193>)
- Halskov, Andreas (2015). *TV Peaks: Twin Peaks and Modern Television Drama*. Denmark: University Press of Southern Denmark.

- Harp, Justin (2015). 'See David Lynch Reunite With *Twin Peaks*' Cast as Revival Series' Fate Remains Unknown. Digital Spy 30 April 2015 (<http://www.digitalspy.com/tv/twin-peaks/news/a645051/see-david-lynch-reunite-with-twin-peaks-cast-as-revival-series-fate-remains-unknown/#~pb-G7KXCSHl0FT2>) (29-10-15).
- Harrington, C. Lee (2013). 'The Ars Moriendi of US Serial Television: Towards a Good Textual Death'. *International Journal of Cultural Studies* 16(6): 579-95. (DOI: 10.1177/1367877912459146).
- Hills, Matt (2002). *Fan Cultures*. London: Routledge.
- Hills, Matt (2003) 'Recognition in the Eyes of the Relevant Beholder: Representing "Subcultural Celebrity" and Cult TV Fan Cultures'. *Mediactive* 2: 59-73.
- Hills, Matt (2006) 'Not Just Another "Powerless Elite"?: When Fans Become Subcultural Celebrities', pp. 101-117 in S. Holmes and S. Redmond (eds.) *Framing Celebrity: New directions in celebrity culture*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Hills, Matt (2012) 'Psychoanalysis and Digital Fandom: Theorizing Spoilers and Fans' Self-Narratives', pp. 105-22 in R.A. Lind (ed.) *Producing Theory in a Digital World: The Intersection of Audiences and Production in Contemporary Theory*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Hills, Matt and Rebecca Williams (2005). "'It's All My Interpretation": Reading Spike Through the "Subcultural Celebrity" of James Marsters". *European Journal of Cultural Studies* 8(3): 345-65. (DOI: 10.1177/1367549405054866).
- Howe, Andrew (2013). 'The Owls Are Not What They Seem: Cultural Artefacts of *Twin Peaks*', pp. 40-49 in M. C. Hayes and F. Boulègue (eds.) *Fan Phenomena: Twin Peaks*. Bristol: Intellect.
- Jacobsen, Kevin (2015a). '*Twin Peaks*' Reboot News: Sherilyn Fenn Keeps Fans Updated & Showtime Thinks David Lynch Has "Cold Feet"?. *EnStars* 14 April 2015 (<http://www.enstarz.com/articles/80140/20150414/twin-peaks-reboot-news-sherilyn-fenn-keeps-fans-updated-showtime-thinks-david-lynch-has-cold-feet.htm>) (14-10-15).
- Jacobsen, Kevin (2015b). *Twin Peaks* Revival News: Sherilyn Fenn Threatens to Quit if Showtime Doesn't Give David Lynch What He Wants. *EnStars* 15 April 2015, (<http://www.enstarz.com/articles/80351/20150415/twin-peaks-revival-news-sherilyn-fenn-threatens-to-quit-if-showtime-doesnt-give-david-lynch-what-he-wants-video.htm>) (14-10-15).
- Jenkins, Henry (1996) "'Do You Enjoy Making the Rest of Us Feel Stupid?'" *Alt.tv.twinpeaks*, the Trickster Author and Viewer Mastery', pp. 51-69 in D. Lavery (ed.) *Full of Secrets: Critical Approaches to Twin Peaks*. Detroit: Wayne State University Press.
- Johnson, Derek (2007). 'Inviting audiences in'. *New Review of Film and Television Studies* 5(1): 61-80. (DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/17400300601140183>).
- Jones, Orlando (2016). 'Foreword: Orlando the Fangirl', pp. xii-xv in L. Bennett and P. Booth (eds.) *Seeing Fans: Representations of Fandom in Media and Popular Culture*. New York and London: Bloomsbury.
- Jowett, Lorna (2015). 'Nightmare in Red? *Twin Peaks* Parody, Homage, Intertextuality and Mashup', pp. 211-28 in J. A. Weinstock and C. Spooner (eds.) *Return to Twin Peaks: New Approaches to Materiality, Theory, and Genre on Television*. Basingstoke, Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Laing, R.D. (1960). *The Divided Self: An Existential Study in Sanity and Madness*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Layder, Derek (1997). *Modern Social Theory: Key Debates and New Directions*. London: Routledge.
- Marino, Matteo (2015). An Unexpected Q&A With Sherilyn Fenn (Audrey Horne). *David Lynch.it*. 9 April 2015 (<http://www.davidlynch.it/an-unexpected-qa-with-sherilyn-fenn-audrey-horne/>) (30-10-15).
- Mittell, Jason (2015). *Complex TV: The Poetics of Contemporary Television Storytelling*. New York: New York University Press.
- Moores, Shaun (2005). *Media/Theory*. London: Routledge.
- Morreale, Joanne (2003). 'Sitcoms Say Good-bye: The Cultural Spectacle of *Seinfeld*' s Last Episode', pp. 274-285 in Ead. (ed.) *Critiquing the Sitcom: A Reader*. Syracuse: Syracuse University Press.
- Morreale, Joanne (2010). '*Lost*, *The Prisoner*, and the End of the Story'. *Journal of Popular Film and Television* 38(4): 176-85. (DOI: 10.1080/01956051.2010.508504).
- Nochimson, Martha P. (1997). *The Passion of David Lynch: Wild at Heart in Hollywood*. Austin, Texas: University of Texas Press.
- Paproth, Matthew (2013) "'Best. Show. Ever.": Who Killed Veronica Mars?'. *Journal of Popular Television* 1(1): 39-52. (DOI: 10.1386/jptv.1.1.39_1).
- Parkinson, Hannah Jane (2015). The Log Lady Will be Soirely Missed. She was *Twin Peaks*' Greatest Hero. *The Guardian* 29 September 2015 (<http://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2015/sep/29/log-lady-twin-peaks-catherine-coulson>) (31-11-15).
- Ritchie, Dale (2003) 'Loss, Grief and Representation: "Getting On With It". *Double Dialogues* 4: 1-3.

- Rodley, Chris (ed.) (1997). *Lynch on Lynch*. London: Faber.
- Thompson, Robert J. (1996). *Television's Second Golden Age. From Hill Street Blues to ER*. New York: Continuum.
- Todd, Amanda M. (2011). 'Saying Goodbye to *Friends*: Fan Culture as Lived Experience'. *Journal of Popular Culture* 44(4): 854-71. (DOI: 10.1111/j.1540-5931.2011.00866.x).
- Todd, Anthony (2012). *Authorship and the Films of David Lynch*. London: I.B. Tauris.
- Turnock, Rob (2000). *Interpreting Diana: Television Audiences and the Death of a Princess*. London: BFI.
- Wang, Yiman (2007). 'A Star is Dead: A Legend is Born: Practicing Leslie Cheung's Posthumous Fandom', pp. 326-40 in S. Redmond and S. Holmes (eds.) *Stardom and Celebrity: A Reader*. London: Sage.
- Weinstock, Jeffrey Andrew (2015). 'Introduction: It Is Happening Again: New Reflections on *Twin Peaks*', pp. 1-25 in J. A. Weinstock and C. Spooner (eds.) *Return to Twin Peaks: New Approaches to Materiality, Theory, and Genre on Television*. Basingstoke, Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Williams, Linda Ruth (2005). 'Twin Peaks: David Lynch and the Serial-Thriller Soap', pp. 37-56 in M. Hammond and L. Mazdon (eds.) *The Contemporary Television Series*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Williams, Rebecca (2010). 'Good Neighbours?: Fan/producer relationships and the broadcasting field'. *Continuum: Journal of Media & Cultural Studies* 24(2): 279-89 (DOI: 10.1080/10304310903576366).
- Williams, Rebecca (2015). *Post-object Fandom: Television, Identity and Self-Narrative*. London: Bloomsbury.
- Williams, Rebecca (2016) 'In Focus: Ontological security, Authorship and Resurrection: Exploring *Twin Peaks*' Social Media Afterlife'. *Cinema Journal* 55(3): 143-47.
- Winnicott, D.W. (1964). *The Child, The Family, and the Outside World*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

TV Series and Films Cited

- Agents of SHIELD* (2013-)
- Angel* (1999-2004)
- Buffy the Vampire Slayer* (1997-2003)
- Chuck* (2007-2012)
- Dallas* (2012-2014)
- Desperate Housewives* (2004-2012)
- Doctor Who* (1963 -)
- Firefly* (2002)
- Heroes* (2006-2010)
- Heroes: Reborn* (2015)
- Hill Street Blues* (1981-1987)
- Lost* (2004-2010)
- Seinfeld* (1989-1998)
- Sex and the City* (1998-2004)
- The 6 Million Dollar Man* (1973-1978)
- The Sopranos* (1999-2007)
- Twin Peaks* (1990-1991, 2017)
- Twin Peaks: Fire Walk With Me* (1992)
- The X-Files* (1993-2002, 2016)

