

Gender Politics and the Critical Gaze: Jean-Luc Godard's Masculin-Feminin

Judith R. Halasz, Ph.D.

Assistant Professor, Sociology Department
State University of New York at New Paltz
600 Hawk Drive, New Paltz,
New York

ABSTRACT

In Masculin-Feminin (1966), avant-garde filmmaker Jean-Luc Godard uses innovative aesthetic strategies to critique gender politics in mainstream cinema and everyday life. By focusing on 1960s youth culture, Godard examines the role leftist politics and late capitalist culture play in gender identities and sexual desire. Adding to Laura Mulvey's concept of the erotic male gaze, this analysis reveals an alternative gaze on gender—a critical gaze—produced by Godard's aesthetic strategies. These strategies include replacing shot-counter shot editing with a journalistic quasi-interrogation interview and a using Deleuzian repetition of differential scenes and characters in lieu of narrative continuity. As a result, Godard subverts the conventional objectification of women as passive screen icons and forces the audience out of an innocent voyeurism into an uncomfortable complicity with the film, actors, and filmmaker. In doing so, Godard invites the viewer to arrive at their own understanding of gender politics.

Key words: Gender, Male Gaze, Critical Gaze, Godard, Mulvey, Deleuze

1. Introduction

Jean-Luc Godard, French filmmaker, critic, and icon of the avant-garde, released his eleventh feature film, *Masculin-Feminin* in 1966, near the culmination of his New Wave period. In this film, Godard addresses three developments that defined this generation—shifting gender politics and sexuality, growing political unrest, and the rise of consumer culture. Against the background of the major social, economic, political, and cultural upheavals of the 1960s, Godard critiques gender politics on two levels—(1) on the level of cinematic representation and spectatorship, and (2) on the level of everyday life under late capitalism. To produce a nuanced critique, Godard deploys two innovative aesthetic structures, in addition to his usual avant-garde repertoire: the journalistic interview and Deleuzian “repetition and difference.” Using Laura Mulvey's concept of the “male gaze” as a point of departure, I will demonstrate how Godard produces an alternative gaze—a critical gaze—on gender.

2. Miss Nineteen and the Children of Marx and Coca-Cola

Masculin-Feminin follows Paul, a 21-year old who recently completed military service and has now landed a job at a Parisian fashion magazine. There he meets his love interest Madeleine, an aspiring pop singer. The film traces their relationship, along with that of their friends, Robert, a young Marxist labor organizer, Catherine, the bookish yet sexually precocious roommate, and Elizabeth, the second roommate with an implicit lesbian love interest in Madeleine. The narrative is intentionally disjointed, broken by aphoristic intertitles and abrupt acts of random violence. Godard uses their stories as a vehicle to explore the issues that concerned French youth in the mid-1960s. At the forefront are national, international, and personal politics. Critiques of American cultural and military imperialism, the Vietnam War, the rise of late capitalism, and consumerism mingle with discussions of sex and product brands. In this way, Godard attempts to define this generation as “the children of Marx and Coca-Cola.”

The film begins by establishing Paul's emergent leftist politics. He states that “the military system goes hand in hand with industry. Money has the same logic as order.” He is fed up. “You have no time to yourself. You spend your life working, eating, sleeping, working, etc.” He aligns himself with the radical Left, and believes that laborers are too overworked to become adequately militant. There is much talk of revolution with his friend, Robert. Paul's budding leftist views lead to a series of minor political actions. He signs a petition against the unjust arrest of eight Brazilian artists and writers, and paints “Peace in Vietnam” on an American military official's limousine. Towards the end of the film, a man borrows Paul's matches and uses them to set himself on fire. He leaves a suicide note: “Peace in Vietnam.”

Powerful protests like this act of self-immolation reduce Paul's actions in relation to the uncompromising political activism of the time. Still he vociferously expresses his political opinions, wondering out loud, how it could be that if you "kill a man...you're a murderer" but if you "kill thousands...you're a conqueror." We witness Paul's radicalization as he increasingly opposes imperialism, sides with the labor movement and embraces socialism. Godard uses Paul and his friend Robert to stand in for the sons of Marx. Their politicization tempers the intensity of consumer desires, ever present in the film; however, libido becomes their foil.

Paul feels compelled to confront capitalism as much as imperialism. He begins at his workplace. In a scene entitled "Dialogue with a Consumer Product," Paul interviews Miss Nineteen, the winner of a beauty contest sponsored by the fashion magazine where he and Madeleine work. Paul's questions highlight Miss Nineteen's rapture with consumer culture and her unawareness of current political issues. When asked about socialism, she demurs. "I can't handle such a question. I get confused." With a little prompting she offers that compared to socialism, the American way of life is "terrific" because it is fast, people seem important, and women have a say in matters. Paul immediately follows up by asking, "Does the word 'reactionary' mean anything to you?" She thinks it means "someone who reacts" and concludes that she likes reactionaries. Paul continues, "Does the Popular Front mean anything?" She is flustered by the question. He switches to issues of sexuality and feminism. Here she seems a little savvy. She knows about birth control pills and even has to explain to Paul what a diaphragm is. Now that she's traveled and enjoyed some fame, she wants to pursue a career. She also wants to delay having children, because they'll limit her independence. Just when her mild feminism seems to have restored her character, Paul returns to the political questioning. He ends the interview by asking her if she knows where in the world there are ongoing wars. She does not. The year is 1965. Unaware of and uninterested in current political events, Miss Nineteen becomes an icon of empty beauty.

By shooting the six and a half minute scene in a single long-take, with no camera movement, not even a zoom, Godard puts Miss Nineteen under the unwavering scrutiny of the camera. She is a captive of the frame, forced to answer embarrassing questions, visibly discomfited by the constant unforgiving gaze of Paul, the camera, and the audience. There is no lace to mask her imperfections, there is no Hollywood Golden Age glamour lighting to enhance her allure. With the plain, everyday background of a grey Parisian cityscape seen through an unadorned window, she is left to fend for herself. At best she has her smile and her mildly liberated womanhood to protect her from the piercing questions, from the unwavering gaze; even then, her grin and feminism seem to fail her. Women's sexual liberation with the advent of effective, accessible birth control and the relaxation of sexual morals is generally heralded throughout the film. However, Godard frames women's increased participation in the workforce as promoting consumerism not feminism. The only real weapon Miss Nineteen possesses—her voice—is regularly undermined, as she is forced to contend with the sounds of the city and the untimely giggles of the girls in the next room.

Prompting Miss Nineteen with provocative questions, Paul directs the flow of the scene from off-screen. We never see him, only his voice is present. The camera's gaze focuses the critical attention on Miss Nineteen. She cannot evade the camera, Paul, or the audience. The audience, too, is captive—we cannot look at anything but her. This intensifies the emotional climate of the scene, the interview as interrogation. The questions are unrelenting and aggressive, politically and sexually. What does she think of the Vietnam War? Birth control pills? Premarital sex? The camera exposes Miss Nineteen as a consummate consumer and a product of consumer society, her every gesture, her appearance, her concerns manufactured. This scene captures the way Godard reproduces and then eviscerates Hollywood conventions of the cinematic representation of the female icon. He transfigures the effect of the image of the woman on screen, producing an alternative to the conventions Laura Mulvey identifies in her seminal essay "Visual Pleasure and Narrative Cinema" (1989). According to Mulvey,

woman ... stands in patriarchal culture as a signifier for the male other, bound by a symbolic order in which man can live out his fantasies and obsessions through linguistic command by imposing them on the silent image of woman still tied to her place as bearer, not maker, of meaning. (1989, p.15)

Using semiotics and psychoanalytic theory, Mulvey argues that classical Hollywood cinematic practice places women on the screen for the benefit of the "male gaze." The implied male viewer seeks erotic pleasure in the image of the beautiful woman. Her image holds the male gaze captive; however, any threat her agency may pose (as Other, as phallic lack, as symbol of castration) is disarmed by an imposed silence—she says little or nothing of consequence.

On one level, Godard fulfills the desire of the erotic male gaze with this beautiful young woman whose immobility makes her increasingly flat and iconic. In this way, he satisfies the voyeuristic desire of the audience and Paul. However, unlike the Hollywood siren, Miss Nineteen is not at all the silent image of feminine beauty. Godard returns the voice to the woman's image—he wants her to be beautiful, sexually attractive, and political. But his critical gaze reveals not her substance, but her political and intellectual lack—she is too caught up in capitalist consumption and too uninterested in the human condition to fulfill Godard or Paul's desire. She is the daughter of Coca-Cola, not Marx.

According to Constance Penley (1989a), Godard's unorthodox interview format forces the audience into an uneasy identification, or at least complicity, with the interviewer. Watching from the same position, the audience is collapsed with the interviewer, who is ever absent from the frame.

We are not given the usual choreography of shot/reverse-shot and the "reaction shot," as we never see the interviewer. This arrangement effectively implicates the viewer in the scene far more than having us look on and overhear the interviewer from a position outside it. We share the imaginary off-screen space of the interviewer and this is a distinctly uncomfortable place in which to be. (Penley, 1989a, p.109)

The woman is captured, deconstructed, flattened by Godard and his audience's gaze. The viewer, in the place of the interviewer, is now aggressively probing into her desires. Because Paul/Godard frames the questions within a Marxist perspective, Miss Nineteen's responses disappoint. While there is still pleasure in the image of the woman, it is tempered by the uncomfortable assault the viewer is led along. According to Penley, the way Godard reveals insight into the social development of gender compromises the sharpness of this insight. "Godard has never adopted the common political film strategy of letting the oppressed speak directly, 'in their own words'" (Penley, 1989a, p.111). Godard uses the interview in lieu of shot-counter shot editing as the dominant aesthetic strategy throughout *Masculin-Feminin*. In every instance, the interviewee is subjected to the overwhelming flow of the interrogation. In the interview with Miss Nineteen, there are no breaks, no disruptions, no shifts in the positions of the interviewer and the interviewee. And, unable to redirect the flow of the dialogue, Miss Nineteen is, for the most part, at the mercy of Paul/Godard.

3. Deleuzian Repetition and Difference

To structure *Masculin-Feminin* without reproducing the patriarchal mechanisms Mulvey and other feminist critics identify in film, Godard uses what Gilles Deleuze (1968) conceptualizes as repetition and difference, adding more layers, more complexity to his criticisms of and insights into gender. He repeats entire scenes, using different characters but similar mise-en-scene and dialogue cues to illicit varied responses. Godard's repetition adds differential layers or paths of flight from the same point. Each scenario engenders countless possibilities; these possibilities constitute the depth of social reality. By showing multiple developments from a given starting point, Godard snatches from the viewer the easy linearity of conventional narratives. In doing so, Godard replaces the psychological depth of character typically produced by narrative continuity with multiple representations of character-types, in this case the political boy on the make and the superficial girl teasing the boys sexually. As a result, the audience struggles to feel empathy for or identify with the characters—for they are each variations on a theme exposing each other's flaws. Paul is just a slightly more sensitive version of the doctrinaire Robert. Both see women's breasts before their personality or political convictions. And while Madeleine and Miss Nineteen are notably superficial, Catherine's appreciation of classical music and poetry seems little more than a ploy to win Paul away from Madeleine. No longer led by the hand along a singular narrative path, the spectator is confronted by different possible trajectories for a given scene, and left to their own devices to locate the logic and meaning. Not only must the viewer make sense out of the repetition, they cannot neglect the complexity difference indicates.

In *Cinema 2: The Time-Image*, Deleuze describes such a structuring of film as "the whole is the outside" (1989, p.179). In contrast to the imposed narrative linearity and continuity editing of classical cinema, modern film operates not by the association of images, but by their differentiation. The effect of the film derives from the interstices between the images, rather than the images themselves.

Given one potential, another one has to be chosen, not any whatever, but in such a way that a difference of potential is established between the two, which will be productive of a third or of something new. ... It is not a matter of following a chain of images, even across voids, but of getting out of the chain or the association. (Deleuze, 1989, p.179–80)

These “unlinked” images are presented not as part of a unified whole, but as categories in a series.

Each series refers to a way of seeing or speaking, for its own purposes, a way which may be that of current opinion operating through slogans, but equally that of a class, a sort, a typical character operating through thesis, hypothesis, paradox or even pretended cleverness, abrupt change of subject. Each series will be the way in which the author expresses himself indirectly in a sequence of images attributable to another, or, conversely, the way in which something or someone is expressed indirectly in the vision of the author considered as other. In any case, there is no longer the unity of the author, the characters and the world such as was guaranteed by the internal monologue. (Deleuze, 1989, p.183)

The spectator is not summoned to identify with one or several characters, or to escape into the fantasy world of the movie, but to take the multitude of character types—categories in a series—and make meaning outside the illusionistic world of cinematic images, based on intertextuality, not ensconement nor suture. In other words, the spectator is beckoned to reflect on the incommensurability of the images and categories.

While the individual characters are at times opaque and categorical, the layering through repetition and difference creates a complexity that comes across as human. Godard does not rely on psychological realism and depth. Instead, he creates sociological depth by concentrating more on what happens between characters than inside them. By repeating interactions between different sets of characters, the multiple sociological types coalesce into a nuanced portrayal of masculinities and femininities. In this way Godard brings pathos to an otherwise biting critique of conventional gender identities. Consider the parallel courting scenes between Paul and Madeleine as compared to Robert and Catherine. Early in the film when Paul first invites Madeleine out on a date, she asks him if he has ever had sex with a prostitute. He responds in the affirmative, but adds that he does not like them because they are “sad and cold.” In a later scene, where the Marxist laborer Robert asks Catherine out on a date, she poses the same question. Again the response is yes. Only this time, Robert adds that he sleeps with prostitutes not out of a lack of a girlfriend, but because he likes prostitutes and “the sort of things they do,” at which point Catherine rejects his invitation. With the repetition of differential scenes, the audience recognizes that the mating dance has a certain rhythm, a certain choreography, which is successful if performed with grace, but the slightest misstep could prematurely cut off the possibilities. The politics of gender and sexuality are made visible by the juxtaposition of such parallel scenes.

It is important to recognize that Godard does not focus his critical gaze on women alone. When Paul first courts Madeleine, the two engage in an interview reminiscent of the “Dialogue with a Consumer Product.” Only in this version, male and female alternate as the off-screen interviewer and the looked-at interviewee, challenging the male gaze. The shot focuses on one character through several dialogue exchanges before cutting to the other, producing uncomfortable yet naturalistic and even revelatory silences. The off-screen interviewer directing the flow of the dialogue dominates the looked-at other with their questions. When Madeleine is at the helm, she first asks Paul why he is pursuing her. He explains that she is pretty and has a certain “tenderness,” to which she coyly responds “there’s nothing else you like about me?” He can only elaborate by talking about her looks in more detail. He sees in her exactly what she emphasizes in herself—her physical appearance. Her success becomes her failure. She has achieved the height of a certain feminine ideal—physical beauty, allure, fashionability. But she seems to want him to see something deeper to give more meaning to his desire than libido alone. She pointedly asks, “By going out, do you mean going to bed?” He cannot respond; still, the camera will not release him from the question that bares his intentions. “Tell me honestly,” she implores.

Still no response. “Tell me.” Neither she nor the camera will let him off the hook so easily. He looks down, grabs a cigarette from his jacket pocket, smiles as he looks up, and flips the cigarette into his mouth. His silence answers the question. It would be uncouth to admit his intentions, but he does not want to lie. It is apparent that Madeleine now has the power to keep him captive with this interrogation, with this critical gaze, or release him from his unease. She relents and changes her tactic, asking about his background, family, and dating habits. Only when he asserts himself and boldly announces his libidinous intentions does the camera release him from scrutiny. As Madeleine is asking the questions, Paul experiences an uncomfortable captivity similar to that of Miss Nineteen. The critical gaze turns on him, and the limits of his political sensibility are revealed. Despite Paul’s leftist politics, his sexual politics are not so radical. Obviously motivated by his libido and an attraction to Madeleine’s superficial traits, he goes as far as to tell her that her breasts are the type he likes. In this light, Paul’s obsession with politics appears superficial, as much a concession to popular culture as Madeleine’s obsession with products and appearance.

In the parallel courting scene, Robert, the doctrinaire Marxist laborer, ineptly attempts to woo the bookish Catherine. This time the critical gaze is directed almost entirely at his machismo and crudeness. Robert rationalizes his poor manners and inability to express himself confidently around women by claiming that the government prevents workers from attending college and becoming properly educated. From earlier scenes, we know that Robert has little difficulty discussing politics at length with Paul. Thus Robert's ineloquence more likely stems from his romantic inexperience and anxious libido. For him, women are objects of sexual desire, not intellectual or political equals. The camera dissects Robert's blatant misogyny with a critical gaze as harsh as that unleashed upon Miss Nineteen. Radical politics concerning the State and labor provide no cover for Robert's conservative attitude towards gender and sexuality. Godard uses Paul and Robert to expose the sexism that lurked in the radical social movements of the 1960s—the young Marxist men in the film not only succumb to their libidinal desires, but relegate women to the libidinal sphere. Through such repetition and difference, Godard exposes masculinity and femininity with his critical gaze.

4. Godard's Critical Gaze on Gender Politics

The critical gaze is the mode of spectatorship Godard's avant-garde cinema conditions. In what sense is this gaze critical? First, it serves the function of critique. The critical gaze foregrounds certain ideological structures—in this film, patriarchy, consumerism, and political apathy—and demonstrates their interconnectedness. Godard invites the viewer to critically engage with what they see, both in form and content. Phenomenologically, this promotes a more intellectual, attuned viewing experience, intentionally disrupting fluid semi-conscious spectatorship.¹ Second, the critical gaze induces dialectical spectatorship, in that it keeps pleasure and displeasure simultaneously in play. In a reflexive moment, this returns our gaze back onto ourselves. Viewing the object compels us to acknowledge how our subjectivity (our viewing position, our role in the objectification of the woman image) is predicated on object relations (not necessarily in the psychoanalytic sense). Subject and object are constantly playing off each other. This produces an active engagement with the text and makes spectatorship a more reflexive, self-conscious activity.

The concept of the critical gaze complements Brian Henderson (1999), Peter Wollen (1999), Deleuze (1968, 1989), and Colin MacCabe's (1976) assessments of Godard's non-classical aesthetic. Hollywood film, both as an industry and an aesthetic, is situated within capitalist structures and culture.² By subverting and at times rejecting Hollywood conventions, Godard attempts not simply to produce an alternative to mainstream cinema, but to produce one that (1) demonstrates mainstream cinema's implication in capitalist and conservative ideological structures, and (2) does not reproduce those very indexical structures in its form. Henderson, Wollen, and Deleuze argue that Godard's avant-garde films produce reflexivity in spectatorship, through non-linear narratives, non-continuity editing, and lack of psychological depth of character, among other strategies. This reflexivity tends to undermine given ideological structures by rupturing assumed linkages. In the place of flow and continuity, Godard offers incommensurables, which must be made sense of, and in the process questioned, scrutinized, and criticized.

The dislocation between [contradictory elements] focuses attention on the position of the spectator—both in the cinema and politically. These juxtapositions make the spectator constantly aware of the discourses that confront him as discourses—as, that is, the production of sets of positions—rather than allowing him to ignore the process of articulation by entering a world of correspondence in which the only activity required is to match one discourse against the realm of truth. (MacCabe, 1976, p.183)

The spectator is no longer Mulvey's pleased male voyeur. Instead, we become the critic—like Godard—of film and society.³ We watch from a psychologically disengaged distance. We are not sutured into the film, we do not identify easily with the characters. No, we watch from a critical distance. From this vantage point, we can analyze the totality, in this case the social system in which consumerism penetrates youth culture and challenges political engagement, which together condition gender politics. We focus alternately on the image itself and the way that it supports this totality. Attunement to these discourses makes our gaze all the more critical.

On the one hand Godard takes a situation recognizable through our own direct experience of life, dilemmas *within* society, similar to and familiar from the real world. On the other, he examines the cinematic image in order to demonstrate how far that direct experience is already an experience of images. This film's foregrounding of its own process of production and its break with the conventions of verisimilitude are not at the service of a formalist aesthetic. They allow Godard to confront the way that consumer society mold woman's image so that it conforms to a given concept of female sexual appeal. ...

The female body has become industrialized; a woman must buy the means to paint on (make-up) and sculpt (underwear/clothes) a look of femininity, a look which is the guarantee of visibility in sexist society for each individual woman. (Mulvey and MacCabe, 1989, p.54)

As Mulvey and MacCabe suggest, Godard's critical gaze confronts not only stereotypical assumptions about gender, but also the taken-for-granted use of gendered images in film. Godard exaggerates the emptiness of the women to illustrate the construction of the male gaze. In this way, Godard performs a double-intervention: in the order of the film and in the order of the lived world. We take pleasure in seeing Madeleine and Miss Nineteen pout for the camera, nevertheless we become uncomfortably aware of our own complicity in this pleasure. Mulvey acknowledges that Godard presents a challenge to the male gaze. She explains,

The first blow against the monolithic accumulation of traditional film conventions (already undertaken by radical film-makers) is to free the look of the camera into its materiality in time and space and the look of the audience into dialectics and passionate detachment. There is no doubt that this destroys the satisfaction, pleasure and privilege of the 'invisible guest', and highlights how film has depended on voyeuristic active/passive mechanisms. (Mulvey, 1989, p.26)

On the level of spectacle, Godard's close-ups and extended shots of beautiful women fulfill the libidinous voyeuristic desire Mulvey identifies in film. And yet he undermines just that pleasure, with a critical gaze. He forces the audience to confront the desire embedded in their spectatorship. By showing the young men and women to be superficial, though not altogether unsympathetic, Godard reveals the compromises involved in the fulfillment of such desire, actual and mediated. Godard is attempting to create a cinematic illumination of the dialectics of gender and desire. He does this, in large part, by undermining the film conventions that feed into the ideological order of the patriarchy. The very camera technique, the mediated gaze, which is intended to fulfill our desire, is used to rescind that fulfillment, by lingering too long, by allowing space and time to reveal the construction lines of gender and sexuality, by reminding us we are voyeurs.

It should be noted that several influential feminist film scholars, including Molly Haskell (1973), Penley (1989a, 1989b) and Mulvey (with MacCabe, 1989) have accused Godard of objectifying and exploiting women in his films. For example, in their critique of Godard's cinematic gender politics, Mulvey and MacCabe question whether the use of an image of a naked woman is inherently complicit with the exploitation of the female as silenced sexual body, as object of the male gaze.

For many, the use of a naked female body immediately casts doubt on Godard's project. The very image for the most visible exploitation that women endure in a sexist society cannot be used with impunity, cannot be used without a certain complicity. Once again, the position is not straightforward. It is possible to argue that Godard's use of the image of the body is resolutely unexploitative. The length of the shots and the fact that the image of the body is not presented as spectacle makes us uneasy in our position of the voyeur. If we look at this woman's body then we are aware of our own look, which is not hidden in the folds of the narrative and the movement of the camera. Similarly there is none of that titillation of vision on which exploitation depends. What we see is not the product of an unveiling, we gaze at a female body for several minutes. But although these arguments are valid they do not resolve the problem. The shot of the naked woman is a good example. On the one hand its length and form are an attempt to demystify the very source of our images of women and yet, at the same time, the potency of that image is such that it is doubtful that any simple demystification is possible. (Mulvey and MacCabe, 1989, p.52)

While there is little nudity in *Masculin-Feminin*, the way that Godard uses the image of the female face and body is problematic similar to the way Mulvey and MacCabe suggest. Godard may illustrate and deconstruct the cinematic exploitation of the female as object; however, he does so through exaggeration, which runs the risk of complicity. The very interview style that constitutes a critical gaze also allows Godard to linger on the faces of Madeleine and Miss Nineteen, especially through their silences. While their hollow beauty and self-absorption may point to the way that mainstream films, not to mention modern consumer culture, foreclose on the depth and agency of women, their beauty is real, and thus produces the very visual pleasure of the erotic gaze that Mulvey describes. Nevertheless, I would argue that Godard's use of the image of the woman in *Masculin-Feminin* is ultimately non-objectifying. Godard's sociological insights into the mutually conditioning relationship between capitalism and gender are revelatory and potentially liberating. Even Mulvey concedes this point.

Women's contribution to the modern world can be measured according to their sex appeal. This is a point that Godard returns to repeatedly in his films. He understands the forces that mold women into a stereotype and reduce them to impotence. ... More than any other single film-maker Godard has shown up the exploitation of woman as an image in consumer society. (Mulvey and MacCabe, 1989, p.50)

Godard uses the image of woman with an awareness of all its effects, and he makes these effects, not the woman, his subject. This allows the viewer to engage in a critical understanding of gender and sexuality, an understanding that accounts for normative pressures to conform to gender conventions, while recognizing them as such. Mulvey suggests that the image of woman on screen has an innate erotic force. Yet, this erotic component does not nullify the critical gaze. In fact, the tension between Madeleine's beauty and her emptiness challenges the viewer to maintain a critical stance towards her and the other women in the film—one aspect draws the audience in, the other repels. The audience experiences the pleasure of the erotic gaze; at the same time, they are confronted by the objectification inherent in such pleasure. The power of Godard's critique lies in how he allows the viewer to arrive at their own awareness of the problematic use and construction of gender in film, and carry that awareness into the whole that is outside the film.

NOTES

1. For more on the phenomenology of spectatorship, see for example Hugo Munsterberg's *The Film: A Psychological Study*, J.L. Baudry's "Ideological Effects of the Basic Cinematographic Apparatus," or Carl Plantinga's *Moving Viewers: American Film and the Spectator's Experience*.
2. For a discussion of classical cinema's relationship to capitalism in particular and ideological structures in general, see the work published in the Cahiers du Cinema. See for example, the Cahier du Cinema Editorial Board's "Young Mr. Lincoln, texte collectif," J.L. Comolli's "La profondeur de champ 'primitive,'" or his "II. Profondeur de champ: la double scene (suite): (Notes pour une histoire materialiste...suite)."
3. Wollen (1972) notes that Godard uses narrative intransitivity among other techniques to engage the viewer as a critic.

REFERENCES

- Baudry, J.L. (1974–1975). Ideological Effects of the Basic Cinematographic Apparatus. *Film Quarterly*, 28(2), 39–47.
- Cahier du Cinema Editorial Board. (1972). John Ford's *Young Mr. Lincoln*. *Screen*, 13, 5–44. Originally published in *Cahiers du Cinema*, 223 (1970).
- Comolli, J.L. (1971a). II. Profondeur de champ: la double scene (suite): (Notes pour une histoire materialiste...suite). *Cahiers du Cinema*, 231, 42–49.
- Comolli, J.L. (1971b). La profondeur de champ "primitive." *Cahiers du Cinema*, 233, 40–45.
- Deleuze, G. (1989). *Cinema 2: The Time-Image*, trans. Hugh Tomlinson and Robert Galeta, Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Deleuze, G. (1968). *Différence et répétition*. Paris, France: PUF.
- Haskell, M. (1973). *From Reverence to Rape: The Treatment of Women in the Movies*. New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Henderson, B. (1999). Towards a Non-Bourgeois Camera Style. In L. Braudy and M. Cohen (Eds.), *Film Theory and Criticism* (pp. 57–67). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- MacCabe, C. (1986). Theory and Film: Principles of Realism and Pleasure. In P. Rosen (Ed.), *Narrative, Apparatus, Ideology* (pp. 179–197). New York, NY: Columbia University Press. Originally published in *Screen*, 17(3) (1976).
- Mulvey, L. (1989). Visual Pleasure and Narrative Cinema. In *Visual and Other Pleasures* (pp. 14–26). Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
- Mulvey, L. and MacCabe, C. (1989). Images of Women, Images of Sexuality: Some Films by J. L. Godard. In *Visual and Other Pleasures* (pp. 49–62). Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
- Munsterberg, H. (1970). *The Film: A Psychological Study*. New York, NY: Dover Publications.
- Penley, C. (1989a). Les Enfants de la Patrie (on France/Tour/Detour/Two Children). In *The Future of an Illusion: Film, Feminism, and Psychoanalysis* (pp. 93–118). Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Penley, C. (1989b). Pornography, Eroticism (on Every Man for Himself). In *The Future of an Illusion: Film, Feminism, and Psychoanalysis* (pp. 83–90). Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Plantinga, C. (2009). *Moving Viewers: American Film and the Spectator's Experience*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Wollen, P. (1999). Godard and Counter Cinema: *Vent D'Est*. In L. Braudy and M. Cohen (Eds.), *Film Theory and Criticism* (pp. 499–507). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.