
Visual Pleasure And Narrative Cinema Mulvey

Visual Pleasure And Narrative Cinema Mulvey
Now available from vdmnp.louper.io by Wilson & Cole

INTRODUCTION: THE ESSAY THAT CHANGED HOW WE WATCH MOVIES

In 1975, a relatively short academic article appeared in the British film journal *Screen* that would go on to become one of the most cited, debated, and influential pieces of film theory ever written. Laura Mulvey's "Visual Pleasure and Narrative Cinema" did not merely offer a new way of looking at films; it fundamentally questioned the very act of looking itself. It argued that mainstream Hollywood cinema was structured around a specifically male point of view, systematically objectifying women on screen and positioning the spectator as a male subject. The essay introduced the concept of the **male gaze**, a term that has since permeated popular culture, media studies, and everyday conversations about representation. But to fully understand the power and the controversy surrounding "Visual Pleasure and Narrative Cinema," we must revisit the essay's core arguments, its psychoanalytic foundations, and its enduring legacy in a world of streaming, social media, and evolving gender politics.

TEXT

Laura Mulvey is a British feminist film theorist and filmmaker. In the early 1970s, she was part of a vibrant intellectual scene in the United Kingdom that was deeply engaged with second-wave feminism, psychoanalysis, and Marxist theory. The question that drove her work was a political one: how do mainstream films shape our unconscious desires and reinforce patriarchal social structures? At the time, feminist film criticism was in its infancy. Most film criticism focused on auteur directors, genre conventions, or narrative style, largely ignoring the political implications of how women were represented. Mulvey wanted to change that.

Her essay was not just a critique of Hollywood; it was an intervention. She wanted to use psychoanalytic theory—specifically the work of Sigmund Freud and Jacques Lacan—as a "political weapon." By borrowing their tools, she could demonstrate how cinema functioned as a powerful ideological apparatus that reproduced the gender inequalities of the wider society. "Visual Pleasure and Narrative Cinema" was, above all, a call to arms for a new kind of filmmaking that would break these established patterns of looking.

THE CORE ARGUMENT: SPECTATORSHIP AND THE MALE GAZE

At its heart, Mulvey's essay makes a deceptively simple claim: in classical Hollywood cinema, the spectator is forced to identify with the male protagonist, and the camera's gaze is coded as male. This creates a structure where women are **passive objects to be looked at**, while men are **active bearers of the look**. This is the famous concept of the male gaze. It is not simply about men looking at women—it is a systemic, formal feature of narrative cinema that shapes every aspect of the film, from camera angles to lighting to editing.

Mulvey argued that this dynamic is not accidental; it is deeply rooted in the unconscious structures of a patriarchal society. The cinema provides a perfect environment for what Freud called **scopophilia**—the pleasure of looking. In everyday life, looking is a social act, regulated by norms and inhibitions. But in the darkness of the cinema, the spectator can indulge in the voyeuristic pleasure of watching others without being seen in return. This pleasure, Mulvey argued, is inherently structured along gender lines.

Scopophilia, Voyeurism, and Narcissism

Mulvey identified two distinct but related forms of pleasure in cinema. The first is **voyeuristic pleasure**, which derives from

the act of looking at another person as an object of sexual stimulation. The second is **narcissistic pleasure**, which comes from identifying with an idealized image on the screen, much like the child's stage of development described by Lacan known as the mirror stage. In the cinema, the male spectator identifies with the heroic male protagonist, who is more powerful, more in control, and more perfect than the spectator could ever be in real life. Through this identification, the spectator participates in the protagonist's mastery over the narrative and over the female characters.

These two pleasures—voyeurism and narcissism—work together to create a seamless, satisfying experience for the male spectator. The female star is there to be looked at (by the male protagonist and by the audience), and the male hero is there to drive the story forward. The woman is spectacle; the man is narrative agent.

THE THREE LOOKS OF CLASSICAL CINEMA

One of the most enlightening aspects of Mulvey's analysis is her identification of three distinct "looks" that operate in cinema, all of which are structured by the male gaze.

The Look of the Camera

First, there is the look of the camera itself. In classical Hollywood cinema, the camera almost always adopts a male perspective. It pans, tilts, and frames the female body in ways that fragment and objectify her. Close-ups linger on her lips, her legs, or her

curves, transforming her into a collection of body parts rather than a whole person. This is not merely a stylistic choice; it is an ideological one, embedding the male gaze into the very machinery of cinema.

The Look of the Spectator

Second, there is the look of the spectator. The spectator is forced to adopt the position of the male protagonist. Even if the person watching the film is a woman, she must temporarily identify with the male hero in order to follow the narrative. This creates what Mulvey called a "trans-sex" identification, where the female spectator must abandon her own gendered perspective. This is a deeply alienating experience, and it explains why women can feel uncomfortable or conflicted when watching many mainstream films.

The Look Between Characters

Third, there is the look between characters on screen. Male characters look at female characters with desire and control. Female characters, on the other hand, are rarely allowed to return the gaze in a way that challenges male authority. When a woman does look, she is often punished or neutralized. The look between characters is therefore a power dynamic, reinforcing the hierarchical relationship between men as subjects and women as

objects.

TWO WAYS MEN DEAL WITH FEMALE THREAT

Mulvey drew on Freudian psychoanalysis to explain why the male gaze is so persistent and obsessive. She argued that the female figure in cinema represents a fundamental threat to the male unconscious: the threat of castration. Because the woman lacks a penis, she reminds the man of his own potential lack. To manage this anxiety, the male unconscious employs two defense mechanisms.

The first is **fetishistic scopophilia**. This involves turning the woman into a fetish object, overvaluing her beauty and glamour to the point where she becomes reassuring rather than threatening. The female movie star becomes a perfect object, untouchable and idealized. This is the strategy of the fetish, and it is particularly common in the films of directors like Alfred Hitchcock or Josef von Sternberg.

The second strategy is **voyeuristic investigation and punishment**. Here, the male protagonist investigates the woman, demystifies her, and ultimately punishes her for her difference. This is the logic of film noir, where the femme fatale must be exposed, controlled, or killed. Both strategies serve the same purpose: to neutralize the threat that the female body represents and to reaffirm the stability of the male ego.

APPLYING THE THEORY: HITCHCOCK AND STERNBERG

Mulvey used two directors as case studies to illustrate her argument: Alfred Hitchcock and Josef von Sternberg. Hitchcock,

she argued, exemplifies the voyeuristic-punitive strategy. In films like *Rear Window* and *Vertigo*, the male protagonist is an obsessive voyeur who must investigate and control the woman. The camera colludes with his gaze, and the narrative structure rewards his mastery. In *Vertigo*, Scottie's attempt to transform Judy back into the dead Madeleine is a literal act of fetishistic reconstruction. When she resists, she must be punished—even if that punishment leads to her death.

Von Sternberg, on the other hand, represents the fetishistic strategy. In his films with Marlene Dietrich, the camera openly adores the star. Dietrich is lit, costumed, and positioned as a perfect icon of femininity. The narrative is secondary to the spectacle of her image. There is no punishment here; instead, the woman is contained within her own beauty, safely removed from the world of active male desire.

These two approaches, Mulvey argued, dominate Hollywood cinema and provide a powerful ideological framework for understanding how films shape our unconscious attitudes toward gender.

CRITICISMS AND REVISIONS OF MULVEY'S WORK

No influential theory escapes criticism, and "Visual Pleasure and Narrative Cinema" has been challenged from many angles. Some critics argue that Mulvey's model is too monolithic. It assumes a single, universal male spectator and ignores the diverse ways that actual audiences watch films. What about male spectators who do not identify with the male protagonist? What about spectators of different races, classes, or sexual orientations? Is

the gaze always male, or can it be queered, racialized, or otherwise destabilized?

Scholars such as bell hooks (Black feminist criticism), Judith Butler (gender performativity), and Jackie Stacey (female spectatorship) have pushed back against the rigid binary of active male/passive female. hooks, for instance, argued that the dynamic of the gaze is also structured by race and that Black female spectators have historically had to resist the white male gaze in complex ways. Other scholars have pointed out that Mulvey's reliance on psychoanalysis is itself problematic, as Freudian theory has been criticized for its biological determinism and its pathologizing of female sexuality.

Mulvey herself has revisited her essay in later years. In a 1989 follow-up article, she acknowledged that the concept of the male gaze was sometimes applied too rigidly. She also recognized that her original essay left little room for the agency of the female spectator. However, she maintained that the core of her argument—that mainstream cinema is structured by patriarchal looking relations—remains largely true, even if the landscape of cinema has changed dramatically since 1975.

THE ENDURING RELEVANCE OF THE MALE GAZE

Despite these critiques, the concept of the male gaze remains one of the most useful tools for analyzing visual culture. In the age of social media, video games, and streaming platforms, the question of who is looking at whom has become more complex—and more urgent—than ever. The term has entered the popular lexicon. People now speak casually of a video game, a

music video, or a movie as having a "male gaze" problem. This is a testament to the power of Mulvey's original insight.

Contemporary debates about the objectification of women in music videos, the representation of female characters in blockbuster franchises like Marvel or Star Wars, and even the algorithms of social media platforms all echo the concerns that Mulvey first raised. The male gaze is not a relic of the 1970s; it is a living, breathing reality of the media landscape. Streaming algorithms, for instance, promote content that reinforces familiar visual patterns, and those patterns often include gendered looking relations. The **visual pleasure and narrative cinema Mulvey** identified has now migrated to Netflix, TikTok, and YouTube.

Furthermore, the rise of female-directed cinema, queer cinema, and international cinema has shown that alternative ways of looking are possible. Filmmakers like Chantal Akerman, Claire Denis, and Kathryn Bigelow have experimented with the gaze in ways that challenge male spectatorial privilege. The emergence of the "**female gaze**" as a concept, while contested, owes a deep debt to Mulvey's pioneering work. She opened the door for a generation of filmmakers and scholars to ask: What does it mean

to look? And who gets to decide how we see?

CONCLUSION: BEYOND THE GAZE

"Visual Pleasure and Narrative Cinema" is not a comfortable essay. It is dense, theoretical, and uncompromising in its political conviction. But that is precisely why it remains so powerful. Mulvey forced film theory to confront its own assumptions about pleasure, identity, and power. She showed that the simple act of watching a movie is never innocent. It is loaded with unconscious desires, social norms, and political consequences.

Today, as we navigate an increasingly visual culture saturated with images, the questions Mulvey posed are more relevant than ever. Who is behind the camera? Who is the audience? And who is being looked at? The male gaze is no longer the only gaze, but it is still the default gaze in far too many contexts. Understanding how it works, and recognizing when it is operating, is the first step toward building the kind of alternative cinema Mulvey envisioned—one that breaks the spell of visual pleasure and narrative cinema Mulvey critiqued, and opens up new ways of seeing, being, and imagining.

The essay remains a cornerstone of film studies