

# **Chapter 2**

## **Review of Literature**

In this chapter, the literature on four crucial themes of gaze, Indian Hindi cinema, the sensation of pleasure and the feminist response are surveyed. If feminist film criticism in India in the 1970s is characterized by debates about the male gaze, debates in the 1980s were characterized by their emphasis on female spectatorship. Largely in response to Laura Mulvey's critique in mid-1970s as well as in late 1980s, the feminists began to explore the possible meanings of spectatorship for women.

The literature is surveyed across four sections under sub-titles in this chapter.

## 2.1. Gaze

Laura Mulvey (1975/1989) has asserted that the cinema contributes to male power by enabling men to make women the objects of a controlling gaze, which she identified as scopophilia. *'Using another person as an object of sexual stimulation through sight is one of the primary pleasure of the cinema'* (Derne and Jadwin, 2000, P. 244).

As Rosemary Betterton (1985, P. 4) asks, given that images of female sexuality in this culture *"are multiplied endlessly as a spectacle for male pleasure ..... what kinds of pleasure are offered to women spectators within the forms of representation ..... which have been made mainly by men, for men?"*

However, a special issue of *Camera Obscura* (1989, Pp. 20/21) demonstrates, there continues to be little consensus amongst feminists about the reference of the term 'female spectator'. Barbara Creed (1989, P. 133) highlights four different definitions operating within feminist film criticism: the diegetic (the woman on screen), the

imaginary (construction of patriarchal Ideology), the theorized (in feminist film criticism) and the woman in the audience.

Creed's separation of these four definitions is unusual. The more typical dichotomy conceptualizes the female spectator either as an effect of discourse, a position, a hypothetical site of address of the filmic discourse (Bruno, 1989, P. 105), or as the woman in the audience who brings to the film her particular history and social identity.

According to K. Moti Gokulsing and Wimal Dissanayake (2004, P. 123) "It is also true that men gaze not only on women but also at men." Drawing our attention to William Holden's bodily displays in *picnic* (1954), Derne and Jadwin (2000) observe that, according to Cohen, cinema has always invested in the spectacle of the male body. In Hindi films such displays are enjoyed by both male and female audiences. Fan magazines and the Indian press often comment on male actors' bodies, for example, Salman Khan often makes a point of showing off his sculptured body.

Closeness between male stars, as in *Sholay* (Dissanayake and Sahai, 1992, P- 95), is sometimes seen as having a homoerotic component. Jani, a female journalist, writing about Indian cinema describes, "how the camera focuses on Jackie Shroff's groin as he dances suggestively 'thrusting his pelvis back and forth'" (quoted in Derne and Jadwin, 2000, P. 261).

## **2.2. Hindi Commercial Cinema**

Hindi commercial cinema – colloquially known as 'Bollywood' – is now the focus of rapidly escalating interest both amongst teachers of film or media and in the academic community. Skillfully choreographed dances, moving songs, aesthetically

pleasing or lavish sets and costumes and sensational plots and characters have invited the attention of newer and wider audiences and, in tandem, given rise to literature that seeks to explain, or to explain away, the popularity of Hindi films.

Recently, dozens of scholarly and journalistic articles and several book-length studies (Chakravarty, 1998; Prasad, 1998; Kazmi, 1999; Mishra, 2002) have offered interesting textual analyses of aspects of Hindi films ranging from nationalism and 'culture' to the 'role of women' and 'nature of the hero'. Others have championed aspects of these films and assumed that viewing them is essentially 'Indian', radically 'traditional' or 'popular' in that it empowers 'Bollywood' audiences by connecting them to a set of necessary cultural traditions.

Susie Bright, (2012) states:

*"I've noticed from my raw empirical studies that a lot of women respond to visual stimuli. I think it's obvious. Look at how fashion magazines are sold. If women didn't like to watch, they wouldn't be so visually sensitive to the many things they do enjoy. So the sexist description of one is being one way and one another... I don't buy it. Women certainly tend to realize their sexual fantasies much later than men. It takes them longer to feel confident about expressing them, searching for them, asking for them, and creating them."*

Banaji, Shakuntala (2006), describes the habit of Hindi film viewers' interpretation phenomenon and the process of selecting the desirable movie.

*"Despite or perhaps because of the continued popularity of Hindi films, it has often been assumed that audience responses can be read from box office takings or film texts. Assertions are also made about how young male audiences of Hindi commercial films go to the cinema because they like action, nudity and sex, while young female audiences deplore it and go to view moral narratives, romance and melodrama. When it comes to young people viewing 'Bollywood' films, few have made more than superficial attempts to engage seriously with the sociocultural contexts of such Hindi film*

*consumption or to explore the range of pleasures and meanings Hindi films hold for viewers across the globe.”*

Viewing nation as narrative Bhabha (1990) puts emphasis on how the nation is articulated in language, signifiers, textuality, and rhetoric. It emphasizes the difference between the nation state as a set of regulations policies, institutions organizations and national identity - that is nation as culture. Looking at nation as text, as culture, questions the tantalization of national culture and opens up the widely disseminated forms through which subjects construct the 'field of meanings associated with national life'. Bhabha (1990) talks about the spaces in between, through which the meanings of cultural and political authority are negotiated.

Despite one study based in India (Derné 2000) and a number of thought-provoking small-scale studies on diasporic viewing (Dudrah 2002; Bhattacharya, 2004) Hindi film audiences remain an undertheorised realm. Clichés about them that circulate amongst the intelligentsia have often suggested that they tend to be pre-rational, childish, individualist, and superstitious, easily influenced, patriarchal, authoritarian and/ or tradition-bound (Valicha, 1988; Nair, 2002; Vishwanath, 2002).

Certainly, given the penchant of Hindi films for melodrama, few audience theorists have seen the audience's emotional engagement and their pleasures in the films as adequate grounds for study. Indeed, assumptions about Hindi film viewing tend to follow in the path of dominant assumptions about much other popular cultural spectatorship across the globe. Namely, critics write as if spectatorship is monolithic and based on demographics; the film texts themselves are coherent and viewed in a linear manner; their spectators have fixed identities and are more or less highly vulnerable to textual influences depending on their social background. Many conclude from this that textual closure must cue psychic closure in the sense that the endings of Hindi films, with all their potential erasures of class differences and ethnic, intergenerational and other conflicts, are somehow seen to affect audiences more than other sequences in the films.

These trends in terms of the theorizing of film texts from production to narrative and these assumptions about spectators have, in general, meant that there is unremitting concern expressed about the effects of Hindi films. Those writers most uneasy about commercial films often eulogise neo-Realist cinema and 'third' cinema in India, and operate on the premise that the effects of commercial films need to be counteracted via censorship or ideological decoding and intellectual critique for the masses.

Sangeeta Datta (2000, Pp. 71-82), describes the changes in representation of women and men in Indian cinema, "The nationalist rhetoric of the pre-independence years produced films valorizing the mother figure. Mehboob Khan's *Aurat*, a modest film made in the early forties was remade in colour as *Mother India* in 1956. The making of the new nation, the projection of Indian culture to the world market, the first International Film Festival in Delhi - perhaps all these factors led to the tremendous reception of the film both at home and abroad. It was the immediate post-independent moment that led to the phenomenal ionization and identification of the mother and nation in popular consciousness.

Nationalist discourse constitutes the female body as a privileged signifier and various struggles are waged over the meaning and ownership of that body. What does it mean for women to be explicitly evoked in theories of nation only when their specificity can serve a particular cause?

The advent of satellite television in the '80s suddenly changed the viewer's world view. Foreign images, MTV culture - became part of everyday viewing experience. Narrative cinema was rather quickly replaced by the dominant image.

*"Many critics have observed the collapse of the romantic heroine and vamp in the persona of the heroine of the eighties and nineties. Duplicate is pastiche, it evokes key scenes from many films from the*

*sixties and seventies and it polarizes the feminine into the romantic lover and the sexual vamp who is on the other side of the law. The narrative uses the space of prime consumer culture - the international beach hotel, with its influx of tourists and foreign delegates. This is where the hero prepares sumptuous banquets as he waltzes and sings in the kitchen. Though the narrative attempts to appear emancipated and contemporary, it presents a conservative ideology in valorizing the male and objectifying the female. The female avenger genre also raises similar problems. The contradiction with these films is that even though they denounce rape, scene of female violation figures centrally in the narrative” (ibid, 2000, Pp. 71-82).*

Every scene of male violence signals the consolidation of criminality and vigilantism with an increasing displacement of the state's law and order role. These films force us to reconsider the limits and possibilities of equating rape and revenge scenes and the masochistic underpinning of the rape scenes in this genre. These revenge films retain the rule of targeting modern urban women as victims - fashion models, college teachers, newlywed wives, policewomen. The metaphor of the city and the criminal/ psychopath lurking in the streets doubly exposes the vulnerability and the threatened or real violation of these women.

Lalitha Gopalan (1997) in her essay on "*Avenging Women in Indian Cinema*" says visual representations of rape in Indian cinema also reminds us of the authority of censorship regulations and suggest the possibility of sadomasochistic pleasures structuring the rape scenes. Even while revenge narratives provide female stars with more dominant roles, women's access to avenging power in these films is intimately predicated on rape. The avenging women genre can actually be said to be a giddy masculine concoction. The rape scene provides the narrative ruse for the revenge plan while providing the spectator with a range of scopophilic pleasures. Gopalan (1997) writes the interlocking narratives of rape and revenge do not sufficiently dislodge or displace conventional representation of Indian cinema.

Indian cinema is today enjoying a huge international market. Films are exported to countries around the world and the audience for it is growing too. The earlier generation of Indian migrants saw these films for the sake of nostalgia. The present day generation view Hindi films more in terms of an identity issue and has appropriated Hindi film music and dance as a means of cultural assertion in order to hold on to something of their own.

Taking one instance, in the UK now there is a vibrant Asian club culture, with underground Asian music bands and it is a common sight on these club nights to see a packed room of people swinging to the tunes of Hindi films remixes. An addition to these has been the recent influx of club dancers - young Asian girls, trained in Indian dance that perform a wild rendition of hip hop, belly dance with snatches of Bharatnatyam gestures and Kathak footwork.

### **2.3. Pleasure**

Now spectatorship and (male) gaze are some of the crucial concepts used both in film theory and feminist film theory. Laura Mulvey (1999) in *Visual Pleasure and Narrative Cinema* intends to use psychoanalysis to discover where and how the fascination of film is reinforced by pre-existing patterns of fascination already at work within the individual subject and the social formations that have moulded 'him'. She feels that 'psychoanalytic theory is thus appropriated here as a political weapon, demonstrating the way the unconscious of patriarchal society has structured film form' (Mulvey, 1999, P. 14).



In a world ordered by sexual imbalance, pleasure in looking has been split between active/male and passive/female. The determining male gaze projects its fantasy onto the female figure, which is styled accordingly. In their traditional exhibitionist role women are simultaneously looked at and displayed, with their appearance coded for strong visual and erotic impact so that they can be said to connote *to-be-looked-at-ness*. (Mulvey, 1999).

This textual construction of the spectator often occurs in strong opposition to the so-called empirical spectator when it comes to the woman in the audience. Following Mulvey's argument of male gaze, the spectator is essentially positioned as male. These aspects of male gaze and spectator (ship) of 1970s feminist film theory could not answer adequately questions like how do women in the audience occupy that spectator position. Is there something called female spectator? What kind of pleasure does a female spectator have?

Madhava Prasad's (1998) '*Ideology of the Hindi Film*' is something of a landmark in the study of Indian cinema. The first systematic application of semiotic film theory to Indian films over a book-length work, Prasad sets up an enquiry that speaks to the major issues generated in Euro-American film studies over the last quarter century: the debates over film realism and film melodrama, the question of how spectators are addressed and positioned by filmic narrative processes, how industrial organization influences the character of the cinematic product. However, this is not a straightforward application of an agenda set elsewhere. Prasad's argument frames and deploys issues of film study to specify the politics and ideology of film culture in a post-colonial society.

This is not by the familiar route of asserting the cultural peculiarity of Indian film culture. Instead, Prasad approaches the cinema as emblematic of India's problematic transition to a capitalist organization of society and polity. This argument develops

around three themes: the economic dimension of popular film, its characteristic narrative form, and the historical elaboration of the institutions of cinema in the 1970s.

To put the economic argument rather boldly, Prasad (1998) argues that:

*“In contrast to Hollywood, where production companies controlled distribution and exhibition, in the Indian case, an industry struggling to establish its claims to state support, bank loans and legitimate investment, was dominated by the distribution sector for its finance. This formal rather than real subsumption of production to capital left the different components of production disaggregated into specific skills such as music direction, choreography and dialogue, whose application was not governed by the needs of a singular story line. Even the main narrative elements were defined by the performative enunciation of already known story elements, moral imperatives and rhetorical modes of character speech; they did not seek to render characters and events in terms of enigma. However, this is not an economic argument” (P. 258).*

Prasad suggests that this loose assemblage of elements positions the spectator in ways governed by an ideological imperative.

In contrast to the Hollywood system in which linear narrative inducts the spectator as complicit agent in the construction of the narrative, and the signs of an external authority narrating the story are occluded, here this authority sticks out, relaying an address to the spectator from the Symbolic Order, the overall source of meaning in society. By this logic, the economic system would change when the transcendent source of social meaning is transformed, and addresses the spectator on different terms.

Prasad (1998, P. 258) uses the category ‘feudal family romance’ to define the dominant structure of symbolic authority retained by the mainstream Bombay film and mirrored in the work of the major film industries of the south. In this narrative form, the identity of characters is not covered by individualist drives to romantic and social fulfillment, or through the resolution of narrative conflicts by modernizing state agencies represented

by judges and policemen. Instead, this function is fulfilled by the paternalist authority reposed in familial patriarchs, respectable landlords, and urban gentry.

For Prasad, this reflects the ideological compromise whereby the Indian National Congress deriving its support from the bourgeoisie and modernizing bureaucracy had to adapt its transformative agenda to pre-capitalist forms of power.

Nevertheless, the feudal family romance is a complex ideological form, carrying within it a potential allegiance to an impersonal state form, individualist drives and consumerist desires, even as the authority of ‘traditionally regulated social relationships’ is reasserted in the narrative resolution.

This argument about the reassertion of feudal scopic regimes and the prohibition on the private forms a part of a larger thesis about the relationship between spectatorship and citizenship. In Prasad’s argument, the dominant form’s highlighting of an address from the Symbolic forecloses on the emergence of the category of the citizen within the spectator, the abstract ideal intelligence invited to participate in the construction of narrative. The Symbolic is relayed through direct address, emblemized by looks into the camera, and through characters that are the bearers of already—interpreted speech and narrative reference. Such an address defines the screen world as acknowledging the audience.

In contrast western classical norms, as theorized by Christian Metz, deny audience presence, and the spectator is voyeur of a self—enclosed fictional world in which his vision and knowledge are channeled through the interaction of characters in a logical, cause—effect chain of narrative construction. In such a system, the Symbolic is no longer externally positioned but comes to repose within the spectator, now the vehicle of story construction rather than its object.

As an advanced representation system, the cinema poses questions of the ways the unconscious (formed by the dominant order) structures ways of seeing and pleasure in looking. Cinema has changed over the last few decades. It is no longer the monolithic system based on large capital investment exemplified at its best by Hollywood in the 1930's, 1940's and 1950's.

Technological advances (16mm, etc) have changed the economic conditions of cinematic production, which can now be artisanal as well as capitalist. Thus it has been possible for an alternative cinema to develop. However self-conscious and ironic Bollywood managed to be, it always restricted itself to a formal mise-en-scene reflecting the dominant ideological concept of the cinema.

The alternative cinema provides a space for a cinema to be born which is radical in both a political and an aesthetic sense and challenges the basic assumptions of the mainstream film. This is not to reject the latter moralistically, but to highlight the ways in which its formal preoccupations reflect the psychical obsessions of the society which produced it, and, further, to stress that the alternative cinema must start specifically by reacting against these obsessions and assumptions. A politically and aesthetically avant-garde cinema is now possible, but it can still only exist as a counterpoint.

Laura Mulvey (1975) describes the work of cinema and states that it satisfies a primordial wish for pleasurable looking, but it also goes further, developing scopophilia in its narcissistic aspect. The conventions of mainstream film focus attention on the human form. Scale, space, stories are all anthropomorphic. Here, curiosity and the wish to look intermingle with a fascination with likeness and recognition: the human face, the human body, the relationship between the human form and its surroundings, the visible presence of the person in the world.

Jacques Lacan (1975), has described how the moment when a child recognises its own image in the mirror is crucial for the constitution of the ego. Several aspects of this analysis are relevant here. The mirror phase occurs at a time when the child's physical ambitions outstrip his motor capacity, with the result that his recognition of himself is joyous in that he imagines his mirror image to be more complete, more perfect than he experiences his own body. Recognition is thus overlaid with misrecognition: the image recognised is conceived as the reflected body of the self, but its misrecognition as superior projects this body outside itself as an ideal ego, the alienated subject. which, re-introjected as an ego ideal, gives rise to the future generation of identification with others. This mirror-moment predates language for the child.

The idea of the male gaze is problematic because it seems at once both generic and too narrow. The current theorization of the male gaze is too narrow because it limits all gazes into two categories which Mulvey (1975) carefully outlines and one goal (domination); it is generic because its function as the sole definition of all gazes forces certain kinds of looking into a category that does not allow for multiple motives.

Much criticism links the male quest for dominance with masturbation fears and castration anxiety, with the male unconscious desire functioning as what Ellie Ragland-Sullivan (1989) calls "an inherent 'lack-in-being' that drives humans to seek resolutions and answers because all subjects are incomplete" (P-45).

In her essay "*Seeking the Third Term: Desire, the Phallus, and the Materiality of Language*," Ellie Ragland-Sullivan builds on Lacan's theories of the male gaze as the familial interpretation that the male strives to find his place as a father-figure, who is supposed to be "an ideal (in the imaginary and symbolic), but is, in actuality, the source of prohibition." Ragland-Sullivan argues that a son is placed in

*"a confused position in terms of both ego and desire. He cannot be the mother. He cannot be the father. He can only await from a posture of*

*aggressive frustration and the position of power tacitly promised” (P. 41).*

This characterizes all men as both empowered and repressed by the father whose role they are to fill; it also delineates the source of the male’s desire for dominance as a learned familial and social urge. Though the masculine traits of some of these women seem to reinforce that the male gaze belongs to those with male-gender traits if not to the male sex, feminine women that partake in the gaze serve to detach gender from the gaze, and the attainment of power by the object of the gaze serves to refute the claim that all gazes are wholly dominant. The desire that fuels the gaze extends beyond the constructed phallus and the need for English identification to the idea of one’s construction—not as a man, woman, feminized man, or masculine female, but as androgynous human.

With Laura Mulvey and others talking the lead in the 1970s feminist film theory was criticized by debates around male gaze which result in arguments about spectatorship, especially female spectatorship, spectatorship studies have emerged with several concepts “to engage with the tension between cinema as monolithic institution and cinema’s heterogeneous diversity”. Commenting on film theory of the 1980s that emerged based on and in critique of 1970s film theory, Mayne says (1997):

*“an opposition between homogeneity and heterogeneity underscore these criticisms, since most alternatives to 1970s film theory take the spectator, not as the effect of the cinema institution, but as a point of departure, and not the ideal spectator as theorized by the cinematic apparatus, but the socially defined words, responses to apparatus theory are founded on a gap between the ideal subject postulated by the apparatus and the spectator who is always in an imperfect relation to that ideal.”*

The distinction of the ‘textual’ versus the ‘empirical’ spectator, or the ‘diegetic’ versus the ‘cinematic’ spectator is a miniature versus the differences between the psychoanalytic model in film studies and ethnographic approaches to female spectatorship and audience studies in order to give a more viable understanding of

female spectator studies Mary Ann Doane(1982) proposes ‘masquerade’. Jackie Stacey also point out that “Mary Ann Doan theory of feminity as ‘Masquerade’ (1982) explore the differences in the female spectator’s relationship to the dominant patriarchal structures of cinematic looking organized around voyerurism fetishism. Doane argues that femininity is constructed differently in relation to heuristic and the fetishistic derives of the masculine subject/spectator” (Stacey 26).the pure binary position of ‘textual’ and ‘empirical’ spectator are even criticized by Stacey. She states (1994):

*“If ‘spectatorship’ is simply a textual position, then there may only be a masculine or a feminine option; however ,if spectatorship refers to members of the cinema audience ,surely the possible position things multiply. The reluctance to engage with questions of cinema audience, for of dirtying one’s hands with empirical material has led to an inability to think about active female desire beyond the limits of masculine positioning.”*

Madhava Prasad (1998) states:

*“The Industry has been constantly bombarded by journalists, politicians, bureaucrats and self-conscious film-maker with prescription for achieving an international-style realist cinema. The not -yet-ness of the Indian popular cinema is thus not just a biased opinion coming from western or westernized crities,but also a thesis at work within the industry as the instrument of drive towards change.”*

Prasad further also states:

*“Heterogeneous form of manufacture does so to the extent that the cinematic instance is not the dominant one in the film text; (like the star system), acquire an independence that retroactively determines the form of the text. The different component elements have not been subsumed under the dominance of a cinema committed to narrative coherence. The heteronymous conditions under which the production sector operates are paralleled by a textual heteronomy whose primary symptom is the absence of an integral narrative structure”(1998).*

Similarly Stacey Jackey said that Guiliana Bruno (1989) states:

*“I am not interested in an empirical analysis of the phenomenon of female spectatorship... I cannot get over an old semiotic diffidence for any notion of empirical ‘truth’ or ‘reality’, which I find very*

*problematic. There are ways in which for me the phantasmatic level is more real than reality itself, or the so-called reality of facts'.*

Soumya Mukherjee says “The marketing of men’s beauty product and their endorsement by celebrities and also the storyline of the advertisements of such products indicate the trend of reversal of the gender roles where men, too urge to become erotic spectacle. The advertisement of Fair and Handsome shows the disappointment of a man as he is unable to attract female gaze and he finally solves his problem by applying Fair and Handsome that enables him to fulfill his desire to be looked at.”(2011)

## **2.4. Feminism**

Third-wave feminism refers to several diverse strains of feminist activity and study, whose exact boundaries in the history of feminism are subject of debates, but are marked as beginning in the early 1990s and continuing to the present. The movement arose partially as a response to the perceived failures of and backlash against initiatives and movements created by second-wave feminism during the 1960s, 1970s, and 1980s, and the perception that women are of many colors, ethnicities, nationalities, religions, and cultural backgrounds.

Third-wave feminists have broadened their goals, focusing on ideas like queer theory, and abolishing gender role expectations and stereotypes. Unlike the determined position of second-wave feminists about women in pornography, sex work, and prostitution, third-wave feminists were rather ambiguous and divided about these themes.

Raynette Halvorsen Smith in her article ‘Intersections Between Feminism and Post-modernism: Possibilities For Feminist Scenic Design’ (1990) questions, “Is there latitude in the profession of scenic design for feminist artistic expression? Is it possible to locate a practice in scene design which can shift the feminist critique from the



margins to the center of this craft? Or is this profession of scenic design, the oldest recognized design area, too steeped in patriarchal theatre culture to admit feminist expression and retain its identity”?

Smith said, “Post-modernism creates a context that would allow feminist expression in scenic design, expression which, until recent developments in feminist theory, has not been possible. This exploration of feminism and Post-modernism cannot outline the details of a new feminist scenic practice, but only point to ideas, directions, and tendencies which allow for such a possibility.”

Talking about female spectator, it is understood differently by many theorists and it complicates and unsettles the category of spectatorship. Marry Ann Doane(1982) said,

*“I have never thought of the female spectator as synonymous with the woman sitting in front of the screen and munching popcorn... It is a concept which is totally foreign to the epistemology framework of the new ethnographic analysis of audiences... The female spectator is a concept, not a person.”*

Patrice Petro’s “*Aftershocks of the New: Feminism and Film History*” (2002), relates historical research and feminist film criticism. Petro inspects how the German cinema, mechanisms of modernism and feminist film theory have evolved. She raises few concerns like role of television and other media play in film studies, the role of feminist film theory in our conception of film history and the relation between German film theory and international film theory. Petro attempted to lower the debates over the place of cinema within the culture of modernity. Petro’s work has helped many to understand the feministic perspective in analyzing films.

Christian Metz in his ‘*Psychoanalysis and Cinema: The Imaginary Signifier*’, digs into aspects of the psychological anchoring of cinema as a social institution. Metz utilizes Freudian psychoanalysis to examine the nature of cinematic spectatorship, the relations

of cinema and voyeurism, interpretation process of the film text and so on. Metz mainly focuses at the understanding of film text, image and sound. (Metz, 1982)

Jenna Wortham (2015) in an article 'The Female Gaze: Critics Take' wrote, "Rupi Kaur, a Canadian artist and poet, posted a photograph of herself lying on a bed, the rear of her sweatpants stained a dark red. Again, Instagram removed it for violating community guidelines. Kaur reposted the message Instagram sent her, along with the caption, "Their misogyny is showing," and invited other women to share. Instagram eventually relented — and apologized. These are among the most visible examples of how young women are pushing back at content policies on social media sites, protesting that the routine removal of images considered to be too "mature" or "obscene" is just another example of how women's bodies are subject to scrutiny and policing." The article helped the researcher to understand the protesting views of women on various social contents and the willingness to revolt on content policing.

Melissa Silverstien in an article 'Embracing the Female Gaze', said, "The female gaze to me is not about pleasure or even power; it is about presence. The female gaze is about women storytellers planting their feet down and shouting with a camera: "I AM HERE. I AM PRESENT. I DO MATTER". The female gaze derives from the desire to tell stories — no matter who they are about — and to share thoughts and feelings and experiences. The female gaze is not only about making political statements. The director Ava DuVernay reminds us, our presence is a political statement. "*When a woman makes a film,*" she has said, "*that is a radical act in itself*".

The female gaze reminds us that storytelling is universal and that the male perspective is not the only or default perspective. There are women all across this industry taking hammers each and every day to bang away at the glass ceiling that creates this deep inequality in storytelling. Women are picking up hammers by making their own films in any way they can by creating and participating in female film groups and helping each

other, as well as using social media to spread the word about the desire for change.” The author of this article, Mr. Silverstien ( 2015), understood that the male gaze is not only the default perspective which increased the curiosity of the study.