

in the studio of a *Hustler* photographer) and an ultimate conversion denouement, in which filmmaker and stripper discuss the latter's re(-)formed vision of her past and future. This thread is intercut with interviews with feminist authorities on the subject. Caught up in the emotional charge of the subject, the audience may not notice that the distribution of representational and presentational roles in the film follows a certain hierarchy. The sex worker, Tracy, is caught in a representational role, performing her ongoing life in the service of the film, while the recruited intellectuals perform their role of analysis and polemics within the presentational interview formats. It is not difficult to conclude that the democratic ideals of feminism are being sacrificed in the process—are sex workers themselves less entitled than intellectuals to verbalize directly about the sex industry? Furthermore, the specter of voyeurism and visual pleasure is unavoidably raised by the strong construction of observational discourse in Tracy's two principal scenes of sexual performance, with their assault on conventional notions of tact and their inescapable flirtation with the "pornographic" discourse that is the target of the film. To compare the *Hustler* posing session, for example, with its scandalous aura of brutality and complicity (the female photographer applies "pussy juice" before the take), with, say, the similar scenes from the improvised but fictional *Prostitute*, where the sexual performance scenes are lucid, controlled, and self-reflexive, demonstrates the clear shortcomings of representational vérité in the domain of sexual politics.

Amatage's *Striptease* has surprisingly more clarity and complexity than *Nota Love Story* despite its infinitely more modest means: strippers and other sex industry workers present themselves in interviews and monologues, and present their work in erotic dance-performances constructed solely for the camera (in *Prostitute*, at the other end of the scale, they perform semifictional dramatizations within a self-reflexive narrative, collaboratively scripted, to a similar effect). In *Striptease*, the sex industry is not validated, but its workers are: subject-generated performance, sharpened by its presentational mode, ensures that the dignity and subjectivity of the subjects are respected along with their right to present themselves, to define their images and their lives. As for

the problem of voyeurism, I suspect that the visual pleasure of the spectator is compromised by the explicit aura of control that characterizes the sexual performance. It is no coincidence that Amatage enables glimpses of a collective political solution (unionization) that makes Klein's ambiguous individual moral solution all the more superficial.

VOICE AND FIRST-PERSON PERFORMANCE

Not a Love Story has been criticized also for the autobiographical presence within the diegesis of author Bonnie Klein. The first-person performance seemed ineffectual in terms of cinematic charisma presumably, but more importantly in terms also of the issue of authorial voice. As Nichols puts it, such authorial presence lacks both the "self-validating, authoritative tone of a previous [voice-of-god] tradition" and "seem[s] to refuse a privileged position in relation to other characters."⁹ Submitting both to the authoritative testimony of the stellar lineup of expert witnesses and to the grandstanding of her representational protagonist Tracy, the diegetic Klein serves rather as a timid, inconclusive, perhaps *faux-naïf* guide throughout the pornographic nightmare. Similar problems are arguably posed by the whole tradition of autobiographical performance, from the first-person narrations of Flaherty (*The Land*) and John Huston (*The Battle of San Pietro*) in the forties to the Me-Decade's self-presentations of everyone from Werner Herzog (*La Soufrière*) to Michael Rubbo (*Waiting for Fidel, etc.*). It seems to me that the first-person format, too often limits social-issue documentary to the exploratory phase, pegs it at the level of political evasion, bewildering empiricism, and individual moral or metaphysical floundering. Even where it is rigorously self-reflexive, as with Jill Godmilow, the personal is perhaps shown to be political, but the political often fails to rise above the personal level. While the first-person performance does undeniably provide a manageable dramatic entry to the enormously complex subjects of pornography, *Solidarity (Far from Poland)*, and the Holocaust (*Dark Lullabies, Shoah*), it does not necessarily

serve the political dissection of these subjects. It may be argued that the strategy seems best suited for properly individual, autobiographical subjects such as intrafamily relationships (*Best Boy, Coming Home*), or for the feminist genre that connects individual socialization to broader political forces (*Daughter Rite, Joyce at 34, Home Movie*).

Ultimately, while the problems of authorial voice can be addressed in part by the strategy of first-person performance, and while authorial presence can signal a refreshingly self-reflexive honesty, more often than not the authorial performance—whether representational in such films as *Not a Love Story*, or presentational and self-reflexive in such films as *Far from Poland*—raises as many issues as it solves. In any case, a whole range of other questions are raised by autobiographical performance in documentary—from ethics to narcissism to the demographic representativity of the media worker—but these are beyond the scope of this paper and are receiving due critical attention.¹⁰

CONCLUSION: THE RIGHT TO PLAY ONESELF

I have offered a historical overview of the presence of performance in documentary. I have discerned alternating and simultaneous impulses toward presentational and representational performance throughout the documentary tradition, then briefly engaged the current debate about voice in political documentary, and finally only touched on the distinct subcategory of autobiographical performance. All of this has led to a global assertion of the special aptness of the presentational mode in the present context, alongside both an insistence on the continuing relevance of the interview format of oral history popularized in the seventies and an enthusiastic welcoming of the current experimentation with hybrid performance modes, including dramatization. Subject performance, affirmed and enriched as a presentational element of documentary film, remains a means by which the most committed of documentary filmmakers can aspire to the realization of their democratic ideals. Collaboration between

artist and subject, as elaborated by Joris Ivens at the end of the thirties, remains a meaningful political ideal as well as an artistic strategy, but the terms he set out have been somewhat transformed. "Acting to play oneself" is still the key, but, "Don't look at the camera" is replaced by, "Look at the camera" as a "basic necessity" of documentary collaboration. In the same decade, Walter Benjamin spoke of "modern man's legitimate claim to be reproduced";¹¹ might we not add that the individual has now established the claim also to construct that reproduction, the right to play oneself?

NOTES

1. This text excerpted from the periodical *Films*, vol. 1, no. 2 (Spring 1940), pp. 30-42, appears in a later modified form in Ivens' autobiographical *The Camera and I* (New York and Berlin: International Publishers, 1968), pp. 187-206.
2. The term "social actors" designating real-life characters playing their own social roles in nonfiction film and presumably having an extratextual autonomy has been standard usage in documentary studies since Bill Nichols' influential *Ideology and the Image: Social Representation in the Cinema and other Media* (Bloomington, IN, 1981) cf., pp. 181-85.
3. Helen van Dongen, "Robert J. Flaherty, 1884-1951," *Film Quarterly*, vol. XVIII, no. 4 (Summer 1965), p. 4.
4. See for example Geoff Pevere, "Projections: Assessing Canada's Films of '85," *The Canadian Forum*, vol. LXV, no. 755 (March 1986), p. 39.
5. Bill Nichols, "The Voice of Documentary," *Film Quarterly*, vol. 36, no. 3 (Spring 1983); rpt. in Nichols, ed., *Movies and Methods, Volume 11* (Berkeley, 1985), pp. 265-6.
6. Jeffrey Youndelman, "Narration, Invention, and History: a Documentary Dilemma," *Cineaste*, vol. XII, no. 2, 1982, pp. 8-15; Chuck Kleinhans, "Forms, Politics, Makers, and Contexts: Basic Issues for a Theory of Radical Political Documentary," in Thomas Waugh, ed., *Show Us Life: Toward a History and Aesthetics of the Committed Documentary* (Metuchen, N.J.: Scarecrow Press, 1984), pp. 318-42.
7. For example, the scope of a 1986 McGill University symposium on docudrama included a range of NFB productions: a TV-movie style fictionalized reconstruction (*Canada's Sweetheart: The Saga of Hal C. Banks*) an archival compilation interpolated with cabaret-style theatrical sketches (*The Kid Who Couldn't Miss*), several documentaries incorporating fictional episodes (*Mourir A Tue-Tete, Le Dernier Glacier, Passiflora*), and a scripted fiction feature constructed on improvisational performances by nonprofessional actors (*Ninety Days*). Cf., the author's "Thunder over the Docudrama:

- Symposium Highlights NEB's World-Class Role," *Cinema Canada*, no. 128 (March 1986), p. 26.
8. Julia Lesage has often discussed the importance of consciousness raising as a deep structure of feminist discourse in documentary, most recently in "Feminist Documentary: Aesthetics and Politics," in Waugh, op. cit., pp. 223-51.
9. Nichols, op. cit., p. 265.
10. See for example a recent installment of the ongoing discussion of autobiographical documentary: David Schwartz, "First Person Singular: Autobiography in Film," *The Independent*, vol. 9, no. 4, pp. 12-15. The author of one of the most elaborate studies of documentary autobiography is John Stuart Katz, e.g., Katz, ed., *Autobiography: Film/Video/Photography* (Toronto: Art Gallery of Ontario, 1978). Katz's more recent work and much other material relevant to this article appears in Larry Gross and Jay Ruby, eds., *Image Ethics: The Moral and Legal Rights of Subjects in Documentary Film and Television* (Philadelphia, 1988).
11. Walter Benjamin, "The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction," in Hannah Arendt, ed., *Illuminations* (New York: 1969), p. 232.

List of Films Mentioned

- A Bigger Splash*, Jack Hazan, U.K., 1974
- All My Babies*, George Stoney, U.S.A., 1953
- Best Boy*, Ira Wohl, U.S.A., 1980
- Before Stonewall: The Making of a Gay and Lesbian Community*, Greta Schiller, U.S.A., 1985
- Bombay, Our City*, Anand Patwardhan, India, 1985
- Burroughs*, Howard Brookner, U.S.A., 1983
- Canada's Sweetheart: The Saga of Hal C. Banks*, Donald Britain (NFB/CBC), Canada, 1985
- Caffe Italia*, Paul Tana, Quebec, 1986
- Chicken Ranch*, Nick Broomfield, U.S.A., 1982
- Comedienne*, Katherine Matheson, U.S.A., 1983
- Coming Home*, Bill Reid (NFB), Canada, 1973
- Dark Circle*, Judy Irving, Chris Beaver, Ruth Landy, U.S.A., 1972
- Dark Lullabies*, Irene Angelico and Abbey Neidik (NFB), Canada, 1985
- Daughter Rite*, Michelle Citron, U.S.A., 1978
- Day After Trinity*, The, John Elise, U.S.A., 1980
- Democracy on Trial: The Morgentaler Affair*, Paul Cowan (NFB), Canada, 1984
- Dernier Glacier, Le*, Roger Frappier and Jacques Leduc (NFB), Quebec, 1984

- Edvard Munch*, Peter Watkins, Norway, 1974
- Enthusiasm*, Dziga Vertov, U.S.S.R., 1931
- Eye of the Mask*, Judith Doyle, Canada, 1985
- Far from Poland*, Jill Godmlow, U.S.A., 1984
- Fires Were Started*, Humphrey Jennings, U.K., 1943
- Four Hundred Million*, The, Joris Ivens, U.S.A., 1938
- Grey Gardens*, David and Albert Maysles and Ellen Hovde, U.S.A., 1976
- Harlan County*, U.S.A., Barbara Kopple, U.S.A., 1976
- High School*, Frederick Wiseman, U.S.A., 1969
- Hookers on Davie*, Holly Dale and Janis Cole, Canada, 1984
- Home Movie*, Jan Oxenberg, U.S.A., 1972
- Housing Problems*, Edgar Ansley and Arthur Elton, (John Grierson, producer), U.K., 1935
- If You Love This Planet*, Terri Nash (NFB), Canada, 1982
- In the King of Prussia*, Emilie de Antonio, U.S.A., 1982
- Jane*, Richard Leacock, U.S.A., 1962
- Journal Inachevé*, Un, Marilu Mallet, U.S.A., 1982
- Joyce at 34*, Joyce Chopra, U.S.A., 1972
- Kid Who Couldn't Miss*, The, Paul Cowan (NFB), Canada, 1982
- Land*, The, Robert Flaherty, U.S.A., 1942
- Life and Times of Rosie the Riveter*, The, Connie Field, 1980
- Lonely Boy*, Wolf Koenig and Roman Kroitor (NFB), Canada, 1961
- Louisiana Story*, Robert Flaherty, U.S.A., 1948
- Man of Aran*, Robert Flaherty, U.K., 1934
- Marjoe*, Howard Smith and Sarah Kernochan, U.S.A., 1972
- Masculine Mystique*, The, Giles Walker and John Smith (NFB), Canada, 1984
- Mental Mechanisms* (series), National Film Board of Canada, 1947-50
- Michael*, A Gay Son, Bruce Grawson, Canada, 1980
- Milhouse*, A White Comedy, Emile de Antonio, U.S.A., 1971
- Middletown* (series), collective, U.S.A., 1982
- Moana*, Robert Flaherty, U.S.A., 1926
- Mourir A Tue-Tête (A Scream From Silence)*, Anne-Claire Poirier (NFB), Quebec, 1979
- Nanook of the North*, Robert Flaherty, Canada/U.S.A., 1922
- Native Land*, Leo Hurwitz and Paul Strand (Frontier Films), 1942
- Night Mail*, Basil Wright and Harry Watt (G.P.O. Film Unit, Grierson, producer), 1936

- Ninety Days*, Giles Walker (NFB), Canada, 1985
- Not A Love Story: A Film About Pornography*, Bonnie Sherr Klein (NFB), Canada, 1981
- Not Crazy Like You Think*, Jacqueline Levitin, Quebec, 1984
- Painters Painting*, Emile de Antonio, U.S.A., 1973
- Passiflora*, Fernand Belanger and Dagmar Gueissaz (NFB), Quebec, 1985
- Paul Tomkowicz Street-Railway Switchman*, Roman Kroitor (NFB), Canada, 1954
- Pink Triangles*, Cambridge Documentary Films, U.S.A., 1982
- Portrait of Jason*, Shirley Clarke, U.S.A., 1967
- Portrait of the Artist—As an Old Lady*, Gail Singer (NFB), Canada, 1982
- Power and the Land*, Joris Ivens, U.S.A., 1940
- Primary*, Richard Leacock, U.S.A., 1960
- Prostitute*, Tony Garnett, U.K., 1979
- Pumping Iron*, Robert Fiore and George Butler, U.S.A., 1976
- Pumping Iron II: The Women*, George Butler, U.S.A., 1985
- Quebec-Haiti*, Tahani Rached (NFB), Quebec, 1985
- Queen, The*, Frank Simon, U.S.A., 1968
- Quel Numéro What Number?*, Sophie Bissonnette, Quebec, 1985
- Quiet One, The*, Sidney Meyers, U.S.A., 1949
- Rape*, Jo-Ann Elam, U.S.A., 1977
- Rate It X*, Lucy Winer and Paula de Koenigsberg, U.S.A., 1985
- Right Candidate for Rosedale, The*, Bonnie Sherr Klein (NFB), Canada, 1979
- Salesman*, Albert and David Maysles, U.S.A., 1969
- Seventeen*, J. De Mott and J. Kreines, U.S.A., 1982
- Shoah*, Claude Lanzmann, France, 1985
- Silent Pioneers*, Lucy Winer, U.S.A., 1984
- Soldier Girls*, Nick Broomfield, Joan Churchill, U.S.A., 1981
- Spanish Earth, The*, Joris Ivens, U.S.A., 1937
- Stop Making Sense*, Jonathan Demme, U.S.A., 1985
- Store, The*, Frederick Wiseman, U.S.A., 1983
- Storytelling*, Kay Armatage, Canada, 1984
- Strange Victory*, Leo Hurwitz, U.S.A., 1948
- Streetwise*, Martin Bell, Mary Ellen Mark, and Cheryl McCall, U.S.A., 1984
- Striptease*, Kay Armatage, Canada, 1980
- Three Songs of Lenin*, Dziga Vertov, U.S.S.R., 1934
- Times of Harvey Milk, The*, Richard Schmiechen and Rob Epstein, U.S.A., 1984

- Turtle Des Années Dures, La (The Ballad of Hard Times)*, Richard Boulet and Pascal Gélinas, Quebec, 1983
- Two Laws*, Carolyn Strachan, Australia, 1980
- Underground*, Emile de Antonio, U.S.A., 1976
- Union Maids*, Julia Reichert and James Klein, U.S.A., 1976
- Vie Est à Nous, La*, Jean Renoir and collective, France, 1936
- 24 (Vingt-Quatre) Heures Ou Plus*, Gilles Groulx (NFB), Quebec, 1972
- Waiting For Fidel*, Michael Rubbo, Canada (NFB), 1974
- War At Home, The*, Barry Brown and Glenn Silber, U.S.A., 1980
- Warrendale*, Allan King, Canada, 1967
- What Sex Am I?*, Lee Grant, U.S.A., 1984
- What You Take For Granted*, Michelle Citron, U.S.A., 1983
- When the Mountains Tremble*, Pamela Yates, Thomas Sigel, U.S.A., 1983
- Woodstock*, Michael Wadleigh, U.S.A., 1970
- Word Is Out*, Mariposa Film Collective, U.S.A., 1978

5. UN CERTAIN REGARD: Characterization in the First Years of the French New Wave

Bart Testa

I. ANTOINE

IN HIS CAREER PROFILE ON Jean Pierre L aud, James Monaco would like to argue a difference between the Hollywood star systems and the position of actors within the French *nouvelle vague*. The latter he sees as collaborators in a *cin ma des auteurs* rather than as merely performers in the movies. But once Monaco begins to discuss L aud's critical importance, he collapses any difference between the actor and a conventional movie star.¹

L aud is very closely identified with a single character, Antoine Doinel. Fran ois Truffaut introduced Antoine as the protagonist of his debut feature film, *The 400 Blows* (1959), when L aud was just 14, and reprised his hero three years later, in *Antoine et Colette* (1962), a short in the omnibus film, *Love at Twenty*. After six years, Antoine returned to *Stolen Kisses* (1968), *Bed and Board* (1970), and *Love on the Run* (1978) to complete a nearly twenty-year career on the screen. A few years after his first two Antoine roles—Monaco points out that L aud was between 15 and 19—the actor played roles in Jerzy Skolimowski's *Le D part* (1967) and for Jean-Luc Godard's *Masculine-Feminine* (1966), *La Chinoise* (1967), *Week-End* (1967), and *Le Gai Savoir* (1968). Truffaut also featured him in *Two English Girls* (1971) and *Day for Night* (1973). At about the same time, Bernardo Bertolucci cast him as the hapless rival of Marlon Brando in *Last Tango in Paris* (1972), and Jean Eustache made him the center of a stormy love triangle in *The Mother and the Whore* (1973).

Monaco believes these later films somewhat freed L aud from

Bart Testa

93

Antoine Doinel. In retrospect, however, it seems more likely that Godard, Skolimowski, Eustache, and Bertolucci deployed the actor as an already well-established type, the young French Everyman L aud had developed in *Antoine et Colette* and who had come of age in *Masculine-Feminine* and *Stolen Kisses*. Monaco goes on to make precisely this point when he praises L aud in this summary of his career:

As Antoine, Paul, Guillaume, Emile, Claude, Alphonse, Tom and Alexandre, he has created a subtle and various persona that explains much about his generation... He represents for many of us the actor surrogate, not portraying a whole gallery of strange, distant and objective characters... but rather illustrating our own deeper selves, subjectively holding the analytical mirror up to our natures.²

This encomium draws on one of the ways in which a movie star can be understood as a repeatable yet variable character who provides a body of films with a revealing and attractive type representative of a moment, class, or generation in the form of an individuality.³ Indeed, Monaco only draws out such an understanding with his further praise: "Like Bogart, he (L aud) has provided an ironic model which viewers of his films can use therapeutically within their own lives."⁴

While one might concede that L aud has not succeeded as a star in some respects—he does not seem to have crossed genres or national boundaries effectively—and that he has distinguished himself from many movie actors in being a *cin aste* (he worked as Godard's production assistant for a few years in the mid-sixties), it is hard to see how Monaco might maintain a fundamental distinction between this *nouvelle vague* actor and a conventional movie star. Yet, such a distinction can be drawn and maintained. However, to do so, we must shift our focus away from impressions of audience reception—and talk about L aud as "analytical mirror"—and over to ways that actors are constituted as characters in a *cin ma des auteurs* such as that of the French New Wave. Throughout this essay the often repeated critical generalization that the French cinema of the sixties uses actors mainly as characters