

9-2013

LSH 391.01B: Survey of African Cinema

Michel R. Valentin

University of Montana - Missoula, michel.valentin@umontana.edu

Let us know how access to this document benefits you.

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.umt.edu/syllabi>

Recommended Citation

Valentin, Michel R., "LSH 391.01B: Survey of African Cinema" (2013). *Syllabi*. 1756.
<https://scholarworks.umt.edu/syllabi/1756>

This Syllabus is brought to you for free and open access by the Course Syllabi at ScholarWorks at University of Montana. It has been accepted for inclusion in Syllabi by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks at University of Montana. For more information, please contact scholarworks@mso.umt.edu.

SURVEY OF WESTERN AFRICAN CINEMA—SEMESTER Fall 2013 UNIVERSITY OF MONTANA

MCLG 339—01-B/ FILM 381--01/ FRCH 339—01-B/ LSH. 391.01/ 3 credits// L.A. BLDG. 308

INSTRUCTOR: Dr. Michel VALENTIN--Professor of French.—

Contact Hours: MONDAY AND WEDNESDAY--Time: 15:10 to 18:00--Aug 26 to Dec. 13 2013.

Office: U.M. MCLL Dept. L.A. 322---Office phone: 243-2301---e-mail:

michel.valentin@umontana.edu

Office Hours: By appointment or Tuesday/ Thursday--12:10 to 13:00, or Monday/Wednesday--14: to 15:00.

COURSE GOAL and OUTCOMES:

Absorption of materials and information (diachronic survey of African cinema) accompanied by interpretation and evaluation of textual dimension of films (i.e., film as text) through the use of filmic critical theory (basically Lacanian inspired and Deleuzian filmic critical theory—for Deleuze, cinema is first and foremost a pre-verbal intelligible content—*pure semiotics*, while for a Lacanian-based critical reading, cinema deals with the sign as the signifier/symptom engaged by and engaging the three dimensions which constitute us as humans: the Real/ the Imaginary and the Symbolic).

The goals of this course are several: 1) to sensitize students to the portrayals of African life in African cinema 2) to place African cinema in the light of a colonial past and later post-colonial concerns, 3) to provide the vocabulary of cinematography and to show how cinema manipulates its meaning, and 4) to provide students with the critical acumen for analyzing African film on its own grounds.

Successful students should be able at the end of this course to : 1) describe filmic procedures and show how they effect targeted audiences , 2) critically analyze film within its social contexts, 3) understand the theoretical basis of multicultural studies as it pertains to film.

CLASS PROCEDURES

1) The Instructor will supply background information on the film to be seen and its filmmaker during lectures.

2) Showing of films. Students will view each film at least twice. A) Once in class—and B) another time by themselves (if possible before “official” designated showing in class)-
- *Three possibilities:* Students will view each film by themselves at a) *U.M. Mansfield Library.*

Half of Class-time is devoted to lectures, analysis of film sequences and discussion. During each film’s screening, students will take notes. Attending the any African movie shown by the UM French Club—please take notes during film screenings.

3) Students will prepare questions about each film and ask them during next class period. Instructor will answer questions.

4) The Instructor will evaluate films through *sequential analysis* and *film clips*—to point out salient features and characteristics of the film considered.

5) Students will identify the main points of the film, then practice *sequence outlining*: students will make an outline of the sequence, and for each scene, count the number of shots and describe the action in one sentence. For that purpose, students will form discussion groups that will also turn in every week group reports about each movie,

reporting their conclusions about the studied film: (*reason*: viewing, discussing and writing about each film will help students to focus on specifics and develop meaningful generalizations about each film.) Groups will discuss major aspects of film studied outside of class. Additional approaches can be used: for instance: Raymond Durgnat suggests studying the frozen image of a film next to a reminiscent painting or still photograph, and that next to the silenced sound, one may play relevant music or read a poem on a similar subject ("Towards Practical Criticism," *AFI (American Film Institute) Education Newsletter*—March-April 1981: 11)

6) Students will have the opportunity to discuss the outline and revise it as necessary (*goal*: to gain a better sense of shots, scenes, and sequences and to understand how they are combined to construct a film.

7) Students will turn group reports about selected study questions about each film and readings reports about selected published analysis of the movie and film maker in question (a list will be supplied—and more can be found on the *Internet* and/or at the *UM library*.) *Reason*: students will learn how to examine a published analysis of a film they know well and measure the criteria, ideas, assumptions, critical acumen of a published film analysis and compare theirs with the writer's.

9) *At the end of the course, students will turn in a ten page term paper* (last day of exam week), after having a) written and discussed with the Instructor, a detailed thesis statement and outline of the essay they plan to write, and submit it to the Instructor. The Instructor will return the marked thesis statement and outline.

→ Imperative is the need to write about cinema, to discuss its images with scruple and vigilance. Well written, adventurous papers are essential for success in this course.

Students then write their final term paper/essay - → *rationale*: to lead student through the process of thinking critically about a movie and then write meaningfully about it.

Course Description

This course intersects academic categories and topics such as Film, Media, Cultural Studies, French civilization and culture, colonialism, emigration, postmodernism.

Cinema is a social discourse, a presentation and representation. As such it is an ideology. This course examines how the new and young cinema of newly independent West African nations strove to deal with the colonial legacy, offset and change the negative iconic portrayal of colonized and subaltern populations in films produced from the thirties to the sixties in the West and especially in France, and in their former West African and Maghrebine colonies. These films not only examine France's colonial past, which until recently has remained obfuscated, but also problematize key postmodern questions such as those revolving around the concept of ethnic/religious/national/sexual identity linked to the larger contemporary issues of race/ racism, ethnicity, sexuality as well as class (exploitation) and gender. The connecting thread that links all the films enumerated here is the resistance and survival portrayed of individuals and groups of different races or ethnic origins and the struggle to forge/portray a new identity.

At one level, we will concentrate on cinema as a language, an ideological discourse that aims to provide a critical exploration. At another level, we will analyze how the selected films erase/subvert the colonial or neo-colonial problematic representations of subjected cultures and races (what is called "minorities" in the ex-colonial power) on the screen. We will also

investigate the epistemology of resistance and identity in films produced within the “Francophone” countries specified above.

The course will follow a diachronic approach: History of African cinema (survey) along lines of chronological development to give a certain historical and political perspective of the medium and bring out the specificity of African cinema.

Survey of African Cinema will also focus on moments that break the lines of narrative cinema from within the structures, patterns and figures that catalyze our will and desire to associate film and story (viewer’s suture). One of the effects will be addressing our eyes to the material forms that hold our attention, dictate (to the point of constituting it) our desire, and promote the institution of cinema as a certain ideology. We shall determine what is at stake in viewing film as a text of mobile, kinetic surfaces of meaning and energy, examining the major positions and issues in film theory and criticism from an historical perspective.

Topics will cover approaches such as aesthetic theory, formalism, and post-structuralist positions: especially feminist and psychoanalytic explanations. Rather than simply following the convention of the medium history for each period of study, too easily and traditionally labeled (“surrealism of the 20s, grand narrative of the 30s, new wave of the 50s, and post-new wave...”), we will test the force of a cinema theory to the degree that an analytical gesture will not be just an act of interpretation. It will give access to what is considered fundamental in the art work. Theory use takes the viewer off from its passive/receptive stand and stance and gives her/him an active role of “scripteur/trice” /decipherer of these modern icons and hieroglyphs constituted by filmic images. Some films unravel the very culture that produced them. With others, one has to read them “against their grain”, i.e., to make them unravel the culture that made them, in spite of themselves so to speak: questions and tactics of critical or semiotic reading, because films (like any other textual surface) have an ‘unconscious’ way of withholding critical and crucial information (tropes of *matter abscondita*.) In order to understand a work of art, (and a motion picture), one has to recognize its rhythms and forms (a film is first and foremost a movement, i.e., a rhythm, i.e., a sequenced time period/frame. The point is also to recognize and deconstruct (Derridean meaning the culture that informed those forms.) The making of a film is not a mimetic, one-way, univocal representation of reality. Making a film consists in selecting/ choosing / privileging certain things (sequences, images, frames, rhythms...) and integrating them within a certain dynamic process.

In this course, a film will be considered as neither a transparent discourse rendering (mimetic of) reality (*mimesis*) nor a technological invention producing a (better) reality, but as a **production** involving a work, a practice, a transformation (metamorphosis) on, and of, the available discourses. We will focus on the ways a film as a discursive practice (discourse) relates to the speaking/viewing subject. The discourse of criticism will answer (and sometimes challenge) the film-text discourse. This answer may displace the combinations of words/images set by the film in the *diegesis*¹, in regard the audience, i.e., the positions/oppositions between “*the*

¹ In **diegesis** the author *tells* the story. S/he is the narrator himself who presents to the audience or the readership his or his characters' thoughts and all that is in his or their imagination, their fantasies and dreams. *Diegesis* has been contrasted since Plato's and Aristotle's times with *mimesis*, the form that is *showing* rather than *telling* the thoughts or the inner processes of characters, by external action and acting. *Diegesis*, however, is the main narrative in fiction and drama, the *telling* of the story by the author, in that he speaks to the reader or the audience directly. He may speak through his characters or may be the *invisible narrator* or even the *all-knowing narrator* who speaks from above in the form of commenting on the action or the characters. *Diegesis* may concern elements, such as characters, events and things within the main or *primary* narrative. However, the author may include elements which are not

enunciated" and "*the enunciation*" --notion of *deixis*--, the subject/object/language triadic summits, the audience/film dichotomy, the way a film "addresses," (seduces, simulates a certain reality to, or wants to pass as reality to) its audience... This is called the *semiotics* of film practice (notion of *seme*). The practices that articulate the different elements in the filmic discourses constitute a film text having certain political effects. One of the goals will be to try to find them out.

From this echoes the *dialectics* of film-work: films also have their unconscious discourse; i.e., an incising of film, body and discourse, a squaring away of the lines of frame, a re-writing of the genre where viewing off-sets the rapport of force which the filmic mechanisms imposes on us, the viewers. Problems will be localized in their own space of production. We shall undertake studies of the modes and effects of movements of meaning in the mechanism of cinema. We say mechanism since not only the apparatus includes machines producing the film and its projection in a movie-theatre (Claudine Eizykman calls it the N.R. I. = *forme narrative représentative-industrielle* or "*representational narrative industrial form*" typical of Hollywood cinema for instance), but also because of the "mechanics" of the imaginary (or technologies of symbolization, of engendering identification, gender and otherness, i.e. *jouissance* --extreme pleasure--for instance: Eizykman calls it the *jouissance-cinéma*— "*cinema-“enjoyment”form.*) Already iconized in/by the culture, these forms are *reified* by the cinema-machine and the spectator responds with his/her psychic mechanism according to the way movies interpellate (Althusserian meaning) him/her, to which s/he answers by producing various systems of meaning. To what extent we can designate the ideology of film—how it will control the perception of the viewer—by problematizing the activity of the spectator as an *interferent* (or what one critic might have designated a "cacographer"--Tom Conley's expression) will be a question of import in our approach. The stakes involve pressure of discourse placed upon the films we choose to see, abandonment of the habit of viewing associated with narrative pleasure or generally the non-cinematographic properties of the medium. For this reason, the virtuality of filmic theory will command our interest throughout the semester. Methodology (critical discourse on the film art) helps construct models of how filmic artefacts work, by intervening between the film-maker and his/her subject (and often not consciously), and between the viewer and the movie watched. Critical discourses help shape thoughts into more than that kind of "petty bourgeois" subjectivism, where the reductionist appeal to the sheer intelligence of the film-maker, the sphere of mere individual impressions, or the self-indulgent satisfaction of the viewer, become the only criterion of value justifying the viewer response. Criticism will help us understand the world of cinema in more meaningful and rich ways: how things inter-relate, how relationships function. How a culture relates to the *death-drive*, *otherness*, women, male unrest, or art. Critical discourses point towards shapes of patterns, taken as a whole, and the elements of which are to be examined, and the relationships of which with other wholes, are to be investigated. Theory (critical thinking, methodology...) offers unique vantage points of view from which miscellaneous concerns and features are highlighted:

intended for the primary narrative, such as stories within stories; characters and events that may be referred to elsewhere or in historical contexts and that are therefore outside the main story and are thus presented in an *extradiegetic* situation. In **film**, *diegesis* is the narrative that includes all the parts of the story that are not actually shown on the screen, such as events that have led up to the present action; people who are being talked about; or events that are presumed to have happened elsewhere; in fact, all the frames, spaces and actions not focused on visually in the film's main narrative. Music in films is termed *diegetic music* if it is part of the narrative of the film, such as the story of a musician's life, or the story of a particular piece of music. However, music is *non-diegetic*, if it consists of mere *background*.

they provide conventions for organizing experience into patterns of meaning. Because art, social expressions, forms of human activity (i.e., texts) are better apprehended by means of conceptual model or frameworks. Art differentiates the undifferentiated.

Films weave the multi threads of the textual tapestry into one. But obviously, not all movies are the same. Moreover, there is a difference in the production intention of films. In spite of what certain critical trends want us to believe, there are still major differences between a Hollywood, or foreign movie, made primary for the mass-market, for entertainment's sake (the multiplexes audience), a personal film, an art film, or a film essay—might it be a foreign movie or a non-Hollywood, or independent film. The films belonging to the second category (the so-called “serious category”) beg to be pulled apart, thought, and rethought. They want you to be a “super-reader” with all your emotions at the ready. Not that one cannot do that to an entertainment type flick (as for instance, Marxist or psychoanalytical criticism do, because films as mass cultural products are often unconsciously motivated, and, also, high-brow art and popular art tend to mix their affects and effects in postmodern cultures), but mere entertainment doesn't seem to suggest that you must do that—on the contrary! You can just be drawn in, identify with the characters, experience self-recognition and re-assurance, univoquely answer the call of ideological interpellation, and be left wanting (especially if you are used to watch *art films*) or contently resolved in the end.

Primarily commercial cinema is about losing oneself, perhaps. *Art films* are often very poetic and are not inaccessible, contrary to public opinion. Poetry is often of primary importance for these type of films and they often intend to leave the audience restless, equivocal, displaced... While the *diegesis* of many commercial pop movies is only motivated by suspense, action, and speed, *art films* (classics also for that matter) are driven by other forces. You have to look for/find meaning(s), even when there seem to may be none. You have to see the ways films mirror and perform what the mind must do, what it is wired to do, its restlessness and drive and you have to analyze and sum things up, to look for the intent in every movement, image, shots, sequences of images, phrase, and to assign meaning even when and where it lurks (heuristic, hermeneutic dimension of criticism). It is perhaps what “the film essence is” or should be. This approach is to be applied to all movies watched. And applicable it is.

Also noteworthy, is the growing heterogeneity of the audience. Audience filmic tastes and consumerist preferences are more and more dependent not only upon socio-economic and class status, but also on ethnic, religious, sexual orientations, which do not necessarily coincide with more traditional categories such as class.

A cinema which is not primarily commercial wants to reverse the priorities which make people conform and capitulate to objects and address the order of love and alienation which govern us all. Our age, the postmodern age, is an age of anxiety. According to Susan Sonntag (*Against Interpretation*, p. 39), art is a way of overcoming or transcending the world, which is also a “*way of encountering the world, and of training or educating the will to be in the world,*” where, in spite of romantic will and hope, style seems to matter less than habit or code. Style seems more and more subordinated to questions of structure.

Criticism is therefore an invaluable mediator between immediate experience and the larger conceptual categories giving structure and meaning to life, since ideology takes root in the same soil as our visual perception of the world around us. Our way of seeing is linked with the realms of Imaginary and *Symbolic* relationships (Lacanian psychoanalytic theories). Students should be able at the end of the course to have 1) a general idea of the development of French cinema; 2) some insights into the reasons why certain patterns in the selection and arrangements of images afford pleasure, 3) and to have some ideas if that pleasure is innocent (with the

dependent aesthetic problems and questions) and does bear necessary and variable relation to ideology; (images-aesthetics- ideology): i.e. how to learn to see signs where there appears to be only natural and obvious meaning; 4) some understanding of the relation between the cinema and other images and the exploitation at the heart of our economic system; 5) some comprehension as to how our consent to this exploitation is solicited, engaged, elicited (our affects, i.e., our positions we occupy as viewers), and how images are used to mask or attenuate the experience of oppression in all its forms.

Student Approach and Work

- 1) The Instructor will supply background information on the film to be seen and its filmmaker during lectures.
- 2) **Showing of films.** Students will view each film at least twice. A) Once in class—and B) another time by themselves (if possible before “official” designated showing in class)— *Three possibilities:* Students will view each film by themselves at a) *U.M. IMS* screening rooms where they will sign up their names after each film (showings in mornings or evenings—see scheduled times; b) in the Foreign Languages Lab—LA. 101—see posted times; c) and at home (videos only of course)—*Crystal Video* has a good selection of the course movies.
Half of Class-time is devoted to lectures, sequences analyzing and film discussions. *During each film’s screening, students will take notes.*
- 3) Students will prepare questions about each film and ask them during next class period. Instructor and students will answer questions.
- 4) The Instructor will be doing the following: with the students, description/ discussion leading/ evaluation of films through *sequential analysis* and *film clips*—sequential showings and re-showings and pointing out of salient features and characteristics of the film considered.
- 5) Students will identify the main point of the film, then practice *sequence outlining*: students make an outline of the sequence, and for each scene, count the number of shots and describe the action in one sentence. For that purpose, students will form discussion groups that will also turn in every week group reports about each movie, reporting their conclusions about the studied film: (*reason*: seeing, discussing and writing about each film, will help students to focus on specifics and develop meaningful generalizations about each film.) Groups will discuss major aspects of film studied outside of class. Additional approaches can be used: for instance: Raymond Durnat suggests to study the frozen image of a film next to a reminiscent painting or still photograph, and that next to the silenced sound, one may play relevant music or read a poem on a similar subject (“Towards Practical Criticism,” *AFI (American Film Institute) Education Newsletter*—March-April 1981: 11)
- 6) Students will have the opportunity to discuss the outline and revise it as necessary (*goal*: to gain a better sense of shots, scenes, and sequences and to understand how they are combined to construct a film.
- 7) Then comparison of similarities and differences between American movies and African movies of the corpus.
- 8) Students will turn group reports about selected study questions about each film and readings reports about selected published analysis of the movie and film maker in question (a list will be supplied—and more can be found on the *Internet* and/or at the *UM library*.) *Reason*: students will learn how to examine a published analysis of a film they know well and measure the criteria, ideas, assumptions, critical acumen of a published film analysis and compare theirs with the writer’s.
- 9) *At the end of the course, students will turn in a ten pages term paper* (last day of exam week), after having a) written and discussed with the Instructor, a detailed thesis statement and

-
- Audio-Vision: Sound on Screen. Michel Chion. Columbia U Press.1990
 - A Semiotics of the Cinema: Film Language. Christian Metz. Oxford U Press. 1974
 - Questions of Cinema. Stephen Heath. Indiana U. Press.1981.
 - Aesthetics of Film. Jaques Aumont, Alain Bergala, Michel Marie, Marc Vernet. U. of texas Press. 1994.
 - Visual and Other Pleasures. Laura Mulvey. Indiana U. Press. 1989.
 - Film Theory Goes to the Movies. Edited by Jim Collins, Hilary Radner, and Ava Preacher Collins. Routledge.1993
 - * Authorship and Narrative in the Cinema: Issues in Contemporary Aesthetics. William Luhr and Peter Lehman. Putnam's Sons. 1977
 - Tracking the Signifier. Theoretical Essays: film, linguistics, literature. Colin MacCabe. U. Minnesota Press.

In French:

Sembène Ousmane: cinéaste. Présence Africaine. Paris. 1972.

- Cinéma D'Afrique Noire Francophone: L'Espace Miroir. André Gardies. L'Harmattan, Paris,1989.
- Le Cinéma colonial: de l'Atlantide à Lawrence d'arabie. Pierre Boulanger. Cinéma 2000/Seghers. 1975
- L'Afrique fait son cinéma: Regards et perspectives sur le cinema africain francophone. Françoise Naudillon, Janusz Przychodzen et Sathya Rao. Mémoire d'Encrier. Québec,Canada. 2006.
- L'Esthétique du Film. J. Aumont, A. Bergala, M. Marie, M. Vernet.
- 50 Ans de Cinéma Français. René Prédal. Nathan. 1996
- Esthétique et Psychologie du Cinéma. (2 volumes). Jean Mitry. Ed. Universitaires. 1965
- La Jouissance-Cinéma. Claudine Eizykman. 10/18.

Only a selection of the following **Films (will be) Screened** :

- 1) The Lumière Brothers (first films ever made) –1895.
- 2) George Méliès (1861-1938): Un Voyage dans la lune (A Trip to the Moon)—1902.
Tarzan the Ape Man (1932)/ Tarzan films with Johny Weissmuller
Luis Bunuel (1900-1974) –Dali (1904- 1989) : * Un Chien Andalou (Andalusian Dog)—1928--24 min. //
1927// Bunuel (1900—1974)//Dali (1904- 1989): L'Age d'or (The Golden Age)—1930.

Alain Resnais (1922-) : Nuit et Brouillard (Night and Fog)—1955//

Alain Resnais and Marguerite Duras (1914-1966): Hiroshima mon amour (Hiroshima my love)—1959//

Sydney Pollack (1934--) : Out of Africa (1985)

Claire Denis (1948-) : Chocolat—1989. Caroline Link () : Nowhere in Africa. --2001--(Germany).

Julien Duvivier (1896-1967) : Pepe le Moko (1936) Mathieu Kassovitz () : La Haine (Hate)—1995.

J. P. Bekolo (1966-) : Quartier Mozart—1992--Cameroon.

Moussa Sene Absa (1958--): Madame Brouette (Mrs Wheelbarrow)--(2000)—Senegal

Ossie Davis (1917-2005) : Kongi's Harvest (1970).

Benoît Lamy—Belgium-- (1945--) & Mweze Ngangura (1950--) : La vie est belle (1987)—Democratic Republic of Congo
 Saddick Balewa () : Kasarmu Ce (1991).
 Dani Kouyaté (1961--) : Keïta ! (1995)—Burkina Fasso.
 Sarah Maldoror () : Sambizanga (1972) —France/Angola.
 Jamie Uys (1921-1996) : The Gods must be crazy. (1980)—South Africa
 Ingrid Sinclair () : Flame (1996).
 Euzhan Palcy () : A Dry White Season (1989). France/Guadeloupe.
 Oliver Schmitz (1960--) and Thomas Mogotlane () : Mapantsula (1988)—South Africa..
 Ramadan Suleman () : Fools. (1997)—South Africa.
 Cheick Oumar Sissoko (1945--) : Finzan (1990). Guimba The Tyrant (1995)/ Yeelen --Mali.
 Mahamat-Saleh Haroun () : Bye Bye Africa.(1999). Abouna (2002)—Chad.
 Raoul Peck () : Lumumba : Death of a Prophet (1991) / Lumumba (fiction film) (2002) / Sometimes in April—(2005)—Haïti.
 Gillo Pontecorvo (1919—2006) : Battle of Algiers. (1966—Italy/A Igeria).
 Idrissa Ouedraoggo () : Yaaba (1989). Kini & Adams (1997)—Burkina Faso..
 Deba N'Daye () : Saaraba (1988)—VT 03099
 Jean-Marie Teno () : Clando (1966).--Cameroon.
 Mohamed Camara's Dakan (1997).--Guinea (Conakry).
 Ousmane Sembene (1925 --2007): Borom Sarret (1963). La Fille Noire (*Black Girl*) (1966) / Emitai (VT11783) –1969 . Xala (1974) . Mandabi (1968)—VT 09883. Faat Kine (2000); Mooladé (2004)—Senegal.
 Joseph Gai's Karmen Gei (2001). –Senegal.
 Moussa Sene Absa () : Tableau Ferraille (1997); Madame Brouette (2002)—Senegal.
 Flora Gomes () : The Blue Eyes of Yonta (1992). –Guinea (Conakry).
 Abderrhamane Sissako () : Life on earth (2000)/ Waiting for Happiness (2002)—Mauritania.
 Mark Dornford-May () : U-Carmen ekhayelitsha (2002)----South Africa.
 Djibril Diop Mambéty () : Touki Bouki : The Journey of the Hyena. (1973)—Senegal.
 John Berry () : Boesman & Lena (2000)—France/ South Africa.
 Issa Serge Coelo () : Daresalam (2000)—Chad.

European Reactions and African Diaspora (multicultural « Frenchness »):

Mehdi Charef's Le thé au Harem d'Arch Ahmed (1984); Claire Denis's J'ai pas sommeil (1994); Thomas Gilou's Black Mic Mac (1988); Coline Serreau's Romuald et Juliet (1988); Brigitte Rouan's Outremer (1990); Mathieu Kassovitz's Café au lait (1993) and La Haine (1995); Dridi Karem's Bye-Bye (1995); Luc and Jean Pierre Dardenne's La Promesse (1996);

NB:

Students will have to watch movies on their own, besides during the regularly scheduled class-room screening time or they can watch some of the video tapes or D.V.D.s of the assigned movies (the UM Mansfield Library video) and screen it on their own a second time **at least.**

SCHEDULE OF CLASSES

AUGUST

I st WEEK

MONDAY 26

Intro

The Colonial legacy

Tarzan (excerpts) (version of Carl Schenkel/

1998 version of Edgar Rice Burroughs's

Tarzan novels and early Hollywood movies)

1995)

The negative (standardized/ naturalized) images

Death of colonial representation, of the "other"
from the beginning.ⁱThe Snows of Kilimanjaro (Henry King—1952) from E. Hemingway's novel.The African Queen (John Huston—1951) // Mountains of the Moon (Bob Rafelson—1989)

a) The Lumières Brothers: 1895

Sun)

b) George Méliès 1861-1938: Le Voyage dans la Lune: 1902/ A Trip to the Moon.)Heart of Darkness (from Conrad's novel) <=> To oppose to Zulu (Cy Endfield—1964)-----
SEPTEMBER

IInd Week

MONDAY 2

LABOR DAY: NO CLASS**African De-Colonization: The Struggle: A double goal: How to de-colonize -> which model to follow: political resistance and liberationist movements/ re-appropriation of African images...**

From "art pompier," photography (invented by

Nicéphore Niepce—1826 and Daguerre--1838), chronophotography (Marey—1830-1904)

realist or naturalist novelistic narrative to moving pictures (invented by the The Auguste and

Louis Before 1907-> French cinema considered as extension or derivative of photography

(invented by Niepce and) After 1907, French cinema produces fiction films and became well

established by 1908-1909> emergence of monopolistic capitalist industries of the spectacle and

invention of a filmic critical discourse.Lumières Brothers--1862-1954//1864-1948) and George

Méliès (1861-1938):

The two poles of filmic fantasy/ realism re-production) > From reproduction to production.

Reflections on cinema.

Silent Cinema (*le cinéma muet*)

Luis Buñuel (1900—1974)//

Salvador Dali (1904- 1989): L'Age d'or (The Golden Age)—1930

AC : Preface + 1—46 (Decolonizing Thoughts)

BAC : Intro + 21-58

Screenings: Sembene's Borom Sarret (1964)Sembene's Emittai 1969Mandabi (1968) //FAF : 33--47 (Ousmane Sembene)-----
IIIrd Week:

MONDAY 9

WEDNESDAY 11

Screenings: Sembene's Mandabi. (1968)Sembene's Mooladé (2004)--

BAC:Francophone Origins & Anglophone Film Production (59-165)

FAF: Africa through a woman's eyes (185-193)-----
IVth Week: **THE 1929 CRISIS**: Invention of the Sound Track.

MONDAY 16

WEDNESDAY 18

Iconicity and

WEDNESDAY 28

Notions of Gaze/ Iconicity/ Master Code

Master Signifier/ Identity/ Desire

Opposition: Congo (Frank Marshall/Congo: White King, Red Rubber, Black

(Peter Bates / U.K./Belguim—2004)

Tutor-Code. Djibril Diop's Touki Bouki: *The Journey of the Hyena*. (1973)

Screenings: Impressionism & Imperialism: Abel Gance (1889-1981) *Napoléon*—1927 (excerpts.)

* Sembene's *Xala* (1974)

BAC: *Cultural Context of Black African Cinema* (166-245)

AC: *Closing your Eyes* (72-81)

Vth Week

MONDAY 23

WEDNESDAY 25

Screenings: Uys: *The gods must be crazy*. (1980—South Africa)

Raoul

Peck's *Lumumba* (2000—Haïti) AC: *Reference to the Past* (47—71) *Opening the cracks in Identity* (82-108)

SEPTEMBER/OCTOBER

VIth Week: **Heritage, Authenticity, Neocolonialism and Lyric Flavor.**

MONDAY 30

WEDNESDAY 2

AC: *An Openness of Approach /Narration* (109-181) FAF: *Deconstructing Contextual Space* (89-155)

Screenings: Sissak : *Waiting for Happiness* (2002—Mauritania)

Haroun : *Abouna*. (2002-

Chad)

VIIth Week:

MONDAY 7

WEDNESDAY 9

Screenings: Dornford-May : *U-Carmen Ekyayelitsha* (2002—South Africa)

Sissoko :

Guimba the Tyrant

(<Bizet's *Carmen*)

(1995—Mali)

AC : *If your son gis no improvement on silence/ Language* (183-218)

MID-TERM

VIIIth Week: **MAGICO-REALISM:**

MONDAY 14

WEDNESDAY 16

Screenings: Absa : *Tableau Ferraille*

Absa : *Madame Brouette*

(name of a Dakar's suburb--1997—Senegal)

(2002—Senegal)

IXth Week: **THE SCREEN OF ABSENCE**

MONDAY 21

WEDNESDAY 23

Screenings: Denis *Chocolat*

Link: *Nowhere in Africa*

(1989—France)

(2001-Germany)

Xth Week:

MONDAY 28

WEDNESDAY 30

(=the Inward Turn of Cinema and Narrative: the Economies of the *Avant-Garde* and Modern Capital: The Body of the Subject as Merchandise and Commodity and The Mother and Delinquency.

=> films to be decided

NOVEMBER

XIth Week

MONDAY 4

WEDNESDAY 6

Turn in: Quiz. Screenings: Alain Resnais (1922 -):

G. Pontecorvo: *The Battle of*

Algiers (1966-Algeria/Italy) Alain Resnais: *Nuit et Brouillard (Night and Fog)* 1955—France. R.

Peck: *Sometimes in April* (2005—Haïti)

1. 12

XIIth Week
MONDAY 11

VETERANS DAY (NO CLASS)

WEDNESDAY 13

Duvivier: Pepe le Moko (1936—France)

XIIIth Week:

MONDAY 18

WEDNESDAY 20

BAC: *New Developments in Black African Cinema*
& *Whither African Cinema?*

(246-311) + AC: III: *Black Prospects*

(221-290)

Screenings: Sissako: Life on Earth (2000-Mauritania)

Coelo: Daresalam (2000-Chad)

XIVth Week

MONDAY 25

WEDNESDAY 27: THANKSGIVING VACATION

MORE TRIANGULATION ABOUT THE DIFFICULTY OF WOMAN'S SPACE AND LANGUAGE... THE IMPOSSIBILITY OF THE SEXUAL RELATION BETWEEN HUMAN BEINGS: LACAN AND LIBIDINAL ECONOMY → Representing the *Sexual Impasse*

Screenings: Sissoko: Finzan (1990-Mali)

Sembene: Mooladé (2004-Senegal)

DECEMBER

XVth Week:

MONDAY 2

WEDNESDAY 4

OTHER IMAGES AND IMAGES OF THE OTHER (S): THE COLONIAL IMAGE AND FRANCOPHONE CINEMA// POSTMODERN LINES OF FLIGHT OR NOMADIC LIVES: The Raw, The Cooked... and the culinary triangle (Lévi-Strauss)

Sembene Xala (1974--Senegal)

D.D. Mambety: Touki Bouki (1973--Senegal)

XVIth WEEK OF FINAL EXAMS

(Final paper due: Thursday DECEMBER 14—hard copy only please)

Last meeting of the class during final exam week: (..... DEC 10 2013)

=====

NOTES:

ⁱ **Tarzan**, a fictional character created by Edgar Rice Burroughs (USA—1875--1950), first appeared in the 1912 novel *Tarzan of the Apes*, and then in twenty-three sequels. He is the son of a British Lord and Lady who were marooned on the West coast of Africa by mutineers. Tarzan's parents died when he was an infant, and he was raised by the Mangani, Great Apes of a species unknown to science. Kala is his ape mother. Tarzan (White-skin) is his ape name; his English name is John Clayton, Lord Greystoke (according to Burroughs; Earl of Greystoke in later, non-canonical sources, notably the 1984 movie *Greystoke*). As a young adult, he meets Jane Porter who, with others of her party, including her father, is marooned at exactly the same spot on the African coast where Tarzan's parents were marooned roughly twenty years earlier. When she returns to America, he leaves the jungle in search of her, his one true love. In later books, Tarzan and Jane marry and he lives with her for a time in England. They have one son, Jack, who takes the ape name Korak the Killer. Tarzan is contemptuous of the hypocrisy of civilization, and he and Jane return to Africa where, both being immortal, they still live.