

THE MAGHREBI CHARACTER IN FRENCH CINEMA: FROM EXTERNAL COLONIAL TO INTERNAL POSTCOLONIAL SUBJECT

Mourad El Fahli

Faculty of Letters, Fès, Sais

The Maghrebi character has been present in French cinema since its inception in 1895. Lumière Brothers shot a number of shorts in North Africa, a space that will be rewritten and transmogrified in colonial cinema of the 1930s, following the logic of a “clear organization of the world into discrete, mappable spaces that were relatively unambiguously positioned within a global hierarchy.” (Elizabeth, 2007: 28) After decolonization, France would host a number of Maghrebi immigrants either as workers in factories and farms, or in the Algerian case, Harki members⁽¹⁾ who fled the prosecutions of FLN (Front National de Liberation). This presence on French soil resulted in discrimination, racism and exclusive policies (Hargreaves, 1995). The marginal situation of Maghrebi immigrants in France made them the focus in the 1960s and 1970s of some militant French filmmakers such as Yves Boisset and Michel Drach, who visualized the hardships of immigrants. Yet, it is Maghrebi immigrants and beur filmmakers that emphasize the Maghrebi, not as an outsider victim but internal other who lives at the margin of society. This marginalization and exclusion remind us of the colonial discourse, where the Maghrebi are always colonial subjects, external in the case of colonial cinema and internal in the case of their presence in France. Such continuity of colonial discourse led French-Maghrebi filmmakers to adopt a postcolonial flashpoint to problematize the absolutist configuration of space.

This article is divided into four sections: In section one, the study provides a detailed examination of the Maghrebi as a colonial subject. Two colonial films will be dissected: *La Bandera* in 1935 and *Pépé le Moko* in 1937. Section two looks at the emergence in the 1970s and 80s of the Maghrebi immigrant as a victim in some militant films such as *The Three*

(1) *Harki* (adjective from the Arabic *harka*, standard Arabic *haraka* “war party” or “movement”, i.e., a group of volunteers, especially soldiers) is the generic term for Muslim Algerians who served as auxiliaries in the French Army during the Algerian War from 1954 to 1962. The phrase sometimes extends to cover all Algerian Muslims who supported the French presence in Algeria during this war. In France, the term is used to designate the *Franco-musulmans rapatriés* (“repatriated French Muslims”) community living in the country since 1962, and its metropolitan born descendants. In this sense, the term *Harki* now refers to a distinct ethnocultural group, i.e. French Muslims, distinct from other French of Algerian origin or Algerians living in France.

Cousins (René Vautier), *Mektoub* (1970) (Ali Ghalem), *Soleil O* (1969) (Med Hondo) *Immigrant Nationality* (1970) (Sidney Sokhona) and *The Ambassadors* (1975) (Naceur Ktari) . The third section examines the image of the “other” as a delinquent and the perpetuation of this image in more recent cinema, particularly in films like *Police* (Maurice Pialat) and *Banlieue 13* (Patrick Alessandrin). The last section examines the role played by young male filmmakers of Maghrebi origins in the problematization of French national space and identity, through an emphasis on French internal other and a “fractured space”. Unlike their predecessors who mainly focused on social and political problems, *beur* filmmakers were haunted with the question of identity. This analysis of the Maghrebi figure in different film practices, ranging from colonial to beur cinema aims to provide an understanding of how this character has been articulated in French cinema.

Maghrebi as a Colonial Subject: Presence/Absence

The Maghrebi figure has been a major component of French cinema since its debut. Les Frères Lumière shot a number of films such as *Le Chevrier Marocain* (1895) in North Africa. French colonial cinema centered its narrative on colonial space, providing French spectators with phantasmagoric and sensual images of North Africa. In the words of Dina Sherzer, French filmmakers presented the colonies “Territories waiting for European initiatives, virgin land where the white man with helmet and boots regenerated himself or was destroyed by alcoholism, malaria, or native women. They displayed the heroism of French men, along with stereotypical images of desert, dunes, and camels, and reinforced the idea that the other is dangerous [...] they contributed to the colonial spirit and temperament of conquest and to the construction of white identity and hegemony”. (Sherzer, 1996:4)

This orientalist visualization of the Maghreb did not only seek to vilify the other but to empower the French working class in a period of tremendous changes in the empire. What distinguishes the colonial period from its postcolonial counterpart is that Maghrebis in the former are not immigrants (in the literal sense) but owners of the land rendered strangers and immigrants in their own environment through exclusion and violence. They are metaphorically what Ella Shohat and Robert Stam called the “tropes of empire,” particularly that of “terra incognita,” (Shohat & Stam: 1994) in the sense that most of French colonial films (French films shot in north Africa during the colonial period) represented the colonial space as an empty space to be “penetrated” and mapped by the colonial power, hence, justifying the colonial “civilizing mission.” This gendered image is better articulated in *La*

Bandera (1935), a film by Julian Duvivier (1896-1967), a French filmmaker who shot several films in North Africa namely, *Les Cinqs Gentlemen Maudits* (1931), and *Pépé le Moko* (1937). It is the latter film that brought the filmmaker to popularity and success through a contract with Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer. In 1938, one year after the release of *Pépé le Moko*, American filmmaker John Cromwell made its remake *Casbah* (1938).

La Bandera, which is based on a novel by Pierre Mac Orlan, narrates the story of Pierre Gilieth, who after committing a murder in France, flees to Spain, where, he is recruited in La Bandera, a legionnaire Legion that is set to fight the rebels in Northern Morocco then called, Spanish Morocco. In a café in the north of Morocco, Pierre falls in love with Aicha whom he married in the presence of all his friends. Pierre discovers later that Lucas, a soldier in *La Bandera* (1935), knows about his past and wants to capture him to get the reward. Pierre died in the battlefield.

Beneath the simple story of a fugitive lie the foundations of a colonial discourse, particularly the trope of the “virgin land”. Such virginity is literally translated via mise-en-scene. The film juxtaposes two main, discrete, mappable, antonymic spaces, that of the colonizer and that of the colonized. While the former is constructed as a highly populated space, the latter is represented as an empty virgin land. To use Deleuze’s (1986) term, most of the shots in Spain are “saturated” with people walking, dancing, eating, trading on, and singing. The soundtrack further suggests a dynamic cultural life through Flamenco and traditional Spanish music. Conversely, in the colony, the shot becomes culturally and ethnically “rarified”, as Deleuze (1986) would put it, since all we see are the legionnaires while the natives are absent from the shot. Even in the battlefield we do not see the natives, but we only hear the sound of their weapons. From this perspective, the colony is constructed as an empty-deserted-virgin space ready to be populated, saturated and penetrated by the colonizer. The only place where we see some “natives” is the “Moorish Café”, where Gilieth meets Aicha. Ironically, most of the “natives” in this café are women, except the two male musicians, one is shot from the back, and the other is black. Yet, it is the women that control everything in the Café. Aicha, the dancer in the Café, is introduced as a snake, which is suggested in her dance as she tries to seduce Gilieth (Figure 1). This narrative strategy of a native woman enmeshing a European man became the underlying formula in colonial legionnaire films that constructed the oriental woman as “seductress” (Sherzer, 1996: 3)



Figure 1: Aicha trying to seduce Pierre with her dance in *La Bandéra* (1935)

Pépé le Moko, the film that brought Duvivier to popularity, is about Pépé le Moko, a gangster trapped in the medina of Algiers. For years, the police try fruitlessly to catch him. His encounter with Gaby, a beautiful French woman, awakened in him a feeling of nostalgia for Paris. The film ends with Pépé stabbing himself after being arrested by Slimane, a native policeman. *Pépé le Moko* (1937) suggests another spatial reading that also serves to justify colonial power. Space in this film is extremely saturated. The first scene opens with a police officer describing the Casbah through a map (the use of the map in colonial cinema is analyzed below). This place is described as a labyrinth (Figure 2), as suggested by the use of high angle revolving shots, that hosts Chinese, Kabylies, gypsies, slaves, blacks, Sicilians, Spaniards, thieves and prostitutes of all ages. The Casbah is, thus, constructed as a timeless phantasmagorical space that represents France's other. While France represents rationality and progress, the Casbah is a symbol of chaos, disorder and irrationality. Such irrationality is implied by the metaphor of a labyrinth, with no center; hence the need to rationalize and organize this space by colonial power.



Figure 2: Casbah as labyrinth in *Pépé le Moko* (1937)

The racial diversity of the Casbah as represented in the film makes of it a space without proprietor; everyone can live there including gangsters. When Pépé takes refuge in the Casbah, he becomes the leader—he is often labeled a Caid, which in Arabic means leader. Everyone in the Casbah sympathizes with Pépé, rescuing him in moments of danger as better illustrated by the first scene of the film. The idea of a land without a proprietor joins that of the virgin land or terra incognita. *Pépé le Moko* (1937) in this sense hides the colonial atrocities that have been taking place in the Casbah. As mentioned above, the film opens with a shot of a map of the region (Figure 3) in the middle of which the word Casbah is written. When the officer begins his description of this space the map dissolves into the “real” Casbah as created by the eye of the camera. As the two British geographers, Blunt and Rose, argue, cartography has received considerable criticism for the way in which this “supposedly scientific space discipline [...] enhanced the possibilities for surveillance and facilitated imperial rule by helping to distance those exercising power from its consequences” (Blunt and Rose, 1994:10). Mapping in this sense operates in hegemonic discourses; its use in the film is an example of the colonial desire to control and homogenize an already heterogeneous space, hence the disparity between the mapped and the real Casbah. What these sensual and phantasmagorical images neglect or overlook is the existence of the Algerian people, both men and women that resist the colonial power. It is years after the independence of Algeria that such resistant space would

be cinematically articulated through the well-made film *the Battle of Algiers* by Gillo Pontecorvo. This film, ironically criticized and censored in France, rewrites this space of the Casbah by revealing the silenced and oppressed voices.



Figure 3: the map of Casbah as used in *Pépé le Moko* (1937)

This brief analysis provides a sample of the workings of the colonial tropes employed in colonial cinema (for more on colonial cinema see: Benali 1998, Shohat and Stam 1994, Sherzer 1996, Boulanger 1975), and focuses on colonial spatial configurations as cinematically articulated. In the next section I try to show how this spatial logic is contested, confirmed and rewritten after the shift of the contact zone to France through immigrants. In fact, the colonial process of “ghettoization,” the division of the French people into “*de-souche*” and “immigrants” was implemented in France by grouping immigrants and minorities in *banlieues*, which reproduced the same colonial division between center/periphery. While the center is highlighted as a sign of progress and prosperity, the periphery is constructed as a threat, thus legitimizing massive discriminating policies against immigrants. While French cinema of the 1930s, 40s and 50s overlooked these issues⁽²⁾, the 1960s onward would witness the emergence of a French militant cinema that sheds some light on these minorities, and denounced the discrimination and racism they were exposed

(2) Except in Renoir’s film *Toni*, which is centered on the condition of Italian and Portuguese immigrants in France?

to. This cinema contributed to the development of a “cinema of immigration” that flourished in the 1970s. These years were characterized by the beginning of a cinema made by immigrants themselves. To better grasp the cinematic articulation of this new contact zone the next section is devoted to the militant cinema made in the 1960s and 1970s.

Militant and Political filmmaking in the 1970s: The Maghrebi as a Victim

Maghrebis' presence in France, either as immigrants or soldiers within the French army, has generally been elided from French film narratives. The first allusions to immigrants were made in two films, *En Remontant les Champs Élysées* (1938) and *Ils Étaient Neuf Célibataires* (1939) by French filmmaker Sacha Guitry. In the former, a school teacher, played by Sacha Guitry himself, while introducing his students to the history of France and Les Champs Élysées, made a xenophobic statement about immigrants: «Nous avons toujours eu en France la fâcheuse tendance d'accueillir chez nous les étrangers qui ne nous étaient pas absolument nécessaires ». It was in the 1960s and 1970s that films about immigrants, particularly North Africans and sub-Saharan, were made. Vautier's film *The Three Cousins* was the first film to address the situation of North African immigrants in France. It depicted the harsh conditions of life of three Algerian cousins in search of employment in France. Housed in an extremely small room, a coal stove caused their suffocation. Films made by filmmakers of North African origin began to emerge in the 1970s, which was the decade that witnessed the production of many films about immigrants, which led the film magazine *Ciném Action* to devote its 1979 number to films on immigration. *Mektoub?* (1970), a film by the Algerian-French filmmaker Ali Ghalem was the first of these films. The story of *Mektoub?* begins in Marseille with the arrival of a boat. Ahmed Chergui, like 50000 others, immigrates to France with the hope of improving his economic situation. In one of the scenes in the film, the protagonist is told by a taxi driver that he is “a lucky boy because taxis don't usually take Arabs”. Through this film, Ghalem focuses on the miserable conditions of Algerians in France through the character of Ahmed. A self-made filmmaker, Ghalem chose the medium of film to denounce this “new form of slavery” (*Ciném Action*, 1979: 77). Robert de Nesle, the film's producer, put pressure on Ali Ghalem to mix “these Arabs' stories with stories of love, to be more commercial, or use a detective story” (*Ciném Action*, 1979: 77). While the title of the film was imposed by the producer, the filmmaker emphasized his world view by adding an interrogation mark next to the title. This intervention from the producer is an example of the obstacles that filmmakers (artists in

general) of North African origin go through. Another example is that of the writer Soraya Nini who was obliged by her editor to use the word *beurette* in the title of her novel, which was later, adapted into a movie (Samia) by Thomas Gilou. She eventually entitled her novel *Ils Disent que je Suis une Beurette*.

In the same year, Mohamed Medoun Hondo, known as Med Hondo, made his film *Soleil O*. Med Hondo, a Mauritanian filmmaker who migrated to Paris in 1958, is considered by many critics as “the most representative and widely known filmmaker of African cinema in exile” (Pfaff, 1986)⁽³⁾. With no formal training in filmmaking, Med Hondo embarked on a number of manual works before becoming a filmmaker:

At first, I became a dock worker in the South of France. Then I worked on a farm and later I got hired as a cook. All these jobs allowed me to learn a lot about the French proletariat. When I came to Paris I became a waiter. As such, I learned a lot about the French bourgeoisie just by observing them eat. (as cited in Pfaff, 1986).

Because of his dissatisfaction with the place allotted to blacks in theater, he established with some African and West Indian friends a theater troupe called Shango. They staged plays that addressed the black experience such as plays by the Martiniquan poet and playwright Aimé Césaire, by Afro-American authors such as Imamu Baraka and by many unknown African and South American playwrights. His desire to spread black culture and denounce neocolonialism and racism both in the homeland and hostland led him to make independent films:

I wanted to explain myself and explain Africa and the Africans. I wanted to explain the causes, structures, and consequences of immigration to audiences whether French, European or universal. Yet above all, I wanted to gear my message to the Africans and the black world. (as cited in Pfaff, 1986)

Med Hondo's agenda is masterly articulated in his first feature length film *Soleil O*, a low budget black and white film, tackles the issues of black alienation, marginalization in France and the corrupted power in Africa. The film opens with a sketch of French assimilationist policy in Africa. The opening scene of the film shows a number of Africans gazing at the camera, with a voice-over commenting:

We had our own civilization. We forged iron. We had our popular dances and songs. We were very good at sculpting wood and working iron, spinning

(3) Françoise Pfaff, *The Films of Med Hondo: An African filmmaker in Paris*. Retrieved from// <http://www.ejumpcut.org/archive/onlinessays/JC31folder/HondoFilms.html//>

cotton and wool, weaving and basketwork, our commerce wasn't just barter. We made gold and silver coins. We had pottery and cutlery. We made our own tools and domestic utensils, using brass, bronze, ivory, quartz, and granite. We had our own literature. We had our legal terminology, our religion, our science and our teaching methods.

This cultural wealth is disfigured in the following scene that shows the same Africans in a church and in front of a priest renouncing their own names, and instead being rebaptized into new European names. Through this opening scene, Hondo identifies with the call of Third Cinema which denounces neocolonialism through a militant, postcolonial cinema. In his essay "What is Cinema for Us?" he argues:

Dominant imperialism seeks to prevent the portrayal of African and Arab values to other nations... we wish to survive, develop, participate as sovereign peoples in our own specific cultural fields, and fulfill our responsibilities in a world from which we are now excluded. (As cited in Bakari, 1996: 39)

After this initial introduction that alludes both to colonial past and its present manifestations, the film introduces the main character, a nameless black man, with his luggage on his way to France. The man proudly states in a soliloquy:

One day, I started studying your writing, reading your thoughts, talking Shakespeare and Moliere, and holding forth, *Sweet France* I am whitened by your culture, but I remain a Negro as at the beginning, I bring you greetings from Africa.

When the protagonist arrives at France, he is shocked by the racism and discrimination against immigrants. He reads posters and graffiti that demonize the Arabs and Africans: "Stop the Negro-Arab invasion!" and "Paris is being blackened. 500,000 blacks are in Paris." Though he comes to France to work as an accountant, he is obliged to work as a street sweeper, a work that all Africans, including the educated, are compelled to do. In 1 hour. Because of his limited financial means, he was forced to live in Riquet, a place where immigrants live in bad conditions as he himself maintains:

I lived for six years in Riquet, I myself lived these conditions. I also witnessed these strikes, the conditions of living were deplorable, two faucets and two toilets for 300 settlers⁽⁴⁾

Yet, Sokhona's film is different from that of Ali Ghalem, in the sense that it avoids the image of immigrants as passive and miserable and instead

(4) Retrieved from// <http://www.africultures.com/php/index.php?nav=film&no=6362//>

portrays active immigrants who try to improve their situations through strikes; like Hondo and Ghalem, Sokhona considers cinema as an appropriate medium to give voice to the disenfranchised immigrant communities.

A year after *Nationalité Immigré*, Tunisian filmmaker Naceur Ktari made his outstanding film, *the Ambassadors* (1976) that won several prizes at various festivals, particularly, the Golden Tanit for best picture in Carthage, the jury special prize in Locarno international film festival (Switzerland), and a selection in Cannes in 1978. Unlike Ali Ghalem, Med Hondo, and Sidney Sokhona, Naceur Ktari had a professional training in filmmaking in both France (IDHEC) and Italy (Centro sperimentale di cinematografia). In Italy, he worked as assistant for leading filmmakers, including Roberto Rossellini, Dino Risi. He also worked as the first assistant for the American filmmaker Steven Spielberg in *Indiana Jones* and *the Raiders of the Lost Ark*. In *The Ambassadors*, most of the events take place in Goutte d'Or, Paris, where both Maghrebis and the French, who live side by side, are in constant conflict and violent confrontations. Most of these racist and violent acts are viewed through the eyes of Saleh, an immigrant who came from the South of France and who witnesses several racist acts against immigrants. In reactions to these, Saleh with the help of some friends decides to take action through a strike in front of the Palais of Justice.

The film does not opt for a Manichean divide of good immigrants and bad French; not all the Arabs in the film are 'angels' as illustrated by the examples of Ali, the shop keepers and consulates. In the film we encounter some French citizens who sympathize with immigrants such as the teacher, the leftist militant and others. Throughout the *Ambassadors*, Ktari attempts to avoid a humanitarian approach, by emphasizing the political, or the need to act against social injustice through collective mobilization. In one of his interviews the filmmaker maintains that:

Je n'ai pas cherché à donner des leçons aux immigrés car j'estime que bien souvent les travailleurs maghrébins en France ont un niveau de conscience supérieur à celui de leurs compatriotes étudiants. J'ai voulu en tant qu'intellectuel m'allier à eux pour les aider à ne plus intérioriser leur condition comme un complexe d'infériorité mais à sortir de leur situation en les incitant à réagir. J'ai évité absolument tout misérabilisme. (*Ciném Action*, 1979: 120)⁽⁵⁾

(5) I did not try to give lessons to immigrants because I often think that North African workers in France have a higher level of consciousness superior to that of their fellow students. I wanted as an intellectual to ally myself with them to help them not to internalize their status as an inferior, but get out of their situation by encouraging them to act. I avoided defeating attitudes" (my translation, unless mentioned otherwise, all subsequent translations are the author's).

It is this call for action and mobilization that links the film of Naceur Ktari with that of Sidney Sokhona.

The same year (1976) was characterized by the production of *A Cloche-Pied Sur les Frontières* by Mohand Ben Salama and Monique Martineau, a film that was the first to address the dilemma of children of immigrant parents. The action takes place in an immigrant family with an unemployed young man and a primary school girl. Beside the emphasis on these youths, the film highlights the celebration of the Muslim Aid of sacrifice. The film, a Documentary fiction, employed both reconstructed scenes and direct interviews to shed light on the positioning of these youths between different cultures, as the filmmakers argue:

Si de nombreux films existaient sur les travailleurs immigrés, il y en avait peu sur le problème de leurs enfants...Nous avons privilégié le fait qu'ils vivent perpétuellement tiraillés entre deux cultures de statut inégal: la culture arabe dans la famille et dans les cités de transit, et la culture française ailleurs. L'une est celle des exploités: elle est vécue en ghetto, ignorée de la société française...l'autre est dominante: elle est véhiculée par des moyens puissants, tels que l'école, la radio et la télévision. (Ciném Action, 1979: 123)⁽⁶⁾

These films have in common the political and militant enunciation that seeks to give voice to the subaltern. From an aesthetic perspective, they joined the project of "third cinema."⁽⁷⁾ Indeed, these films contributed to the dissemination of the immigrants' problems and led the way to the emergence of beur cinema in the 1980s. In the next section, I analyze the cinematic construction of the immigrant as a delinquent. The purpose is to show that the immigrant has been portrayed in different ways.

The Maghrebi as Delinquent in France:

The image of the Maghrebi immigrant as a delinquent characterizes most of the French films produced in the 1980s. These films represented immigrants as a source of public disorder, incapable of respecting and abiding by the social norms and Republican values. This image, which became an archetype for future filmmakers and politicians, reinforced the racist policies that divide the French into *les Français de Souche* and those of color. The

(6) If there are many films about immigrants, there exist few that address the problems of their children...we privileged the fact that children live between two unequal cultures: the Arab culture within the family and transit cities and the French culture. While the first is experienced within the family and the banlieue, the second is the dominant culture for it is conveyed through powerful media such as the school, radio and television. (Ciném Action, 1979: 123)

(7) As theorized by Getino and Solanas, "Third Cinema" rejects the view of cinema as a vehicle for personal expression, seeing the director instead as part of a collective; it appeals to the masses by presenting the truth and inspiring revolutionary activism. (Getino and Solanas, 1967).

banlieue, where the immigrant mostly lives, is represented as a highly stigmatized space, a marker of deviance, crimes and political-economic crisis.⁽⁸⁾ As banlieues grow, their stigmatization and racialization intensifies, as illustrated by the films discussed below.

Maurice Pialat's film *Police* (1985), for instance, depicts Maghrebi immigrants as drug dealers and criminals. The film follows the itinerary of inspector Mangin who tries to arrest a network of Maghrebi drug dealers, led by the Slimane brothers. After cooperation with Claude Loauki, the dealers' friend, Mangin arrests Simon Slimane, the youngest brother, and his girlfriend Noria (Sophie Marceau) who becomes the mistress of Mangin. Indeed, all Maghrebis in the film are newly arrived immigrants, who choose crimes and drugs as a source of living. This narrative discourse denies the Maghrebi the status of French citizen and instead constructs the immigrant community as a dangerous alien whose presence threatens the stability of the social order. The same discourse is perpetuated in a number of films produced in the same period, ranging from *Tchao Pantin* by Claude Berri, *Spécial Police* by Michel Vianey, and *L'Arbalète* by Sergio Gobbi to *Tranche de Vie* by François Leterrier. The same discourse is instrumentalised to justify France's discriminatory policies towards immigrants.⁽⁹⁾

In 2002, French filmmaker Eric Pittard made the film *Le Bruit, l'odeur et quelques étoiles*, deconstructing and criticizing Chirac's racist speech. Certainly, these same negative images are still used by filmmakers and politicians for whom the banlieue and Maghrebis are a mere source of troubles and crimes. The banlieue is rendered, thus, a space, requiring the intervention of the representative machine of the state. The film *Banlieue 13*, the first part portrays the banlieue as a site of crimes, delinquency and chaos as suggested by the opening scene, which accounts for the main reason behind building the wall that surrounds the banlieue. This justification reads as follows:

(8) Indeed, this image of the Banlieue is not a new phenomenon caused by immigrants as it is widely believed, but goes back to the thirteenth century, where "Banlieues marked the peripheral space one league from the centre of the city and the term "au ban" meant to be excluded from a group by proclamation." (Sicilliano, 2007) During the 19th century, Paris was the ground for a massive dispersal of the urban poor, under the Hausmannian projects, inaugurated by Napoleon III, leading to the formation of the "historic working-class Red Belt bordering Paris." (Sicilliano, 2007) It is after the Second World War that France would witness an expansion of banlieues throughout the country. This expansion was triggered by, first, a massive economic boom in Paris, resulting in a housing shortage as people from the countryside moved to the cities to look for job opportunities. The second reason behind such growth is undoubtedly attributed to the movement of people from Africa, particularly French colonies, to France.

(9) as illustrated by former French president Chirac's statement of "the noise and the smell," which refers to a speech given in 1991 by Jacques Chirac, the mayor of Paris who later became French president

Paris 2010,

Devant la montée incontournable de la criminalité dans certaines banlieues, le gouvernement autorise la construction d'un mur d'isolement autour des cités classées à haut risque.⁽¹⁰⁾

This opening statement summarises the discourse on the banlieues which favours total assimilation and integration over ethnic and cultural diversity. This attitude is clearly embodied in the electoral campaigns and the French political discourse in general, where the vocabulary of diversity and multiculturalism is displaced in favour of assimilation. Such omission is accompanied by a process whereby ethnic minorities or even attempts to claim an ethnic identity are represented as alarming phenomena that threaten social stability.

The second part, produced after the 11/September terrorist attack, revisits its imagery of the banlieue to include Islamism and terrorism, phenomena that are not referred to in the first part. This development is the outcome of the aftermath of the terrorist attacks on the U.S.A which led western media in particular to become obsessed with Islamic fundamentalism and terrorism. A case in point is the large number of American and European films that deal with these issues. Unlike *la Haine*, and films made by the Maghrebi diasporic filmmakers, these films, instead of addressing the responsibility of the state towards its immigrants and ethnic minorities, make of the victim a victimizer and the victimized a victim.

The banlieue is further constructed as a “hyper- masculinised space” (Orlando, 2003), where women are oppressed and confined, a phantasmagorical image reflected in the newly produced documentary *La Cité du Mâle* (2010) by Cathy Sanchez. After successive debates and criticisms of the film, the documentary was initially cancelled from ARTE. It was one month after this cancellation that the film was broadcast on TV. As its title illustrates, *La Cité du Mâle* constructs the banlieue as a prison for women, a metaphor reinforced by a mise-en-scene that represents the banlieue, through the example of “la cite Balzac” as a male territory. The documentary is centred on violence against women through the example of the burning alive in 2002 of a 17 year old girl (Sohane) by her boyfriend. It revisits this event through interviews with the friends of both the victim and offendant, making of these few interviews a general judgement about the whole banlieue. Besides, the choice of interviewees is itself problematic for the focus on the people involved in these

(10) *Paris 2010*, Because of the increase of crimes in some Banlieues, the government authorises the construction of a wall around the neighbourhoods that represent high risk.

violent events either as victims or victimizers. Furthermore, throughout the documentary, the voice-over employs a Manichean discourse that categorises people in the banlieue as bad or good. Hence, the problem with *La Cité du Mâle* is not its reference to violence in the banlieue, for violence is everywhere, but rather its manipulation of an event to draw a general picture of the banlieue, strengthening and perpetuating stereotypes and clichés. Therefore, the focus on delinquency overlooks the role of the centre in the marginalization of these minorities through exclusion and vilification. Conversely, beur filmmakers construct the banlieue as a multi-ethnic space. In beur cinema, the focus is on everyday life in the banlieue and the challenges that face male youth. In the next section, I show how beur filmmakers represent their own communities.

Beur cinema: the Voice of Multi-ethnic Male Youth

The 1980s witnessed a number of political events that influenced the development of what is commonly known as beur filmmaking, particularly the rise of three decisive factors: racial tension, the rise of extreme rightwing movements through the growing influence of Jean-Marie Le Pen and Le Front National, and national debates about immigration, integration, and assimilation in France. This beur voice was concretised in the famous “Marche pour l'égalité et contre le racisme”, a march from Marseilles to the centre of Paris in 1983 to protest against discrimination. However, it was not just through street protests and other forms of collective political action that the beurs became prominent since the new social and political consciousness also translated into an emergent powerful cultural movement through music, radio stations, art, photography and literature. At the same time, Azouz Begag's *le Gone the Chaaba*, Mehdi Charef's *Le thé au harem d'Archy Ahmed*, Akli Tadjer's *Les ANI du 'Tassili'* (1984) and Leïla Houari's *Zeïda de nulle part* (1985) set the foundations for what would develop into an esthetic of beur cinema.

Farida Belghoul divides beur cinema into three major categories:

Films made by filmmakers who were born and bred in France

Those made by émigrés filmmakers

And those made by French filmmakers which portrays beur communities (Naficy, 2001:97)

Following this categorization, while filmmakers such as Rachid Bouchareb, Abdelatif Kechiche, Souad Bouhati, Zaida Gharrab-Volta, Djamel Bensaleh, and Malik Chibane form the first category whereas Ali Akika, Bahloul Abdelkrim, Med Hondo, Ali Ghalem, Karim Dridi, Touita Okacha and others form the second one. The last category is exemplified by French filmmakers who make films about beur issues; cases in point are the

film *Laisse Béton* by Serge Le Péron and films made by Gerard Blain. Beur cinema in this sense is not only defined by the identity of the filmmaker (of North African origin) but by the themes (beur issues) as well. However, the first and second categories pose some methodological problems concerning the definition of an émigré filmmaker. In other words, Belghoul's definition makes it difficult to situate filmmakers like Benayat Mohamed (arrived in France at the age of four) and Mehdi Charef (age of 10) who moved to France with their parents at an early age (below 10 years old)?

Christian Bosseno, however, offers a narrower definition of beur cinema that identifies a beur film as “one which was made by a young person of North African origin who was born or who spent his or her youth in France, and which features beur characters” (as cited in Naficy 2001: 97), thus equating beur cinema with the origin of the filmmaker. Yet, the second part of the definition further narrows this filmmaking down by emphasizing “beur themes”. From this perspective, only those films that tackle beur issues are to be considered beur films. But, what about a film made by a filmmaker of North African origin but which does not address beur themes? Hamid Naficy added more complexity to the term by including those films “made in the homeland about beur issues” (as cited in Naficy 2001: 97)

In general, these definitions reveal two main approaches, namely a thematic based and an author-based approach with a prioritization of the thematic aspect, for “not all the films of beur characters are beur since some of them deal with non beur characters” (as cited in Naficy, 2001: 97); in the case of Bosseno both are pertinent. An author-based approach in these definitions is not analogous with the “auteur film theory” that refers to “the stylistic signature” and the “distinctive worldview” that some filmmakers, particularly the French New Wave continually adopt. It rather classifies films on the basis of the director's origin. Conversely, the thematic approach on the other hand, refers to some recurring themes that have become archetypes of beur cinema. In his article “the Themes of Beur Cinema,” Hedi Dhoukar (Ciném Action, 1990: 56) identifies 15 themes that are recurrent in beur cinema namely, the American dream, friendship, love, delinquency, family, French, war, immigration, Islam, memory, death, homeland, fathers, work, and return. Hence, in contrast to the militant films of the 1970s that were focused on the exploitation of immigrants, beur films introduced new themes, broadening their scope of focus. A number of French filmmakers have dealt with these issues. Yet, it was Serge le Peron, who first portrayed the beur community in his film *Laisse Béton*. The movie follows the itinerary of two children (Brian

and Nourddine) whose only dream is to go to the United States of America, specifically San Francisco. Nourddine's main motive behind leaving France is to escape his family's misery, a theme present in most of beur films. Though *Laisse Béton* is not made by a filmmaker of North African origin, it anticipated and pioneered most of the issues discussed later in beur filmmaking among which is the entrapment of children of North African origins in the banlieue. *Laisse Béton* was made in 1984, a year after the famous "Marche des Beurs", led by children from North African origin who were born in France. Contrary to other films that focused on immigrants, the film's originality lies in its emphasis on the new generation, an emphasis that would be later on the focus of beur filmmakers.

In contrast to the militant and political cinema of the 1970s, the 1980s and 1990s witnessed both a thematic and aesthetic shift. The thematic shift is illustrated by the focus on new themes, particularly that of the second generation immigrants' struggle between the culture of their parents (homeland) and French culture. This theme is omnipresent in most of the films produced in this period. As far as the aesthetic aspect is concerned, these commercial films relied on humor in the depiction of beur issues. Films that better exemplify these two shifts are *Prends 10000 balles et casse toi* by Mohamed Zemmouri, *Thé au Harem d'Archimède* by Mehdi Charef and *la Haine* by Mathieu Kassovitz.

Mahmoud Zemmouri,⁽¹¹⁾ an Algerian French filmmaker, born in Algeria in 1946, is one of the most prolific and popular filmmakers both in Algeria and France. He was one of the first Maghrebi-French filmmakers to cinematically articulate the concerns, problems and challenges facing the so-called "second-generation immigrants." Unlike the other directors who focused on the racist and discriminatory policies against immigrants and their children, Zemmouri, with a view from within provides an alternative vision that not only emphasizes the external forces (state policies, racism... etc) but internal ones (the relationship son/daughter vs. parents) as well. He also extends his analysis to include that of the rapport of these youth with their homeland as better illustrated by his first film *Prends dix mille balles et casse-toi* (1981).

(11) The films of Mahmoud Zemmouri which include *Prends dix mille balles et casse-toi* (1981), *Les Folles années du twist / Sanawât al-twist al-majnouna* (1983), *De Hollywood à Tamanrasset* (1990), *L'Honneur de la tribu / Charaf al-gabilu* (1993), *100 % Arabica* (1997) to *Beur Blanc Rouge* (2006) have known a considerable success both inside and outside France. Beside being a filmmaker, Zemmouri has featured in a number of films made by leading French and American filmmakers such as Claude Berry (*Tchao Pantin*) and Steven Spielberg (*Munich*).

Prends dix mille balles et casse-toi reveals the absurdity of racist laws that target immigrants. Under the pretext of facilitating the integration of the children of immigrants in their homeland (their parents' original countries) the French government issues a new provision whereby Maghrebi families would be granted 10000 Franc if they leave France and return to their original countries. Accepting this offer, the Lounés family returns to Algeria where they have become the center of attention of everyone in the village. There, they are perceived as delinquent and disrespectful of the social norms and religious values. For instance, while on their way to the village, the family stops at a Café where everyone looks at them as if they were aliens. The villagers' contempt towards this family grows gradually, putting pressure on the school and police to expel them from the community, pretending that Lounés' son and daughter have spoiled the morals and behavior of youths in the village. Made in 1981, *Prends dix mille balles et casse-toi* offers a counter-analysis of some measures taken not only against immigrants but their French children. Among these exclusionary measures is the famous "Stoléru's million" (1977) following which immigrants would be granted 10000 Fr if they accepted to go back to their original countries. Lionel Stoléru justified his policy by his concern towards the integration of children born in France in their fathers' original homelands. The film's first shot alludes to the enactment of this policy through a newspaper article which reads as follows:

Plusieurs dispositions seront prises pour faciliter l'insertion future des enfants d'immigrés dans leur communauté nationale.

This policy was in fact one of successive measures that began in 1974, a year which witnessed two major events, namely the election of Valéry Giscard d'Estaing as the France's president and the end of the thirty glorious⁽¹²⁾. Starting with this year, the flow of immigrants would be increasingly controlled and monitored, culminating in the suspension of immigration in July 1974. This halt of temporary individual immigration was accompanied by an encouragement of "family regroupment" or the possibility of workers' families to take up permanent residence in France. This policy "transformed the North African, or Maghrebi community in France from a group of primarily single males to families whose children and grandchildren would have French nationality." (Levine, 2008:3) These same families would be urged to leave France voluntarily via Stoléru's new measure.

(12) Les Trente Glorieuses ("The Glorious Thirty") refers to the thirty years from 1945-1975 following the end of the Second World War in France. The name was first used by the French demographer Jean Fourastié. Fourastié coined the term in 1979 with the publication of his book *Les Trente Glorieuses, ou la révolution invisible de 1946 à 1975*.

Prends 10000 et Casse Toi ironically deconstructs “Stoléru’s million” policy, building its narrative on the main idea that runs through the article in the newspaper-to facilitate the integration of these children in their homelands. Zemmouri critically demystifies such claim that overlooks the complexity of the rapport homeland/ hostland. In his film, young men and women are neither accepted in France nor in Algeria; but are rather rejected and marginalized in both countries which further problematizes their situation. While most of beur filmmakers centered their narrative on “a single host land” (Naficy 2001: 95), Zemmouri included that of the homeland. Villagers in *Prends 10000 balles et casse toi* do not identify Mustapha and Fifi as Algerians; they alternatively describe them as strangers, westerners (they use the name Travolta for Mustapha and the girl with red lipstick for Fifi) who threaten the integrity and traditions of their community. Through his film, Zemmouri levels a double critique at both Algerian traditions and attitude towards its diaspora and the French exclusionary policies towards this same diaspora. Other films chose to focus on the homeland and the ambivalent condition of “second-generation immigrants” who are situated between different cultures. Mehdi Charef’s film *Thé au Harem d’Archi Ahmed* was the first film to fully explore such a theme.

Thé au Harem d’Archi Ahmed (1985) by Mehdi Charef is seen by many as the precursor of beur cinema. This film, which was produced by Costa Gavras, is based on the autobiographical novel written by Mehdi Charef. *Le thé au harem d’Archi Ahmed* is the story of two teenage boys, a French, Pat, and an Algerian immigrant, Madjid who live in a working-class neighbourhood where the unemployed often outnumber the employed. To survive, Madjid and Pat resort to theft (pickpocketing in the metro, stealing money from vestuary) and prostitute a drunk woman. Unlike Pat, who is a “Français-de-Souche”, Madjid was born in Algeria and arrived at France at an early age. While Majid’s father is depicted as an impotent and powerless man (as a result of an accident in the workplace), the mother (Malika) has a powerful presence. She constantly reminds Madjid of the homeland, Algeria, about which he has no memory. Beside raising her children, Malika takes care of Josette’s son while she is outside looking for a job. Josette has been fired from her work in the factory, which pushes her to attempt suicide. Pat’s sister, whom Madjid loves secretly but is shocked when he finds out she works as a prostitute at St. Denis Street, is another major character in the film.

The novelty of *Thé au Harem d’Archi Ahmed* (1985) lies in its representation of the banlieue as a space where multiple ethnicities, including the “Français-de-Souche”, coexist. Whilst Ktari’s film *the Ambassadors*

emphasizes conflict and violence between the French and minorities, Charef's film focuses on cooperation and solidarity; cases in point are the three duos Malika/Josette, Pat/Madjid and Madjid/Pat's sister. Malika and Josette are two mothers, with no husbands to support them for the former is divorced and the latter's husband is mentally sick. The only solace for Josette in moments of hopelessness is Malika. Pat and Madjid on the other hand are two friends who do everything together, they steal together, go out together... etc. A psychoanalytic reading of the film may interpret the two characters through the dichotomy of ego/ alter ego, with Pat being the alter ego of Madjid. At the end of the film, when Madjid is arrested by the police on the beach, Pat voluntarily joined him, suggesting a strong solidarity between the two. Another significant dual is that of Madjid and Pat's sister. Certainly, the discovery that she is a prostitute is one of the main reasons behind Madjid's disillusionment, because he has always considered her as the ideal girl.

In *Thé au Harem d'Archi Ahmed* (1985) the *cité* is doubly articulated in the sense that it is represented as both an insular, claustrophobic and open space. This double articulation is suggested by the verticality and the horizontality of the high buildings. While the former accentuates the confinement of characters, the latter hints to their ability to create new spaces as Charef maintains:

On n'étouffe pas dans les cités...on a résisté puisqu'on vit encore... on se créait un espace...c'est pour ça que j'aime bien ces plans-là, où on voit les bâtiments, à l'horizontale. J'avais envie qu'on voyage de la cave jusqu'au toit, les escaliers et l'ascenseur aussi. Je voulais montrer la verticale et l'horizontale, c'est-à-dire qu'on se tient debout...c'est un apprentissage la banlieue, tu en sors quelque chose. (Fabrice, 2005: 26)⁽¹³⁾

The insularity of space is further suggested by the repeated use of crane shots of empty streets, always limited by walls or fences; windows serve as barriers as it is illustrated by the shot of Josette's face reflected on the glass of the window that looks at high buildings (Figure1). It is through their solidarity and cooperation that the youths of the *cité* forget their entrapment between these walls and within the house in the case of Madjid. Madjid, the symbol of the beur generation, is torn between the worlds of the immigrants and the French. In the house he is always reminded by his mother of a homeland that he hardly remembers. When he told her that in order to find a work he should

(13) In the *cité*, since we still live, we have resisted. Because we created a space ... that's why I like those shots, where we see the buildings from the horizontal. I wanted that trip to the cellar to the roof, stairs and elevator as well. I wanted to show vertically and horizontally, that is to say that it stands ... learning the suburbs, you go out in something

be French, she gets irritated. The last shot of the film with Madjid and his friends in the beach reflects a real desire to flee their symbolic entrapment.

Indeed, *Tea in the Harem* is considered as the manifesto of beur cinema. In this film, Mehdi Charef avoids the Manichean discourse of victim/victimizer, racist/ French ‘de-souche’ and marginalized/ immigrant. Instead, he highlights the values of fraternity and solidarity within the banlieue. Yet do these beur films reflect a “Beuritude”, a specific aesthetic that underlie this film practice? *Thé au Harem d’Archi Ahmed* (1985), though subsumed under the label beur cinema, offers two different visions, with two different approaches that represent the banlieue as both insular and open. Hence, this film practice “s’appréhende essentiellement par ses variations thématiques plus que par l’osmose d’une approche esthétique collective, en effet, pour ainsi dire, inexistante” (Fabrice, 2005: 34)⁽¹⁴⁾

This film practice would increase in the 1990s with the production of a number of films by new beur filmmakers such as Malik Chibane, Karim Dridi, Hakkar Amor, and Rachid Bouchareb (though his first film was released in 1985). It would further witness the emergence of banlieue cinema, which is highly influenced by beur films made in the 1980s. The term banlieue was used immediately after the release of five commercial feature films that focus on the banlieue in 1995. *La Haine* (Mathew Kassovitz) was one of the most successful among these five films. It charts the itinerary of three main characters in 24 hours after a night of rioting in a Parisian banlieue. These characters are Said, of Arab Decent, Hubert, of African decent, and Vinz, a Jew. The bringing together of a black, an Arab and a Jew invokes the imagery of a multi-ethnic France, better epitomised by the slogan Black-Blanc-Beur. This multi-ethnic France is not only rejected by the French universalist and republican discourse but is also countered violently as illustrated by the footage of violence against these communities at the beginning of the film. As the film elucidates, neo-racism is grounded in “the cultural superiority of the bourgeois urbanite’s style of life over the young banlieusards.” (Sicilliano, 2007) this disparity which characterises late capitalist cosmopolitan spaces is exemplified by the wandering of the three men on the streets of Paris after they miss their last train home. While at the centre of Paris, they find themselves in a vernissage where they try fruitlessly to fit in, by first trying to engage with artwork, and second by their conversation with some women. Their efforts to find a foothold in the Parisian world turn out to be in vain since they are expelled from the gallery.

(14) Beur cinema could be essentially understood through its thematic variations rather than an approach that considers a collective esthetics, which, we can claim, does not exist.

La Haine is, indeed, a critique of a neo-racist France which is devoid from any sense of heterogeneity. Such neo-racism is masterly expressed in the opening credits of the film that provides footage of appraisals and riots in the banlieue along with the song *Burnin and Lootin* by Bob Marley, thus linking these acts of resistance to wider post-colonial struggles against racist policies and social injustices. The scene also alternates between shots of strikers with those of the state's violent intervention through policemen. Yet, while the film disapproves of the political discourse towards minorities it also seeks to deconstruct and question dominant constructions of the geographical space of the banlieue. Though the film is concerned with the banlieue, nearly half of it is set at the centre of Paris. This division is very important for it highlights the striking divide and gap between the periphery and the centre and "inverts conventional imaginary associated with each space." (Siciliano, 2007) in the scenes shot in the banlieue, Kassovitz makes use of short lenses and long takes to suggest the integration of protagonists in their social milieu, while in the scenes shot in Paris he uses short takes and long camera lenses to convey a sense of alienation and anxiety.

Kassovitz departs from negative images by a juxtaposition of sensual images of the banlieue with banality to elucidate just how these images are produced as a "consumptive form of voyeuristic entertainment." (Siciliano, 2007)⁽¹⁵⁾ In one of the scenes, as Hubert talks to his mother, who is sewing in the kitchen, television projects images of the *cité* in flames from the previous night of rioting. Actually, this scene provides two opposing images. On the one hand, there is the image of the banlieue as a social space shot through the flashpoint of everyday life, on the other hand, there is the image projected through the media and which constructs the banlieue as a threat, an idea that is further implied by the newsreader whose discourse makes of the strikers the victimizers and depicts policemen as victimized through the focus on acts against police such as the assault on the police station. Certainly, *la Haine* is one of the few films to render visible a side of France that for too long dwelt in the shadows of a dominant geographic imaginary.

The intersection between banlieue and beur aesthetic is articulated in the films of Malik Chibane who resents to be labelled beur and insists on being called banlieue. Douce France is his second long feature film after Hexagone (1993). Unlike, Zemmouri, Charef and Bahloul, Chibane was born in a French banlieue. Following his conception and definition of banlieue cinema, these films manifest two main aspects:

(15) Retrieved from// <http://www.acme-journal.org/vol6/ASi.pdf/> (April 2010).

*Vertical urbanism (HLM); a specific social class and urban milieu
A cultural aspect, for beurs inherit the culture and religion of
their parents* (Chibane, 2003: 35).

Douce France takes place in the banlieue (Saint Denis). The main characters are Farida, Souad, Moussa and Jean-Luc. Farida is a well-integrated, educated, religious girl who has chosen to wear the veil out of conviction. Because of her generosity, she spends most of her time doing charity work in the mosque, an act that is often criticized by her father. From the very first scenes, she is depicted as a strong girl who regardless of social pressure (the demand by the officer for her to remove her veil to check her identity), does not give up her principles. It is her relationship with Moussa that will change her trajectory. Her sister Souad is quite her opposite. She is liberal, outgoing and rebellious. She moves out when she has a problem with her father. She refuses to be submissive either to the parents or Jean-Luc who loves her and keeps chasing her. Moussa's mother, arranging her son's marriage, brings Mysad, a beautiful Algerian girl, to France as a prospective wife to Moussa. When Mysad realizes that Moussa does not love her, and instead loves Farida, she flees France during her wedding party with the help of Moussa's two sisters. The film ends with Farida, removing her veil and throwing it on the sides of the road as she drives, enacting a symbolic sign of self-realization.

Conclusion: This article has examined the emergence of the Maghrebi character in French cinema from colonial to postcolonial era. The postcolonial period was mainly characterized by the shift of the contact zone to the metropole and the rise of new Maghrebi voices, first as victims of the racist policies of the French government and then through the youth movement as a subculture that tried to problematize French conception of space and identity. Throughout the chapter, the analysis is based on an analysis of individual films that address various thematic and aesthetic issues.

In conclusion, we can say that the perpetuation of colonial spatial ideology is based on a Manichean divide of space. While in the colonies space or the city is divided into the old and the modern, the former for natives and the latter for French citizens. The same divide was transferred to France with the coming of immigrants, hence the division of cities into centers and peripheries (banlieue).

Maghrebi presence in France is to be understood in its heterogeneity which is reflected in the development of filmmaking from militant to beur as I attempted to illustrate through examples throughout this chapter. The

presence of the Maghrebi figure in France could be outlined in four moments which are not to be understood as linear and chronological for they may exist in various films as exemplified by the films discussed in this chapter. The 1990s witnessed the development of banlieue cinema, hence blurring the boundaries between banlieue and beur filmmaking as illustrated by *la Haine*.

Bibliography

- Bakari, Ishaq., *African Experiences of Cinema*, London, BFI Publishing, 1996.
- Barthes, Roland., *Image-Music-Text*. New York City, Hill and Wang, 1978.
- Belghoul, Farida., *Georgette*, B. Barrault, 1986.
- Benali, Abdelkader., *Le cinéma colonial au Maghreb: L'imaginaire en tromp-l'œil*, Paris, Editions du Cerf, 1998.
- Bhabha, H., 'The Third Space'. In J. Rutherford (ed.) *Identity: Community, Culture, Difference*, London, Lawrence & Wishart, 1990.
- Bhabha, H., *The Location of Culture*, London, Routledge, 1994.
- Boulanger, Pierre., *Le cinéma colonial de l'Atlantide à Lawrence d'Arabie*, Paris, Seghers, 1975.
- Blunt and Rose (Eds.), *Writing women and space: Colonial and postcolonial geographies*. New York, Guilford Press, 1994.
- Coly, Ayo., *The Pull of Postcolonial Nationhood: Gender and Migration in Francophone African Literatures*, Maryland, Lexington Books, 2010.
- Deleuze, Gille., *Cinema 1: The Movement-Image*. Minneapolis, University of Minnesota Press, 1986.
- Deleuze, Gille & Guattari Felix., *Kafka: Toward a Minor Literature*. Minnesota, the University of Minnesota, 1986.
- Hargreaves, Alec., "Chemins de traverse. Vers une reconnaissance de la postcolonialité en France", *Mouvements* 2007/b3, N° 51, p. 24-31.
- Hargreaves, Alec., *Immigration, Race and Ethnicity in Contemporary France*, London-New York, Routledge, 1995.
- Hargreaves, Alec., *Immigration and Identity in Beur Fiction*, London-New York, Routledge, 1997.
- Hargreaves, Alec., *Post-Colonial Cultures in France*, London-New York, Routledge, 1997.
- Hargreaves, Alec., "Postcolonial Cultures and Globalization in France," Retrieved from // <http://escholarship.org/uc/item/8j15f28g;jsessionid=CDDA76D0269450D38B72A0EE65030A1F>// (November 2010)

- Houari, Leila., *Zeida de nulle part*. L'Harmattan, 1990.
- Henderson, B., *A critique of film theory*, New York, E.P. Dutton, 1980.
- Lefebvre, Henri., *The Production of Space*, New Jersey, Wiley-Blackwell, 1991.
- Marks, Laura., *The Skin of the Film, Intercultural Cinema, Embodiment, and the Senses*, Durham and London, Duke University Press, 2000.
- Nini, Soraya., *Ils disent que je suis une beurette*, Pocket Collection, 1998.
- Orlando, Valerie., "From Rap to Raï in the Mixing Bowl: Beur Hip-Hop Culture and Banlieue Cinema in Urban France.", 2003, Retrieved from http://www.unc.edu/depts/europe/francophone/Muslim_women/eng/orlandoarticle.pdf//(November 2009).
- Pfaff, Françoise., "The films of Med Hondo: An African filmmaker in Paris" From *Jump Cut*, no. 31, March 1986, pp. 44-46 copyright *Jump Cut: A Review of Contemporary Media*, 1986, 2006.
- Rosello, Mireille., "Ismaël Ferroukhi's *Le Grand Voyage*: Successful Rudimentary Transactions and the Failure of Globalized Languages" Retrieved from// <http://home.medewerker.uva.nl/m.g.bal/bestanden/Rosello%20paper%20Ferroukhi.grand.vogage%20READER%20OPMAAK.pdf//> (January 2008).
- Said, Edward., *Orientalism*, New York, Vintage, 1978.
- Said, Edward., *Reflections on exile: and other literary and cultural essays*, Michigan, Granta Books, 2001.
- Scott, Joan Wallach., *The Politics of the Veil*. Princeton, New Jersey, Princeton University Press, 2007.
- Sherzer, Dina., *Cinema, Colonialism, Postcolonialism Perspectives from the French and Francophone Worlds*, Texas, University of Texas Press, 1996.
- Shohat, Ella and Stam, Robert., *Unthinking Eurocentrism: multiculturalism and the media*. London-New York, Routledge, 1994.
- Smelik, Anneke., *And The Mirror Cracked: Feminist Cinema and Film Theory*, New York, Macmillan Press Ltd, 1998.
- Spivak, Gayatri., "Can the Subaltern Speak," retrieved February 2009 from // http://www.mcgill.ca/files/crclaw-discourse/Can_the_subaltern_speak.pdf//
- Tarr, Carie., *Reframing Difference: Beur and Banlieue Filmmaking in France*, Manchester, Manchester University Press, 2005.

Thrift, Nigel & Pile, Steve., *Mapping the Subject, geographies of cultural transformation*, London and New York, Routledge, 1995.

Winter, Jay., *Remembering War: The Great War between Memory and History in the 20th Century*, New Heaven, Yale University Press, 2003.

Wollen, Peter., "Cinema and Semiology: Some Points of Contact," in *Movies and Methods* Volume 1. Berkeley, Los Angeles, London, the University of California Press.

Young, Robert J.C., "Ideologies of the Postcolonial." Retrieve from// <http://www.robertjcyoung.com/ideologies.pdf> (December 2010).

ملخص:

تعكس الصناعة السينمائية الفرنسية ما كان من تطور نظرة الفرنسيين إلى سكان أبناء المغرب الكبير من نظرة المعمر إلى المستعمر أيام الاحتلال من خلال شريطين هما البانديرا (1935) وبيبي الموكو (1937) إلى نظرة صاحب المركز إلى المهمشين من المهاجرين والأقليات الإثنية القاطنة في أحواز الحواضر الفرنسية يبدو فيها هؤلاء ضحايا مخلفات الاستعمار في أفلام صورها أبناء هاته الأقليات أو بعض المتعاطفين أمثال ريني فويتي في شريط «أبناء العم الثلاثة» أو «مكتوب» لعلي غالم (1970) أو «صولي» أو لميد هوندو (1969) أو «جنسية المهاجر» لسيدني سوخونا (1970) أو «السفراء» لناصر اكناري (1975). ثم صار المهاجر المغاربي صورة لحامل كل الآثام أو المجرم بالسليقة مثلما جاء في شريط موريس بيالا «بوليس» وشريط باتريك بّيالا ألساندران «بانليو 13». أما آخر ما جد من أفلام المخرجين مستوطني فرنسا الجدد فيطرح مشاكل الهوية ومكانة هذه الشرائح في المجال القومي الفرنسي في أشرطة مالک شيبان وكريم دريدي وهكار عمور ورشيد بوعراب.

