

**Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research**  
**Mouloud MAMMERI University of Tizi-Ouzou**  
**Faculty of Letters and Humanities.**  
**Department of English**



**Dissertation submitted for the Partial**  
**Fulfillment of a Magister Degree in English**

**Option: Cultural Studies**

**Presented by:**

**CHAOUCHE Karima**

**Title**

**Identity and Immigration in Francis Ford**  
**Coppola's *The Godfather II* and Rachid**  
**Bouchareb's *Outside the Law***

Board of Examiners:

Dr. ZERAR Sabrina , M.C.A, University of Tizi -Ouzou , Chair

Dr. GUENDOUDI Amar, M.C.A, University of Tizi -Ouzou , Supervisor

Pr. RICHE Boutelja, Professor , University of Tizi -Ouzou, Examiner,

**Academic Year: 2014/2015**

**DECLARATION :**

I affirm that this is my own work and that all references to other sources are duly acknowledged

# Contents

Acknowledgment:.....	iii
Abstract:.....	iv
List of Illustrations:.....	vi
<b>General introduction:.....</b>	<b>01</b>

## **Part One: Historical and Contextual Backgrounds**

<b>Introduction:.....</b>	<b>11</b>
---------------------------	-----------

<b>Chapter One: A History of immigration.....</b>	<b>12</b>
---	-----------

The History of Italian Immigration to the United State (1920s):.....	14
--	----

The History of Algerian immigration to France (1950s):.....	19
---	----

<b>Chapter Two: <i>The Godfather II and Outside the Law</i> the Contexts Beyond the Films</b>	
---	--

### ***The Godfather Part II:***

The Context Beyond the Film:.....	27
-----------------------------------	----

A Synoptic Overview:.....	35
---------------------------	----

### ***Outside the Law:***

The context Beyond the Film: .....	37
------------------------------------	----

A Synoptic Overview:.....	45
---------------------------	----

<b>Chapter Three: Directors from the Diaspora: Francis Ford Coppola, Rachid Bouchareb</b>	
---	--

Francis Ford Coppola's Biography:.....	49
--	----

New Hollywood Cinema/ Hollywood Renaissance:.....	51
---	----

Rachid Bouchareb's Biography:.....	52
Beur/ Banlieue Cinema:.....	54

**Part Two: Bouchareb's Stylization of Coppola's *the Godfather***

<b>Introduction:</b> .....	57
----------------------------	----

**Chapter Four:** Bouchareb's Epic Re-Writing of Coppola's Gangster Genre: A Comparison of the Plots of *Outside the Law* and *The Godfather II*.

Introduction:.....	59
Family as heritage and refuge:.....	59
Oppression and Forced Exile :.....	65
The Rise to Power:.....	71
Ethnic Identity in a Capitalist and Post colonial Contexts:.....	76

**Chapter Five:** Bouchareb's Stylization of the Gangster: Comparing Characters and Settings between *The Godfather II* and *Outside the Law*

Introduction:.....	82
Characters in <i>the Godfather II</i> and <i>Outside the Law</i> :.....	82
Vito Vs Messaoud:.....	83
Michael Vs Said:.....	86
Abdelkader:.....	89
Setting in <i>The Godfather II</i> and <i>Outside the Law</i> : .....	90
The Presentation of Native Lands:.....	91
The Host Countries:.....	94

**Chapter Six:** A Study of Cases of Intertextuality between *Outside the Law* and the  
*Godfather II*

Introduction:.....	97
Homeland: back to the origins.....	99
The meeting: mainstream Vs minority groups.....	108
The Vendetta: a Cultural Heritage.....	119
The Confession to the mother:.....	127
Stylizing Spectacle in <i>Outside the Law</i> .....	133
<b>General Conclusion:.....</b>	<b>139</b>
<b>Bibliography:.....</b>	<b>143</b>

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This thesis will always be indebted to a panel of people who made its fulfillment possible. First, I would like to express my deepest gratitude to my supervisor Dr GUENDOUDI for initiating me to the idea of this dissertation and for providing me with valuable feedback, advices and guidance.

Particular thanks are extended to Professor RICHE Boutelja for his tireless effort to push the student further the limits. To Dr ZERAR Sabrina who initiated this first Magister promotion in **Cultural Studies**, to all the teachers who made this incredible journey possible and also to the library staff of the Department of English. I won't forget my colleagues of the 2011/2012 Magister promotion with whom I have shared this rich experience.

This thesis would not be possible without the unconditional support and encouragement of my family.

## Abstract

This dissertation presents a comparative analysis between *the Godfather II* released in 1974 and directed by Francis Ford Coppola, and *Outside the Law* released in 2010 and directed by Rachid Bouchareb. It addresses two themes, identity and immigration through two perspectives: a new historicist and a post colonial. The aim of a comparative study between *the Godfather II* (1974) and *Outside the Law* (2010) is to provide the historical and immediate context in which the two films could be discussed and compared with a focus on the representation of the history of immigration and its impact on the immigrants' sense of identity and belonging in the United States and France. This dissertation discovers that Rachid Bouchareb's stylization of the *Godfather II* is based on the similarities between the two migrations and the emergence ethnic minority group cinemas against the mainstream culture in a context of ethnic revival in *the Godfather II* and the debate upon national identity in the case of *Outside the Law*. Through highlighting the tragic stories of two immigrant families pursuing two similar exile trajectories from their displacement and separation from their homeland countries, their settlement in foreign countries to the emergence of conflicts through the process of violent rebellion or organized crime. However the two films stand for two completely separated identities and the appropriation of the gangster characters in *Outside the Law* is only meant for dramatic purposes.

### **List of illustrations:**

Figure 1-2. The remote landscapes of Sicily.	Page 99
Figure 3-4. The Mamma holding Vito.	Page 99
Figure 5-6. The Mamma crying the loss of her son Paolo and Vito standing alone.	Page 99
Figure 7-8. The remote landscapes of Setif.	Page 100
Figure 9. The mother screaming at the Caid.	Page 100
Figure 10. The Souni Family leaving their land.	Page 100
Figure 11. Said gazing at his crying mother.	Page 100
Figure 12. A close up on the mother.	Page 100
Figure 13. Michael dealing business.	Page 108
Figure 14. Senator Geary teasing the Don.	Page 108
Figure 15. Senator Geary taking his medicines	Page 109
Figure 16. <i>Michael listening to the Senator's menaces</i>	Page 109
Figure 17. An over the shoulder shot of Abdelkader Gazing to the colonel	
Figure 18. a reverse shot of the Colonel	Page 109
Figure 19. Abdelkader explaining the rightness of his cause	Page 109
Figure 20. The colonel arrogant gaze	Page 109
Figure 21. A two shot of Abdelkader and Colonel Faivre	Page 109
Figure 22. a long shot of the Don resting on his chair	Page 119
Figure 23. Tomazino introducing Vito to the Don	Page 119
Figure 24. a medium shot of Vito looking at the Don	Page 119
Figure 25. Vito paying respect to the Don	Page 119
Figure 26. Vito stabbing the Don	Page 120
Figure 27. Said making his way to the Caid's house in his chair	Page 120
Figure 28. a long shot of the Caid sleeping	Page 120
Figure 29. -a point of view shot of the Caid	Page 120

Figure 30. Said is about to kill the Caid	Page 120
Figure 31. Said stabbing the aged Caid	Page 120
Figure 32. a close up to the dead Caid	Page 120
Figure 34. Michael and his sick mother	Page 127
Figure 35. Michael making his way to his mother's place	Page 127
Figure 36. a long shot of Michael and his mother	Page 127
Figure 37. Michael's half lighted face	Page 127
Figure 38. a two shot of the mother and the son	Page 127
Figure 39. the half lighted face of the mamma	Page 127
Figure 40. Messaoud making his way to his mother place	Page 128
Figure 41. a two shot of the mother and her son	Page 128
Figure 42. a close up to Messaoud's face	Page 128
Figure 43. the mother's reaction to Messaoud's sufferance	Page 128
Figure 44. a three shot of Pantengeli meeting the Rosato Brothers	Page 133
Figure 45. A street gunshot involving the police and the mafia	Page 133
Figure 46. a gangster pointing his gun	Page 133
Figure 47. spectacular gunshootings	Page 134
Figure 48-49. Michael, Fredo and Senator Geary in Cuba.	Page 134
Figure 50. the street confrontation	Page 134
Figure 51. the attempt to kill Pantengeli	Page 134
Figure 52. Abdelkader pointing his gun toward the inspector	Page 134
Figure -53. Messaoud spectacular shootings	Page 134
Figure 54. Said's gangster posture	Page 135
Figure 55. The police interrogating Said	Page 135
Figure 56. Said alone in his Night club	Page 135
Figure 57. the police eruption in the Casbah	Page 135

***GENERAL  
INTRODUCTION***

## ***General Introduction:***

Identity is not as transparent or unproblematic as we think. Perhaps instead of thinking of identity as an already accomplished historical fact, which the new cinematic discourses then represent we should think, instead, of identity as a “production” which is never complete, always in process, and always constituted within, not outside, representation.

(Stuart, Hall, 1996)

Immigration is one of the most prominent issues in the modern world. It is at the heart of social, cultural and political debates in many countries especially western ones. The large scale of immigration has led to an incredible diversity around the globe. This transformed communities in fundamental ways and challenged the notion of “identity”. France and the United States are both western nations that share a long history of immigration even though their immigration policies diverge in terms of identity and immigration history. Immigration in France as well as in the United States is a burning issue; it has been a common denominator in the question of national identity. However, the concept of national identity is not the same in the two countries. As the history of the two countries differs from each other, their conception of their identity differs also.

More than any other western countries the United States and France can be qualified as nations of immigration. It is also in these countries that policies and ideologies on immigration were mostly developed. The elaborated policies are related to integration or acculturation of immigrants who came from different historical, social, economic, religious or ethnic background .Because “immigration is a transformative force” (Rubén, G. Rumbaut, 2005: 3), the comparison between the attitudes of France and the United States as receiving countries toward their immigrant population which transformed not only their demography but also their social structure is interesting at many levels.

This dissertation centers on the representation of the history of immigration and its impact on the immigrants’ sense of identity and belonging in the United States and France

through a comparison between two films: Francis Ford Coppola's *The Godfather II* (1974) and Rachid Bouchareb's *Outside the Law* (2010). The films respectively depict the trajectories of two immigrant communities, the Italian and the Algerian, through the lenses of a family unit.

The study aims to highlight the tragic stories of two immigrant families pursuing two analogous exile trajectories from their displacement and separation from their homelands, their settlement in foreign countries, to the emergence of conflicts through the process of violent rebellion or organized crime. It attempts to illustrate how Bouchareb stylizes Francis Ford Coppola's gangster movie to produce an epic film which addresses the issue of the Algerian immigration to France and its participation in the struggle for liberation. Stylization is the intentional re-creation of another person's style in order to present a particular aesthetic and ideological position in a new artistic context. (encyclopedia2.thefreedictionary.com). It involves imitation without any accompanying parodic or ironic intent. (Morace, Robert A., 1989: 186)

David Bordwell defines style in films as "*systematic use of cinematic device*" (Bordwell, David, 1985: 35) The purpose of style is to enhance and support the narrative through the use of diverse techniques such as editing, camera work, mise-en-scene, lighting and sound to achieve similar effects. Bouchareb, in his film *Outside the Law*, employs some Coppola's cinematic representations (editing, camera work, mise-en-scene...etc) in *the Godfather II* to provide his own narrative about the immigrants' involvement in the Algerian struggle for independence.

At first glance there is not much in common between *The Godfather II* and *Outside the Law*, but when we examine the themes of exile, immigration and identity we can easily draw a parallel between the two stories. It is true that the influence of Coppola on Bouchareb's film is obvious, the director himself admitted and claimed it in many interviews: "*I wanted the*

*film to have an epic quality. I developed characters that run the revolution in the same way Al Pacino ran business and the family in The Godfather. That freed my hands from a historical point of view. My film isn't a documentary. I make movies".* ( Rachid Bouchareb. Press file of the film: 2011)The question is why does he deliberately choose to stylize a gangster film to tackle a sensitive historical issue?

“Identity”, as a concept, derived mainly from Eric Erikson’s works in the 1950’s. Phillip Gleason points out that “Erikson was the key figure in putting the word in circulation. He coined the expression *identity crisis* and did more than anyone else to popularize identity.”(1983: 6)In recent years, academicians and scholars from various disciplines (social sciences, political sciences, humanities, psychology and cultural studies) showed an interest in questions related to “identity”. This complicated and unclear concept plays an important, often central, role in ongoing debates all over the world. In Cultural Studies, especially in minority studies, issues of national, state, gender and ethnic identities are explored in various perspectives. “Identity” is also, crucial in issues like multiculturalism, nationalism and ethnic conflicts.

The introduction of “identity” into social analysis and its initial diffusion in the social sciences and public discourse occurred in the United States in the 1960’s. (R. Brubaker, F. Cooper, 2000). The concept was appropriated from Erikson’s works on psychoanalysis to be linked with ethnicity and sociological role theory. In the 1960’s the term “identity” found an echo in the American context. With the rise of the Black Power Movement and other minority (ethnic) movements concerns about individual identities were transposed on groups’ identities. The notion of the United States as homogeneous Melting pot was questioned.

Debates on “identity” are not limited to the United States. In Europe, the issue took different forms. “Identity” in the old continent, until recently, was mainly debated in the public sphere and in politics not in academic institutions. The problem is often related to

nationalism and citizenship. Countries like France, which has a long republican tradition, witnessed an “identity crisis” illustrated by the debate on national identity initiated by the French government in 2007.

The notion of “identity” is often related to minorities and immigration. According to Monterrat Gui Bernau(2007) “*the diversity of migration is greater than ever before. Whenever they settle, migrants act as carriers of distinct cultures and languages which in some cases are similar to those of the host society while in others they are completely alien to them.*”(58)In fact, immigration plays an important role in forming and reshaping identities. When people immigrate to another country they take with them their traditions, language, religion, history and identities which are most of the time different, if not opposed to those of the host country.

Some countries embrace the new qualities that immigrants brought with them and adopt a multiculturalist approach; other (more conservative) reject those qualities and favor assimilation and integration into the country’s dominant culture. These differences make it difficult to the Immigrants to integrate local cultures, and to the local residents to understand and accept the immigrants. The issue is worse especially for second or third generation immigrants who grew up between two cultural heritages. As a matter of fact, these issues are reflected in cinematic productions and representations of immigrant communities in different stages.

The study of films as an important aspect in the representation and in the formation of identity gains more value by comparison and contrast between two national cinemas: strong points in one draw attention to the weaknesses of the other, and vice versa. The comparative approach enables researchers to explore more aspects and to find potential interrelations between different disciplines. A comparative approach seemed therefore pertinent for this study: it would help in identifying the parallels and divergences between *The Godfather II*

(1974) and *Outside the Law* (2010) which help to reveal which factors have influence on identity, and which not. The advantages of using a comparative approach in a study on identity are numerous. If we consider films from different countries the outcomes of the study will be larger and more relevant.

The study of films as products of culture, contexts and nation implies to borrow methodology and concepts from different disciplines, e.g. anthropology, cultural, film and media studies, history and sociology. Therefore, the methodological approach selected for this study is a combination of inter-disciplinary theories. This comparative study will rely on two perspectives. In order to examine the films' contents within the contexts of their production we will adopt the new historicist approach. When dealing with the issue of identity and immigration we will rely on the postcolonial approach.

Historical context is very important in understanding films. In order to link the cinematic spaces with the history of their time period, we will study the contextual backgrounds of our selected films with regard to their respective directors' curriculum and the social, political environment surrounding the time of their production. It is important to ask the following questions: why did Francis Ford Coppola, a second generation Italian American, make a gangster film about Italian Americans in the 1970's? And why did Bouchareb, a French of Algerian descent, choose to make an epic about the struggle of Algerian immigrants for independence in 2007? Why did both directors use the gangster genre to depict two different immigrant communities?

Novels, films and art works don't come out of the blue; they are products of their time and of a given background. These products are shaped by the context and the major issues existing in the period. Films are coded messages to the audience; they are influenced not only by the directors' vision of art but also by political, social, historical and economic environment of the latter. New Historicism considers works of literature (in our case films) as

historical texts. According to new historicists, identity is fashioned by social institutions. Cinema is a form of social construct, which is produced by society and in return it reshapes the culture of that society. Films are cultural creations constructed by more than one consciousness. Therefore, social, political, religious, and economic factors of a given society determine the work of art it produces. In the light of this overview of new historicism, this work explores the different possibilities from other perspectives. As the English professor H. Aram Veeseer suggests:

[...] the New Historicism has given scholars new opportunities to cross the boundaries separating history, anthropology, art, politics, literature, and economics. It has struck down the doctrine of noninterference that forbade humanists to intrude on questions of politics, power, indeed on all matters that deeply affect people's practical lives – matters best left, prevailing wisdom wits, to experts who could be trusted to preserve order and stability in "our" global and intellectual domains (1989, p. ix).

New historicism is a literary movement which developed mainly during the 1980s. It was Stephen Greenblatt who gave it its current meaning in his book: *Renaissance Self-Fashioning: From More to Shakespeare* (1980). (Bertens, Hans, 178: 2001) New historicism emerged mainly in reaction to the new criticism and it is a historical approach. Its literary criticism and literary theory are based on the principle that a literary work should be considered as a product of the time, place, and circumstances of its composition rather than an isolate creation.

New historicism claims that all cultural activities may be considered as important text for historical analysis. Peter Barry points out in his book: *Beginning Theory: an Introduction to Literary and Cultural Theory*, that "new historicism is indeed a historicist rather than a historical movement" (1995: 175). Brannigan explains that according to new historicists "literature can have powerful effect on history, or vice versa." (1998:3) He defines new historicism as:

A mode of critical interpretation which privileges power relations as the most important context for texts of all kind... as a critical practice it treats literary texts as a space where power relations are made visible. (1998: 6)

Literary texts are seen as absolutely inseparable from their historical contexts. Bertens

Hans claims that:

Literature does not simply reflect relation of power, but actively participates in the consolidation of discourses and ideologies, just as it functions as an instrument in the construction of identities, not only at the individual level- that of the subject- but also on the level of the group or even that of the national state. Literature is not simply a product of history, it also actively makes history. (2000: 177)

As two filmmakers who belong to immigrant backgrounds, Coppola and Bouchareb are very sensitive to themes like immigration, exile, memory and identity. Those issues constitute the core of their films in a given period of their respective careers and make their identities as directors. From this point of view, we can classify *The Godfather and Outside the Law* in what Hamid Naficy called “accented cinema”(2001:109) which examines cultural differences and the concept Nationality through categories such as “Hybridity”, “Diaspora”, and “Exile”

Hamid Naficy (2001) points out in the introduction to his book *Accented Cinema* that “*Accented filmmakers are not just textual structures or fictions within their films; they also are empirical subjects, situated in the interstices of cultures and film practices, who exist outside and prior to their films.*”(Hamid Naficy, 2001: 3). He argues that these films are characterized by a specific style, they:

are open-form and closed-form visual style; fragmented, multilingual, epistolary, self-reflexive, and critically juxtaposed narrative structure; amphibolic, doubled, crossed, and lost characters; subject matter and themes that involve journeying, historicity, identity, and displacement; dysphoric, euphoric, nostalgic, synaesthetic, liminal, and politicized structures of feeling; interstitial and collective modes of production; and inscription of the biographical, social, and cinematic (dis)location of the filmmakers. .”( Hamid Naficy, 2001: 3)

Naficy elaborates by saying that although the experience of Diaspora and exile differs from one person to another, films produced by diasporic and exilic filmmakers show similarities at many levels. He states that despite the fact that “*there is nothing common about exile and*

*diaspora deterritorialized peoples and their films share certain features,”* Whether at the stylistic, aesthetic, thematic, ideological or technical level. (Naficy, 2001:3)

According to him accented films are constructed like ‘border crossing’ journeys where identity is a crucial element:

In the best of accented films, identity is not a fixed essence but a process of becoming, even a performance of identity. Indeed each accented film may be thought of as a performance of its authors identity. Because they are highly fluid, exilic and diasporic identities raise important questions about political agency and about of the ethics of identity politics.(Naficy, 2001: 5-6)

Both Coppolla and Bouchareb belong to an immigrant background and their respective films: *The Godfather II* and *Outside the Law* are directly linked to their respective land of origin. They both depict an immigrant family journey in the host land, a journey characterized by a quest for identity. The manifestation of these identities takes the form of organized crime against the system in *The Godfather II* or armed rebellion against the colonial power in *Outside the Law*.

Accented films, according to Naficy’s definition, “*operate independently, outside the studio system or the mainstream film industries, using interstitial and collective modes of production that critique those entities*”. However, there are some filmmakers “*who have made the move with varying degrees of success out of ethnic or Third World filmmaking and into mainstream cinema by telling their ethnic and national stories in more recognized narrative form.*” (Naficy, 2001:20) This comparative study also investigates how Bouchareb has made the move of stylizing Coppola’s crime epic, *The Godfather II*, an attempt to fashion his film identity.

This study is divided into two parts. The first one maps the historical and contextual backgrounds of *The Godfather II* and *Outside the Law*. In the historical background, an overview of the Italian immigration to the United States and the Algerian immigration to France is provided with respect to the periods depicted in the two films. This brief history of

the two immigrations will help in situating the stories of the two families in the larger frame of history.

The study of the film contexts' of production will allow the identification of any possible discourse on identity and immigration in the 1970s America and in 2010s France. It explores the different contexts that led to the production of *The Godfather II* (1974) and *Outside the Law* (2010).

Finally, the biographies of Coppola and Bouchareb are provided in order to detect any possible affinities between them. The profiles of the two directors strongly intersect with each other, owing not only to the subject of their films but also their social and historical backgrounds. Therefore, it is interesting to include the personal history of both authors to better understand the motivation behind their films. Because the two directors emerge in a particular period of the American and the French Algerian cinema, a brief overview of the prevailing tendencies of that time is provided.

The second part represents the core of this study. It highlights how Bouchareb stylizes Francis Ford Coppola's gangster film in order to give his own film a distinctive identity. Similarities between *The Godfather II* and *Outside the Law* will be explored in terms of plot, setting, characterization and themes. Thus the focus will be on how the two films respond to the challenges on identity that prevailed in their contexts of release. As questions of identity, belonging, tensions between minority groups and mainstream group are not exclusive to one country; these comparison will be helpful in assessing how Coppola and Bouchareb address problems whose complexities are unique to their respective cultural contexts.

A whole chapter illustrates the intertextuality in *The Godfather II* and *Outside the Law*. Through comparing similar scenes from the films it offers an intertextual reading in terms of homage paid by Bouchareb to *The Godfather*. Thus, the scenes are situated in the films and related to their resonance in 1970s America and 2010s France contexts. The scenes are

selected for their significance and will be analyzed, situated in the film context and compared. In order to map the *Outside the Law's* *Godfather* parallels which are suggestive of the director's desire to highlight the immigrant community experience both in past and present.

# *PART ONE:*

## **Historical and Contextual Backgrounds of *The Godfather II* and *Outside the Law***

## ***Part One: Historical and Contextual Backgrounds***

The first part of the present dissertation examines the historical and contextual backgrounds of the Italian immigration to The United States and the Algerian immigration to France during the periods represented in the two films. It explores the different contexts that led to the production of the *Godfather II* (1974) and *Outside the Law* (2010). It also provides a brief explanation of the background of the two directors namely Coppola and Bouchareb. The profiles of the two directors strongly intersect with each other, owing not only to the subject of their films but also their social and historical backgrounds.

This part is divided into three chapters. In the first one we provide a brief history of the Italian immigration to the United States and of the Algerian immigration to France with a particular emphasis on the historical context of the time periods depicted in the selected films. In the second chapter the emphasis is put on the contexts of the films' productions, it studies in details the immediate cultural, political, and social forces which help to shape the films' contents. Finally, the third chapter provides the directors' respective biographies with respects to the cinemas they represent. These three chapters together will help us to set parallels between the Italian and the Algerian experiences of migration. These parallels in turn will serve as basis to our further analysis of *The Godfather* and *Outside the Law*.

Films are cultural artifacts which are not isolated from the contexts of their production. The direct and indirect impacts on their content can be explored through a narrow study of the immediate environment. To fully understand the directors' conscious or unconscious intentions projected in their films we have to shed light on the most important events surrounding the life of their political, cultural and sociohistorical backgrounds.

## ***Chapter one: A History of immigration***

Migration has a great impact not only on the size and the demographic composition of the population of the receiving country but also on its political, social and cultural behavior. Societies are challenged by flows of migrants from different cultural backgrounds and those newcomers have to relate to the people and institutions that are already there, and vice versa. The history of immigration is as old as the world; it is the history of humanity.

It is important to our study to start by examining the two immigrations depicted in our selected films. In *The Godfather*, Coppola shed light on the Italian (Sicilian) immigration to the United States in the 1920s whereas in *Outside the Law*, Bouchareb explores the promise of the Algerian immigration during the liberation war (1954-1962).

The Algerian sociologist: Abdelmalek Sayad (1999) states that we cannot study immigration without studying emigration. (*On ne peut faire la sociologie de l'immigration sans esquisser, en même temps et du même coup, une sociologie de l'émigration ; immigration ici et émigration là sont les deux faces d'une même réalité, et elles ne peuvent s'expliquer l'une sans l'autre.*) (Sayad, 1999: 14) Therefore it is important to first state the history of both immigration and emigration to give a complete vision of the phenomenon.

Although Sayad's book, *La double absence* (1999), studies the Algerian immigration to France we can notice that his assertions can be extended to any immigrant population at least in the twentieth century. Sayad denounces the arbitrary separation between immigration of workers and immigration of population. This separation led to the difficulties in dealing with the immigration issue. Because immigrants were received as a labor force they were expected to be temporary settlers. However, when they started to have their families in the receiving countries they became part of the hosted society. As one can read in Sayad's book :

On établit...une séparation arbitraire entre d'une part une immigration de travail qui ne serait que le fait de travailleurs (apport de mains d'œuvres sans plus) et ne poserait que des problèmes de travail, et, d'autre part, une immigration de peuplement dont la signification et les conséquences sont d'une autre portée, les

implications beaucoup plus larges et les problèmes qu'elle suscite, multiples et d'une étendue telle qu'ils touchent à toutes les sphères de la société et notamment à la sphère qu'on peut dire culturelle et politique. (Sayad, 1999: 18)

Immigration is not only a question of individual displacement or a movement of persons from one place to another. It is about different cultures, languages, religions, traditions and way of lives transported from their natural environment to an alien place. The massive waves of migrations which the western countries witnessed challenged their familiar way of life. In fact at the moment when the immigrants discovered the other's culture the locals meet with another vision of existence often opposed to their perceptions. A whole process of assimilation or integration is undertaken. In order to adapt to his new situation the immigrant has to make efforts to learn the language and to acquire the culture. These efforts are either encouraged or stopped, according to the "inclusive or exclusive" policies of the receiving countries.

...Immigrer c'est immigrer avec son histoire ( l'immigration étant elle-même partie intégrante de cette histoire) , avec ses traditions, ses manières de vivre, de sentir, d'agir et de penser, avec sa langue, sa religion ainsi que toutes les autres structures social, politiques, mentales de sa société, les premières n'étant que l'incorporation des secondes, bref avec toute sa culture. On découvre cela aujourd'hui et on s'étonne (pour ne pas dire qu'on s'en scandalise) , alors que la chose était prévisible dès le premier acte de l'immigration ; c'est à-dire dès l'arrivée du premier immigré : prévisible en droit mais imprévue de fait, car il fallait refuser de prévoir pour que l'immigration naisse et se continue sous la forme qu' on lui connaît. C'est, notamment, le sens pour une partie du discours actuel sur les apports culturels ou sur les effets culturels de l'immigration, qu' on se réjouisse ou qu'on les déplore, qu'on les loue ou qu'on les dénonce se qui est toujours une manière de les reconnaître, une manière d'aveu et aussi une manière de faire figurer ces apports au titre, tantôt de profits, et , tantôt de coûts dans cette grande comptabilité à laquelle donne lieu la présence des immigrés et qui, ici, intègre ce qui ne relève pas de l' ordre du comptable( *i.e* de l'économie au sens strict). ( *ibid.* 18)

This long passage is important in our attempt to examine the Italian and the Algerian immigrations in terms of their sociohistorical contexts. Sayad explains that immigration was necessary for the receiving countries because immigrants, as it will be seen in details later, were a cheap labor force. The presence of this force was supposed to

be temporary; therefore, they were not seen as an issue. When the country of immigration discovered that these immigrants were due to settle, their presence became a problem.

The following section will introduce the history of two distinct immigrations: the Italian and the Algerian. Before being a sociological, political, economical or cultural issue migration is first a human experience that implies the singularity of each story. The narrative behind our films revolves around two immigrated families which can be representative of each community. In addition to the sociological reading of the phenomenon we have to shed light on historical facts that intersect with the two stories depicted in both *The Godfather* and *Outside the Law*.

### ***The History of Italian Immigration to the United State (1920s):***

The United States is a nation of immigration. In his book *The Uprooted*, Oscar Handlin (1973) points out that “immigrants were American history” (p3). “Since 1820, nearly 45 million immigrants have reached these shores from all corners of the world. As a result, American society represents one of the most colorful and interesting human mosaics of all time”. (Loevy, Robert D, 1970:3) Different groups came to the country from all over the world such as Eastern and Southern Europe and Mexico. They were Slavic like Russian and Ukrainian, Mediterranean like Italian, Sicilian, Greek, Turk or religious groups like Eastern European Jews. They mostly arrived by boats in New York City through Ellis Island. The immigrants were poor, barely speaking a word of English and escaping poor living conditions, political or religious oppression.

The United States knew four major waves of immigration (Di Benedetto, A. 2000). The first wave (1600's – 1820) began with the colonies and reached its highest point before the American Revolution (1775). Most of immigrants came from England and later from France and Ireland. The second wave (1820s- 1870s) witnessed a major flow of immigrants from Ireland and Germany. The third wave (1870s- 1960s), which is the largest, consists of

immigrants of Slavs, Jews, and Italians. The arrival of immigrants from Southern and Eastern Europe marks the era of a “New Immigration”. The “Old Immigration” consisted of Germans, Irish, British, and Scandinavians .The fourth wave extends from 1970s to present days. These immigrations have made of America a mosaic of people and ethnicities. (Di Benedetto, A. 2000).

The new immigration era started with the passage of the Immigration and Naturalization Act of 1965, this Act nullified the previous Immigration Acts of 1921 and 1924 which established Quotas on the basis of the immigrants’ nation of origin. (Sobczak, Michael, 2010; Myron A. Marty, 1997)

Among the immigrants who made the American history we find the Italians. Their migration is rich and tragic at the same time. It started in the nineteenth century and continued through the Second World War, around twenty million immigrants left Italy ( Gabaccia, 2001: 1-2). Most of them were from Southern Italy and left after the reunification which enhanced the gap between the industrial North and the agricultural South.(Alba, R. 2005: 46)

In 2000, the U.S. Census Bureau reported that Italian Americans are the nation’s fifth largest ethnic group, with two- thirds in white collars position in business, medicine, law, education and other professions. (American Immigration Law Foundation, 2008) It is obvious that the Italian Americans have made significant progress comparing to the first Italian immigrants who arrived to the United States centuries before. Their story is tragic but compelling. It was an Italian who began the story of immigration to America. When Christopher Columbus first discovered the new world in 1492, he opened wide doors to a flood of immigrants from allover the world .The continent is also named after another Italian explorer: Amerigo Vespucci.

When the Italians first arrived to Ellis Island, they termed the island “Isola della Lacrime” which means Island of Tears (Sollors, 1991: 30). The experience was so traumatic

that Coppola reconstructed the scenery in his film *The Godfather Part: II*. Over four and a half million Italians arrived to the United States between 1876 and 1924. Those immigrants came mainly from southern Italy and Sicily. Most Italians were a migratory labor force from an agricultural background.

Before the massive arrival of Italians to the New World, there were already established communities from Ireland and Germany. The Italians set up in enclaves based mainly on kinship and place of birth. They set their own communities, referred to as Little Italies, where they reconstructed their own way of life, small businesses and bakeries. The majority of them were Catholics. Francis Ford Coppola reproduced the Bronx in his film. He sets an important part of his film in little Italy of the 1920s.

The history of the Italian migration was rich but irregular. In fact the Italians immigrated later than the other Europeans to the United States. Because of economic, social and political reasons thousands of Italians arrived to the United States. The period between 1880 and 1920 knew a flow of Italians to Ellis Island.(Cavaoili, Frank J. 2008: 214). Before 1820, few Italians settled in America “*those who were there represented the elite class of missionaries, travelers, teachers, artists and other professionals*” (ibid). These immigrants represented mainly northern Italy.

According to Cavaoili’s report on the Italian immigration to the United States, since 1820 Italians started to arrive massively to America, Around 81,249 persons settled during this year. But during the 1880 to the 1920 era, 4,114,603 out of 23,465,374 immigrants to the United States were from Italy. The massive arrival of Italians(and other immigrants) to the United States caused concerns with the host society which wondered how they would assimilate (Cavaoili, 2008).There had been movements to exclude alien groups which led to the restrictive immigration Laws of the 1920s. This period corresponds to the period depicted by Francis Ford Coppola in his film the *Godfather part: II*. “*Attempts to exclude alien groups*

date before 1860's and were driven by nativists; such as Know Nothing movement. Their arguments were based on the writings of social scientists." (Ibid: 215)

Michael Burgan in his book: *Italian Immigrants*(2011) assumes that "by the early 20<sup>th</sup> century, Italy was sending more immigrants to the United States than any other country". According to Frank J. Cavaoli (2008)between 1900 and 1915, 3 million Italians immigrated to America, which was the largest nationality of "new immigrants." These immigrants, mostly artisans and peasants, represented all regions of Italy, but mainly came from the *mezzogiorno*, Southern Italy. Between 1876 and 1930, out of the 5 million immigrants who came to the United States, 4/5 were from the South, representing such regions as Calabria, Campania, Abruzzi, Molise, and Sicily. They composed a large part of the following three labor forces: mining, textiles, and clothing manufacturing.

Burgan states that most Italian immigrants in the 20<sup>th</sup> century were peasants without much education. They were pushed from their homelands by extreme poverty while the promise of jobs and better life pulled them to America. (Burgan, 2011:12)

Italians were the new immigrants *par excellence*. (Lopreato, Joseph, 1970: 12) However they have been in America since Columbus. In the beginning there were few Italians in the new land. According to the first official enumeration of immigrants to the United States (1820), only 30 Italians were reported. (Ibid: 12)But the next sixty years saw the arrival of 81,337 Italians on the American land. Between 1881 and 1890, 307,309 Italian immigrants entered the United States. The following ten years witnessed the arrival of the first significant waves of Italians to the country. More and more Italians continued to arrive to America, in fact the first decades of the twentieth century 2,045,877 Italians landed in the United States and half of them arrived between 1911 and 1920. (ibid: 12)

According to Burgan's book, the Italian immigrants often faced prejudices. He argues that many Americans did not like the Italian religion. Because they were not conform to the

WASP mainstream, Immigrants who were from Southern and Eastern Europe found difficulties in assimilating the culture of the host country. “*Americans began to associate Italian immigrants with crime because a few of them were involved in illegal activities*” (Burgan, 2011:12)

The stereotypes around the Italians revolve around the way Americans often see them: as violent, cruel, gangster and connected with the world of organized crime or with the Mafia. The fact that most of immigrants came from the *Mezzogiorno*, a region known for being associated with organized crime, contributed in stereotyping Italians. De Stefano points out that “*Racist stereotypes of southern Italians as having a peculiar, possibly inborn tendency toward criminality followed the immigrants to the Americas*” (De Stefano, 2006: 25). Newspapers also helped in the widespread of such misconceptions on the Italian immigrants. In 1876, *the New York Times*’ editorial was titled “*A Natural Inclinations toward Criminality*”. DeStefano (2006) comments this fact:

The headline of a New York Times editorial from 1876, —A Natural Inclinations Toward Criminality,— says it all. There was no question mark in the headline, nor did the editorial entertain any doubt regarding the veracity of this claim. The Times authoritatively informed its readers that the —natural inclination stemmed from the fact that —the Italian is lazier, more gossiping, and fitter for intrigue than the American.(DeStefano, 2006: 25)

### ***Birds of Passage:***

An interesting feature of Italian immigrants to the United States between 1901 and 1920 was the high percentage that returned to Italy after they had earned money in the United States. About 50% of Italians returned, which meant that very often immigrants did not care about learning English or assimilating into American society because they knew that they would not remain in America permanently.(Lopreato, Joseph, 1970: 14-15)

Italian immigrants weren’t interested in acquiring the language and assimilating the American culture, they tended to return home after they made some money in the United

States. This phenomenon increases concerns among the American population. *“The fact that the Italians, like most others except the Anglo- Saxon immigrants, tended to come to the United States in throngs of males, rather than in whole family units, greatly added to the concern of the nation. A large proportion was "birds of passage," a relatively new phenomenon in the history of American immigration”*. (Lopreato,Joseph,1970: 14) The term ‘*bird of passage*’ is used to describe:

temporary migrants who move so they can fill jobs that are often viewed as beneath native-born laborers. [...] The phenomenon of temporary or return migration can be traced back to the early decades of industrialization. [...] Industrial expansion, economic opportunities, and the possibility of returning to their homelands motivated birds of passage. (“Birds of passage”)

Burgan describes the phenomenon

[...] Most of the Italian immigrants in America were men between the ages of 15 and 45. Many of them were so-called birds of passage. They worked part of the year in the United States, then either returned to Italy or travelled to another warm climate during the winter. The next year, the men would come back to the United States. (Burgan, 2005: 33)

Until the 1920s Italian immigration included one of the smallest proportions of women and children, and Italian immigrants displayed one of the highest rates of return to the homeland. (Lopreato,Joseph,1970:15). According to Mary Elizabeth Brown (2007) these birds of passage tended to flock together because they came from the same villages in Southern Italy. (2007: 10)

### ***The History of Algerian immigration to France (1950s):***

The Italian history of immigration to the United States is many ways similar to the Algerian immigration to France. In fact, the major reasons behind the two immigrations are economic. Both populations share a poor background and migrate to improve their living conditions. Italians as well as Algerians come from a Mediterranean cultural heritage, and their journey to a foreign country paved the way to the rise of many issues.

During the World Wars, France needed employees in its factories and other unskilled jobs, to replace French men who were fighting and dying in the wars. “*Three large waves of immigration have occurred over the last hundred years: the end of the nineteenth century saw an influx of Belgians and Italians, the 1920s saw the arrival of Poles, Czechs and Slavs, and the post-war period has seen an immigration from North and West Africa as well as a large Portuguese immigration in the 1960s.*”(Silverman P.1992: 10).France recruited workers from its North African colonies.

At times, the French forcefully emptied entire Algerian villages and brought young men to France to work. Rabah Aissaoui (2008) states that “*Algerian migration to France in the inter war period was inextricably linked with social, economic and political conditions both in Algeria and France.*”In the 1950s, 60s and 70s, France allowed many of these workers’ families to move to France from Algeria and settle. The war between Algeria and France to end colonialism in Algeria in the early 1960s fueled the flames of racism and hatred of North Africans and Muslims in France. When an economic recession hit France in the 1970s, and with growing problems of unemployment, France no longer needed or wanted the immigrant laborers from North Africa. (Stora, 1992)

The history of migration from and to Algeria was mainly related to its relations with France. Despite the history of colonialism and the tense relationship between Algeria and France, immigration was very active. According to Jim House (2006), the migration of colonized Arab-Berbers from Algeria to mainland France was the earliest and the most extensive of all colonial migrations to Western Europe before the 1960s.The first Algerians headed to France before the First World War (Geneviève, Massard-Guilbaud, 1999).Prior to 1962,Algeria constituted a colonial territory fully integrated into the Republic. These immigrants were not leaving one country to enter another, since they were French nationals. (House, Jim, 2006).However, Algerians were French *subjects* but not French *citizens*. (ibid)

In 1912, an official census estimated 4 to 5000 Algerians workers in France. Their presence was mainly in Marseille, Paris and in the North.(B.Stora,1992: 13). Around 1.500 worked in the Nord Pas de Calais. As WWI left France with a shortage in labor force, immigration was encouraged to replace the French soldiers in the industry.(ibid: 14). A large exodus of the Kabyle population started in the year 1914, and was mainly recruited in the military. (ibid: 14)

The French government created a service linked to the ministry of War: *Service des Travailleurs coloniaux charger d'organiser le recrutement de mains d'œuvre indigène en Indochine et Afrique du Nord*. According to the decree of September 1916, this service is charged with the mission of recruiting soldiers in the French colonies in Indochina, China and North Africa. Of the 132.321 North Africans recruited, 78.056 were Algerians (1916-1918). They were employed in the military industry, mines, transportation and in factories. (Stora B., 2006:15)

According to historian Benjamin Stora (2006), the 1914-1918 War was a shock for the Algerian immigrants because on the one hand they suffered from the brutality of the war and, on the other hand, they witnessed a brutal change in culture. They found themselves in a different society with industrialized cities opposed to their peasant backgrounds. Stora states that the 'colonial ghetto 'makes of the Algerians a 'second zone citizens'( *un citoyen de second zone*). (Stora B., 2006:15) The Senatus- Consulte of July 1865 defined the juridical status of the Algerian "indigenous" and thus makes of him a *colonial subject* who suffered inequality in employment and citizenship. The 1881 code de l'indigénat which technically makes of the Algerians French citizens, reduces them to French subjects on the ground.(ibid:15)

The end of the WWI implied the reconstruction; therefore France needed the presence of more immigrants. Algerians as well as other North Africans continued to arrive in waves.

This migration was due to economic reason for both parties: the immigrants who tried to improve their poor livings and France which was in a period of reconstruction and mass industrialization. That explains the increase of the migration rates after 1919. (Stora, 1992; Aissaoui, 2008)

The first large flow of Algerian immigrants appeared between 1919 and 1924 as explained by Stora in his book *Ils Venaient D'Algerie (They Came from Algeria) 2006*. The departures to France are replaced by large returns to Algeria, a system known as the *Noria*. The mass immigration is explained by the land expropriation, the increasing level of poverty, the decline of economy in Algeria and the bad harvest especially in 1921. The migration from villages to urban zones where the economic and social situation was better, characterized Algeria at that time.

However this migration was contested by the colons (settlers) who were deprived from the cheap labor force. Jim House wrote that after 1919, “*economic lobbies in Algeria feared losing their colonial workforce to mainland French employers, and supported hostile press campaigns in mainland France that denounced the supposed criminality and sexual aggressiveness of Algerian men, stereotypes that largely remain.*” (House, Jim, 2006). Because of their complaints the General Governor of Algiers took restrictive measures. They established a controlled immigration which obliged candidates to immigration to have a contract, an ID card, a certificate of ability to work, and to not have a contagious illness. The candidates were selected. Despite those restrictive measures Algerians continued their migration to the metropolis, and in 1937, 46.562 persons left for France. (Stora, 2006)

Before 1945, Algerian migration was almost exclusively male. (House, 2006; Stora 2006; Benamrane, 1981). They established themselves in enclaves near the factories and among the Algerian or Maghrebi community. Algerians worked in coal- mining, iron, steel and in car manufacture, and were concentrated in Marseilles, Lyons, St. Etienne, Lille and the

industrial east around Strasbourg in addition to Paris and its suburbs (Jim House, 2006). Indeed, Algerian migrants arriving in the shanty towns of Nanterre had simply left behind one colonial society to enter another, that of metropolitan France, for many migrants there were significant social, cultural and linguistic differences to negotiate.

In the 1940s, the immigrants became more politically conscious because of the rising of the nationalists parties, the mass participation in syndicates and the French communist party. A form of political consciousness appeared among the workers. Benjamin Stora points out that the immigrants were against the integrationists movements and wanted to keep their identity against the assimilationists.

At that time the French Left supported an assimilationist policy according to the principles of the French revolution (1789). The motto was a one and indivisible republic and, as Jim House (2006) argues Algeria constituted a colonial territory fully integrated into the Republic and Algerians embodied a significant exception to the established French republican 'model'. France was convinced of its role in civilizing the local population and prized "la mission civilisatrice".

Benjamin Stora explains that "*l'argument de l'assimilation se trouve justifié par la supériorité de la civilisation des lumières*" (Stora, 1992: 62) He reports in his book the following statement of Daniel Cianfarani, Secretary of the Socialist Federation of Constantine states:

La colonisation est un devoir pour les peuples civilisés lorsqu'elle constitue un facteur de progrès moral en apportant aux indigènes, attardés et ignorants les lumières de l'instruction et les bienfaits d'une saine éducation pouvant les élever en conscience et en dignité, en même temps qu'ils se familiariseront avec les données de la science moderne, la technique de la production européenne qui accroît le bien-être matériel et aide au progrès social(...). S'ils sont éclairés, aidés, soutenus dans leur évolution vers une forme supérieure de vie, les indigènes coloniaux finiront par rejoindre les peuples civilisateurs ; car tous les hommes sont perfectibles, et les indigènes sont des hommes. (quoted in Benjamin Stora 1992 : 62)

This passage is important to understand the French colonial discourse in Algeria. It reflects the colonial arguments in its ambitious enterprise of civilizing the indigenous population. He

justifies the role of France as a duty in order to enlighten the ignorant local population. The author finishes his statement by saying that after all, the indigenous populations are men. We can guess the whole embodied discourse in these words.

At the eve of WWII (1939), there were four North African divisions in metropolitan France (Stora, 1992:75); which meant that the war changed the immigration patterns. The population is no longer free to migrate by its own will but it was the French institutions which organized the departures according to the war needs. In January 1940, the Ministry of Work asked for thousands of workers; as a result 3000 arrived to France before March. (ibid: 75)

Most of Algerians aged between 25 and 30 were mobilized by force. After the armistice, many of them returned to their county. However, in 1942, the German authorities encouraged immigration that is why more than 8000 Algerians arrived at France. It was the landing of the alliance that caused the suspension of the immigration movement. The end of the war is marked by the Setif massacres in Algeria.

The French Office of Immigration was created on November 1945 (Stora, 1992: 94) It was responsible for the recruitment of workers. At that time the migration seems to be seasonal. From 1947 to 1953, 746.000 workers arrived at France and 561.000 returned to Algeria. The immigrants started to settle in the metropolis, the first immigrants were from Kabylia but after the war the other regions of Algeria become migrant regions. (ibid: 95)

The immigrants settled in France and brought their families. In 1953, the number of Algerian families in France increased. In fact they were around 3400. (ibid: 95) As we have said above, the patterns of immigration had changed. Before migration was exclusive to male, they were the supporters of their families and villages by sending money at home and by perpetuating the *noria* system which maintains the existence of their mode of life in Algeria. Most labor migrant initially expected to be only temporary residents in France. Under the 'rotation' system of labor recruitment which initially prevailed in the colonized or formerly colonized

regions. (Hargreaves G. Allec, 2007: 75) The shift to a family immigration broke up the way of life in Algeria and led to the formation of an important Algerian community in France. (Sayad, 1999)

The War for Independence started in 1954, but the migration movement did not stop, it surprisingly doubled during the war. According to a report of le Centre Algérien de Documentation et d'Action Familiale, 211.000 Algerians were in France in 1954 and reached 350.000 in 1962. Indeed, the Algerian Diaspora in France played a leading role in the Algerian War of Independence (1954-1962).(House, 2006)

### **Conclusion:**

Migration is a universal phenomenon and its influence on the ethnic composition of the host countries is at the heart of many issues. In fact massive migration helped to establish many minority groups abroad. These communities were put in a dilemma whether to embrace the dominant culture and acculturate or keep their original culture and alienate. In this chapter we have provide a brief history of the Italian immigration to the United States and of the Algerian immigration to France with a particular emphasis on the time periods depicted in *The Godfather* and *Outside the Law*.

A number of similarities can be observed between the two migrations. In the first place, both migrations share a close cultural backgrounds since they are both Mediterranean. However the strong common point remains the reason behind the act of migration. Italians as well as Algerians were obliged to travel to America and France to improve their living conditions and to supply their families. The majority were peasants from poor villages.

In addition, both populations were oppressed whether by the post feudal system which prevents Italian peasants to own land or by the French colonial occupant which dispossessed Algerians from their ancestral land. Both populations were exploited and witnessed injustices.

In order to escape poverty and oppression, Italy and Algeria witnessed a massive immigration which contributed to maintain the social structures of the villages.

At the beginning these immigrations were temporary. Italians were called “birds of passage” because they came to America, made their fortune and return home. Algerians also migrated to France for a period of time and returned home to be replaced by other members of their families according to the “rotation system”. Furthermore, the Italians as well as the Algerians established themselves in enclaves such as Little Italies and shanty towns. Later on they brought their families and settled. More and more children were born in the host countries and after generations these children are caught between two cultures.

## ***Chapter Two: The Godfather II, outside the Law and the Contexts Beyond the films***

### ***The Godfather Part II: The Context beyond the Film***

The United States is often referred to as a “melting pot” where “Americans of all nations” (Walt Whitman in *The Leaves of Grass*: 1955) come together to form the American identity. It is a country shaped by immigration, large numbers of people from all over the world immigrated to the United States since the first English settlement in James Town in 1667. The nation emphasizes commitment to three principles: “*Liberty, Equality and consent-based government*”. (Joppke, Christian, 1999: 148) The expression “e pluribus unum” (i.e: many are united into one.), (Rumbaut, Rubén G. 2005: 4) is etched on the nation’s Great Seal. It epitomizes the idea of the United States as a ‘melting pot’.

The expression ‘melting pot’ is coined by Izrael Zangwill in his 1908 drama of the same title. The idea behind this concept is that the immigrants who arrived in the United States of America would fuse together and form a new and exceptional American culture. However, this ideology was challenged by many scholars arguing that it is the diversity of the immigrants that makes up the nation.

Until the 1970s America was presented as the pot where everyone melt and embrace the Anglo-Saxon conformity. However, the Civil Rights Movement changed minds and opened the United States to other perspectives. In fact, minority groups began to unite under their various ethnic backgrounds rejecting the assimilationist model that had been the norm for decades. Joppke explains that the “post-civil-rights context is characterized by ethnic revivals and identity politics than by forced Americanization campaigns.” (14) During the 1970s, Ethnic organizations emerged demanding their rights and claiming their pride of their

ethnic heritage. According to Thomas Borstelmann, the 1970s are a decade of ill repute. (2012: 1) He argues that:

Beneath the surface waves of economic, political, and cultural challenges that have captured the most attention flowed two powerful undercurrents. One was a spirit of egalitarianism and inclusiveness that rejected traditional hierarchies and lines of authority, asserting instead the equality of all people, particularly women, gays and lesbians, people of color, and the disabled—that is, the majority of people. For most Americans, “the 1960s” really happened in the 1970s. Even animals found a place in this inclusive vision through the Endangered Species Act of 1973. (P3)

The 1970s were a tumultuous time. They were characterized by the widespread of counter culture, the achievements of the Civil Rights movements, Affirmative Actions, the Civil Rights Acts. During this period, the Civil Rights Movement expanded to touch different categories of the American Society Women, African Americans, Native Americans, gays and lesbians and other marginalized embraced the struggle for equality. The period is also known for the development of the counter culture. (Bostelmann, 2012)

At that time the United States was involved in Vietnam against the will of the majority of its population. Many Americans joined the protest against the ongoing war in Vietnam. On the political side, conservative populism prevailed defending traditional family role. Composed mainly of working class and white middle class, they formed the silent majority enthusiasm for the independent campaign of George C. Wallace who was hostile to the civil Rights Movement and in favor of racial segregation. In September 1968, national polls showed Wallace with the support of nearly 25 percent of American voters which contributed largely to the election of Richard Nixon in 1968. (Marty, Mayron A. 1997)

African Americans are not the only group of people who have suffered discrimination in the United States. Other minority groups have witnessed the same treatment in the country. In the early years of the young American republic, Jews and Catholics were denied the right to vote in some States. The Irish, the Italian and other immigrants faced a great discrimination in housing, education and employment. The Civil Rights Movement didn't only involve

African Americans, but other racial and ethnic minorities were concerned, as well as disabled, homosexuals and women.

As their African Americans counterparts, the Italian - Americans found that the best way to achieve their goals lies in organizing themselves .Minorities started to organize in order to preserve their culture and recover their heritage. At that time the Immigration Reform was a pressing issue. Myron A. Marty describes the years from 1967 to1974 as “troubled times.”He argues that “*the civil rights revolution made it clear that domestic tranquility could not be restored apart from equal treatment of all citizens. Demands for change constantly tested the traditions and practices of families, schools, churches and organizations of all kinds.*” (Myron, A. Marty, 1997: 77)

Thimoty J. Meagher wrote in *Race and Ethnicity in America* that:

The Civil Rights Movement that reached its peak in 1965 had been dedicated to eliminating Jim Crow—the state impositions of racial inferiority and discrimination that existed throughout much of the South. Buoyed by the discrediting of scientific racism that followed the defeat of the Nazis, by the American government's sensitivity to third-world reactions during the Cold War, by the Democratic Party's recognition of black voters in northern cities, and by the decisions of an activist Supreme Court, the Civil Rights Movement waged a steady, heroic, and successful “war” of nonviolent protest against Jim Crow from the midfifties to the mid-sixties. The Civil Rights Acts of 1964 and 1965 broke forever state-enforced Jim Crow in the South, and made deliberate, transparent state racism forever impossible.

### **The Civil Rights Acts:**

In 1964, congress passed a public law, Civil Rights Act which forbids discrimination on the basis of sex as well as race in hiring, promoting and firing. According to the West Encyclopedia of American Law, the term Affirmative Actions refers to “*both mandatory and voluntary programs intended to affirm the Civil Rights of designated class of individuals by taking positive actions to protect them.*”The primary impact of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 was “*the almost immediate elimination of racial discrimination in places of public accommodation throughout the United States*”. (Loevy, Robert D. 1997:333) The Act opens up public accommodations to African Americans and other minorities.

In 1965, Congress revised the immigration laws that had established national origins quotas favoring immigration from western and northern Europe. The revision placed all countries of the world on an equal footing. (Myron, A. Marty, 1997: 93) This law led to changes in the American ethnic composition.

The new U.S. Immigration law abolished discriminatory quotas and opened up to immigrants from other horizons. More and more hyphenated Americans appeared and formed new ethnic communities which enriched the “American mosaic”. The Civil Rights Movement played an important role, as the amendment to immigration and nationality produced major changes in patterns of immigration to the United States (Di Bennidito, 2000)

By 1970 large numbers of immigrant arrived from “China, Japan, the Philippines, and elsewhere in Asia, as well as from Mexico, Central America, and South America”( ibid: 93). There was also an important exile of population from Cuba which settled under other laws. According to Myron the arrival of these immigrant groups in the late 1960s and early 1970s changed America's racial and ethnic patterns. He states that these groups often encountered difficulties similar to those faced by earlier immigrant groups in assimilating into American life. (Mayron, 1997)

The Voting Rights Act which was passed in August of 1965 is considered to be the most successful piece of civil rights legislation ever adopted by Congress. (Berkowitz, 2006: 3) It states that no person could be denied the right to vote on account of race or color. The act abolished literacy tests and poll taxes imposed soon after the 15th Amendment of 1870 was ratified, granting blacks the vote. (Berkowitz, 2006)

Through Affirmative Actions, attempts were made in the 1970s to equalize the educational, employment, and contracting opportunities for minority members and women. These attempts were based on the Civil Rights act of 1964. (The West encyclopedia of American Law)“Affirmative action” means positive steps taken to increase the representation

of women and minorities in areas of employment, education, and culture from which they have been historically excluded. When those steps involve *preferential* selection—selection on the basis of race, gender, or ethnicity—affirmative action generates intense controversy.(Stanford Encyclopedia)

The era is also characterized by changes in family patterns and activities. The period saw a tremendous rising divorce rates and declining birthrates and the increase of single-parent families. According to Thomas Borstelmann *“families, the traditional foundation of American society, unraveled amid soaring divorce rates. This change brought liberation and relief to millions of people, but also psychological distress and considerable downward mobility for many women and children.”*(2012: 2)

### **The Watergate:**

The Watergate scandal becomes one of the seventies signature events. (Berkowitz, 2006) Richard Nixon was elected in 1968 and the Republicans replaced the Democrats in the White house. Berkowitz points out that Nixon *“made significant inroads among urban ethnics, including Catholics, who had previously been among the most democratic of voters.”* (ibid: 2)He describes the expectation of the American and the emergence of the biggest political scandal of all time pointing out that:

In the postwar era, the nation looked to its presidents for leadership and accorded the office a great deal of respect. That situation changed in 1973 with the Watergate scandal. Reelected in a landslide in 1972, President Richard Nixon came close to impeachment and resigned in disgrace in 1974. Using funds raised for his reelection, the president conducted a private and illegal vendetta against his enemies.”(Berkowitz Edward D. 2006: 2).

The Americans have no more trust in their politicians. To borrow Thomas Borstelmann, Richard Nixon *“disgraced the office of the presidency in the Watergate scandal and became the nation’s first chief executive to resign.”*(Borstelmann, Thomas, 2012: 1)

In 1972 and 1974 when *the Godfather* and *the Godfather part II* were released, respectively, the United States experienced a period of turmoil and changes. In his book : A

*Political and Cultural Overview of the Seventies*, Berkovitz explores the period of the 1970s and describes it as an era marked by the Watergate, the oil crisis, economic stagnation and ethnic solidarity. The end of the sixties witnessed the war in Vietnam which involved many American young soldiers and experienced the culture wars. The Civil Right Movement led by the African Americans opened the doors to other minority groups to place themselves in the “American mosaic”. The era is known for an “ethnic revival.”

### ***Ethnic Revival:***

Tyson Gibbs (1997) writes that from the early 1950s, through the mid-1960s, Americans considered the United States a "melting pot," a place where people from around the world mixed, and became American. However, it was Glazer and Moynihan (1963), in their study on immigrants from different countries who lived in New York who contested this assumption. According to Gibbs, “*what Glazer and Moynihan discovered was that America was not a melting pot, and that the strength found in groups bonding together because of national origin, language, religious beliefs, customs, or group traditions were the ties that maintained ethnic boundaries*”. (Gibs, 1997: 91)

It seems that the attempts to completely assimilate different cultural groups into an Anglo-Saxon mainstream culture failed to achieve its purpose. The myth of America as a melting pot where everyone regardless of his country of origin, culture or religion, abandons his culture to embrace the mainstream one, does no longer exist. The United States are more a mosaic of ethnicities than a melting pot.

The study resulted in the concept of *ethnic minority*. An ethnic minority, to use Gibbs’ words, is distinguished from the majority population by internal adoption, and practices of customs, religion, dress, food habits, language, and values that promote group cohesiveness. (Gibs, 1997: 92) Ethnicity is a social construction that indicates identification with a particular

group which is often descended from common ancestors. Members of the group share common cultural traits and are an identifiable minority within the larger nation-state.

In *Beyond the Melting Pot* (1963) Nathan Glazer and Daniel Moynihan argued for a variation of assimilation based on cultural pluralism, in which various racial and ethnic groups retained some dimension of distinct identity. Evoking the “melting pot” they state that:

The notion that the intense and unprecedented mixture of ethnic and religious groups in American life was soon to blend into a homogeneous end product has outlived its usefulness, and also its credibility...the point about the melting pot...is that it did not happen.( Glazer N. Moynihan D.P. qtd in Jacobson M.F. 2006: 1)

Werner Sollors states in his book *Beyond Ethnicity: Consent and Descent in American Culture* published in 1986 that “ethnicity truly was in vogue in the 1970s and the power of descent affiliations became fashionable again.”(1986: 21) At that time ethnicity “was still perceived as a new word that sent scholars to their dictionaries.” Nathan Glazer and Daniel Patrick Moynihan wrote in the introduction to their 1975 *Ethnicity* collection:

Ethnicity seems to be a new term. In the sense in which we use it -- the character or quality of an ethnic group -- it does not appear in the 1933 edition of the *Oxford English Dictionary*, but it makes its appearance in the 1972 Supplement, where the first usage recorded is that of David Riesman in 1953.( qtd in Sollors; 1986: 21)

Sollors points out in his book that the first occurrences of the word "ethnicity" was in W. Lloyd Warner's Yankee City Series, which is a five-volume community study of Newburyport, Massachusetts ( 1941). In the first volume, entitled *The Social Life of a Modern Community*, Warner and Paul Lunt, “dedicated one chapter to the ten ethnic groups of Yankee City which they correlate to their system of six classes: "(1) Native, or Yankee; (2) Irish; (3) French (French Canadian); (4) Jewish; (5) Italian; (6) Armenian; (7) Greek; (8) Polish; (9) Russian; and (10) Negro” (Sollors, 1986: 23). Only Natives is the group which is not considered to be an ethnic group.

By the early 1970s, white people of various ethnic backgrounds rejected the assimilationist model that had been the norm for decades, and they found a renewed pride in their heritage. (Schulman B, 2001: 81) The notion of the melting pot was challenged by white ethnics in the seventies, and ethnic groups became proud and united.

There has been “a huge explosion of interest in white ethnicity and in retracing the immigrant saga since the late 1960s. This trend is most evident in the outpouring of ethnic and immigrant themes in Broadway plays and Hollywood movies, including *Funny Girl*, *Fiddler on the Roof*, *Finian’s Rainbow*, *The Godfather*, *Ragtime*, *America*, *Avalon*, and dozens more”.(Charles, Hirschman, 2007 :275). In his book: *Some Thing Happened: A Political and Cultural Overview of the Seventies*, Berkowitz writes that: “the best films of the seventies used the form of established genres such as the detective movie or the gangster movie to comment on the state of American life.” He also classifies *the Godfather* as the best American film ever made along with *Chinatown*. According to the author, the era was marked by the Watergate scandal, the oil crisis, economic stagnation and ethnic solidarity.

Movies of this period mirrored the condition of the society that found them attractive. *The Godfather (1972) and The Godfather II (1974)* showed a deeply pessimistic side of American life, portraying a patriarchal, closely knit family dominated by a tough, protective godfather as a refuge from society's pervasive ills. (Myron, A. Marty, 1997: 119)

Wes D. Gehring defines *Bonnie and Clyde (1967)* and *The Godfather I and II (1972, 1974)*, as “the best films of the genre's second renaissance”, these three films were made during the Vietnam era, when skepticism about American values reached an apogee, and reflected this widespread malaise. They adopted a historical perspective in their reassessment of American culture. (Gehring, Wes. D, 1988: 55) The Gangster films of the seventies unlike their precedents make the criminal family “the only haven in a heartless world”. Jack Shadoian wrote about the popularity of gangster films in the seventies saying that:

The moral anger of fifties Mafia films and syndicate films is no longer appropriate. There is no way of working out of the condition of them being us and us being them. Gangster and nongangster alike are immobilized in the vacuum left by the untenability of the American dream for a post-Vietnam, post-Watergate society. Nor are we left aghast by the situation. If Michael is a monster, we realize and accept why he has to be one. The man must do what he does; his choices are made *for* him and not by him. They have been made for him long ago by the competitive business society in which he lives. The audience understands, and regrets the *inevitability* of his situation, because the lines of its own lives have similarly rigidified after the evaporation of the dreams of the late sixties. Michael does not fall to pieces at the end; he is not shattered. He is burdened, lonely, and withdrawn, very much like ourselves, who act out the reality of our lives without a full awareness of what it signifies. The films are neither revolutionary nor masochistic. They elicit our curiosity in a context of stalled contemplation.( Jack Shadoian 2003: 270)

*The Godfather II* is the product of 1970s America; it reflects some major issues of that period. The political corruption, the prevailing capitalism and the disintegration of old family values are strong images of this gangster epic. “*The Godfather films were certainly gangster films but they went far beyond the bounds of that genre into a much wider context. That context is the way in which those films brilliantly, at exactly the right time in exactly the right place, caught the temper of a changing America on films.*”(Palmer, 1987) Pollard and O’Hara (1999) point out that the “*20<sup>th</sup> century has witnessed the transformation of the United States from a predominantly white population rooted in the western culture to a society with rich array of racial and ethnic minorities.*” (1999: 3) Because films reflect the society for which they are made and illustrate social changes, thus cultural diversity and ethnical revival are directly transposed in their contents. According to Jonathan Cavallero (2011), *the Godfather* films are the most associated with Italian ethnicity. (p99)

#### ***A Synoptic Overview:***

*The Godfather II* (1974) is a sequel to *the Godfather* (1972). It is an adaptation of Mario Puzo’s ( 1969) bestselling novel of the same title. The film is a two plot lines narrative about the Corleone family from the Island of Sicily to becoming the most powerful crime family in the United States. The story is a metaphor of the American dream, and the immigrant who makes it in the New World.

The film follows the progress of the Corleone family from the small Island of Sicily, the enclaves of New York (Little Italy) in the 1920s to Nevada in the 1950s. Coppola depicts the story of a father and his son through flashbacks and flash-forwards. The two are portrayed at a similar age. The plotlines juxtapose the rise of both Vito and Michael Corleone in the American mob world.

The first plotline follows Vito Corleone from his exile in 1901 to his settlement in the enclaves of New York in the 1920s. Vito who emerged as a respectable Don led his way in the Bronx after killing the Black Hand local chieftain. Together with his friends he created a company which imported olive oil from Sicily. The plot line follows him from his exile, his first crime with Clemenza, his assassination of Don Fanucci and the revenge he committed in Sicily.

The second plot follows the story of Michael Corleone, Vito's youngest son. Michael evolves in the shadow of his father's story. He takes over the family business and expands to Nevada where he settles with his WASP wife Kay. They now live a life of luxury in their compound in Lake Tahoe. That life is shattered one night, the night of their son Anthony's confirmation, when gunmen target Michael for assassination and shoot up his bedroom.

The attempt to Michael's life fails and he realizes that there is a traitor in his family. He decides to undertake his revenge and continues to expand his business. He associates with Hyman Roth, a Miami rival whom he meets in his house. Despite Michael's suspicion about Roth's intentions in killing him, he carries on his work with him. The two along with other businessmen flee to Havana.

Michael seeks revenge upon his brother Fredo who conspired with Hyman Roth to have him killed. However, Roth outsmarts Michael through an assassination attempt on the Corleone Family friend, Frankie Pentangeli. They make him believe that it was Michael who

tried to kill him, Pentangeli escapes death and becomes an FBI informant and has Michael summoned before a Congressional committee on organized crime.

All the while, Michael's family is disintegrating; his marriage to Kay and his relationship with brother Fredo are falling apart. Michael destroys not only his enemies but also those closest to him. He ordered the murder of his brother Fredo.

At this point, the Corleone Family is falling apart. As Tom and Frankie discussed in a powerful prison scene, the Corleones is compared to the Roman Empire and has suffered the same fate. Michael is left alone at his Lake Tahoe Estate, weighing the consequences of his actions and recalling better times when the film shift to a flashback showing the family celebrating Vito's birthday in 1943. *The Godfather II* was nominated for the Oscars in eight categories.

### ***Outside the Law:***

#### ***The context Beyond the Film:***

It is not sufficient to read *Outside the Law* merely as the story of the Algerian struggle for independence and to limit the work of Bouchareb to that of a historian. Much of the film's artistic and political values come from the interaction between the film itself and the political, historical and social contexts which gave rise to its production. It is important to understand the past exclusions rooted in the French colonial mentality (Balibar, 1991: 9) to figure out the present of the French society particularly the Algerian immigrant minority.

The film through both content and form, exposes historical and emergent forces which framed today's France. The formation of both national and ethnic identities as combined to the issue of immigration serve as a back scene to the film. *Outside the Law* offers a subtle critical reflection on many levels. If we consider it as a product of its time not as a simple reconstruction of past events the film "offers a genuine conversation with the French society". (Bouchareb, 2011)

In January 2009, former socialist Eric Besson was appointed new minister of Immigration and National Identity.(Villard, Florent; Pascal Yan Sayegh, 2013: 247) On October, he announced a proposal for a nationwide, state-organized debate on “national identity.”Besson announced his intention to “launch a great debate on the values of national identity, on what it is to be French today.” He stressed the need for “pride in being French.”These “debates” will be organized in the two-and-a-half-month period leading up to the regional elections in March 2010.The debate was organized around two central questions; “What does it mean to be French today in your opinion?” and “What has immigration contributed to our national identity?”

The Ministry for Immigration and National Identity was created by President Nicholas Sarkozy after his election in 2007.(Florent Villard; Pascal Yan Sayegh, 2013: 245) However, it was contested by many French elite and population. The debate “*was unpopular and highly criticized by actors in civil society due to its political underpinnings and was closed down quickly.*” (ibid: 248) Gerard Noiriel left the National Museum of Immigration as a reaction to this ministry. (Gossman, Evelyn, 2008)

France is a country with a long history of immigration (Loch, Dietman, 2009). The migrant are originated from the European countries or from former French colonies in Africa or Asia. As far as policies on immigration are concerned the country praised its « model of integration ».On October 10th, 2007, the “ Cité Nationale de l’Histoire de l’Immigration” (CNHI) was inaugurated in Paris, to commemorate two hundred years of immigration in France and its deep impact on French society.(Gossman, Evelyn, 2008)

The museum recognizes the important contributions made by immigrants who have shaped French cultural identity. And yet, in spite of all its positive reassessment of the successive waves of immigration to France, the museum fails to deal with the important

question of French colonialism and its legacy .The opening wasn't attended by the president Nicholas Sarkozy, and the ministers of the Republic were also absent of the event.

On October 27, 2005, two French youths of Malian and Tunisian descent were electrocuted as they fled the police in the Parisian suburb of Clichy-sous-Bois. (Peter, Sahlins 2006,SSRC.org; Catherine, Wihtol de Wenden, 2006) . Riots erupted on the outskirts of major French cities.The rioters, mostly unemployed teenagers from destitute suburban housing projects (the *cités* HLM) caused over €200 million in damage as they torched nearly 9000 cars and dozens of buildings, daycare centers, and schools. Around to 2900 rioters were arrested,126 police and firefighters were injured, and one person died.( Levin, Alison J. Murray, 2006; Hargreaves, 2005)

The French government responded through its Interior Minister, Nicolas Sarkozy who declared a “zero tolerance” policy towards urban violence. On 8 November 2005, the government declared a state of emergency, allowing curfews to be imposed. This was an unprecedented response to revolts in the banlieues, and the fact that the state of emergency was based on a 1955 law dating from the Algerian war added insult to injury.( Mustafa Dikec, The Open University 2006; Catherine Wihtol de Wenden, 2005; Michel Wieviorka, 2005). For president Chirac the riots reflect “a crisis of meaning, a crisis of bearings, it's an identity crisis" (Le Monde 2005).The president remained silent on the issue for about three weeks.

The riots shed light on many problems in the French immigrant communities, particularly among Algerian immigrant youth. (Kastoryano, Riva, 2005) The residents of the French banlieue (shantytown) resorted to civil violence to make their voices heard. Tension has been building in France for years, with an important immigrant population stigmatized and isolated in enclaves. Both immigrants who have become naturalized citizens of France and other non-citizen immigrants living in France were involved in these riots. As France has always had a large immigrant population, for years this mostly consisted of immigrants from

other parts of Europe. In recent decades, immigration has been substantially from former French colonies in North and sub-Saharan Africa.

The November 2005, riots on the outskirts of France's major cities drawn international attention to the difficulties facing the French model of integration. The rioters who were mainly from immigrant background expressed their malaise as young in the French society. The uprising weren't only for socioeconomic reasons but they were also embodying cultural differences. The debate that followed these riots centered on the issue of French national identity and the integration of immigrants. Ezra Soleiman (2006) argues that "*The urban riots that recently broke out in France result from a loyalty to a philosophy that has scarcely been modified even in the face of a society whose ethnic, class, and religious composition has been evolving*". By philosophy he means the French Republican model of integration which

The riots that occurred in France in October and November 2005 were far from being the first and only ones of their kind. (Jobard, Fabien, 2009). Similar incidents had occurred in the banlieues, as early as the 1970s. However, two major series of revolts were most influential in shaping political debate around banlieues. The first took place in the so-called 'hot summer' of 1981, a few months after the arrival of the Left in power.

By the end of the summer, some 250 cars had been stolen and burned in the peripheral social housing neighborhoods of Lyons, Marseilles, Roubaix, Nancy, and Paris. The second occurred a decade later, taking the Socialist government once again by surprise. On 6 October 1990 the social housing neighborhoods of Vaulx-en-Velin a banlieue of Lyons seen as exemplary under urban policy's rehabilitation program were the sites of revolts, following the killing of a young inhabitant in an accident in which the police was implicated. Incidents occurred in other banlieues as well in the following months and years, and the decade saw forty-eight compared with five in the 1980s large-scale revolts in French banlieues, in

addition to some 250 of a smaller scale. (Mustafa, Dikec , The Open University 2006; Riva Kastoryano, 2005)

Françoise Gaspard and Claude Sevrain-Schreiber wrote in their book: *The End of Immigrants. (La fin des immigrés 1985)* That

De Dreux à Marseille, de Roubaix à Grenoble, de Mulhouse à Toulon, notre pays a connu en 1983 une grave poussée de fièvre politique : la réapparition inattendue et brutale du racisme idéologique dans une campagne électorale. Sous le prétexte qu'il y aurait trop d'immigrés en France. En quelques semaines, la présence des étrangers est devenue un enjeu, perturbant les élections municipales, masquant leurs véritable objet. Depuis la poussée la fièvre n'est retombée qu'en apparence. Elle couve. Il suffit désormais d'une campagne électorale pour la faire remonter. On l'a vu à l'occasion du scrutin européen du 17 juin 1984. (1985 : 56)

The 2007 presidential campaign built its discourse on the debate on national identity. (Martigny, Vincent, 2009) Until recently, themes such as national identity, immigration, integration were the battlefield of the extreme right. Since its creation in the 1980's the FN has been in crusades against immigrants and their negative influence on the French society. In France racial and ethnic discrimination were formally prohibited by the French constitution and by a law passed in 1972. Until quite recently, most politicians denied that ethnic discrimination was a sufficiently serious problem to merit their attention. (Hargreaves, 2010: 87)

The debate about the ability of the French Republican model to integrate recent immigrants and their descendants into mainstream French society (Levin, Alison j. Murray, 2007: 1) occupied the French media and political scene during the campaign. The concept of national identity was strongly linked to immigration. In its every day usage the word 'immigration' has come to denote not simply the process of movement from one country to another, but everything associated with the permanent settlement of foreign origin within receiving society. (Tribalat, 1993: 19. quoted in Hargreaves, 1995: 1).

According to Hargreaves the French use of the word immigration to refer to post migratory processes, is symptomatic of its difficulties to cope with the 'settlement of

immigrant origins' ,unlike its counterpart in the English speaking world who use the term 'ethnic minorities' or 'ethnic minority groups'.

Paul Silverman explained that in contemporary France, the term 'immigrant' has frequently been used to signify those of non-European origin(or appearance) and specifically North Africans and their children. He continues, in other words, a number of distinct categories have been conflated within the term immigration so that what has become known as 'the problem of immigration' can designate people, irrespective of their nationality, who are defined as a threat to national unity and national identity. (Silverman, Paule,1992 : 3)

The 2007 campaign has been the occasion of fierce debate between Sarkozy and Segolene Royal on the issue of national identity. (Vincent, Martigny, 2009: 1). The two candidates developed their own approach on the subject. Nicolas Sarkozy, who in his presidential election campaign openly courted FN voters capitalized on themes usually defended by the extreme right. For instance "*he vowed to ensure that Muslims would not be allowed to slaughter sheep in their bathtubs*" (Hargreaves, Allec, 2010: 86)

During the last quarter century, discourses of ethnicity in France have been characterized by a major paradox. (ibid: 83) For a long time ethnicity has no rightful place in French public discourse except to the extreme right party. According to Hargreaves, politicians of almost all shades of opinion and a very large part of the academic and research community have until recently been united on that view. However those same politicians, together with the mass media, have been deeply involved in the ethnicization of French politics. (Hargreaves, 2010: 83)

Immigration contributed widely in shaping the French demographic composition. "During the first half of the twentieth century, Jews were the main minority at issue in public debates". (Hargreaves, Allec G. 2010: 84)Since the Second World War, the focus has shifted

to postcolonial immigrant minorities, originating principally in North Africa and other parts of France's former colonial empire.

This demographic shift, according to Hargreaves, has coincided with major social and economic changes. “Since the oil shocks of the 1970s, France has experienced high unemployment levels than any other West European country, inducing high levels of insecurity amongst the population.” (ibid) This situation has led to the “stigmatization of immigrants” (ibid). Although the second and the third generation of immigrants were born in France and benefited from the right to citizenship they are still considered as immigrants and are thus blamed for the current situation. As described by Hargreaves:

Although these minorities have been the principal victims of unemployment, with jobless rates far higher than those of the national population as a whole, they have frequently been scapegoated not only as the causes of that unemployment but also as threats to the integrity of French society and the very foundations of French national identity.( ibid: 85)

The categorization of the postcolonial immigrant knows a change in terminology applied to immigrants. Until the late 1970s, they were labeled primarily in economic and/or national terms as “*travailleurs immigrés*” [immigrant workers] or as “*Algériens*” [Algerians] or “*Maghrébins*”. Since the early 1980s, “*travailleurs immigrés*” has been replaced by “*immigrés*” [immigrants], then by “*jeunes issus de l’immigration*” [youths of immigrant origin] and, increasingly, by “*Musulmans*” [Muslims]. (ibid: 85) Paule Silverman argues that

The change from an economic to a social/cultural perspective on immigration parallels the change in focus from immigrants as a simple labour force (‘les travailleurs immigrés’ or ‘la main d’oeuvre étrangère’) to immigrants as social actors or victims, from the ‘first’ to ‘the second generation’ (‘la seconde génération’ or ‘les jeunes issus de l’immigration’), from immigrants as single men on temporary work and residence permits (‘une immigration temporaire’) to families settled in France (‘une immigration sédentarisée’).( Silverman Paule 1992: 11)

As stressed by Hargreaves, no one of these expressions contain the word ethnic despite the fact that “they are all de facto markers of ethnic consciousness and have frequently served to stigmatize immigrant minorities originating outside France as alien groups that can never really fit into French society.” (ibid: 85)

Catherine Raissiguier points out in her book: *Reinventing the Republic: Gender, Migration, and Citizenship in France*.(2010) “that French republicanism is often described as a unique system that has generously opened the door to political refugees, established equal rights for individual immigrants settled within the national territory, and conceptualized nationality in terms of political membership rather than ethnic descent.” (2010: 4) The word ethnic still remains largely taboo in French political discourse because “the French republican model of immigration is said to have successfully integrated several waves of immigrants into the national community and socialized them into the French republican culture.” (ibid: 4) Despite these assumptions, immigration’s negative impact on ‘national identity’ is highly denounced in France. Since the early 1980s “it has become commonplace in France to claim that immigration is a threat to national identity.” (Hargreaves, 1995: 151)

It is important to consider the development of issues over immigration in the French public debate to explore Bouchareb’s works. In France it is the political unity and the tripartite Republican ideals of “liberté, égalité, fraternité” that have shaped the nation and defined citizenship. (Zimmerman, 2012: 9) The diversity of immigration to France caused a significant shift in the nation’s ethnic composition consequently ethnicity rises as an obstacle to integration. Zimmerman points out that “ethnic identity was always an obstacle to national solidarity and to immigrant integration.” (ibid: 9)

When *Outside the Law* was released in 2010, a year after the initiated debate upon national identity, it caused a huge controversy not only for its content but also for its identity. The film is a co-production of many countries including Algeria and France; however it was nominated to the Oscars as representing Algeria. A controversy rose before its premiere in Cannes Film Festival because “the film has been condemned by some politicians as historically revisionist and “anti-French”” (The Guardian, 21 May 2010) Ahmed Bejaoui

(2014) contributes the reaction against the film to the colonial culture that still exists in France. “*Ce film a mis à nu l’autisme dans une culture colonial encore très vivace en France.*”( Bejaoui, 2014: 35)He points out that *Outside the Law* denounces the colonial crimes and the double standard discourse of the French republic. “ Hors-la-loi a appuyé en effet, là ou cela fait mal : les crimes coloniaux et le double discours sur les principes de la république.”(ibid: 35)

Released in the setting of a debate on national identity in France, *Outside the Law* reflects the social issues of its time. It is true that the film’s plot revolves around the story of an Algerian immigrant family in the 1950s, however the issue of immigration still sensitive in cotemporary France. The director creates a context easily identifiable with the 2005s riots which involved the “immigrant community”

By setting his story in the Algerian immigrant past and associating them with the struggle for independence, Bouchareb provides his audience with a fiction which substitutes the reality of the 2005s riots and the upcoming debate on identity. The rioters were from the “visible minority”, they asked for the recognition of their full citizenship as French. This demand resonates in the context of the film protagonists who asks for their identity through liberation. However, the response of the French government by the establishment of a curfew reminds of the colonial practices. Through considering the past as a vehicle for echoing contemporary issues *Outside the Law* offers a reworking of historical past to present a present reality.

#### ***A Synoptic Overview:***

An Algerian family struggles for freedom in this historical epic drama from filmmaker Bouchareb. Opening with a prologue in which the French colonial authorities force an Algerian family to leave their home in 1925. The opening sequence makes an allusion to the Code de L'Indigénat which was applied by France to dispossess the Algerians from their

ancestral land. The film jumps forward to 1945, as WWII ends with the victory of the Allied forces. The celebrations in Paris coincide with a demonstration in Setif, in which Algerians demand equal rights and independence from France.

The epic depicts the life of an Algerian family from the countryside of Setif. The father (Ahmed Benaïssa) took his family to the slums of Setif, after they had been unjustly expelled from their ancestral land. The three brothers namely: Messaoud, Abdelkader and Said witnessed the injustices of the French colonial empire. When the demonstration of 1945 erupted in Setif Said (Jamel Debbouze) was more interested in boxing than politics. However when his father is killed and his brother Abdelkader (Sami Bouajila) is arrested by French troops during the protests, his attitude begins to change. He convinced his aged mother to leave the country. Messaoud the eldest is involved in the Indochina. The family is scattered and displaced around the globe.

In 1953, Said and his mother landed in the shanty town of Nanterre. He makes a living by running a night club and looking after a handful of prostitutes, much to the chagrin of his mother, and his brother Messaoud (Roschdy Zem) returns home wounded from Indochina. He decides to join Abdelkader in a rebel group, the National Liberation Front which fights for the independence of Algeria. French military officer Colonel Faivre (Bernard Blancan) refused to deal with the FLN, and ran a secret squad of death to counter their actions. A bloody conflict in the streets of Paris targets Algerian immigrants. *Outside the Law* was an official nomination at the *2010 Cannes Film Festival*, and its screening was contested by some French politicians and war veterans.

The three brothers have different trajectories. The film builds its narrative around the life of these three protagonists under the circumstances of the war of liberation. Each of the three is trying to construct his life according or against the events. Abdelkader becomes an FLN leader in France after receiving an initial political formation in the prison. Messaoud

who is wounded in Indochina is trying to find a meaning for his life as the head of the family, he joins his brother and struggle to free Algeria. Said, the younger brother, is not interested in the revolution. All he wants is to improve his living and to succeed in Paris. He becomes a cabaret owner and refuses to join his two brothers.

The film covers a long period time in the history between Algeria and France, revisiting thus important events and incidents. The first important and significant event is the demonstration of May 1945 in Setif when thousands of Algerians asked for equal rights. This demonstration resonates in the 2005 riots in the outskirts of Paris where many young demonstrated in reaction to the death of two young from immigrant descent. Both demonstrations were heavily repressed.

Another important event is the war of liberation which is also a sensitive issue in the French history. The director evokes two major dates of the war of independence which still controversial in the French history, the first is the “1945 Setif massacre”; whereas the second is the October 1961 deadly repressed demonstrations of the Algerian immigrants in Paris. The film also covers the war between brothers on the French soil, the MNA and the FLN. Said is the only brother who witnessed Algerian independence.

### **Conclusion:**

This chapter has mapped the contexts that correspond to the release of *The Godfather II* and *Outside the Law*. It is obvious that the two films were produced in distant times, however many similarities characterize their respective contexts. In the first place, *The Godfather II* and *Outside the Law* are released in contexts where issues about identity and immigration were prominent. In fact, 1970s America was characterized by an ethnic revival which questioned the concept of America as a ‘melting pot’ and proposes an alternative concept which sees America as a ‘salad bowl’ celebrating ethnic differences. Similarly, 2000s

France witnessed a fierce debate on 'national' identity urged by the unprecedented riots of 2005.

The issue of identity in both countries is strongly related to immigration. Because on one hand they are two countries which have known waves of massive immigrations from all over the world; and on the other hand their policies of assimilation have been challenged by the ethnic changes on the ground. These issues are appropriated by filmmakers from immigrant backgrounds who directly or indirectly tell stories about their ethnic or national identities. In these particular contexts, *The Godfather II* and *Outside the Law* (among many other productions) emerged as two major works in their respective countries. They are works which caused controversies right after their release either because of their contents or representations.

### ***Chapter Three: Directors from the Diaspora: Francis Ford Coppola,***

#### ***Rachid Bouchareb***

It is important at this level to study the two directors' biographies in order to reveal any possible affinities between their respective works. Considering the fact that both of them are from immigrant origin and their works revolve around issues of identity and immigration, the comparison between their lives will help us to identify the motivation behind Bouchareb's use of *The Godfather II* as a cultural reference to his film.

#### ***Francis Ford Coppola's Biography:***

For a better understanding of Coppola's outstanding family sequels *The Godfather*, one has to get acquainted with the life of the director and particular events that created the overall background of filmmaking. The following biography is mainly based on Nick Brown's and Gene D. Phillips' respective books.

Francis Ford Coppola was born to Carmine and Italia Coppola in Detroit, Michigan, 1939. Because he was born in the city of the automobile industry, his parents gave him the middle name "Ford", which was not, common in American society. (Gene D. Phillips, 1999: 143) Francis was born into a second-generation Italian American family and has two siblings, older brother and younger sister. According to Nick Browne (2000), Coppola's father, Carmine Coppola, "was a professional musician, a concert flautist, composer, and conductor, who played under Toscanini in the NBC Symphony". (Brown, 2000: 11) Coppola was influenced by his father's talent and sense for art, the family had to move quite often because of Carmine's work.

Francis Ford Coppola considered himself to be New Yorker, since he spent all his childhood in the New York borough of Queens.<sup>29</sup> He is a New Yorker by adoption like many other Italian American directors. Coppola performed the title role in *Cyrano de Bergerac* and also tried his luck in writing some plays by his own. He was offered a

scholarship at Hofstra University, in Hempstead, New York, where he made some friends .D. Phillips (2006) provides details about Coppola's classmates, "*Two of his classmates, Ronald Colby and Robert Spiotta, would later be involved in producing some of his films. James Caan, who would appear in The Godfather and other Coppola pictures, was another classmate, as was Lainie Kazan, whom Coppola would cast in One from the Heart*". (10)

After several directorial attempts in student productions, he won "*the Hofstra Award for outstanding service to Hofstra Theater Art Department conferred on him by the chair of the department*"(Phillips, 2006: 10). This enhanced his attention to him to build a career as a movie director, "*On Monday I was in the theater, on Tuesday I wanted to be a filmmaker*"(ibid: 11).

Coppola decided to enroll in the master's program at the University of Carolina at Los Angeles (UCLA). However he wasn't able to cope with this environment, Gene D. Phillips points out that "*The common practice in the Hollywood studios was for an aspiring movie director to serve an apprenticeship in a film studio, where he would have to work his way up to the status of director by way of lesser jobs*". (ibid) At that time Coppola was broken and the only way he found to make some money make his own picture is to shoot an erotic film. At the age of thirty-one, he was offered *The Godfather*. Sarah Kozloff points out that Coppola "*was granted the job of directing partly on the basis of his ethnicity, because Italian American groups were offended by the novel and the producers believed that hiring a director from Italian American descent would blunt their criticism.*" (2000: 220)

Before he started *the Godfather*, Coppola directed his first commercial feature called *Dementia 13* which was financed by independent-producing director: Roger Corman.(Browne, 2000: 11). Gene D. Phillips then claims that "*Coppola was the first of several young filmmakers that Corman provided an entry into the film business in Hollywood, a list that*

*includes Martin Scorsese (Raging Bull), Jonathan Demme (Silence of the Lambs), and Peter Bogdanovich (The Last Picture Show)*". He acquired the necessary practical skills, which he found useful later, as well as connection in the commercial movie business.

Francis Ford Coppola has a preference to independent filmmaking and new way of combining cinematic elements together. In 1969 he brought the idea of the Zoetrope concept which represented his individual and auteurist filmmaking till the mid-1990s. Nick Browne states that it was "*the public face and form of Coppola's attempt to merge personal, auteurist, film making with an ensemble cast with a new type of studio film and associated distribution*" Thanks to four particular movies – *The Godfather* (1972), *The Godfather II* (1974), *Conversation*(1974), and *Apocalypse Now* (1979) - during 1970s he achieved international acclaim and status of well-known and respected director. With the movie *Apocalypse Now* he illustrated that he can not only produce blockbusters of *The Godfather* type, but also, according to his original visions, an independent "ultimate kind of a movie."

### **New Hollywood Cinema/ Hollywood Renaissance:**

Francis Ford Coppola belongs to the New Hollywood era which between the 1960s and the 1980s. A new generation of young filmmakers came to prominence in American cinema. This era is also known as Hollywood Renaissance. Many filmmakers have seen their career soaring this period, for instance Martin Scorsese, Lucas and others. Glenn Man wrote that "*during the years 1967s-1976s an artistic renaissance energized the American commercial films.*" (1994: 1)

The period witnessed the birth of the American counter culture and the decline of Old Hollywood cinema. This trend occurred at a time where America underwent many social reforms because the young generation voiced its protest and anger. They were disillusioned by the Vietnam War, the lack of trust in the ruling elite.

The filmmakers who emerged during this period came from educated background and were mainly influenced by the European Cinema. They graduated from film schools unlike the old Hollywood filmmakers who relied on their experiments' on the ground. Gene D. Phillips states that *Coppola ... has the distinction of being the first major American motion picture director to emerge from a university-degree program in film making.*(1999: 143)The New Hollywood gets rid of old systems of production which considered the filmmakers, actors and directors more as employees than as creative people.

Many directors from this trend were influenced by the French New Wave and by the Italian Neo-realism. So they use locations rather than studio setting for their shoots. *The Godfather* and *the Godfather II* reflects this influence in its use of location, mise-en-scene, lightning...etc. They re-adapted some of Hollywood's classic genres – such as the crime film, the war film and the western presenting thus a more critical view of America past and present.

#### ***Rachid Bouchareb's Biography:***

Born in Paris to an Algerian immigrant family, Bouchareb is a second generation immigrant director .As an Algerian filmmaker he is “*notorious for applying the art of storytelling to analysis of immigration, rootlessness, racism, alienation, and cultural pluralism-matters*”. ( Mischa Geracoulis, 2010)

Since his first films, Bouchareb has been questioning immigration and mixed cultures. Sylvie Dulmela (2011) noticed that “*ethnic markers are present in all his works*”. (35) After his diploma from the Centre d'étude et de recherche de l'image et du son, he started his career as an assistant director on a French public channel where,he also *made* some short films(1977- 1984). In 1985 he directed his first film to cinema, *Baton Rouge* which tells the story of three jobless young persons who have decided to immigrate to the United States and pursue the American dream. The film received the Grand Prix Du Festival d'Amiens (a local

film festival). His second production is *Cheb*(1989) which was not a big success but enhanced the director's interest on issues related to immigration, identity and social *malaise*.

Themes like: integration, memory, history and identity are frequent in Bouchareb's works. Because of his origins as a second generation immigrant whose father was an FLN member in France, he experienced the weight of a double culture and a dual heritage. However his films are not limited to the Algerian community in France. In fact, his first critical and public success came with his film *Poussière De Vie (Dust Of Life)*(1995) a film about Amerasians and the struggle to survive at the Phu Van camp near the Cambodian border. The camp was raised by Northern Vietnamese soldiers who think that the Southern population was corrupted by the imperialist ideas. Shortly after the fall of Saigon, disruptions occurred between the North and the South Vietnam. The film "*passed almost unnoticed in France.*" (Sylvie, Durmela, 2011: 35)

*Little Senegal* (2001) shot among the Afro-American community in Harlem, New York. Then came the multi awarded film *Days of Glory(Indigènes)* which depicts Northern African soldiers' sacrifices for France during World War II, the wrenching tale of discrimination and valor brought new respect from France for these veterans. Nominated in 2006 Cannes Film Festival and received Le Prix Collectif d' Interprétation Masculine.

The film caused a huge debate in France. With this film, Bouchareb paid tribute to the thousands of African soldiers who fought and died to free Nazi-occupied France during the Second World War. President Chirac at last recognized the duty of former colonies' war veterans and increased their pensions. "Cinema is a wonderful tool to converse with the French society" Bouchareb says. His following film is *London River*(2009) with the senegalese actor Sotigui Kouyaté. It is set in London "*in the wake of the terrorist bombing of 2005*" (ibid: 37)

In 2010, he released *Outside the Law* (*Hors la loi*) presented in Cannes among the official competition. The film gives a close look on what happens in Algeria and France during the war of independence. Before its presentation in theaters the film caused a controversy among a certain political class in France. The director picks up the threads of *Days of Glory's* story and digs even deeper into war's inherent brutality in "*Outside the Law*," imagining what the Paris-based Algerians and their underground fight to free their homeland from French colonial rule might look like. ( Betsy Sharkey, 2010)

Bouchareb is not only a director, he is also a screen writer and a producer. In 1987, together with his friend Jean Bréhat he founded the production firm 3B that produces all his films and other directors films from France and abroad. Thus he produced many films, like *La Vie de Jésus* (Jesus Life,1997), *L'Humanité* ( Humanity,1999), *Flandres* (2006), and Bruno Dumont's films which received awards at Cannes.

Cultural assimilation has been a driving force in the films of Bouchareb, whether dealing with Harlem's community of *Little Senegal*, the devastation of terrorism in *London River* or the plight of Amerasian children in the Oscar-nominated *Dust of Life*. The Franco-Algerian director and screenwriter has recently received great interest from academicians and critics. Considered as belonging to what is coined as **Beur Cinema**, his works deal mainly with issues linked to identity, immigration, memory and challenges facing the minority groups in France. His films offer a unique view on the Maghrebi community in general and the Algerian, in particular; they open dialogues in the society and sometimes raise polemics.

### **Beur/ Banlieue Cinema:**

**Beur cinema** refers to the work of filmmakers of Maghrebi descent who grew up in France. Since the early 1980s, French citizens of Maghrebi immigrant descent have actively engaged in making a cinema that foregrounds their experiences (Durmelat S., Swamy V. 2011: 2) "The term *cinéma beur* was first coined in a special issue of *Cinématographe* in July

1985 to describe a set of independently released films by and about the *beurs*, that is, second-generation generation filmmakers of Maghrebi descent' (Tarr 2005: 2). Tarr explains that during the tumultuous 1980s, a genre of beur literature was identified in which some twenty writers commercially published. (2005: 96)

Filmmaker and novelist, Farida Belghoul divides beur cinema into three categories. Films made by beur filmmakers such as Mehdi Charef and Rachid Bouchareb, who were born and bred in France, those made by émigré filmmakers such as Ali Gholam and Mouhamed Zemmouri who were born and raised in Algeria but are conflicted about national identity; and those made by French filmmakers such as Gerard Blain and Serge LePeron, which portray the beur communities. ( qtd in Tarr 2005: 96-97)

Hamid Naficy argues that **Beur cinema** has evolved in several stages. (2001: 96)

According to him beur filmmakers first

produced realistic shorts and documentaries about the conflicts and experiences of racism, unemployment, and immigration in France during the 1970s. Then by the mid of 1980s, they made long fictional films dealing with similar themes. Those films enjoyed popularity beyond the ethnic communities. ( Hmid Naficy 2001:96)

Those films “*internalize and duplicate dominant stereotypes of the beur in France as victims and delinquents.*” Carrie Tarr explains that in the late 1990’s and early 2000s number of filmmakers begins to investigate their roots, representing Algeria through the filter of the imagined and remembered experiences of their parents. (Tarr Carrie 2005: 189) Filmmaking by and about descendants of Maghrebi immigrants has since gained international appeal, as evidenced by the 2006 nomination of *Indigenes( Days of Glory)* by Rachid Bouchareb for an Academy Award (Oscar) for the Best Foreign Film in the year of its release. (Sylvie Durmelat; Vinay Swamy 2011: 2)

Hamid Naficy, points out that: “*North African filmmakers in France form sufficient cohesiveness by their concentration in a “single” host over a long period of their films to assume a kind of collective identity.*”(Naficy H. 2001: 95) He argues that this identity is

*“partly a result of unifying structure of colonization and subsequent circumstances of decolonization, particularly in the cast of assimilationist Algeria.”* (ibid: 97) Directors like Bouchareb who are born in France to Maghrebi parents emerged under these circumstances therefore most of their films *“are largely dominated by themes of integration, racism, delinquency, identity and belonging in France.”* (Will Higbee 2013: 9)

The 1980s mark a watershed in the representation of ethnic minorities in French cinema, *“due largely to the emergence of a cluster of independently released features labeled as Beur Cinema”*.( Will Higbee 2013: 9)Beur Cinema thus refers to a limited number of short films, video documentaries and commercially released feature films directed by French filmmakers of North African immigrant origin, whose narratives focus on the experiences of young *beur* protagonists and are largely dominated by themes of integration, racism, delinquency, identity and belonging in France. It is defined by French film critic Christian Bosséno (1992: 49)

Martine Beugnet in her article: *“French Cinema of the Margin”* states that *“the construction of modern France's national identity has been underpinned by a certain ideal of democracy based on unity and equality”*. She points out that these progressive principles imply tendency to centralization and homogenization. Despite the challenges raised by the contemporary social fragmentation and multiculturalism *“much of French identity and culture remains defined by centralist beliefs”* (Martine Beugnet : 283)

Beur Cinema thus functioned in the 1980s as the cinematic manifestation of a wider socio-political and cultural mobilization of French-born descendants of North African immigrants who demanded the recognition of their rightful place in France as citizens of the Republic. *Beur* films also showed their central protagonists to be as much French as they were ‘Arab’. (Will Higbee 2011: 10)

## **Conclusion:**

Migration is a universal phenomenon and its influence on the ethnic composition of the host countries is at the heart of many issues. This ethnic composition is reflected in the different works of art, particularly films. The Italian immigration to the United States and the Algerian immigration to France, as they are depicted respectively in *the Godfather II* and *Outside the Law*, form two ethnic entities which share similar features.

The historical background reveals that both migrations represent cheap labor forces in the host countries. Italians as well as Algerians migrate to improve their living conditions. Both communities were oppressed either by the post feudal system in Italy or by the colonial ruler in Algeria. The immigrants established in enclaves and suffer discrimination because of the widespread of racial theories. The peasants who were not allowed to possess land in their native countries found themselves alienated in slums.

*The Godfather II* and *Outside the Law* were released in a context of 'identity crisis'. In fact, on the one hand the ethnic revival which questioned the idea of the United States as a melting pot; and on the other hand the debate on French 'national identity' which interrogates the consistency of the Republican model of integration. Minority groups in both countries voiced their ethnic belongings and express the malaise with the imposed idea of 'assimilation'. Both Coppola and Bouchareb produce their films in respect of the immediate contexts.

Being from immigrants origins influence both directors' choices of themes, techniques and genres. The biographies of Coppola and Bouchareb help us to draw a larger picture of their respective works. The biographical events that can be translated in the films and the cinemas that influenced them are key elements to our second part.

# ***PART TWO:***

**Bouchareb's Stylization of Coppola's *The Godfather II***

## **Part two: Bouchareb's Stylization of Coppola's *the Godfather***

### **Introduction:**

When Bouchareb's film *Outside the Law* (2010) was released, many critics noticed *the Godfather's* impact on the film. This modest dissertation considers that Bouchareb's explicit homage to *The Godfather II* is motivated by his desire to give his film a distinguished identity in order to open a dialogue with his immediate audience. By considering the two directors as enacting critiques of their contemporary contexts through their choice of stories and themes, we will explore the similarities between *the Godfather II* and *Outside the Law*.

The previous part provides the historical, political and social contexts of the films' production in an attempt to unravel the similar motivations behind the directors' choices of themes, content, and representations of the immigrants. This part will illustrate these affinities considering that the films speak for the political and social forces at work in their respective context of release.

Compared to the products of the French or the Algerian cinema, *Outside the Law* offers a different perspective in narratives about history. It employs elements from an unusual genre, the gangster, to dramatize the events that mark the French colonial history. In doing so, Bouchareb attempts to give his film a distinguished identity and style. In fact, *Outside the Law* comes closer to *the Godfather*, more than to any other film, in terms of style and aesthetic.

Through the use of elements from Coppola's crime film, *Outside the Law* sounds as a product of mainstream entertainment. However, the controversy it caused among the French political class blaming the film for holding "anti French sentiments" makes the comparison more interesting. Regarding this fur about the film, one cannot reduce it to a simple imitation of a blockbuster movie. Consequently, this study is concerned with the deeper motivations behind Bouchareb's choice of stylizing *the Godfather II*.

To this end the following chapters will attempt to illustrate how Bouchareb stylizes Coppola's gangster movie to produce an epic film which addresses the issue of the history of the Algerian immigration to France and its role in the struggle for independence.

## **Chapter Four: Bouchareb's Epic Re-Writing of Coppola's Gangster Genre: A Comparison of the Plots of *Outside the Law* and *The Godfather II*.**

This chapter will set the affinities and the differences between *the Godfather Part II* and *Outside the Law* in terms of plots and themes. Considering the fact that the two films are classified as epics following the story of an immigrant family in the receiving land; we will examine their similarities. According to Jack Shadoian *The Godfather and the Godfather II* are “a rhythmically ponderous domestic epic about the consequences of American capitalism on family life.” (2003: 268) He points out that both films are painterly nostalgic tableaux of an irretrievable past. (ibid: 273).

Kenneth Turan in the *Los Angeles Times* also defines *Outside the law* as being a film which “*adroitly puts Hollywood epic style at the service of compelling Third World subject matter.*” *Outside the Law* is the sequel of *Days of glory*, an epic war film. Bouchareb's film resonates in Coppola's Epic Crime Film through its depiction of similar themes through the use of analogous shots, aesthetic and devices.

*The Godfather II* as well as *Outside the Law* exposes a number of similar themes within their respective narratives. These similarities are firstly due to the common experience of migration whether the Italian or the Algerian. Then to the directors' backgrounds as their immigrant origin provide them with specific cultural heritage. Both films reflect themes such as family, exile, ethnicity and power pursuit.

### **Family as heritage and refuge:**

The plotline of *The Godfather II* as well as that of *Outside the Law* depicts the journey of an immigrant family. The films explore through a long period of time the relationships between the families' members and the difficult experience of displacement. The two films' protagonists undergo the assimilating process in new territories. The experience of the

Corleone family is a source of inspiration to Bouchareb who makes his protagonists evolve in the shadow of the gangster realm.

Moreover, the plot lines depict the journey of two immigrant families from Mediterranean backgrounds who exiled because of tragic events. The families are followed through an important period of time in the history of both the United States and France. The two stories mainly intersect in the depiction of the 1950s. *The Godfather II* as well as *Outside the Law* film about protagonists' sense of identity after the act of migration. It is the time period which gives *Outside the Law* most elements of stylization. Giving the fact that both films intersect in the depiction of the 1950s, the stylization takes its first elements of

*The Godfather II*(1974) is a sequel to *the Godfather* (1972). The film is a two plot lines narrative which follows the progress of the Corleone family from the small Island of Sicily, the enclaves of New York (Little Italy) in the 1920s to Nevada in the 1950s. Francis Ford Coppola depicts the story of a father and his son through flashbacks and flash-forwards. The two are portrayed at a similar age. The plotlines juxtapose the rise of both Vito and Michael Corleone in the American mob world.

In a similar fashion, *Outside the Law* tells the story of three Algerian brothers, who have their home stolen from them by French colonists because they were unable to provide documents of their land ownership. The father is killed during the 1945 demonstrations of Setif. The brothers take their separate paths: the eldest, Messaoud (Roschdy Zem) enlists in the French army, he is captured at the battle of Dien Bien Phu, Abelkadir (Sami Bouajila) is sent to prison, and the youngest, Said (Jamel Debbouze) to a life of crime as a pimp in Paris, owning a nightclub and managing boxers.

The process of assimilating in a foreign country is not easy as it is celebrated by theories. Migrants who move from a given environment like the Corleone or the Souni and who are exposed to different culture experience a dilemma. They are obliged to cope with

their host countries' culture in order to succeed; however, they are excluded or marginalized. Often, in the receiving countries some immigrants are said to be inassimilable because of their country of origin or because of their different culture and religion.

In the case of *the Godfather II* and *Outside the Law*, the protagonists come from southern Italy and Algeria. The Italian immigration in the United States, as it has been already explained in the first chapter, is considered to be of an inferior status than the immigration from Northern Europe because of their catholic background. Similarly the Algerians were considered as colonial subjects. The colonial discourse at that time claimed the superiority of the colonial empire. Both Coppola and Bouchareb build their films' plots on this historical background not only to evoke the past but also to address current issues.

In fact, the prevalence of ethnic pride in the 1970s America foregrounds the release of films from ethnic backgrounds. Coppola who is an Italian American himself undertook the task of adapting the crime family to the big screen taking thus the risk of teasing the Italian American community which no longer bears the stigmatization of their Italian origins.

In France, Bouchareb also took a risk while he addressed the sensitive issue of history between Algeria and France in his film *Outside the Law*. In a context of a fierce debate on the national identity, the film raised a controversy even before it was released in theater. Bouchareb who is French from Algerian descent undertook the task to depict the origin of the current immigrant population in France tackling, thus the colonial past of France.

In terms of similarities, the family unity in troubled times is a predominant theme of both *The Godfather II* and *Outside the Law*. Bouchareb constructs a strong image of the Algerian family following Coppola's Corleone family. The narrative revolves around the tragedy that surrounds the three brothers in exile.

In *The Godfather II*, Coppola uses the dynamic between Michael and his mother and brothers to highlight the importance of family in the Sicilian culture. He shows a family leaving under one roof, under the codes of the Sicilian heritage, sharing the same habits, tradition and loyalty. In his book, *The Italians* (1964), Luigi, Brazini stresses that family is the first source of power and the Italian family is a strong hold in a hostile land. Individuals find consolation, help, advice, provisions, loans, weapons, allies and accomplices to aid them in their pursuits. (p190) When the Italians immigrated to the United States they found a hostile land their only refuge was in their families and communities.

As Brazini argues, many scholars have always recognized the Italian family as the only fundamental institution in the country. It is therefore not surprising that in order to give authenticity to their film; Francis Ford Coppola and Mario Puzo rely on the Corleone family. Through a dramatic editing, they paralleled the story of the son Michael and the story of his father Vito Corleone as the two act as the family protectors. Gehring (1988) explains that “*in the Godfather family solidarity among the Corleone nurtures its members and protects them against a normative society consistently portrayed as unjust, repressive, and corrupt.*” ( 57)

The Italians have many points in common with the Algerians; they two give similar importance to family, tradition, ceremonies and blood-relatives. Unlike the western societies they don't have traditions of nucleus families. Usually they have large families, often three generations in one house. The older member assumes the role of the head and all the other members owe him respect and loyalty. The family honor must not be tarnished.

Like his counterpart Francis Ford Coppola, Bouchareb also sheds light on the dynamic between the family members to emphasize connection to Algeria. In the film, the act of immigration was meant to reunify the family. In order to convince his mother to migrate, Said told her that the only way to group the split family is to go to France. The mother finally accepted to leave her country.

Through the film we can notice the strong relationship between the three brothers, in spite of their divergent positions toward the FLN and the war of independence. Their first loyalty goes to the family. Indeed, Messaoud who is the eldest brother tries hard to maintain the family spirit. He begged his mother to forgive Said and accept his visits. In *The Godfather*, Connie took the same attitude when she intervenes in favor of her brother Fredo. Although Fredo has betrayed his family, he is still a member of that family. Both films provide two or three shots of the brothers discussing or arguing. Connie kneels before Michael to ask him to forgive Fredo:

Connie: Michael, I'd to stay close to home now if it's all right. Is Kay coming? Michael: no. Connie: Fredo's in the house with MAMA. He asked for you and Tom Said you wouldn't see him. Michael: that's right. Connie: kids why don't you go outside for a while. Michael: I hated you for so many years. I think I did things to myself..to hurt myself So you would know..that I could hurt you. You're just being strong for all of us, the way PAPA was. Now I forgive you..can't you forgive Fredo..he is so sweet and helpless without you. You need me Michael..I want to take care of you now

Connie reminds Michael of his role as the Godfather of the family. He has to be there for every one as his father used to be. After the death of Mama the family has to be strong and show solidarity. Connie, herself returns to home after a long absence. She was angry after Michael but she manages to forgive him. She now understands her future role and seeks refuge in the family. After his conversation with his sister, we have a cut to Michael walking toward his brother Fredo who is sitting in a chair, smoking. He looks at him and moves close to him and they hug each other but Michael looks down which means that he doesn't really forgive him.

In an earlier scene (the beginning of the film) Michael blamed Connie for being irresponsible toward her children and her family.

MICHAEL : the ink of your divorce isn't dry yet and you'r getting married ? You see your children on weekends..You know your oldest boy Victor was picked up in Reno for some petty theft that you don't even know about.CONNIE : Michael ?MICHAEL : you fly around the world with men who don't even care about, and use you like a whore.CONNIE : Michael , you'r not my father.MICHAEL : then what do you come to me for ?CONNIE : cause I need money.MICHAEL : Connie, Connie, Connie,

Connie, Connie, Connie...I wanna be reasonable with you. Now, why don't you stay with us- with the family. You can live here on the estate with your kids. You won't be deprived of anything and you can have everything you want

In *Outside the Law*, Said brings shame to the family because of his involvement in illegal activities opposed to the family's traditions and culture. Said is the youngest son, he is the only one who was with his mother after the massacre. He refuses to join his two brothers in the FLN because he has his own opinion on things and aims to raise his own business. He tried in vain to convince his two brothers, to join him.

The Corleone family is a strong family among the Italian American community. Michael is the protector of the family. Like Messaoud he is responsible for his brothers and mother. Although he is the youngest son of the family, he was appointed as the Godfather. The circumstances of this appointment are explored in the Godfather: part I. Michael shows no mercy when it comes to his family's honor. When the senator Geary shows despise against Michael and the Italian Americans, Michael becomes furious.

GEARY: because I intend to squeeze you. I don't like your kind of people. I don't like to see you come out to this clean country in your oily hair. dressed up in those silk suits- and try to pass yourselves off as decent Americans. I'll do business with you, but the fact is, I despise your masquerade..the dishonest way you pose yourself, and your whole fucking family. MICHAEL: were'r both of the same hypocrisy senator. But never think it applies to my family.

Like the Corleone, the Souni have their loyalty to the family. Despite their divergent position towards the struggle of independence the three brothers remain strongly devoted to each other. This can be seen in many situations where the choice between the family and the organization is imposed. One among the strongest scenes of the film involves the brothers after the Algerian Kid won the French Boxing championship. Said nourishes bigger ambitions for his "protégée", however Abdelkader refuses to let him fight under the French identity. The three engaged in a strong argument, ending up with Abdelkader menacing Said. Outside of the gymnasium, Messaoud refuses to harm his younger brother, he tells Abdelkader that if he wants to kill Said, he has to kill him first. Similarly Said, in another scene, hurries to rescue his brothers when they were trapped by the police.

Many scenes in the films celebrate the family. In fact, the image of the family in *Outside the Law* resonates in that of *The Godfather*. For instance in one of the rare scenes where Messaoud talks with his wife about his son: *he is a grown up! I have done a lot for him*. We see a clear parallel to Vito's return to his family after Don Fannucci's murder when he told his son: Michael, *Your father loves you very much...very much*.

Another example which reveals similarities between Vito and Messaoud is on the one hand, the scene where Vito is observing his sick son Fredo unable to do anything and on the other hand the scene where Messaoud is gazing at his wife after the birth of his son. These two situations are similar and express the two fathers care of their respective families.

### ***Oppression and Forced Exile:***

The theme of exile lies at the heart of both films. When the *Godfather II* depicts the exile of the young Vito, *Outside the Law* explores the different exiles of the three brothers. In fact, it is Abdelkader who first exiled to France since he was arrested and sent as a political prisoner to France. Messaoud is sent to Indochina before he joins his family in Nanterre. And Said fled to Paris after he assassinated the Caid.

In his book devoted to the Irish experience of exile, Michael Boss (2005) traces back the origin of the term exile. He states that "*the etymology of 'exile' goes back to the Latin noun exsilium, which had three meanings in Antiquity: (1) enforced removal from one's native land in accordance with an edict or sentence, (2) penal expatriation or banishment; (3) the state or condition of penal banishment to a foreign land.*" (2005: 16) In the Middle Ages the term tends to mean "expatriation and prolonged absence from one's native land by voluntary decision." (Ibid)

Paul Tabori describes exile as a universal social, political, indeed even biological phenomenon. (qtd in Boss, 2005: 17). He defines the exile as

'a person who is compelled to leave his homeland - though the forces that send him on his way may be political, economic, or purely psychological. It does not make an

essential difference whether he is expelled by physical force or whether he makes the decision to leave without such an immediate pressure.’ (37)

Exiles are often separated from their homeland and established in foreign countries. The experience of dislocation is terrible. They exist between two places and two cultures as expressed by Britta Olinder (2005) “*there are two poles in any exile: home, the point of departure, geographically or symbolically, on the one hand and, on the other, the place or state of banishment, of being away from home.*” Both *Outside the Law* and *The Godfather II* reflect this reality. In fact, on the one hand the Corleone family evolves between two spaces and cultures namely the Italian and the American and on the other hand the Souni family evolves between two spaces and two cultures the Algerian and the French.

Boss in his book *Re-Mapping Exile: Realities and Metaphors in Irish Literature and History*. (2005) suggests the following working definition which, in our opinion, is applicable to the contents of the selected films:

Exile refers to the status or experience of individuals and collectives who, against or with their own will, are subject to exclusion, expulsion, removal, severance, marginality, dislocation, and estrangement for political, religious, cultural, sexual, and economic reasons. (2005: 19)

Hamid Naficy in his turn states that exile “*often begins with trauma, rupture ad coercion, and it involves the scattering of population to places outside their homeland.*”(Naficy, 2001: 14). In *The Godfather II* and *Outside the Law*, the directors depict two traumatic events in the life of their respective protagonists. In *the Godfather II*, the vendetta culture deprived Vito of all his family. His exile is meant to escape death. In *Outside the Law*, colonialism splits the family and scatters them around the globe. Their exile is meant to improve the living conditions.

Various forms of dislocation such as exile, Diaspora and migration are often associated with colonialism and its aftermath. It is an undisputed historical fact that the French colonial presence in Algeria has led to a large scale of displacement and dispersal of

the Algerian population. Algerians experienced homelessness and dispossession, they were expelled from their land by force later they witnessed separation and disruption. Edward Said (2000) states in his essay *'Reflection on Exile'* that "exile is strangely compelling to think about but terrible to experience." (173)

Exile refers to people displaced from their original home. In *Outside the Law*, Bouchareb depicts the terrible experience of this Algerian family who suffered a double exile. First, they were dispossessed of their ancestral land in favor of their European neighbor and forced to move to the slums of Sétif. Later they were obliged to exile to metropolitan France in an attempt to improve their living and gather the split family.

*Outside the Law* opens on the exclusion of the family from their land. The Caid had an order from the tribunal that obliged the farmers to quit their land in favor of the French colon. Because they were unable to deliver proof of their owning the land, the French authorities took it from them. The Caid addressed the father in an authoritarian way and asked him to leave.

The father: Monsieur le Caid. Cette terre, je l'ai héritée de mes ancêtres.  
The Caid : Tu as l'acte de propriété ?  
The father : quel acte ? On n'en a jamais eu.  
The Caid : Sans acte je ne peux rien pour toi. Tu dois partir.

It is hard for the family to live their ancestral land for nowhere. The land is all that they have; they are peasants from generation to generation and they don't have any other incomes. The father begs the caid:

The father : Impossible. Je suis né sur cette terre. Mon père y'est né.  
Mon grand père, mes ancêtres. Mes enfant y'ont grandi.  
The Caid : tu as trois jours pour partir .  
The father : si je quitte ma terre comment nourrir mes enfants ?  
The Caid : c'est la loi, je ne peux rien y faire.

The family was obliged to abandon the home. The journey towards exile is symbolically represented through the mother who takes dust from the land and keeps it until

her last days in France. Said who builds his reflection on his personal experience as an exile describes the experience of exile as:

Strangely compelling to think about but terrible to experience. It is the unhealable rift forced between a human being and a native place, between the self and its true home; its essential sadness can never be surmounted. And while it is true that literature and history contain heroic, romantic, glorious, even triumphant episodes in an exile's life, these are no more than efforts meant to overcome the crippling sorrow of estrangement. The achievements of exile are permanently undermined by the loss of something left behind forever. (173)

Coppola and Bouchareb's portrayals of exile have nothing to do with a heroic, romantic, glorious or triumphant episode. Their family backgrounds provided them with compelling stories. Being respectively a third and a second generation immigrants help them in shaping their protagonists' experience of exile. In the commentaries on *the Godfather II*, Coppola states that some of the events are inspired by his family stories.

Vito Corleone was obliged to flee Sicily at the age of nine. He arrived alone in the New World. When he enters Ellis Island, he wasn't able to speak or understand a word of English. As Coppola reconstructed the Ellis Island, we can see the different immigrants from all over the world speaking different languages, dressed in different garments and feeling themselves strangers. Coppola gave us an authentic portrait of these new waves of immigrants who discover their final destination, the tired, fade faces of thousands of people who are about to start their journey as exiled.

Vito was born Vito Andolini in the town of Corleone in Sicily. His father was murdered by the local mafia chieftain Don Ciccio. Later, his brother Paulo and his mother were also killed. As he was the only male heir of the family, Don Ciccio will not let him alive. Despite his mother's begging, Don Ciccio refuses to spare little Vito. The mother says that Vito 'can't hurt anyone'; however the mafia chieftain knows well the Sicilian traditions. The boy will seek revenge.

Vito's mother( in Sicilian) : Don't worry. This little boy can't do a thing to you.

Don Ciccio : when he is a man , he will come for revenge.  
Vito's mother : I beg you, Don Ciccio, spare my son. He is all I  
have left. I swear to God that he will never do any harm to you.  
Spare him.

Don Ciccio killed the mother but Vito managed to runaway. Later, he was helped by the family and exiled to the United States. As in *Outside the Law*, we are in front of a forced exile which is induced by traumatic events. Vito witnessed the murder of his family and the protagonists in *Outside the Law* were expelled from their home and have a part of their family killed. In *The Godfather Part II*, Vito went to exile because of vendetta laws. Both films depict the traumatic experience of up rootedness and displacement. Vito, Said, Messaoud and Abdelkader had to leave their homeland to join the other territory. They are not only geographically displaced but also linguistically and culturally.

When, Said asked his mother to leave to France, she refuses and said that she is already dead. After she left her house, her land, having her husband and daughters killed she is no longer alive. The idea of "exile is death" is expressed by the poet Ovid when he was banished from Rome he declared that 'exile is death' (*Exilium mors est*). In *the Godfather Part II* the idea of exile is expressed through nostalgia, the Italian community organized itself around enclaves similar to villages in Italy.

Songs are a mean of evoking nostalgia in exile. As young Vito was put in Quarantine he started to sing in Italian in front of the statue of liberty. The song is a cultural heritage, it is an identity marker. We find the same reference to songs, in the theater in New York City 1917. Vito with his friend Genco enter the theater the performance was in Italian and the audience was from the Italian community. They seemed moved by the lyrics even the mafia chieftain was absorbed by it. The performer says in Italian:

I left Nape, I left my mama, for a no-good tramp. Now here I am in America  
In New York. Alone, thinking of my mother. Without news from home.

This song represents the common experience of the Italian immigrants in New York, their suffering and longing for their homeland. The theater represents a form of collective

experience. The immigrants have their stories staged and represented through a form of art they appreciate. The operetta representation belongs to the Italian culture. Therefore the immigrants recognize themselves and their stories.

We find the same references to cultural heritage in *Outside the Law*, the community celebrates through displaying traditional music, food and costumes evoking home. This nostalgia is expressed in the scene where the family is celebrating Messaoud's wedding. Their suffering and longing for their homeland is replaced by the solidarity they develop between themselves.

Through exile the links with the motherland are broken; the immigrants feel a kind of nostalgia toward what they used to be. That is why they develop a strong community relationship in their host country. This community makes its living in the United States but resists complete assimilation in the mainstream culture. *The Godfather II* provides strong examples of the pride of ethnic background. In *Outside the Law*, the immigrant community shows pride in the Algerian Kid when he wins the combat. The fact of winning gives them a positive image and the analogy to the struggle to independence takes another significance.

Vito returned to Sicily and revenged his family. Despite his growing up in the United States, he bears his Sicilian heritage. He remains faithful to his origin and he didn't melt in the mainstream culture. He married an Italian woman and takes care of his family as any good Sicilian would do. The Sicilian culture is strongly present in *the Godfather Part II*, in food, language, theater, religious ceremonies, music...etc.

We find the same references in *Outside the Law*; Messaoud also married an Algerian woman from the same village in respect of traditions. The marriage is celebrated among the immigrant community according to the Algerian traditions.

Exile is not only a physical but also a psychological experience. The exiled person exists between a place of origin and a place of exile. The homeland exists in the memory and

the hope of return and the exile becomes the place of survival. In *Outside the Law*, colonialism made people aliens in their own country, by trying to deprive them of their language, tradition, religion, culture and land. Besides the geographical displacement, Algerians also suffered from socio-economic and cultural displacements.

Even though it is not directly shown in the film the acculturation is referred to. In the factory all the workers who used to be farmers are wearing the 'bleu de travail' they leave their traditional garment to adopt another. The same situation is depicted in *the Godfather*, the way in which Sicilians are dressed is different from that in which Italian American are dressed. The transformation in the immigrants' way of dressing is obvious.

The protagonists in *the Godfather*, as well as in *Outside the Law* have to overcome the trauma of surviving in a foreign land and to make of their exile a new homeland. This attempt to survive in the other's territory with one's own cultural heritage contributes to the formation of a new identity. For instance, Vito and Said are trying to carry on with their lives. They develop their own businesses; they cope with their new environments bringing their own visions. They are not in direct opposition to their new situations.

### ***The Rise to Power:***

Power relation is an important motif in both *The Godfather II* and *Outside the Law*. In fact the two families struggle to impose themselves in a hostile environment. On the one hand the Corleone who takes the head of the organized crime is trying hard to legitimize the family business in the American society. On the other hand the Sounni family which capitalizes on the rising power of the FLN in Algeria to recruit among the Algerian immigrants.

*The Godfather Part II* centers on the business of Michael Corleone, as he becomes the new Don and depicts in flashbacks the rise to power of his father Vito Corleone before him. The film parallels the two stories to show Michael's dilemmas and doubts and his father's gradual ascent to becoming the powerful Don.

Vito Corleone arrived in the United States as a little boy. Coppola portrays him as calm and weak; he was diagnosed with smallpox and put in quarantine. His mother described him as being dumb-witted and he never speaks. She begged Don Ciccio to spare Vito's life because the boy is weak and can't hurt anyone. However, the Don is not convinced, he predicts that when the boy grows up he will be strong and will come for revenge. The scene between the mother and Don Ciccio is important in the life of Vito.

Vito immigrated to the United States as an orphan, there he undergoes another traumatic experience when he was isolated because of his illness. After that he led a quiet peaceful life in the Bronx with his wife and child. The turning point in his life happened when he witnessed the power wielded by Don Fanucci who later tried to extort money from him and his friends. Vito involved in criminal activities when he met Clemenza, his next door neighbor who asked him to hide guns. Vito hides the guns without asking any question and returns them to Clemenza. In order to thank him, Clemenza proposed to give him a rug as a present for his wife. They stole from the reach and gave it to the poor.

One of the most important and memorable scenes of *the Godfather* is when Vito Corleone kills Don Fanucci. This scene illustrates the rise of Vito Corleone as the Don, Glenn Man points out that Vito's killing of Don Fanucci "*during the festa San Gennaro in Little Italy... catapults him to the leadership of his gang.*"(1994:122) It was during the religious celebration. First Vito meets Don Fanucci in the cafe. Calm and confident, he gave Don Fanucci only 100 Dollars of the sixty hundred requested. The scene in the cafe, in our opinion, is one of the most powerful moments of *the Godfather*. It marks the intentions of Vito. The place was empty, only Don Fanucci was there. Vito enters, sits with the Don and puts the money on the table.

Fanucci: It looks like there's \$100 under my hat.( he looks under the hat)  
Ahh..I was right. Only \$100.( he pushed the hat over to Vito)  
Vito ( in Italian) : I am short on money right now. I've been out of work  
So just give me a little time. You understand, don't you.  
( Fanucci laughs and takes back the money)

Fanucci: you've got balls, young man ! How come I never heard of you Before? You've got a lot of guts. I'll find you some work for good Money.( he stands up and gets his jacket.)  
No hard feeling, right? If I can help you, let me know. ( he pinched Vito's cheek)  
You have done well for self.

The conversation between Don Fanucci and Vito reveals to the viewer a calm and lucid Vito who seems not afraid by the Don. Don Fanucci appeared ironic when he told Vito that he'll find him some work for good money knowing that Vito was fired from his job in favor of Fanucci's nephew. From the conversation we can feel that Don Fanicci is impressed by Vito's courage. The charismatic, cold and silent features of Vito allowed him to challenge the Don. Before meeting the Don, Vito told his friends who were worried about the situation that he'll make an offer he couldn't refuse. It is the most famous quote of the trilogy, it occurs more than once in each movie; it also shows us the very beginning of Vito's rise to power. *"I'll make him an offer he can't refuse. Don't worry!"* -- Young Vito to Clemenza about Fanucci. Vito's unheard and unseen murder of Fanucci, sets him as the new Don. His reputation widespread in the neighborhood and everyone is paying him respect. One sees him transformed into the powerful Don respected and feared by the neighborhood.

In this sequel Michael is the Don, he is the head of the Corleone family. As we have already explained it, *The Godfather Part II* is juxtaposing the two stories of Michael Corleone and his father Vito Corleone as Dons. Don Vito is portrayed in the 1920s whereas Michael Corleone is portrayed in the 1950s. The two contexts as well as the two characters are different. The continuation of Don Michael Corleone's reign of power led to the destruction of his family.

Michael leads his own business. He is aware that times are changing. That is why he changes his way of doing business. In his pursuit of legitimacy he ruins his own family. Michael aims to grow the family business let him associate with Hyman Roth, a guy who is not really respected by his father Vito. When Pentangelli tried to convince him to abandon the

idea he goes furious. During a visit to Hyman Roth, he said that he doesn't mind if Pentangelli is eliminated.

Michael tries also to get rid of his rival Roth, because he knows that it was him who was behind the assassination attempt. To get more power Michael transgresses the code of the family. His notion of doing business is now different from the old times. In the corrupted environment where everyone is looking for his interest he has to be merciless. He blackmailed the Senator who despised him in the opening scene. He even succeeds in having him testifying in the favor of the Corleone family during the mafia Hearings.

None can beat the family; Michael has worked hard to achieve this status. The Hearing saw him triumphant against the government and Pantengelli who was the FBI witness stepped back at the last moment. Michael now has the absolute power on his business, however his family is split.

In *Outside the Law* the three brothers have their own paths in life. Abdelkader who is arrested in the 1945s demonstration receives his political formation in the prison. Once he is released he attempts to convince the Algerian immigrant workers to join him. It was in vain. Along with his brother Messaoud, a war veteran, they kill their rival from the MNA. The assassination made their reputation and people started to adhere to the FLN. Backed with the information from the homeland which state that the FLN leads an armed resistance, the two brothers take the lead in among the immigrant community in France. Like Vito, the two brothers have to kill their opponent in order to establish their reputation. Bouchareb capitalizes on this aspect of *the Godfather II* and makes his characters acting like Vito. In fact Abdelkader and Messaoud seem to be members of an organized crime syndicate rather than as freedom fighters.

Despite the fact that he is the FLN leader in the shanty town, Abdelkader is unable to kill a person. As it is illustrated in two key scenes, the first is in executing the FLN decision to

kill the MNA leader and the second is in the attack against the police station. It is Messaoud who takes the dirty job. Abdelkader acts more like a political leader who gives orders to his subordinates. He is completely absorbed in the party's ideology and doesn't tolerate any disobedience even when it comes from his younger brother.

Said in return has his own plans. He refuses to join the FLN which is sometimes against his personal ambitions. When he first arrived to France he wanted to succeed. He worked in Pigalle at his mother's chagrin. Before leaving Algeria, Said revenged his family by assassinating the Caid. Said has his loyalty to his brothers only, and all he wants is to start a familial business with them. Tod Shepard points out that "Said's expanding business empire masks his secret dream of training a champion boxer. He has risen through the Parisian *pègre* to run both a cabaret ("La Casbah") and a boxing club". He managed to have a champion France in boxing and wanted to target the United States.

Despite the FLN warnings Said refuses to let down his ambitions. He runs a cabaret against the will of his mother who complains to her two eldest sons. Said looks for his mother's respect, as if he wanted to gain legitimacy but in vain. The mother cannot stand the neighbors' talk about her son as a pimp and low-level crook. Said's activities are similar to those of the Corleone family, he is the only one involved in criminal milieu. Like the Corleone, he is familiar with gambling, prostitution and he even deals with the Corsican mafia.

Like Vito, Said wrecks vengeance when he killed the Caid in the beginning of the film. Their revenge is caused by the violence they witnessed in their childhood. Both of them have seen their families' murdered. After he had assassinated the Caid Said left the country to France.

Similarly, in *the Godfather II* or in *Outside the Law* the protagonists' pursuit of power is linked to the organization whether the crime family in the former or the FLN party in the

later. Vito's first steps to achieve power starts with his association with Clemenza and consolidates with his killing of Don Fanucci. Like him Said killed the Caid and associates with a man that he first meets in the Shanty town to achieve a significant position in Pigalle with the protection of the FLN. In both cases the rise to power relies on ethnic brotherhood.

### **Ethnic Identity in a Capitalist and a Post colonial Contexts:**

Massive migration contributes in changing the demographic map of the receiving country. It also reshapes the ethnic composition. Immigrants who arrived with a given cultural, historical, religious backgrounds tend to set themselves among their own communities and most of the time established in enclaves like little Italies or the shanty towns of Nanterre.

Cultural differences are often seen as obstacles to assimilation. In fact, the immigrant is asked to forget about his culture of origin to integrate the mainstream culture. He is faced with a dilemma of giving up his culture and embracing the host land culture, in fact, theories on assimilation whether in the United States or in France prized this tendencies. The "melting pot" or "the French model of integration" does not take in consideration the two ways possibilities of assimilation.

Assimilation doesn't concern only immigrants but also locals. To borrow Richard Alba's words " for the past half century, the standard view of assimilation has been simple and one-directional, immigrants and their children shed their old world identities to adapt to the cultural and social norms of an idealized Anglo-American mainstream." (Alba, R. Nee V. 88) This view is challenged by the ethnic revival which followed the Civil Rights movements. In an essay titled "*Is Assimilation dead ?*" the sociologist Nathan Glazer points out that " assimilation is today a popular term".

In the Italian case, Thomas J. Ferraro, assessing both the scholar and popular treatment, states that:

ethnic culture and extended kinship are interpreted as barriers to the successful negotiation of the mobility ladder, particularly its upper ranks. Southern Italian immigrants and their descendants have long been thought to exemplify the principle that the more clannish an ethnic group, the slower its assimilation and economic advancement.( 1991: 178)

The ethnic Revival in America or the debate on National identity in France brought to the stage the question. So that the concepts of assimilation as they were defined are challenged and pride in ethnic heritage flourished among ethnic minority groups. It is a fact that cinema is the ground where any change in society can be reflected. The representation of minority groups in both Hollywood and France witnessed a significant shift. As it has been already explained in the section devoted to the two directors, Coppola represents what Hamid Naficy calls post ethnic studio directors and Bouchareb represents an accented director.

*The Godfather II* as well as *Outside the Law* depict a minority group experience of immigration and exile. These groups are confronted with a hostile environment which led to their settling in enclave in the margin of the receiving countries local culture. The resulted communities were obliged to developed strategies in order to survive injustices and exclusion. *The Godfather II* and *Outside the Law* shed light on two forms of strategies. On the one hand the organized crime in Little Italies which rises mainly during the prohibition .And on the other hand, the armed rebellion of the Algerian immigrants in France to gain independence. In both cases a strong ethnic brotherhood is developed. This reliance on ethnicity is symptomatic in the two contexts of 1970s America and 2010s France.

In the context of an Ethnic Revival or a fierce debate on national identity, the two directors have chosen to foreground the ethnic aspects of their respective communities. It is a fact that the Italians and the Algerians constitute two of the most important minority groups in the United States and France. Historically, massive immigration helped in forming and

perpetuating those groups which represents a force against the capitalism and a counter discourse in an era of post colonialism.

In terms of ethnicity, *the Godfather II* emerged in a context of an ethnic revival. The film celebrates an ethnic American-Italian family, tracing back life in Sicily, the Bronx and finally Nevada. Werner Sollors writes that:

At no time in United States history has ethnicity enjoyed the vogue it first achieved in the years of *the Godfather's* greatest popularity and in large measure now maintains...the congruence is no coincidence, *the Godfather* does indeed participate in the new ethnicity by celebrating the ethnic family.( 1986: 93)

The term “ethnic” is derived from the Greek. According to Werner Sollors there are two sources to the word, first from “ethnos” which means nation or people, in this context the term has the sense of “people hood” or “community”. And second from another Greek word “ethnikos” which has the explicit designation of “ heathen” or “other”. Sollors attributes the second explanation to the use of the term in the American context.

Michael Novak writes in his book *the Rise of Unmeltable Ethnicity*( 1972) in favour of ethnicity “as a solution to the collective identity crisis experienced by his subject population”(5)

People uncertain of their own identity are not wholly free. They are threatened not only by specific economic and social programs, but also at the very heart of their identity. The world is a mediated to human persons through language and culture, that is, through ethnic belonging. (229)

He also argues that scholars in a number of fields are working to change the way we think about ethnicity. There is a need to examine “ethnic cultures not as Old World survivals but as strategies to deal with the unequal distribution of wealth, power, and status.” In other words ethnicity is no longer considered to be the oppressed marginal group but “but any groups who use symbols of common descent and tradition to create or maintain power” (1991:179)

In a context of doubt and decreasing trust in the American political class, and the disintegration of traditional family values the ethnic family imagery, to borrow Jameson's words, satisfies " a utopian longing" for collectivity. (qtd in Sollors :19) . Ethnicity in the seventies America provides a refuge from capitalism. Sollors maintains that "*if Americans in the seventies needed to vent rage at capitalism or fantasize about ethnic solidarity, the Godfather II would be the better vehicle for doing it.*"(198)

Ethnicity plays an initial role in the identity formation and performance for characters in *the Godfather II* and *Outside the Law*. Since both films refer to the ethnic cultural heritage through situating their opening scenes in the homelands. Celebrations linked to the ethnic communities stress the fact that minority groups express their belonging through practices like Antony's first communion, and Messaoud wedding celebration.

Vito's return to Sicily is perhaps the most symbolic act of belonging. It shows the importance of roots and heritage in the immigrant's life. Although, he grew up in the United States Vito is still act like a Sicilian, he returned home to revenge his family assassination. The identification with the past is also expressed through the scene where Vito feeds his son Michael with olives.

In *Outside the Law* the three brothers grew up in Algeria. They immigrated to France in the 1950s and live in the shanty town of Nanterre. The mother plays an important role in keeping the family together and in perpetuating the old traditions. She refuses to bless her youngest son Said who conducted illegal business arguing that it is not our traditions whereas she completely supports the activities of her two other sons who are involved in the struggle for independence.

Ethnicity is also performed through the use of the mother language in both films. Italian and Algerian languages are used to communicate between the members of the community. Language is an identity marker that enhances the relationship in the enclaves. In

addition to that, food also remains an important sign of ethnic belonging. We find it in the different celebrations and in many shots along with traditional music and outfits. It goes without saying that Bouchareb uses similar images to *the Godfather II* to convey ethnicity. For instance the wedding celebration, the conversation between the three brothers around a traditional meal and the outfits...etc

The celebrations remain the best illustration of ethnic performance in the country of immigration. These practices serve as strong “cement” in maintaining ethnic identities. The violence, the injustices and the oppression can be faced through the enforcement of ethnic brotherhood. In *Outside the Law* the police eruption in the wedding is followed by a strong reaction of the population of the shanty town. Abdelkader who improvises a kind of meeting finds an echo in the crowd. So as a reaction to the police arbitrary arrest among the workers a form of opposition is created. The director uses this device to remain the community that they are a force. Abdelkader’s speech raises the anger of the immigrants workers who have not equal rights as the French.

In the context of contemporary France, the simple evocation of such an episode in the French history is controversial because of the sensitivity of questions of history in the country. Bouchareb opens the debate and tackles one among many issues concerning the colonial past of France. It is clear that from the point of view of a “French –Maghrebi” director, revisiting the history which marked his parents is not an easy enterprise.

Martine Beugnet in her article: “*French Cinema of the Margin*” states that “the construction of modern France's national identity has been underpinned by a certain ideal of democracy based on unity and equality”. She points out that these progressive principles imply tendency to centralization and homogenization. Despite the challenges raised by the contemporary social fragmentation and multiculturalism “much of French identity and culture remains defined by centralist beliefs” (Martine Beugnet : 283) That is why Bouchareb and

other filmmakers from former French colonies origins tries to bring another perspective in the French cinema. It is important to mention the role their ethnicity plays in their works, despite the fact that those filmmakers refuse any form of categorization.

In *the Godfather II*, there is also the strong ethnic family against the system. The family expands a business which follows its own codes. The film capitalizes on the rise of ethnic protagonists setting their own way of doing business. The ethnic family is then proposed as an alternative to the capitalist expansion. As explained in the section devoted to ethnic revival American films of the 1970s mirror the public's expectations in an era of turmoil characterized by the political malaise of the Vietnam War and the Watergate scandal, and a loss of faith in the United States government.

The film portrays the family as a strong refuge in front of the uncertainty of the era. The protagonists have devoted loyalties to the family. Michael Corleone doesn't tolerate any insult to his family, he doesn't accept the betrayal of his brother Fredo. During the late 1960s the traditional family was endangered. Many young people left home to find themselves alone.(Lobrutto V. 2005:56)

In his book *Becoming Film Literate: The Art and Craft of Motion Pictures* Vincent Lobrutto explains that Coppola takes on organized crime to meditate on the corruption of American political and corporate values in *The Godfather* and *The Godfather Part II*. Thomas J. Ferraro goes further in assuming that "in *The Godfather*, the representation of the Mafia fuses ethnic tribalism with the all-American pursuit of wealth and power. (1991:177) He pursues saying that "family and business working in tandem -- as pure mythology"(ibid) Bouchareb follows Coppola's paths when he stylizes a gangster film to represent an important episode in the Algerian and French history. The shaping of the characters like members of an organized crime is not meant to condemn them but it is a way to give his narrative a different form from his predecessors either Algerians or French.

**Conclusion:**

The comparison between the plots of *the Godfather II* and *Outside the Law* reveals that Bouchareb deals with similar themes as Coppola. His narrative is constructed around the Souni family which is a stylization of the Corleone family. This stylization is due to the similarities between the Italian and the Algerian experience of immigration. The two stories depict the hardship and exile of immigrant families. Bouchareb stylizes *the Godfather II* through similar themes such as family, exile, power relations and ethnicity.

Both films are representation of ethnic groups' journeys in host countries. They reflect major issues of their times. On the one hand *The Godfather II* proposes the family as a refuge and alternative to the 1970s capitalist America; and on the other hand *Outside the Law* embraces the idea that family is the only refuge in turmoil.

In addition, both films reflect the major forces at work in their respective contexts of release. For instance, in *Outside the Law* Bouchareb explores the historically sensitive issues between France and Algeria. His film offers thus a different cinematographic perspective on the Algerian war of independence and the role played by immigrants in France. Coppola also delivers a complex and unprecedented portrayal of the Italian-Americans. Both films give their characters voices to speak about themselves and propose a different perspective to the usual representations of immigrants

## **Chapter Five: Bouchareb's Stylization of the Gangster: Comparing Characters and Settings between *The Godfather II* and *Outside the Law***

The following chapter is devoted to compare characters and settings between *The Godfather II* and *Outside the Law*. In doing so, we will illustrate how Bouchareb appropriates some gangster's features and adopt them to his protagonists. By stylizing the actors' performances and the story setting *Outside the Law* plays with the traditional conventions of films dealing with the Algerian war for independence; he offers a new perspective to this kind of fictions.

### **Characters in *the GodfatherII* and *Outside the Law*:**

Bouchareb's characters appear to be constructed according to those of *The GodfatherII* at many levels. They, similarly, experience 'border crossing' and exile during their journeys. They are also mainly portrayed at two periods in their lives namely as child in the opening scenes and as adults in the rest of the films. Childhood operates as a background which allows the viewer to understand the identity construction of the important characters.

In *Outside the Law*, the characters' nature and personalities are borrowed from the gangster world and transformed into revolutionaries who fight for their freedom. Bouchareb deprives the initial characters of their criminal substances and conserves their attitudes and performances. The three brothers are designed like the Corleone brothers, they run the FLN operations like an organized crime family.

It goes without saying that the similarities between the two films' protagonists begin by the fact of being immigrants. They struggle to survive and cope in a hostile environment through criminality in *The Godfather II* and through armed rebellion in *Outside the Law*. In addition, they are rejected or oppressed by the society or the colonizer.

The main characters featured in *The Godfather II* and *Outside the Law* are from ethnic minority groups. They are Italian-Americans in *the Godfather II* and Algerians in *Outside the*

*Law*. The casting in both films selected Italian-American and French from Maghrebi descent or Algerian actors to perform as protagonists. Bouchareb reunites the cast of his previous film *Days of Glory*(2006) and Coppola relays on the same cast of the prequel. The two films relay on an ensemble cast of bankable stars and the stories use massive scale and large casts of characters. The main characters are reunited from the prequels.

Bouchareb transcends the Gangster genre through his attribution of gangster characteristics to his main protagonists. In fact, he shapes his heroes who fight against the French colonial empire like member of the organized crime family. This section is devoted to the comparison between the main characters in *Outside the Law* and *The Godfather II*.

#### ***Vito/ Messaoud:***

The audience is first introduced to Vito at the age of nine in Sicily. Vito Corleone is a vulnerable young boy who left Sicily in 1901, and became a powerful Don in the 1920s Bronx. Despite his tragic experience in Sicily, Vito succeeds to set himself in the Italian American community through perpetuating old Italian behavior. The personality of Vito Corleone is shaped by two vulnerabilities, on the one hand his physical condition (diagnosed with smallpox at his arrival to Ellis Island, he was put into quarantine), on the other hand his social condition (a poor Italian immigrant in post World War I little Italy).

Much like Vito, the viewer is first introduced to Messaoud ( Rouchdi Zem) as a young boy in 1925. He was working in the field when the Caid was walking toward their home. The boy alerted his father. Since this event he is not present on the screen until 1954, where he is shown in his way to Indochina. Messaoud joins the French army fighting in there.

Both boys remained silent in the beginning of the films. They are portrayed as observers. Later, the audience meets with two young men who started their own families respectively in the enclaves of The Bronx and Nanterre. The calm and silent nature of both protagonists is perpetuated along the films.

When Messaoud returned from the war he knows that the foundation of his family rests on his shoulders. He comes back as a changed man from Indochina where he survived as a prisoner of war. His wounds are not only physical. He is also tortured by the violence he witnessed since his young age. In his confession to his mother, one can see a tired man who cannot stand any more the blood on his hand. Messaoud is standing the atrocities of the war only for a better life for his little child.

What is most interesting in these portrayals is that both Vito and Messaoud are represented in many scenes involving their families. They are shown close to their families either to his children and wife in Vito's case or to his mother and two brothers in Messaoud case. It is obvious that Bouchareb has chosen Messaoud to be the alter ego of Vito. Most of his features resonate in those of Vito.

One among the best scene of *Outside the Law* involves all three brothers. They meet after Said's boxer has scored an important victory; however, it was only Said who celebrates this victory. "*I'll take him to the French Championships,*" he says, holding a cigar, "*and he'll win it all.*" Abdelkader, though, believes that having an Algerian fight in the French Championships is treason, and becomes more and more agitated as Said refuses to back off. Messaoud steps in and makes it clear that, by refusing to obey, it is his life that he risks. "*If you want to kill me, kill me,*" Said says. "*I've dreamed of this all my life, and I'm not giving up on it now.*" But after Said has left, Messaoud blames Abdelkader's attitude towards his youngest brother "*What are you going to do? Kill your own brother?*" he asks. Then he pulls out a gun and holds it to his own throat, before forcing it into Abdelkader's hand. "*Then do it now. Come on, shoot.*" Abdelkader, of course, can't.

Another important scene which involves the family is when Vito killed Don Fanucci and returns to sit beside his family. The Corleone family was sitting on the steps in front of their apartment. Vito walks up to them, holds his son Michael and kisses him saying in Italian

“ *your father loves you very much—very much.*” This scene shows the importance of family to Vito Corleone.

To Messaoud, like to Vito, the family is very important. Therefore he stands against his brother Abdelkader when this later threatened Said on behalf of the revolution. He refuses that any hurt be done to the young brother. Even though Said is openly against the FLN points of view; he also pledged for his mother’s reconciliation with Said however it was in vain.

Both *the Godfather II* and *Outside the Law* construct strong images of the family involving respectively Vito and Messaoud. The scene which depicts Vito gazing his first born son resonates in the scene where Messaoud holding his newly born son. Both men express their fist loyalty to the family. The image of the family men contrasts with the violent world they evolve in.

Bouchareb’s stylization occurs in many scenes. For instance, the scene where Messaoud is waiting outdoor the birth of his first son is similar to the scene when Vito is suffering at the sight of his sick son Fredo who is treated for pneumonia. Both men suffer because they can’t offer better living conditions to their families. They are shown standing behind the doors.

In *The Godfather II*, Vito is fighting for his survival. He stands up at the injustice caused by the Black Hands and eliminates Don Fanucci who exploits the community. He also acts like an urban Robin Hood who steals from the rich and gives to the poor. Thus he proves his loyalty to the community. Along with Clemenza and Geneco, he starts his gang.

Much like Vito, Messaoud stands to injustice and engages in a struggle against colonial rule. When Vito is struggling to survive, Messaoud is fighting to gain independence. It is clear that Bouchareb has moulded him as the Don; however, he has added a historical dimension. This makes of Messaoud a war hero who fights for a noble cause. He sacrifices his life to achieve his purpose.

### **Michael Corleone/ Said:**

The viewer first meets with Michael in the opening scene of the film where he received people who pay him respect as the new Godfather. Michael is a man absorbed in vengeance. He sacrifices his family for the sake of his ambitions. Al Pacino plays the notorious Don Michale Corleone in the 1950s. He portrays a Michael already consumed by power and greed who continues to push for more and more, letting nothing get in his way.

Michael Corleone, Don Vito's third and youngest son, is the central character of the "Godfather" saga. In "*The Godfather, Part II*," Michael, now pointed as head of the Corleone Empire, seeks to legitimize the family's enterprises. As part of his reorganization plan, he moves the family compound from New York to Nevada where he invests heavily in gambling casinos and hotels.

Said, like Michael Corleone, also invested heavily in night club in Pigalle. He wants to leave the slums of Nanterre for a better place. In the beginning of the film Said refuses to join the other Algerian workers in the Renault factories. He refuses to be a slave to Renault. Said considers himself as being free despite the French colonization of Algerian. Like Michael his only objective is to raise his business.

Both characters, Michael and Said don't trust anyone. They only have confidence in their families. Michael is developing his business and tries to keep an eye on his rivals. The attempt on his life in his own room increases his vigilance and the betrayal of his brother Fredo reveals a merciless person. Like Michael, Said only trusts his two brothers. He refuses to be involved in the FLN. In fact, Said refuses to give a bigger part of his benefits to the organization. He is shown smoking a cigar in many scenes despite the interdictions imposed by the party.

Michale Corleone's story is set in the 1950s, heis now the new "Don" of the Corleone crime family. He lives in Lake Tahoe (Nevada) where he moves the Corleone business. Now

he is planning an alliance with Hyman Roth a Miami leader played by Lee Strasberg. Michael is a successful business man and owns a few casinos in the state.

In retrospect Michael Corleone (Al Pacino) is growing in the shadow of his father Vito Corleone and the story tells the relationship between them when Michael was a kid. The youngest son of the Corleone who grew up to be his father successor, but at the same time how he became a different person than his father was.

Al Pacino portrays a “dark, gritty, unforgiving, and merciless” Michael Corleone. The contrast between a warm and caring father portrayed by his father Vito Corleone is enhanced through the different flashbacks. Married to the outsider Kay (Dian Keaton) a WASP who cannot understand the Sicilian culture, he is working to legitimize the Corleone family but without success.

After the Hearings Michael beats the system because nothing is proved against him; however, the pursuit of power and his greediness for vengeance cost him his family life. Unlike his father who managed to keep his family safe in his way to glory. Michael then tells Fredo: *"You're nothing to me now. Not a brother, not a friend, nothing"*. He is unable to forgive.

Al Pacino's “mannered soft-spokenness, small build, tight uncomfortableness, and minor-key presence suit the more reductive and darker vision of the sequel”.( Jack, Shadoian, 2003: 271) The viewer first meets Michael in the opening scene of the film where he received people who give him respect as the new Don. His way of doing business is contested by many persons of his family. For instance, Frankie Pentangeli who reminds him of the old times and complains about this new way of doing business

He doesn't trust anyone as he confesses to his brother Tom after the attempt to his life. He leaves the family under Tom's protection because he is the only one he trusts in these

times. Michael thus starts his quest of vengeance. Michael is a man absorbed in vengeance. He sacrifices his family for the sake of his ambitions.

Like Michael, Said is the youngest of the three brothers. He is not interested in politics or in the FLN's activities. In 1954, he moved to Paris to make his fortune in the shady clubs and boxing halls of Pigalle. Said is working hard to gain his mother's respect. However, it is in vain because she doesn't approve the way he conducts his business. Once in Paris, Said and his mother set up home in the shantytown of Nanterre and Said starts to make a living as a pimp. He refuses to conform to the other immigrants and works as a "slave chez Renault".

Said's expanding business empire masks his secret dream of training a champion boxer. Said has risen through the Parisian *pègre* to run both a cabaret ("La Casbah") and a boxing club (Shepard Tod, 2011). He pursues his dream of creating the first Algerian boxing champion. Unlike Abdelkader, his first loyalty goes to his family. The attempts to convince him to join the FLN are without any success. All he wants is to do business and earn more money. He tries vainly to convince his two older brothers to start a work together but without a result.

Of the three brothers, it is Said who shows more similarities with Michael Corleone. Like him he conducts an illegal business and deals with the world of crime. He runs a night club which reminds the viewers with Michael's Las Vegas business. He refuses to stay in the enclave and wants to expand his work to make more money. He also wants to start a family business with his two brothers who don't share his opinion.

Like Michael, Said doesn't trust anyone. He relies on himself and rejects any attempt to involve him in the FLN activities. Despite his brothers' insistence, he continues to run his club and to manage a Kid in order to win the French championship. Much like Michael Corleone, Said's way of doing business is contested by many persons of his family and the

neighborhood. His mother refuses to talk to him despite Messaoud insistence. Like Michael he alienates himself from his family through his pursuit of power.

**Abdelkader:**

Abdelkader is the second son of the Souni family. He is arrested in the demonstrations of May 1945 and jailed in France. The audience is introduced to the character in the opening scene where he was obliged to leave school because his father cannot offer for his education. The boy seemed to be good at school and was among the best student. At a young age he shows protest against the injustice.

Bouchareb portrays him as being good at school, he is distinguished from the others by wearing glasses which is a promise of his future career. During the Setif demonstrations, the young Abdelkader was in the first line. It was him who held the Algerian flag after the assassination of young scout. He is arrested and taken to a prison in Paris. Since his youth, Abdelkader showed interest in politics, he tried to convince Said to join him in the demonstration.

Once in prison Abdelkader is initiated to the FLN through the Algerian prisoners. He witnessed more injustice when he assisted through his jail window to the execution of an Algerian prisoner. The guillotine was a common practice at that time. Out of prison Abdelkader reunites with his family in the shanty town of Nanterre where he continues in the resistance movement. Gradually climbing up the ladder of the FLN, he is joined in the struggle by Messaoud. They try to convince the Algerian immigrant workers to join the FLN, not without difficulties because of the already established MNA party.

Like gang leaders, Abdelkader and Messaoud begin to take increasingly violent actions. They first assassinate the MNA leader and then take his place to collect taxes. They also kill policemen who were known for torturing Algerians. Abdelkader rises up the ranks of

the FLN and leads a clandestine life. He is obliged to change his residence and moves to a flat in the City.

The FLN leader acts like an intellectual whose devotion is only to his party. He is unable to kill the MNA leader delegating this hard task to his brother Messaoud. Abdelkader can be considered as a tragic hero,. He is first arrested and taken to France where he receives his political formation. Later, out of prison he starts to affirm himself as a notorious FLN leader. He is tracked by the French police and hides in the city. At the end of the film he is killed during the October 1961s demonstrations.

Among the three brothers, it is perhaps Abdelkader who hasn't a counterpart character in *the Godfather II*. Bouchareb shapes him like a revolutionary leader in the shoes of a gangster. He represents the FLN's ideology of that time. His existence in the film reminds the audience that the film is not a traditional gangster film but a film about the struggle for independence.

#### **Setting in *The Godfather II* and *Outside the Law*:**

Bouchareb's stylization of Coppola's *the Godfather* concerns also the different settings he refers to in his film. Almost every key setting in *the Godfather II* has its counterpart in *Outside the Law*. The large on location decors, the beautiful scenery in the homelands sequences, the confined spaces in apartment, cafés or bars and the big Cities are similar choices that Bouchareb has adopted.

Hence, the analogies between *the Godfather II* and *Outside the Law* can also be seen at the level of their respective settings. The actions of the two films take place in similar periods and spaces. The films also cover a long period of history in the United States and in France. Similarly, both films' narratives evolve mainly in three locations: the homeland (Sicily and Setif), the immigrant's enclaves (the Bronx and Nanterre) and the city ( New York, Nevada

and Paris). This diversity of locations offers the directors the possibilities to play with the contrasts and symbolic aspects of the setting to the immigrant population.

Bouchareb's use of settings shows many similarities with *the Godfather II*. The overall nature of the settings in *The Godfather II* and *Outside the Law* are representative of the duality that characterizes the immigrant countries. On the one hand there are the enclaves that host the immigrants, and on the other hand the local population places. These two separated world are symbolic of the attitude toward immigrants.

### **The Presentation of Native Lands:**

Indeed the two references in the films to the homeland are nostalgic and evocative of the importance of roots in the life of immigrants. *The Godfather II* first scenes occurred in Sicily. The director filmed this part on location to bring authenticity to the narrative line of the story. The beautiful, pastoral landscapes of Italy contrast with the later urban cityscapes of the United States. Vito is walking with his mother in his father's procession. The camera offers us an overall view of the harsh and minimalist nature of Sicily. It is this environment which has shaped the character of Vito. The reference to nature as the first setting in *the Godfather II* is a nostalgic one.

*In the Godfather II* the return to Sicily is of a major importance in the film. The opening scenes establish the island as a place of Vito's childhood. The camera offers a wide-angle shot of the countryside. The first scenes depict the island in a sunny and beautiful day. There is no sign of modern life there, the landscapes are rocky and hilly. In the next scene, nine-year-old Vito Andolini walks with his mother through the Sicilian countryside, near the town of Corleone. They are at the head of a funeral procession for Vito's father, who was killed by a local Mafia boss, Don Ciccio. The year is 1901. During the procession, Don Ciccio's men open fire in the surrounding hills and kill Vito's older brother, Paolo. A few days later, Vito's mother takes Vito with her to see Don Ciccio and begs the don to spare

Vito's life. When Don Ciccio refuses, Vito's mother puts a knife to his throat and tells Vito to run. When Vito looks back, he sees his mother being shot squarely through the chest by Ciccio's bodyguards. Then he keeps running. Don Ciccio hunts for young Vito, but friends help smuggle him onto a boat bound for America. Vito arrives at Ellis Island, where he is given the last name Corleone and quarantined for three months until he recovers from small pox.

In a similar fashion, Bouchareb opens his film in his homeland Setif. The countryside is portrayed as *Outside the Law* opens in 1925 colonized Algeria. A Setifian family is expelled from its ancestral land. The French authorities represented by the Caid (Laarbi Zekal) forced the family to leave its property in favor of the French colon because they have no legal papers to prove their ownership. The policy of expropriation led by the French colonizer displaced many Algerians from their lands reminds us with the feudal practices in Sicily. We are introduced to the story through the eyes of Messaoud the eldest son who is working in the land. Here also Setif like Sicily represents the land of innocence because it represents the childhood of the main characters.

The director uses a perspective view through the children's eyes who witnessed the injustices and oppression. So that we can see the Caid's arrival and his eviction of the family from the ancestral land from the three brothers eyes in a similar fashion as Vito's witness of his family's assassination. The children in both films are portrayed as observers. The audience identifies thus with their points of views and the different close ups of them enhances the directors' intention.

The mother in *Outside the law* (Shafia Boudraa), much like the mother in *the Godfather II*, is a strong figure who can be identified with the homeland. She is shown screaming on the Caid and his men, challenging thus his authority similarly like Vito's

mother in front of the local mafia chieftain. Both women are portrayed in a similar attitude reflecting the harshness of Sicily and Setif. They stand as major forces against the injustice.

The next scene in *Outside the Law* is a jump cut to May 1945. It is the end of Second World War. Images from the archives are included in the film. The celebration in the streets of Paris contrast with the violent repressions in the streets of Setif. The Algerians demonstrated and asked France to keep its promises and claimed their liberty. Abdel Kader was among the demonstrators whereas Said was preparing a boxing combat. The repression was very violent, the military and colons participate against no-armed “citizens”. Abdelkader was arrested but Said escaped and returns home to find that his father and sisters were killed. Only the mother survived the massacre, he finds her in a state of shock. The film reports real historic events on the Setif massacre of 1945.

Unlike *the Godfather II*, *Outside the Law* adds a historical dimension to its narrative. Through the inclusion of historical facts and images, Bouchareb clearly shows that his film is not for mere entertainment. He places these references to history in a way that makes the relationship to the homeland stronger and symbolic. In fact, the oppression and displacement are predominant factors in the lives of the three brothers.

Cut to the eve of the war of independence, Said is observing the situation. The atmosphere in the streets, the oppression and injustices and the suffering of the population are signs which indicate something is going to happen. The next shot shows Said walking in a beautiful garden. We recognize the aged Caid who is sleeping on a chair. Said accomplished his revenge, he stabbed the Caid and took his watch and wallet. This scene is a combination of two scenes from *the Godfather*. The first is when Robert De Niro killed Don Fanucci and took his wallet and the second in Sicily where he stabbed Don Ciccio. After he kills the Caid, Said washes his hands from blood and returns home to convince his mother of the necessity to leave the country.

In both *The Godfather II* and *Outside the Law* the homeland is the place of oppression. It is associated with the injustice that the protagonists undergo. Algeria was a colonized country where peasants were expelled from their ancestral land and Sicily was under the domination of the mafia. In these harsh countries the mother emerges as a figure of resistance and protection.

### **The Host Countries:**

The second common experience is the host countries through the enclaves and the big city. Little Italy is very represented in Hollywood films unlike Nanterre which is recent in the French cinema. The directors' aims to capture the real essence of the life in the slums lead to a realistic representation of the immigrant's experience.

The arrival in the host country is a new experience which has its impact on the identity of most immigrants. Vito's entrance to Ellis Island is similar to that of Said and his mother to the shanty town of Nanterre. Although these characters are seemingly different by language, generations, religion, historical and cultural background and even age; they share a similar experience of displacement and humiliation. Vito is put in quarantine in Ellis Island and the Algerian family is reduced to almost nothing after its eviction from its land and home.

We are introduced to the street of the Bronx through grown up Vito who is trying to make a living in the new world. Vito represents the struggle of the immigrant who tries to cope with the conditions in the host country. Despite his endless efforts and devotion he is fired from his job as grocery clerk in favor of a Black Hand chief's nephew. Vito rediscovers the old practices that he left behind him in Sicily. In fact, life in Little Italy has the same structures and organization as in Italy.

Vito Coreleone is a young man who grew up in the Bronx and managed to start his family and business. In turn Said with his mother and later joined by his two brothers Abdelkader and Messaoud try to reconstruct their lives in the slum of Paris. Both directors

reconstruct the immigrants' enclaves of Little Italy and Nanterre to convey the actual immigrant experience. These settings belong to the collective memory of immigration either in the United States or in France. In these enclaves communities, the Italian in *the Godfather part II* or the Algerian in *Outside the Law*, maintain their ethnic identities.

The 1920s Bronx is depicted as an overcrowded enclave of Italian immigrants. The director reconstructed the setting from archives. The location is in New York. Coppola tries to depict the daily life of the Italian community in their host country. He refers to the different ethnic celebrations which happened in the streets. The theater and the artistic activities at that time helped in maintaining the Italian culture and a strong sense of community in the United States. Vito's life centers within this minority group which resisted complete assimilation in the mainstream culture.

Life in the Bronx also revolves around gangster activities, the Black Hand that reminds us about life in Sicily. The organization of the Italian community in America is similar to that in Sicily. People have to pay in order to be protected otherwise they will be subject to injustices by the police.

Much like the Little Italies, the shanty town emphasizes the otherness; the immigrant population settles in enclaves because the host country offers to be a hostile environment. In fact, because of their cultural, language, religious and ethnic differences the immigrants tend to settle among the same community. In many cases, the Italian immigrants were unable to communicate in English, so they grouped themselves together in small ethnic communities within the large cities of the eastern seaboard (Ianni & Reuss-Ianni, 1972). *The Godfather II* and *Outside the Law* offer two similar experiences of life in enclaves.

The shanty towns are also maintained by the host country to contain the immigrants who are mainly from poor backgrounds and different ethnic origins. Nanterre, like many other shanty towns, is separated from Paris. The Algerian immigrants who landed in France in the

1950s grouped in enclaves near the factories. *Outside the Law* provides an archive based reconstruction of the shanty town of Nanterre.

The slum of Nanterre is situated at the periphery of the capital Paris. However Paris is not shown in the film except for the Pigalle of the 1950's. Apart from the shantytown the other action take place in the streets of Paris .The events usually happen at night. The two brothers, Abdelkader and Messaoud, accomplish their missions during the night a characteristic of film noir and gangster movies. The city is shown at night when the streets are full of criminals, prostitutes or such types of the alienated population.

The slums provide another significant setting in *the Godfather II* and *Outside the Law*. The most important part in the slums is located in the families' houses or in confined spaces. After their arrival to Nanterre Said and his mother established in an empty shelter which Said paid with the watch he stole from the Caid. The house mirrors the hardship the family would face in France. Similarly, Vito's life in the Bronx revolves around his home or office.

Most of the time the enclaves are depicted in rainy or snowy time, the dim light is used to signify the misery and the suffering of the immigrants. Poverty and hardship can be observed in the streets and the shelters in both Little Italy and Nanterre.

To sum up, *the Godfather II* evolves in three major settings. The film setting begins in the Italian countryside in 1901. It moves to the Bronx in 1917 as Vito establishes himself as the new Don of the city. The New York scenes are generally set in confined spaces: small rooms, apartments, bars or houses. When Michael took over the family business the location shifts to Nevada and Cuba during the 1950s. The new locations become vaster and brighter than Vito's time. However the focus is still on the inside such as Michael's office or houses. The film opens to new areas in conducting business like Las Vegas, Reno and Havana.

Like *the Godfather II*, *Outside the Law* opens in the country side of Setif in 1925, then moves to the slums of Setif at the end of WWII. The film continues in the shanty town of

Nanterre in the 1950s where said and his mother settled, later they were followed by Abdelkader and Messaoud. Most of the scenes are in confined spaces, in the factory, the café, apartments or prison. The brothers rising as leaders within the FLN's structures open the film to other locations such as Switzerland and Germany in the late 1950s.

The variety of locations *in the Godfather II* as well as in *Outside the Law* demonstrates the expansion of the families' activities in their respective environments. It also reflects the changing times as the protagonist evolve in underground spaces. Bouchareb's appropriation of the gangster setting is not only due to his but also to the similarities between the immigration's experiences. The films showcase compelling stories about exile.

## **Chapter Six: A Study of Cases of Intertextuality between *Outside the Law* and the *Godfather II***

Since its release in 2010, many cinema critics noticed the various references that Bouchareb used in *Outside the Law*; whether to other films, to history or as some viewers states to his personal biography. The interest in this chapter is the intertextuality in the *Godfather II* and *Outside the Law*. Intertextual referencing is a way to pay tribute to a favorite director or to a favorite film. Through making similar shots, scenes or setting the director can convey similar meaning or emotion to the audience. The viewer will thus link with the original film.

That is why in the following selections from both films will analyze, interpret, compare and relate the different key sequences to the context of their production. Our aim is to demonstrate the intention behind Bouchareb deliberate choice of *The Godfather II* as a cultural reference to portray his characters.

In order to explore intertextuality in *Outside the Law*, we start from the opening sequence. We have selected the homeland episode which in our opinion is a device to identify the characters in their home country by making allusions to the cultural and ethnic heritage of each one. We will proceed first by analyzing selected images from the *Godfather* through describing the scene, the mood, and the dialogues. Then we will place them in the larger frame of the sequence and relate the content to the director's context. Secondly we will apply the same process to similar scenes from *Outside the Law* and finally we will compare between the two showing how Bouchareb has used intertextual references.

**Homeland: back to the origins**



**Fig-1-2**The remote landscapes of Sicily



**Fig-3-4** The Mamma Holding Vito



**Fig-5-6** the Mamma crying the loss of her son Paolo and Vito standing alone



**Fig 7-8**The remote lands of Setif



**Fig 9**-The mother at the caid



**Fig-10**The family leaving their land



**Fig- 11** Said supprting his crying mother



**Fig- 12** a close up of the mother

The above shots are selected from the opening sequences of *the Godfather II* and *Outside the Law*. They represent the establishing shots which introduce the main characters in their environments. Bouchareb stylization of the opening scenes of *the Godfather II* appears in various ways. Much like *the Godfather II* which sets in the Island of Sicily, *Outside the Law* sets in the remote land of Setif. The film starts with an extreme long shot introducing the landscapes, which clearly resonates in the long shot introducing Sicily. Bouchareb's use of

editing, mise-en-scene, plot, settings and characterization is quiet similar to those of Francis Ford Coppola.

The sequences from both films are filled with long shots of Sicily and Setif( Fig-1,2 Fig-7,8). A device that helps to emphasis the role and the importance of the homeland in the films' respective narratives. It also helps to establish the main characters. Both films introduce the viewers to the origins of the Italian immigration to the United States and the Algerian immigration to France because first and foremost both films represent an immigrants' journey.

Bouchareb's stylization of *the Godfather II* occurs at the level of the settings. He introduces the audience to the landscapes of Setif through the camera movements, so that the camera pans the vast, rocky and almost empty landscapes in a similar way to Coppola's depiction of the remote lands of Sicily. Before the main characters emergence on the screen. The time period of the events is subscribed on the screen, so that we know the stories happened in 1901 Sicily and 1925 Algeria. In the following, a detailed description of the main shots.

This similar use of setting is suggestive of the director's desire to highlight the similarities between the two immigrant communities' experiences both in past and present. In the *Godfather II*, the film opens in Sicily on a tragic event in the life of Vito Andolini. The boy flees to the new world to escape death. This opening scene is paralleled in *Outside the Law*, the film also opens in Setif on tragic events in the life of the family. The exile which occurred later is the core of both films. It is necessary to examine how both directors have dealt with the homeland in their respective films to determine their discourses.

Bouchareb opted to open his film in his country of origin. Similarly to Francis Ford Coppola who sets the opening scenes of *the Godfather II* in his ancestral Italy. Both directors capture the beauty of the landscapes and show outdoor locations rather than inside settings.

The depiction of the past seems to be a common aspect of the two films, since both of them transport the viewers to the immigrants' memory through the homeland.

Coppola sets the Sicilian shots in a sad atmosphere, the tragic events that followed this scene mark the life of Vito Corleone and determine his following reactions and actions in the new world. Life in Sicily shaped the boy's identity and provided him with his ethnic heritage. As we have already seen it in the previous chapter, Vito internalized the Sicilian culture and performed it in the Bronx.

The return to Sicily is a kind of return to the origin of things. Coppola makes the audience sympathize with the young boy who witnessed a tragic experience in his homeland and flees to the new world. The dramatic tone in which Sicily is introduced to the viewer implies the suffering that immigrants experience in their trajectories before they arrive to the United States.

The episode in Sicily is meant to better understand the transformation in Vito's life. The sequence introduces the viewer to the Sicilian culture. The vendetta, the language the traditions that the young boy internalized there and brought with him to the United States are illustrated in the beginning of the film. The environment which shaped the earlier identity of Vito contrasts with the American mainstream culture. The film captures the essence of the Sicilian heritage and exposes it to the audience through the boy. It is obvious that the story doesn't end by escaping the Island. Vito, who is later forced to exile to the New World, maintains his homeland's images more vivid and present in his performances. This cultural heritage will be challenged by a new different and sometimes opposed mainstream culture.

Through showing Sicily in the opening of the film Francis Ford Coppola makes his audience think about the dilemma that immigrants face in their host lands. Sandwiched between two lands, two languages, two cultures, the process of assimilation is not as simple as it is suggested by the melting pot concept. The events in the film can concern any immigrant

from any other culture. May be the vendetta is specific to the Mediterranean culture, however cultural differences are similar to any other minority group.

This return to the roots symbolizes the ethnic revival of the 1970s when every minority group takes pride in its culture of origin. The Civil Rights Movements which benefits are extended to other groups than African Americans, led to an outspread of representation of the different hyphenated identities in the United States. Gangster film which usually dealt with the Italian American community are not set in Italy.

At first glance, it is clear that the sequence in *Outside the Law* is not a remake of *The Godfather II*. However, one can trace similarities. On the one hand *The Godfather* tells the story of a young boy deprived from his family because of the vendetta rule. On the other hand, *Outside the Law* tells the story of three brothers deprived of their land and family because of the colonial oppression. Both films depict injustices undergone by the protagonists in their youth. The young Vito witnesses the massacre of his family by the local powerful Don. In the same way the three brothers witnessed the expropriation the assassination of their father and sisters. The humiliation that both protagonists in the *Godfather II* and in *Outside the law* experienced in opening scenes has foot printed in their minds.

Another common element, on which Bouchareb bases his stylization of *The Godfather*, is the figure of the mother (**Fig- 3,4Fig-9,10**). One can see the similarities between Vito's mother and the mother in *Outside the Law*. In the scene where the Caid was leaving, the camera displays the mother holding his youngest son Said in a similar way to the mamma holding Vito. Both directors use actresses with specific features to portray the mother; so that they represent and reflect the specificity and the harshness of the environment. Another point which has its importance is the fact that both homelands are of Mediterranean background which make resemblances plausible. Cultural similarities shared by the two minority groups in their exile can also explain Bouchareb's choice.

The mother in *the Godfather II* represents the Italian woman, she has a strong face with harsh features. She puts her arms around Vito as if she is protecting him from something big. The scene stresses the importance of the family in the Italian culture. This figure of the mother is central in the life of Vito. The boy is shown as silent and fragile walking besides his protective mother. The mother is also representing this Sicilian land she is strong as the harsh land of the southern island. Her courage is shown later when she visits Don Ciccio and puts the knife on the Don's throat.

The mother in *Outside the Law* also represents the Algerian woman; she has a strong face with harsh features. She puts her arms around her youngest son Said protect him. The scene stresses the importance of the family in the Algerian culture. This figure of the mother is central in the life of Said. The boy is shown as close to his mother trying to comfort her when she cries.

Both mothers symbolize the mother land. They are identified with struggle and resistance. The Mamma protects her son Vito and faces the Don when she puts the knife on his throat. She urged Vito to run away before she was killed by the Don's men. Much like her, the mother in *Outside the Law* represents the struggle and cement which keeps the family together. When the Caid arrives with his men she holds her youngest son Said and asks him to stay near her. Bouchareb gives close ups of her grasping the dust from their land ( Fig- 12), to convey this identification with the land.

There is an interesting element which captures attention in the sequence. It is the use of the music theme which reveals some similarities with *the Godfather's* music theme. The music track enhances the idea of loss and conveys a melodramatic aspect to the two films. It is true that in the chosen scene, Bouchareb approaches the sound effect from another perspective; nonetheless, there are similar patterns which can be intertextual references to *the Godfather*. For instance the silences, Messaoud the eldest brother reminds silent through in

the beginning of the film. Apart from giving the alert, he didn't intervene when they were expelled, he didn't complain like his two brothers. Like Vito who remained silent in the whole episode in Sicily.

Another common feature between the opening sequences is the use of native languages respectively Italian and Arabic. Thus the viewer is conscious of the difference in the cultural heritage of the immigrants. By doing so, the two directors add authenticity to their characters. It goes without saying that the first obstacle the immigrants face in assimilating in receiving lands is the language. Vito and to some extent the three brothers will face difficulties because of the language.

In addition to what, both films depict oppressed people who suffer injustices. On one hand Vito have all his family assassinated by the local mafia chieftain, and on the other hand the three brothers suffer at the hand of the colonizer. The films foreground the conditions that led to the migration of the protagonists in *The Godfather II* and *Outside the Law*. In fact, Vito is smuggled to the New World to escape death, the same way that Said is fleeing Algeria after the Caid's murder.

Bouchareb is strongly influenced by Coppola's aesthetic principles in *the Godfather II*. He embraces similar techniques to expose his characters backgrounds. Firstly, he introduces the viewers to the homeland through extreme long shots which depict the panoramic landscapes. Secondly, the main characters emerged on the screen and the camera provides long shots then close ups to set the most important characters and the affinities between them. Through editing techniques he gives different perspectives of the protagonists.

To achieve his stylization of *the Godfather II*, Bouchareb deploys similar techniques. He relies on many close ups of the main protagonists to gain the spectator's sympathy. (Fig-4,11,12) He also uses long shots of the landscapes of Setif, opting like his counterpart

Coppola to rely on natural light to show the brightness of the mother land which contrast with the rest of the film.

Like *the Godfather II*, *Outside the Law* offers a return to the roots. Being a son of immigrant himself, Bouchareb capitalizes on this cultural heritage to open his film in the land of his origin. Through his stylization of the opening shots of *the Godfather II*, he allows his audience to identify the film's characters with their cultural heritage. Indeed the place of origin plays an important role in the identity formation of individuals and groups. Hence, in the two films the origin of the protagonists remains a source of their troubles.

Bouchareb's use of similar devices like *the Godfather II*, serves not only his introduction of the main characters and the oppression they underwent but also his tackling of some crucial historical events. For instance the 1945 Setif massacres, the war of independence and the Algerian involvement in Indochina. In fact, Bouchareb goes further than a mere stylization to include images from the archives showing the celebration of the end of World War II to contrast them with the massacres in Algeria. In addition, he evokes many stages of the French colonial presence in Algeria through a choppy editing that spans the period between 1925 and 1954.

Through his return to the Sicilian land Coppola addresses the 1970s ethnic revival. Because the context celebrated ethnicity and pride in the immigrant's cultural heritage, the film operates this symbolic representation to tell the story of the Corleone family. The audience sympathizes with this little boy who lost his entire family. The film thus reflects the discourse of its context shifting from the previous representations of the gangster; Whereas bouchareb's return to the Algerian land addresses the 2000s French context which witnessed several controversies about the positive role of colonialism.

Unlike *the Godfather II* opening scenes which focus only on Vito's story and vendetta, *Outside the Law* induces a historical discourse. Through our previous examination of the

selected scenes, we have noticed the similar use of cinematography techniques. For instance, the use of long shots introducing the motherland (Fig-1,2,7,8), the use of three or two shots to present the main characters according to their affinities (Fig-3,4,11) and the close ups to create favorable emotion toward a given character. (Fig-3,12) However, Bouchareb goes further through his inclusion of images from the archive to evoke history. That makes his film goes beyond the ethnic discourse and the pride of cultural heritage to an anticolonial discourse through the voice of one of his main characters. In fact Abdelkader sets the tone in the opening scene by his refusal to quite school and later with his participation in 1945 demonstration which asked for equal rights. It is clear that with Abdelkader, Bouchareb has his first voice of contest. Unlike Vito who remained silent along the opening scenes, Abdelkader voiced his claims setting thus the mood of the film.

In the selected sequence from *Outside the Law*, the father argues with the Caid about the injustice they undergo. The three brothers, much like Vito, are observing the conversation with their mother's whereas the grandfather is sitting silently near the house door. The protagonists are poorly dressed in traditional garment in contrast to the Caid who wears refined white outfit. The soundtrack effect is minimalist we can hear the wind, the different animals in the farm during the conversation. The device is used to make the sequence as realistic as possible.

The scenes are set in the countryside of Setif during colonization. Algeria is under French colonial rule. Technically Algeria is a French department and Algerians are French citizens; however, the family's eviction of the land in favor of the colon tells an opposite reality. We are in a post WWI, the French presence in Algeria almost achieves a hundred years. The colonial system established the "Code de L'Indéginat" which dispossessed many Algerian families from their ancestral lands.

The film through this scene sheds light on one practice of the French during colonization. This mainly contrasts with the idea of the “mission civilisatrice” defended by many French politicians in 2003. The debate which occurred in France after the proposition of the 23th February law praising colonialism was fierce and significant of the sensitiveness of the colonial past of France. This law was contested by Algeria but also by French citizens from Algerian descent and other French from former French colonies.

Hence the opening sequence of *Outside the Law* serves to establish a historical dimension to the film. It deprives Coppola’s similar shots from its criminal aspect to substitute it with the revolutionary trend. While *the Godfather II* comes in a context of ethnic revival, *Outside the Law* comes in a context of an identity crisis in France. The debate on National identity and the French model of integration and France’s attitude toward its colonial history prevailed in the Media. Bouchareb appropriates some aspects of *the Godfather II*(and other films) to tackle the French and Algerian common history.

#### **The meeting: mainstream Vs minority groups**



**Fig-13**Michael Dealing Business



**Fig-14** Senator Geary Teasing the Don



**Fig-15** Senator Geary taking his medicines



**Fig-16** Michael listening to the Senator's menaces



**Fig-17** an over the shoulder shot of Abdelkader Gazing to the colonel



**Fig-18** a reverse shot of the Colonel



**Fig-19** Abdelkader explaining the rightness of his cause



**Fig-20** the colonel arrogant gaze

The images in Fig-( 13,14, 15, 16) are taken from Michael Corleone's meeting with Senator Pat Geary from Nevada. Michael is expanding the family business. This meeting occurred during Anthony's first communion. We can see through the window behind Michael that the party is going on whereas Michael is dealing business behind closed doors. The editing is shot-reverse- shot so we can see Senator Geary from Michael's perspective and vice versa.

We are in 1958, Vito's grandson, Anthony Corleone receives his First Communion in Lake Tahoe, Nevada. After the ceremony, his parents, Kay and Michael, host a big party at their house. Michael, who has succeeded Vito as the don of the Corleone family, receives guests who seek his favor in his office. The scene shifted from Ellis Island to Lake Tahoe, in the 1950s as Michael conducts business in his office with Nevada Senator Pat Geary. Michael plans to expand his casino empire and rejects the senator's attempts at extortion and his ethnic slurs against Italians. Senator Pat Geary demands money in exchange for the license Michael seeks for a gambling casino. The conversation between the two turns to mainstream discourse on an ethnic minority group, Michael gets upset by the Senator's insults on the Italian-Americans and on his family.

Senator Geary enters the office where Michael introduces him to his Brother and lawyer Tom Hagen. It is clear that the two are not close friends as the Senator's statement before the meeting suggested it. Michael is dressed in a light colored suite whereas Senator Geary is in a black suite. Through lighting them

Michael: This is my lawyer, Tom Hagen; Senator Geary. He is the one who arrange this whole thing through your man Turnbull.

Geary: Yes, Yes

Michael: Sit down.

Geary: Well I was under the impression that you and I would talk alone.

Michael: I trust these men with my life, Senator. If I were to ask them to leave, it would be an insult.

Geary: Well uh, it's perfectly all right with me , but I should tell you that I am a blunt man and I intend to speak very frankly to you..may be..more frankly than any one in my position.

Through these lines we can understand that the Senator will express what his follow mate think but don't dare express publically. At this point Michael lights a cigarette and continue to listen to the Senator. Geary seems to be comfortable and carries on his expose not without a kind of arrogance in his voice. One can notice from this long dialogue that it is the senator who has the large part and Michael is just listening and responding with very short sentences.

Geary: the Corleone family has done very well in Nevada. You own, or, you control, two major hotels in Vegas..one in Reno. The licenses were grandfathered in, so there is no problem with the gaming commission. Now, my sources tell me that..you plan to make a move against the Tropicalla. They tell me within a week..you're gonna move Klingman out. That's quite an expansion. However it will leave with one little technical problem.

Michael: Turnbull is a good man.

Geary: yeah, well let's cut out the bullshit. I don't want to spend any more time here than I have to. You can have the license, the price is 250,000 dollars. Plus a monthly payment of 5% of the gross..of all four hotels Mister ..Corleone.

Michael: Now the price of the license is less than 20,000 dollars, am I right?

Geary: That's right.

Michael: Now would I ever consider paying more than that?

Geary: Because I intend to squeeze you. I don't like your kind of people. I don't like to see you come out of this clean country in oily hair..dressed up in those silk suits- and try to pass yourselves off as decent Americans. I 'll do business with you, but the fact is, I despise your masquerade.. the dishonest way you pose yourself. Yourself, and your whole fucking family.

Michael: Senator- we're both part of the same hypocrisy. But never think it applies to my family.

The Senator offended Michael with his slurs toward the Italian Americans and the Corleone family. The way with which he spells the name of the Corleone shows his despise and his intention to squeeze them because of their origin is a WASP attitude towards non-white. This reflects the questioning of the myth of America as a melting pot of all origins. The Senator has no problem in doing business with the Italian Americans but he clearly despise their culture and behavior. He assumes that the Italians came to this clean country and blur it with their behavior like Americans. Michael's response to Geary sounds like resonating capitalism, he says that they both part of the same hypocrisy. They are there to do business. However, that doesn't apply to his family. Senator Geary is a corrupted politician who takes bribes from the businessmen. Through the Corleone and Senator Geary, Coppola highlights the corruption of the 1970s. It reflects the lack of trust in politicians, the degeneration of moral values and the prevailed corruption at that time. We can consider the film as a metaphor to the 1970s America.

Senator Geary stands up from his seat and came near to Michael's desk with a menacing tone in his voice. He points a canon which was put on the desk toward Michael and says:

Geary: All right, all right...some people have to play little games. You play yours. So let just say that you'll pay me because it is in your interest to pay me. But I want your answer and the money by noon tomorrow. And one more thing: don't you contact me again..ever. From now on you deal with Turnbull.

The Senator addressed then to Al and orders him to open the door; he started to leave when Michael stopped him by saying:

Uh, Senator..you can have my answer now if you like. My offer is this..nothing. Not even the fee for the gaming license, which I would appreciate if you would put up personally.

Geary laughing at Michael's word opens the door and walks out, he finds Mrs. Geary and Kay talking in the living room. He adopted another tone greeting politely the two ladies and sparkling jokes at them. This reflects the hypocrisy Michael refers to inside the office. The Senator represents the politicians who have different attitudes in public and in private spheres. The 1970's finds echoes in this sequence because of the lack of trust on the politicians at that time. Senator Geary represents the kind of politicians denounced for the corrupted mind.

The dialogue between Michael and the senator, in our opinion, is one among the most emblematic sequences in *the Godfather Part II*. Senator Geary is a corrupted politician who reflects the Nixonian era characterized by the Water gate scandal and the degeneration of moral values. The film through this passage criticizes the 1970s America.

The scene shifted from the church communion to the harsh lawn party and then between Michael's office and the ongoing party outside. The long sequence is fragmented by the editing of both the images and the sounds. Coppola cuts repeatedly from the outdoor party to the indoor meetings in Michael's office, from bright colors outside to the near darkness of the office, from the harsh dance music to the near silence of the indoor scenes.

Others at the party include Michael's older brother, Fredo, who cannot control his drunken wife, and younger sister, Connie, who prefers to lead a high life with her new Wasp boy friend to caring for her children. Al Neri, who represents elderly Jewish gangster Hyman Roth, discusses a Cuban casino deal between Roth and the Corleones, while old family friend

Frankie Pentangeli begs Michael not to do business with Roth and the ruthless New York Rosato brothers. Late that night, as Michael was in his bedroom admiring a picture that Anthony has drawn for him, there was an attempt to kill him. Because Michael drags himself to Kay's side and covers her body they managed to escape the shout out. Michael warns his security men to capture the assassins alive, but the men are found near the lake, they have been killed. Aware that there is a traitor in the family, Michael confides in his adopted brother, Tom Hagen, that he is the only person he trusts to protect his family during his absence.



**Fig-21 A two shot of Abdelkader and Colonel Faivre**

This scene (Fig- 21) depicts the first meeting between Abdelkader and colonel Faivre. It is located in a luxurious hotel of the capital Paris, a place usually not attended by Algerians. The two protagonists are sitting in front of each other, Colonel Faivre seems to be more comfortable than Abdelkader. Abdelkader planned the encounter to convince the colonel to join the FLN cause. Faivre is forced to encounter Abdelkader. In fact, after he discovered

Abdelkader's identity, Faivre visited Said in his nightclub. Said who denied any relationship between him and Abdelkader alerted his brothers.

When the Colonel visited Said, he closed his place for security reasons. The theme of security here is very sensitive in the French context. It resonates in the French politicians' discourse which capitalizes on the issue of security and its tight link to immigrants. The French fear of the other is thus justified by the association with criminality thus the FLN's members are considered as terrorists.

In this scene, Abdelkader as an FLN leader is in a meeting with his French nemesis, colonel Faivre who is running a death squad called The Red Hand. He tells Faivre that they are not different. Faivre fought with the Resistance against the Nazis, while he is carrying out the same kind of fight against the French. Colonel Faivre defends the French empire; this sequence epitomizes the colonial discourse. It is impossible to Colonel Faivre to compare the resistance with the Algerian struggle for independence. The two protagonists meet in a luxurious Parisian hotel in the 1950s.

The Colonel enters the hall of the hotel where Abdelkader was waiting for him. The two are dressed in refined suits wearing glasses and hats. The soundtrack music stopped when they come into the hall. Abdelkader started the conversation while his brother Messaoud along with another FLN guys are controlling the place. There are few costumers in the hotel they seem all to be Europeans.

The dialogue between the two antagonists opens with a strong statement; Abdelkader addresses the colonel about his past as a resistant.

Abdelkader: Dites moi Colonel, avez vous honte de ce que vous avez fait dans la résistance ?

Faivre : ( after a short silence) No.

Abdelkader: Je vous ai invité ici pour vous donner une chance. Une chance de vous racheter à vous propres yieux.

Faivre : ( with a steady smile) Je suis content de vous rencontrer ! Un homme sans reproches. Les policiers que vous avez assassiné n'avaient ni mères, ni femmes, ni enfants.

Abdelkader: Je suis une cause just.

In this dialogue Abdelkader asks the Colonel if he is ashamed of his past as a resistant against the Nazi. The question aims to compare the Algerian struggle for independence to the resistance against the Nazi. However the Colonel rebuts this comparison evoking the policemen killed by the FLN arguing that these policemen have families. The Colonel omits the fact that even the persons killed and jailed by the colonial police have mothers, wives and children. Faivre responds to Abdelkader's claim of serving a right cause by justifying his own cause.

Faivre: Moi aussi je me bat pour la grandeur de la France qui veut garder son empire pour exister entre les Etats Unis et l' URSS. C'est De Gaulle qui le dit.

Abdelkader : Mais moi aussi je suis gaulliste, vous savez ?( at this moment he comes near Faivre)

Que diriez vous qu'il est absolument normale et absolument justifié que des Français se fassent tuer par des Algériens ? Il suffit de remplacer Algériens par Français et Français par Allemands pour obtenir le discours du General De Gaulle à Radio Londres en 1941. Vous êtes dans le mauvais camps Colonel. Il y'a dix ans vous étiez dans le bon.

Faivre : Vous auriez fait un bon résistant, j'aurais aimé vous avoir dans mon réseau.

The confrontation between the two men ends with an allusion to history. Faivre is convinced with the illegality of the FLN and Abdelkader failed to convince him to join what he calls the right cause. As Faivre evokes the idea of a complete citizenship to Algerians who technically were French citizens in 1950s, the colonel partially admits that Algerians didn't enjoy this supposed citizenship. Abdelkader argues that the FLN succeeded to federate the Algerian immigrants workers because of their living conditions in France.

Abdelkader: Vous pourrez nous donner des renseignements sur les actions de la police, les directives du ministère. Les résistants considéré comme des traîtres pendant la guerre..ont aujourd'hui tout les honneurs.

Colonel Faivre : Ce n'est pas la même guerre, il y'a une histoire entre la France et l'Algérie.

Abdelkader : Mais comment croyez vous qu'on ai fédéré aussi rapidement la totalité des travailleurs Algérien ? Parce que tout un peuple est en colère. Mais vous pensez qu'ils sont en colère pour rien ?

Colonel Faivre : Laissez nous un peu de temps, les Algériens deviendront peu à peu des citoyens à part entière. Tout cela progressera.

Abdelkader : Le progrès est une guerre. Vous pouvez de nouveau être un héros, sinon l'histoire se rappellera de vous comme un vaincu.

Colonel Faivre : Nous sommes tout les deux pareil.

Abdelkader : Oui, nous sommes tout les deux des sacrifiés Faivre..mais vous au passé.

Through his filming techniques Bouchareb focuses on the two antagonists as representatives of two different and opposed points of view. The director uses shallow focuses in filming Abdelkader and Colonel Faivre whereas the rest of elements in the scene are faded. He also uses over- the shoulder- shot to clearly distinguish between the two (Fig- 17, 18, 19, 20). The camera sometimes detaches itself so the viewer can have a distant view of the situation. Because of the sensitiveness of the issue of the common history between Algeria and France, the director didn't engage in a confrontation. He rather uses his film to convey the idea of opening a debate instead of denying the issue. The dialogue between the two men is suggestive about the French and Algerian tumultuous relationship and cannot be divorced from the contemporary context of France. In fact, controversial issue of the positive role of colonialism still resonates in the film context. Therefore *Outside the Law* is a genuine response to the defenders of the "mission civilisatrice" of France.

The following scene will stresses on the French reaction to the FLN's activities in the metropolitan France. The Red Hand is created. This organization is similar to a criminal organization, however it is backed by the French government. Its role consists of terrorizing

all the FLN sympathizers. By using methods similar to criminals the Parisian police will arrest, assassinate any immigrant on the base of his Algerianess. These methods stigmatize the French police in the eyes of the immigrant population. This episode can be related to the riots of 2005 where two teens from immigrant origin were tracked by the police. They died because they wanted to escape what is an ordinary ID control.

A massive oppression against the Algerian immigrants was led by the police forces, they were arbitrary killed in the streets of Paris. A curfew is established, a fact that also recalls the riots of 2005 when the government declared a curfew in response to the unrest of the banlieue. The film reports another example of the Red Hand activities which is posing bombs in the shanty town making victims among the immigrant population. As a reaction to the Red Hand's operations and assassinations the FLN has decided to react.

#### **Intertextuality in the meeting scene:**

As we have already demonstrated in the vengeance scene analysis Rachid Bouchareb pays an homage to *the Godfather* through making a very similar shot in Said's revenge scene. The dialogues the sitting and the motif refer directly to Vito's emblematic scene. In this meeting scene, Bouchareb borrowed from Coppola, he recreates a similar meeting to that of the Senator and Michael to convey a different content. The scene bears some similar features as in *the Godfather II*, for instance the meeting takes place in a closed space where the two antagonists have a kind of confrontation in discourse. The events occur in the 1950s and the protagonists are dressed in the same way. Although, one can assume that the Algerian immigrants to France were not dressed Italian gangsters. The Senator as well as Faivre assumes the western superiority upon minority groups. Geary a corrupted politician despises the Italian Americans and Faivre a colonel who runs a squad of death defends the French empire. The two men respectively represent the WASP culture in *the Godfather II* case and the colonial discourse in *Outside the Law*.

The atmosphere during the meeting is also similar, there is no use of musical soundtracks. The director creates the same intimate environment as in *the Grandfather II*. Because inspite of the presence of other characters during the meeting no one intervene in the conversation. We can consider the meeting as a minor intertextual reference because it doesn't integrally copy the original *Godfather II*, however the use of the confrontation between two characters to criticize the cotemporary context of the films is common in both. Bouchareb who put a colonial discourse in front of an anti colonial discourse resonates in the *Godfather II* criticism of Capitalism in America and the ethnic revival of the 1970's. Michael and the Senator are discussing business and Abdelkader and Colonel Faivre are discussing politics.

The editing of the two scenes seems to be the strongest point of difference between the two scenes. When Coppola filmed his scene in a shot- reverse- shot Bouchareb chose to us an over shoulder shot. The difference resides in the fact that Coppola depicts the dialogue between the two characters through each one perspective's whereas Bouchareb leaves a margin to the viewer to make a distance between him and the characters. The scene in *the Godfather* is filmed with a deep focus so one can notice what happens in the office and outside through the window and in *Outside the Law* the scene is in a shallow focus so that the viewer's attention is directed to the two protagonists.

### **The Vendetta: a Cultural Heritage**

The scene of revenge where Vito Corleone violently stabbed Don Ciccio finds its parallel in *Outside the Law*. Bouchareb uses the same structure to accomplish vengeance. The

following shots illustrate the key affinities between Vito's and Said's respective revenge.



**Fig- 22-**a long shot of the Don resting on his chair **Fig-23** Tomazino introducing Vito to the Don



**Fig-24-**a medium shot of Vito looking at the Don **Fig-25** Vito paying respect to the Don



**Fig – 26**Vito stabbing the Don



**Fig-27**-Said making his way to the Caid's house  
sleeping



**Fig-28** a long shot of the Caid  
in his chair



**Fig-29**-a point of view shot of the Caid



**Fig-30**Said is about to kill the Caid



**Fig-31** Said stabbing the aged Caid



**Fig-32** a close up to the dead Caid

As it is clear from the deconstruction of the above images, Bouchareb stylizes the revenge scene through the use of a similar composition. This sequence represents the most significant intertextual reference to *the Godfather II*. In fact Bouchareb makes a direct allusion to Vito Corleone's revenge. Said the youngest son of the Souni family undertakes the task to avenge his father and his family. It is the eve of the war of independence, Said who seems to be worried about the upcoming war decides to avenge his father. He discretely introduces himself in the Caid's house while he was resting in his chair alone in an immense garden. The Caid owns a luxurious house and Said walks through the alley with his eyes big open on the difference between the Caid's life and theirs. At the view of a strange person in his property, the Caid asked him how he entered the house and Said responds with calm and comes near to him.

Said's revenge echoes that of Vito. The scenes which represent Vito's return to Sicily in order to perpetuate the ancestral vendetta are stylized in *Outside the Law* to obtain similar effect. The image which represents Vito paying respect to an old Don Ciccio serves as a model to Bouchareb narrative line. Vito's revenge on his family's murderer is at the core of the Sicily trip. In fact, he visited his homeland which he left as an orphan with all his family. The sequence starts with a train which arrives at the village of Corleone's Railroad Station in Sicily, it is 1925. Vito returns to his homeland with his wife and family. They are welcomed by relatives and friends and driven to Tommasino's house. There, during an outdoor meal with everyone seated around a table, they open up gifts, including a small Statue of Liberty that they gave to an aged woman. The children are playing around in a joyful mood which contrasts with the Bronx life.

Later, Vito and Tommasino visit Don Ciccio's villa, where the old man sleeps on the balcony, and armed guards patrol the estate. The old Don is introduced to Vito Corleone, as

being an olive oil importer and Tommasino's associate in America in New York, at the Genco Olive Oil Company. The men ask for the Don's blessing, however the old man can't hear Vito's name:

Vito: *Mi chiamo* Vito Corleone.

Don: Vito Corleone. You took the name of this town! And what's your father's name?

Vito: His name was...Antonio Andolini.

Don: Louder, I don't hear so good.

Vito: My father's name was Antonio Andolini...and this is for you!

The dialogue between Said and the Caid seems to be a replicate of the above dialogue.

Said: Caid...Caid!The Caid: What are you doing here?

Said: Forgive me Caid. I am here to greet you.

The Caid: how did you enter here?

Said: I... have a present for you.

The Caid: what ... kind of presents?

Said: death...I am here to revenge my father, and all my family.

Die for all what you have done, traitor!

Like Vito, Said's vengeance is motivated by his father's and family's death. The figure of the father is important in the patriarchal society. Both Vito and Said feel the duty to revenge them, by doing so they perpetuate the cultural heritage and they affirm their masculinity. Vito as well as Said are responsible of the family now ( Said is the head of the family because his two brothers are absent and Vito is the only son of the Corleone).

The selected scenes (**Fig- 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27** ) belong to a larger sequence devoted to Vito's return to Sicily. When Vito arrived with all his family to Sicily, no one expected the following of events. In fact, the young man seems to be absorbed in his life in America that one thinks he has forgotten about his native Sicily. However the succession of events shows that this *Sicilian thing* cannot disappear with the forced assimilation he underwent in Ellis Island through changing his first name to Corleone.

Similarly, in *Outside the Law* the audience doesn't expect Said to accomplish revenge. Because of his apolitical position, his rejection of the demonstration in 1945 and his only interest on boxing. It is 1954, the eve of the war. Said witnessed attack on the colons in the

streets of Setif. He knows that thing will get worse for them. His brothers are already exiled, Abdelkader is jailed in France and Messaoud is sent to Indochina. Said is neither interested in politics nor in fighting against France. His main interest is in managing boxers and organizing combats. Among his brothers he is the one who feels free in his mind. His decision to migrate is meant to follow his ambitions to make a better living.

The director portrays Said as different from his two brothers. He is the youngest and has the responsibility to protect his mother. His act of revenge is calculated and tells a lot of his temperament. After accomplishing his father's revenge, Said stole the Caid watch and money. He is not only defending his cultural values but he is greedy of money.

The scene which shows Vito stabbing the Don with calm is close to that of Said's killing of the Caid. Vito carries out the vengeful vendetta against the Mafia chieftain that Don Ciccio had feared years earlier. Vito pulls out a knife from under his coat and plunges it into the Don's belly, ripping and pulling the knife up his stomach and leaving it there. When they were running away, one of the guards is killed and Tommasino is wounded. Before leaving, Vito and his family are bid farewell on the steps of the Corleone church shown in the opening sequence. At the railroad station Vito takes Michael's hand and they wave good-bye as they depart.

These scenes are great and memorable. Vito returned to the same place where he saw his mother shot while trying to spare his life. He is dressed in refined attire, a brown suit whereas the Don has the same outfit that appears in the opening scenes of the film. He fell asleep on his chair, While Vito is a strong young man who returned as a successful American. Vito's revenge marks also a shift of power, he sees himself as the Don in Sicily.

The shot seems to be a repetition of the opening credit. Vito who arrives in a car with his associate and men is entering the ally that he walked once with his mother. He waits

calmly when Tomasino introduces him to the Don than he introduces himself. Before stabbing Don Ciccio, Vito whispered in his ear: *My father's name was Antonio Andolini...and this is for you!*

The return to Sicily and the revenge for his family's death proves that the cultural heritage is strongly in the immigrant's mind. It questions again the myth of the melting pot. After many years spent in the United States, Vito returns to Sicily in order to revenge his father. It is due to the culture that he internalized in his childhood that Vito accomplish revenge. The culture which is maintained in the enclaves of New York defines Italian Americans. Vito acts more as a Sicilian than as an American. He adds to his culture the business dimension, now he is an entrepreneur who wants to do business with his homeland country. One can see the link to preserving the ethnic and cultural heritage while evolving in a host country. Exporting olive oil from Sicily to the United States symbolizes the Italian culture.

The act of revenge in both films reflects the culture of vendetta which characterizes the Mediterranean region. Vito and Said decide to revenge their families after their coming in age, they have the same age. The scene in *Outside the Law* is very similar to that of *the Godfather II*. It is the most significant intertextual reference in the film. In terms of cinematography, composition, dialogue, shots.

The composition of the shots is the same. Both the Don and the Caid are depicted as old men resting in the gardens of their luxurious properties. Vito and Said enter the house and pay respect to the victims before stabbing them. They both whisper in the ear of the Don and the Caid. The dialogues are also similar, in fact Bouchareb refers to Vito's word when he attributed similar dialogue to Said.

Coppola and Bouchareb use the same techniques to depict the events. Indeed, both sequences are filled with shot reverse shots and over shoulders shot which alternate between

the main protagonists in the same scene. Several close ups of Vito, the Don, Said and the Caid are provided to convey their emotional state of minds. As far as lightning is concerned, the shots are filmed in natural lightning combined with diegetic sounds which set a realistic tone.

Both Coppola and Bouchareb start the scene through a long shot which shows respectively the Don and the Caid sleeping in their chairs. These images are given from the points of view of Vito and Said. The scenes symbolically represent the end of an era. In fact, the Don as well as the Caid are about to be killed. They no longer detain power over events. *The Godfather II* depicts Vito's rise to power through establishing himself not only as a Don in the Bronx but also in his homeland Sicily. It represents the end of the pre feudal system in favor of a capitalist one. Meanwhile, *Outside the Law* depicts the upcoming war of liberation which will end the French occupation of Algeria and the privileges given to men like the Caid.

It is obvious that Bouchareb films and edits the scene of vengeance on the model of Coppola. The editing, juxtaposing of shots, the dialogue are reworked to obtain similar impact on the viewer. In *the Godfather II*, Vito's vengeance marks his settling as a new Don, he extends his power to his homeland. This act is premeditated and shows Vito's manipulative aspects. He violently stabbed the Don and then returns to his family as the lovely father who holds his little baby Michael.

Said's revenge in return, marks the eve of the war. Bouchareb exploits the similarities between the two situations to comment on the upcoming war. In fact, the analogies between the oppression experienced by Vito in his homeland by the mafia system and the oppression witnessed by the three brothers by the colonial rule led both characters to seek revenge on their respective oppressors. The revenge reflects the violence oppression. Chris Missenger( ) comments the violent which prevailed in Sicily: “ *the historical legacy of Sicilian oppression*

*that the immigrant carries to the New World is that society is oppressive and hierarchical”(174)*

Vito's revenge occurred when he returns as a successful business man to Sicily; whereas Said's revenge happens before his leaving. The difference in placing the revenge scene in the film represents the impossibility of return. Said wants to leave the country and succeed in the metropolitan France; unlike Vito who left Sicily as a young boy and then decided to return home in order to accomplish his duty as a Sicilian. Another point also makes a difference between Vito and Said's revenge, Vito killed the Don in an act of revenge and thus takes his position in the community whereas Said killed the Caid and stole his wallet and expansive watch. That is why, Bouchareb has used point of View shots( Fig- 24) to film the scene from Said perspective that shows his assassination of the Caid is for personal motives. In fact, as explained above Said is not involved in the struggle. His revenge accomplished he gives the viewer a premise of his future life in Pigalle.

**The Confession to the mother:**



**Fig-33** Michael and his sick mother **Fig-34** Michael making his way to his mother's place



**Fig-35** a long shot of Michael and his mother **Fig-36** Michael's half lighted face



**Fig-37** a two shot of the mother and the son **Fig-38** the half lighted face of the mamma



**Fig-40** Messaoud making his way to his mother place **Fig-41** a two shot of the mother and her son



**Fig-42** a close up to Messaoud's face **Fig- 43**the mother's reaction to Messaoud's sufferance

The above images are selected from Michael's and Messaoud's visit to their respective mothers. A first analysis of the juxtaposed images reveals key similarities between them. Both Michael and Messaoud are visiting their sick mothers in their places. A common feature to both sequences is the use of chiaroscuro technique which reveals the schism between good and evil. In fact both characters' faces are half dark, half light, a device that reflects the duality of the person and supports the gloomy and dark atmosphere. This technique is usually used in gangster movies or film noir, helps to convey the state of mind of the characters.

In addition, both sequences starts with two shots of the mothers and the sons then break up to shot reverse shot scenes emphasizing the protagonists' faces. The shot reverse

shot here doesn't denote confrontation like in the meeting scenes. It is rather used to convey emotions and to support the dramatic effect of the conversation.

This is the only scene that shows Michael alone with his mother. It occurs after the first mafia hearings in Washington. Michael walks through the snow to Mama's house on the Tahoe compound. He passes a snow-covered children's playground. The music theme of the film gives melodramatic tone to the scene. The snow covers the compound and Michael enters his mother's place. In front of a fireplace, he pulls up a chair close to his mother and he speaks to her (in Sicilian) about his father's strength, changing times, and the feared loss of his family:

Michael: Tell me something, Ma What did papa think—deep in his heart? He was being strong...Strong for his family. But by being strong for his family, could he lose it?  
Mama: You're thinking about your wife...about the baby you lost. But you and your wife can always have another baby.  
Michael: No, I meant...lose his *family*.  
Mama: But you can never lose your family.  
Michael: Times are changing.

Michael visits his mother and asks her if Vito ever worried about losing his family. His mother says “*you can never lose your family*”. The scene depicts a confused and disturbed Michael who seeks refuge in his sick mother. It is the only scene that shows Michael with her. In the opening scene they were all gathered for dinner in Lake Tahoe but we barely see Michael talking to her.

The place is low lighted and one can see the fireplace's effect on the protagonists faces. The setting contrasts with the outside, the light and snow outdoor and dark and fire indoor. Michael's face is half lighted. The medium shots reveal the two protagonists very close. The director alternate between shot reverse shot and the over shoulder shot so that the conversation is set in an intimate mood. Michael speaks in a low voice to his mother that one can barely hear him if not the subtitles in English because the dialogue is in Sicilian.

This visit occurred after Michael's return from Havana, where he discovered that Fredo, his eldest brother, is the traitor. He returned home to find that Kay miscarried their child. He enters an empty house which contrasts with the lavish party of the opening scene.

Although Michael has always been strong and determined, the dawn of the new era also has an impact on him as well. With the Senate Hearings, the traitors trying to beat him, to the new business in Havana, Michael is fully absorbed in his business. The legitimization of his empire which never occurred makes him questioning himself. It is the degeneration of his family that worries him the most. Although, he is the one who contributed to this disaster. Michael's pursuit of power costs him his family and friends.

Mama Corleone (Morgana King) dies a few time later at the family compound. Her death marks the death of old times because she was the only one who prevents Michael to get his brother Fredo killed. With her death the Corleone family of old times disintegrated.

Similarly to *the Godfather's* scenes, the scenes from *Outside the Law* represent Messaoud with his sick mother. The visit occurred after that the FLN conducted a revenge operation on the Shanty town bombings. They have eliminated a unity of harki. Messaoud too, is shown walking in the empty venues of the slum watching his back. As the camera follows him, the audience can feel the pressure and anxiety he feels. This technique intensifies the involvement of the viewer with the character. Unlike Michael's scene which is a long shot that distanced the audience from him as he makes his way through the snow.

The scene between Messaoud and his mother is similarly constructed as in *the Godfather*. He sits beside his ill mother who gives him her last will. The dialogue between the two turns to a confession showing Messaoud's rejection of violence. Indeed he tells his mother that he is fed up with all this violence.

The mother: Messaoud my son, here is my last wish. There is here a part of our land. If we return to Algeria, we will plant a , but if I die before put it under my right ear. Don't forget ?

Messaoud: don't worry, we will return to our land. Mother!

The mother: yes.

Messaoud: I don't lie to you anymore. I have killed people.

I have killed a lot...with those hands... I have strangle them;

Mother.I was obliged to do that. God knows, it is for my son, for a better life for him. All what I have done is for him. Since a long time I have only known death. I know only death, mother. Forgive me mother.

The mother listens to her eldest son silently whereas a melodramatic music serves as a soundtrack supporting the dramatic scene. The music reflects Messaoud's state of mind. He is tortured by the killing of people. The conflict is getting more violent and makes many victims in both sides. That reflects Bouchareb's aim to give his protagonist a human dimension. His intention is not to glorify one side upon another but to present a fiction based on true events. He portrays his characters as ordinary people put in extraordinary situations.

The sequence depicts the human dimension of Messaoud which contrast with some previous representations of the Algerian rebels as terrorists. The image of a completely dehumanized person widely spread by the police and the Media at that time is challenged by Messaoud's conversation with his mother.

Bouchareb's stylization of the same scene from *the Godfather* serves a different purpose. Here Messaoud explains to his mother and thus to the audience that violence is not meant for violence but it is the violence of colonialism which leads to the violence of rebellion. Algerians are fighting for a better life for their children. This discourse resonates in the context of the riots of 2005 which were violent. The young protestors who were fed up of

their alienation in the French society despite the fact that they are French citizens reacted violently the systematic exclusion they witness every day.

It is true that Bouchareb uses the same devices to represent the scene between Messaoud and his mother. However the meaning of the two conversations is different. That is due to the different contexts and also to the two characters that are opposed. Messaoud resembles more to Vito than to Michael. The later represents the capitalist America whereas Vito represents old familial values. Messaoud is involved in violence to secure a better life to his son unlike Michael who sacrifices his family to secure his business.

The disintegration of Michael's family reflects the declines of the family as a value in the 1970s America. Whereas Messaoud sacrifice for his family raises the national identity and pride among his family. Messaoud who will die later in confrontation with the police represents many Algerian immigrants who were involved in the struggle. The historical heritage which the later generation of immigrants received, is an important component of their identity as second or third generation immigrant. That is why Messaoud in the above sequence voiced his concerns about the future of his son.

### **Stylizing Spectacle in *Outside the Law***

In his stylization of *the Godfather* gangster epic film, Bouchareb plays with mise-en-scene. In fact, settings, costumes, lightening and actors' performances resonate clearly in Coppola's film. The selected shots represent similar features proving that Bouchareb is looking to add spectacle to *Outside the Law*. In fact, besides relying on a set of bankable actors such as Jamel Debbouze, he also incorporates references from well known films.

In our previous analysis of the main characters we have set the affinities between the different protagonists. We have also state that Bouchareb combines features from different characters from *the Godfather II* within one character in *Outside the Law*, so that characters in

Bouchareb's film are not simply alter egos of those of Coppola's. The above shots show characters dressed in a similar fashion. We can notice in (Fig- 59-60)that Said is represented like Michael Corleone dressed in a refined suite and holding a cigar in his hand. The other actors also ar stylized in a similar way



**Fig-44** a three shot of Pantengeli meeting the Rosato and the mafia



**Fig- 45A** street gunshot involving the police and the mafia



**Fig-46** a gangster pointing his gun



**Fig-47**spectacular gunshootings



**Fig-48-49** Michael, Fredo and senator Geary in a night club during the Havana trip



**Fig-50** the street confrontation



**Fig-51**the attempt to kill Pantengeli



**Fig-52** Abdelkader pointing his gun toward the inspector



**Fig-53** Messaoud spectacular shootings



**Fig-54** Said's gangster posture



**Fig-55** The police interrogating Said



**Fig-56** Said alone in his Night club



**Fig-57**the police eruption in the Casbah



**Fig-61** An FLN activist pointing his gun **Fig-62** the FLN conducting a spectacular operation  
Like a gangster



**Fig-63** the violent gun fighting in the street of Paris

These scenes illustrate spectacle in *the Godfather* and *Outside the Law*. They show how Bouchareb stylizes the gangster aspect of *the Godfather* in his film through the use of techniques and devices proper to the genre. The selected shots are similar in many levels, particularly in the use of costumes, props: guns and cars, and settings. By doing so, Bouchareb offers spectacle to his audience. Indeed it is unusual to present a historical narrative within a gangster form.

The events are set in the streets or in confined spaces. They show the gangster or the gangsters like characters within the City shooting at each other. The confrontations are violent and happen usually at nights. Bouchareb appropriates these characteristics and make the FLN operates like the organized crime family. The attack on the police station is filmed like the attempt to kill Pantengeli. It started first in a confined place, the inspector's office, and then it moves to the street where a more violent confrontation takes place. The viewer can identify these scenes with the classical gangster films.

The characters in these shots are portrayed in a similar fashion. They are dressed alike in refined suits with fedoras reflecting thus the 1950's gangsters. They use the same guns and fight back against the system and the society. That is what makes Bouchareb's stylization of *the Godfather II* goes beyond the search for spectacle and a larger audience to parallel between the metaphor of a gangster fighting against the society that had alienated and deemed him to be an outcast and the Algerian immigrant who struggles for independence against ruler that oppressed and exploited them.

The scenes in both films are intense and violent, so that they reflect the violent conflict and opposition between the rivals. The FLN struggle in France is compared to the organized crime family in *the Godfather II*, to give a dynamic unusual plot line to *Outside the Law*. Because the film is first and foremost about the three brothers, this approach allowed the director to explore the different positions of the protagonists. They are not portrayed like traditional freedom fighters that are only devoted to their cause but as ordinary characters put in extraordinary situations.

In these selected shots, one can observe that Bouchareb uses the same techniques like Francis Ford Coppola. He relies on many close ups of the person who is shooting to convey his state of mind to the audience. He also provides many shot reverse shot to enhance the opposition between the different protagonists. The gangster genre has always been associated with the immigrants in the United States that is why Bouchareb, encouraged by the similarities between the Algerian and the Italian immigration, opted to stylize *the Godfather II* to represent the struggle of the Algerian immigrants in the 1950s.

Rachid Bouchareb portrays the FLN as a criminal organization collecting money from imposed taxes on the Algerian workers, trafficking and prostitution to fill the FLN's coffers. He also makes allusion to battles between North African and Corsican gangsters in Pigalle. Like the Corleone family, the FLN deploys its network among the Algerian community,

relying in ethnic brotherhood to rise to power. Thus a strong national identity developed among the shanty town population. This structure reminds the viewer with the organized crime family. Despite the fact this analogy was widely criticized in Media, it serves the distinct approach that Bouchareb chooses to tackle this sensitive episodes in the French and Algerian history.

The French police is also portrayed like a gangster mob. The Red Hand which was created to counter the FLN took a form of a criminal organization. This death squad had for target the FLN activists in the French capital. They use criminal methods to eliminate the Algerians. Both characters whether from the FLN or the Red Hand are portrayed like gangsters, they are similarly dressed in refined suits with fedoras. The parallel war between the FLN and The Red Hand is filmed like the adversity between the families in *the Godfather II*.

Bouchareb succeeds in portraying a spectacular rivalry which is epitomized in the violent shootings and fighting throughout the film. This device prevents the narrative to be a mere documentary film on the Algerian revolution. It comes to accelerate to slow motion of historical narration of events and takes it to the realm of a street fighting or spectacular confrontation involving large scale settings.

*Outside the Law* seems to be molded as a gangster film in the mood of *The Godfather*. Set in the streets of 1950s Paris, it reminds the audience of the Bronx gun fighting in Coppola's epic crime saga. The FLN activists are shaped like members of the Little Italy organized crime family rather than to the traditional war heroes depicted in the Algerian or the traditional French cinema. The characters Abdelkader, Messaoud, Said and the other activists mirrors those of Al Neri, Pantengelli's men or the Rosato brothers.

## **Conclusion:**

The Godfather's trilogy is considered to be among the most referenced film in cinema from *the Simpson*, *The Soprano*, *analyze that*, *Goodfellas* many directors get inspired by Hollywood most renowned family. Quotations like "I will make him an offer he can't refuse" are used around the globe. Bouchareb, in his film, attempts to place some intertextual references from *the Godfather II* in a form of similar shots, setting, outfits and style, and more interestingly content. The above selection has attempted to give adequate samples of these references. As we have demonstrated in our analysis the film *Outside the Law* contains traces of *the Godfather II* placed in a significant purpose so that they serve as a different stand points to the film narrative.

Through his stylization of *the Godfather II*, Bouchareb offers a singular identity to a film that explores the role of the Algerian immigrants in the struggle for independence. He made a fiction in the mood of *the Godfather II* through the appropriation of some elements of Coppola's epic crime film. These elements serve as skeleton to the content of *Outside the Law*. In terms of outcomes, what Bouchareb achieves by his production of *Outside the Law* is a stylization of *the Godfather II*. He deprives Coppola's film of its gangster aspects and retains some other features such as the epic dimension of the story shown in the temporal and spatial scales, the family unit resisting the dominant hegemonic discourse and coercive practice practices and the spectacle, shown in some scenes of execution and armed confrontation.

***GENERAL  
CONCLUSION:***

## **General Conclusion:**

This thesis is a comparison between Coppola's *the Godfather II* (1974) and Bouchreb's *Outside the Law* (2010). It centers on the representation of the history of the Italian and the Algerian immigration and its impact on the immigrants' sense of identity and belonging respectively to the United States and to France during the time depicted in both films. A New historicist and post colonial perspectives are adopted through providing their historical and contextual backgrounds, as well as their respective directors' biographies. The overall picture and detailed analysis of both films has for aim situating the reader with their contents and contexts.

At first glance there is not much in common between *the Godfather II* and *Outside the law*, but through examining the themes of exile, immigration, family and identity alongside with the histories and contexts of both immigration this work dressed a close parallel between the two narratives. It is true that the influence of Coppola on Bouchareb's *Outside the Law* is obvious on the level of the film's aesthetic, which provides the best argument to this dissertation. However, considering a

This modest dissertation highlights the tragic stories of two immigrant families pursuing two analogous exile trajectories from their displacement and separation from their homeland countries, their settlement in foreign countries to the emergence of conflicts through the process of violent rebellion or organized crime. It illustrates how Bouchareb stylizes Francis Ford Coppola's gangster movie to produce an epic film which addresses the issue of the Algerian immigration to France and its participation in the struggle for liberation.

More than the differences, it is the similarities that make the interest of the work. In fact the two directors, respectively Francis Ford Coppola and Bouchreb, capitalize on their ethnic heritage to deliver two films which with respective communities. Being an Italian American was one among the reasons that helped to choose Coppola to direct the first

*Godfather* ( 1972). Similarly, Bouchareb exposes a “semi biographical” film, being a son of an Algerian immigrant from Setif who joined the FLN in France.

Both *the Godfather II* and *Outside the Law* attempt to represent an immigrant experience through the story of two families. The films reflect the context of their time release. Both films expose the enduring experiences that the first generation immigrants have had in their respective host countries. Although, they came from different backgrounds, the adventures undertake are similar on many levels.

Coppola directed his film in the 1970s, a period of ethnic Revival in the United States. American from different horizons witnessed a gain of pride in their ethnic heritage. This resonated in the films of that period and minority groups representation in cinema raised significantly. Bouchareb also, produced his film as an immediate reaction to the ongoing debate on national identity in 2009 France. A debate urged by the 2005 riots in the outskirts of Paris and by the creation of the Ministry of Immigration Integration and National Identity.

The two films give a different stand point to the previous minority group’s representation in cinema. Despite the controversies which followed their respective release. Whether the accusation of perpetuating old stereotypes about the Italian Americans in the *Godfather*’s case or holding anti French sentiments in *Outside the Law*’s case, they remain to some extent a counter discourse to the dominant hegemonic discourse. In fact, the *Godfather* exploits the gangster genre to criticize capitalism in 1970s America, making of the Corleone family a metaphor to the American society.

*Outside the Law*, in its turn, stylizes *the Godfather* to tackle sensitive issues in the French society. In post colonial France, questions linked to the old empire still remain taboo in the public debate. Issues like the Setif’s massacres, the oppression of the Algerian immigrants in the 1950s which resonated in the 2005s riots violent response of the French authorities, still are not resolved. The emergence of the second and third generation immigrant

filmmakers helped in changing the situation. These directors dare to tackle issues of history, identity and immigration through another and different perspective opening thus the debate to wider audience. Those directors feel the legitimacy to rise such issues in their films.

Both films are representation of a minority group trying to make its way in the host land. *The Godfather II* takes upon itself the task of following the journey of the Corleone family through the harsh and hostile lands of Sicily to the passage of Ellis Island in the 1900s. Then it depicts what can be called a typical immigrant life in the enclave of Little Italy. Similarly, *Outside the Law* follows the journey of the Souni family from the harsh land of Setif to the enclaves of Nanterre then to the armed rebellion in the French Capital.

Hence, through following the Hollywood canons in his films, particularly *Days of Glory* (2006) and *Outside the Law* (2010), Bouchareb positions himself in international Film Festival gaining thus more recognition. The universality of his themes makes it easier to adopt unusual forms and styles to the French or the Algerian cinema industry. In doing so Bouchareb offers not only a cinema of spectacle which drain a larger audience but also a cinema that converse with the French Society because it subscribes locale issues in a global scale.

*Outside the Law* distinguishes itself from *the Godfather II* not only at the level of its content but also to the audience it addresses. It is clear that aesthetically Bouchareb borrowed from Coppola's masterpiece. However the two films stand for two complete different identities. *The Godfather II* belongs to the gangster genre par excellence. It respects the codes of the genres whereas *Outside the Law* appropriates these codes to criticize the situation of the Algerian immigrants in France. Since gangster films are always associated with the immigrants, Bouchareb maintains a kind of tradition. Immigrants in France are also associated with the film and Roman noir and the world of criminality (la pègre). Because of its fictional

dimension, Bouchareb wanted to add a kind of depth to his main characters through shaping them as *the Godfather II* protagonists.

Through his stylization of *the Godfather II*, Bouchareb offers a singular identity to a film that explores the role of the Algerian immigrants in the struggle for independence. He made a fiction in the mood of *the Godfather II* through the appropriation of some elements of Coppola's epic crime film. These elements serve as skeleton to the content of *Outside the Law*. In terms of outcomes, what Bouchareb achieves by his production of *Outside the Law* is a stylization of *the Godfather II*. He deprives Coppola's film of its gangster aspects and retains some other features such as the epic dimension of the story shown in the temporal and spatial scales, the family unit resisting the dominant hegemonic discourse and coercive practice practices and the spectacle, shown in some scenes of execution and armed confrontation.

## **Bibliography:**

### **I Primary Sources:**

*Outside the Law*. Dir. Rachid Bouchareb. Esplanade, 2010.

*The Godfather II*. Dir. Francis Ford Coppola. Esplanade, 2008.

Puzo, Mario. *The Godfather*. London: Arrow, 1998.

### **II Secondary Sources:**

#### A. Historical Books:

- Alba, Richard and Nee, Victor. *Remaking the American Mainstream; Assimilation and Contemporary Immigration*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press. 2003.
- Allatson, Paul and McCormack, Jo. *Exile, Cultures, Misplaced Identities*. New York: Edition Radopi B.V., Amsterdam. 2008.
- Barzini, Luigi. *The Italians*. New York: Atheneum. 1964.
- Bayor, Ronald H., ed. *Race and Ethnicity in America: A Concise History*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2003. <http://www.questia.com/read/118065013>.
- Benamrane, Jillali. *L'Emigration Algerienne en France (passé, present, devenir)*. Alger : CREA. 1981 .
- Benjamen, Stora. *The Algerian War in French Memory: Vengeful memory's violence. In Memory and Violence in the Middle East and North Africa*, edite by Ussama Makdissi, and Paul A. Selverstein. Indiana University Press. 2006.
- Berkowitz, Edward D. *Something Happened: A Political and Cultural Overview of the Seventies*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2006. <http://www.questia.com/read/119500827>.
- Borstelmann, Thomas. *The 1970s: A New Global History from Civil Rights to Economic Inequality*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2012.

<http://www.questia.com/read/120905110>.

- Brubaker, Rogers. *Citizenship and Nationhood in France and Germany*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1992. <http://www.questia.com/read/28523510>.
- Burgan, Michael. *Immigration to the United States: Italian Immigrants*. Ed. Robert Asher, Ph.D., General Editor. New York: Facts On File, Inc., 2005.
- Dinnerstein, Leonard, and Frederic Cople Jaher, eds. *The Aliens: A History of Ethnic Minorities in America*. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1970. <http://www.questia.com/read/58170427>.
- Edward W. Said, *Reflections on Exile and other Essays*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2000.
- Favell, Adrian. *Philosophies of Integration: Immigration and the Idea of Citizenship in France and Britain*. 2nd ed. New York: Palgrave, 2001. <http://www.questia.com/read/101718971>.
- Ferraro, Thomas. *Feeling Italian. The Art of Ethnicity in America*. New York: New York Press. 2005
- Fitzgerald, Keith. *The Face of the Nation: Immigration, the State, and the National Identity*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1996. <http://www.questia.com/read/65672955>.
- Foner, Nancy. *In a New Land: A Comparative View of Immigration*. New York: New York University Press, 2005. <http://www.questia.com/read/117565258>.
- Freedman, Jane. *Immigration and insecurity in France*. England: Ashgate Publishing Limited. 2004.
- Garis, Roy L. *Immigration Restriction: A Study of the Opposition to and Regulation of Immigration into the United States*. New York: Macmillan, 1927. <http://www.questia.com/read/5444160>.

- Gaspard, Françoise, Sevran. Shreiber, Claude. *La Fin des Immigrés*. Paris. Ed duSeuil. 1985.
- Glazer, Nathan and Moynihan, Daniel. *Beyond the Melting Pot*. Cambridge: MA: MIT Press, 1963.
- Greeley, Andrew M. *Why Can't They Be like Us? America's White Ethnic Groups*. New York: Dutton, 1971. <http://www.questia.com/read/98622902>.
- Hodgson, Godfrey. *More Equal Than Others: America from Nixon to the New Century*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2004. <http://www.questia.com/read/118113179>.
- House, Jim, and Neil Macmaster. *Paris 1961: Algerians, State Terror, and Memory*. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press, 2006. <http://www.questia.com/read/118729789>.
- Hsu, Roland, ed. *Ethnic Europe: Mobility, Identity, and Conflict in a Globalized World*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2010. <http://www.questia.com/read/117577746>.
- Ianni, A. J. F. & Reuss-Ianni, E. *A family business: Kinship and social control in organized crime*. New York, NY: Russell Sage Foundation. 1972.
- Joppke, Christian, ed. *Challenge to the Nation-State: Immigration in Western Europe and the United States*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998. <http://www.questia.com/read/13672886>.
- Juliani, Richard. *Building Little Italy*. Pennsylvania State University. 1999
- Marty, Myron A. *Daily Life in the United States, 1960-1990: Decades of Discord*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1997. <http://www.questia.com/read/9507942>
- Novak, Michael. *The Rise of the Unmeltable Ethnics*. New York: Mcmillan, 1971.
- Raissiguier, Catherine. *Reinventing the Republic: Gender, Migration, and Citizenship*

*in France*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2010.  
<http://www.questia.com/read/118168266>.

- Reimers, David M. *Unwelcome Strangers: American Identity and the Turn against Immigration*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1998.  
<http://www.questia.com/read/99569753>.
- Silverman, Maxim. *Deconstructing the Nation: Immigration, Racism, and Citizenship in Modern France*. New York: Routledge, 1992.  
<http://www.questia.com/read/103447544>.
- Sollors, Werner. *Beyond Ethnicity: Consent and Descent in American Culture*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1986. <http://www.questia.com/read/83237185>.
- ———, ed. *The Invention of Ethnicity*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1991.  
<http://www.questia.com/read/24341104>.
- Sowell, Thomas. *Ethnic America: A History*. New York: Basic Books, 1981.  
<http://www.questia.com/read/27170919>.
- Sutton, David, and Peter Wogan. *Hollywood Blockbusters: The Anthropology of Popular Movies*. New York: Berg, 2009. <http://www.questia.com/read/120802731>.
- Zimmerman, Klaus and Amelie Constant. *Ethnic Identity and Nation State*. Institute for the Study of Labor. 2012.

#### B. Literary History and Literary Theory:

- Barry, Peter. *Beginning Theory: An Introduction to Literary and Cultural Theory*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1995.
- Brannigan, John. *New Historicism and Cultural Materialism*, New York: St. Martin's Press, Inc, 1998.
- Marazzi, Marino. *Voices of Italian America. A History of Early Italian American Literature with a Critical Anthology*. Translated by Ann Goldstein. Rosemont Publishing and Printing Corp. 1963.
- Naficy, H. *An Accented Cinema: Exilic and Diasporic Filmmaking*. New Jersey:

Princeton University Press. (2001).

- Veese, H. Haram, ed, *The New Historicism*, New York: Routledge, 1989.

### C. Film Criticism:

- Bejaoui, Ahmed. *Cinéma et guerre de libération. Algérie, des batailles d'image*. Alger : Edition Chihab. 2014.
- Berardinelli, J. (1994). Review: *The Godfather*. Retrieved Octobe30,from<http://moviereviews.colossus.net/movies/g/godfather.html>
- Bordwell, David and Thompson, Kristin. *Film Art: an Introduction*, New York: the McGraw-Hilli Companies, Inc, 2008.
- Browne, Nick. *Francis Ford Coppola's Godfather Trilogy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.
- Cavallero, Jonathan. *Hollywood's Italian American Filmmakers: Capa, Scorsese, Savoca, Coppola and Tarantino*. University of Illinois, 2011.
- Cawelti, J. G. (1976). *Adventure, mystery and romance: Formula stories as art and popular culture*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- De Stefano, George. *An Offer We Can't Refuse. The Mafia in the Mind of America*. New York: Faber and Faber, Inc. 2006.
- Higbee, Will. *Post Beur Cinema. North African Emigréand Maghrebi-French Filmmaking in France*. Edenburgh: Edenburg University Press. 2013.
- Leitch, Thomas. *Crime Films*. England: Cambridge University Press. 2002.
- Phillips, Gene D. *Godfather. The Intimate Francis Ford Coppola*. The University Press of Kentuckey. 2006.
- Lubrutto, Vincent. *Becoming Film Literate: the Art and Craft of Motion Picture*. Westport CT: Paeger. 2005.

- Sylvie, Durmelat and Vinay, Swamy. *Screening Integration: Recasting Maghrebi Immigration in Contemporary France*. Nebraska: University of Nebraska Press. 2012.
- Tarr, Carrie. *Reframing Difference: Beur and Banlieue Filmmakers in France*. Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press. 2005.

#### D. Articles and Essays:

- Alba, Richard D. "Assimilation's Quiet Tide." *The Public Interest*, Spring 1995, 3+. <http://www.questia.com/read/1G1-17002004>.
- Barber, Ben. "France Finds Bitter Taste at Bottom of Its Melting Pot." *Insight on the News*, February 8, 1999, 42. <http://www.questia.com/read/1G1-53744915>.
- —Birds of Passage.‖ Gale Encyclopedia of U.S. Economic History. 1999. Web. 20 oct. 2013.<<http://www.encyclopedia.com/doc/1G2-3406400097.html> >
- Dika, Vera. "The Representation of Ethnicity in *The Godfather*." *Francis Ford Coppola's Godfather Trilogy*. Ed. Nick Browne. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.
- Fofana, Idriss. "Black, Blanc, Beur: France Debates Counting Its Minorities." *Harvard International Review* 31, no. 2 (2009): 11+. <http://www.questia.com/read/1G1-205506310>.
- Hargreaves, Alec G. "An Emperor with no clothes?" 2005. <http://riotsfrance.ssrc.org>.
- Hussey, Andrew. "Hatred in the Banlieue: In the Poor Outer Suburbs of France's Major Cities, a Generation's Alienation Has Erupted into Violent Loathing. They Are at War, and They Call It the "French Intifada"" *New Statesman (1996)*, April 2, 2012, 22+. <http://www.questia.com/read/1G1-287751962>.
- Jabr, Samah. "The Rebellion of France's Poor: An Act of Anger, Not of Hatred." *Washington Report on Middle East Affairs*, January/February 2006, 34+. <http://www.questia.com/read/1P3-958998561>.

- Jobard, Fabian. “*Rioting as a Political Tool: the 2005 Riots in France.*” The Howard Journal Vol 48 No 3. July 2009 Issn 0265-5527, pp. 235-244.
- Kastoryano, Riva. “*Territories of Identity in France.*” 2005. [http // riotsfrance.ssrc.org](http://riotsfrance.ssrc.org).
- Martigny, Vincent. "Le Debat Autour De L'identite Nationale Dans La Campagne Presidentielle 2007 : Quelle Rupture?" *French Politics, Culture and Society* 27, no. 1 (2009): 23+. <http://www.questia.com/read/1G1-202253141>.
- Pape, Eric, and Christopher Dickey. "Fiddling after Paris Burned; A Month after Widespread Riots, France's Efforts to Address the 'Root Causes' of the Unrest Are Looking More and More like Purely Cosmetic Changes." *Newsweek International*, December 26, 2005. <http://www.questia.com/read/1G1-140198617>.
- Roy, Olivier. “*The Nature of the French Riots*”. 2005. [http // riotsfrance.ssrc.org](http://riotsfrance.ssrc.org).
- Schier, Steven E. "*From Melting Pot to Centrifuge: Immigrants and American Politics.*" *Brookings Review*, Winter 2002, 16+. <http://www.questia.com/read/1G1-82376222>.
- Wieviorka, Michel. “*Violence in France*”. 2005. [http// riotsfrance.ssrc.org](http://riotsfrance.ssrc.org).
- Wihtol de Wenden, Catherine. “*A Chaud on the French Suburban Crisis.*”2005. [http // riotsfrance.ssrc.org](http://riotsfrance.ssrc.org).

## Résumé

Cette thèse présente une analyse comparative entre le film de Francis Ford Coppola *Le Parrain II* sorti en 1974, et le film de Rachid Bouchareb *Hors-la-loi* sorti en 2010. Elle traite de deux thèmes, l'identité et l'immigration à travers deux approches : une approche new historiciste et une approche postcoloniale. L'objectif d'une étude comparative entre *Le Parrain II* (1974) et *Hors-la-loi* (2010) est de fournir le contexte historique et immédiat dans lequel les deux films pourraient être discutés et comparés avec un accent sur la représentation de l'histoire de l'immigration et son impact sur le sens d'identité et d'appartenance des immigrants aux États-Unis et en France. Cette thèse découvre que la stylisation que fait Rachid Bouchareb de *Le Parrain II* est basée d'une part sur les similitudes entre les deux migrations à savoir l'immigration italienne aux États-Unis et l'immigration algérienne en France et d'une autre part sur l'émergence d'un cinéma de groupes minoritaires et ethniques contre la culture dominante dans un contexte de renaissance ethnique dans *Le Parrain II* et le débat sur l'identité nationale dans le cas de *Hors-la-loi*. En soulignant les histoires tragiques de deux familles d'immigrants qui poursuivent deux trajectoires d'exil similaires à partir de leur déplacement et la séparation avec leur pays nataux, leur établissement dans des pays étrangers jusqu'à l'émergence de conflits à travers le processus de rébellion violente dans *Hors-la-loi* ou le crime organisé dans *Le Parrain II*. Toutefois, les deux films représentent deux identités complètement séparées et l'appropriation des personnages de gangsters dans *Hors-la-loi* sert uniquement à des fins dramatiques.