

Dudley: My name's Dudley Andrew, long standing member of the society for Cinema and Media Studies. We're here, I'm here with André Gaudreault, at the Sheraton hotel in Toronto, on St. Patrick's Day, March 17th, 2018. It's great that we're in Toronto because we have a Canadian film scholar, the premier Canadian film scholar André Gaudreault, and I'm very excited to learn about his past and his plans for the future.

André, thank you for being here.

Andre: Thank you.

Dudley: Let me begin by starting at the top. André is a larger than life figure and he has been feted with some tremendous prizes just this year and this interview is one of them. It's a recognition of his lifelong service to cinema in Canada and everywhere. But this very last few months, he received the Prix Quebec that was honored for his province as one of the most important humanist in the entire region. It's very rare.

And then, just now, we're not even supposed to announce it but by the time this comes out you will be allowed to know that he received the Killam Prize which is the national prize in Canada for his discipline. Given once a year, which comes with a substantial financial award, I'm pleased to say. It's not just honorary, it's really something. It's a tremendous recognition, very rare, especially in our field. Maybe the rarest. So, congratulations André.

Andre: Thank you very much, Dudley.

Dudley: You've hit a large limit. But I wanna start actually when you were nothing, when you were small. Not fetus, but you were just getting going. Did you sense yourself that you would become a film scholar, a recognized film scholar? What set you on your career path? And in fact, was there something about the cinema or the kinematic turn in your own youth that got you going in a direction that you've grown into?

Andre: Well, first I have to say that my kinematic turn, I think it was only when I was about 23 when I was at the University Laval where I taught first. I was a student, 1973. And I was in courses in cinema and then I discovered my path. Before that, I was going to films, you know, but I remember some specific examples of viewing films. But I wouldn't say that I was attracted by cinema more than any other thing I would say. But when I started in 1973, well, it was fast my friend. Because two years after, I was in front of the class. So it's a way of saying things, but it's true.

It's like a discovery. But in fact, it's not totally true because in some respect, the conditions of my youth, not youth. Before youth, infancy was kind of related to silent cinema. I'll explain to you. In fact, I suffered. This is a sofa, not a psychoanalytic one. But I suffered all of my infancy of ear infections, and I always had cotton balls in my ears. And I always had these for retaining the medication that they put, the liquid medication. Like a joke with that, because we call these cotton balls what. So I say to people, I was like, what? What? What? So, I was not able to talk before long because I didn't hear. So,

I talked ... I don't know I start talking like the other ones at about maybe four or three years old, I don't know exactly.

But then it's like if I would have been ... how do you say that, vaccinated with a gramophone needle, I took back. But also, I was looking at scenes and silent scenes when I was young because my father and mother were having scenes. My father was an inveterated alcoholic, drunkard. And I was looking at that in low angle. That's the analysis I'm doing of my past and my relation to early silent cinema. Also, I would add one other thing. I have always been fond of short objects. Not long. Short duration objects, which relates to attraction. Because I'm not that good as sustaining attention. So, I would not diagnosticate that, but early film may be related to my infancy.

Also I have to say, I like this one, but it's true. My first film, not my first film. The first film I worked on was Life of an American Fireman. And I found out, a clip in the archive, the family archive, where I see that there was a burning house where I was born, it was my house and my mother saved me from the fire. So, I don't know. What can I tell you? But that's it, that's one path to understand maybe why I was so much interested in the cinema. Or, at least in the silent cinema.

But in fact, the event that struck me, was that what I was after that ... when I was a student, I never knew exactly where to go. Because you know, it ~~was~~ the beginning of the time where we were eighteen and you know, the youth people now, young people are difficult to choosing, you have to choose where to go. So I hesitated between music and literature. Then I said okay, I'll go to literature. And then I said to myself, let's see what's going on. I went to literature at the equivalent of lycée, in Quebec we call this CEGEP. So two years before university, college you would say, no?

Dudley: Right.

Andre: So anyway, I was going in literature, and I had one course of philosophy. And the course in philosophy, I got a great grade and I was tired of going to the college for learning English because I said to myself, I'll learn it in the life, in real life. Spanish, I said why not go to Spain? I'll learn it. So I decided to switch for philosophy. And then, from philosophy, I was really interested especially since it was courses about Marxism which interested me a lot at the time. And then, I decided to go to University in Montreal instead of Quebec City, because I was born in Quebec City. All I told you has passed in Quebec City up to that date.

And then I decided to go to Université du Quebec à Montreal. Not my university, the other one. Because in the philosophy for the university. Because at Laval, it was ... it had the reputation of being theological. And you know, we were in Quebec, *Grande Noirceur*.

Dudley: Conservative.

Andre: Conservative. But now changing. But, still in the university, university's always a little late. Sometimes it's in advance, but on this kind of a thing it's always late. And I went

there at UQAM in philosophy. But I didn't like it for many reasons I won't explain here, and I stopped for one year working here and there. And I came back to university in journalism, and I was looking for myself or my way. And I didn't like it, but I stayed there.

And then, by chance, I entered in a course in cinema. Because I'd been attracted by those students who were walking in the-*couloirs*?

Dudley: Corridors.

Andre: In the corridors of the University of Laval in Quebec in 1972, '73, with those books. Very attractive and very intriguing books for me. One of them ... both of them were from the collection dix, dix-huit. Ten, eighteen, which is very well known. And one of them was written S.M. Eisenstein *Au-delà des étoiles*. Beyond the stars. I said, what's that? And the other one was Dziga Vertov. I said, what? What's that?

So the extraneity, it was extraneous for me. I was intrigued. And the title of the book of Vertov was *Articles, journaux, projets*, so it intrigued me. All these books were advised by one professor of cinema there, whose name is Paul Warren, who was a Jesuit, Jesuit you say? Before and he quit and he became of the first professors of cinema in Quebec and in Canada in '72. There were about 10 of them all over Canada, but that's it. There was no field at all in 1972. I entered a course, not by this professor but by another one, François Baby, who was more related to television. By chance, when I entered late, he was showing a clip from Citizen Kane, so I fell down in the trap. That's the way it happened.

Dudley: So when you first started to teach in Laval, it's 1976. This is the era of high theory in France, big era. Christian Metz has brought out, *Le Signifiant imaginaire*, but you're attracted to film history and short film. Did you play with ... did you have to deal with film theory as the same time as film history? How did that work out in that era?

Andre: Well in fact, it was first theory that interested me. I was listening to those courses by those two professors I told you about, the other one were *chargé de cours*, lecturers, with no one had any *doctorat*, they were not doctors at all but good willing people. Anyway doctors in cinema in Canada in 1973, maybe there were one or two, but from elsewhere or going elsewhere but mostly being immigrating in Canada. It's impossible to have this solid cinema in the doctoral level at that time. But anyway, I was interested by this matter and Metz was very important for me but I have to say also that others that are a little bit forgotten were very important for me like Amengual. *Clefs pour le cinéma*, for me that book is very important. It changed my mind.

Also I have to say *Praxis du cinéma* by Burch, which ... because Burch I don't have a feeling totally stable with Burch's work because I think it's very important for what he did for early cinema, but at the same time, in his book is doing ... I think he has one foot on the frontier - at the side of the frontier - and the other foot the other side. But anyway, this is a guy who has ideas and his ideas are sometimes not documented, most of the time it's not documented, but sometimes it's a flash that's good. Anyway, *Praxis*

*du cinéma* before that, a book that he changed the title after, for *Une Praxis* because he took some distance with it, this book was very important for me but also the books of Metz but more the semiological one, that the psychoanalytical one. I wanted to understand how does cinema came to narration.

That is the old story and with Metz, I couldn't find that. And Mitry, I was reading Mitry theory a little bit and I couldn't learn that with them but with Metz what I learned, and this is what helped me a lot and changed everything that brought me to Brighton and the way I did Brighton, is the rigueur? rigor and you don't say something if you don't know or you say something you don't know but you say that you don't know or you try to prove it or you make a lot of precautions, you're cautious. You have to be cautious and maybe I'm too much cautious but I prefer to be too much cautious than to say anything.

This is why ... And also, the other thing is when I was studying in cinema, 1973 to '75, before the end I got a job at the college, lower than university, to give a course and it was difficult to give a course with the courses I had. So I came back to the university to not my colleagues, but my future colleagues and I said, "There are two things lacking here," like anywhere. One course *introduction to film*. There was none. And the other one would be something like *history of cinema* but I didn't want history of cinema. It was too much classic so I had the idea of proposing *Évolution de l'expression filmique*, which maybe I don't agree with everything, every sense of it, but evolution of film makes expression. For me, it was important to see the development. I would say development instead of evolution today and expression, I'm not sure I would use it.

Anyway, it was a way in 1975 to say, "I'm not going to do what has been done, is being done elsewhere in an automatic pilot manner." And I proposed that and they said, "Okay, prepare the courses." I said, "Okay. I prepare the courses." I did and that's the way it is. The one which is called *Évolution de l'expression filmique*, this explained everything that followed after because I had to know what's what.

Dudley: So the beginning and it was Darwin. You went back to the very first ...

Andre: Yeah, I had to know because my question, which is also a little bit of influence of materialist thinking, from where comes narration. I already told that to you and I said, "Is it given to film or is it in film?" That's the story of my thesis. My concern was where can we say that film narrates and where can we say it doesn't narrate and with this I had these hypothesis about theatrical, about scriptural literature, and filming but the most important thing about that is in order to be able to make a hypothesis, which these hypotheses I made in 1979, '80, '81, my thesis, which finished in '83, I had to know what the other ones had to say about film history. So they said to me, "You give the course." I had one year and three months maybe to prepare myself. I said, "Okay, I'm going to make a compendium of notes from my readings of all Sadoul, all Mitry, all Deslandes et Richard, a little bit of Ford and Charles, a little bit of Bardèche and Brasillach, a little bit of Lewis Jacobs, a little bit of this and that; but especially in French because I didn't want to add the difficulty of ... because I was in Quebec, Quebec City, five person speaking English.

I'm not a native English speaker at all, you can see and everyone can see. So I did a book notes of about let say 200 pages, almost no reflection but a little bit, quotations. And then, one friend of mine came back from France. He had made a cultural trip, a group, *L'Office franco-québécois pour la jeunesse* was sponsoring these, and he came back with two issues of *Le Cahiers de la cinémathèque*. One was the Griffith one, which I don't know which issue; was something like 25, and another one. And I read in this that Barthélémy Amengual, I think, and Román Gubern talked about *Life of an American Fireman*, and they were talking about it without knowing each other that they were talk about this film and that issue and one of them is saying, "Well there is another version passed on TV recently," so there was two versions and poor them; they were away. Over the Atlantic. So, they were talking about *Life of An American Fireman* in the Library of Congress and the version of the Museum of Modern Art so you know me, I took my car and I went down to Library of Congress.

It's easy to know the date because when I arrived in my creepy motel I opened the TV and it was the ~~date~~ death of the King so August '77, and then I went to see films, a lot of films, but especially *Life of American Fireman*. Thirteen hours of car, looked at that, stayed there three days, came back to Montreal, stopping in New York where Charles Silver welcomed me and it was very keen, very fine. Eileen Bowser was on leave, maybe it was summer, August, so she was ~~on~~ in vacation, and I look at the film and I had two versions. Automatically I had the feeling, without knowing too much because I didn't know too much at that time, that the version - the awkward version - would be the right one. It's always the awkward version, it's always the right one but I had to think about it and Charles Silver gave me the address of a guy from California who was working on the same subject - Charles Musser.

So he was in California, I wrote to him, we exchanged, we realized that we had the same kind of, not the same ideas, the same kind of interest and I had made this paper that I had offered to *Cahiers de la Cinémathèque*, and I said to Charles Musser, "Dear Mr. Musser, why don't you offer me your article to put it in French and put at the *Le Cahiers de la Cinémathèque* with mine so both our articles will be in better in unity and you do the same in English, so that's what happened. But then Brighton, because of that, I wrote to Eileen Bowser that was absent, she read my article, she said, "Oh, there is a Brighton conference. You should be coming." I never saw her but she knew I came and she read the article and she said, "You should talk with ... write to David Francis."

At that time, writing was by post, by normal mail. But anyway, it worked and then I was in Brighton with-all these other ones.

Dudley: Explain Brighton in one sentence to everybody.

Andre: Brighton is the conference of FIAF - Fédération Internationale des Archives du Film. International federation of film archives that has a congress every year and that year, 1978, they made this convention (congress) with special symposium, they always have a special symposium, and this is the symposium which is the most famous because of aftermath, and it was *Brighton cinema 1900 to 1906* and so they showed 600 films from ... they gathered from everywhere in the world, in the cinémathèques, the film archive,

and we were invited - the specialists - we were invited to look at those films one week before the convention and all of us had seen some of them but when we've seen 600 of those from 9 to 5, 6 days or 5 days during the week, I can tell you the metaphoric way I say that, you were looking at the films and they were all the theories about early cinema were falling down on the scene because it was a theater.

Falling down. Falling down because it was real discovery. 600 films. So you don't have ... because all those films were described, if you had not seen them, by the historians who could not have seen them sometime and we don't criticize them for that. It's great they did that but you know, for Sadoul to look at film, to watch a film that is in England means try to avoid the German expedition, take a train, take a boat, a plane, have a meeting... he did but it's complicated. Whereas today, we have 500 films in our key-how do you say that?

Dudley: Thumb drive.

Andre: Yeah, thumb drive. Thumb drive so it's completely different way of doing things. Also there was something happening. I don't know what was happening but at this convention, there was Noël Burch, myself, and Charles Musser all together by their own means, arrived to the same conclusion about the same film - *Life of an American Fireman* - plus Gunning, plus Bowser, etc. And that's why when I got back from there, I had my meeting with *Cahiers de la Cinémathèque* in Toulouse, in order to provide with Musser's article and mine, but I said, "Look, I've got all that bunch." They said, "Okay, we buy," so we did that issue, the number 29 issue of *Cahiers de la Cinémathèque*, which name was *Le cinéma de premier temps (1900 to 1906)*.

And I remember having hesitated to call it *Cinéma primitif (1900 to 1906)*, but I refrained myself.

Dudley: Wow. That's fabulous. A couple of years later is the birth of Domitor and you had a lot to do with that. Does it come out of the Brighton experience and how did you think about making Domitor ... it's one of the great events and I'm not part of it, it's not my field, but I know everyone is devoted to this and I think it's one of things you should be most proud of. You want to tell us how that got going?

Andre: This is one of the things I'm most proud of, even though I'm just a regular member. They named me a life member. I don't pay anymore, good. I'm honored by that also. The honor, the five founders. So, yes, it comes from Brighton because at the time of Brighton, I was so amazed that after the first day I said, "I cannot leave that to go astray." I bought lectorette, kinorette?

Dudley: A recorder.

Andre: A recorder and I was describing the films and I was describing the films not too loud. I wasn't the only one that did that. I could not leave that away. Listen to that. We didn't note that they would keep all those films in London. Maybe we knew but they all kept them because one day they get their copy, they keep it. They have an agreement but at

least ... England is far from my home, at least I'll keep a trace of the film. Can you imagine? Now you just make a copy or you don't have a copy? Go on the web. I did a filmography with that and I gathered the notes from Noël Burch, he accepted from Spehr, from Gunning, from Musser. So I gather this in an artisanal way how you would say that. It's not very scientific. It's more the impression of ... but I wanted the thoughts or the notes of Gunning, Musser, Gaudreault, Burch, and so on and so on, to be gathered in a document - which is not a great filmography- but it gives existence to the thing.

It gives dates, maybe it's not the right dates but it-

Dudley: Keeps a trace.

Andre: Yes, establishes ... and I remember that even Paul Spehr said to me at some point, "It won't be very good." I said, "No, I know but I have the confidence that this will help," and it helped a lot because after that I had this other project that I was to make a filmography of Pathé's film or some of the films from Brighton and I had this agreement with David Francis, who is a marvelous person, who was welcoming people, and I had this team of my students were working at Berkhamsted to take notes about the films. All this has been, if we had known that five years or ten years we could make copy of film on video, maybe we would have not done that. But anyway we did it, and we studied the film. And this is a little bit part of the reason why Domitor was born.

Because it was born because Tom Gunning was included in this. He was my partner on the SSHRC, SSHRC is a *Social Science Humanitarian Research Council of Canada*, who gave me the money for making this project, Tom Gunning was part of that. And we were in England at some point. Paulo Cherchi Usai came to us. We met Bottomore, Stephen, I'm talking about all those founders and Emmanuelle Toulet, that I've seen at the conference in 1985 where Tom Gunning was absent and me launched for the first time the cinema of attractions. We gathered during lunch time and I told to them, not all of them, but I think it was Emmanuelle and Paulo, so Italy for me was important. One French, one Italian, one Canadian, one American, and one British. They were young, we were young, and I said, "Why don't we establish a society for studying early cinema?"

So, Tom Gunning was not there, Stephen Bottomore neither, but then we gathered with Emmanuelle, Paulo, myself, with Tom and Stephen Bottomore in England, when we were going to study films for that project, and we established the society and I came back to Université Laval, where with my students and my assistants we launched Domitor by sending an invitation to 500 addresses and the first one who became a member from abroad was Christian Metz.

Dudley: Wow. That's spectacular.

Andre: He believed in these things.

Dudley: Yeah. That's wonderful.

Andre: It was related to Pordenone also because we had the ... we could not make a convention and pay for all these trips but we knew that most of us would be in Pordenone, so in Pordenone, *Le Giornate del cinema muto*. In 1977 maybe, maybe '75-

Dudley: '75?

Andre: '85. '85 we had our first meeting and we had made a first instalment of the association which was founded in '87, also in Pordenone. It's working. It's working without us. That is what is extraordinary. We launched a kid, and the kid is working. Walking, growing. It's every two years there's a big conference. Every two years there is a publication in a great publisher so it's marvellous. And also, it gives you an idea of liking for other subjects because the only, maybe it's the only association on the specific subject.

Dudley: That's what's wonderful about it. It has a-

Andre: Small subject.

Dudley: Yeah. But if people do lots with the subject, and they've done a huge amount with it. Well at the same time you were pressing the early cinema key to the limit, especially with the cinema of attractions. You also have this parallel theoretical world of the *récit*, the narratology, and you're working through your dissertation and so you have your first publication *Du littéraire au filmique*.

Andre: Which was published later as *From Plato to Lumière*.

Dudley: It came out much later in English but I remember seeing that book and then you had the book with François Jost, *Le Récit Cinématographique*, 1990. The late '80s for you was both pressing the cinema of attractions area but also the narrative area. They're related but did you sense a continuity in your life or were you doing two different things and did you have different kinds of students that were following?

Andre: No, I don't think the students because the students I know they would take what I would offer them but maybe you're right a little bit because one of them is related to ... yeah, it's interesting what you say because those two courses, *Introduction to film* and the other one *Évolution de l'expression filmique*, *Evolution of filmmaking expression* is through cinema, is one of them looking at film synchronically, not diachronically, and it relates to my concerns. Narration, but also time, space, filming, cadre, language, all these kinds of material and the other one is looking where does it come from, what happened first, what happened next, and it's kind of a mix of the two things because you can have an approach for early cinema, which is not at all related to narration.

Which, I respect absolutely, but mine was especially about this and that's why I coined the term *monstration*. I coined it by borrowing it and it was absolutely important for me to get this and I coined this sometimes around 1979 or '80 from Betty Rodham, a writer in a theater, and I thought it was important because I didn't want to have narration versus *représentation* because representation means ... narration is a diegesis, lets say, and the other one is mimesis, lets say. The lets say is very important. I wanted to have a

couple of terms, of concepts and representation is not good because representation ... you have representation and you have in French we can say that when you go, you're a selling traveler and come back and you ask for your *frais de representation*.

It was absolutely impossible so I said narration, good. Monstration, better. But attraction was not there. So monstration was important because I wanted to show that theater was telling stories by monstrating thing and literature or scriptural by talking about them, by narrating them. I wanted to make a mix and see what cinema was doing. What happened when cinema came to life, if I can say, and had to do something like *L'arroseur arrosé*, so if Lumière has to do *L'arroseur arrosé*, he has to imitate a little bit the metteur en scene of theater. You have to hire actors. You have to put them in from of spectator, and ask them to play. It's like theater, kind of, but it's film. Whereas the narrator of the written expression of a novel will say, "Well there was a gardener at one point was doing his job while a terrible kid played a trick on him."

It's two different things but then I said, "Okay, cinema comes with monstration first, and then it adds something else for going to monstration which was, lets say, editing.

Dudley: Going to narration?

Andre: To narration. What did I say?

Dudley: You said monstration.

Andre: Monstration to narration because I was saying that every *plan*, every shot is a *micro récit*. If you have one micro-narrative, one micro-narrative, but of monstration style. Monstration, monstration. But if you put them together, there is a thread of narration and editing is an example of how the narrator, the film narrator, not a person, came into play and pushed away the monstrator saying, "I am the master. I'm going to bring together the shot and I will depart from the recording style of monstration to bring it to something else."

Dudley: So in you work, Paul Ricœur did the preface for your book. How did you get him to do that by the way? People that know me know he's a hero to me and I was so impressed that you got him to do this. If it's a digression, you can leave it.

Andre: No, no, no. I always say the truth and the truth is that I was in Toronto in 1985, maybe '86, and he was there. And also there was Umberto Eco that was there. It was the SSS Summer School of Semiotic study of Paul ... I forget his name. The Toronto circle, symbiotic circle, so it was full of promises and it was summer school so I came here because of the Film Studies Association of Canada who made its annual conference and I went to listen at Ricœur and when he was outside of the building, I had my thesis in my hand. I don't know if I prepared myself but I guess I did but what you see is what you get with me. It's a word I always use, especially with my wife because her mother's name is Huguette so what you see, what you get.

Hello, Sylvie. "Hello professor Ricœur, I'm André Gaudreault from Quebec. As you can see, I speak French - I talked to him in French, and this is my thesis. I would be very happy if you could bring it with you and read it if you can and tell me what you think about it." So I received a letter 6 or 7 months later, not an email. I had this letter I cherish it. He said ... it's the first time I say it in public, "Your hypothesis on mimesis and diegesis totally convinced me."

Dudley: Wow.

Andre: So I said he has to pay for that. I said, "What about writing a preface?" I said, "Maybe I will die, he will die." I received the letter, yes. In the pocket. And he wanted to publish one of my chapter because the book would be different, very different, because the book was much too focused on the great problem of the explanation, a little bit, but not too much. But the chapter on Plato, one of them, I don't remember. The Plato one I think, was published in his *Revue de métaphysique et de morale*, which by chance ... well not by chance but I'm saying that it was published by Armand Colin, by the way. No relation with my future, but the same great editor, publisher.

Dudley: I don't want to get us too far off into theoretical questions but I do want to see whether or not you can put together these two aspects of your own work that I sense. On one hand, you are really interested in these philosophical questions that have to do with narration and monstration, as you say, and you're in the world of Ricœur here, hermeneutics, history. This is straight-line humanism of the sort that I totally honour. I just read from you recently, if I can find it here that you gave a talk in which you said, "Cinema studies is now perhaps linked, maybe soft, to science," and you were very proud of this. This was in ... you were receiving an award and you said, "I'm glad that cinema has finally entered the world of sciences. It may be soft science but I really believe that cinema studies should be related to social science and especially to science."

And you also work a lot on ... you've got a book on ... you edited on technology. So you have this science technology part, and you've got the humanities part. Do you see any conflict in that?

Andre: No I don't think there's a conflict because you're doing editing now but you have the right to do that. I explain to you that this statement about the science was for many reasons and also for giving a lesson to my son. It's a joke a little bit. Hello, Grégoire. In fact, there's two things. First, film studies were not, you know that, recognized at the university as being scientific-

Dudley: Rigorous.

Andre: Recognized field. And it's normal, you had to make your proofs. People like Metz helped us a lot in 1960s and '70s but when we came, you a little bit before me, in the '70s, '80s, we had to ground a little bit. But I'm almost sure you are the first professor of cinema at the university where you were hired. Maybe not the first one but almost. Was it Iowa?

Dudley: Yeah, it was Iowa. Ted Perry was before me.

Andre: What?

Dudley: Ted Perry was before me.

Andre: But then almost nobody and maybe I also wasn't the first one but there were no doctors. It was not the same game. But then for me it was ... I'll tell you something. I'm happy to have honours, I'm happy to receive the bursaries. I'm happy of all this recognition but I have to tell you, most of the work I do sometimes is not helping me putting books together. I don't have that much books by myself where I've written four or five. Two of them with coauthors but I lost a lot of time working for establishing the field-

Dudley: The foundation.

Andre: -In Quebec and in Canada and it worked. For me, the Prix Léon-Gérin in November, last November, and that's where I said this was very important because for the Quebec, not province we don't say that, Quebec nation, it was important. It is important that in Quebec and maybe also in Canada but there it was Quebec that some "appareil d'état", to quote Althusser, state, well, state apparatus, state that cinema is something that has value and giving a prize, this price, for someone's cinema, the first one, but it says something. It says that the intelligentsia of Quebec, researchers in philosophy, in humanities, in literature, in social sciences, sociology, all gathered and usually they give that to a great sociologist, a great. Historian of art maybe. But to a film specialist? No. No, yes.

They gave the prize for social ... because they divide that in five sectors and one of the sectors is social science and what is it? Human and social sciences. The pun I had, because I always try to have pun, the pun I had at the end of my speech of 3 minutes was the following. I'm glad ... recognition of the field. I partake this honour with my colleagues of cinema, my students, but also I'd like to tell you an anecdote. Sometimes when I was at home I would say to my son, let me go, I'll go in my office to ... in French I would say "faire avancer la science". How would you say that?

Dudley: I'll make some progress in my scientific work. Or in my research I would say.

Andre: No, la science.

Dudley: Okay.

Andre: To have science to make progress.

Dudley: Knowledge, I don't know.

Andre: Yeah, knowledge. So he said something was looking at ... cinéma? Études cinématographiques? Sciences? It wasn't an argument but at one point I said that and I

said yes, my son Grégoire. He was in front of me with all these people at the ceremony with the premiere, the Deputy Prime Minister of Quebec and I was saying to this assembly, "Yes, Grégoire, the Quebec government says to you today what it says. What it says is that film studies is a science. A social one, a human one, but still a science." Which is important for me.

This is the most important thing for me. I don't know why. I always ask myself why do I do that. I know I take advantage of that but also I never counted my hours for getting the university where I was. Laval first and then the Université de Montréal to develop the field and it worked. And also to develop the studies because when I started, when we all started in 19-I don't know what, there was no master. Since 1994 there are masters in cinema in Quebec, Canada and no doctoral. I'm glad to say that I was ... I'm happy and proud that we at University of Montreal were the first one to get, in 2007, the doctorate program in film studies in Canada.

Then the year after there were two other ones ~~more~~ and later other ones.

Dudley: So Quebec for us is a place that you ... it's your homeland and you've used that, your pride in that, as a way to make alliances with the rest of Canada with the Francophone world in Europe and with the United States. These three prongs is that right?

Andre: Yeah because there's an expression in Quebec and it's poetic expression. We say that this country, Quebec, is a country of *presque Amérique*. Almost America. So we're not America. We're *presque* America because we are related to France and to Europe. We are Latin. We have *sang chaud*, not cold blood, hot blood. Do you say that in English? Anyway, you understand. Latin. And it's very funny because this problem we feel it in the title of my first article, the partaking I have from being *presque Amérique* but also French because my article relates to what I talked about today, here, at the conference - SCMS conference.

The article says ... the article was *Life of An American Fireman*, but I don't know what exactly, and then about the birth of *montage parallèle*, which I wouldn't say that. I would say *montage alterné* because Tom Gunning was talking to me and Charles Musser about parallel montage or editing, which was crosscutting but in English you don't make the difference. But then the French one like Michel Marie or other ones or Jacques Aumont were talking about *montage alterné*. I was in the middle of the battlefield and I didn't know exactly how to do the thing.

In some respect, I never thought about that but today what I did with the conference I made today, which was written by Philip Gauthier, a former student of me, now a lecturer and professor; is about *montage alterné* and it's very important for me to state what is *montage alterné* because of my partaking between two continents. I couldn't know what it was because in English they were saying something in French they were saying something else and now I have the answer.

Dudley: So I think we should move to the issue of the larger sphere of cinema which you have developed sometimes in conflict with me about the end of cinema. The movement

towards video games and the movement towards media studies - the many screens which the Society for Cinema and Media Studies has embraced and I want to ask you your own sense of this field. Is this is a series, the world that you use always of a cultural series, where we move from animated moving pictures towards other sorts of audio visual entertainments and today we arrive at a plethora of possibilities with the computer. Is this all the field that you feel now you belong to and that you are working in, even though you begin and still remain mostly with the early cinema?

Andre: It's funny that you say that because I'm going to make a conference in Wisconsin.

Dudley: A lecture.

Andre: A lecture, yeah. Sorry. You're right. A lecture at Grusin's place, which is Wisconsin-

Dudley: Milwaukee.

Andre: Milwaukee. And it's about the end of cinema. And I'm not sure I'm going to do what I'm going to tell you but the first idea I have, I think I proposed them this title, "Cinema cannot die. It Never Existed." So I like this idea of trying to circumvent the objects and try to see what it is because you know ... I've got an idea for you. What is cinema? Or cinema is. What cinema is. So this is very important for me and also the title of my book, I always say when I teach in French, *La fin du Cinéma? Avec un point d'interrogation. Pourquoi le point d'interrogation? Parce qu'on n'est pas des cons.* So there's a rhyme there.

The question mark is very important because cinema will not end. Anyway, we just have to call anything cinema and it will be cinema and that is what is happening now, a little bit, because I received recently, three days ago here, a leaflet, a pamphlet-

Dudley: What is-

Andre: Prospectus

Dudley: Prospectus.

Andre: Yeah of the conference in Paris, with Jacques Aumont and other people. Also, Rodowick will be there. Also, Bellour. All these people with other people, Somaini. They all talk about anything but cinema. I think this is great that we talk about virtual reality. I don't see a lot of field that have changed as much in so few time, short time. And in fact, it's the same thing for me. Not that much but someone would have told me 20 years ago I seen your, I see in your future that you will be the director, co-director, of a conference on television I would say. No, impossible. But no. It's possible. I did it. I made that book with François Jost recently.

Dudley: You redid the book?

Andre: I redid the book. We didn't change the-

Dudley: The 1990 book.

Andre: Yeah, the 1990, *Le Récit cinématographique*. They asked us after 25, 27 years to reshape it, we decided not to change the original text because we would have to write another book, which is impossible. Together we are not the same man, but we decided to revamp it to restore it to the modernity I would say. Not to cheat on the product, we kept the same title but we add *Le Récit cinématographique: film et séries télévisés*. So we added a television series, tele series, and we added a lot of things about recent films and things like that. We shaped it but with television because François Jost had become a specialist of television. I would not hide nothing to you.

So that's why it's funny because I always say like in kind of a contradictory way, at last, film studies is existing as being recognized but it's dying because it's becoming something else. And it's becoming something else. The fault of who? The Society for Cinema and Media Studies, it's a joke. But I studied that and it's very funny because in 2002, the Society changed its name for adding media. I think there was a battle about media or television I'm not sure.

Dudley: That's right.

Andre: But also they were saying that first it was the Society for Cinematologists, with Robert Gessner.

Dudley: I remember that.

Andre: Well not me but who was a visionary. I can tell you I've seen, I've really read something from him. He's too much forgotten. Me, it was a little bit considered not too much serious, I'm not sure. But I think they were happy, those who gathered around him, when he quit. They take out this bizarre word of cinematologists who was French obedience of filmologie, but rearranged, cinematologists, and I think the people who ran the Society for Cinema Studies at the time didn't like the cinematologists. When he quit, they changed the name for Society for Cinema studies or another one and then they changed for ... and I was very interested in this votation about the name of the journal, which changed for that.

And also I'm amazed because when you look at the Society for Cinema Studies advertisement for advertising, they write something like Society for Cinema Media Studies, they write ... I don't remember exactly but film, TV shows or TV, video games. So there's kind of an enumeration of everything that covers the field. The field is so large. I'm not saying it's not good. We're all doing this but my example with Aumont and Bellour who are doing it, running a conference where everyone will talk about anything but film, in fact, it's very representative of that.

Dudley: That's still hardcore cinema screen people as you know.

Andre: Even Jacques Aumont, but-

Dudley: But it's still doing this.

Andre: But he's doing that just the same because he's open to these kinds of things but he won't say cinema, maybe. Whereas Philippe Dubois would say yes, it's cinema. Because there's been a big battle in France about that.

Dudley: Is there anything else you want to ... before we wind down?

Andre: Well I think this is a terrific period.

Dudley: The current period.

Andre: The current period. It changes everything. Can you imagine I say that to my students often; can you imagine students? Can you imagine when we wanted to show a film, we had to struggle with the film. We had to struggle with the projectionist, if there was one.

Dudley: But that made it precious.

Andre: That made it precious. You're right but science maybe was not as easy as if it is today but I will never, renier?

Dudley: Deny.

Andre: -Deny the absolute importance of going back hands on the films themselves. I will make a pride and I've done that to always go to the cinémathèques to look at the film and not at the cinémathèques in the room but in the editing room, the viewing room, in order to ... because you know I'm found of looking at the film to see if there's a cut of this, not a cut there and in fact you talked about Technès but Technès is a child of this mobilization that came with the digital transition because it threatened a lot of things of regular cinema or classical cinema. There will be no more pellicule film-

Dudley: Film, celluloid

Andre: Well almost none. There will be no specialist of 35 millimeter screening. There will be no more this and this and that. This is going out. In fact, one part of the Technès' the *L'encyclopédie raisonnée*, the encyclopaedia of techniques of cinema, one part of it will be devoted to retaining the memory of those times because the encyclopaedia is not only words. It's based on a database, in which database there will be a lot of interviews, of film interviews, of demonstration, of a 3D digital object and things like that.

So we're retaining because those people will not be us anymore and it's funny because sometimes I'm talking about the edits in the film of Méliès to my students and they never took in their hand a strip of film. And myself, I had my own part of technicité, if I can coin that word. The thinking of Technès because one of my research ... maybe the one I'm most proud of is the research I started in 1993 on the Lumiere's film because I said in two years it will be the invention of so called cinema.

But in fact, it's invention ... the anniversary of cinema cinématographe Lumière and there will be a lot of it. I want to have my own research on this so I said, "What should I do?" And I said, "Okay, I'll look at the poncif ... the cliché." What is the more cliché thinking about the film Lumiere? Lumiere's film. That it is continuity from the beginning to the end. There will be one shot, one film. 900 photograms, frames, one after the other one. Recording of one instant. I said, "I guess this is not true."

Dudley: Yeah.

Andre: And I found out it is not true and while I was doing this with Services des archives du film à Bois D'Arcy du Centre national de la cinématographie en France, they had to restore all these films so I had an agreement with them that the team there would work with me, for me a little bit, and looking at all the breaks that they have, they would find in the strips.

Dudley: In the original.

Andre: I found out a lot of new ideas of looking, of trying to see how we can understand the advent of editing. This was a hands on project because I had to look at the films to see the cuts and also it's funny because it helped me to find some practices in the film archives that should not be talked too much about but I will tell it.

There was a film named *Président Hubbert...*, I don't remember the title, but the camera man, the Lumiere camera man, had to film *M. Loubet aux courses*, 1900 I think. So M. Loubet is the president of France. He had to film, okay? And he had one minute of film, like everyone at that time. And then President Loubet came out of the frame. He quits, he quit, cranking.

Dudley: He stopped the film.

Andre: And he pushed, while it was not recording, pushed the camera a little bit. During that time, the manivelle, the crank fell down, registered two images, or three I don't remember, that are *fou*, blurred and washed up and then he resumed the cranking. This is the kind of ... *raccord de vingt degrés*-

Dudley: 20 degree.

Andre: 20 degree cut but also panoramic filée a little bit. How do you say that?

Dudley: A broken pan.

Andre: A broken pan. So that's it. That's one story about that but the story about the film, at some point in France they had to give part of their printing process to the industry. So some guy or some woman, a man, I don't know, in the industry cut those three measures out and then I had seen the film, I went to see it - the new version - there was frame missing so it was a scandal. They restored it just after but it's great that someone was working on this because we'd have less that. Maybe I think we wouldn't have loss

that for every ... all the rest of the time because the originals were not broken. They would do another correct version later but those two images had disappeared and this is the difficulty sometime for the film archive when they have to give contract outside of their premises.

Dudley: Well André I'm told we have to stop this now but for someone who covered so much, two frames of a film maybe back in 1900 and yet is looking with joy at the development of the impossibly large scale of things that happening now, you've led a happy and productive life and you've got plenty more to do and you're getting further prizes, I'm sure of that. Congratulations-

Andre: Thank you very much, Dudley. I'm very proud to have been interviewed by you.

Dudley: Thank you so much.