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Office Hours: Mon. 11:30-12:20
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Instructor
Prof. Andrew Nestingen
Raitt 305P
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akn@u.washington.edu

1. COURSE DESCRIPTION

SCAND 360 surveys chronologically the cinema of the Nordic countries. The course has three aims. First, it seeks to help you develop skills for studying and writing well about film in an academic setting. Second, the course seeks to explain the films, terms, ideas, institutions, conflicts, and changes that have comprised Nordic national cinemas since 1897. Third, it seeks to acquaint students with some major figures in Nordic cinema, including, among others, Victor Sjöstrom, Carl Dreyer, Ingrid Bergman, Ingmar Bergman, Liv Ullman, Henning Carlsen, Thomas Vinterberg, Lars von Trier, and Aki Kaurismäki

2. LEARNING OBJECTIVES

The course has two chief aims: to increase your knowledge of Scandinavian cinema in its national context, and to deepen your skills in acquiring, processing critically, and understanding culture. The first component is knowledge-based, the second skill-based. Toward this end, there are three specific sub-aims for the course.

a. Become familiar with Scandinavian cinema by viewing eleven significant and exemplary films, discussing them, and establishing a basic familiarity with major components of Scandinavian cinema and culture.

b. Organize your familiarity with these films into historical and comparative categories. In other words, you should know which countries the films come from, who made them, and how they have been understood. On this basis, you should be able to compare the films among themselves, and with others outside Scandinavian cinema.
c. You should be able to write accurately and thoughtfully about these films, and their histories, which you’ll demonstrate through class assignments.

What, you might ask, is the benefit of knowing about the rather esoteric topic of Scandinavian cinema? Where will the course goals ‘get you,’ to put it bluntly? The knowledge you acquire through the course provides you skills that will help you do the following: complete other courses in Scandinavian studies; compare Scandinavian national cultures among themselves, and with other cultures; the course may even help you better understand a part of your own or a friend’s cultural heritage. At least as important as what you learn, however, is broadening and deepening your skill in learning about culture. In the course, cinema and national culture are prominent ideas; understanding how cinema became an artistic and important form of cultural expression in Scandinavia (not just an entertaining pastime) will help you practice thinking historically and theoretically about the way people imagine culture and identity, and how these ideas are used politically. In short, then, the course will help you acquire knowledge about Scandinavia, and help you connect this knowledge to deeper theoretical understanding of cultural identity. Effectively ‘learning how to learn’ about culture can make you a person more able to complete thoughtfully and satisfactorily the tasks and questions you take up in your personal, public, and work life—and, you can impress your friends with your enormous knowledge of Ingmar Bergman’s gloom.

3. ASSIGNED TEXTS


The Course Reader (CR) is available at the Ave. Copy Center, 4141 University Way NE.

4. GRADES

The scheme I’ll use for calculating your final grade will be the following:

- Participation 10%
- Mid-Term 20%
- Response Papers 40%
- Final Paper 30%

Grades will be assigned based on the UW’s suggested percentages. Grades are determined according to the criteria listed in the table below.
5. COURSE ACTIVITIES & REQUIREMENTS

READING: It is essential that you complete all readings, so that you can understand the frame of reference for each lecture as well as be ready to view and discuss the films aptly. As a 300-level humanities course, you can expect to spend a good part of the out-of-class homework reading in preparation for lectures and discussion. You should have the reading completed by the day that it is listed in the syllabus, and be prepared to ask questions about and discuss the assigned texts.

LECTURES: Another key component in the course is the in-class lecture. The lectures provide explanations of the key terms in the course, which provide context for understanding the readings.

    Each week’s lectures and discussion questions will be posted on the course website by Monday. You can use the posted notes as a guide to taking notes in class.

PARTICIPATION: Participation is your responsibility, and so you contribute to deciding your participation grade. When you hand in the take-home mid-term and the final paper, you will submit to me a statement with your name, the grade you assign yourself, and a brief statement explaining why you’ve awarded yourself the grade. You may also do this by email. I will reply to your statement with a brief response and your participation grade. I’ll average the two participation grades to determine your final participation grade. If you do not turn in a self-evaluations, I will determine your participation grade.

    Discussion will occur informally after the films, as well as before the lecture on Wednesdays. I will post discussion questions on the website on Monday each week, which will help guide you through the films and readings. However, if you have questions, you can send them to me by email, and I’ll raise them in discussion.

RESPONSE PAPERS: You will submit TWO response papers during the course. Each one should be at least 3 pages. The paper must be typed and double-spaced, with one-inch margins, and should be no larger than 12-font. We will sign up for response paper due-dates on Wed. 10/1. Choose your date carefully, because you MAY NOT change your mind once you have signed up for due dates!

    If you turn a paper in late, I will deduct 2.0 GPA points from the grade as a late penalty. Papers more than two weeks late will not be accepted. You may not submit a paper to me as an email attachment; you must turn it in during class.

    You may choose the topic of the paper, but it must have to do with the film assigned for the week before your paper is due. The best response papers will also discuss the readings and lectures to help develop the paper. The response paper SHOULD NOT summarize the film. Your response papers, then, should follow this structure. The paper should be built around a question, or questions, to which you should answer with a thesis and supporting argument, which uses evidence from the film(s) and readings. An effective way to do this is to base the paper on a question that occurred to you while viewing the film you’re discussing. Work on answering your question by writing about
details from the film, whose importance you explain in connection with your question and your response to it (your argument). A good way to proceed is by relating a formal aspect of the film (how the film is made) to a more general view of the story. You might ask, for example, “what is Carl Dreyer trying to do with his close-up shots?” Or, “how is music used to shape the viewer’s feelings The Face of a Woman?” Or, “Why is there racism in The Celebration?”

The point of these writing assignments is to spur you to think critically about what you’re viewing, reading, and learning, and to give you the opportunity to synthesize and present your ideas by responding clearly and thoughtfully to the course material. Often, the best papers arise from uncertainties; explaining what you don’t understand can help you truly understand what’s going on in a film or reading. Follow your interests and curiosity, affirm your questions, and explain the films in a way that makes sense to you, but can also be explained clearly to others as well.

MID-TERM: The mid-term will be a take-home examination, you will answer one of three essay questions. You’ll receive the test questions on Mon. 11/3/03 and must return your exam during class on Mon. 11/10/03. Your answer should be at least four pages, typed and double-spaced, with one-inch margins, and no larger than 12-font.

FINAL PAPER: The final paper should be at least four but no more than five pages long. It must be typed and double-spaced, with one-inch margins; type should be no larger than 12-font. The final paper is due during the last course meeting, 10 December 2003. The final paper should develop a thesis supported by film analysis and citations from readings assigned in class. The paper should respond to one of the following questions:

1) Why is it appropriate to describe A Woman’s Face as a “Studio Film”? Make at least three comparisons with other films we watched in class to explain your answer.

2) What is the place of Carl Dreyer, Ingmar Bergman, and Aki Kaurismäki in Scandinavian cinema? Should they be understood as “national figures” or as “film artists” whose national identity is not important? Make at least two comparisons to explain your answer.

3) In your view, what is Scandinavian cinema? Discuss at least four films viewed in class.

If you feel uncertain about writing a thesis paper, please make an appointment to discuss your final paper with me. I also urge you to study the discussion of thesis paper writing in The Art of Research, which is on course reserve in the Odegaard Undergraduate Library. All references should be cited appropriately (MLA or Chicago Style are preferable; if you don’t know what these are, please look into the matter, then talk to me.)
### 6. CRITERIA FOR EVALUATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UW Decimal Grade: 3.9-4.0; Percentage: 97-100%; Letter Grade: A-A+</th>
<th>Response Papers: The paper presents a clear, thoughtful question and thesis, which it supports with ample evidence from texts and class discussion, indicating a grasp of material and careful elaboration of a response to it. The paper is distinguished by the writer's originality; it does not repeat points made in class, but rather picks up on class and the readings while to develop, deepen, and qualify the author's view. The author indicates clearly the sources cited, showing an understanding of them. Writing is well-organized, clear, error free, and fresh. Participation: Consistently asks thoughtful questions and makes insightful comments. Remarks indicate understanding of material and critical, reflective response to it; active discussion participant in all contexts.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UW Decimal Grade: 3.5-3.8; Percentage: 90-96%; Letter Grade: A-</td>
<td>Response Papers: Paper's question and thesis are thoughtful, and supported with sufficient evidence from texts and class discussion, indicating a grasp of material and a thoughtful response to it. The paper does not repeat points made in class, but pushes them further, developing the author's view. Author cites sources, and writing is well-organized, clear, and error free. Participation: Asks questions and comments often; participation reflects understanding of material; active discussion participant in all contexts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UW Decimal Grade: 3.2-3.4 Percentage: 87-90% Letter Grade: B+</td>
<td>Response Papers: The author's view. The author indicates clearly the sources cited, showing an understanding of them. Writing is well-organized, clear, and originality; it does not repeat points made in class, but rather picks up on class and the readings while to develop, deepen, and qualify the author's view. The author indicates clearly the sources cited, showing an understanding of them. Writing is well-organized, clear, error free, and fresh. Participation: Consistently asks thoughtful questions and makes insightful comments. Remarks indicate understanding of material and critical, reflective response to it; active discussion participant in all contexts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UW Decimal Grade: 2.9-3.1 Percentage: 84-86% Letter Grade: B</td>
<td>Response Papers: Paper offers a minimal question and thesis, which it supports with some evidence from texts and class discussion, indicating an acceptable understanding of material and some response to it. The paper develops one or two points, but derives extensively from observations made in class. The paper is predictable, although it develops the author's view. Author cites one or two sources, and writing reflects good organization; it contains no major errors. Participation: Irregular questions and comments that usually but not always indicate thoughtful response to class material. Participates in small-group discussions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UW Decimal Grade: 2.5-2.7 Percentage: 80-83% Letter Grade: B-</td>
<td>Response Papers: Paper offers an unclear question and predictable thesis, which it clumsily supports with some evidence from texts and class discussion. It indicates a shaky understanding of material. The paper reflects an incomplete understanding of class material. The paper relies extensively on observations made in class, and shows little original thought. The paper is predictable, and the author's own view is not elaborated. Author cites one or less sources. No major errors in evidence. Organization and writing are acceptable, if unremarkable. Participation: Some participation, which varies in quality. Long periods of minimal participation. Thoughtfulness not usually evident in remarks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UW Decimal Grade: 2.2-2.4 Percentage: 77-79% Letter Grade: C+</td>
<td>Response Papers: Paper offers a minimal question, argument, or response, which it clumsily supports with minimal evidence from texts and class discussion. It indicates a shaky understanding of material. The paper relies wholly on observations made in class. The paper is predictable, and the author's view is not clear. Author does not cite sources. One or less major errors in evidence. Organization and writing are not thoughtful. Participation: Occasional comments and questions over the course of the quarter, but questions do not reflect understanding of material or critical response to it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UW Decimal Grade: 1.9-2.1 Percentage: 74-76% Letter Grade: C</td>
<td>Response Papers: A minimal and problematic question, thesis, or response is presented, which is clumsily supported. The paper indicates little thought about in-class material or texts read. The paper relies wholly on observations made in class. The paper is predictable, and the author does not develop her view. Author does not cite sources. At least two major errors in evidence. Organization and writing are mediocore. Participation: Present and alert. Five or less comments and questions over the course of the quarter, and remarks are predictable and do not reflect thoughtfulness about material.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UW Decimal Grade: 1.5-1.7 Percentage: 70-73% Letter Grade: C-</td>
<td>Response Papers: The paper's question and thesis are badly flawed by at least one major misunderstandings, and evidence is not used to support the claim. Writing is poor and creates problems for the reader. Organization and quality of writing indicate significant carelessness. Participation: Present and alert, but no response to class discussion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UW Decimal Grade: 1.1-1.4 Percentage: 66-69%; Letter Grade: D+</td>
<td>Response Papers: Paper riddled with errors that indicate general misunderstanding of material from class and readings. Writing seriously undermines paper's intelligibility, although the paper can be read and evaluated. Within the errors that dominate the paper, there is a slight indication of understanding and perhaps thoughtfulness. Participation: Present, but not paying attention to lectures or discussions. Talks to others during lectures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UW Decimal Grade: 0.8-1.0; Percentage: 62-65%; Letter Grade: D</td>
<td>Response Papers: Paper riddled with errors that indicate general misunderstanding of material from class and readings. Writing seriously undermines paper's intelligibility. Participation: Total anonymity and absent often.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UW Decimal Grade: 0.5-0.7; Percentage: 60-62%; Letter Grade: D-</td>
<td>Response Papers: Nothing: no question or thesis, rambling, no evidence of response to in-class material or texts. Participation: Total anonymity in class, and constant absence. Occasional willfully disruptive participation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7. COURSE POLICIES

ACADEMIC INTEGRITY: The University of Washington is a community dedicated to learning. Ethical expectations of students belonging to the community are defined in the student conduct code (http://www.washington.edu/students/handbook/conduct.html). Plagiarism, cheating, and disruptive behavior in class violate the code, and harm your own and others’ learning. Any violations of the code in connection with the course will result in referral to the university administration for appropriate action. If you want to learn more about how to avoid plagiarism, please consult the following resource page on academic honesty, (http://depts.washington.edu/grading/issue1/honesty.htm), or speak to me directly.

GRADES GRIEVANCE POLICY: If you disagree with the grade you have been awarded and wish to appeal your grade, you must follow the policy outlined below. I will make no exceptions to this policy, and I reserve the right to refrain from considering your complaint if you do not follow the policy.

   a. Wait twenty-four hours from the time you receive the grade.
   b. Deliver a written statement to my post-box in Raitt 318 (Campus Mail Box 353420) explaining your complaint. (No emails or telephone calls accepted)
   c. Make an appointment with me to discuss your written complaint (email is fine for making the appointment).
   d. I will indicate my final decision to you by email after our meeting.
   e. If you disagree with my final decision, request a meeting with the Chair of the Scandinavian Department, Prof. Terje Leiren, and me to come to a final solution.

8. EXTRA CREDIT

There are two extra-credit opportunities during the course: Finnish Cinema Day in the HUB Auditorium on Sat. Nov. 8th, and Jack Stevenson’s lectures at the Northwest Film Forum Nov. 12 -16. Stevenson is an expert on Danish film, although his lectures will not necessarily be on Danish Cinema; I will announce details in class and on the course website about Stevenson’s visit. For details about the Finnish Cinema Day, visit the event’s website www.FinnishCinemaDay.com.

   I will add .5 to one of your response paper grades if you write a 2-page response paper about the event. You can write a maximum of THREE extra-credit responses during the quarter. I will distribute your points to your response paper grades evenly.
# COURSE PLAN

## Week 1: The Golden Age of Scandinavian Cinema, 1897-1924

| M. | 9/29 | Course Overview  
The Outlaw and His Wife (1917, Berg-Ejvind och hans hustru) S Dir. Victor Sjöström. 72 Min.  
View: Film, Form, Culture CD-Rom, “Introduction” and “Mise-en-scène” |
| W. | 10/1 | Lecture 1: The Golden Age of Scandinavian Cinema, 1897-1924  
Read: Nordic National Cinemas 1-6, 7-11, 142-163.  
Stephen Crofts “Concepts of National Cinema” (CR) |

## Week 2: The Singular Carl Th. Dreyer

View: Film, Form, Culture CD-Rom “The Long Take” and “Camera”  
Read: Film, Form, Culture 1-26 |
| W. | 10/8 | Lecture 2: The Singular Carl Th. Dreyer  
Read: Carl Dreyer Interview (CR); Film, Form, Culture 66-82. |

## Week 3: The Scandinavian Studio Film, 1930s-1950s

| M. | 10/13 | A Woman’s Face (En kvinnas ansikte, 1938) S Dir. Gustaf Molander. 100 Min.  
View: Film, Form, Culture CD-Rom, “Continuity Editing” and “Point of View”  
Read: Film, Form, Culture 26-65 |
| W. | 10/15 | Lecture 3: The Scandinavian Studio Film, 1930s-1950s  
Read: Nordic National Cinemas 11-24, 107-113, 163-181; Kimmo Laine “English Summary” of Pääosassa suomen kansa (CR) |

## Week 4: The Institution of the Art Film, 1960s-1980s

| M. | 10/20 | Hunger (Sult 1966) N/DK/S Dir. Henning Carlsen. 112 min.  
View: Film, Form, Culture CD-Rom “Montage”  
Read: Film, Form, Culture 83-87,196-206; Henning Carlsen Interview (CR) |
| W. | 10/22 | Lecture 4: The Institution of the Art Film  
Read: “The Art Cinema as a Mode of Film Practice” David Bordwell in CR |
### Week 5: Ingmar Bergman

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M.</th>
<th>10/27</th>
<th><strong>Cries and Whispers (Viskningar och rop, 1972)</strong> S. Dir. Ingmar Bergman. 106 Min. View: <em>Film, Form, Culture</em> CD Rom “Lighting” Read: <em>Nordic National Cinemas</em> 194-222</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>W.</td>
<td>10/29</td>
<td>Lecture 5: Ingmar Bergman Read: Ingmar Bergman Interview (CR); <em>Nordic National Cinemas</em> 79-89, 130-136</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Week 6: The Heritage Film, 1980s-2000s

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M.</th>
<th>11/3</th>
<th><strong>Babette’s Feast (Babette's Gæstebud, 1987)</strong> DK Dir. Gabriel Axel. 102 Min. View: <em>Film, Form, Culture</em> CD-Rom “Genre” Read: Selections from <em>The Condition of Postmodernity</em> by David Harvey (CR); Isak Dinesen “Babette’s Feast” (CR)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>W.</td>
<td>11/5</td>
<td>Lecture 6: The Heritage Film Read: “Themes of Nation” Mette Hjort (CR); <em>Film, Form, Culture</em> 153-161; <em>Nordic National Cinemas</em> 24-30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FINNISH CINEMA DAY, Sat. Nov. 8th in the HUB Auditorium, 12:00-9:00 PM (Extra-Credit Opportunity). Info at www.FinnishCinemaDay.com

### Week 7: Dogma, 1995-2002

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M.</th>
<th>11/10</th>
<th><strong>The Celebration (Festen, 1998)</strong> DK Dir. Thomas Vinterberg. 105 Min. View: Film, Form, Culture CD-Rom “Music and Sound” Read: Read “Dogma Manifesto” and “Vow of Chastity” (CR)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>W.</td>
<td>11/12</td>
<td>Lecture 7: Special Discussion on Dogma with Jack Stevenson Read: Interview with Thomas Vinterberg (CR); Interview with Lars von Trier (CR); “Introduction” to <em>Purity and Provocation: Dogma</em> 95 Mette Hjort and Scott MacKenzie (CR)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Evening Lectures with Jack Stevenson 11/12-16. (Extra-Credit Opportunity, Details to be announced on course website)
### Week 8: Cinema and Cultural Identity, The Sami

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Read: Thomas DuBois “Folklore, Boundaries, and Audience in the Pathfinder” (CR); Rey Chow “Film and Cultural Identity” (CR) |
| W. 11/19 | Lecture 8: The Sami, Colonialism, and Cinema  
Read: Gunnar Iversen “Learning From Genre: Genre Cycles in Modern Norwegian Cinema” (CR) |

### Week 9: The Finnish Film Boom, 1999-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| M. 11/24 | *On the Road to Emmaus* (*Emmauksen tiellä*, 2001) SF Dir. Markku Pölönen. 80 Min.  
Read: *Nordic National Cinemas* 89-95; *Film, Form, Culture* 115-130 |
| W. 11/26 | Lecture 9: The Finnish Film Boom  
Read: Mervi Pantti “Art or Industry? Battles over Finnish Cinema during the 1990s” (CR) |

### Week 10: Cinema and Multiculturalism in Scandinavia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Read: *Nordic National Cinemas* 222-242; Marianne Gullestad “Invisible Fences: Egalitarianism, Nationalism, and Racism” (CR) |
| W. 12/3 | Lecture 10: Cinema and Multiculturalism in Scandinavia  
Read: Robyn Wiegman “Race, Ethnicity, and Film” (CR) |

### Week 11: Auteurism and National Cinema 1990s-2000s, Aki Kaurismäki

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| W. 12/10 | Lecture 11: Aki Kaurismäki  
**COURSE EVALUATIONS FINAL PAPER DUE** |