

Vol 25 No 1 March 2005

translate the subtitles in order to sell and distribute any production all over the world. Experiments with dubbing and subtitling were initially badly received by the public, prompting Hollywood, as well as some European countries, including Germany, to opt for 'multiple-language versions'. From 1929 until 1931/1932, this solution was considered to be the best. For every English or German language version made, several more versions of the film in question were produced in other languages. By and large, the plot and setting remained the same, while at least some part of the actors, and sometimes even the director, were replaced along with the language spoken in the film. One single picture could thus result in eight different versions being produced. The western *The Big Trail* (Raoul Walsh, 1930) was shot in Spanish, French, English, Italian, as well as in German, each time with a different actor in the leading role. Performers with the required linguistic skills, such as Maurice Chevalier, Greta Garbo or Lilian Harvey, could reprise their own parts. Paramount Pictures set up a studio at the town of Joinville, just outside Paris, soon-to-be nicknamed 'Babylon-upon-Seine', expressly in order to produce the French and other language versions of its American films.

For a long time, the multiple-language versions were dismissed as artistically inept and sociologically uninteresting poor relations of the initial work. Over the past couple of years, however, interest in these productions has been mounting in the various countries concerned, as researchers are increasingly paying attention to the production history and reception of these films. Having already engaged with multiple-language versions in his book *En route vers le parlant* (*On the road to talkies*), a study of the technological, economic and aesthetic evolution of cinema from 1926 to 1934, the French cinema historian Martin Barnier, in his latest offering, *Des films français made in Hollywood* (*French films made in Hollywood*), is shifting his focus towards the lesser known aspects of the history of the multiple-language versions, namely the 33 French-language versions of American films made in the United States between 1930 and 1934.

In the first part of the book, the author presents the numerous artists and screenwriters involved in these multiple-language versions, relating the experiences and, more often than not, the trials and tribulations on the international circuit of these artists, both known and unknown, many of whom were European expatriates, or of European stock, such as Jacques Feyder, Ernst Lubitsch, Ludwig Berger, Paul Fejos, Claude Autant-Lara, Henri de la Falaise (Gloria Swanson's husband) or Erik Charell. These directors, whose task was to replicate the American film in question frame by frame, generally resented their lack of artistic freedom. It was pointed out to the script- and dialogue-writers of the French versions, who were mostly treated with disdain by the studios, that they were not producing French films, but American films made for the French market. Among the 33 French-language versions made in Hollywood, only one film (*His Glorious Night/Si l'Empereur savait ça*, respectively directed by Lionel Barrymore/Jacques Feyder, 1930) presents significant plot deviations from the primary work. It is hence little surprising that most scriptwriters didn't had great esteem for the multiple-language versions they made in the early 1930s.

In a second major chapter, Martin Barnier turns his attention to the French actors working in Hollywood, and performing occasionally, as in the cases of Maurice Chevalier and Charles Boyer, or exclusively, in French-language versions. A lot of those artists, such as Françoise Rosay, Jeanne Helbling and Lily Damita, who had 'sold out to the dollar', spoke out in souvenir booklets or contemporary interviews with the French press against the productions methods in use in the American film industry, the dearth of personal and artistic freedom, as well as contracts that came with stringent conditions attached. These

same actors and actresses were attacked at home for yielding to the lure of California. Articles with chauvinistic, anti-American and even racist undertones, in which the French press voiced their disapproval of the mental and physical 'Americanisation' (like weight loss, dyed hair and speech mannerisms) of actors and actresses working in Hollywood, were legion.

The third section of the book is devoted to the critical and popular reception of the French-language versions in France and Quebec. Whereas the French press was often less than delicate in its appraisal of the films, which goes some way towards explaining the 'predominantly negative if not catastrophic' reputation enjoyed by these films today, Barnier presents concrete evidence that, contrary to common assumptions, most French-language versions drew very large audiences. Barnier shows that despite their small number, the economic impact of the films, which attracted millions of spectators to cinemas in France and other French-speaking countries, was far from being negligible.

Barnier's conclusion is that French-language versions made in Hollywood were not only commercially successful, but also had long-term effects upon the French film industry. Thus, the prolonged stay in Hollywood of numerous French directors, screenwriters, actors and actresses, and their brush with American production methods, proved enriching in many ways. According to Barnier, French box-office-guarantees-to-be, like Claude Autant-Lara or scriptwriter Yves Mirande, had been strongly influenced by their experience Stateside.

By dragging the multiple-language versions out of the dismal 'footnotes' of cinema history, Martin Barnier is filling a major gap in film studies. It goes without saying that a good many other areas, such as an aesthetic and ideological evaluation of the French-language versions made in Hollywood still remain to be explored. The same holds true for a specific study of all the French-language versions produced in Berlin, London or (by Paramount) at Joinville.

Barnier's remarkable analysis would have gained in attractiveness had it been supplied with a series of illustrations such as movie stills permitting readers to compare the French and American versions and, more crucially, with portraits of the actors and actresses mentioned in the text. Another point of regret is the somewhat poor layout and formatting, which is characteristics for most books this publisher produces. Yet these purely form-related objections should not in the least distract from the quality and scientific interest of a publication that brings out into the light a hitherto little known aspect of cinema and of French-American cinematographic relations.

PAUL LESCH (Trans. Christine Dury)  
Centre national de l'audiovisuel Luxembourg

#### Clio de 5 à 7. Les Actualit es Film es de la Lib eration: archives du futur

SYLVIE LINDEPERG

Paris, CRNS  ditions, 2000

318 pp., bibliography, index,  29.73 (pbk)

Sylvie Lindeperg's book on French post-war newsreels is a brave attempt—it is a hybrid which she has designed to meet the needs of the multimedia age.<sup>1</sup> Divided into two distinct parts, the first, which she calls 'Traverse' (shortcut), is a chronological history of the development of the post-war French newsreel. It starts in the weeks following the liberation of Paris in August 1944 and follows through until the end of 1945. Lindeperg focuses her

study on this period for two main reasons: January 1946 witnessed the effective ending of the monopoly exercised by *France-Libre-Actualités* and it also coincided with the departure from the political stage of General de Gaulle, one of the principal players in her story. She does, of course, not confine her narrative exclusively to that period and draws on later developments to reveal some of the consequences of the decisions and actions that she describes. The second part of the book, entitled '*Vagabondage*' (wandering), is a thematic examination of some of the stories covered by the newsreels and others. It is as much about setting the news agenda as it is about depicting liberation and the visions of the future of France. It seeks to explain the events as well as describing their coverage and unravelling some of the underlying pressures that influenced what was shown to audiences.

Lindeperg ably demonstrates that almost as soon as the last members of the German *Wehrmacht* and the collaborationist *Milice* has been rounded up in Paris, the struggle for a new newsreel began. The heady days that followed saw the film of the liberation of Paris released to wide popular acclaim. This aroused in many cineastes hopes that a free newsreel—one free from political pressure—would soon emerge. However, the fight for control of the new newsreel—initially called *France-Libre-Actualités*—quickly got underway. The stakes were high and the struggle was at times nasty: there were industry professionals (many with good resistance pedigrees) who envisaged a completely liberated and unfettered newsreel; there were the unions that empathised, but saw opportunities for bolstering their own status within the post-war industry; there were the politicians—communists and anti-communists alike—who sought to capture control of the industry and the newsreel for their own political purposes. All of this was conducted in a climate increasingly sensitised by the developing Cold War.

Lindeperg punctuates this story with eyewitness testimony and finely targeted quotations from public and private archives. She uses the evidence well in telling the story. Here is a taste: there is a letter from early 1946, in which the minister of information André Malraux dismisses Nicholas Hayer, manager of the *Actualités françaises* newsreel. There is a note by François Héliard (general manager of *Actualités françaises*) to Jean Painlevé, who had been called to explain by the ministry of information why so little footage of French troops had been included in the newsreel during the final months of 1944. It positively hisses steam. There is also a quotation from the communist newspaper, *L'Humanité*, from April 1948 which criticizes the *Président du conseil* of Ramadier's government, Robert Schuman, as being a threat to democracy. It describes his remarks explaining why certain stories about industrial unrest were not included in the newsreel, as Jesuitical. (It summarises his comments as the government 'does not censor, it cuts'.) Lindeperg also surveys the types of story covered month by month by the newsreel from September to December 1945, indicating the story running time and the frequency of stories divided into eight broad categories. She also has things to say about the increasing use of technical effects used to transit from one story to the next and also about the commentaries: some of which are clearly comparable to the stilted style sometimes used by their British counterparts. Interestingly, she notes that one commentator used in the post-war newsreel, Pierre Blanchar, is noticeable by his democratised vocal resonance—one that was quite distinct from the suburban, slightly nasal tones of the pre-war and Vichy and collaborationist newsreel commentaries.

The second part of the book investigates some of the themes reported by the newsreel and actuality films of the period. Lindeperg pursues three subjects: the depiction of the personality of General de Gaulle, the return of prisoners of war, deportees and forced labour, and the 'purification' of post-war French society. Lindeperg investigates

why the newsreels concentrated on the repatriation of prisoners of war from the German camps but paid less attention to the plight of those returning from forced labour and survivors of the concentration camps. She shows that the new French authorities wished to emphasise factors such as French mothers, wives and children waiting faithfully for the return of their men folk, emphasising reintegration. Only during the late spring 1945 did the possibility that some might not return receive an airing. A big splash was, however, made for the millionth returnee (Jules Garron) in the 8 June 1945 newsreel. That story came only a month after the first film of Bergen-Belsen concentration camp had been shown to audiences. The shock of those images caused the military censors to issue a provisional ban on Soviet film of Majdanek; and the film of Dachau shown on 25 May was carefully edited to avoid showing scenes of naked female bodies which were, as Lindeperg describes, still a major taboo.

The purification of France, Lindeperg argues, was shown to audiences in a carefully controlled way. There were not many scenes showing women collaborators being shaved and abused by crowds. The general approach adopted was that 'justice will be done' and, supported by film of the former grandees of Vichy and German-occupied France under arrest, was being seen to be done. The new French authorities were keen to allay fears that collaborators were not being pursued to ensure that audiences did not take matters into their own hands.

Where Lindeperg's book is innovative is in its use of 'collaborators' to help move the argument and narrative forward. In this sense she is not only an author but also a director, using paper and words rather than film or videotape. She marshals their comments and testimonies in much the same way as a director uses interviews in a documentary. Similarly, any moderation of the contributions—such as specific questions posed to the 'collaborators' are hidden from the reader, although their contributions are all clearly identified in the book's margins, and Lindeperg gives each a brief introduction that contextualises their contribution. This technique is increasingly common in factual programmes; and in this sense the book would work well on radio. The contributors come from several different backgrounds: eyewitnesses (the film industry—Gilbert Larriaga, whose witness testimonies appear at relevant places throughout the book; and Anne-Lise Stern—concentration camps), historians, philosophers and critics. Their observations and testimonies add to the detail and also provide a degree of interpretation, summary and indeed comment on the discussion. Lindeperg tells us that their contributions have been purposely sought for this work; and not simply quoted from other works. It is this use of 'witness' and 'experts' that really supports the assertion in the book's sub-title 'archive of the future', since this is what the collaborations are.

This book has much to recommend it: good use of archival material, clear commentary and, of course, collaborators. It remains to be seen whether other writers adopt this technique, although the diverse experiences brought to the printed page do seem to work in this case and suggest that more such experiments should be tried.

JEFF HULBERT  
*Newsfilm Online, London*

## Note

- 1 There are reasons why the book has been given its title: *Clio* is the muse of history and *de 5 à 7* is a quotation from Bernard Stiegler [*De la différence des Arts*] in which he

describes the cinema as the seventh art and writes about the space between it and the five classical arts. Sylvie Lindeperg's book addresses directly issues about the gaps in both the film and written archival resources of the period immediately following the liberation of France. The title is also a direct reference to the film by *Agnès Varda*, *Cléo de 5 à 7* whose main character is worried about the results of a medical examination. The author had the idea for the book when she accompanied someone—only described as A—to the Salpêtrière hospital for nerve-wracking medical tests.

### Film in Nederland

ROMMY ALBERS, JAN BAEKE and ROB ZEEMAN (eds.)  
Ghent and Amsterdam, Ludion and Filmmuseum, 2004  
445 pp., illus., appendix, indices, €35.00 (pbk)

### Van Fanfare tot Spetters: een cultuurgeschiedenis van de jaren zestig en zeventig

HANS SCHOOTS  
Amsterdam, Uitgeverij Bas Lubberhuizen and Filmmuseum, 2004  
220 pp., illus., appendices, bibliography, index, €24.50 (pbk)

### De Documentaire Film 1945–1965: de bloei van een filmgenre in Nederland

BERT HOGENKAMP  
Rotterdam, Uitgeverij 010, 2003  
316 pp., illus., appendices, index, €45.00 (paper, incl. region free DVD)

### MM2: Experimentele film in Nederland sinds 1960

ANNA ABRAHAMS, MARISKA GRAVELAND, ERWIN VAN'T HART and PETER VAN HOOFF (eds.)  
Amsterdam, de Balie/Filmbank, 2004  
285 pp., illus., €35.00 (pbk, incl. region free DVD)

### Jean Desmet and the Early Dutch Film Trade

IVO BIOM (Trans. JAMES LYNN)  
Amsterdam, Amsterdam University Press, 2003  
472 pp., illus., appendices, bibliography, indices, €35.90 (pbk), €51.90 (cloth)

National cinema and local film history seem to have become a popular subject for several researchers and other writers in the Netherlands. It may be too soon to talk about a new wave of Dutch film historiography, but the rich harvest of new book publications proves that the subject has become fashionable, which is undeniably a good trend. This combined review offers a critical examination of five very different recent Dutch publications on Dutch film history, ranging from the popular to the thoroughly academic approach.

*Film in Nederland* (*Film in the Netherlands*), a publication initiated by the Dutch film museum, is produced in collaboration with Ludion publishers. Ludion previously collaborated with the Belgian Royal Film Archive on a large, three-language anthology (*Belgian Cinema – Le Cinéma Belge – De Belgische Film*, 1999) of Belgian film production. *Film in Nederland*, published in Dutch only, is a smaller and more modest publication, clearly aimed at a larger, less international audience. The book covers the whole spectrum

of Dutch film production, from the beginnings (1896) to the present (2003), and ranges from features to documentaries, newsreels, animation, experimental and amateur films. Each left and right page form a single entity and have a short introduction to a specific film accompanied by a short article on a related subject. An entry on the Academy Award winning *Karakter* (*Character*, 1996) is for instance combined with a short lemma on the eight Dutch films that so far won an Oscar (pp. 176–177). The entry on *Nederlands in zeven lessen* (*Dutch in seven lessons*, 1948) is at its turn accompanied (pp. 244–245) by some information on the actress that debuted in this film: Audrey Hepburn. The films are listed in alphabetical order and therefore not divided or ranged according to their production date or genre. One can read the book from cover to cover, but the reader is actually supposed to browse back and forth, reading parts that somehow intrigue him. Inevitably, the choice of films is eclectic, which is acceptable (or rephrased, rather interesting and daring). The intention is to offer a broad perspective on Dutch film heritage, to show the existing diversity of Dutch cinema, and to stimulate an appetite for more information about more films. In its introduction the volume is presented as 'a kaleidoscope', which is a nice old fashioned metaphor. The editors are aiming high: each page contains at least one illustration and should offer an attractive and interesting line of thought in less than 300 words. Regrettably, this aim is not always achieved. Some texts will be too sophisticated for the general, uninformed public while others are too simple for the connoisseurs. The volume offers a collection of scattered pieces of information, like a giant jigsaw puzzle, without a general big picture. My main point of critique is the absence of any guidance for readers who want to know more about the subject. Entries never credit their sources, a general bibliography is neither provided and is never made clear whether the films discussed have been preserved by the *Filmmuseum* (or another archive) or not. *Film in Nederland* contains in an appendix three excellent essays (case studies on film exhibition, film reception and film archiving) that are very recommendable but insufficient to fill this gap. The nicely illustrated volume looks like the collected inscriptions of an imaginary exhibition, or like the result of a lively pub discussion between film friends, exchanging enthusiastically some information and ideas. The lay-out makes the book look like a printed website or a CD-rom. It would be interesting to do just that: to transform the book in an interactive digital menu. It would also be a nice opportunity to enlarge the texts and to correct the many minor editorial mishaps.

Publicist Hans Schoots is well known for his thorough biography of Joris Ivens, which was recently translated into English (*Living Dangerously*, 2000). In his newest book *Van Fanfare tot Spetters* (*From Fanfare to Spetters*, the book title cites two well-known Dutch films) Schoots wishes to describe Dutch feature film production of the 1960s and 1970s in relation to its cultural context. He is more or less the first to enter this field, so it is a pioneering work, based on many still unexplored sources. It is also an ambitious work. Schoots' historical-sociological approach touches many issues, like the influence of film critics, the influence of the government and foremost the relationship between film producers and the political and social situation they work in. Schoots starts with the classic film comedy *Fanfare* (Haanstra, 1958), which he sees as a reflection of Dutch society in the late 1950s, an era in his view dominated by nostalgia for good old times (to put it very briefly). He concludes with a chapter about *Spetters* (1980), the controversial film by Paul Verhoeven, which Schoots sees also as a sign of its time. In his view, *Fanfare* marks the end of an era of optimism, and *Spetters* marks the beginning of an era of nihilism. In between there are two decades of a society in transition. Interpreting cinema as a mirror of society is an interesting but dangerous hypothesis, because conclusions are