From International 'High Art' to the Parisian Political Melee

Tate Modern, London, autumn, 2012.

The cinema is an art form equal to any other and as such it is appropriate to find examples of it displayed in esteemed galleries, often alongside a focus on photography, pop art or video installations. A helpful way into the themes addressed in this book begins at precisely one such exhibition: the autumn 2012 Tate Modern show dedicated to two artists known primarily for their photography, William Klein and Daido Moriyama. There, the first exhibition space is dedicated to the screening on a permanent loop of an early short film from Klein that is titled *Broadway by Light* (1958). This semi-documentary, semi-abstract work was produced by the famous French house, Argos Films, the production company better known for completing several classics from the New Wave, including works from both Alain Resnais and Jean-Luc Godard. Klein's short is a beautifully shot evocation of the passing of time from daylight hours to night as witnessed on the quintessential American city space, Broadway. For fifteen minutes or so Klein's camera focuses on the advertising hoardings and neon lights that are so prominent in central New York and which come to life just as the dusk settles in. For a visually aware spectator, much of this film hauntingly prefigures Godard's own filming of Paris in *À bout de souffle* (1960).

The visitor exploring the gallery is next treated to Klein's cinema through a second set-piece projection. Here Klein has created an installation film composed of edited clips from several of his major feature films, including many that were made in France. For example, the visitor glimpses scenes from his work dedicated to haute couture – *Who are you Polly Magoo?* (1966) – and there is a prominent inclusion of sequences from his psychedelic pop-art classic *Mister Freedom* (1969). Interspersed are further snippets from his documentary work including film from the demonstrations of May 1968. Again aligning himself with the New Wave, Klein selected pictures of his fellow directors Godard, François Truffaut and a bearded Louis Malle marching, with students and other youths, in protest against the Gaullist state.

Klein and his curators at Tate Modern are astute arbiters and purveyors of contemporary cultural taste. Featuring the 'French' cinema of Klein in the exhibition blends together both traditional and relatively new modes of understanding and representing the medium to an international audience. Thus, one can see that the filmic content of the Klein exhibition supports classic British and American perceptions that Paris is the home of art cinema, and that directors working there display special ingenuity, quality and intellectual content that merit acknowledgement via display in a contemporary art context. Similarly, inclusion of direct reference to May 1968 confirms many people's popular belief that, generally speaking, the cineastes occupy a position on the left of the political spectrum. They were free spirits, critical of commonplace or conventional political ideas, so the story goes. Moreover, the selection of Klein's work for a major multimedia show is also astute because his life and work evidence the current emphasis in film studies and film criticism on the themes of cosmopolitanism and transnationalism. Let us recall that since around the turn of the new millennium a significant amount of academic discussion of French and Western European cinema has underlined how filmmaking is productively analysed for being situated in an international and transnational context. Quite brilliant works of new scholarship have analysed how the cinema functions in global markets – how in the modern period of postwar economic growth the European film industries worked on co-productions with stars who developed careers in more than one national film industry; one thinks, for example, of Romy Schneider working in Austria and then France, or her sometime partner Alain Delon, an iconic French film star, but also famous for starring in the Italian work *Rocco and his Brothers* (Visconti, 1960). Vanessa Schwartz's persuasive account *It's So French!: Hollywood, Paris and the Making of Cosmopolitan Film Culture* and Mark Betz's *Beyond the Subtitle: Remapping European Art Cinema* exemplify the fascinating and high-quality contributions this school of interpretation has achieved.[1] Clearly, Lucy Mazdon's work on Hollywood remakes of French cinema, *Encore Hollywood,* merits note as an early landmark text, as, on similar grounds, does Peter Lev's *The Euro-American Cinema.*[2] Indeed, few scholars working in the humanities in the 1980s and 1990s would have ever foreseen how influential this approach would become. In Britain alone there is now a scholarly journal entirely dedicated to transnationalism and cinema (*Transnational Cinemas*), as well as edited 'Readers' of the writings considered to be the most influential

texts. William Klein's selection for the Tate Modern show of autumn 2012 corresponds perfectly to this momentum. After all, Klein was an American living and making cinema outside of his country of birth. Similarly, his work focuses on international culture (the fashion industry being a very good example) and indeed also competitive sport, including a documentary on the world of professional tennis. Thus, *The French* (Klein, 1982) is not an anthropological dissection of Klein's adopted homeland but rather a loving celebration of the French Open tennis tournament. Here Klein's focus is the international cavalcade of players, coaches, mentors and their fans that descends on Roland Garros to compete in the world famous clay-court tournament.

A second visit to an exhibition is a rewarding opportunity to re-examine works and to review pieces with a fresh eye. Dwelling a little longer at the impressive installation of snippets from Klein's collected cinema, my attention was repeatedly drawn to the colourful and surrealistic clips from *Mister Freedom*. Although highly international (made by an American director, filmed in France, featuring stars from Europe and the U.S.A.), it can equally be read so as to take one directly into an encounter with the domestic politics of late-1960s France. Thus, the key protagonist, Mister Freedom (played by John Abbey), is a re-creation of an imaginary American comic-strip superhero, who is sent to France to 'bring freedom' and to assert American values in the face of French obstinacy and the threat posed by Soviet and Chinese Marxists. In light of a full viewing of the work on DVD (it is available for purchase at the Tate Shop that concludes the exhibition), one discovers that it is a bitter political satire on Cold War sensibilities that is quite as savage as Stanley Kubrick's *Dr Strangelove* (1964). In addition, Klein's narrative frame is informed by, and transmits, powerful French nationalist anxieties about Americanization, which were contemporary to its production. The work is a dramatic and colourful projection of the commonly aired fear that the nation was under threat from U.S. cultural imperialism, a theme much espoused from 1946 onwards when Franco-American trade agreements brought Hollywood back into the European film market. *Mister Freedom* is a work of frenetic and absurd pop art, but it is also a metaphorical expression of common concerns in Paris over the perceived erosion of sovereignty because of 'Americanization'. I consider that the work is productively reviewed in light of the arguments mounted in the major texts on French anti-Americanism, Philippe Roger's

L'ennemi américain or Richard F. Kuisel's *Seducing the French: The Dilemma of Americanization*.[3] It stands good comparison with the cinema of Fernandel or Jacques Tati that had earlier toyed with similar themes, albeit in a more whimsical fashion.[4] Indeed, Klein's film was viewed with some concern by French state censors precisely because of its very open playing with politics so soon after the events of May 1968.[5]

In a single snapshot the polysemic quality of *Mister Freedom* exemplifies much of what I aim to discuss using the larger canvas of this book. Just as in the case of the ambiguities of *Mister Freedom* it seems to me that it is enlightening to open up new readings of French cinema that discuss nationalistic subtexts, sometimes explicit, but more often than not nuanced in tone. In these pages the intention is to question how the narrative inflection of selected symbolically important works of cinema and their reception histories are coloured by nationalist discourses. Certainly the twentieth century offers numerous confirmations that peoples, ideas, cultures and art forms are hybrid structures reflecting productive multicultural syntheses, travels, journeys and complex exchanges. What is emphasized in this treatment is that these processes and their representations in visual culture occurred alongside and in dialogue with more fixed notions and expressions of pride in nationhood (1945 to 1995). The evidence marshalled in this historical treatment recalls where the residual and conventional national loyalties existed in cinema in parallel to the development of transnationalism.

Not of course that the basic fictional binary of a separation between 'transnational' and nationalist/ism can be fully sustained for very long, and that is also a subtext of this book. The cinema in which we are interested was being made in a context of decolonization that meant that the borders of France, Algeria, Indochina and elsewhere, were being reshaped and newly hewn throughout the period, and that the world of cinema was far from isolated from this shape-shifting phenomenon. Moreover, postwar France witnessed a relatively rushed process of modernization that was associated with Americanization. As Kristin Ross underlined so effectively in *Fast Cars, Clean Bodies*, culture and cinema were being made in a society that was highly permeable and in flux from pressures coming from within and without. France is a place that Ross so memorably describes as being characterized by 'exploiting colonial populations at the same time that it [France] is being

dominated by, or more precisely, entering more and more into collaboration or fusion with, American capitalism'.[6]

To underline the complexity further with reference to the specific context of postwar cinema, it is the case that in some significant instances it was migrants to France who expressed some of the sharpest and most explicit political documents, including reflections marked by nationalism or Eurocentrism. Godard is the locus classicus, in the late 1940s making the short journey from Switzerland to the Hexagon. But there were also other important figures with international backgrounds, such as the prolific action-filmmaker Henri Vernueil, who in 1924, at the age of just four, fled with his family from Armenia to build a new life in France. Or, there is the life story recounted in the recent memoirs of the film critic Henry Chapier. In *Version originale* he explains that it was partly because he was an outsider in Paris (having grown up in Romania, born of Franco-Austrian parents, and living briefly in Israel) that he felt obliged to express strong loyalty to the idea of France and French cinema.[7] Thus, although the intellectual starting point for this study is the analysis of nationalism as expressed in and disseminated through cinema, that concept taken in naïve isolation is reductive.

To add further explanation, the book I am writing is not a critical re-evaluation of the state of contemporary French filmmaking (it focuses on film history and presumes not to speak to recent works from the past fifteen to twenty years). Similarly, it is not a chronological guide to the history of film after the Liberation (1944 to 1945). Great works already exist in this important style, so repetition would be redundant.[8] In any case, my preference for uncovering and analysing the subjects treated in this book is to adopt a more thematic form of organization. In these necessary preliminaries let me underline too that 'the nationalist question' offers no special hermeneutical key to unlocking the cinema, let alone organizing a modern society. On the contrary, the research that informs this study is conducted so as to add in some small way to a growing picture of rich complexity that is increasingly emerging as a defining quality of film studies and the writing of contemporary history in the twenty-first century. Nonetheless, it seems to me that now is a significant time to reflect on selected sites from postwar history and to tease out and relocalize analysis of the cinema around the politics of nationalism – not least because the archival documentation of film reviews from the French press is so rich and readily accessible to the researcher at three institutions:

Bibliothèque du Film (BIFI), Paris, the Cinematek, Brussels, and the British Film Institute (BFI), London. Their archives of extensive and sometimes digitalized dossiers of original press clippings offer the historian detailed reception documentation that capture when and how film was interpreted as a site of nationalism. Here, however, variation in archival practice differs quite significantly between the institutions. For instance, in Paris at BIFI it is exclusively film reviews that are held, and no press material relating to more general biographical information (about directors, stars or other filmworkers) is archived. Distinctively, in London the microfiche files cover a wider range of aspects relating to general biographical information, including news stories on romances, crimes and political interventions (broadly what the French dismiss as *faits divers*). In support of this wealth of documentation, the uniquely literary and literate culture of filmmaking in France in our period means the historian has access to more pages of testimony and reflection from that milieu than for perhaps any other place where cinema is made.

To review, this book aims to be a discussion about a place: the problematic and contested area that we call France, shaped externally as well as internally by migrations and changing geopolitical framing. It is also focused on a time: what is increasingly being called the postwar period, 1945 to 1995, the latter date coinciding with the centenary of the invention of cinema. And the primary evidence that I am working on is the cinema, ranging from analysis of important films from a variety of genres to press reviews, writings from the rich supply of specialist cinema periodicals, film festival events and other forms of reception. These documents are to be critically analysed through the tool of historical description and reconstruction to consider whether they have been explicit or implicit conduits for nationalism. The book does therefore take us some distance from interpreting cinema as a high art for exhibition in galleries. As the individual titles of chapters signal, the material focused on includes exclusionary, implicitly racist and anti-Semitic discourses. Acknowledgement of such hard nationalist material in some quarters of cinema is foregrounded in this book so as to openly debate and discuss its disturbing historical presence. This is not to imply that all French cinema is shaped or characterized by these perspectives, even in a period when such attitudes were relatively commonplace in the minds of many Europeans (1940s to 1980s). One should add that this theme is not entirely new or unexamined, just less familiar in existing English-language scholarship. Thus, the analyses that are developed

on this subtopic in parts of three substantial chapters seek to expand on Jacques Siclier's nuanced discussions of the right and cinema and Pascal Ory's more wide-ranging interpretation in his essay, *L'Anarchisme de droite*.[9]

Filmmaking in France from 1945 to 1995 is a rich corpus indeed, and this author has identified what he believes to be some of the more significant issues and evidence for a reflexive discussion. As such, the work explores the influence of nationalistic dispositions and codifications in selected films from, and including, Michel Audiard, Claude Autant-Lara, Bertrand Blier, Marcel Carné, and many other once famous figures. A counter-filmography of directors and works that are distinctive from the more nationalist-sounding voices is a far more limited concern for this book. Certainly directors such as Claude Chabrol, Claude Lanzmann, Alain Resnais, Bertrand Tavernier, René Vautier and others stand out anew because their films differ greatly from issues and works discussed at length in this book. I suppose because I was still something of a structuralist at heart when I worked through the approach I wanted to develop in this study, it means there is a core discussion: the nationalist-cinema nexus; and there is a periphery: the works marked by more universal or antinationalist dispositions.

Two questions falling under the heading 'method and theory' are probably helpful to discuss further.

(1) What do we mean when using the term nationalism? Following Ernst Gellner and Benedict Anderson, it is helpful to underline that the national idea is a modern construct, perpetuated in the minds of people and disseminated through politics and culture (including in subtle and not so subtle ways through films and their reception, which is the underlying premise of this book), and inflected to preserve class positions.[10] Returning to the much used, but quite brilliant, phrase from Anderson, it is the case that France is an 'imagined community' and it is the hypothesis of this book that the cinema has contributed in part to that imaginary, added or played a role in perpetuating it. Furthermore, in twentieth-century France the basic content of the 'imagined national community' has been a contested and a disputed body of culture, opinion and knowledge. As the political historian Michel Winock so helpfully guides, two imagined Frances have existed in the modern period, these based on distinctive and competing notions dating from the divisions of the Revolution (1789) and subsequent revolutionary periods (1830, 1848 and 1870).[11] On the one hand, there is the Republican imaginary of France, which is

socially inclusive and founded on the notion that citizenship is about a loyalty to the constitution. On the other hand, organic or counter-revolutionary versions of France are commonly adumbrated in politics and culture. Herein, the notion of belonging is linked not to constitutional loyalty but rather to a perceived shared set of cultural values, including language (French), religion (Catholicism) and ethnic and cultural traditions and practice. At times, though not exclusively, of political crisis such as the Dreyfus Affair (1898) or defeat to Nazism in 1940, the exponents of this vision of France have espoused anti-Semitic views, and most political historians agree that this tradition of organic nationalism strongly informed Vichy's collaboration with Nazism (1940 to 1944) and that regime's complicity in the Holocaust. A further very important lesson from Winock is that the boundary between the two imagined 'Frances' is not fixed and that in some historical contexts it is exceptionally blurred. In practice constitutional nationalists can express and have expressed hard, more closed, nationalist opinions that might be more readily associated in a purely theoretical sense with the organic nationalist right wing. One thinks, for example, of no less a figure than General Charles de Gaulle whose writing, rhetoric and actions included loyalty to the Republic but were shaded with organic nationalism. In short, once one understands that 'France' in the twentieth century is a contested national identity, it is often best to explore focused and precise examples of expression of nationalism and to detail the specific micro-contexts because so often generalization is too simplistic. This is a perspective that this book follows ardently by recurrently underlining the importance of contextual evidence from film reception and through careful close rereading of symbolically important films or repeated patterning in sets of films of a similar type.

Further historical generalizations, which are necessarily problematic, are also still helpful to situate nationalism in our period. Firstly, the tensions of the 'two Frances' noted in the paragraph above were partly in abeyance in the decades we are addressing. Generally speaking, the political expression of royalism was marginalized after 1945, though maintained as a part of intellectual and cultural life.[12] Qualities of being French, the warp and weave of nationalism, are therefore less closely aligned in our period to an explicitly tense competition around the national brand, and are instead centred on softer more ambiguous concepts like 'being chic'; 'demonstrating intellectual refinement'; 'valuing traditional rural life over new forms of (foreign/American) urban modernity';

or even 'making great cinema', the latter trope being the subject of the first chapter of this book. It is also the case that after the Second World War there was slowly recognition that xenophobic nationalism in extremely hard forms was politically scandalous. For example, expressions of anti-Semitism in the postwar decades are relatively distinctive because of their more coded nature, as when compared to the 1930s or under Vichy. Secondly, to repeat from earlier, this was an era coloured by political violence around definitions of Frenchness mainly because of decolonization (1945 to 1962, with legacies and impacts long after). Thirdly, French patriots in the period imagined the rank of their country in contradictory and complex terms because in some respects this was a genuinely confusing time. The nation was rebuilding and growing in confidence after 1945 and there was a renewed sense of success: the early postwar decades were experienced as 'good times', *les trentes glorieuses*, and continue to be memorialized as such in today's news magazines and other pop-history memorabilia.[13] The people were at peace (when they were not fighting in the wars of decolonization); they were in employment and, depending on income, enjoying some of the gifts of modernity, including the leisure to enjoy art and cinema, as well as new technology ranging from the TGV super-trains to the mini-tel computer communication network (the French forerunner to email, which was much used for dating, and which ceased function in 2012). However, the French also found themselves being a reduced middle power, no longer as influential in the world as in the years before 1940 and learning to live with the two superpowers whose might was both admired and feared.

Much of the rest of this book will explore and specify as plausibly as possible how works of cinema exemplified and added to the very general context of nationalism described above. Nevertheless, this work does not propose that the cinema simply mirrors the larger societal and political trends that were occurring, as was developed in Siegfried Kracauer's classic study *From Caligari to Hitler*.[14] In fact, the idea of the 'cinema as mirror' or 'national barometer' or 'window on the national psyche' is for the most part avoided because of the lack of precision. Hence, we must ask a second question of a rather general, methodological, type.

(2) What are the intellectual tools needed for the analysis of our general theme to achieve a finely graded form of historical writing? For me, the valuable theoretical ideas that inform the research developed herein are 'political myth'

and the 'film event', the latter less familiar concept being first articulated by Marc Ferro in his *Cinéma et histoire*.[15]

The idea of political myth continues to be a useful way of grounding any reading of cultural products, including films and their narratives, that seeks to account for political subtext. Hence, for my political analysis of filmic content I follow the definition of modern political mythmaking provided by Christopher Flood in *Political Myth: A Theoretical Introduction*.[16] For Flood, political myth is when narratives in any form are coloured by ideological values of one kind or another or when these doctrines are communicated to audiences or readerships in narratives. Though drawing on Roland Barthes's still remarkably pertinent *Mythologies*, Flood is clear that he is not linking mythmaking to one dominant ideology (for example, bourgeois oppression and mythmaking to conceal that injustice) but rather that all political doctrines express ideas and values through narrative communication, including visual narratives such as films, and it is this that is political myth.[17] In short, a film can be 'mythopeic' when it carries overt or covert ideological narrative content that an informed viewer is likely to either identify and support (to believe in to greater or lesser extent) or to contest and therefore explicitly reject (because they hold different ideological opinions and hence recoil maybe in anger). Works of cinema clearly do communicate political myths, including variations of nationalism, but what I will often underline herein is how series of films with repetitious political subtexts make an impact on society, thereby shaping a common, and not random, nationalist-ideological mode. This occurs in highly complex ways; few films in our period work as crude propaganda that is easily interpreted or reducible to a single meaning or political message. The mythic content of many films is subtle, open to inferred reading, and also in some cases internal contradictions. This kind of approach does place great emphasis on analysing narrative and so plot summaries of films are presented far more often in this work than is sometimes common. To see the political subtexts one needs to describe how films narrate stories coloured by nationalist ideology. As such, the work that follows is close in style and tone (for good or ill) to two other myth-film discussions that also spend considerable time describing filmic content: Yannick Dehée's excellent general account *Mythologies politiques du cinéma français* and the well-regarded new analysis of the ideology of recent Hollywood movies, Laurent Aknin's *Mythes et idéologie du cinéma américain*.[18] For now, let us also add that for a form such as cinema it will also

be important to consider the ideology of representations of space and backdrop, the mise en scène, as well as basic narrative structures.

Throughout the research for this analysis I have also become increasingly fascinated by how the release and distribution of films regularly provoked political melees, both large and small, around their meaning. This aspect of reception is what I am calling the 'film event' or 'film events' or as in the original conceptualization where Marc Ferro wrote quite simply 'le film crée l'événement' ['the film stimulates an event'].[19] Little theoretical work to date has been contributed on this concept because to some extent film history has been written from above, constituted by discussions of major aesthetic periods, or individual directors or landmark works. Nevertheless, we can say that film events or 'films making events' are when works of cinema promote societal interactions, where the cinema goes beyond a projection machine and a screen to meet real people with complex social-political needs, attitudes and reactions. It is hoped the reader finds that this book expands quite significantly on these areas by discussing some familiar and some new forms of this type of evidence in relation to expression and circulation of nationalism. Therefore it includes detailed discussions of competitions and the award of prizes at film festivals – notably Cannes, but also the César, Deauville, Venice and the Academy Awards – polemics and public disputes between directors, and even violent street protests against films, including the extreme right wing's attacks on *La Bataille d'Alger* (Pontecorvo, 1965) and their later protests against *The Last Temptation of Christ* (Scorsese, 1989). For me the term 'film event' has also opened up discussion of the accoutrements of official state promotion of the cinema and consideration of the ideological subtext around that kind of marketing-cum-heritage strategy. For example, in the first chapter of this book I focus in part on the Centenary of Cinema when in 1995 industry groups and state officials commemorated the invention of film in France (1895). Thus, a further contribution of this study will be to draw greater attention to the politics of these little researched types of historical event. An important sub-aim of this research is to enhance our understanding of their character and to begin an informed analysis of film events around the themes of nationalism.

Let me underline the significance of film events a little further because of their significance for the period that is treated herein. Going to the cinema between 1945 and 1995 was mostly a one-off experience, meaning a time-limited encounter with a work. This audience experience of film was far less

mediated than it is today by the technologies of DVD, internet, wi-fi and so on. Without blogs, or social media, films were less 'invented' by fan-audiences and far more mediated by quite bold and traditional formats: mainstream press reviews; film festivals and reporting thereon; specialist periodicals, including public and trade publications; bureaucrats and politicians. Cinema was arguably itself more of an event in the postwar years than ever before or since because of these highly structured and controlled forms of public reception. All of which did of course mean that works of cinema could gain a genuine life in the minds of people, many of whom may never have actually even seen the work in question. It is a wager of this study that finding out how people talked about influential films (and the structures that made this talk socially legitimate – press columns, festivals, trade journals) is as valuable a historical task as conventional criticism of aesthetics or philosophy.

The book is a work of politically informed cultural history (or culturally informed political history, if you prefer) and not a sociological essay. Clearly, nevertheless, it reiterates some lessons taught by the work of Pierre Bourdieu. In particular, it is committed to reading film ('culture') for political values. Similarly, because so often the work is unpicking complex discourses that appear apolitical but which are actually very marked by patriotic values, it follows in the spirit of Bourdieu's clever deconstruction of the euphemistic discourses found in Martin Heidegger's philosophy. To some extent too, because so often films and film reviewers offer competing versions of nationalistic opinion one could consider the work to be a preliminary sketch of what Bourdieu might have called the tactics being pursued by different actors in the field of cinema.[20] However, the work does not pretend to offer anything close to a sociological map of a field, nor does it explore the social habitus of the players in the fascinating game of cinema creation in France. Neither is it of concern here as to how cinema gained in legitimacy as an art form in the period under discussion. Such an angle of analysis would make for a fascinating further work, since clearly even euphemistic claims to speak for the nation are potentially also subtle assertions of the importance of the whole field per se. What the approach developed does indicate is that the 'film event' opens up a scope of discussion too rarely developed in the wider historical literature. At the least, the work will show the many and varied actors all vying to discuss cinema and offer readings of films that carry political implications and inferences.

Finally, the practical organization of the work is thematic and is framed in two distinct parts. Thus, the opening part of this book, set out in the next three chapters, is a discussion of where the cinema can be said to have offered outlines of what French nationhood could be taken to be and where cinema offered ideals or models to maintain and sustain nationalism. In other words, these chapters deal with self-assertions, projections of myths about the grandeur and glory of France. The second part of the work is devoted to far more negative discourses and film events where cinema has expressed anxiety or concern about the influence, or role, of non-French Others. As we will see this thematic division of labour is useful to keep hold of a relatively large body of quite complex historical data. However, it is also the case that when cinema connotes a positive valorization of France it has an exclusionary subtext in the background. Likewise, when the cinema negatively depicts the Other there is an implied notion of the 'perfect nationhood' ordering that discourse.

French cinema (from 1945 to 1995) will always mean many different things to many different people and that is all for the good. This book is not even about French cinema in any totalizing or classical sense. What it does seek to map through for the first time is the complex modes of the cinema world's encouragement and dissemination of forms of nationalism, including extreme cases, as well as more implied attitudes and ambiguous undercurrents. That is a very different subject from where this chapter started and the world of film and the international art scene (a subject to which I hope to return in future research). What has been increasingly evident in the course of writing this book is that filmmakers are very subtle and sophisticated mythmakers of nationalism and that the localized public reception of works in press coverage, at festivals and through organized promotional activities, has been a space for contestation and debate. For some limited periods and in some quarters, there were instances of ferociously exclusionary discourses at work. It has been my academic duty to weigh that material as meticulously as possible and to describe its political dynamics. Such genuinely disturbing matters are inevitably a proportionately greater part of this book than in more general studies or thematic works dedicated to different questions.

Notes

1. V. Schwartz, 2007, *It's So French!: Hollywood, Paris, and the Making of Cosmopolitan Film Culture,* Chicago: Chicago UP; M. Betz, 2009, *Beyond the Subtitle: Remapping European Art Cinema,* Duluth: Minnesota UP.
2. L. Mazdon, 2000, *Encore Hollywood. Remaking French Cinema,* London: BFI; P. Lev, 1993, *The Euro-American Cinema,* Austin: University of Texas Press. For a different kind of comparative approach see the broad-ranging and original work, C. Celli, 2011, *National Identity in Global Cinema,* Basingstoke, Palgrave.
3. P. Roger, 2004, *L'ennemi américain,* Paris: Seuil; R.F. Kuisel, 1997, *Seducing the French: The Dilemma of Americanization,* Berkeley: University of California Press.
4. R.F. Kuisel, 2000, 'The Fernandel Factor', *Yale French Studies* 98, 119–34.
5. See L. Garreau, 2009, *Archives secrètes du cinéma français, 1945–1975,* Paris: PUF, 230–31.
6. K. Ross, 1996, *Fast Cars, Clean Bodies,* London: the MIT Press, 7.
7. H. Chapier, 2012, *Version originale,* Paris: Fayard.
8. See for example, C. Drazin, 2011, *The Faber Book of French Cinema,* London: Faber; J. Forbes, 1992, *The Cinema in France after the New Wave,* London, BFI; J-M. Frodon, 1995, *L'Âge moderne du cinéma français,* Paris: Flammarion; S. Hayward, 2005, *French National Cinema,* London: Routledge.
9. J. Siclier, 1997, 'Le cinéma', in J.F. Sirinelli (ed.), *Les Droites en France,* Vol.2. *Culture,* Paris: Gallimard, 293–324; P. Ory, 1985, *L'Anarchisme de droite,* Paris: Grasset.
10. B. Anderson, 1991, *Imagined Communities. Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism,* London: Verso; E. Gellner, 1997, *Nationalism,* London: Weidenfeld.
11. M. Winock, 1996, 'Qu'est-ce qu'une nation?', *L'Histoire,* 201, 8. For the wider current of 'organic' nationalism see P. Birnbaum, 1993, *La France aux Français: histoire des haines nationalistes,* Paris: Seuil.
12. R. Girardet, 1957, 'L'Héritage de l'Action française', *Revue française de science politique* 7 (4), 765–92; N. Hewitt, 1996, *Literature and the Right in Postwar France,* Oxford: Berg; F. Dufay, 2006, *Le soufre et le moisi. La droite littéraire après 1945,* Paris: Perrin; and Ory, *L'Anarchisme.*
13. For example, Historia-Paris Match, 2012, *1945–1975. La France Heureuse,* Paris: Paris-Match.
14. S. Kracauer, 1947, *From Caligari to Hitler: A Psychological History of the German Film,* London: Dennis Dobson.
15. M. Ferro, 1993, *Cinéma et histoire,* Paris: Gallimard-Folio.
16. C. Flood, 1996, *Political Myth: A Theoretical Introduction,* New York: Garland.
17. R. Barthes, 1970, *Mythologies,* Paris: Seuil.
18. Y. Dehée, 2000, *Mythologies politiques du cinéma français, 1960–2000,* Paris: PUF; L. Aknin, 2012, *Mythes et idéologies du cinéma américain,* Paris: Vendémiaire.
19. Ferro, *Cinéma et histoire,* 14.

20. Particularly interesting for a different methodology to that adopted in this history, see the classic sociological discussions around themes of legitimacy, cultural field and habitus in P. Bourdieu, 1993, *The Field of Cultural Production*, Cambridge: Polity; while for examples of Bourdieu's skill at unpicking political euphemism in discourses that seek to deny their implicit political values, see P. Bourdieu, 1991, *Language and Symbolic Power*, Cambridge: Polity; as well as the more extensive P. Bourdieu, 1988, *L'ontologie politique de Martin Heidegger*, Paris: Éditions de Minuit.