



La notte (dir. Michelangelo Antonioni, Italy/France, 1961).
Courtesy the Museum of Modern Art Film Stills Archive,
New York.

The Name above the (Sub)Title: Internationalism, Coproduction, and Polyglot European Art Cinema

Mark Betz

Dubbing is not only a technique, it's also an ideology. In a dubbed film, there is not the least rapport between what you see and what you hear. The dubbed cinema is the cinema of lies, mental laziness and violence, because it gives no space to the viewer and makes him still more deaf and insensitive. In Italy, every day the people are becoming more deaf at an alarming rate.

—Jean-Marie Straub, *Interview*, 1970

It has to be possible to think of a European film. To think of film in European terms. Without the consequence of a thoroughly watered-down Euro-film.

—Alfred Behrens, “New European Film and Modernity,” 1986

Sounding Off

From September 1995 to December 1998, I worked as the film programmer at George Eastman House/International Museum of Photography and Film, located in Rochester, New York. As programmer I was responsible for conceptualizing film series

Copyright © 2001 by *Camera Obscura*

Camera Obscura 46, Volume 16, Number 1

Published by Duke University Press

and securing film titles for several hundred screenings in the museum's on-site Dryden Theatre. One of the series I put together, "Soon to Be a Major Motion Picture," comprised eight feature films on the subject of filmmaking and was scheduled over the months of May and June 1998. The choices were eclectic and based on a series of factors, including relevance to the subject, print availability and condition, and frequency of exhibition: *The Big Knife* (dir. Robert Aldrich, US, 1955), *8 1/2* (dir. Federico Fellini, Italy/France, 1963), *Le Mépris* [Contempt] (dir. Jean-Luc Godard, France/Italy/US, 1963), *For Ever Mozart* (dir. Jean-Luc Godard, Switzerland/France, 1996), *La Nuit américaine* [Day for night] (dir. François Truffaut, France/Italy/United Kingdom, 1973), *Stardust Memories* (dir. Woody Allen, US, 1980), *Venice/Venice* (dir. Henry Jaglom, US, 1992), and *Irma Vep* (dir. Olivier Assayas, France, 1996). As is evident from the titles in the list, the series leaned heavily toward European art cinema, which has not only produced a high proportion of such metafilms, but has always been one of the mainstays of contemporary international film archive exhibition. As one would expect, the clientele for this and other film series at the Dryden Theatre was a mix of buffs and aficionados, professors and students, and regulars with relatively high amounts of cultural capital.¹

On 7 May 1998, the museum received and passed on to me for response the following e-mail message from a member who lived in another state and had perused the May-June film calendar in both hard copy and on the World Wide Web:

Please tell me it's a typo in your calendar. You can't seriously plan on a DUBBED version of "Day for Night"!! Especially not as a 25th Anniversary special. I saw a lovely new subtitled print in NYC last summer; surely you can get your hands on that.

I had planned to tell my parents and brother to attend, as "Day for Night" is one of my favorite films. But I would tell everyone I can to avoid at all costs a dubbed version.

I grew up in Rochester, and spent more time at the Dryden than I can guess. For a real movie fan, the Eastman House is a treasure.

How can a film archive, dedicated to preserving films as originally produced, fall to such a level as this? If this is the real policy, I'll have to consider my membership and support of the Eastman House.

Please advise ASAP. (And, if it is merely a typo (though I checked your on-line calendar for corrections)), please accept my apologies for this rant.)

The person who wrote this message obviously had a deep investment in film culture (both as a museum member and as an attendee of screenings of art films elsewhere) and clearly felt strongly about the matter of a dubbed print of *Day for Night*, so I was careful in preparing my response. I explained, for example, that the (indeed) dubbed print of *Day for Night* we were screening was not from the Eastman House's archive but a neighboring one, that the only other prints in current distribution were also dubbed, that we chose the best quality print we could find, and that the subtitled print shown in New York City the previous year was one obtained through the French Consulate and was at that time unavailable for screening in the US. I pointed out that *Day for Night* was shot in France by a French director with a largely French cast and crew with the key exceptions of the Italian actress Valentina Cortese and the British actors David Markham and Jacqueline Bisset; their presence registers the fact that *Day for Night* is not a French film per se but an international coproduction among France and Italy and Great Britain. In fact, the film was coproduced by Warner Brothers through its London subsidiary, and one of the stipulations of the agreement was that Warner Brothers would have worldwide distribution rights for the film, excluding France and Italy.² This meant that, in its first-run release in the US and Great Britain in late 1973, *Day for Night* was shown in a version dubbed into English, as one would expect of a major Hollywood studio whose business is to reach as large an audience as possible.

I pointed out as well that, like so many other postwar European films that have won an Academy Award of some kind, the critical and popular success of *Day for Night* in the US was due in no small part to the fact that it was distributed, and distributed

widely, in English-dubbed prints—other such examples, from France and Italy alone, include *Forbidden Games* (dir. René Clément, 1952), *La strada* (dir. Federico Fellini, 1954), *Mon oncle* (dir. Jacques Tati, 1958), *Yesterday, Today, and Tomorrow* (dir. Vittorio De Sica, 1964), *A Man and a Woman* (dir. Claude Lelouch, 1966), and *Amarcord* (dir. Federico Fellini, 1974). From a historical/exhibition standpoint, showing a dubbed print of *Day for Night* for a twenty-fifth anniversary screening was entirely in keeping with how most US viewers experienced the film in 1973, save the odd prestigious festival screening or limited runs of subtitled prints in New York City, Chicago, Los Angeles, and other American cities participating in the art house exhibition circuit. From an archival standpoint, there really is no version of a film “as originally produced” to preserve or, as is more often the case, conserve, except perhaps for the unviewable in-camera negative, the only use for which is to strike the positive prints that constitute the bulk of every film archive’s holdings.³ Our presentation of a dubbed print of *Day for Night* was, I assured the concerned member, archivally sound as a practice. I received in turn a pleasant response that brought forth other interesting issues, and we engaged in a brief correspondence.

One of those issues, and one that I will only touch on here, is how high/low distinctions determine one’s expectations and reactions concerning dubbed versus subtitled films. Of the ten features not produced in English that were screened at the Eastman House that May and June, only two were shown in dubbed prints—*Day for Night* and *Fuego* (dir. Armando Bo, 1968), an erotic melodrama from Argentina screened as part of series on exploitation films. I expected no complaints regarding the aural status of the latter, nor did I receive any. Further, I was never questioned in any way about other dubbed prints we had shown from similarly low or debased genres: spaghetti westerns like *The Good, the Bad, and the Ugly* (dir. Sergio Leone, Italy/Spain, 1966), *giallo* like *The Bird with the Crystal Plumage* (dir. Dario Argento, Italy/West Germany, 1970), Hong Kong kung fu comedies like *Drunken Master* (dir. Woo-ping Yuen, 1978), and *anime* like *Barefoot Gen* (dir. Mamoru Shinzaki, Japan, 1983). One of the unwrit-

ten rules of art cinema culture is not simply a preference for but the absolute exigency of the subtitled print, and clearly these rules do not apply for popular or low genres. The name of the auteur and the purity of his or her intentions, the need to hear the “original” sound track in its “original” language—both of these mutually determining notions are invoked as proof of the superiority of subtitling over dubbing, yet few find these issues of any relevance to popular cinemas. One of the ironies of this situation is that many low genre films are distributed and exhibited, cheek-by-jowl with art films, in subtitled versions in several countries (the Nordic states, for example) where the matter is one not of aesthetic distinction, as it is in the Anglo-American context, but of national size, wealth, and tradition.⁴ When it comes to the distribution and exhibition of non-English-language films in Britain or North America, however, a variety of factors determine which ones are subtitled and which dubbed. And when a European art film is shown in the latter version, cinéphiles are the first to object.

It is only by tabling the welter of production, distribution, exhibition, and reception factors as they pertain to national and international histories and traditions in Western Europe that one can argue at all for the inferiority of dubbed prints compared to subtitled ones. Such arguments raged in the entertainment and op-ed pages of the *New York Times* and film culture journals and little magazines in the early to mid-1960s, and their outcomes effectively determined the common knowledge that to this day permeates Anglo-American film studies, which was forged at least as much by the cosmopolitan British and American film magazine cultures bolstered by European art cinema in the 1960s as by forces within the academy.⁵ The case against dubbing, then as now, thus tends toward four related issues: national language, temperament, and acting style; voice/body incongruity and infidelity; illusion of reality and spectator identification; and authenticity of the filmic text. In a survey of widely used introductory film texts published in the US, I have found that almost all contain at least a paragraph on the matter of subtitling versus dubbing, and while some admit that subtitling has its deficiencies

(cumbersomeness, oversimplification of dialogue, divided viewer attention between reading text and watching images), it is unanimously declared the victor over dubbing.⁶

Strong support for this position is provided by many a European auteur working within national traditions and industries—such as in Italy and Germany—that postsynchronize domestic films and dub imports. In *Cahiers du cinéma* in the mid-1950s, Roberto Rossellini pronounced the “dubbing of Italian films in English and attempting to distribute them in America” a “mad idea. . . . Failure is assured.” This aside was less than prescient of the distribution and commercial success of Italian cinema abroad, and Rossellini would later recant this position and accuse critics who objected to dubbing of being “cinematic fetishists.”⁷ But it was very prescient indeed of the objections that would begin to be expressed by other Italian filmmakers and would result in a manifesto, presented in February 1967 in Amalfi at a conference on film language and the sound film and signed by some of Italy’s most renowned auteurs, which called for the “abolition of the indiscriminate use of dubbing, whose existence compromises the very possibility of an Italian sound cinema.”⁸ Even more extreme protests were voiced in a 1970 *Cahiers du cinéma* interview with Jean-Marie Straub and Danièle Huillet, experimental modernist filmmakers who are noted for filming in direct sound and whose statements appear in one of the epigraphs at the beginning of this essay. While it is difficult to take seriously Straub’s claim that Italian people were literally becoming deaf due to their exposure to postsynchronized films, he and his partner do offer other provocative comments that broaden the scope of the issue and that set the terms for my exploration of the soundscape of European art cinema in this essay: that postsynchronization is not only a technique but also an ideology; that “only by accepting the dictatorship of dubbing can you use two or three stars from different countries in the same film”; that it is part and parcel of an “international aesthetic” that “is like Esperanto.”⁹ The tensions here, tensions dubbing apparently magnifies or produces and that direct sound or subtitling apparently solves, are between the industrial and economic determi-

nants of European art cinema casting and the personal vision of the director, between language as national signifier and nation builder, and between conflicting national and international ideologies. The dialogue tracks of art films are thus a rich site of contestation and are symptomatic of larger economic, political, and cultural forces in Europe in the 1960s and 1970s.

Although the results of the critical debates about dubbing versus subtitling in the 1960s have become received wisdom in Anglo-American film studies, the facts of pan-European coproduction during the same period have most definitely fallen by the wayside in film historical writing, or rather they have been confined to other periods and been narrativized in ways that continue to regard European cinema as a victim of Hollywood. Except for some periodic historical exceptions, such as the “Film Europe” movement of the 1920s, the coming of sound to Europe and the so-called failed experiments with multilanguage film versions in 1930–31, and the cross-cultural initiatives of the European Community (EC), since the early 1980s, film historical writing continues to carry on under the rubric of the nation as if it has been a stable category and geopolitical entity in Europe throughout most of the twentieth century. Even the handful of texts that deal at all with the subject of coproduction in any period locate the axis of production as Hollywood-Europe, exploiter-exploited. While economic and industrial approaches to the history of Hollywood cinema are a matter of course in Anglo-American film studies, such approaches remain rare in the historiography of European art cinema.

Despite, then, the fact that contemporary cooperative strategies taken by national cinema industries in the European zones are not a recent phenomenon—Penelope Houston was speaking of a “Common Market cinema” as early as 1963, a decade before Great Britain acceded to the European Economic Community (EEC)—the paradigm of national cinema has tended to preclude extensive scholarly discussion on the subject. And all of that discussion focuses on the menace US moving-image culture and commerce present to Europe’s national film industries that were and are forced to compete on Hollywood’s

terms by increasing film budgets and opting for high-production values, popular stars, elaborate and expensive costumes and sets, and so on. European coproduction, especially between France and Italy, emerges in this narrative as a forced swerving away from natural national traditions, as an aberrant industrial and economic response that holds little interest for stylistic or aesthetic national histories, the proper domain of postwar European cinema. Thus Robin Buss considers postwar film initiatives toward internationalization to be “disastrous for Italian cinema,” and Susan Hayward, who has some of the most interesting things to say on the matter, nevertheless continually refers to coproductions as a “murky area” and a “thorny problem,” in fact, “the greatest problem for France’s national cinema.”¹⁰ But most national cinema historians’ response to the problem of coproduction is to ignore it.

Or to relegate it to the detritus of commercial Anglo-European coproducts like *pepla*, spaghetti westerns, or sex comedies, what Geoffrey Nowell-Smith in 1968 called “bastard genres,” with all that term has entailed for their validity as historical objects of inquiry in the years hence.¹¹ More recently, Peter Lev has coined the term “Euro-American Cinema” to describe an aesthetically higher form of US industrial influence on postwar European film production, “the big budget English-language film made by a European art film director.”¹² At present, Lev’s study stands as the only sustained study of postwar European film coproduction by an Anglo-American scholar that is currently in circulation—as the only other study, Thomas H. Guback’s trenchant Marxist/economic analysis, *The International Film Industry: Western Europe and America Since 1945*, published in 1969, has been out of print for several years. What is most significant about both of these works is that they situate their analyses of postwar European coproduction in clear and constant relationship to Hollywood. The result is that the ubiquitous coproductions of European art cinema are, in the case of their backing by US dollars, read as rather “unnatural” hybrids, as compromises of the auteur’s vision, or as cautionary examples of the damage that

Hollywood's crass commercialism and manifest destiny can inflict upon Western European cinematic traditions.

European art films have thus been left free to carry on as signifiers of stable national cinemas and identities or as gleaming expressions of their auteur's vision, somehow not blurred by the quite specific determinants of cross-national cooperation that leave their marks everywhere on the film, from its budget to its shooting locations to its cast to its sound track. Here again is Nowell-Smith, now in 1996, in a sidebar on Michelangelo Antonioni in the context of a piece entitled "Art Cinema": "The success of *L'avventura* [The Adventure, Italy/France, 1960], gave Antonioni access to larger budgets and the opportunity to work with international stars: a languid Marcello Mastroianni and morose Jeanne Moreau in *La notte* [The Night, Italy/France, 1961], a wonderfully dynamic Alain Delon in *The Eclipse* [Italy/France, 1962], and a rather doltish Richard Harris in *Red Desert* [Italy/France, 1964]. He was then engaged by producer Carlo Ponti to make a series of international co-productions."¹³ Those films are, of course, *Blow-Up* (UK, 1966), *Zabriskie Point* (US, 1969), and *The Passenger* (France/Italy/US/Spain, 1975), English-language films produced by Ponti and financed through a three-picture deal with the American studio Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer. They are indeed "international co-productions," all made with largely Italian crews and non-Italian casts in London, southern California, and, in the case of *The Passenger*, North Africa, London, Munich, Barcelona, and coastal Spain. But what of Antonioni's three previous films, all Italo-French coproductions? Are they not "international co-productions" as well? Presumably, the presence of international stars in these films has nothing to do with the exigencies of international finance—they are there because the success of *L'avventura* (also an Italo-French coproduction) gave the director the "opportunity" to work with them.

When I watch and listen to these films in English-subtitled versions with their Italian sound tracks, however, I notice something that gives me pause: the "morose Jeanne Moreau" in *La notte* is mouthing Italian, but the synch between her lips and her

voice is off—in fact, it is not her distinctive voice at all. Her vocal part has been dubbed into Italian by someone else. The “wonderfully dynamic Alain Delon” in *The Eclipse* is out of synch as well: at times he appears to be voicing Italian as his labials lag behind the speed of the speech on the dialogue track, at others his lip movements seem to have no correspondence at all to the Italian and he may very well be speaking French. In any case, his vocal part, like Moreau’s, has been dubbed into Italian by a voice actor. And as for the “rather doltish Richard Harris” in *Red Desert*, he clearly enunciates his lines in English, so infrequently do they correspond with the Italian dialogue postsynchronized onto the sound track by yet another voice actor. Other non-Italian actors with speaking parts in these films are noticeably out of synch and similarly looped or dubbed: Bernhard Wicki in *La notte*, Francisco Rabal and Louis Seigner in *The Eclipse*, Rita Renoir in *Red Desert*. In fact, if one watches and listens carefully, the synch is frequently off for even the Italian actors. All three of these films appear to have been shot without sound and postsynchronized later, sometimes with the performers looping their own dialogue (for example Monica Vitti, who met Antonioni in her capacity as a voice actress dubbing the Italian vocal part for one of the three non-Italian female performers in the Italo-American coproduction *Il grido* [dir. Michelangelo Antonioni, 1957]), and at other times, especially when they are “international stars,” with the dialogue dubbed into Italian by uncredited Italian voice actors. There is no “original” sound track for any of these films: they are always already dubbed in any release print one can see and hear. It is this very instability—a historical and economic fact of the Italian sound film industry on the one hand, a variable syncing of bodies to voices in the case of non-Italian performers in prominent roles in coproductions on the other—that offers a fascinating site of incoherence in European art cinema.

The past two decades have witnessed a growing concern over the development of a European cinema arising through coproduction, of much-maligned Eurofilms whose policy-driven mixing of performers from various countries and cultural traditions yields a so-called Euro-pudding that collectively bespeaks contemporary fears of US cultural and economic imperialism

and predicts the erosion of national cultures in the wake of globalization. “Every film must declare its nationality and its own cultural identity,” pronounced Bertrand Tavernier in 1982, and it appears that he was speaking not only for filmmakers in Western Europe but for cinéphiles and academics in Britain and the US as well. Tavernier further derided the prospect of “Sophia Loren playing a Berlin housewife, and Catherine Deneuve a Sicilian peasant.”¹⁴ Tavernier voices the need to retain the notion of national cinemas in Europe through film stars taken as secure embodiments of nationhood. It is more than fortuitous that the stars he has chosen for his negative prediction of Eurofilm casting—Sophia Loren and Catherine Deneuve—rose to prominence in the 1950s and 1960s and themselves participated in numerous European coproductions during the very period when they became national signifiers.

In this essay I explore how anxieties in Europe about economic and cultural cooperation on the one hand and nationalism and national identity on the other are present and readable through the coproduced art cinemas of Italy and France from the late 1950s through the mid-1970s, a period that saw the protracted and complicated establishment of the EEC, not to mention numerous other economic and cultural alliances. The soundscape of the European art film, particularly the coproduced one, is a terrain upon which national and international anxieties are mapped. The aims of this essay are largely speculative, insofar as I intend to bring into relation varying sets of discourses—historiographic, aesthetic, industrial, geopolitical, historical—in order to propose their necessary intersection as part and parcel of a postmodern historical practice attuned to the play of inter- and extratextual discourses. While I do not come to any firm conclusions about how European art films are functioning in this network of conditions, I do want to stress the importance of reading these films closely through the discourses of nationalism/internationalization, auteurism, subtitling and/or dubbing, polyglot filmmaking, and star textuality. For it is through such readings that one might concretize some of the tensions and contradictions essential to a remapping of European art cinema.

Hollywood and Coproduction in Postwar Europe: a Historiographic Survey

An economic historical narrative of European domination by Hollywood in the immediate post–World War II era was forcefully proposed in 1969 by Thomas H. Guback in *The International Film Industry*. Guback’s pioneering study was constructed from published statistics and unattributed interviews by necessity, for it was undertaken before government files began to be opened and when no studio files were yet made available. It remains the only sustained economic history of post–World War II European film production.¹⁵ As Robert C. Allen and Douglas Gomery have noted, “Guback proceeds from an analysis of the economic base of European-American trade in motion pictures to one of the ideological effects on the motion pictures produced. First looking at the economic base, he finds that, with the direct assistance of the US government, the giant Hollywood corporations . . . formed a cartel after World War II to coordinate economic action in Western Europe.”¹⁶ That cartel was, of course, the Motion Picture Export Association of America (MPEAA), formed in September 1945 out of the former Foreign Department as an exploiting arm of the Motion Picture Producers and Distributors of America (MPPDA) to expand markets and lobby for international free trade of US films. Dubbed by Jack Valenti “the little State Department,” the MPEAA undertook (with the added ballast of a quid pro quo for Marshall Plan aid and the establishment of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade [GATT] in October 1947) the ambitious dismantling of the cumbersome structure of quotas, visas, exchange controls, and bilateral trade agreements that had been in effect in Europe since the 1920s and had gained force throughout the 1930s and the war years, particularly for the nationalized film industries of Italy, Germany, and the USSR. Thus began a protracted series of new agreements between the US and the devastated European nations that at first allowed for the almost unchecked flow of US films onto the screens of a reconstructing Europe. The outraged reactions and protests on the part of many national film indus-

tries and filmmakers to this development set in motion a new wave of protectionism in the form of revised quota and subsidy systems, reactive MPEAA boycotts, and eventual compromises that bespeak a consistent pressure from the late 1940s through the late 1950s on the European film industry to accommodate US visual culture and capital investment. Post–World War II Europe emerges in Guback’s account as an economic, political, and cultural battlefield upon which is waged a war of many fronts between a newly emergent superpower and the disunified nations of Europe.¹⁷

The bulk of US overseas participation in the European film industry in the 1960s was centered in Great Britain, Italy, and France, and Guback offers extensive documentation of purportedly European productions and coproductions that are, in fact, US studio productions or European-US coproductions (such as *Day for Night*). He follows this sobering analysis with a penultimate chapter on European coproduction proper, which he seems to consider a positive development to counter Hollywood imperialism insofar as it allows a more elaborate kind of film with bigger stars and appeal to more markets than a single European country could finance and produce alone. In a Europe versus US conception of the international film industry, whatever pooling of resources it takes with however many European national industries, and with whatever kind of filmic results, is a necessary and useful armament.

The information Guback provides in this chapter is the most extensive and detailed I have yet to find by a film historian on the issue of French, Italian, and other European countries’ coproduction agreements in the 1950s and 1960s. What is important for the present discussion is that no one has followed up on Guback’s research here by continuing to explore the centrality of European coproductions—economically and ideologically—to postwar European art cinema and film history. Not even Guback. He concludes *The International Film Industry* with a warning against internationally coproduced aesthetics, Anglo-European or simply European, and the kinds of films they affect:

So many of the new international films border on dehumanization by brutalizing sensitivity, often deflecting attention from reality. They count on developing audience response with synthetic, machine-made images. Their shallowness and cardboard characters are camouflaged with dazzling colors, wide screens, and directorial slickness. Of course, undistinguished pictures have always been made, but now the context in which they are produced and marketed is substantially different. Films of this genre are not a form of cultural exchange. In reality, they are anti-culture, the antithesis of human culture.¹⁸

In taking this turn he both forecloses an exciting avenue of research in his own work and sets the terms for subsequent Anglo-American economic historiographic analyses of international filmmaking in Europe: economics in the European film industry equals Hollywood imperialism; the true realm of European cinema is not commercial but artistic, cultural, and national. Thus, writing in 1971, Guback argues on the one hand for “pan-European cooperation because the problem is multi-national in character and bigger than the resources any one nation could devote to it,” and on the other for “a program which would safeguard and strengthen the existence of an autonomous national film production while encouraging a vigorous multi-national exchange of motion pictures.” And by 1974 he has pretty much abandoned the idea of EC filmmaking as a viable defense against US imperialism: “One must guard against the danger of unwittingly submerging the great variety of spirits in the headlong administrative rush toward creation of a ‘Europe.’ The aim must be to preserve the mosaic of cultures and to resist the temptation to rely upon size itself as a solution—even in the face of seemingly overwhelming political and economic trends.”¹⁹

While subsequent historians of the French and Italian cinemas of the 1950s through the 1970s have acknowledged international cooperative developments as important factors of each country’s cinema culture (the signings and the terms of the Blum-Byrnes Agreement of 1946 and the Franco-American Film Agreement of 1948 for France, or of the Andreotti Law of 1949 and the MPEAA-ANICA Agreement of 1951 for Italy, for example), these developments are couched in terms of national pro-

tectionism against and compromise with the US film industry and not in terms of pan-European film industrial initiatives proceeding in parallel with the economic and governmental establishment of the EEC. In short, coproductions are a problem for national cinema, and that problem is connected with Americanization and cultural imperialism. Thus when coproductions are mentioned at all, they are characterized as Euro-American and summarily relegated to the despised zone of European popular cinema, wherein *popular* signifies a commercial betrayal of national traditions (*pepla*, spaghetti westerns, horror, and sex films in Italy, or the Tradition of Quality in France), which Roy Armes, for example, links to “the whole machinery of the expensive international co-production, designed for an anonymous international audience and with pretensions which were commercial rather than artistic.”²⁰

In 1993, Peter Lev published *The Euro-American Cinema*, and in some respects his work challenges entrenched preconceptions about the nationalist base of the European art film. First, he considers the criticism and film practice of the new wave filmmakers from the late 1950s and later to have been concerned with a reevaluation of Hollywood cinema rather than an outright rejection of it: the *Cahiers* group, for example, sifted through the lower echelons of Hollywood genres and budgets to find directors and auteurs as models of individual personalities working within a highly institutionalized system yet able to make personal films. Second, he takes Steve Neale’s statement that art cinema “always tends to involve a balance between a national aspect on the one hand and an international aspect on the other” hand and pushes it in the direction of the international, emphasizing that the art film does not just happen on occasion to find an international audience but is *intended* for an international audience with shared class and cultural backgrounds or pretensions.²¹ Third, he argues that the art film proceeded after the European new waves of 1958–63 in three directions: a continued flourishing of low cost, high prestige, non-English-language art cinema by established auteurs (Fellini, Resnais, Bergman, Godard, etc.); a move toward US auteurs and art films, beginning with *Bonnie and Clyde* (dir.

Arthur Penn, US, 1967) and extending through the mid-1980s; and a move toward “European-American hybrids, combinations of American and European approaches to filmmaking” in terms of film form, budgeting, finance, and language.²²

It is the third direction that Lev pursues in his study, and he is careful to establish a set of eight criteria for what he labels “Euro-American art films.” Of these, the first two are of particular interest to the present discussion: “1. The film makes prominent, but not always, exclusive, use of the English language. 2. One of the film’s key collaborators is a European film director.”²³ In establishing these criteria, Lev effectively tips the scales of his discussion toward a certain type of European art film that bears at the level of its aural inscription the markers of US capital investment. Again we are firmly within the grasp of a discourse that marks coproductions and international European films as Americanized or, from a financial standpoint, just plain American. This is an overstatement, but only insofar as the name of the auteur serves in these Euro-American art films as the ultimate stabilizer of identity in the face of the international aspects of the enterprise. Thus, the films that Lev chooses for his case studies—*Contempt*, *Blow-Up*, *The Canterbury Tales* (dir. Pier Paolo Pasolini, Italy/France, 1972), *Paris, Texas* (dir. Wim Wenders, West Germany, France, UK, 1984), and *The Last Emperor* (dir. Bernardo Bertolucci, Italy, UK, China, 1987)—are, in film historical writing, Godard, Antonioni, Pasolini, Wenders, and Bertolucci films first and foremost. Few would consider these to be French, Italian, German, or Chinese films, so clearly international are they in their casting and use of language (except, perhaps, for *Contempt*, which is why the dubbed version of this film is so reviled by film culture).²⁴ But nor would many consider them to be US films, even though the bulk of the funding for each came from the US and the primary language in each is English (except, again, for *Contempt*). When confronted with the evidence of multinational investment in an art film, authorship picks up the slack and protects it from the taint of Americanization.

The historiographic lineage of the European art film demonstrates how it is considered a national *and* a personal prod-

uct when it is made in the language of the director and just a personal product when it is made in English. In both cases, the issue of national stability remains relatively unchallenged, although the name of the auteur above a subtitle does anchor the European art film to its nation in a way that the same name above an English title does not. Art film coproductions among European nations, with no US investment, thus continue not to be recognized as such, because the inscription of national language at the level of the sound track and of national character in the person of the director combine to form an almost inviolable bond—a bond that is only broken by the travesty of the dubbed print. And this is why dubbed prints are perfectly acceptable for coproduced low genre films rather than high ones—in the former, there is no director's vision or national tradition to be thrown into question by a signifier of another language and another culture. Low genre coproductions are always already Hollywood films anyway.

Following the 1993 Uruguay round of GATT, from whose terms film and audiovisual material were excluded, there has been a burst of scholarship on the economic and industrial intersections between European cinema and Hollywood. Much of this writing proceeds from European fears of American cultural and economic imperialism and predicts the erosion of European national cultures as an inevitable effect of globalization. Certainly the prominence of international coproductions and of the adoption of English as the language of global cinema in the last decade has increased awareness of recent strategies taken by national cinema industries in the European Union (EU). But such strategies are by no means a recent phenomenon. Indeed, they have been employed, in varying degrees, throughout the history of European sound cinema. And while the establishment of recent EU cinema initiatives offers up a compelling groundswell of attention to the need for European cultural cooperation, the degree to which the rise of coproduced European art cinema in the late 1950s and its flowering in the 1960s occurs in parallel with developments in the EEC is not to be underestimated as a site for historically grounded, internationally oriented textual analysis.²⁵

The recent publication of a number of EU-sponsored

studies on the economic and industrial problems of contemporary European cinema suggests that such outcry is both premature and damaging to the prospect of future health for the industry.²⁶ In *Budgets and Markets: A Study of the Budgeting of European Film*, Terry Ilott documents the complexities, problems, and potential rewards of pan-European filmmaking. His study stresses the practical compromises that must be made (in budget, in language, in casting) to ensure the future of Europe's national film industries. And although he praises Lars von Trier's *Europa (Zentropa in the US, 1992)*—a film made and financed by Swedish, Danish, German, and French partners, filmed in English and German, and shot in Poland—as “that rare thing, a genuinely European film,” he ultimately concludes that, despite “the rhetorical desires of some European legislators, the European film does not yet exist.”²⁷ Published the same year, Angus Finney's *The State of European Cinema: A New Dose of Reality* is of similar size and organization as Ilott's study (and, interestingly, as Lev's *The Euro-American Cinema*): a two-part structure comprising a recent history of coproduction initiatives and analysis of general data on markets and audiences, then a follow-up section of case studies of individual films and projects. Finney is critical of the entrenched resistance of Europe's national film industries to European integration, and he even goes so far as to point to 1960s European art cinema's simultaneous elevation of the director and denigration of the scriptwriter and producer as one of the sources for “the undoing of European cinema in the past three decades. . . . In an *auteur*-dominated environment, feature-film development was an idea in a director's head, rather than a team-driven process involving the producer's input, let alone a script editor or co-writer.”²⁸

Resistance to either the recognition of past European coproduction or proposals for new forms of multinational cooperation among Europe's national film industries has in the last decade remained high for most art filmmakers, critics, and scholars. Meanwhile, the equation of coproduction in Europe with Hollywoodization and US economic and cultural imperialism is ubiquitous. In June 1992, Spanish filmmakers held a three day

conference in Madrid entitled Audiovisual Español 93, during which participants

urged the government and, more specifically, the current minister of culture, Jordi Solé Tura, to introduce a new audiovisual law to protect it from the total domination of Spanish screens by Hollywood movies and by North American multinational distributors and from the “europuding” [*sic*] coproductions of the new European community that threaten to erase the cultural specificity of Spain and its diverse autonomous regions.²⁹

One year earlier at Stirling University in Britain, the British Film Institute (BFI) organized and held a conference entitled “Borderlines: Films in Europe,” one of the results of which was the BFI publication *Screening Europe: Image and Identity in Contemporary European Cinema*.³⁰ Reading through the papers presented by the established British film and media scholars at this conference, one soon realizes that they are all reacting, and not positively, to the bustle of EC media program initiatives that since the late 1980s were attempting to construct a notion of “Europeanness.” In the context of the historiographic tradition I have outlined here, it comes as no surprise that the filmmakers these scholars point to as representing a positive future direction for European cinema—Jean-Luc Godard, Chantal Akerman, Derek Jarman, Isaac Julien—are, characteristically, art film directors or their preferred replacement, countercinema imagemakers. Despite the fact, then, that all of them have been involved in European coproductions, their auteur status excuses them from any complicity with the new imperialism of European integration. It is for me a poignant moment when, in the discussion after a final panel of respondents, a member of the audience puts forward the following question, in fact the final one of the conference:

I want to ask a question which hasn't come up. It's about European co-production, a trend of co-production between different nationalities and different sources of funding which has been accelerating as we approach 1992. Does the panel consider that this will vitiate or destroy

the national tradition of film-making (if there is such a thing), or do they think that it's the key to the future and to a unification of European film-making?³¹

It is symptomatic of what I have been arguing in this section that the question is not answered, not even addressed, by the two respondents who speak after it and wrap up the conference. European coproduction, at least in terms of European art cinema and its heirs, is simply not an issue.

What all of this means, ultimately, is that the international dimensions of European art cinema, not only in its consumption but also in its production, demand more attention in film historical writing. The conceptual boundaries that have been mapped for this cinema—the film text, the director as generator of meaning, the nation as contextual limit—form a set of concentric circles for a synchronic analysis that, with the exception of occasional forays into the diachronic realm of aesthetic cinema history, essentially confine it to the borders of its own nation. Economic or global historicization has no place within this system, the logic of which matches its object of study: art films are about aesthetics and national culture, not economics; therefore the proper approach to their study is aesthetic and national-cultural. The issues of internationalization, European cooperation and integration, and industrial coproduction are anathema to this historiography, despite the fact that such issues have been part of European film discourses since the 1920s and were put into place in the form of the EEC at precisely the moment the French new wave and Italian auteur cinema, among others, came to fruition. The strain of the effort necessary to maintain this isolationist position is evident throughout Anglo-American writing on European cinema. It is also inscribed at the very levels that have served as guarantor of any given art film's national identity: auteurs, stars, and language. The relay between all three is, as we shall see, rarely unbroken, and in this respect the art film bears in its very textuality all of the contradictions, tensions, and anxieties of both its time and its historicization.

Speaking of European Art Cinema

The following table represents production and coproduction figures for French cinema and Italian cinema between 1941 and 1975 as referenced in the back pages of the two recently published Cassell/BFI *Companion to French/Italian Cinema* guides and in two standard national filmographies. What does this table tell us? First, that the available statistics on the proportions of national productions to coproductions are widely at variance. But they also indicate, despite their disparities, that coproduction has been a consistent feature of both French and Italian cinema since World War II. In fact, in the heyday of each nation's art cinema production, coproductions at times equaled and, in the case of France, surpassed national productions.

Clearly, the French and Italian film industries were engaged in coproductions in the postwar era. But coproductions with whom? These films were not predominantly Euro-American but Euro-European, and the majority of them were Franco-Italian. The signing of the Franco-Italian coproduction agreement in Rome in October 1949 marks the beginning of a consistent trend in French and Italian coproduction that developed slowly until 1953 but then really began to take off, hitting its stride in the late 1950s, peaking in the early to mid-1960s, and tapering off somewhat in the late 1960s to early 1970s. According to Maurice Bessy and the other scholars whose work informs this table, in 1959, thirty of France's thirty-nine coproductions were with Italy; in 1963, forty-three of forty-seven; and in 1968, twenty-one of thirty. Aldo Bernardini documents similar ratios for Italy: in 1959, twenty-seven coproductions with France of a total of thirty-six; in 1963, forty-two of sixty; and in 1968, twenty-five of sixty-four. Another trend for both cinemas through the 1950s and 1960s was the proliferation of bi- and trilateral coproductions with more and more national partners. By 1950, for example, Italy had established bilateral agreements and was actively coproducing films with France, Spain, Great Britain, the US, and Austria. By 1960, Italy's partners included all of the above plus West Germany, Yugoslavia, Turkey, Japan, Argentina, and Venezuela, and trilateral coproductions between Italy, France, Spain, and West

**Table. Film Production and Coproduction Figures
for France and Italy, 1941–1975**

| Year | FRANCE | | ITALY | |
|------|------------|--------------|--------------|------------|
| | Vincendeau | Bessy et al. | Nowell-Smith | Bernardini |
| 1941 | — | 60 | — | 72 |
| 1942 | — | 77 | — | 118 |
| 1943 | — | 60 | — | 72 + 3 |
| 1944 | — | 21 | — | 27 + 2 |
| 1945 | 72 | 73 | — | 50 |
| 1946 | 94 | 91 + 2 | 62 | 53 + 1 |
| 1947 | 72 | 78 + 1 | 60 | 58 + 1 |
| 1948 | 91 | 91 + 4 | 54 | 54 + 6 |
| 1949 | 99 + 8 | 104 + 3 | 76 | 65 + 4 |
| 1950 | 99 + 18 | 103 + 3 | 92 | 91 + 4 |
| 1951 | 94 + 18 | 87 + 8 | 104 | 105 + 3 |
| 1952 | 88 + 21 | 85 + 15 | 119 + 13 | 131 + 10 |
| 1953 | 64 + 47 | 67 + 26 | 125 + 21 | 133 + 18 |
| 1954 | 52 + 46 | 49 + 28 | 144 + 46 | 178 + 28 |
| 1955 | 76 + 34 | 70 + 21 | 74 + 52 | 124 + 19 |
| 1956 | 90 + 39 | 85 + 22 | 68 + 23 | 75 + 23 |
| 1957 | 81 + 61 | 80 + 28 | 66 + 71 | 105 + 32 |
| 1958 | 75 + 51 | 69 + 26 | 76 + 65 | 97 + 35 |
| 1959 | 68 + 65 | 70 + 39 | 83 + 81 | 131 + 36 |
| 1960 | 79 + 79 | 83 + 39 | 94 + 66 | 139 + 31 |
| 1961 | 98 + 98 | 65 + 38 | 117 + 88 | 167 + 44 |
| 1962 | 43 + 82 | 47 + 41 | 139 + 106 | 178 + 50 |
| 1963 | 36 + 105 | 40 + 47 | 135 + 95 | 187 + 60 |
| 1964 | 45 + 103 | 42 + 47 | 135 + 155 | 217 + 76 |
| 1965 | 34 + 108 | 33 + 55 | 94 + 109 | 143 + 69 |
| 1966 | 45 + 85 | 46 + 45 | 89 + 143 | 176 + 53 |
| 1967 | 47 + 73 | 56 + 32 | 130 + 117 | 195 + 64 |
| 1968 | 49 + 68 | 49 + 30 | 130 + 116 | 204 + 64 |
| 1969 | 70 + 84 | 74 + 29 | 146 + 103 | 200 + 69 |
| 1970 | 66 + 72 | 60 + 35 | 132 + 99 | 185 + 65 |
| 1971 | 67 + 60 | — | 128 + 88 | 175 + 67 |
| 1972 | 71 + 98 | — | 169 + 111 | 224 + 65 |
| 1973 | 97 + 103 | — | 171 + 81 | 196 + 56 |
| 1974 | 137 + 97 | — | 176 + 55 | 192 + 55 |
| 1975 | 160 + 62 | — | 177 + 53 | 191 + 31 |

Figures are for feature film production only. "91 + 2" indicates national films plus coproductions. The sources are as follows: Ginette Vincendeau, *The Companion to French Cinema* (London: Cassell, 1996); Maurice Bessy and Raymond Chirat, *Histoire du cinéma français. Encyclopédie des films 1929–1934, 1935–1939, and 1940–1950*, 3 vols. (Paris: Pygmalion/Gérard Watelet, 1986–1988); Maurice Bessy, Raymond Chirat, and André Bernard, *Encyclopédie des films 1951–1955, 1956–1960, 1961–1965, and 1966–1970*, 4 vols.

(1980–92); Geoffrey Nowell-Smith, with James Hay and Gianni Volpi, *The Companion to Italian Cinema* (London: Cassell/British Film Institute, 1996); Aldo Bernardini, ed., *Il Cinema Sonoro 1930–1969* (Rome: ANICA, 1992) and *Il Cinema Sonoro 1970–1990* (1993).

Germany were on the upswing. And by 1970, Italy's roster of bilateral partners had expanded to include Bulgaria, the USSR, Algeria, Tunisia, and Egypt; trilateral coproductions were prominent as well, and in a dizzying array of combinations among an ever-widening group of participants. Two trends are thus notable: a high incidence of French-Italian coproduction since 1950, and a proliferation of bi- and trilateral coproduction agreements since the late 1950s among the film-producing nations of Europe, along with several from North Africa and South America.

What kinds of films are these coproductions? Their impetus was to allow for a broadening of their financial base and at the same time to ensure their status as national products in their respective countries in order to qualify for state subsidization. Coproductions thus generally cost more than purely national productions—indeed the qualifications for state subsidies and the rules for the coproduction agreements established strict guidelines for minimum and maximum financial outlay on the parts of the coproducing partners according to broad definitions of film types. As Steve Lipkin has pointed out, from

1950 to 1965, the average cost of Italian/French coproductions was \$465,000 with Italy supplying 52 percent of the total investment. These coproductions were at least one-and-a-half, and often three times as expensive as normal national productions. . . . A 1966 treaty between Italy and France recognized three classes of coproductions: "normal coproductions," "coproductions of artistic value," and "coproductions of exceptional entertainment value." Normal coproductions cost at least \$285,000 with the minority partner's financial contribution amounting to at least 30 percent of the total cost. Films of artistic value cost somewhat less, and lowered the minority partner's contribution to no less than 20 percent of the production cost. Coproductions of exceptional entertainment value, however, had a minimum budget of \$509,000, with similarly lowered requirements for the minority partner's contributions.³²

For historians of French cinema, it is the third category, "coproductions of exceptional entertainment value," that has been deemed the most salient of France's coproductions, and copro-

duction becomes one of the sticks with which to beat the aesthetically moribund and internationally oriented Tradition of Quality and other big-budget costumers of the 1950s and early 1960s.³³ And for Italian film historians, the first category, “normal coproductions,” is most characteristic of Italy’s multinational films of the 1960s, purely commercial ventures that tend toward the popular, or low, end of the genre scale.³⁴ But there is no doubt about it: a high proportion of French and Italian art films from the late 1950s through the early 1960s were international—European—coproductions. Indeed, some of the prototypically “French” and “Italian” art films of the period directed by the most celebrated auteurs were in fact the products of French and Italian (and West German and British and Portuguese and Swedish and Spanish) partnerships: Louis Malle’s *Zazie dans le métro* (France/Italy, 1960) and *The Fire Within* (France/Italy, 1963); Alain Resnais’s *Last Year at Marienbad* (France/Italy, 1961), *Muriel* (France/Italy, 1963), and *La Guerre est finie* (France/Sweden, 1966); François Truffaut’s *La Peau douce* (France/Portugal, 1964), *The Bride Wore Black* (Italy/France, 1967), and *Mississippi Mermaid* (France/Italy, 1969); all of the films of Antonioni’s tetralogy starring Monica Vitti (1960–1964); all of Luchino Visconti’s films from *The Stranger* (Italy/France/Algeria, 1967) through *The Innocent* (France/Italy, 1976); all of Fellini’s films from *Il Bidone* (Italy/France, 1955) through *Satyricon* (Italy/France, 1969); and most of the 1960s films directed by Jean-Luc Godard, Claude Chabrol, Vittorio De Sica, and Bernardo Bertolucci.

Such art film coproductions at times acknowledge their status as such, through allegory or indirection. Godard is particularly noteworthy in this respect: of the thirteen features and five shorts for omnibus films he made during the Karina years, eight of the features and four of the shorts were coproductions, and of those, three have been noted for their critiques of such international filmmaking. One is *Contempt*, of course, whose subject is precisely the making of an Anglo-Italo-French coproduction, which it itself is. Another is *Pierrot le fou* (France/Italy, 1965), for which Susan Hayward has put forward an interesting reading that regards Ferdinand’s (Jean-Paul Belmondo) behavior at the

beginning of the film as an allegory for the state of French cinema in the mid 1960s.³⁵ A critique of forced internationalism and coproduction is explicit in Godard's next film, *Masculin féminin* (France/Sweden, 1965), at the center of which is a scene in which the four young Parisian protagonists watch a lumbering foreign film in a rather shabby movie house. When the lights dim and the credit titles appear on the screen, "4X: EIN SENSITIV UND RAPID FILM," Madeleine (Chantal Goya) remarks, "Oh, it's in the original language," to which Catherine (Isabelle Dupont) replies, "All the better. This way they can't put anything over on you." And neither, apparently, will Godard, for *Masculin féminin* is a Franco-Swedish coproduction, and as such requires the participation of Swedish personnel, including actors, in its making. Rather than arbitrarily cast the requisite Swedish performers and have them dubbed into French, the filmmaker has placed them in a Swedish film-within-the-film, where their presence is both contained and draws attention to itself as a fiction and a construction. Further, Godard does not know Swedish and



Masculin féminin (dir. Jean-Luc Godard, France/Sweden, 1965). Courtesy the Museum of Modern Art Film Stills Archive, New York.

is therefore not in a position to direct their vocal performances, another problem coproductions elicit among their casts and crews. So the film in which they appear is a heavy chamber drama about male-female sexuality (reputedly a parody of Ingmar Bergman's *The Silence* [Sweden, 1963]), in which a man and a woman (Birger Malmsten and Eva Britt Strandberg, credited only as "He" and "She") meet in an uninviting apartment for an afternoon tryst, grunt unintelligibly, and paw at each other clumsily as they undress and have joyless sex. An allegory for the arbitrary and pleasureless cojoining of national cinema traditions and personnel necessary to make a European film in the mid-1960s? Perhaps. At the very least, through this scene the filmmaker fulfills the stipulations of the coproduction agreement without compromising his own film. Or does he? The romantic Paul (Jean-Pierre Léaud), hero of the film, closes the scene with a voice-over: "This wasn't the film we'd dreamed of. This wasn't the total film that each of us had carried within himself, the film that we wanted to make, or more secretly, no doubt, that we wanted to live."

It is tempting just to take Godard's critique of European cooperative filmmaking here at face value, but to do so is to foreclose a potentially rich and disruptive avenue of research. What do coproduction agreements actually consist of, for example, and how does that affect the textuality of films made according to these strictures? The bilateral film agreements drawn up between European national partners since 1949 have contained clauses that serve to ensure that the nationality of a given film is not in any way "endangered," and these clauses circulate around criteria that define a film as national for both coproducing partners, including minimum financial outlay, language, location of shooting, cast and crew, and other prominent creative personnel.³⁶ In the French-Italian Agreement of 1 August 1966, for example, one finds the following stipulations under Article 5:

- I The budget of a coproduction can be no less than \$285,000.
- II The minority participation in each film cannot be inferior to 30 percent of the cost of its production.

III 1. The contribution of the minority coproducer must include an effective technical and artistic participation and at least an assistant director, a writer, an actor in a principle role, and an actor in a secondary role.

2. Each film must include employment of an Italian director or a French director corresponding to the conditions cited in Article 2.

IV Exceptions to the conditions of the preceding paragraphs can be granted by the authorities of the two countries to films of obvious artistic value or to special entertainment films.³⁷

Regulations such as these go some way toward explaining the wave from the early 1950s through the early 1970s of several prominent “international” film actors who were in perpetual migration across national borders to make European films—some, famous art films with directors in the pantheon of the art film canon, and others, less-than-famous entertainment films with directors whose names have been long forgotten. These international performers constitute a casting call of impressive geographic and generational breadth: Burt Lancaster, Rod Steiger, Anthony Perkins, Charles Bronson, Clint Eastwood, and Jean Seberg of the US; Alexandra Stewart, Genevieve Bujold, and Donald Sutherland of Canada; Dirk Bogarde, Terence Stamp, Alan Bates, Barbara Steele, Jane Birkin, and Jacqueline Bisset of Great Britain; Anita Ekberg, Ingrid Thulin, and Britt Ekland of Sweden; Curt Jurgens, Hardy Kruger, Klaus Kinski, and Elke Sommer of Germany; Maria Schell, Oskar Werner, Romy Schneider, Senta Berger, and Helmut Berger of Austria; Ursula Andress of Switzerland; Francisco Rabal and Fernando Rey of Spain; Gina Lollobrigida, Alida Valli, Lea Massari, Virna Lisi, Raf Vallone, Claudia Cardinale, Franco Nero, Ugo Tognazzi, and Laura Antonelli of Italy; and Jeanne Moreau, Annie Girardot, Anouk Aimée, Catherine Deneuve, Dominique Sanda, Alain Delon, Michel Piccoli, Jean-Louis Trintignant, and Gérard Depardieu of France. Their cross-presence in art films from all nations of the burgeoning EC registers how national and international filmmaking structures and practices are in a continual process of negotiation and redefinition in parallel with other economic and

political developments of the period. The appearance of an actor from one nation in an art film from another represents more than the fortuitous meeting across national borders of a talented performer and a brilliant director: it is also an indicator of two (or more) nations' capital investments and industrial cooperation in the making of a film misrecognized as a purely national product by dint of its language and the nationality of the director, the name above the subtitle.

It is at the levels of casting, language, and aural translation/transformation that perhaps the most interesting ideological tensions between nationalism and internationalism are inscribed and played out in the European art film. Multilingual productions or multiple language versions have of course been made since the introduction of sound in film, and Josephine Dries distinguishes three methods of multilingual production: double shooting, remakes, and double versions.³⁸ Double shooting refers to the multiple language versions (MLVs) shot predominantly in Hollywood and in Joinville, France, in the early years of sound, whereby the same sets were utilized for from between two and fourteen different sets of casts and crews from different countries and language communities. While the MLVs are generally considered to have been a failed experiment of the early sound period, a look at some art films suggests the degree to which they neither failed nor were an experiment. MLVs have continued to be made in Europe after the Joinville era and through the postwar period: Jean Renoir's *The Golden Coach* (1952) was shot MOS (without recording accompanying sound) at Cinecittà with a largely Italian cast, most of whom, including the star Anna Magnani, played and spoke in three languages in three separately shot English, Italian, and French versions. Another Renoir MLV bears different titles for its French and English versions, *Elena et les hommes* and *Paris Does Strange Things* (1956), respectively. And Werner Herzog's *Nosferatu* (1979), to take an even later example, was shot as well with the same cast performing separate German and English versions.

Related to the MLVs are remakes, which for Dries occur when there is a time lag between the production of two language

versions. Many of these language remakes, especially today, are of popular European films that American companies find less profit in promoting and distributing than in buying the rights for the original story, adapting them to American values, and shooting the whole production in an American context. But the reverse is not unheard of: Renoir's *Diary of a Chambermaid* (US, 1946) and Luis Buñuel's 1964 French remake of the same title, for example. However the vast majority of multilingual productions are neither MLVs nor remakes but what Dries calls double versions, of which there are two types:

The first is the production that is shot in one language and afterwards dubbed into other languages. Actors can be of different nationalities, but they must have the ability to act in the shooting language. The second is the so-called "Babelonian" shooting: the international cast will all act in their mother tongue. Their voices will be dubbed afterwards by dubbing actors from the respective language areas.³⁹

It is the second of these double versions, the Babelonian or polyglot film, that is of primary concern here.

When confronted with the reality of coproduction and the particular problems it produces for a national cinema—an international cast and a polyglot sound track—art film directors tend to take three approaches. The first involves foregrounding the tyranny and/or absurdity of international coproduction in the texture of the film's narrative, as Godard does in *Contempt* and *Masculin féminin*. A second, more frequent approach is to acknowledge at the level of narrative the copresence of multiple nationalities in the same national space by casting actors as characters of their own nationalities. This approach appears to increase in frequency in France-located coproductions in the late 1960s and early 1970s, and such celebrated films as *Murmur of the Heart* (dir. Louis Malle, France/Italy/West Germany, 1971) and *Last Tango in Paris* (dir. Bernardo Bertolucci, Italy/France/US, 1972) utilize this model. Perhaps my favorite example, however, is *Mademoiselle* (1964), a Franco-Italo-Anglo coproduction set in France, starring Jeanne Moreau and Ettore Manni, and directed

by Tony Richardson. In this film Manni is cast as an Italian woodcutter and thus his appearance and language nominally indicated, though not entirely explained. But *Mademoiselle* goes a step further in filming his and Moreau's climactic nocturnal tryst toward which the entire film has been building and which occupies several minutes of screen time in complete silence: the characters cannot and do not communicate with each other except through gesture and their own expectant bodies, eliminating on the one hand the need for Richardson to master French or Italian in order to direct his two key actors to complete performances and, on the other, the inevitable synch problems their close-ups here would display in both the French and the Italian dubbed release versions of the film.

But neither of the above forms of open acknowledgment of international casts and polyglot sound/image tracks are practiced in art cinema with anything like the frequency of the third approach, which is to ignore the matter entirely and simply make everyone on the screen French (*Cleo de cinq à sept* [dir. Agnès Varda, 1961]) or Italian (*Teorema* [dir. Pier Paolo Pasolini, 1968]) or Spanish (*Tristana* [dir. Luis Buñuel, 1970]). The result in such cases is the dubbing of much of the polyglot dialogue of the film into one language, a reduction of a film's polyphonic profilmic event into a univocal sound track that nevertheless leaves as trace of its international production context the unsynched images of the mouths and voices of an international community of actors. In a passage that draws attention to the unhinging of voice and body in art cinema at the same time as it offers a restabilization of national integrity as regards this issue, Michel Chion states:

The freedom allotted in Italy for the synching of voices is already enormous, but Fellini in particular breaks all records with his voices that hang on the bodies of actors only in the loosest and freest sense, in space as well as in time. . . . In France the voice is often something people keep to themselves, as if someone might steal it. In Italian cinema, when someone begins to speak, everyone joins in; it's all right to leave behind your own individual vocal contours, then return to them. No one makes a big deal out of it. Fellini takes this convivial side of

voices in Italian movies quite far. He plays to the hilt the freedom cinema gives him to mix together voices and actors.⁴⁰

It is certainly the case that every Fellini film from *La Strada* through to the end of his career exhibits noticeable and at times considerable evidence of its postsynchronization and casts of multiple nations and languages. Italian-dubbed, English-subtitled prints of these films present something of a limit case of loose play between actor and language, voice and body, that is everywhere in operation in not only Italian but French art cinema of the period. But perhaps the real limit cases are those international coproductions by Italian art film directors whose lead roles are played by performers who speak in a language other than Italian during the profilmic event—Fellini's *La Strada*, *Il Bidone*, and *Satyricon*; Visconti's *The Leopard* (Italy/France/US, 1963) and *Rocco and His Brothers* (Italy/France, 1960); and Bertolucci's *The Conformist* (Italy/France/West Germany, 1970) and *1900* (Italy/France/US, 1976), for instance. In such cases, to demand a unilingual Italian sound track is to erase the linguistic polyvocality that registers the political economy of art filmmaking in that country from the 1950s through the 1970s. As the films were predominantly shot without sound, there is no "original" sound track to worry about here. Yet art film viewers invariably prefer to listen to the dialogue dubbed into Italian and watch an image track with not one but two added idiosyncrasies—subtitles, of course, but also the major characters' lips out of synch with the language quite evidently not emerging from their body. Why?

One of the reasons is that these are Fellini and Visconti and Bertolucci films, thereby art films, and therefore they should be seen in subtitled prints. While this seems self-evident enough, it does not sufficiently explain the process by which the image/sound and actor/language disunities are bridged. Ella Shohat and Robert Stam have offered one theory:

In the case of the subtitled film, we hear the more-or-less alien sounds of another tongue. If the language neighbours are our own, we may recognise a substantial proportion of the words and phrases. If more

distant, we may find ourselves adrift on an alien sea of undecipherable phonic substance. Specific sound combinations might remind us of locutions in our own language, but we cannot be certain they are not phonetic *faux amis*. The intertitles and subtitles of foreign films, meanwhile, trigger a process of what linguists call ‘endophony,’ i.e., the soundless mental enunciation of words, the calling to mind of the phonetic signifier. But the interlingual film experience is perceptually bifurcated: we hear another’s language while we read our own. As spectators, we forge a synthetic unity which transcends the heteroglot source material.⁴¹

The “synthetic unity” forged by the spectator of a subtitled film is twofold. On the one hand, the interlingual film experience synthesizes the discoordination between the mouths and the words of those in the film’s diegesis who are either voicing their lines or speaking a different source language than the one on the sound track. This is a rather remarkable achievement, given the traditional impatience British and American viewers demonstrate when confronted with poor sync, an impatience that is the product of both lack of exposure to dubbed films (as they live in an English-language culture and cultural marketplace) and a fetishistic attachment to the idea of the “authentic” cut of film, an attachment dubbing disturbs. In the art film, the achievement is related to the issue of an imagined nationhood as it pertains to language and director more than to a cognitive process. The “synthetic unity” forged at the meeting of hearing another’s language while reading one’s own is one in which the spectators imagine themselves to be actually understanding, speaking, another’s language as they read and call “to mind the phonetic signifier.” But it is also a unity that extends across the sound/image and international actor/national film divide that dubbed and subtitled coproductions like *The Leopard* produce. In the Italian-dubbed, English-subtitled version of this film Burt Lancaster and Alain Delon become, *are* Italian as an effect of the spectator’s own desire for imagined nationhood through her or his interlingual relation to the film. This is why, as linguist Thomas Rowe noted in 1960,

audience consciousness of lip synchronization is confined to films in its own language. Even film critics are blithely indifferent to the fact that most of the foreign films shown in original version with subtitles are egregiously out of synch by American standards, although their criticism invariably notes such defects in the [English-]dubbed version.⁴²

In the art film as it is received in Britain and the US, non-English language and subtitles are perceived as markers of authentic (usually European) nationhood. But at other levels it is evident that subtitles afford *more* opportunity than dubbing for cross-cultural translation and transformation, for the effacement of the marks of national differences. Indeed part of the means of effecting the silent cinema as a “universal language” was precisely the malleability of the film’s cultural signifiers as relayed by dialogue. As Richard Maltby and Ruth Vasey have pointed out, “Silent movies were peculiarly well-suited to consumption in a wide range of different cultural contexts, but this was probably due less to their capacity to impart a single universal message than to the fact that they were amenable to a wide range of different interpretations.” For silent films were easily modified through the translation of their intertitles, which they continue, “constituted the principal site of international adaptability. . . . Visuals were subject to excision or rearrangement, but titles could be creatively modified to cater to diverse national and cultural groups.”⁴³ When subtitling and dubbing became viable options of translation following the early 1930s’ spate of MLVs, many countries opted for subtitling not only because it was much cheaper but also because it

managed to ameliorate some of the problems produced by the cultural specificity that characterized sound production, reintroducing some of the advantages of semantic flexibility provided by silent intertitles. Although audiences could hear the action being played out in a foreign tongue, the meaning of the dialogue was less specifically located through being indicated, in condensed form, in the local language. Specific cultural sensibilities could be accommodated by adjustments and naturalisations in the titles themselves.⁴⁴

Thus, the “original” language of another on the sound track would seem to bind the film to its nation of origin, but the subtitles the spectator reads may equally become that language, take it over, colonize it, and make it into their own.

By the same token, the rote dubbing of films both intra- and internationally in Italy, Spain, Germany, and France functions variably as the effacement of the national signifier and the very building block of it. In Italy especially, where most of the populace and, indeed, the actors speak dialect rather than the official Tuscan (a cultural leveling that began with unification in the 1860s and became official national policy during the Fascist regime), dubbing forges a “synthetic unity” of a shared national language. Intranational dialects and the specificities of social and cultural differences are ironed out in the process. At the international level, dubbing may be regarded not as a leveler of national difference but a form of national protectionism, a different kind of nation building. As early as 1929, Mussolini’s government had decreed that all films projected on Italian screens must have an Italian-language sound track regardless of whether they were produced in Berlin, Paris, or Los Angeles. Both Franco’s Spain and Hitler’s Germany established strict quotas regarding the proportion of subtitled to dubbed imports, with the scales tipped heavily toward the dubbed. Through the quickly established and standardized dubbing industries that were built up in these countries to fulfill these directives, dubbed movies might be and undoubtedly were seen in these countries as local productions. Indeed, Dries notes that, from an industrial perspective,

National borders are of less importance in the operation of the subtitling industry than for dubbing. A dubbing company is dependent on the availability of actors for the recording of voices and therefore needs to be situated in an environment with good infrastructure, studios and a lot of actors. For subtitling, these factors are not an issue at all. Translators are used to working at home with their own subtitling equipment. Competition in the subtitling business crosses national borders much more easily than it does for dubbing.⁴⁵

In all of these senses, subtitling is more international, more American (free market capitalist, competitive) than is dubbing (national-protectionist, union controlled), which is more European.

And where does all this leave the polyglot international art film in terms of nationhood and identity? Certainly, the rise of European coproductions, particularly between France and Italy, from the 1950s through the early 1970s, had visibly and aurally inscribed effects on the textuality of the European art film in this period. The proliferating internationalism of the casting of these films in accordance with the growing concatenation of cooperative production agreements among the nations of the burgeoning EEC, combined with the polyphony of the languages being spoken during the filmmaking process and the complex ideological, historical, and industrial issues surrounding dubbing and subtitling in these countries, makes the European art film's visual and sonic terrain an extremely rich network of signifiers to map. The tensions between national identity and international policy are borne out in the ultimate untranslatability of its specific confluences of sound and image, voice and body, language and performer. More than a set of historically isolated moments or the latest adaptation of the European film industries to the geopolitics of the postmodern era, international coproduction has been a consistent feature of European cinemas—quality, entertainment, or art—since the beginnings of European cooperation and integration in the immediate postwar period. In this sense its elision from Anglo-American film history and film studies must be read as a symptom of the nationalist blinders the discipline continues to wear. Stephen Heath once wrote, “Language is a site of struggle, and a site of struggle in film: imagine a cinema that would show what was at stake in its language and make heard what was invisible in its images.”⁴⁶ Without denying the validity of Heath's examples of such a cinema—Straub and Huillet's *Othon* (Italy/West Germany, 1971), Godard's *Ici et ailleurs* (France, 1977)—I would nevertheless suggest that the coproduced art films I have discussed in this essay offer the critical imagination an equally complex and shifting set of horizons of intelligibility. The stable nationalist base of European art cinema, when unan-

chored from the name of the author above the subtitle, becomes immediately swept away by a sea of crosscurrents whose new waves may very well be the aftershocks of a rather rapid continental drift.

Notes

1. In 1984, Bruce A. Austin published a questionnaire-based reception study of Dryden Theater patronage entitled “Portrait of an Art Film Audience,” *Journal of Communication* 34.1 (1984): 74–87. His findings remain pertinent for the contemporary film-going preferences of Dryden Theatre audiences.
2. At the time, I gleaned much of this information from trade journal articles and reviews of the film. This information has since been confirmed and condensed by Antoine de Baecque and Serge Toubiana, who in their recently translated biography of François Truffaut note that *Day for Night* was initially pitched at a budget of 3.5 million francs to United Artists, who refused to finance it because they thought it “too intellectual.” Truffaut’s longtime producer at Films de la Carosse, Marcel Berbert, then approached Robert Solo, Warner Brothers’s London representative, who agreed to coproduce at a meeting in November 1971. The contract was signed in May 1972. See Baecque and Toubiana, *Truffaut: A Biography*, trans. Catherine Temerson (New York: Knopf, 1999), 295.
3. In fact, although I did not mention this in my response, the new subtitled print this person saw so recently would be rather far removed, historically and generationally, from the “original” source, and according to the slippery logic of origins would have less business being in a film archive than a vintage dubbed print.
4. Josephine Dries, in a recently published guide on dubbing and subtitling in the contemporary European context, notes that the “Scandinavian countries, the Netherlands, Portugal, Greece and Rumania are known as subtitling countries,” with dubbing “done only for films or TV programmes aimed at very young children” (*Dubbing and Subtitling: Guidelines for Production and Distribution* [Düsseldorf: European Institute for the Media, 1995], 26). In France, Italy, Germany, and Spain, by contrast, “dubbing is the

most common method of language transfer” due to their large home audiences and the widespread use of these countries’ languages in Europe, both of which legitimize the significantly higher costs involved (Dries, *Dubbing*, 10).

5. For an overview of the *New York Times* debates, see Fausto E. Pauluzzi, “Subtitles vs. Dubbing: The *New York Times* Polemic, 1960–1966,” in *Holding the Vision: Essays on Film*, Proceedings of the First Annual Film Conference of Kent State University, held 21 April 1983, ed. Douglas Radcliff-Umstead (Kent State University, OH: International Film Society, 1983), 131–37.
6. In *Film Art*, David Bordwell and Kristin Thompson recite their version of the debate in a special “Notes and Queries” section, and their answer to the question “Why do most people who study movies prefer subtitles?” is typical of the discipline as a whole: “Dubbed voices usually have a bland ‘studio’ sound. Elimination of the original actors’ voices wipes out an important component of their performance. . . . With dubbing, all of the usual problems of translation are multiplied by the need to synchronize specific words with specific lip movements. Most important, with subtitling viewers still have access to the original soundtrack. By eliminating the original voice track, dubbing simply destroys part of the film” (*Film Art: An Introduction*, 5th ed. [New York: McGraw-Hill, 1997], 353–54).
7. Roberto Rossellini, “Ten Years of Cinema,” in *Springtime in Italy: A Reader on Neo-Realism*, ed. and trans. David Overbey (Hamden, CT: Archon Books, 1978), 96; 111–12 n. 7.
8. Quoted in Geoffrey Nowell-Smith, “Italy sotto voce,” *Sight and Sound* 37.3 (1968): 145.
9. Jean-Marie Straub and Danièle Huillet, “Direct Sound: An Interview with Jean-Marie Straub and Danièle Huillet,” in *Film Sound: Theory and Practice*, ed. Elisabeth Weis and John Belton (New York: Columbia University Press, 1985), 152.
10. Robin Buss, *Italian Films* (New York: Holmes and Meier, 1989), 9; Susan Hayward, *French National Cinema* (New York: Routledge, 1993), 11, 37.
11. Nowell-Smith, “Italy sotto voce,” 147.
12. Peter Lev, *The Euro-American Cinema* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1993), xii.

13. Geoffrey Nowell-Smith, "Art Cinema," in *Oxford History of World Cinema*, ed. Geoffrey Nowell-Smith (London: Oxford, 1996), 568.
14. Quoted in Thomas Elsaesser, *New German Cinema: A History* (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1989), 321. For a rare and interesting counterposition, see Alfred Behrens, "New European Film and Urban Modernity," in *West German Filmmakers on Film: Visions and Voices*, ed. Eric Rentschler (New York: Holmes and Meier, 1988), 93–96.
15. Geoffrey Nowell-Smith and Steven Ricci's recent collection *Hollywood and Europe: Economics, Culture, National Identity 1945–95* (London: British Film Institute, 1998) contains a number of pieces that fill the void somewhat. And one of Guback's "mistakes" has proven to be an inordinately rich source of European film historical writing: his claim that Hollywood's pursuit to control the European market after World War II was unprecedented and driven by capitalist greed. Subsequent work has demonstrated that exports, especially to Europe, had been an essential part of Hollywood's thinking and activity since as far back as the late 1900s. In a longer version of this essay I trace the development of a body of economic and industrial historical work on this subject, particularly that pertaining to the "Film Europe" movement and the so-called failed experiment of multiple language version (MLV) production in the early sound years. See especially: Douglas Gomery, "Economic Struggle and Hollywood Imperialism: Europe Converts to Sound," *Yale French Studies* 60 (1980): 80–93; Kristin Thompson, *Exporting Entertainment: America in the World Film Market 1907–34* (London: BFI, 1985) and "National or International Films?: The European Debate during the 1920s," *Film History* 8.3 (1996): 281–96; Ginette Vincendeau, "Hollywood Babel: The Coming of Sound and the Multiple Language Version," *Screen* 29.2 (1988): 24–39; the contributions to David L. Ellwood and Rob Kroes's edited collection *Hollywood in Europe: Experiences of a Cultural Hegemony* (Amsterdam: VU University Press, 1994); and the essays collected in *"Film Europe" and "Film America": Cinema, Commerce and Cultural Exchange 1920–1939*, ed. Andrew Higson and Richard Maltby (Exeter: University of Exeter Press, 1999).
16. Robert C. Allen and Douglas Gomery, *Film History: Theory and Practice* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1985), 136.

17. Thomas H. Guback, *The International Film Industry: Western Europe and America since 1945* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1969). This is a very sparse summary of a very detailed and well-supported argument. It is not insignificant for my polemic here that Guback's book should be so long out of print.
18. Guback, *The International Film Industry*, 199.
19. Thomas H. Guback, "Film and Cultural Pluralism," *Journal of Aesthetic Education* 5.2 (1971), rpt. in *Cinéaste* 5.1 (1971-1972): 7; and "Cultural Identity and Film in the European Economic Community," *Cinema Journal* 14.1 (1974): 16. See also Guback's "Hollywood's International Market," in *The American Film Industry*, ed. Tino Balio, rev. ed. (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1985), 463-86; "Film As International Business: The Role of American Multinationals," in *The American Movie Industry: The Business of Motion Pictures*, ed. Gorham Kindem (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1982), 336-50.
20. Roy Armes, *French Cinema* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1985), 148.
21. See Steve Neale, "Art Cinema as Institution," *Screen* 22.1 (1981): 34.
22. Lev, *The Euro-American Cinema*, 15-16.
23. *Ibid.*, 31.
24. A French-Italian-US coproduction, *Contempt* is the only film among Lev's case studies that is not predominantly in English—it is a polyglot mix of French, Italian, German, and English, with each character speaking mostly in his or her native tongue. Lev thus remarks, following the lead of the *Variety* reviewer (Gene Moskowitz, review of *Le Mépris*, *Variety*, 1 January 1964, 6), that the use of multiple languages "makes *Contempt* easy to subtitle but difficult to dub" and that Godard perhaps included the character of the interpreter, played by Georgia Moll, "as a way to maintain his control against dubbing the film" (86). In this he was not entirely successful, and when faced with the eventuality of coproducer Carlo Ponti's dubbing (and cutting) of the Italian release version, he removed his name from Italian prints.

25. From the start, the emphasis of the EEC was on economic rather than cultural cooperation: directives on the cinema only came into action in 1984, when the issue was catalyzed by a 1984 proposal by then-President François Mitterand to establish a pan-European coproduction fund for work in cinema and television. Mitterand's plea started the ball rolling on a set of initiatives that addressed cooperation on the part of the European media industries in terms of the community rather than bilaterally: the Mesures pour Encourager le Développement de l'Industrie de Production Audio-Visuelle (MEDIA), which was adopted by the Council of Ministers of the European Community in December 1990; Eurimages, a coproduction established in 1988; the Audiovisual EUREKA programme (AVE), which encourages the development and application of advanced audiovisual technologies; and Broadcasting Across the Barriers of European Language (BABEL), designed to give support in the area of subtitling and dubbing. For more specific information on these initiatives, see Paul Hainsworth, "Politics, Culture and Cinema in the New Europe," in *Border Crossing: Film in Ireland, Britain and Europe*, ed. John Hill, Martin McLoone, and Paul Hainsworth (Belfast: Institute of Irish Studies in association with the University of Ulster and the British Film Institute, 1994), 8–33; and Simon Horrocks, "European Community and the Cinema," in *Encyclopedia of European Cinema*, ed. Ginette Vincendeau (New York: Facts on File, 1995), 133–34.
26. In addition to the two I deal with here, see also British Screen Advisory Council, *The European Initiative: The Business of Film and Television in the 1990s* (London: BSAC, 1991); Martin Dale, *Europa Europa: Developing the European Film Industry* (Paris: Academie Carat and Media Business School, 1992); and London Economics, *The Competitive Position of the European and US Film Industries* (Madrid: Media Business School, 1993). For an excellent overview of these documents and their relation to film cultural discourses on European coproduction, see John Hill, "The Future of European Cinema: the Economics and Culture of Pan-European Strategies," in *Border Crossing*, ed. Hill, McLoone, and Hainsworth, 53–80.
27. Terry Ilott, *Budgets and Markets: A Study of the Budgeting of European Film* (London: Routledge, 1996), 15, 108. Ilott's study presents both hard to find data on the budgeting of selected coproduced

European films and practical assessments of the success of different kinds of European films —“success” meaning a balance between outlay and earnings. The study was commissioned by the Ateliers du Cinéma Européen (ACE) in September 1994.

28. Angus Finney, *The State of European Cinema: A New Dose of Reality* (London: Cassell, 1996), 21, 27; see also 30–31. In his essay “Moving Lips: Cinema as Ventriloquism,” Rick Altman has leveled a different yet germane critique of auteurism as it pertains to a repression of sound in film theory: “As the thirties progressed . . . it became increasingly clear all over the world that language, far from being anathema to the cinema experience, lay at its very heart. Unable to suppress language, cinema theory transferred its resentment to the source of that language, banning the screenwriter eternally from serious consideration. With the *auteur* ‘theory’ the screenwriter was finally done away with all together, and the scandal of language’s dominance over and independence from the image was further repressed” (*Yale French Studies* 60 [1980]: 70). This development leads to an interesting paradox when we think of it in concert with the translation of art films into other tongues. For if art cinema is even more a cinema of the image than others by dint of its auteurist mode of production, it would seem to be the case that the image should take priority over sound; an art film, then, should be dubbed into other languages in order to preserve the purity of its *mise-en-scène*. And yet the opposite is the case, in North America and Britain at least: the image track of the subtitled art film is transgressed by the sound track in the form of text and punctuation. In effect, language in a subtitled art film is present at the level of both sound and text and is thus privileged over image. While the nationality of the coproduced art film is thus fixed by the nationality of its director, the auteur’s vision is simultaneously usurped by the very signifier of his or her nationhood and language. This is simply one of many such double movements and structuring paradoxes underpinning the sound/image collisions of European art cinema.
29. Marsha Kinder, *Blood Cinema: the Reconstruction of National Identity in Spain* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993), 441.
30. BFI, *Screening Europe: Image and Identity in Contemporary European Cinema*, ed. Duncan Petrie (London: British Film Institute, 1992).

31. "Discussion," in BFI, *Screening Europe*, 95.
32. Steve Lipkin, "The New Wave and the Post-War Film Economy," in *Current Research in Film: Audiences, Economics, and Law*, vol. 2, ed. Bruce A. Austin (Westport, CT: Ablex, 1986), 173. See also Guback, *The International Film Industry*, 181–97.
33. According to Susan Hayward, "Another clue to the so-called lack of invention [in the Tradition of Quality] is the proliferation of co-productions. Since they were expensive to make, the tendency was to play safe, even though they did permit the implementation of colour on a reasonably large scale. . . . By 1954, almost half the films were co-produced, creating a crisis not just with the look of the product but also of identity for France's cinema" (*French National Cinema*, 158). Of course, Franco-Italian Tradition of Quality costumers and historical films directed by auteurs are in the historiography of French cinema generously excluded from this criticism and held up as high points of 1950s French filmmaking such as Jean Renoir's *The Golden Coach* (1952) and *Elena et les hommes (Paris Does Strange Things)*, 1956), Max Ophüls's *Madame de . . .* (1953) and *Lola Montès* (France/West Germany, 1955), René Clair's *Les Grandes manoeuvres* (1955) and *Porte des lilas* (1957), and Jacques Becker's *Montparnasse 19* (1957).
34. For example, Pierre Sorlin writes: "In a few cases, when the director could control the whole project, the co-operation of two companies helped make difficult films: Antonioni's *L'avventura* (*The Adventure*, 1960), *La notte* (*The Night*, 1961), and *The Eclipse* (1962) were all co-produced. But, most of the time, greater commercial appeal was the spur, and companies decide to shoot commercial products likely to interest cosmopolitan audiences. Two series of films, the historical or mythological epics and the 'spaghetti westerns,' are the most characteristic products of international collaboration" (*Italian National Cinema 1896–1996* [London: Routledge, 1996], 125). This is one of those rare moments when a European national historian acknowledges the existence of coproduced auteur films or art cinema. But their existence is nonetheless remarked as exceptional. For if art films are the products of international coproduction deals equally as much as big budget, historical epics or as commercially oriented popular genres, then they are equally as much the products of

larger economic, industrial, and market forces, all of which mounts a rather serious challenge to their celebrated marginality and status as torchbearers of their national cinema cultures.

35. Hayward writes: "Near the beginning Ferdinand (alias Pierrot), who is in the advertising business, is obliged by his Italian wife to attend a cocktail party. He turns up with her, as an unwilling guest. This seemingly 'innocent' beginning is in fact a reference to the state of the French film industry which, in order to compete against Hollywood products, has found itself since the mid 1950s obliged to make co-productions with Italy. At the party, the entire shooting of which is through a pink filter, women and men talk to each other in advertising-speak. . . . At the end of the sequence, Ferdinand picks up a huge piece of cake and throws it in a woman's face. He then runs out of the party and dashes home only to elope with his former lover of five years past. . . . Marianne, the symbolic name of France, might just rescue Ferdinand/Pierrot from the 'hell' in which he finds himself. In other words, the French film industry might just be able to avoid going under as an indigenous industry in its own right not only by foregoing co-productions with Italy but also by refusing to follow the candy-floss practices of Hollywood" (*Key Concepts in Film Studies* [London: Routledge, 1996], 230, 231).
36. The Conseil de la Communauté Economique Européenne (CCEE) established in 1953 the criteria for determining the nationality of a film. See Lipkin, "The New Wave and the Post-War Film Economy," 172.
37. "French-Italian Film Agreement of August 1, 1966," in Guback, *The International Film Industry*, 210-11.
38. Dries, *Dubbing and Subtitling*, 39.
39. *Ibid.*, 41.
40. Michel Chion, *The Voice in Cinema*, ed. and trans. Claudia Gorbman (New York: Columbia University Press, 1998), 85-86.
41. Ella Shohat and Robert Stam, "The Cinema after Babel: Language, Difference, Power," *Screen* 26.3-4 (1985): 41.
42. Thomas L. Rowe, "The English Dubbing Text," *Babel* 6.3 (1960): 117.

43. Richard Maltby and Ruth Vasey, "The International Language Problem: European Reactions to Hollywood's Conversion to Sound," in *Hollywood in Europe: Experiences of a Cultural Hegemony*, ed. David W. Ellwood and Rob Kroes (Amsterdam: VU University Press, 1994), 78–79.
44. *Ibid.*, 88.
45. Dries, *Dubbing and Subtitling*, 27–28. The literature on subtitling and dubbing makes for fascinating reading, particularly the industrial analyses. I encourage the reader to seek out the following: Herman G. Weinberg, interview by Colin D. Edwards, audiocassette (University of California Extension Center, 1969); István Fodor, *Film Dubbing: Phonetic, Semiotic, Esthetic and Psychological Aspects* (Hamburg: Helmut Buske, 1976); Hans Vöge, "The Translation of Films: Sub-Titling Versus Dubbing," *Babel* 23.3 (1977): 120–25; Max Weinberg: *An American Film Institute Seminar on His Work*, held 24 April 1973, American Film Institute Seminars 1.185 / *New York Times* Oral History Program (Glen Rock, NJ: Microfilming Corporation of America, 1977); Mikhail Yampolsky, "Voice Devoured: Artaud and Borges on Dubbing," trans. Larry P. Joseph, *October* 64 (1993): 57–77.
46. Stephen Heath, "Questions of Property: Film and Nationhood," in *Explorations in Film Theory: Selected Essays from Ciné-Tracts*, ed. Ron Burnett (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1991), 184.

Mark Betz has taught at the Universities of Manitoba, Rochester, and Alberta and is currently a lecturer in film studies at King's College, University of London. His essay is part of a forthcoming book entitled *Remapping European Art Cinema*.



The Conformist (dir. Bernardo Bertolucci, Italy/France/
West Germany, 1970). Courtesy the Museum of Modern Art
Film Stills Archive, New York.