Chapter 1

Introduction: German-speaking Emigrés and British Cinema, 1925–50: Cultural Exchange, Exile and the Boundaries of National Cinema

Tim Bergfelder

Britain can be considered, with the possible exception of the Netherlands, the European country benefiting most from the diaspora of continental film personnel that resulted from the Nazis' rise to power.[1] Kevin Gough-Yates, who pioneered the study of exiles in British cinema, argues that 'when we consider the films of the 1930s, in which the Europeans played a lesser role, the list of important films is small.'[2] Yet the legacy of these Europeans, including their contribution to aesthetic trends, production methods, to professional training and to technological development in the film industry of their host country has been largely forgotten. With the exception of very few individuals, including the screenwriter Emeric Pressburger[3] and the producer/director Alexander Korda,[4] the history of émigrés in the British film industry from the 1920s through to the end of the Second World War and beyond remains unwritten. This introductory chapter aims to map some of the reasons for this neglect, while also pointing towards the new interventions on the subject that are collected in this anthology.

There are complex reasons why the various waves of migrations of German-speaking artists to Britain, from the mid-1920s through to the postwar period, have not received much attention. The first has to do with the dominance of Hollywood in film historical accounts, which has given prominence to the exodus of European film artists to the United States. Numerous studies since the 1970s have charted the trajectories of German-speaking (and other European) film personnel to Los Angeles, especially after 1933, and their eventual integration or failure within the studio

system.[5] A succession of scholars has traced the legacy of 'mittel-European' émigrés either through high-profile biographical trajectories (e.g., Ernst Lubitsch, Marlene Dietrich, Fritz Lang, Billy Wilder, and Peter Lorre),[6] or in terms of specific genres such as film noir.[7] Other studies have documented how Hollywood became a dead end for formerly successful or promising filmmakers, including directors Joe May, Reinhold Schünzel, E.A. Dupont, Richard Oswald, and Gustav Machaty.[8]

Thus, emigration in film historical terms has been mostly associated with the lure of Hollywood as the focal point or as the crucible of the global film business. This perception gains even more strength given the fact that indeed many relocations within Europe during the 1930s often only marked an intermediate stopover for émigrés who would continue and usually end their journey (by the outbreak of the Second World War at the latest) in the USA. In terms of the sheer volume of individuals, the dominance of this particular stream of migration is thus undoubtedly justified. However, as a result of the overwhelming focus on Hollywood, a whole range of other, and culturally significant, migratory processes and cultural exchanges, some permanent and some more temporary, have been ignored.[9]

Exiles or Emigrés?

The assessment of the legacy of émigrés is complicated by the very definition of the word 'émigré'. This umbrella term has been used in film historical accounts, sometimes too indiscriminately, for a range of quite different existential experiences, encompassing purely economically motivated, brief and voluntary production trips between countries, extended and often permanent periods of enforced exile and personal reinvention, and a number of ambiguous cases in between. For an accurate assessment of émigré activities it is essential to differentiate their place within wider paradigms, such as sociopolitical events and developments (e.g., the migrations from and within Central and Eastern Europe prior, during and after the First World War; and the rise of fascism and ethnic and political persecution that follow in the 1930s), but also within the parameters of national and transnational economic strategies and policies.

For the film historian, it is important not to conflate these contexts too readily, as the aims and requirements associated with politics and economics may indeed sometimes coincide, but may on occasion also pull in different directions. As I have argued in a previous essay, the history of European cinema has frequently been 'characterised by two simultaneous yet diverging processes, namely the film industries' economic imperative of international expansion, competition and cooperation (often accompanied by a migration of labour), and the ideological project of re-centring the definition of national cinema through critical and public discourse, and film policy'.[10]

The case of British cinema from the 1920s through to the 1940s, and its shifting relations with other film industries in Europe as well as with Hollywood, is particularly instructive in this respect. As several scholars have suggested, the deliberate adoption of internationalist principles, looking across the English Channel for artistic inspiration and technological innovation and training, and across the Atlantic for economic success and potential distribution markets, was key to the resurgence of the British film industry in the second half of the 1920s and the mid-1930s, and resulted in a busy transnational traffic of production strategies, generic formulae and personnel.[11]

The same period, however, saw the emergence of protectionist measures, such as the introduction of national quotas in the 1927 Cinematograph Act (designed primarily to stem the growing influence of Hollywood), and from the early 1930s the attempts by the film technicians' union, the Association of Cine-Technicians (ACT), to block and prevent the employment of foreigners in British studios (a policy that was primarily aimed at continental technicians).[12] It is against this context of contradictory forces impacting on the film industry that émigré activity in Britain during this period needs to be seen, while it is also important to acknowledge that the exchange and migration of film personnel was well established before the Nazis' rise to power initiated a far more urgent and existentially motivated wave of emigration.

Extending the time frame of émigré activity back into the 1920s allows one to recognise filmmakers and artists who, within the parameters of reciprocal arrangements between national film industries, travelled between, and made films in, different countries. Such an understanding would encompass on the British side temporary 'émigrés' such as Alfred Hitchcock who made his first films in Germany in 1925, but also Graham Cutts, Ivor Novello, Henry Edwards, Mabel Poulton, Warwick Ward, Robert Stevenson and a host of other names, all of whom were filming at one time or another in German studios. Michael Powell, meanwhile, began his career at about the same time working for American director Rex Ingram in the South of France. To these names one could add the British-born actors Lilian Harvey or Jack Trevor, who predominantly worked in German cinema. Arriving from the continent were figures such as the directors E.A. Dupont, Arthur Robison and Paul Czinner; actresses including Anny Ondra, Pola Negri, Olga Chekhova and Lya de Putti; cinematographers Werner Brandes and Theodor Sparkuhl; and set designer Alfred Junge, who made films in Britain in the late 1920s, joining other professionals who were arriving from the United States.

In a previous article I referred to this category of film personnel as 'commercial travellers'.[13] Such purely industry-determined migrations extended to some extent from the late 1920s until the late 1930s, reaching its peak during the years of multilingual sound film production early to mid-decade, which is mapped in this volume by Chris Wahl's essay on

Ufa's English-language projects.[14] However, from 1933 onwards, the term émigré became more prominently associated with the experience of exile, as numerous film artists were forced to leave Nazi Germany, and subsequently other European countries, to escape persecution on racial and/or political grounds. The commercial two-way traffic of the late 1920s thus gradually turned into a forceful one-way exodus, with the number of émigrés in the British film industry in the late 1930s and 1940s rising to around 400, a significant amount considering the size of the British film industry.

Again, it is necessary to distinguish between individual cases, as the emerging differences often challenge a straightforward historical narrative of a clear-cut caesura, or normative experiences of exile. As a part of the close relationship between the German and British film industries in the 1920s and 1930s, a number of German-speaking filmmakers working on Anglo-German co-productions or multilingual versions of the early sound period later became established in the film industry of the Third Reich, including cinematographer Robert Baberske (*A Knight in London*, 1929) and Hans Steinhoff (*Nachtgestalten/The Alley Cat*, 1929), the latter one of the most prominent directors of Nazi propaganda films and prestige productions from 1933 onwards. Although far less common than before 1933, German film personnel continued coming to Britain on purely professional temporary visits for the remainder of the decade (often under contract with Korda), including cinematographers Franz Weihmayr, Sepp Allgeier, and Hans Schneeberger.

Other film artists, however, such as the set designers Alfred Junge or Oscar Werndorff, may originally have moved to Britain for economic reasons, but they effectively changed into political exiles after 1933 when a return to Germany became a definitive impossibility. They thus shared the same fate, though not the same professional status, as those filmmakers who entered Britain as refugees. Indeed, while many of the émigrés of the late 1920s could attain a relatively stable position within the British studios, for later émigrés the situation looked far bleaker. Influential studio positions such as the one Alfred Junge enjoyed at Gaumont-British and later at M-G-M British, or the public profile of émigré actors such as Conrad Veidt, Elisabeth Bergner, Richard Tauber, Anton Walbrook or Lilli Palmer remained relatively isolated occurrences in the British film industry of the 1930s and 1940s.

In some cases, exile could spell the end of one's career altogether. Brigitte Mayr's moving account in this volume of the screenwriter Carl Mayer's years in British exile documents one of the more tragic examples in this respect. Penniless and unemployed, the celebrated creator of Robert Wiene's *Das Cabinet des Dr. Caligari* (1920) and F.W. Murnau's *Sunrise* (1927) could in his final years at least rely on the kindness and pity of his British friends. Kevin Gough-Yates has previously pointed to similar destinies of formerly celebrated artists of Weimar stage and screen, including the

directors Leo Lasko and Max Mack.[15] Meanwhile, not even established industry figures such as Junge were immune from being interned as 'enemy aliens' following the outbreak of the Second World War, let alone artists who were less settled at this moment in time, such as another Powell and Pressburger stalwart, Hein Heckroth, who was temporarily deported to Australia.

In between those 'who had to flee' and those 'who stayed' were, especially during the 1930s, a number of more ambiguous career trajectories. Actress Lilian Harvey and the Czech-born cinematographer Franz Planer, for example, continued prolific pan-European careers until the late 1930s, which significantly included working for the Nazi film industry. Planer's credits in Britain included Vistor Saville's *The Dictator* (1935) and Curtis Bernhardt's *The Beloved Vagabond* (1936), while in Germany he worked until 1937 with directors such as Gustaf Gründgens and Carl Froelich. As Michael Omasta in his essay in this book notes, the cinematographer Günther Krampf returned in 1935 from Britain to Nazi Germany to shoot Gustav Ucicky's *Das Mädchen Johanna* (Joan of Arc). Harvey made her last film in Germany in 1939 (see Chris Wahl's chapter in this volume). That same year, she fled to Hollywood via France while Planer and his Jewish wife also sought safety in the USA. They were part of a final wave of émigrés that included directors Douglas Sirk and Frank Wysbar. There were some last-minute émigrés to Britain too, including the Czech actor Karel (Karl) Stepanek, who had appeared in German productions up to the outbreak of the Second World War, and who from 1942 became one of the most reliable foreign villains in British films.

It is worth remembering in this context that although the German film industry introduced racial exclusion policies almost immediately after the Nazis took control and summarily dismissed the overwhelming majority of Jewish film personnel (including such prominent figures as the producer Erich Pommer), until the late 1930s policies of exclusion on ethnic or political grounds were applied expediently. In the early years of the regime, Jewish or half-Jewish directors such as Kurt (Curtis) Bernhardt or Reinhold Schünzel (who both eventually emigrated to Hollywood) were given special permission not only to direct films in Germany, but also to provide with their work an illusion of continuity from Weimar cinema in terms of visual style and urbanely modern narratives.[16] Prior to his emigration to London (via Hollywood, an unusual trajectory), Anton Walbrook was (as Adolf Wohlbrück) an established matinee idol of German-speaking productions until 1936.

A particularly ambiguous case is the career of producer Günter Stapenhorst during the 1930s and 1940s. A lifetime personal friend of Emeric Pressburger, he did not face any personal threats from the Nazis on either political or racial grounds; indeed he had endeared himself to the regime by producing two of the most nationalistic films at Ufa in the early 1930s, *Morgenrot* (Dawn, 1933) and *Flüchtlinge* (Refugees, 1933). As a

former 'old school' naval officer, however, Stapenhorst (reputedly a model for Anton Walbrook's Theo Kretschmar-Schuldorff in Pressburger's 1943 *The Life and Death of Colonel Blimp*) refused to join the Nazi Party and emigrated to Britain in 1935.

Working for Korda, he produced Milton Rosmer and Geoffrey Barkas' *The Great Barrier* (1937), with an uncredited contribution to the screenplay by Pressburger. The film was an adventure spectacle about the building of the Canadian Pacific Railway that featured the exile actress Lilli Palmer, but was photographed by Sepp Allgeier, previously one of the principal cameramen on Leni Riefenstahl's *Triumph des Willens* (Triumph of the Will, 1935). Stapenhorst's other contribution to British cinema was *The Challenge* (1938), a remake of Luis Trenker's mountaineering drama *Der Berg ruft* (The Mountain Calls, 1937), a film that in its German version displayed explicit nationalist tendencies. After a failed attempt to return to Germany in the late 1930s, Stapenhorst spent the war years in neutral Switzerland, supporting and employing genuine exiles, but also surreptitiously receiving financial support from the Nazi film industry, which brought him under suspicion of espionage.[17]

Stapenhorst's biography illustrates the murky distinctions between a more traditional form of German nationalism and National Socialism, and the rather dubious importation of at best ambivalent ideological messages into British cinema; and it helps to disperse the assumption that all exiles and émigré technicians working in Britain prior to the Second World War were politically on the left (although some, such as the cinematographer Wolfgang Suschitzky, or the set designer Ernö Metzner, indisputably were).

There were, of course, numerous émigrés who actively campaigned during the 1930s against fascism, German nationalism, and anti-Semitism, and who subsequently made significant contributions to Britain's war effort, both on-screen and off. It is no coincidence that some of the most prominent attacks on Hitler's Germany in British cinema during the 1930s (as far as this was possible given the stringent restrictions by the British censorship board, BBFC), including Lothar Mendes' *Jew Süss* (1934) and Karl Grune's *Abdul the Damned* (1935),[18] were made by film teams comprising a high proportion of émigrés, including the non-Jewish Conrad Veidt who through his role in *Jew Süss* effectively and very publicly declared his rejection of the Nazi regime. As Gerd Gemünden in his essay on Veidt in this book demonstrates, this not only earned the star the status of a *persona non grata* in the eyes of the Nazis, but also placed him in genuine danger during his final visit to Germany in 1934. During the Second World War, émigrés supported the war effort by playing Nazi villains in, or contributing in other technical capacities to, British propaganda productions (feature films as well as documentaries), or making German-language broadcasts for the BBC's German service. Tobias Hochscherf's essay in this volume provides a number of examples of such activities.

Finally, there is the generation of émigrés in British cinema that emerges after 1945, comprising genuine exiles who fled as very young children or young adults and who either began to make their mark in the British film industry after the war (the James Bond set designer Ken Adam is a prominent example), or returned to Germany (such as the later stage and film director Peter Zadek), alongside a new succession of professional travellers who have moved across the Channel from the 1950s to the present for a variety of reasons.[19]

All these very diverse examples raise fundamental questions for an assessment of émigrés within British cinema. For example, a simplistic celebration of the creative transnational imagination of émigré production across different decades could be accused of ignoring the crucial differences in actual lived experience that I mapped above; and it might well end up underestimating or glossing over the sometimes traumatic dimension of diasporic biographies. Conversely, approaches that are exclusively concerned with the tragic aspects of the exile's condition and that lament a loss of culture are in danger of perpetuating narratives of victimisation and of unproblematically stable categories of belonging. Such narratives can be seen to disallow the possibility of individual resilience, personal as well as creative reinvention, and they deny the (at least for some individuals) positive potential of cultural adaptation and change. As Gerd Gemünden argues in his chapter in this volume:

> [R]esearch on exiled artists has long emphasised the significance of the disabling, paralysing, and traumatic dimension of exile, but has mostly neglected to consider the more productive dimension that forced displacement and disorientation can create.[20]

Exile studies is often more interested in the nature and consequences of exile as an existential condition than in questions of aesthetic influence. From this perspective the émigré's work is of interest where it engages with or reflects the exilic experience. In studies on film exile there consequently has been a tendency to prioritise the biographical/personal dimension over the aesthetic, professional and economic. This has to be understood both as an act of ongoing resistance against the political forces that aimed to displace the respective biographies in the first place, and as a commitment towards acknowledgement and remembrance. Thus, the process of discovering forgotten careers, and of giving a voice and afterlife to destroyed, interrupted or redirected careers is part and parcel of creating a wider picture of exilic experience that extends beyond the narrow concerns of film history.

For the film historian, on the other hand, the social and existential dimension of exile is important primarily where it impacts on wider patterns of a national film culture. The fact that the number of émigrés in the British film industry increased dramatically after 1933, for example, does not necessarily entail that the actual influence of émigrés increased

accordingly. Determining 'influence' is notoriously complex. In the sense of meaning popularity, it can be assessed by economic data, in other words, what films, stars and directors attained the greatest number of audiences. At the level of production it can encompass an effect on specific studio practices (e.g., technological innovations, management and organisation), a training function for younger personnel (i.e., British technicians learning from European cinematographers or set designers), but it can also mean determining a film's visual style and its narrative content.

As far as the 'influence' on narrative content and style is concerned, one needs to ask how far 'authorial' control among émigrés actually extended. In the case of relatively independently working filmmakers such as Emeric Pressburger, an exilic perspective is perhaps most easily identified.[21] In other cases, such an approach may be more difficult. Thus, while it is legitimate to point to émigrés' personal investment in contributing to wartime propaganda (e.g., as a way of demonstrating loyalty to their host country), assumptions about their ability to exert influence on the content and narrative of their respective films often overestimate the position of émigrés within studio hierarchies. This is not to say that tracing an émigré 'sensibility' is impossible. In this volume, the contributions by Gerd Gemünden and Michael Williams on Conrad Veidt and Anton Walbrook exemplify analytical approaches that identify a particularly exilic 'inflection' in the respective stars' performance style.

To reiterate, then, individual, economic, political and cultural contexts constitute a complex and sometime contradictory force field that determines the assessment of exiles in British cinema; and it is crucial to realise that none of the different markers by which one could measure their influence (economic success, technological know-how, stylistic legacies, audience popularity, or narrative/political content) necessarily need to overlap or coincide at any given time.

Emigrés and National Film Histories

As we have seen, by the very nature of their cultural background and career trajectory, émigrés destabilise fixed notions of national identity. As a result their disjointed biographies and creative efforts (dispersed across two, or more, cultural contexts) have often fallen through the net of standard narratives of national cinemas, presented at best as a parallel history that can never be totally integrated into the mainstream of the national canon.

In an influential essay, Jan-Christopher Horak has pointed to the difficulties histories of cinema have had in situating émigré activity within national boundaries.[22] In Germany, particularly in the West, it took a long time after the end of the Second World War for the contributions and experience of exile filmmakers to be acknowledged. References to émigré

artists during the 1950s and 1960s frequently glossed over their fate under the Nazis, skipped the years 1933 to 1945 altogether, or euphemistically presented their departure from Germany in retrospect as a voluntary career choice.[23] Moreover, émigrés to the United States frequently faced criticism for having succumbed during their time in Hollywood to brash American populism, and were thus seen as part and parcel of an unwanted postwar American colonisation of Germany.[24] Some émigrés, the most prominent example being Marlene Dietrich, encountered open hostility on their return to Germany for having 'betrayed' their country during the Second World War.

Emigrés to Britain received little attention within discourses on German cinema, while most of the wider studies of artistic exile to Britain have originated with British or British-based scholars.[25] The émigré background of the few exiles to Britain who managed to reestablish a career in postwar Germany (mainly the West) or who maintained a dual career between the United Kingdom and the Continent (e.g., actors such as Lilli Palmer, Albert Lieven, Lucie Mannheim and Walter Rilla, or the set designer Hein Heckroth) was frequently overlooked. Since the 1970s, Germany has witnessed a veritable academic industry of exile studies, yet the problem of how to reconcile narratives of German cinema and exile trajectories persists. Horak's above-mentioned essay represents one particular approach to the historical integration of exile. For Horak exile constitutes an integral part of a comprehensive history of German cinema, and is chronologically placed between a chapter on Weimar cinema and one on National Socialism. He argues that

> the history of exile film must not be considered as a peripheral aspect of the national canon of individual countries of exile; it needs to be seen as part of German film history, running parallel to the film of the 'Third Reich', as a piece of film culture associated with a non-fascist, 'other Germany'.[26]

Horak distinguishes between 'exile films' as a temporary generic category, valid for the duration of the Third Reich, as long as there was no possibility of a 'free German film production', and 'film exile', which in the case of many individual émigrés became a more permanent, and often life-long condition. It is precisely the latter term that marks the gradual transition towards the adoption by the émigré of a new national identity, which however never fully loses all traces of its former cultural formation. Between the poles of Horak's proposal to integrate émigré activity into the national canon, and postwar Germany's attempts to keep émigrés out of it, more recent studies have attempted to use the narrative of exile and émigrés as a means of challenging the concept of national cinema itself. Nationally discrete film histories are opened up in terms of their relation to other film cultures, transnational migration, and to the wider context of a global film industry.[27]

As with discourses on German cinema, British film historiography has in the past often avoided addressing the complex processes of cultural exchange and exile in favour of simpler and culturally 'purist' historical narratives. This striving for exclusivity has to be partly understood, as scholars such as Charles Barr and Alan Lovell have argued, as a reaction against a longstanding and unjustified international perception of British cinema as artistically insignificant.[28] On the other hand, Kevin Gough-Yates has pointed to an equally long tradition within Britain of underestimating or denigrating foreign contributions to the national canon.[29] One can find the origins of this tradition in the sometimes virulently xenophobic attacks on émigré filmmakers and producers (particularly Alexander Korda and Max Schach) in Graham Greene's film reviews of the 1930s,[30] which mark the beginning of an all too familiar rhetoric that equates a serious, and nationally pure (and overwhelmingly masculine) British cinema with 'realism', whereas commercial, popular genres (particularly those of the 1930s and 1940s) were seen to be tainted by their association with both feminine tastes and with the foreign, the latter of which was not infrequently portrayed as an 'invasion'.[31]

An apparent division between a nationally rooted realism and a foreign-influenced populism in British films continues to inform the public perception of the national cinema to the present day. Even scholars who have questioned the supposed superiority of the realist canon and who champion non-realist traditions on the whole accept this division. Among the most notable examples of such interventions is the feminist reassessment since the 1980s of Gainsborough's melodramas, and of historical costume drama more generally.[32] Yet a distinction between realist and non-realist strands in British cinema, at least as far as émigré involvement is concerned, is rarely clear-cut. Foreign filmmakers and personnel prior, during and after the war could be found contributing to the documentary tradition (e.g., the cinematographer Wolf Suschitzky, or the composer Ernst Meyer) as much as to melodrama (e.g., the composer Hans May). (See Geoff Brown's chapter in this volume). Alan Lovell has convincingly argued against a discourse that separates realist and non-realist traditions in British film history, suggesting that 'contemporary scholarship has fallen into a trap by posing excess and restraint against each other. British cinema is often most exciting when restraint and excess interact'.[33]

As I have argued elsewhere, the coding of 'foreign' influence in British cinema as 'non-realist', 'excessive' or 'Expressionist' not only homogenises the range of aesthetic approaches among exile filmmakers, but also resorts to reductive assumptions about the nature of foreign versus indigenous film styles.[34] After all, realist traditions were and are hardly exclusive to British cinema; indeed, many of Britain's avowed documentarists had themselves been influenced in the late 1920s by realist filmmakers from Russia, Germany and France. The preferences of the socialist critic,

historian and filmmaker Paul Rotha provide an interesting test case in this respect. An admirer of German cinema (and, as Brigitte Mayr's chapter in this book outlines, a supportive personal friend of Carl Mayer, he was also one of the founding figures of the documentary movement in British cinema.

Rotha had no difficulties in reconciling non-realist and realist traditions as well as foreign and indigenous styles. The real schism for him was between commercial mass culture on one hand and 'quality' art cinema on the other; and the ultimate aim was to strategically promote the production and distribution in Britain of films with an educational, artistic, and socially engaged remit.[35] In his major historical survey, *The Film Till Now*, Rotha did take continental filmmakers working in the UK in the 1920s and 1930s to task for 'failing to understand British temperament and trying to mix German psychology with British bourgeois unintelligence'.[36] Yet it is clear from this waspish comment that his real target was less the émigré, but the – in his view – mediocre state of a class-driven and middlebrow British culture at the time.

Historical narratives persist that pit émigré activity (seen as either refreshingly non-realist or alternatively as weird and alien, depending on one's critical agenda) against an unproblematised indigenous canon; and such narratives can be found in academic discussions as much as in more populist representations. An example of the latter is Matthew Sweet's television documentary *Silent Britain* (2006), co-produced by the BBC and the British Film Institute. Sweet's approach marks a refreshing departure from the highbrow assessment of British realist cinema as the pinnacle of national achievement. To that extent, he can be congratulated for promoting a 'forgotten' and 'underrated' history.[37] At the same time he maintains suspicious of foreign influence, demonstrating that in discourses on British cinema foreigners can conveniently function both as pedlars of populist Eurotrash (as Greene perceived it) and as role models for an un-British, elitist art cinema.

In Sweet's version, British cinema drew primarily on native cultural references, and provided a staunch defence of British values and traditions in the face of an economic threat from Hollywood and the more insidious cultural infiltration from the continent. There is no mention here that already in the earliest years of cinema, British film pioneers were actively pursuing international contacts;[38] no mention either of early incursions of foreign companies into Britain, including two that would later transform into genuine British enterprises, Gaumont and Pathé.

Whereas for the earliest periods the omission of cross-national exchanges between Britain and continental Europe may be explained as a way of keeping the story simple, in Sweet's discussion of developments in the 1920s his bias towards national exclusivity comes to the fore. Thus, a German influence on Alfred Hitchcock (difficult to ignore altogether)[39] is summarily dismissed, discounting the fact that the director himself

acknowledged this influence throughout his career. Similarly, viewers of *Silent Britain* are not told that many of the major directors and stars feted by Sweet as local heroes, including Graham Cutts, Henry Edwards, Guy Newall, Joan Morgan, Ivor Novello, Betty Balfour, and Miles Mander, worked on films that were either made in continental studios or produced in collaboration with European partners. Not much mention either that the Film Society, led by the committed internationalists Ivor Montagu and Adrian Brunel, provided an additional forum for foreign films and their specific stylistic innovations to be disseminated and discussed in Britain.[40]

Far from being an insular cultural backwater, Britain during the 1920s was keen to engage with European and wider international trends in culture and intellectual thought, as well as with more specific cinematic innovations and developments from abroad. Yet instead of celebrating this cosmopolitanism, Sweet champions the ideal of a Little Englander film culture. It comes as no surprise that although E.A. Dupont's *Piccadilly* (1929) and Arthur Robison's *The Informer* (1929) are justifiably hailed as masterpieces of late British silent film, unlike any of Sweet's other film examples, the non-British directors alongside other continental collaborators on these productions remain nameless.

The real villains of Sweet's narrative, however, are British 'cinema intellectuals'. He specifically singles out the critics associated with the magazine *Close Up*, who, in Sweet's words, 'wrote gushing fan letters to foreign directors, while dismissing the work of British film directors as third-rate and uninspired'. This argument creates simplistic dichotomies between filmmakers and critics, and between the terms 'British' and 'foreign'. Thus, some of the unnamed *Close Up* critics, including Rotha and John Grierson, in fact were or became significant British filmmakers themselves. Grierson, in particular, was hardly writing fan letters to foreign directors, certainly not gushing ones. In 1927, he considered the imitation of German styles by British directors 'a fallacy and a very dangerous one'.[41]

It is true that *Close Up* celebrated the work of Pabst and Eisenstein, but it was far less enamoured of popular imports from the continent.[42] It was also highly critical of the collaboration between continental and British filmmakers, as its harsh review of Dupont's *Piccadilly* attests to, which specifically criticised the film's multinational film crew.[43] Thus, while there is scope to criticise the elitist scope and limitations of *Close Up*'s aesthetic criteria, there is a a more complex attitude at work towards the place of the 'foreign' in British cinema than Sweet gives the magazine and its writers credit for.

It might seem churlish and ungracious to berate an all too rare attempt to promote the history of (especially silent) British film in the popular media, whatever its flaws and generalisations may be. Nevertheless, *Silent Britain*'s parochialism is symptomatic of a latent hostility in Britain towards cultural cosmopolitanism that was already much in evidence in

the 1920s and 1930s, as Amy Sargeant's chapter in this book documents. Sweet's TV programme demonstrates how foreign, and particularly European, contributions to British cinema continue to be almost instinctually negated.

Emigrés and British Cinema: Whose Cultural Imaginary?

Over the past two decades, academic research has witnessed British film historiography focusing on questions of national identity, or, to be more precise, specifically on 'Englishness'.[44] On the whole, this emphasis is quite different from the perspective that *Silent Britain* exemplifies. Taking note of the devolution of Britain and acknowledging the ongoing regionalisation of Europe within the framework of wider globalisation processes, studies associated with this approach have overall avoided the homogenising tendencies of previous national film histories, and replaced them with nuanced arguments concerning the relationship between the national, the regional and the foreign. In this respect, studies on English cinema have been complemented by studies on the 'Scottishness' of Scottish films, by histories of Welsh cinema, and by the relations between Ireland, Britain and Europe.[45]

One of the most sophisticated recent studies representing this focus on English cinema is Christine Gledhill's *Reframing British Cinema 1918–1928. Between Restraint and Passion*.[46] Arguing for a 'locatedness of art practices' within discourses and traditions of nationhood, Gledhill provides a particularly useful suggestion for reconciling transnational traffic and local impact:

> If notions such as 'cultural poetics', 'horizon of expectation' or 'cultural imaginary' hold any force, then ideas and practices crossing national and cultural boundaries are subject to locally conditioned uses and interpretations even as they contribute to shifting, expanding, or contracting the frames within which local cultural practices operate.[47]

Gledhill's notion of Englishness in British cinema, then, functions less as an inherent characteristic or stable identity, but rather as a local negotiation of cultural practices that embraces cultural exchange, and thus also appears to be able to encompass the contribution of the émigré. It is interesting that one of Gledhill's main theoretical references is the work of a Jewish-German exile, the Leipzig-born art historian Nikolaus Pevsner's *The Englishness of English Art* (originally delivered as a BBC Reith lecture in 1955).[48] One can speculate whether Pevsner's investment in stable national roots of artistic expression was motivated by his own biographical experience, but his lecture – and his encyclopaedic assessment of English art and architecture in their regional variations – certainly demonstrate that some of the most articulate definitions of national identity, culture

and history are formulated by the immigrant or the exile (see also Amy Sargeant's discussion of Pevsner in her chapter in this volume).

Given the inclusivity of Gledhill's theoretical framework, however, it is disappointing that when it comes to cinematic examples, her book once again omits the contributions by émigré filmmakers. This may in part be due to her schematic differentiation between 'American filmmaking' (continuity cinema) and 'continental modernism', with 'English pictorialism' as a distinctive aesthetic running parallel to both. But while Gledhill acknowledges the exportability of some features of British cinema (especially acting conventions), there is much less discussion on whether the indigenous aesthetic itself is hybrid and the result of cultural mixing. Amy Sargeant has pointed out that Gledhill's book has 'scant regard for international cooperation as a conscious policy to secure screenings for British films abroad and to enhance their popular and critical standing at home'.[49]

Justifying her choice of case studies, Gledhill argues that she wanted 'to avoid cherrypicking the few titles already feted in the British historical canon: the silent Hitchcocks, the Duponts and Asquiths'.[50] Yet while it is true that Hitchcock and Asquith's films of the late 1920s have indeed been discussed previously, where is the extensive literature on Dupont or, for that matter, Robison or Bolvary; and where are the émigrés (once again, later exceptions such as Pressburger and Korda excluded) 'feted in the historical canon'?[51] If one takes the major academic surveys from the late 1990s as a measure of what constitutes the canon in British cinema, one finds that in 1997 Dupont's *Piccadilly* was still too obscure to feature in Sarah Street's first edition of *British National Cinema*, making a brief, but hardly extensive appearance in an article on BIP by Tom Ryall in Robert Murphy's *British Cinema Book*, and only latterly gaining in prominence in Amy Sargeant's *British Cinema. A Critical History*, following the film's restoration, high-profile recommendation from Martin Scorsese, and re-release by the British Film Institute on DVD.[52] As noted above, by the time of *Silent Britain*, *Piccadilly* had become an apparently unauthored masterpiece of 1920s British film. In the sleeve notes of the BFI's DVD edition of *Piccadilly*, Ian Christie comes closer to the mark when he suggests:

> Arguably, internationalism has been the true strength of British cinema; and this sumptuous revival allows us to discover an almost forgotten moment when London seemed to be the capital of European cinema.[53]

Towards a Transnational History of British Cinema

One influential approach of assessing the intersections between the national and the international is the concept of an 'accented' cinema.[54] The work of Iranian-American film theorist Hamid Naficy has become a major reference point for many recent studies of exiles, émigrés, and cultural exchanges in cinema. In this volume both Gerd Gemünden and Tobias

Hochscherf cite his ideas.[55] His study posits that the emergence of a new exilic or diasporic cinema is primarily a post-1945 phenomenon. Naficy sees exile cinema as a consequence of 'Third World decolonization, wars of national liberation, the Soviet Union's invasion of Poland and Czechoslovakia, Westernization, and a kind of "internal decolonization" in the West itself'.[56]

Couched in an *auteurist* discourse, informed by postcolonial theory, and resolutely committed to alternative or art cinema practices, Naficy's book provides many useful insights on how an exile filmmaker's work can be stylistically informed by their own biographical background, and how it can intersect with diasporic communities and networks. At the same time, one has to be cautious about how far his model can be extended retrospectively to production practices and career trajectories in the first half of the twentieth century. Naficy's insistence on relative authorial autonomy, for example, does not easily fit the working conditions in British, European or Hollywood studios of the 1930s and 1940s, because the majority of émigrés prior to 1945 did not work on art cinema productions, but more often on popular genre films. These, however, rarely fit Naficy's suggestion that an accented cinema can be understood as a countercurrent to the mainstream. Identifying 'embedded criticism' as a cornerstone of an accented style, Naficy argues:

> By its artisanal and collective mode of production, its subversion of the conventions of storytelling and spectator positioning, its crucial juxtaposition of different worlds, languages, and cultures, and its aesthetics of imperfection and smallness, it critiques dominant cinema.[57]

Although Naficy qualifies this statement by saying that accented films are not necessarily politically progressive, it is problematic to simply import his definitions to production practices of the 1930s and 1940s. To give an example, the films of exile Alexander Korda in the 1930s did not adopt an 'artisanal' aesthetic of 'smallness and imperfection' – in fact, they specifically attempted to compete with Hollywood in the field of big-budget spectacles in order to gain a foothold in the US market.[58] Also, Korda's glorification of British imperialism hardly constitutes a politically marginal position. His productions are thus not immediately conducive to the kind of postcolonial subversion that Naficy's own case studies suggest; indeed many of them, for example *Sanders of the River* (1935), represent the pinnacle of colonial discourse itself. Nevertheless, despite or even because of their adherence to the ideological and the artistic mainstream, there is scope to explore films by the Kordas and indeed by other émigrés of the period according to some of Naficy's 'accented' motifs that mark them as the work of exiles: for example in terms of storytelling and spectator positioning, their insistent articulation of themes of nationhood, and their juxtaposition of public and private histories.

Elsewhere I have proposed understanding transnationalism in cinema not as a recent phenomenon, nor as a practice that is necessarily marginal or alternative, either in political, aesthetic or commercial terms, but rather as a succession of persistent exchanges that have characterised film history from its very beginning.[59] More crucially, and in this respect I echo Gledhill's earlier quotation, I argue that transnationalism always needs to encompass a dialogue between transitoriness and location, and between émigrés and hosts, and involve a process that blurs and ultimately dissolves the boundaries between these oppositions.

Destination London: German-speaking Emigrés and British Cinema, 1925–50

The subsequent chapters will engage in varying degrees with the issues and debates outlined in the previous pages, although not all of the contributors necessarily share my theoretical premises or conclusions. The essays in this volume, the majority of which were originally presented as papers at an international conference at the University of Southampton in July 2005, deliberately comprise a diversity of approaches that can be applied to the subject, ranging from biographical studies to cultural and industrial contextualisations, as well as close textual readings. They encompass – and allow comparisons between – perspectives and prevailing perceptions from different national contexts (Germany, Austria, the United States and Britain) and different disciplines (musicology, exile history and film studies). The émigrés discussed in this volume include directors and cinematographers, set designers and composers, actors and writers, as well as specific German and British production companies. Of these various professional groups, it is primarily the cinematographers and set designers whose influence on British cinema has previously been acknowledged.[60]

The present anthology does not claim, nor could it realistically achieve, comprehensiveness. Although some of the names covered in this anthology are well known (e.g., Conrad Veidt or Alfred Junge), the contributions of others discussed here have barely been recognised in previous accounts, despite the fact that some of these individuals worked on major British productions. This collection explicitly does not want to create the impression that all émigrés managed to have a marked influence on the direction of British filmmaking. Laurie Ede's essay on Ernö Metzner and Brigitte Mayr's study of Carl Mayer in particular demonstrate the inability of some émigrés to integrate or to find employment, and as a not infrequent experience this fact needs to be documented. Conversely, we felt that the two most prominent and influential émigrés in the British cinema canon, Emeric Pressburger and Alexander Korda, had been amply as well as ably discussed in previous accounts. Thus, although their names come up repeatedly (for example in the essays by Tobias Hochscherf and

K.J. Donnelly), there are no specific chapters devoted to them. In any case, given the extent and volume of film émigrés working or living in Britain during the 1930s and 1940s in particular (numbering in the hundreds across these two decades), any anthology on this topic can inevitably only provide a snapshot of a few individuals.

The contributions in this volume are structured chronologically and in thematic clusters. The essays by Tim Bergfelder, Lawrence Napper, Chris Wahl and Kelly Robinson are all concerned with the early period of exchange between Britain and the German film industry. While Bergfelder and Robinson analyse respectively the work of director E.A. Dupont and cinematographer Werner Brandes in the context of the British studio system in the late 1920s, Napper and Wahl discuss 'British' productions made in German studios. Napper's study of Geza von Bolvary's *The Ghost Train* (1927) demonstrates how British reviews camouflaged the film's hybrid production context in order to make it more appealing to British audiences. Wahl's essay, meanwhile, is concerned with Ufa's short-lived strategy in the early sound period of making English-language versions of their box office hits, and analyses the input from British production personnel (in particular the script-doctor and later director Robert Stevenson) in the process. Evaluating the ultimate cultural as well as economic failure of multilingual productions, Wahl points to the technically efficient, but also inflexible organisation of German studios in the early 1930s, the seemingly inevitable national differences in temperament and attitude; and it documents the fascinating and often highly creative attempts by British script-doctors to adapt German narratives for a British market. Despite their eventual discontinuation as a production practice, multilingual versions nevertheless paved the way for subsequent exchanges and film personnel coming to Britain. For while German-made films may not have appealed to large sections of the British audience, British-made films based on continental sources and benefiting from continental technical know-how certainly did.

The contributions by Michael Omasta, Amy Sargeant, Sarah Street, Laurie Ede, Christian Cargnelli, Gerd Gemünden and Michael Williams (and partly Barbara Ziereis) concentrate on developments and individual careers during the 1930s. Omasta's essay on Günther Krampf complements Robinson's piece on Brandes, and demonstrates a distinctive visual imagination at work in Krampf's films in Britain. Sargeant situates émigré activity in the film industry of the 1930s within wider contexts of artistic exchanges and developments in modern design. Drawing in particular on the case of former Bauhaus guru Laszlo Moholy-Nagy, she argues that artistic activity during the 1930s should be seen as an itinerant practice that cannot be contained by singular national developments.

Street and Ede offer contrasting assessments of émigré production designers in 1930s British film. Street makes a persuasive case for the set designer Alfred Junge to be recognised as an important contributor to the

visual style of many British films of the period, significantly enhancing the look and atmosphere of musicals and thrillers, while also transporting ideas about modernity and design trends. Ede's essay on Ernö Metzner, on the other hand, while acknowledging the quality and imagination of some of his British films, comes to the conclusion that his specific working style did not match the practices of the British studio system, which resulted in Metzner leaving Britain for Hollywood.

Christian Cargnelli discusses the work of director Paul L. Stein who, though prolific and successful at the time, has been entirely forgotten by film history. Cargnelli explores the images of Vienna Stein created in his British films, memorably starring fellow exile Richard Tauber. Alongside Tauber and Elisabeth Bergner, Conrad Veidt and Anton Walbrook were the most popular émigré actors working in Britain during the 1930s. They are discussed here respectively by Gemünden and Williams. Both authors detect an émigré inflection in the on- and off-screen personae of the two actors, and suggest how their image underwent significant changes as a result of their move from one country to another.

Lilli Palmer also emerged as a popular actress in the latter half of the 1930s, but unlike Veidt and Walbrook, she had no experience in the continental film industry prior to her arrival in Britain. Ziereis's essay documents the difficulties involved in an unknown émigré actress establishing herself in British cinema, and looks at the range of roles and types she was assigned according to her perceived national background, in particular in films made during the Second World War. In this emphasis, her essay overlaps with the next contribution, focusing on the 1940s: Hochscherf concerns himself with a number of wartime feature films, looking in particular at the contributions by émigré writers and actors, including Emeric Pressburger and Anton Walbrook.

As the chapters by Williams, Gemünden, Ziereis and Hochscherf make clear, linguistic factors, such as a foreign accent and linguistic ability more generally, played an important part in how successful émigré actors became, and what kind of roles they were given. The loss of one's own language was even more acutely felt among writers. Thus, while British cinema throughout the 1930s relied heavily on stories and remakes of films from the continent (comedies, operettas and costume dramas in particular often had continental origins), the number of exiled screenwriters who managed to establish a career for themselves in England is negligible. Emeric Pressburger's success is a notable exception in this respect. Far more representative trajectories are the erratic careers of authors such as Anna Gmeyner (aka Anna Reiner) and Wolfgang Wilhelm, or indeed the dead end mapped for Carl Mayer in Brigitte Mayr's chapter.

The volume concludes with three essays on film composers, bridging the war years and the late 1940s. Geoff Brown's comparison between the divergent and yet complementary careers of Ernst Meyer and Hans May illustrates émigré activity in a range of different genres and production

environments, and in the context of the conflicting demands of serious, politically motivated art versus mass entertainment. K.J. Donnelly sees Allan Gray's score for Powell and Pressburger's Scottish-set *I Know Where I'm Going* (1945) as a crucial element in the film's narrational strategies, and as an example of the importation not only of Scottish idioms, but also of 'Germanic' musical conventions into the repertoire of British cinema. Florian Scheding, meanwhile, makes an interesting case for an émigré inflection in Mátyás Seiber's score for the animated experimental film *The Magic Canvas* (1948).

As suggested previously, to some extent the temporal demarcation of émigré activity and cultural exchange between Britain and Germany between 1925 and 1950 is an artificial one. One could find earlier examples, while some significant émigré careers really only begin in the 1950s. The latter would include the eminently influential émigré producer, writer and director Rudolph Cartier, and his contributions to the development of both quality and popular British television drama, and the set designer Ken Adam, in particular in his work for the James Bond series and for Stanley Kubrick. Meanwhile, as Sarah Street's chapter demonstrates, some prewar careers such as Alfred Junge's very successfully continued into the postwar period. All of these examples (to which one could easily add more) underline the point made earlier in this introduction that émigré activity in British film does not just encompass the 1930s and 1940s, but constitutes an ongoing and productive element in the continual regeneration of British cinema. It is our hope that this collection may not only provide the incentive to consider British cinema in more international (or cosmopolitan) terms, but that it may also trigger the rediscovery of a host of forgotten names, who – in similar ways to the case studies presented here – left their mark on the history of British and global film culture.

Notes

1. See, for instance, 'Deutsche Künstler im englischen Film. Eine vorläufige Bilanz', *Pariser Tageblatt*, 12 December 1934, p. 4; Kevin Gough-Yates, 'The British Feature Film as a European Concern. Britain and the Emigré Film-Maker, 1933–1945', in Günter Berghaus (ed.), *Theatre and Film in Exile. German Artists in Britain, 1933–1945* (Oxford, New York, Munich: Berg, 1989), pp. 135–66; Gough-Yates, 'Exiles and British Cinema', in Robert Murphy (ed.), *The British Cinema Book* (London: BFI, 1997), pp. 104–13.
2. Gough-Yates, 'The British Feature Film as a European Concern', p. 140.
3. Since the rediscovery of The Archers in the late 1960s, an extensive literature on the partnership between Michael Powell and Emeric Pressburger has emerged. Among the best-known publications on the subject are Kevin Gough-Yates, *Michael Powell in Collaboration with Emeric Pressburger* (London: BFI, 1971); Ian Christie, *Arrows of Desire. The Films of Michael Powell and Emeric Pressburger* (London: Waterstone, 1985); Kevin Macdonald, *Emeric Pressburger: The Life and Death of a Screenwriter* (London: Faber and Faber, 1994); and Andrew Moor, *Powell and Pressburger. A Cinema of Magic Spaces* (London: I.B. Tauris, 2005).

4. See Karol Kulik, *Alexander Korda, the Man Who Could Work Miracles* (London: Allen & Unwin, 1975); Charles Drazin, *Korda: The Definitive Biography* (London: Sidgwick & Jackson, 2002).

5. Among the most notable studies are: John Baxter, *The Hollywood Exiles* (New York: Taplinger, 1976); Otto Friedrich, *City of Nets: A Portrait of Hollywood in the 1940s* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1977); Maria Hilchenbach, *Kino im Exil. Die Emigration deutscher Filmkünstler* (Munich: K.G. Saur, 1982); John Russell Taylor, *Strangers in Paradise: The Hollywood Émigrés 1933–1950* (London: Faber and Faber, 1983); *Exil. Sechs Schauspieler aus Deutschland* (Berlin: Stiftung Deutsche Kinemathek, 1983); Jan-Christopher Horak, *Fluchtpunkt Hollywood. Eine Dokumentation zur Filmemigration nach 1933* (Münster: MakS, 1986); Ronny Loewy (ed.), *Von Babelsberg nach Hollywood: Filmemigranten aus Nazideutschland* (Frankfurt am Main: Deutsches Filmmuseum, 1987); Christian Cargnelli and Michael Omasta (eds.), *Aufbruch ins Ungewisse. Österreichische Filmschaffende in der Emigration vor 1945* (Vienna: Wespennest, 1993); Helmut G. Asper, *'Etwas Besseres als den Tod …' Filmexil in Hollywood. Porträts, Filme, Dokumente* (Marburg: Schüren, 2002); Helmut G. Asper, *Filmexilanten im Universal Studio, 1933–1960* (Berlin: Bertz und Fischer, 2005); and Alastair Phillips and Ginette Vincendeau (eds.), *Journeys of Desire. European Actors in Hollywood* (London: BFI, 2006). See also a special edition on 'Film and Exile', edited by Gerd Gemünden and Anton Kaes, in the journal *New German Critique*, no. 89 (Summer 2003).

6. The following titles constitute a small selection of an extensive literature on the subject: Werner Sudendorf (ed.), *Marlene Dietrich* (Frankfurt am Main, Berlin and Vienna: Carl Hanser, 1977); Scott Eyman, *Ernst Lubitsch: Laughter in Paradise* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1993); Cameron Crowe, *Conversations with Wilder* (New York: Alfred Knopf, 1999); Tom Gunning, *The Films of Fritz Lang: Allegories of Vision and Modernity* (London: BFI, 2000); Michael Omasta, Brigitte Mayr and Elisabeth Streit (eds.), *Peter Lorre: Ein Fremder im Paradies* (Vienna: Zsolnay, 2004); Erica Carter, *Dietrich's Ghosts* (London: BFI, 2004); Stephen D. Youngkin, *The Lost One. A Life of Peter Lorre* (Lexington: University of Kentucky Press, 2005); and Gerd Gemünden, *Filmemacher mit Akzent: Billy Wilder in Hollywood* (Vienna: Synema, 2006).

7. See Thomas Elsaesser, 'A German Ancestry to Film Noir?', *Iris*, no. 21 (1996), pp. 129–44; Christian Cargnelli and Michael Omasta (eds.), *Schatten. Exil. Europäische Emigranten im Film Noir* (Vienna: PVS, 1997); Lutz Koepnick, *The Dark Mirror. German Cinema Between Hitler and Hollywood* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002); Tim Bergfelder, 'German Cinema and Film Noir', in Andrew Spicer (ed.), *European Film Noir* (Manchester University Press, 2007), pp. 138–63.

8. Jörg Schöning (ed.), *Reinhold Schünzel. Schauspieler und Regisseur* (Munich: edition text+kritik, 1989); Helga Belach and Wolfgang Jacobsen (eds.), *Richard Oswald. Regisseur und Produzent* (Munich: edition text+kritik, 1990); Hans-Michael Bock and Claudia Lenssen (eds.), *Joe May. Regisseur und Produzent* (Munich: edition text+kritik, 1991); Jürgen Bretschneider (ed.), *Ewald André Dupont. Autor und Regisseur* (Munich: edition text+kritik, 1992); Jürgen Kasten and Armin Loacker (eds.), *Richard Oswald: Kino zwischen Spektakel, Aufklärung und Unterhaltung* (Vienna: Filmarchiv Austria, 2005); and Christian Cargnelli (ed.), *Gustav Machaty. Ein Filmregisseur zwischen Prag und Hollywood* (Vienna: Synema, 2005).

9. An example of particular cultural influence constitutes émigré activity in the French film industry of the 1930s. Cf. Sibylle M. Sturm and Arthur Wohlgemuth (eds.), *Hallo? Berlin? Ici Paris! Deutsch-französische Filmbeziehungen 1918–1939* (Munich: edition text+kritik, 1996); and Alastair Phillips, *City of Darkness, City of Light. Émigré Filmmakers in Paris 1929–1939* (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2004). For migrations between Russia, Germany and France, see Jörg Schöning (ed.), *Fantaisies Russes. Russische Filmmacher in Berlin und Paris 1920–1930* (Munich: edition text+kritik, 1995). German-speaking emigration to the Netherlands is explored in Kathinka Dittrich van Weringh, *Der niederländische Spielfilm der dreißiger Jahre und die deutsche Filmemigration* (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1987), while the work of exiles in 1930s Austria has been analysed in Armin

Loacker (ed.), *Unerwünschtes Kino: Der deutschsprachige Emigrantenfilm 1934–1937* (Vienna: Filmarchiv Austria, 2000). A range of other migratory trajectories, including to Mexico and China, were covered in articles in the unfortunately now defunct journal *FilmExil* (1992–2004). See also a number of essays in Erwin Rotermund and Lutz Winckler (eds.), *Exilforschung. Ein internationales Jahrbuch, Band 21: Film und Fotografie* (Munich: edition text+kritik, 2003).

10. Tim Bergfelder, 'The Nation Vanishes', in Mette Hjort and Scott Mackenzie (eds), *Cinema and Nation* (London and New York: Routledge, 2000), p. 139.

11 See Jeffrey Richards (ed.), *The Unknown 1930s. An Alternative History of the British Cinema, 1929–1939* (London and New York: I.B. Tauris, 1998); Andrew Higson and Richard Maltby (eds.), *'Film Europe' and 'Film America': Cinema, Commerce and Cultural Exchange 1920–1939* (Exeter: Exeter University Press, 1999); Mark Glancy, *When Hollywood Loved Britain: The Hollywood 'British' Film, 1939–1945* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1999); and Sarah Street, *Transatlantic Crossings. British Feature Films in the USA* (New York: Continuum, 2002).

12. For a discussion of the ACT's actions with regard to émigré personnel, see Kevin Gough-Yates, 'The British Feature Film as a European Concern', and Tim Bergfelder, 'The Production Designer and the *Gesamtkunstwerk*: German Film Technicians in the British Film Industry of the 1930s', in Andrew Higson (ed.), *Dissolving Views. Key Writings on British Cinema* (London: Cassell, 1996), pp. 20–37.

13. Bergfelder, 'The Production Designer and the *Gesamtkunstwerk*', p. 22.

14. See the three special thematic editions of the journal *Cinema & Cie* on multiple-language versions in early 1930s European cinema: no. 4, Spring 2004; no. 6, Spring 2005; and no. 7, Fall 2005.

15. Kevin Gough-Yates, 'Jews and Exiles in British Cinema', in *Leo Baeck Yearbook*, vol. 37 (1992), pp. 520–21.

16. See Thomas Elsaesser, *Weimar Cinema and After. Germany's Historical Imaginary* (London and New York: Routledge, 2000), pp. 383–91.

17. For more detailed information on Stapenhorst, see the biographical entry in *CineGraph* (Hamburg 1984–) which can also be viewed online: www.filmportal.de

18. See Richard Falcon, 'No Politics! "German Affairs" im Spionage- und Kostümfilm', in Jörg Schöning (ed.), *London Calling. Deutsche im britischen Film der dreißiger Jahre* (Munich: edition text+kritik, 1993), pp. 77–88; and Christian Cargnelli, '*Abdul the Damned* (1935) und *These Are the Men* (1943): Anmerkungen zu Robert Neumanns Filmarbeit im englischen Exil', in Anne Maximiliane Jäger (ed.), *Einmal Emigrant – immer Emigrant? Der Schriftsteller und Publizist Robert Neumann (1897–1975)* (Munich: edition text+kritik, 2006), pp. 102–8.

19. Examples of German-speaking actors to cross over the Channel to work on British productions in the 1950s and 1960s include Hardy Kruger, Curd Jürgens, Peter van Eyck, and Horst Buchholz. See Melanie Williams, '"The most explosive object to hit Britain since the V2!": The British films of Hardy Kruger and Anglo-German relations in the 1950s', *Cinema Journal* 46 (1): 2006, pp. 85–107; Tim Bergfelder, 'The Passenger – Ambivalences of National Identity and Masculinity in the Star Persona of Peter van Eyck', in Sabine Hake and John Davidson (eds.), *Take Two: German Film in the 1950s* (Oxford and New York: Berghahn, 2007).

20. p. 143.

21. For recent evaluations of the respective contributions of Michael Powell and Emeric Pressburger to The Archers, see Charles Barr, 'The First Four Minutes' (pp. 20–35), and Ian Christie, 'Another Life in Movies: Pressburger and Powell' (pp. 171–86), in Ian Christie and Andrew Moor (eds.), *Michael Powell. International Perspectives on an English Film-Maker* (London: BFI, 2005).

22. Jan-Christopher Horak, 'Exilfilm, 1933–1945', in Wolfgang Jacobsen, Anton Kaes and Hans-Helmut Prinzler (eds), *Geschichte des deutschen Films* (Stuttgart and Weimar: Metzler, 1993), p. 102.

23. See my study of the reception in postwar West Germany of former émigré actor Peter van Eyck in 'The Passenger – Ambivalences of National Identity and Masculinity in the Star Persona of Peter van Eyck'.

24. See Lutz Koepnick's discussion of Robert Siodmak's postwar German reception in *The Dark Mirror*, pp. 192–200. See also my chapter 'Artur Brauner's CCC: Remigration, Popular Genres, and International Aspirations', in *International Adventures. German Popular Cinema and European Co-Productions in the 1960s* (Oxford and New York: Berghahn, 2005), pp. 108–25.

25. See Berghaus (ed.), *Theatre and Film in Exile*. The notable German exception is Schöning (ed.), *London Calling*.

26. Horak, 'Exilfilm, 1933–1945', p. 103. My translation.

27. See the representation of exile and cultural exchange in Sabine Hake, *German National Cinema* (London and New York: Routledge, 2002); and in Tim Bergfelder, Erica Carter and Deniz Göktürk (eds.), *The German Cinema Book* (London: BFI, 2002).

28. Cf. Charles Barr, 'Amnesia and Schizophrenia', in Barr (ed.), *All Our Yesterdays. 90 Years of British Cinema* (London: BFI, 1986), pp. 1–26; Alan Lovell, 'The British Cinema: The Known Cinema', in Robert Murphy (ed.), *The British Cinema Book*, 2nd edition (London: BFI, 2001), pp. 200–6.

29. Gough-Yates, 'Jews and Exiles in British Cinema', p. 517.

30. See Bergfelder, 'The Production Designer and the *Gesamtkunstwerk*', p. 32.

31. See the chapter on 'The German Invasion' (meaning the work of émigré filmmakers, not the attacks by Hitler's Luftwaffe) in C.A. Oakley's jingoistic historical survey of British cinema, *Where We Came In* (London: Allen & Unwin, 1964).

32. See Sue Aspinall and Robert Murphy (eds.), *BFI Dossier, no. 18: Gainsborough Melodrama* (London: BFI, 1983); Sue Harper, *Picturing the Past. The Rise and Fall of the British Costume Film* (London: BFI, 1994); Pam Cook, *Fashioning the Nation. Costume and Identity in British Cinema* (London: BFI, 1996); Pam Cook (ed.), *Gainsborough Pictures* (London: Cassell, 1997); Claire Monk and Amy Sargeant (eds.), *British Historical Cinema* (London: Routledge, 2002); and Andrew Higson, *English Heritage, English Cinema. Costume Drama since 1980* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003).

33. Lovell, 'The British Cinema: The Known Cinema', p. 202.

34. Bergfelder, 'The Production Designer and the *Gesamtkunstwerk*', pp. 33–37.

35. See John Ellis, 'The Quality Film Adventure: British Critics and the Cinema, 1942–1948', in Higson (ed.), *Dissolving Views*, pp. 66–93. See also Leo Enticknap, '*This Modern Age* and the British Non-Fiction Film', in Andrew Higson and Justine Ashby (eds.), *British Cinema, Past and Present* (London and New York: Routledge, 2000), pp. 207–220.

36. Paul Rotha, *The Film Till Now: A Survey of World Cinema*, rev. edn. (London: Vision Press, 1951), p. 254.

37. Of course, there had been a significant amount of prior academic groundwork in rediscovering these forgotten histories, most notably the efforts of the scholars associated with Nottingham's annual silent British cinema events. See Alan Burton and Laraine Porter (eds.), *Pimple, Pranks and Pratfalls. British Film Comedy Before 1930* (Trowbridge: Flicks Books, 2000); Andrew Higson (ed.), *Young and Innocent? Cinema and Britain 1896–1930* (Exeter: Exeter University Press, 2002); Jon Burrows, *Legitimate Cinema. Theatre Stars in Silent British Films, 1908–1918* (Exeter: Exeter University Press, 2003); Michael Williams, *Ivor Novello. Screen Idol* (London: BFI, 2003); and Michael Hammond, *The Big Show: British Cinema Culture in the Great War (1914–1918)* (Exeter: Exeter University Press, 2006).

38. See Martin Loiperdinger, *Film und Schokolade. Stollwercks Geschäfte mit lebenden Bildern* (Frankfurt am Main and Basle: Stroemfeld/Roter Stern, 1999).

39. For a discussion of Hitchcock's first two German films, see Charles Barr, *English Hitchcock* (Moffat: Cameron & Hollis, 1999), pp. 215–17; and Joseph Garncarz, 'German Hitchcock', in Sidney Gottlieb (ed.), *Framing Hitchcock: Selected Essays from the 'Hitchcock Annual'* (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 2002).

40. See Jamie Sexton, 'The Film Society and the Creation of an Alternative British Film Culture in the 1920s' (pp. 291–305), and Gerry Turvey, 'Towards a Critical Practice: Ivor Montagu and British Film Culture in the 1920s' (pp. 306–20), both in Higson (ed.), *Young and Innocent?*

41. Ian Jarvie, 'John Grierson on Hollywood's Success', in *Historical Journal of Film, Radio and Television* 9.3 (1989), p. 323.

42. See James Donald, Anne Friedberg and Laura Marcus (eds.), *Close Up 1927–1933. Cinema and Modernism* (London: Cassell, 1998).

43. *Close Up*, July 1929.

44. Other prominent examples include Andrew Higson, *Waving The Flag. Constructing a National Cinema in Britain* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995); Jeffrey Richards, *Films and British National Identity. From Dickens to Dad's Army* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1997); Barr, *English Hitchcock*; and Higson, *English Heritage, English Cinema*.

45. See John Hill, Martin McLoone and Paul Hainsworth (eds.), *Border Crossing: Film in Ireland, Britain and Europe* (Belfast, Dublin and London: Institute of Irish Studies/BFI/University of Ulster, 1994); Dave Berry, *Wales and Cinema – The First Hundred Years* (University of Wales Press, 1996); and Duncan Petrie, *Screening Scotland* (London: BFI, 2000).

46. Christine Gledhill, *Reframing British Cinema 1918–1928. Between Restraint and Passion* (London: BFI, 2003).

47. Ibid., p. 5.

48. Nikolaus Pevsner, *The Englishness of English Art* (London: The Architectural Press, 1956).

49. Amy Sargeant, 'Review of *Reframing British Cinema 1918–1928*', in *Modernism/Modernity* 12.4 (2005), p. 732.

50. Gledhill, *Reframing British Cinema*, p. 1.

51. Among the very few essays in English on Dupont is Andrew Higson, 'Polyglot Films for an International Market: E.A. Dupont, the British Film Industry, and the Idea of a European Cinema, 1926–1930', in Higson and Maltby (eds), *'Film Europe' and 'Film America*, pp. 274–301.

52. Sarah Street, *British National Cinema* (London and New York: Routledge, 1997); Murphy (ed.), *The British Cinema Book*; Amy Sargeant, *British Cinema. A Critical History* (London: BFI, 2005).

53. *Piccadilly* (London: BFI video, 2004). It is encouraging to see that similarly affirmative acknowledgments of the productive and positive contribution of internationalism to British film are becoming more common. See, e.g., Sarah Street, 'British Cinema: Introduction', in Pam Cook (ed.), *The Cinema Book*, 3rd edn. (London: BFI, 2007), pp. 175–76.

54. For introductions to this debate, with a particular emphasis on the British case, see Andrew Higson, 'The Instability of the National', in Higson and Ashby (eds), *British Cinema, Past and Present*, pp. 35–47; and Tim Bergfelder, 'National, Transnational, or Supranational Cinema? Rethinking European Film Studies', *Media, Culture and Society*, vol. 27, no.3 (Spring 2005), pp. 315–31.

55. Hamid Naficy, *An Accented Cinema: Exilic and Diasporic Filmmaking* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001).

56. Naficy, *An Accented Cinema*, p. 10.

57. Ibid., p. 26.

58. See Street, *Transatlantic Crossings*, pp. 43–69.

59. Bergfelder, 'National, Transnational, or Supranational Cinema?'

60. See Catherine A. Surowiec, *Accent on Design. Four European Art Directors* (London: BFI, 1992); Duncan J. Petrie, *The British Cinematographer* (London: BFI, 1996); Tim Bergfelder, Sue Harris and Sarah Street, *Film Architecture and the Transnational Imagination. European Set Design in the 1930s* (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2007).