

UCLA

Paroles gelées

Title

Contested Nationalism: Naturalism & Agrarian Tropes in French Films of the Occupation

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/10t5m2tx>

Journal

Paroles gelées, 23(1)

ISSN

1094-7264

Author

Casi, Nicole

Publication Date

2007

DOI

10.5070/PG7231003171

Peer reviewed

Contested Nationalism: Naturalism & Agrarian Tropes in French Films of the Occupation

Nicole Casi, Cornell University

Created in December 1940, the C.O.I.C (Comité d'organisation de l'industrie cinématographique) proposed to render into *mise en scène* the “return to the land” ideology of Marshal Pétain’s *National Revolution*, reflected in speeches and posters such as these (figures 1-2).



Figure 1. (left) Vichy, 1941, Gervereau.

“Répondez à l’appel de votre clocher. Retournez à la terre. Vous qui avez quitté la terre et désirez y retourner demandez aide au commissariat à la lutte contre le chômage. Service Agricole- 45Rue de Chabrol- Paris.”

Figure 2. (right) *Compagnons*-7/4/1942.

“Du nouveau dans nos villages Charbonnier est maître chez lui... désormais ce ne sont plus les avocats à la peau blanche et aux mains douces qui gouverneront la terre, mais d’authentiques paysans du terroir à la peau tannée et aux mains calleuses.”



Figure 3. Vichy, 1941.



Figure 4. Vichy, 1943, Rousso.

The new regime offered government support to families willing to return to farming. While the attendant rhetoric promised hope for a new France wherein the plow was key to French liberty, they masked a nation on the brink of starvation—a theme this poster (figure 3) conveys in its request that people volunteer for the Rural Civil Service so that France might eat.

In major cities like Paris and Lyon, the average adult lost nearly twenty pounds within the first two years of the Occupation,¹ because France had the burdens of feeding itself and the German troops. By 1942 many peasants, at whom these messages were aimed, became disillusioned and withheld portions of their harvests, preferring instead to sell on the black market to the French for nearly twice the price Germany paid the Vichy government (figure 4). Vichy's contempt for this practice is well documented in this poster (figure 4). Here the government warns that racketeering is a punishable crime against

the community. While petty farm racketeers were typically fined under the charge “indignité nationale”, those involved with large scale smuggling for the underground Resistance were often threatened with execution, as the noose in the poster forewarns.

From these small “panivorous acts” of resistance emerged the “de Gaullist denial theory,” which refused to acknowledge that any Frenchman was a German/ Vichy collaborator. Roger Régent, one of the better known advocates of this theory wrote in the late 1940s: “Si parmi ces deux cent vingt films tournés dans d’aussi désastreuses conditions, on relève beaucoup de bandes médiocres, au moins gardons-nous la fierté de n’avoir pas vu un seul producteur français digne de son nom consentir à réaliser une seule oeuvre de propagande en faveur de l’ennemi.”² Since Naturalist literature laid the aesthetic foundation for French cinema, which Poetic- Realism defined in the 1930s through its Zola-influenced Realism and Popular Front motifs, de Gaulle theorists maintained that any adaptation of these texts during World War II covertly upheld French nationalism. Faced with the overwhelming evidence of German collaboration that came to the fore after de Gaulle’s death in 1970, the French could no longer accept the denial theory. However, revisionist film theory is equally problematic in its assertion that the Vichy government alone, and not France proper, collaborated with the Germans. This theory is augmented through the division of Occupation-era films into two camps: those produced by Vichy’s C.O.I.C. in the unoccupied south, and those produced by Nazi Continental Films in the German occupied north. Within this binary, Vichy films are dismissed as escapist renderings of Pétain’s *Révolution nationale*, whereas Continental films are applauded for their nationalism. This theory is developed through the darker, more claustrophobic settings characteristic of Continental films, which revisionists perceive as “anti-French anomalies”, lacking a “discernable French style”.³ Often regarded as plotless, these films comprise diverse genres and styles that embrace the pathological, which film historians have dubbed— “regard cruauté.”⁴ Compared to

German Expressionism rather than French Realism,⁵ revisionists argue this “stylistic break” from films of the 1930s represents a form of resistance insofar as the cinematic malaise undermines “Vichy’s exaltation of provincial life.”⁶

While I do not discount these insights into the stylistic differences between films of the 1930s and 1940s, I think this analysis is too simple in that it overlooks the influence literature had on the companies producing these films. For example, if the “regard cruauté” is a repudiation of Vichy ideology, why are more than one-third (~35% percent) of the 220 films created during the Occupation set in the country?⁷ Despite their macabre outlook, why do these films feature return to the land motifs? Central to these diverse receptions is the concept of nationalism: how can two different accounts of nationalism be construed from the same works? In light of these questions, the remainder of this presentation will focus on agrarian imagery with particular emphasis paid to the recurring trope of the sower in two films endorsed by both Vichy and liberated France: *Regain* (1937) by Marcel Pagnol and *Farrebique* (1947) by Georges Rouquier.⁸ In my opinion, these films exemplify not only the Vichy/ Resistance film schism, but they also illustrate how the ideology of nationalism is central to understanding the contrary views of de Gaulle and revisionist theorists.

Regain and Farrebique

Set in the French countryside, *Regain* and *Farrebique* nostalgically depict 19th-century agrarian life as utopia. Not surprisingly, the Vichy government endorsed both films for their “moral valor.” Even though *Regain* was produced two years before World War II, it was promoted by Vichy alongside Pagnol’s *La fille du puisatier* (1940)—the first film to be produced under the collaborative government. The *Regain* narrative is structured around the regeneration of a deserted Provençal village, from which all the youth have left in search of industrial labor. Rouquier’s film *Farrebique*, which depicts daily life on a family farm in Aveyron, was funded jointly in

1943 by the *Ministère de l'agriculture et du ravitaillement*, and *La Corporation nationale paysanne* for C.O.I.C. Originally titled, *Les Quatre saisons*, its purpose was to educate the masses on the “l'esthétique de la maison traditionnelle.”⁹ Before *Farrebique*, Rouquier produced five other rural documentaries for Vichy called “ethnographies folkloriques” that recorded the traditions and popular arts of the Midi. Based on the success of these works, most notably *Le Tonnelier*, to which C.O.I.C. and the *Ministère national de l'education* awarded a grand prize, Rouquier won government funding to expand the rural documentaries into a full movie feature. Delays, however, prevented him from completing the project until after the war.

Although neither film was realized during the Vichy Regime proper, *Regain* and *Farrebique* visually celebrate Pétain's tri-part campaign slogan—TRAVAIL, FAMILLE and PATRIE—which formed the ideological cornerstone of his *Révolution nationale*, and its subsidiary the *Corporation nationale paysanne* (figure 5).



Figure 5. Vichy, 1941-1943, Villemot in Rossignol.

According to Dominique Rossignol's study on Vichy propaganda, these images were Vichy favorites: appearing in colors of the French flag, they comprised 90% of its visual propaganda. In Pétain's speeches from 1940-1942, the words Frenchmen appeared 128 times, France 170, and state 75.¹⁰ These words, however, are typically couched in the past, as this ad (figure 5) illustrates: nation and history are invoked through the rhetoric—"Patrie", "Passe d'honneur" and "France

éternelle.” In keeping with Vichy’s bucolic model, both films promote the countryside as the site of national rejuvenation, and echo the same escapism central to the *Révolution nationale*’s “retour à la terre” propaganda. In *Regain*, the old plow-maker’s son, Jamin leaves his job as a railroad conductor to return to the land and take up the plow; and Rouquier returns to his father’s farm during the war to record what he later recalled as his “childhood memoirs of a pre-industrial past.”¹¹

Primarily, the films document the *vie quotidienne* of peasant life wherein family is linked to the land: life, death, and procreation are signified by the harvest and four seasons. In both films, the familial patriarchs and matriarchs die in the winter. In addition, the tableau-vivant image of the sower (rooted in the earth and silhouetted against the sky) recalls not only Millet’s sowers and numerous copies of them (see figures 6-8), but also functions as a trope for rebirth. While sowing with her husband (Panturle), Arsule in *Regain* discovers she is pregnant. After the camera spans the field’s horizon, the panoramic tracking shot ends with the couple’s embrace (see figure 9).



Figure 6. Millet. *The Sower* (Semeuse), 1865.

Figure 7. Heliogravure after Millet’s *Sower* Drawing.

Figure 8. van Gogh. *The Sower* (Arles), October 1888



Figure 9. Pagnol. *Regain*
(1937)

Dropping their seed bags, Panturle declares: “Tu as ton travail maintenant: le blé, c’est ma graine à moi; occupe-toi de la tienne!” Similarly in *Farrebique*, a child is also conceived during the sowing season. The regenerative image of the sower both Pagnol and Rouquier draw upon is a recurring image in Pétain’s *Révolution nationale* campaign. Following Pétain’s declaration that the “ancient gesture of the sower gives to the land... the seed that will grow into the harvest, a promise of recovery for eternal France. . .and bread for the nation”¹², Vichy minted a series of coins after the sower, in which the Marshal’s message was reiterated on the obverse side: “La Terre de France n’est pas moins riche de promesse que de gloire.” Pétain’s message was reinforced through Vichy’s adaptation of the sower and harvesters on stamps in 1940-1941(see figures 10-12).



Figures 10 and 11 Piel. *Harvester Stamp*, 1940. Munier. *Sower Stamp*, 1940.



Figure 12. Vichy Medallion. 1941, Gervereau
“La Terre de France n’est pas moins riche de promesse que de gloire.” – Petain

As the films, coins, and stamps illustrate, the sower’s seed is a metaphor for both bread and children that captures Pétain’s trilogy—*travail, famille et patrie*. Through rigorous labor, family and nation are created and maintained. Visually embodied through the sower, this palingenetic motif is also woven throughout these films, functioning as a meta-narrative to combat the larger fears of rural depopulation and foreign invasion that came to the fore with World War I and coalesced with the German Occupation in World War II. Xenophobia in French culture of the 1930s metamorphosed into Vichy’s *Révolution nationale*, whose primary mission was to repopulate the nation with Frenchmen after its defeat and occupation in June 1940. By returning to France’s traditional agrarian structure, national unity would be restored through the spirit of the countryside. Men would attend to the work of France—ultimately reproduction, as the fruits of labor (i.e. bread) nourish the country; and women would assume their “rightful” places as mothers. This motif is played out in Arsule’s pregnancy in *Regain*, which Rémy Pithon characterizes as the ultimate “hymne à la gloire du blé et du pain”;¹³ and it reoccurs in *Farrebique*’s regenerative theme of Spring that culminates with the birth of the second son.

Vichy’s nostalgia for a palingenetic autarky is further exemplified in the film script for the original shot of *Farrebique*. Through its storybook introduction that recounts the farm’s

history, readers are informed of the farm's locale: "Farrebique est une ferme familiale de polyculture située dans la province de Rouergue qui forme le département de Aveyron, à la limite méridionale du Massif Central." Situated in the breadbasket of the nation, readers also learn the farm is xenophobia:

Cette province est restée, aujourd'hui assez fermée aux touristes et a conservé intactes ses mœurs, ses coutumes et ses traditions... Chaque agriculteur n'a comme main d'oeuvre que sa famille: c'est moins coûteux et cela donne un travail plus consciencieux. C'est peut-être pour cela que ce pays est resté l'un des plus prolifiques de France.¹⁴

These lines contradict the economic predicament of small farming just before World War II. Although Large-scale industrial farms fared well in the region, small family farms did not: they been on the decline since the 1880s, and produced less per acre than any other nation in the 1930s.¹⁵ Family and modern industry are also diametrically opposed in *Regain*. Panturle has the most beautiful grain in the region because he cuts and beats it by hand using traditional tools instead of machine-powered cutters and mills. Earning more than twice the actual quintal market price in 1937 (~70 F),¹⁶ the proceeds from Panturle's grain enables him to start a family.¹⁷ Envious of his success, Jamin and other residents, who deserted during the rural exodus, return with their families. Throwing his railway cap and jacket to the ground, Jamin grabs the plow from Panturle and declares that he would prefer to work for himself if the land alone could feed his family. Panturle replies that the land has fed millions before him and will feed millions more. This scene recapitulates the Vichy propaganda illustrated in figures 1 and 2, since there is little distinction between the ex-coalman (charbonnier), who donning the vestments of a farmer, is now master of his own domain and Jamin's renunciation of railway

bureaucracy. As Figure 1 implies, the call of the land and plow also equate liberty for Jamin.

The connection between the film and Vichy ideology is reinforced in the film's final scene. Here the camera dollies back from a medium-shot of Panturle sowing (after he discovers his wife is pregnant) to a deep-focus long shot that depicts a valley teeming with sowers. However, this rebirth would never have occurred had the village elders (Gaubert and Mamèche) not bequeathed a wife, and a handcrafted plowshare to Panturle—the last young man in the village. From these two items, the village renaissance occurs with the harvest its golden apogee. Linked by bread, they drive Panturle to mine the fallow but fertile soil, prophetically foreshadowed by Gaubert moments before his death: "Je vois que la terre d' Aubignane va repartir. L'envie du pain, la femme, c'est ça, c'est le signe...Le jour où un homme dur s'y mettra, alors, ça sera une bénédiction de blé."

Despite the similarities between these films and Vichy rhetoric, French film historians often argue these works do not support Vichy ideology. In their books on Rouquier and Pagnol, Dominique Auzel and Claude Beylie¹⁸ assert that these filmmakers' "retournez à la terre" motifs preceded Vichy, and, therefore, were not influenced by the folkloric themes of Vichy and Fascist Italy. What then differentiates their appropriation of the sower from Vichy and Fascist depictions of it, like these ones produced for Mussolini's "*Battle for the Grain*" campaign and Vichy's *Corporation nationale paysanne* (see figures 13-14)?



Figure 13. Mussolini's Battle for the Grain Campaign: "Il Dovero dei Rurali—SEMINARE MOLTO E BENE—PANETTIVITTORIA."

Figure 14. *Compagnons 5/31/1941*, Faure.

The most interesting argument comes from Auzel, who differentiates *Farrebique's* rural setting from Neo-Realism, and thus Vichy, under the premise that it is timeless: "elle se déroule dehors de tout contexte historique,"¹⁹ and represents the timeless seasons and labor in daily life, whereas Rossellini "s'applique à saisir une époque très précise."²⁰ Jacques Siclier supported this viewpoint in a 1961 interview with *Télérama* wherein he argued that the success of *Farrebique* lies in its "sens cosmique" and not in its "sens historique."²¹ A similar argument is articulated for Pagnol's *Regain*. Robert Chazal in *La Griffie Cinématographie* characterizes *Regain* as "merveilleusement convaincant en faveur de la terre et des enfants, de cette véritable oeuvre de regeneration."²² These reviews suggest that concepts of time and duration are quintessential to the categorization of these films as anti-Vichy.

Another differentiating element is their use of Zola's "scientific Realism"—a genre first employed by French filmmakers, who flocked the countryside at the turn of the century trying to capture the verisimilitude²³ of Balzac, Zola, and the Impressionists by filming real people in their environs. For example, Zecca and Nonguet in their two films after Zola's novel, *Germinal* (1885) used outdoor settings and an actual coalmine in which to film their works, *Germinal: La Grève* (1903), and *Au Pays noir* (1905); André Antoin went to the farming village in Zola's novel, *La Terre* (1887) in order to film,

La Terre (1921). The fact that Rouquier used his actual family and farm, instead of trained actors, was key to differentiating his films from both Vichy and Fascist Neo-Realist ideology. Praising his use of peasants, one critic compared Rouquier to Zola, stating his film illustrates that “c’est la nature qui conditionne le paysans...soc de charrue, mains, etc...”²⁴ In his book, *Georges Rouquier: de Farrebique à Biquefarre*, Auzel expands on this rationale by comparing Rouquier’s film to the *plein air* effects created by Impressionist and post- Impressionist painters. After relating the long, tracking shots of the farm’s environs to Cézanne’s landscapes, Auzel compares them to Monet’s stating Rouquier achieved what the latter could not:

Monet peignait la cathédrale de Rouen à différentes heures du jour et il évident qu’ il cherchait, par ce moyen, à fixer une évanescence fluidité des rapports d’ombre et de lumière. Il lui manquait une caméra enregistrant au ralenti pendant toute une journée l’édifice comme le fera Roquier montrant un instant plusieurs heures de la course de soleil au dessus de la campagne de Farrebique.²⁵

By aligning Rouquier’s cinematography with the traditions of French landscape painting, Auzel grounds *Farrebique* within the canon of French art and cinema.

In his book, *Marcel Pagnol ou le cinéma en liberté*, Beylie makes a similar argument in his assertion that Pagnol’s use of family members and on –location shooting eschews Vichy ideology. Often compared to the works of Antoine, Vigo and Renoir, both films are situated within the national rhetoric of the Resistance insofar as they exude the Frenchness of Zola’s Naturalism that Poetic-Realism perfected through the use of André Bazin’s much advocated “long-traveling” shots, which contiguously matched landscape with narrative, creating a

pantheistic symbiosis between man and nature.²⁶ This argument is extremely problematic for three reasons. First, Vichy did endorse these films; secondly, neither one reflect the Zolaian “real”, but are imbued, instead, with the Vichy ideology they supposedly refute: Aubignane in *Regain* is an imaginary town liberally interpreted from Giono’s novel; and everything in *Farrebique* (minus the family members themselves) is fictitious—the grandfather did not die; the baby was not born; the son was already married; the family did not have electricity; and they employed migrant workers. Lastly, Beylie’s and Auzel’s arguments contradict revisionist theory that dismisses Vichy films as “anti-French” anomalies. By stylistically linking *Regain* and *Farrebique* with 1920s and 1930s cinema, they imply that de Gaulle denial theorists were not inaccurate in their assertion that films of the Occupation are distinctly French.

Despite the solipsism that no Frenchman was a collaborator, these films demonstrate that Vichy and the Resistance drew upon the same Third Republican literary and artistic themes, which glorified the countryside as the patriarchal center of France. After Siméon and Balzac, Zola and Maupassant were the third and fourth most popular authors to have their works adapted during the Occupation.²⁷ Not surprisingly, the majority of these works were nostalgically set during the French Revolution, or in the *Belle Époque* of the Third Republic. The statistics should not be discounted since sixty percent of these film adaptations were produced under C.O.I.C.’s strict regulation that required all film scripts be submitted for pre-production censorship.²⁸

After the liberation, a “new genre” of national cinema emerged. Declared the “Cinema of the Resistance”, it employed the same governmental structure as C.O.I.C., which the *Comité de Libération* expressed in its September 1944 manifesto:

to defend French cinema as a national spiritual patrimony; to assure its technical and moral quality...to encourage the distribution of film

shorts in rural areas as a means to bring farmers and city dwellers together.²⁹

By 1945, *Le Cinéma Français* concluded that “national patrimony” could be maintained by adhering to a “French Tradition of Quality” that promoted not only rural films like *Farrebique*, but also emphasized literary adaptations as a way of asserting national character: “Hugo, Stendhal, Zola, Maupassant and other greats of the literary pantheon belonged to the national patrimony: films based on their works shared their relations to the national spirit.”³⁰ Trained in the conventions of Naturalist literature and theater, Giono and Pagnol belonged to this tradition, which grew under Vichy’s C.O.I.C. to include “religious naturalism” and “romantic pantheism.”

Conclusion

In conclusion, how might the national cinemas of Vichy and liberated France be more broadly related to models of collective identity? Given the vocabulary of film criticism of *Regain* and *Farrebique*—such as time, duration, and literary versus filmic narration—the unusual categorization of these works can be better understood from within the context of Poststructuralist theory concerning the function of ideology and memory. According to Jean Baudry (1970), in order for material objects (such as photos and films) to function at the symbolic level, the conscious belief must first exist that these objects represent something real, even though in reality they do not.³¹ Likewise, as Baudry and Dudley Andrew (1994) point out, the subject “I” is the ideological locale for narrative transcendence.³² Any investigation into the narrative conundrum presented by Vichy and Resistance cinema must, therefore, take into account how the concept of “I” represents competing narratives that semantically and syntactically demarcate what cinematic nationalism is and is not. Since both governments drew their film narratives from the same collective body of work, the question emerges: where did the conscious realization come

from that agrarian images characteristic of Realism and Naturalism represented something “real”— such as nationalism?

Naomi Greene’s work on 1940s French cinema provides invaluable insights into this query.³³ Expanding on Pierre Nora’s models of memory,³⁴ Greene also delineates memory as a two-fold process composed of both individual and collective memories in what Nora calls *mémoire particulière* (psychological memory pertaining to the individual) and *histoire-mémoire* (which represents a collective continuity “from the Greco- Roman cradle of the nation’s birth to its most glorious years of the empire” that ended in the *Belle Époque*).³⁵ Accordingly, the fall of the French Republic in the 1930s brought about a shift in memory from the collective social *histoire-mémoire* to an individual one (*mémoire-particulière*) experienced as ‘devoir’ or ‘duty’:

...impelled by the “internal coercion” to remember, people create “archives” or “sites of memory”...But the very creation of such sights – which range from monuments and museums to symbolic commemorations and celebrations- is imbued with a terrible paradox: the conscious and deliberate attempt to preserve the past that we are irretrievably distanced from...³⁶

Greene’s revision of Nora’s *mémoire- particulière* is key to understanding Vichy and Resistance film analyses for two reasons: 1) it validates Baudry’s and Andrew’s theory that genre is a guise of ideology specific to individual readers/ spectators, which accounts for these film’s divergent receptions by de Gaullists and revisionists; and 2) the desire to link the self with history through the construction of sites describes how the narrative transcendence of “I” is projected externally and imbues objects with meaning.

Further support for this idea comes from Mark Antliff’s research on Fascist aesthetics in Italy and France that emerged

during the interwar period (1917- 1939).³⁷ Triggered by a reactionary response against the loss of tradition caused by emergent global economies, Fascist art parallels the temporal shift in modern memory observed by Nora and Greene. Palingenic myths, which glorified the countryside, gave rise to a form of secular religion wherein Catholic religious devotion was transferred onto the landscape of the nation: in lieu of Mary statuettes, regional texts and paintings from the Third Republic became new icons of Fascist aesthetics. This synopsis of Antliff's work presents a visual model as to how ideology functions at the mnemonic level. This inability to disengage individual memories from the ideology of the collective is a recurrent theme in scholarship regarding both Fascist Vichy and Nazi Germany, which Hayden White's research on the "final solution" directly addresses in that he links the dichotomy between competing histories surrounding the "final solution" to the fallacy of figuration, in which the interpreter's interpretation of factual statements determines the language discourse and medium in which the facts are to be articulated:

A division of an epoch into two stories "sets up an oppositional structure constitutive of a semantic field in which the naming of a plot type of one story determines the semantic domain within which the name of the plot type of the other is to be found."³⁸

White's words capture the essence of the Vichy/ Resistance film schism. Divided into two competing narratives with corresponding theories espoused by de Gaulle theorists and revisionists, the iconography of the Vichy sower has informed the semantic domain in which the idiom of the Liberation exists.

Nowhere is White's theory better visualized than in this image of the sower from *La Terre Française*. This ad quotes not only the closing line of Hugo's celebrated poem,³⁹ but the text itself also recapitulates Pétain's speeches to farmers that drew on

the sower as a symbol of sustenance. In addition to the text's plurality, the medieval image was extracted from a 16th century prayer book that a Popular Front museum owned and a Vichy official exhibited.⁴⁰ Here religious symbolism is transferred onto the fatherland through the icon of the sower that combines the literature and art of four governments across four centuries. The words "témoin" and "devons" further reinforce the ideological dyad as a structure for memory, since the sower is experienced, and thus remembered, as state duty. In turn, the obligation inherent to *mémoire particulière* manifests itself through collective state holidays, such as *Semaine de la Révolution nationale* (July 11-17, 1942), where rural shorts like Rouquier's *Le Tonnelier* were screened.⁴¹ Vichy festival replaced Bastille Day and the motto of liberated France — *liberté, égalité, and fraternité* with Vichy's own— *travail, famille, and patrie*, through its dedication of honorarium days to Frenchmen and women who exemplified Vichy virtues.

Although well documented by sower iconography, these syncretic *fêtes* function as ghosts irreversibly distanced from the corporality of the past they assay to explicate in the present. Vacated of temporal meaning, the slippage created from an inability to disengage one genre/narrative of sower from another is at the heart of the "timeless" cliché revisionists (such as Beylie and Auzel) use to buttress their claim that neither *Regain* nor *Farrebique* belong within Fascist/ Vichy nomenclature. History is often constructed collectively by a community in such a manner as to serve the political claims of that community, and the political aims of Vichy and the Resistance were not in accordance with each other: one tried to maintain nationalism through the heritage of its soil while pacifying its occupying power, whereas the other invoked nationalism associated with the sower as a vehicle with which to revolt against such subjugation. Vichy and Liberated France's endorsement of the *Regain* and *Farrebique* thus represent two faces of the same historical coin minted by Third Republican nationalism.

Notes

¹ See Denis Peschanski, *Collaboration and Resistance: Images of Life in Vichy, France, 1940-1944*, trans. Lory Frankel (New York: Harry Abrams, Inc., 2000) 124-127; and Henry Rousso, *Les Années noires: vivre sous l'occupation* (Paris: Gallimard, 1992) 66. Based on a 1200 to 1800 calorie diet (3/5 the normal calorie intake of 2,000- 2,500), ration tickets were issued to Parisians that allotted them 275 grams of bread per day; 350 grams of meat, and 100 grams of fat per week. In the winter of 1940-1941, however, there were more tickets than food; and the average Parisian received far less.

² Roger Régent, *Cinéma de France sous l'occupation*. (Paris: Editions Bellefaye, 1948) 132.

³ See Jean Mitry, *Histoire du cinéma de Vichy. Vol. 5: 1940-1950* (Paris: Delarge, 1980) 132-140; Jacques Siclier, *La France de Pétain et son cinéma* (Paris: H. Veyrier, 1981) 69-87; and Naomi Greene, "Mood and Ideology in Vichy Cinema", and *Landscapes of Loss* (Princeton: University Press, 1999).

⁴ See Jean-Pierre Jeancolas, *Quinze ans d'années trente: le cinéma français, 1929-1944* (Paris: Editions Stock, 1983) 320-354; and Evelyn Ehrlich, *Cinema of Paradox: French Filmmaking Under the German Occupation* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1985). See also Siclier's analysis of these films as "derangéant" in *La France de Pétain* 225, 236-239.

⁵ Henri Angel in his book *Miroirs de l'insolite dans le cinéma français* (Paris: Cerf, 1958) was one of the first film scholar to compare French films of the Occupation to German Expressionism: "Les architectures de Max Douy se fondent avec les éclairages extrêmement bien doses de Louis Page pour tresser autour des personnages un réseau de menaces" (102).

⁶ Greene *Landscapes of Loss* 443.

⁷ Pierre Sorlin, "Stop the Rural Exodus: Images of the Country in French Films of the 1950s",

Historical Journal of Film, Radio and Television 18.2 (1998): 183-199; and Ehrlich 35.

⁸ *Harvest*. Dir. Marcel Pagnol. 1937. VHS. Interama Video Classics, 1989;

Farrebique. Dir. Georges Rouquier. 1946. DVD. Documents Cinématographiques, 2001.

⁹ Christian Faure, *Le Projet culturel de Vichy* (Lyon: Presses Universitaires, 1989) 260-261.

¹⁰ Rossignol 117.

¹¹ Dominique Auzel, *Georges Rouquier: De Farrebique à Biquefarre* (Paris: Cahiers du cinema, 2002) 114.

See also John Weiss, "An Innocent Eye? The Career and Documentary Vision of Georges Rouquier up to 1945", *Cinema Journal* 20:2 (Spring 1981): 38-62.

¹² This speech by Pétain appeared in the weekly newspaper *La Terre Francaise*, 11 January 1941 and is recited in Peschanski 72.

¹³ Rémy Pithon, "Regain de Marcel Pagnol: La Terre, elle ne ment pas", *Etudes de Lausanne_2* (1993) 116.

¹⁴ The original film script is reprinted in Azul 263

¹⁵ Gordon Wright, *Rural Revolution in France: the Peasantry in the Twentieth-Century*

(Stanford: University Press, 1964) 26-27; and Roberto O. Paxton, *French Peasant Fascism: Henri Dorgères' Greenshirts and the Crises of French Agriculture* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997) 13.

¹⁶ See Paxton 14-15 for statistics and grain pricing charts.

¹⁷ Despite failed protectionist policies in the past (from Méline to Daladier) that tried to keep foreign grain out of France and stabilize the grain market through import tariffs and fixed pricing, Blum's agrarian "New Deal" was equally detested by farmers, who preferred the old system, which kept them suspended in a 19th-century agrarian system. In order to combat the inequity of the former exacerbated by grain surplus on the international market, the new policy promoted "free trade"

regulated through the establishment of a national Wheat Office in 1936. Film viewers in 1937, would have perceived the grain remarks in *Regain* as an intertextual dig against the Blum administration.

¹⁸ Auzel, Georges Rouquier: *De Farrebique à Biquefarre*; and Claude Beylie, *Marcel Pagnol, ou, Le cinéma en liberté?* (Paris: Éditions de Fallois, 1995).

¹⁹ Auzel 121.

²⁰ Auzel 122.

²¹ Jacque Siclier, *Télérama* 586: 9 avril 1961 “Farrébique n’a pas un sens historique masi cosmique.”

²² Robert Chazal, *La Griffé Cinématographie* 5 novembre 1937.

²³ See Leo Braudy, *Jean Renoir the World of his Films* (Garden City: Double Day and Co., 1972) 24-31; and Susan Hayward, *French National Cinema*. (London: Routledge, 1993) 81-83; 102-104.

²⁴ Auzel 119.

²⁵ Auzel 125. * The asterisk here indicates a typo that I corrected in the citation. In Auzel’s text, he mistakes Monet with Manet and writes “Manet peigneit la cathédrale de Rouen...”

²⁶ See Hayward 104; and Richard Abel, *French Film Theory and Criticism, 1907- 1939* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1988) 112-117.

²⁷ Siclier 117-129, 269- 433.

²⁸ Alan Williams, *Republic of Images: A History of French Filmmaking*(Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1992) 249-251, 254.

²⁹ This passage by André Bazin appeared in *Le Parisien* – 17 September 1944 and appears in his book, *French Cinema of the Occupation and Resistance: The Birth of a Critical Esthetic*, trans. Stanley Hochman (New York: Frederick Ungar Publishing Co., 1975) 102- 103.

³⁰ Williams 278. See also Williams’ chapter four, “Liberation-Change and Continuity” for a detailed description of the

similarities between the governmental structure of Vichy's national cinema and that of post- World War II liberated France.

³¹ Jean Louis Baudry, "Ideological Effects of the Cinematographic Apparatus", *Film Theory and Criticism: Introductory Readings*, eds. Leo Braudy and Marshall Cohen (New York: Oxford University Press, 1999).

While Baudry's work is generally considered to be Structuralist, as he believes, (like Metz) that ideology is created and imparted by the apparatus. His theory here is applicable to Poststructuralist theory too, as it identifies the subject as the vehicle through which narrative transcendence occurs. In contradistinction to Structuralist theory proper, this idea opens up a multifaceted arena of discourse in which the self cannot be freed from the illusions it has created.

³² See chapter four in Williams' book, as well as chapter six in Dudley Andrew's book *Film in the Aura of Art* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994) for a more thorough analysis of the literary importance these writers' works served in creating a national cinema.

³³ Naomi Greene, "Golden Ages: Between Memory and History", *Landscapes of Loss: The National Past in Post War French Cinema* (Princeton: University Press, 1999).

³⁴ Pierre Nora, *Les lieux de mémoire* (Paris: Gallimard, 1984).

³⁵ Greene 153.

³⁶ Greene 154.

³⁷ Mark Antliff, "Fascism, Modernism and Modernity" *Art Bulletin* 1 (2002): 158-160.

³⁸ Hayden White, *Probing the Limits of Representation: Nazism and the "Final Solution"*, ed. Saul Friedlander (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1992) 43.

³⁹ Victor Hugo, "Le Saison des semailles" (1866) was first published during the Third Republic in an 1882 chapbook/ collection titled *Chansons des rues et des bois* by J. Hetzel et A. Quantin. This edition, along with the 1933 one published by the Imprimerie National, sold the most copies and still numbers the

most in circulation. Not coincidentally, the dates correspond with the periods and governments in which Hugo's work was most supported.

⁴⁰ Laure 32-34. Martin de Beaune was the archbishop of Tours from 1517- 1529; Musée National des Arts et Traditions Populaires was founded in 1937, and under the direction of its director at the time.—G.H.Rivière, it became the center from which all folkloric art was organized and emitted during the Vichy administration. As a board member on the *Comité national du folklore*, he was an advisor for Pétain's *Revolution nationale*, who oversaw the folkloric and traditional art for the *Corporation nationale paysanne*, the *Société du folklore français*, the *CNRS*, *Ministère de l' agriculture* and the Universities.

⁴¹See Rossignol 118-120.

Works Cited

- Abel, Richard. *French Film Theory and Criticism, 1907- 1939*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1988
- Andrew, Dudley. *Film in the Aura of Art*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994.
- Angel, Henri. *Miroirs de l'insolite dans le cinéma français*. Paris: Cerf, 1958.
- Antliff, Mark. "Fascism, Modernism and Modernity." *Art Bulletin* 1 (2002): 148- 167.
- Auzel, Dominique. *Georges Rouquier: De Farrebique à Biquefarre*. Paris: Cahiers du cinema, 2002.
- Barbas, Jean-Claude, ed.. *Philippe Pétain. Discours aux Français, 17 juin 1940- 20 août 1944*. Paris: Éditions Michel Albin, 1989.
- Baudry, Jean Louis. "Ideological Effects of the Cinematographic Apparatus", *Film Theory and Criticism: Introductory Readings*. eds. Leo Braudy and Marshall Cohen New York: Oxford University Press, 1999.

- Bazin, André. *French Cinema of the Occupation and Resistance: The Birth of a Critical Aesthetic*, trans. Stanley Hochman. New York: Frederick Ungar Publishing Co., 1975.
- Claude Beylie. *Marcel Pagnol, ou, Le cinéma en liberté?* Paris: Éditions de Fallois, 1995.
- Braudy, Leo. *Jean Renoir the World of His Films*. Garden City: Double Day and Co., 1972.
- Chazal, Robert. *La Griffes Cinématographie* 5 novembre 1937.
- Ehrlich, Evelyn. *Cinema of Paradox: French Filmmaking Under the German Occupation*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1985.
- Farrebique*. Dir. Georges Rouquier. 1946. DVD. Documents Cinématographiques, 2001
- Faure, Christian. *Le Projet culturel de Vichy*. Lyon: Presses Universitaires, 1989.
- Garçon, François. *De Blum à Pétain, cinéma et société française (1936- 1944)* Paris: Les Éditions du cerf, 1984.
- Greene, Naomi. "Mood and Ideology in Vichy", *Landscapes of Loss: The National Past in Post War France*. Princeton: University Press, 1999.
- "Mood and Ideology in the Cinema of Vichy, France," *The French Review: Journal of the American Association of Teachers of French* 59.3 (1986): 437- 445.
- Harvest*. Dir. Marcel Pagnol. 1937. VHS. Interama Video Classics, 1989.
- Hayward, Susan. *French National Cinema*. New York: Routledge, 1993.
- Jeancolas, Jean-Pierre. *Quinze ans d'années trente: le cinéma français, 1929-1944*. Paris: Editions Stock, 1983.
- Mitry, Jean. *Histoire du cinéma de Vichy. Vol. 5: 1940-1950*. Paris: Delarge, 1980.
- Nora, Pierre, and Lawrence Kritzman, eds. *Realms of Memory: Rethinking the French Past, I: Conflicts and Divisions*. Trans. Arthur Goldhammer. New York: Columbia University Press, 1996.
- Paxton, Roberto O.. *French Peasant Fascism: Henri Dorgères' Greenshirts and the Crises of French Agriculture*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997.

- Peschanski, Denis. *Collaboration and Resistance: Images of Life in Vichy, France, 1940-1944*, trans. Lory Frankel. New York: Harry Abrams, Inc., 2000.
- Pithon, Rémy. "Regain de Marcel Pagnol: 'La Terre, elle ne ment pas'", *Etudes de Lausanne* 2 (1993) 111-123.
- Régent, Roger. *Cinéma de France sous l'occupation*. Paris: Editions Bellefaye, 1948
- Rosignol, Dominique. *Histoire de la propagande en France, 1940- 1944*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1991.
- Rouso, Henry. *Les Années noires: vivre sous l'occupation*. Paris: Gallimard, 1992.
- Siclier, Jacques. *La France de Pétain et son cinéma*. Paris: H. Veyrier, 1981.
- *Télérama* 586: 9 avril 1961.
- Sorlin, Pierre. "Stop the Rural Exodus: Images of the Country in French Films of the 1950s", *Historical Journal of Film, Radio and Television* 18.2 (1998): 183-199.
- Weiss, John. "Innocent Eye? The Career and Documentary Vision of Georges Rouquier up to 1945", *Cinema Journal* 20:2 (Spring 1981) 38-62.
- White, Hayden. *Probing the Limits of Representation: Nazism and the "Final Solution"*, ed. Saul Friedlander. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1992.
- Williams, Alan. *Republic of Images: A History of French Filmmaking*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1992.
- Wright, Gordon. *Rural Revolution in France: the Peasantry in Twentieth- Century France*. Stanford: University Press, 1964.

L'exception française
Negotiating Identity in the
French National Imagery

Paroles Gelées
UCLA French Studies

Volume 23
Spring 2007

Selected Proceedings from
the Eleventh Annual UCLA Department of
French and Francophone Studies
Graduate Student Conference

November 2 and 3, 2006

Paroles Gelées

UCLA French Studies

*Ce serait le moment de philosopher et de
rechercher si, par hasard, se trouvait ici
l'endroit où de telles paroles dégèlent.*

Rabelais, *Le Quart Livre*

**Volume 23
Spring 2007**

Editor-in-Chief: Elizabeth Vitanza

Assistant Editor: Bob Hudson

Sponsors: The UCLA Department of French and Francophone Studies, Eugen Weber Chair of Modern European History, UCLA History Department, the UCLA Fowler Museum of Cultural History, the UCLA Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies the UCLA Center for European and Eurasian Studies, the UCLA Campus Programs Committee of the Program Activities Board, the UCLA Department of Public Policy, the UCLA Graduate Student Association

Paroles Gelées was established in 1983 by its founding editor, Kathryn Bailey. The journal is managed and edited by the French Graduate Students' Association and is published annually under the auspices of the Department of French and Francophone Studies at the University of California, Los Angeles.

Paroles Gelées

Department of French & Francophone Studies
212 Royce Hall, Box 951550
Los Angeles, CA 90095-1550
frenconf@ucla.edu
<http://www.french.ucla.edu/gradconf>

Copyright © *Paroles Gelées* 2006-2007 by the Regents of the University of California. ISSN.

CONTENTS

Acknowledgements	1
Introduction	
L'Exception française: Exploring the notion of Nation Elizabeth Vitanza and Bob Hudson, Editors	3
Selected Presentations	
Le nationalisme de Barrès : Moi, la terre et les morts Maud Hilaire Schenker	5
Contested Nationalism: Naturalism & Agrarian Tropes in French Films of the Occupation Nicole Casi	27
In Defense of <i>Civilisation</i> : Modernism, Anti-Americanism and the Struggle for Cultural Identity in French Art (1953-1968) Rhiannon Vogl	51
Je ne suis pas de la famille": Queerness as Exception in Gide's <i>L'immoraliste</i> and Genet's <i>Journal du Voleur</i> Olivia Gunn	71
Laïcité in the French public school system: an <i>exception française</i> ? Mireille le Breton	93
L'Antiaméricanisme intellectuel français : l'exception culturelle par excellence? (Revisited) Maria Manuella Coelho Glaziou Tavares	113
