Tricks of the Light:

A Study of the Cinematographic Style of the Émigré Cinematographer Eugen Schüfftan

Submitted by Tomas Rhys Williams to the University of Exeter

as a thesis for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy in Film

In October 2011

This thesis is available for Library use on the understanding that it is copyright material and that no quotation from the thesis may be published without proper acknowledgement.

I certify that all material in this thesis which is not my own work has been identified and that no material has previously been submitted and approved for the award of a degree by this or any other University.

Signature: .................................................................
The aim of this thesis is to explore the overlooked technical role of cinematography, by discussing its artistic effects. I intend to examine the career of a single cinematographer, in order to demonstrate whether a distinctive cinematographic style may be defined. The task of this thesis is therefore to define that cinematographer’s style and trace its development across the course of a career. The subject that I shall employ in order to achieve this is the émigré cinematographer Eugen Schüfftan, who is perhaps most famous for his invention ‘The Schüfftan Process’ in the 1920s, but who subsequently had a 40 year career acting as a cinematographer. During this time Schüfftan worked throughout Europe and America, shooting films that included *Menschen am Sonntag* (Robert Siodmak et al, 1929), *Le Quai des brumes* (Marcel Carné, 1938), *Hitler’s Madman* (Douglas Sirk, 1942), *Les Yeux sans visage* (Georges Franju, 1959) and *The Hustler* (Robert Rossen, 1961). During the course of this thesis I shall examine the evolution of Schüfftan’s style, and demonstrate how Schüfftan has come to be misunderstood as a cinematographer of German Expressionism. The truth, as I will show, is far more complex. Schüfftan also struggled throughout his career to cope with the consequences of exile. In this thesis I will also therefore examine the conditions of exile for an émigré cinematographer, and in particular Schüfftan’s prevention from joining the American Society of Cinematographers. I intend to demonstrate how an understanding of cinematographic style can shed new light on a film, and to give renewed attention to an important cinematographer who has been largely ignored by film history.
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Eugen Schüfftan is a name little known, except perhaps for his famous invention, ‘The Schüfftan Process’. His craft of cinematography is one that is often misunderstood and is little discussed. This thesis aims to fill that critical and historical gap by examining the cinematographic work of Eugen Schüfftan.

Eugen Schüfftan entered the film industry in the 1920s with the invention of the famous special effects process that shares his name, and which was used to famous effect on Fritz Lang’s *Metropolis* (1927). Schüfftan began a career as a cinematographer in Berlin in 1929, when he made *Menschen am Sonntag/People on Sunday*, alongside Billy Wilder, Fred Zinnemann, Edgar G. Ulmer, and the brothers Curt and Robert Siodmak. The film took a realist perspective on life for the youth of the city, a far cry from the trends of Expressionism that the 1920s German cinema had become famous for. Schüfftan continued to make films in
Berlin until 1933, developing his interests in realism and drawing his aesthetic inspiration from painters such as Rembrandt.

Following the rise to power of the Nazi Party, Schüfftan fled Germany in 1933, and began a period of work throughout Europe, finding particular success in France. Schüfftan continued to develop his painterly approach to the film image, whilst also nuancing this style to meet the demands of those directors who expected of him an Expressionist technique. Schüfftan found particular success in this period through his collaborations with other German exiles, such as Max Ophüls and G.W. Pabst. His work in Poetic Realism with Marcel Carné (on Le Quai des brumes/Port of Shadows (1938)) also proved a great success. The outbreak of war followed by the Nazi occupation of France forced many film personnel, including Schüfftan, to flee Europe.

For Schüfftan this exile occurred in 1941, when he left Europe for America, where he had been promised work by the producer Arnold Pressburger. Upon his arrival Schüfftan learned that it was necessary for him to be a member of the American Society of Cinematographers (ASC) before he was allowed to act in that role in America. Schüfftan was blocked from membership on his continual attempts to join throughout the 1940s, which effectively prevented him from working for any of the major studios. Instead, Schüfftan was forced to rely upon work for the low-budget films made by Hollywood’s Poverty Row, where a number of other émigrés had been forced to gravitate. In these Poverty Row studios, old friends of Schüfftan’s (most notably Edgar Ulmer) helped by allowing him to act as a cinematographer, although union laws prevented him from being credited for these roles. This continued throughout the 1940s, until frustration caused by Schüfftan’s effective blacklisting from the major studios forced the cinematographer to return to work in Europe at the end of the decade.
During the late 1940s and 1950s Schüfftan travelled between Europe and Canada for a variety of film and television projects, including collaborations with Alexandre Astruc and Julien Duvivier. At the end of the 1950s Schüfftan would unite with the French director Georges Franju, which would bring him renewed success, and lead at last to some recognition in America. Finally, in 1960 Schüfftan was admitted to (the New York branch of) the American Society of Cinematographers, allowing him to shoot films in the New York area. Schüfftan then achieved the greatest successes of his career, including work for Robert Rossen’s *Lilith* and for Marcel Carné on *Trois chambres à Manhattan*. The crowning glory at the end of Schüfftan’s long career was an Academy Award for his cinematography of *The Hustler* (1963), nearly twenty years after he had arrived in America and was prevented from joining the American Society of Cinematographers.

The aim of this thesis is to tread new ground by examining the career of a single cinematographer, in order to investigate whether a coherent cinematographic style may be attributed to a cinematographer, which thereby impacts upon film meaning. The role of the cinematographer should not be underestimated. The difficulty in discussing the work of a cinematographer has been that it is an artistry achieved through a highly technical craft. However, they are the image-makers, responsible for ensuring that the content of the frame is visible through correct lighting. It is fair to assume therefore, that the cinematographer has the ability to greatly alter the meaning of an image through his or her approach to lighting. And yet the role of the cinematographer is rarely understood as offering a unique approach to the image, instead merely undertaking the will of the director.

Through such a study I intend to rectify this critical oversight and grant renewed attention to the role of the cinematographer. The brief biographical overview I have offered demonstrates a number of reasons why Eugen Schüfftan is an important subject for such a study. He made a great number of significant films, with an assortment of highly-regarded directors
throughout his career, and yet he is little known. Furthermore, he encountered a notable number of obstacles throughout his career, which challenged his developing style. To define the cinematographic style of a cinematographer of Hollywood’s Golden Age would be one matter, but to define and trace the style of a cinematographer across a 40 year career, in which he filmed in America, Britain, France, Germany, Mexico, Canada, Spain and Italy (to name but a few), is a more rigorous test. For Schüfftan also offers an exile story, from the largely untold perspective of the cinematographer, who as technicians in the eyes of the industry were subject to a great number of challenges and limitations not encountered by émigré directors and stars.

**Cinematography: Art or Craft?**

Literature on cinematography is somewhat sparse presently and limited primarily to two common forms: either practical guides to the craft, or cinematographers in their own words (autobiographies or collections of interviews). Indeed, a number of the practical guides have been written by practitioners. The most exemplary in this context is *Painting With Light*, by the Hollywood cinematographer John Alton (1995). This was first published in 1949 at the height of Alton’s success in Hollywood, and is considered the first text about cinematography to be written by a major practitioner. *Painting With Light* has proven an indispensible source of reference for the research of this thesis, offering practical and straightforward advice about how certain effects and locations were lit at a time when Schüfftan was at work. Other examples of such manuals by cinematographers who have also worked on motion picture film production include Blain Brown’s *Cinematography: Theory and Practice* (2002), Joseph V. Mascelli’s *The Five C’s of Cinematography: Motion Picture Filming Techniques* (1965) and Raymond Fielding’s *The Technique of Special Effects Cinematography* (1985).
A second significant contribution to the existing literature on cinematography has been autobiographies and interviews with practitioners. Of those cinematographers who have written books about their craft there are few who have philosophised about their use of lighting. Vittorio Storaro is one exception with the three volume opus *Writing With Light* (*Vol.1 The Light* (2003), *Vol. 2 Colours* (2003), *Vol.3 The Elements* (2003)), and Henri Alékan is a rare example from outside Hollywood, with *Des lumières et des ombres* (1984), which has not been translated from the original French. Autobiographical examples include *Every Frame a Rembrandt: Art and Practice of Cinematography* by Andrew Laszlo (2000), *Huston, We Have a Problem: A Kaleidoscope of Filmmaking Memories* by Oswald Morris (2006), *Magic Hour: A Life in Movies* by Jack Cardiff (1996), *A Man With a Camera* by Nestor Almendros (1986) and *A Cast of Shadows* by Ronnie Maasz (2004). These texts tend to be anecdotal (light reading, if you will), and rather reinforce the cinematographer’s relegation ‘below the line’, a term that is actually used in film budgets to refer to the less costly personnel, highlighting how the creative efforts of the cinematographer have not always been recognised (Simon and Wiese, 2006: 82). Those seen as the creative force behind a film’s success – directors, producers, screenwriters and stars – were known as ‘above the line’ costs on a film budget sheet (*Ibid.*). Those personnel ‘below the line’ are purely seen as technicians, charged with realising the creative vision of those above the line. The above-mentioned autobiographies in some way reinforce this divide, through a tendency to emphasise the technical quality of their collaborations with renowned directors or stars – a supporting role therefore. For example, in *Huston, We Have a Problem* Oswald Morris emphasises the ways in which he resolved lighting, shooting effects required by the likes of Sidney Lumet, Carol Reed and John Huston, and in *A Cast of Shadows* Ronnie Maasz focusses upon his encounters with film stars.
The divinization of the director is also the cause of a critical absence in terms of cinematography in film studies, thanks to the continuing overbearance of *auteur* theory. This has privileged the position of the director at the cost of all other artists and craftspeople involved in production, save perhaps the stars. The director either receives credit for a role performed by another crafts-person, such as the cinematographer, or that crafts-person’s influence is ignored. Peter Wollen (1998: 71) provides a fine example of how the deification of the director has been at the cost of a deeper understanding of the film text in terms of the various other craftspeople involved:

> What the *auteur* theory does is to take a group of films – the work of one director – and analyse their structure. Everything irrelevant to this, everything non-pertinent, is considered logically secondary, contingent, to be discarded. Of course, it is possible to approach films by studying some other feature; by an effort of critical ascesis we could see films, as Von Sternberg sometimes urged, as abstract light-show or as histrionic feasts. Sometimes these separate texts – those of the cameraman or the actors – may force themselves into prominence so that the film becomes an indecipherable palimpsest. This does not mean, of course, that it ceases to exist or to sway us or please us or intrigue us; it simply means that it is inaccessible to criticism. We can merely record our momentary and subjective impressions.

This thesis therefore sets out to examine that which is ‘secondary’, ‘indecipherable’ and ‘inaccessible to criticism’ in terms of dominant *auteur* theory. Within the auteurist framework, the work of the cinematographer is rarely discussed, and when it does appear, it is more often than not attributed as a structure of the director’s oeuvre. The cinematographer is rarely considered to have shaped a film text in terms of his or her own personal style, a style which has been shaped through the variety of films/nations/genres etc. worked upon. In this sense, the auteurist perspective removes the context of all other artists and craftspeople and their contribution to a given film. This thesis aims to reinsert one such artist, Schüfftan,
into the narrative of film history, by addressing his personal circumstances and the films
which he worked upon throughout his career, in order to see how he developed a distinct
cinematographic style.

There is only one text which explicitly deals with the work of Schüfftan. It is a German book
called Nachrichten aus Hollywood, New York und anderswo: Der Briefwechsel Eugen und
text deals with both Schüfftan and the theorist Siegfried Kracauer. The pair became friends
during their exile to America, and they wrote to each other for many years following. The
primary aim of the book is to reprint this correspondence, but there are also a number of brief
essays which deal with both Schüfftan and Kracauer. Asper provides an overview of
Schüfftan’s American exile, while Pierre-Damien Meneux discusses Schüfftan’s work
throughout Europe between 1933 and 1940, and Robert Müller tackles Schüfftan’s work in
Hollywood during the 1940s. Entirely absent from discussion however, is Schüfftan’s work
in Germany before exile, and his work following his return to Europe in 1947. That amounts
to a total of around around 24 years of Schüfftan’s career which are not properly addressed.
Furthermore, those stages of Schüfftan’s career which are discussed receive little more than
an overview. This is largely because Asper’s text does not have the same aim as mine,
namely a detailed study of the development of Schüfftan’s style across his career. Rather, the
primary interest of Asper’s text has been to reprint the correspondences between Schüfftan
and Kracauer, as well as other points of interest, such as an appraisal by Schüfftan made in
1943 about his work in Germany. These reproductions have certainly proven a welcome
source of information during the course of writing this thesis.

I am aware of the danger of falling foul to auteur theory myself, of falling into the trap of
positioning Schüfftan as the mighty auteur. It is true that I seek to analyse Schüfftan’s career
in order to demonstrate the contribution of his evolving style to each film, but this is intended
only in terms of the cinematographer’s specific contribution, merely one element of the many which combine to create a film’s success. I am careful not to attribute elements to a cinematographic style which the cinematographer would not have had a role in, and I am careful, when talking about the combination of cinematography with another element of film production, to name the rightful craftsperson. Indeed, as Petrie (1996: 2) has noted, it is also important when discussing cinematography to acknowledge that the cinematographer is a member of a wider team, including camera assistants, grips, technicians and others, who combine to create the desired effect. It is true to say that many hands make ‘light’ work.

The democratisation of film personnel in film studies is already underway for a number of crafts, although cinematography still awaits its turn. Of particular note are the fields of set design and costume design. In terms of costume design there has been Stella Bruzzi’s *Undressing Cinema: Clothing and Identity in the Movies* (1997), in the British context Pam Cook’s *Fashioning the Nation: Costume and Identity in British Cinema* (1996), and in the French context Susan Hayward’s *French Costume Drama of the 1950s: Fashioning Politics in Film* (2010) and Jennie Cousins’s *Unstitching the 1950s Film à Costumes: Hidden Designers, Hidden Meanings* (2009). For the craft of set design more recently, there has been Bergfelder, Harris and Street’s *Film Architecture and the Transnational Imagination: Set Design in 1930s European Cinema* (2007), and *Architecture for the Screen: A Critical Study of Set Design in Hollywood’s Golden Age* by Juan Antonio Ramirez (2004). These studies investigate the work at hand and in many ways it is clearly easier to identify, when watching a film, the contribution of the costume designer or set designer. The product of their craft is physically present, recorded on film for all to see. The cinematographer’s contribution is less easy to define. A film’s lighting not only changes every scene, but every frame. Every movement of the camera or of the subjects of the frame alters the fall of light upon the shot – an overwhelming amount of data which perhaps accounts for the dominance of
autobiographies and practical guides within cinematography literature, and the lack of studies
dedicated to analysis and to identifying cinematographic style. The subject matter, viewed in
this light, appears daunting, to say the least. Indeed, when I began my research, I spent hours
obsessively noting each type of shot and shift in lighting in Schüfftan’s work for the Poverty
Row studios during the 1940s. The outcome in the end proved that this sort of approach was
not particularly effective in the long run. I was drowning in statistics and not really finding
the way to grasp a critical model that would help me discuss Schüfftan’s work effectively. I
will set out later in this introduction the methodological approach I did eventually manage to
develop.

Even if they have not helped in the critical analysis of cinematography, the autobiographies
have aided in an understanding of the role of the cinematographer, as have the numerous texts
which collect interviews with cinematographers. In terms of the collections, there is Film
Lighting: Talks with Hollywood’s Cinematographers and Gaffers (Malkiewicz and Gryboski,
1992), Reflections: 21 Cinematographers at Work (Bergery, 2002), Masters of Light:
Conversations with Contemporary Cinematographers (Schaefer and Salvato, 1986),
Contemporary Cinematographers on their Art (Rogers, 1998) and Principal Photography:
Interviews with Feature Film Cinematographers (LoBrutto, 1999). These collections, whilst
a valuable tool in certain terms, are too limited in their scope to be of any great use. For
example, of the 81 interviews in the above 5 books, only 12 are not with members of the
American Society of Cinematographers. There is therefore a huge bias in such texts towards
American Cinematographers, and in particular those who work within Hollywood.
Furthermore, certain cinematographic stars of Hollywood dominate. Of the above 5 books,
Conrad Hall, Haskell Wexler and Vilmos Zsigismond are featured 3 times each.
Furthermore, there is a periodic focus upon those cinematographers (such as Hall, Wexler
and Zsigismond) who rose to fame in the ‘New Hollywood’ era of the late-60s and 1970s.
This corresponds to a new sense of self-conscious artistry introduced by the New Hollywood filmmakers, who had been emerging from film schools rather than working their way up through the studio system. Considering that I have already argued that the dominance of auteur theory has problematized the analysis of cinematography, it is therefore somewhat of a paradox that such a bulk of cinematography literature should emerge from this period of New Hollywood, which reasserted the position of the auteur following the dissolution of the studio system. The only such text to my knowledge that compiles cinematographers in their own words from before this period is Sterling’s *Cinematographers on the Art and Craft of Cinematography* (1987). This comprises essays first published between 1929 and 1937, by the likes of Curt Courant, Billy Blitzer and Günther Rittau.

Two books which do seek to delve into the field of cinematography in greater depth are Duncan Petrie’s *The British Cinematographer* (1996) and Mike Cormack’s *Ideology and Cinematography in Hollywood, 1930-39* (1994). However, Petrie’s valuable addition to the field of literature on cinematography shares little with the aim of this thesis. Petrie’s concern is with the history of a national cinematography, and so tends to focus upon technological innovations and change rather than identifying a cinematographic style. Cormack also does not seek to define the style of a single cinematographer, but rather a Hollywood style of the 1930s. Cormack’s approach of course denies the artistry of any one individual, instead finding a homogenous ‘look’ to which all cinematographers contributed under the studio system. He does however share my aim of identifying a cinematographic style, albeit for the Hollywood studios of a particular period, rather than an individual, and so it is worth examining Cormack’s methodology and its limitations.

Cormack admirably attempts to tackle the problem of talking about the ephemeral nature of cinematography, which has been a continual bane of writing on the topic. The problem simply being, how can one discuss in clear terms such an unquantifiable entity such as light?
Cormack’s solution is a structuralist approach, in which he defines cinematographic style in a set of four categories, each of which are then further subdivided into sub-codes. The main categories are lighting, camera angle, camera distance and camera movement. The following table illustrates Cormack’s four main categories of cinematography and their corresponding sub-codes, with a range of values listed for each (e.g. the scale upon which each sub-code can be judged, such as high contrast to low contrast) (1994: 19).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lighting</th>
<th>Camera Angle</th>
<th>Camera Distance</th>
<th>Camera Movement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Light/dark (extreme over-exposure to extreme under-exposure)</td>
<td>Contrast ratio (high contrast/low contrast)</td>
<td>Distance (very close/very distant)</td>
<td>Pan (speed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intensity (soft/hard)</td>
<td>Horizontal angle (directly in front/directly behind)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tilt (speed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direction (diffuse/precise)</td>
<td>Vertical angle (overhead/underfoot)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Track (speed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location of shadow (absent/present)</td>
<td>Upright angle (upright/upside-down)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Elevation (speed)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cormack then extrapolates these values so that each sub-code directly signifies a set of meanings which range across its scale. So, the level of lighting creates a meaning on a scale of clarity to obscurity, the vertical angle signifies inferiority/superiority, the horizontal angle signifies directness/indirectness, the upright angle signifies balance/imbalance, and the distance signifies importance/unimportance (Ibid.). Having established these cinematographic codes and their meanings Cormack’s analysis then takes the form of
identifying a position along the scales shown in the above table, and applying the corresponding meaning.

By creating such a rigid system of signification Cormack is in constant risk of oversimplifying the complexity of a given image. Furthermore, as Cormack is not concerned with defining the cinematographic style of a single cinematographer, but rather a period of Hollywood filmmaking, he includes a number of fields in his definition of style, such as camera angle, camera distance and camera movement, which may not always be attributed to the influence of a cinematographer. He is concerned with the general Hollywood visual style of this period. That is to say that Cormack is not interested in the effects that are produced by a single cinematographer, rather he is concerned with the effects that are produced by the Hollywood of that given period, under what he terms to be a cinematographic style of the industry.

My approach is different. I intend to take the corpus of films by a single cinematographer, Eugen Schüfftan, and to seek to identify the evolution of a style (in a craft that is presumed only to support a director’s style) across his career. Many would argue that a cinematographer’s role is simply to create the style of lighting demanded by the director. But few could deny that a cinematographer is often chosen to work upon a film based the proven styles of lighting he or she has demonstrated. Cinematographers must therefore offer unique stylistic approaches to the cinema. By exploring the work of a cinematographer we can therefore presume to cast new light upon those films that he worked upon. This is the task of this thesis.

My approach to describing and analysing the cinematographic style of a film also varies from Cormack’s, as I am wary of the simple cause and effect paradigm he sets in place. My method is to describe the construction of lighting set in place for a given scene. To achieve
this I employ terms used in cinematography to describe the different light sources. Examples of this are key light, side light and fill light.¹ I employ these terms not because I am interested in exactly how the cinematographer achieved the final effect, or to demonstrate technical prowess – indeed, my description of the construction of lighting is interpretive rather than based on any facts which demonstrate which lights were actually used – but because these terms paint the clearest picture of the look of the final frame. It is far clearer to describe light sources, direction and strength, than to simply note a high or low contrast in lighting. For the cinematographer’s artistry lies in employing light to create the impression of three dimensions, registered on a two-dimensional screen. This is achieved by using light and shade to give the impression of depth, and therefore to create a coherent cinematographic space. Establishing the lighting structure of a scene is therefore crucial to an understanding of the cinematographic space that the cinematographer has achieved. Having clearly demonstrated the lighting structure of a given scene, I am then able to discuss how this relates to wider issues in terms of the scene and the film, and also in the development of Schüfftan’s style.

Exile

A further crucial aspect to this study of a specific cinematographer comes down to the particular circumstances of Schüfftan’s life, which has been rarely understood from the experience of those personnel ‘below the line’: Exile. There are a great number of texts in

¹ The key light is the primary source of illumination in an image. The use of a strong key light is an important element in the creation of chiaroscuro and Rembrandt lighting effects, which are discussed at greater length throughout this thesis. The side light is a light cast from the side of the set onto the subject of the image, often employed to light one side of the face. The carefully use of side lighting can therefore be a useful tool in the creation of shadows within the frame. In contrast, the fill light can be used to diffuse shadows. It is a soft, broad light cast across the set (or face) to create an even structure of light tones, and to reduce unflattering shadows in close-up shots.
exile studies which examine the conditions of exile of film personnel, and which discuss the influence of those personnel upon the national industry that they have settled within. Unfortunately, by ‘personnel’ I refer to actors, directors, producers and screenwriters. The authorial dominance of these figures has once again caused the struggle of other, lesser known personnel, to be overlooked. This is perhaps an example of film theory and criticism reflecting film history: the struggles of prominent figures such as Fritz Lang were far less than the struggles of craftspeople such as Schüfftan. Their prominence afforded them some luxury in exile, and this prominence has been remembered at the cost of lesser others, and their greater struggles. There is no text, for example, which examines the conditions of exile for cinematographers and other technicians. The reality is that German émigré directors, stars, producers and screenwriters were welcomed to Hollywood and other industries. The technicians, not recognised for any individual artistic skill, were subject in exile to strict quotas, permit regulations and industry unions, in order to protect the indigenous personnel of the host nation. Schüfftan’s own struggles shall become clear during the course of this thesis. But to offer here a dramatic example, Curt Courant, the famous cinematographer of Weimar Germany, who also found success in exile in France, failed entirely to succeed as a cinematographer upon his arrival in the US, thanks to the protectionism of the unions. After arriving in 1941, Courant was only able to photograph two films before his death in 1968, Charlie Chaplin’s *Monsieur Verdoux* in 1947 (for which he is uncredited) and *It Happened in Athens* (Andrew Marton) in 1962. Such stories of exile trauma for film technicians, including Schüfftan’s, remain largely unwritten, although Phillips (2004: 46-50) does provide a rare case study of Courant’s work in French cinema and Omasta (2008: 78-88) has addressed Günther Krampf’s work in Britain. Conversely, the list of texts which examine exile for major European directors includes *Exiles in Hollywood: Major European Film Directors in Hollywood* (Phillips, 1998), *Passport to Hollywood: Hollywood Films, European Directors*
Furthermore, major directors who were forced into exile, such as Fritz Lang, F.W. Murnau, Billy Wilder, Douglas Sirk, G.W. Pabst, Robert Siodmak and Edgar G. Ulmer have all had texts dedicated solely to their work. In examining the work of a single cinematographer who experienced the traumas of exile I seek to redress this balance, demonstrating the very different conditions of exile for technicians.

The *de rigueur* text in recent years for exile studies of cinema has been Hamid Naficy’s *An Accented Cinema: Exilic and Diasporic Filmmaking* (2001), however I shall employ a different key text in this thesis to elaborate upon the understanding of Schüfftan’s exile. I feel that Naficy’s approach of designating exilic cinema as ‘accented’ risks the same oversimplification and labelling that has already blighted mention of Schüfftan’s style in previous criticism (although Gemünden (2008) chooses to apply this label to his subject in his exile study of the films of Billy Wilder). For I argue during the course of this thesis that Schüfftan is *not* a cinematographer of German Expressionism, contrary to the belief of many. This exile story highlights the lazy shorthand in film studies for discussing cinematographic style. In the case of Schüfftan, the failure to investigate the history of his cinematographic style and his actual conditions of exile has resulted in a crucial misconception of his style. This misconception is that Schüfftan is a cinematographer of German Expressionism. A large task of this thesis has been to disprove this myth, to demonstrate a far more complex development of Schüfftan’s style (which actually began in realism rather than Expressionism), which goes far beyond the tokenistic descriptions ‘chiaroscuro’ and ‘Expressionist’ that are so readily employed for Schüfftan’s work. The risk of employing Naficy is that Schüfftan can then simply be designated an ‘Accented Expressionist’ instead. This could perhaps be viewed as an accurate description, however it is not a productive one, nor is it in fact correct. This still offers an oversimplification, for Schüfftan’s style and its
development is far too dense and complex to be understood when reduced to the human desire for nomenclature. Therefore, I seek not a term to capture Schüfftan’s style and development, but rather a way of understanding why and how Schüfftan’s style has been subject to misrecognition during the process of exile. For this I turn to Thomas Elsaesser and his concept of the ‘historical imaginary’ and of ‘mis-cognition’, put forward in *Weimar Cinema and After: Germany’s Historical Imaginary* (2000).

Elsaesser’s theory of the historical imaginary seeks, ‘to name the way in which the perception of the German cinema’s film, genres, stars and directors has been warped’, by the overbearing significance of the Weimar cinema and of German Expressionism (2000: 437). One such example that Elsaesser provides is the cause-and-effect drive within film history that has seen *film noir* positioned as a direct descendent of German Expressionism, thanks in part to the number of European exile directors who made Hollywood *noir* films. This is despite, as Elsaesser and Marc Vernet before him have pointed out, a long history of chiaroscuro-style lighting in Hollywood. As Vernet (1993: 11-12) notes, after a reading of early American cinema by the likes of Cecil B. DeMille and D.W. Griffith, ‘the American cinema had, ever since the 1910s, a long and important tradition of “noir” lighting, whether in gothic or detective films, or simply in order to give greater pathos to scenes set at night.’ In the authoritative text ‘The Classical Hollywood Cinema’ (Bordwell, Staiger and Thompson, 1985), Kristin Thompson (1985: 223) supports Vernet’s view, demonstrating how, during the teens, Hollywood moved away from ‘a dominant use of diffused, overall illumination toward a concentration of “effects” lighting,’ characterized as a greater use of ‘directional patches of light’, although she does clarify that ‘extreme contrasts of light and dark […] did not become the standard way of creating a selective lighting set-up.’ (1985: 225)
Vernet’s (1993: 7-8) revisionist reading of the *film noir*, also debunks another myth, and demonstrates how Expressionist lighting was a rarity in the early films of *noir*: ‘the “expressionist” image is relatively rare in the period 1941-45 (it is represented only by a few isolated scenes in an otherwise “normally” lit film)’.

Elsaesser, commenting on the connection between German Expressionism and *film noir*, makes the point clearly that ‘By placing them across a listing of German émigré directors, the histories are made to mirror each other in an infinite regress that has tended to produce a self-validating tautology, where mutually sustaining causalities pass off as film history what is in effect more like a time loop.’ (2000: 420) This thesis aims to demonstrate how Schüfftan has been subject to the same historical imaginary, which has led to him being viewed as a cinematographer of German Expressionism. As I shall demonstrate during the course of this thesis, Schüfftan’s style in Weimar Germany was actually opposed to that of German Expressionism, and that it was during his exile in Europe that a process of mis-cognition occurred – an expectation for Schüfftan to provide an Expressionist form of lighting – which led to Schüfftan incorporating elements of Expressionism into his developing style, even though, as I shall demonstrate, Schüfftan’s style in this context is far more painterly. Indeed he turns to the Old Masters (especially Rembrandt) for his inspiration.

By channeling the influence of Rembrandt and the Old Masters in his work for the cinema (particularly in the case of the pulp material shot for Poverty Row, which is discussed in Chapter II, Part Two), Schüfftan can be seen to be challenging the boundaries of high and low culture. Furthermore, this can be understood as a challenge to the boundaries between high art Modernism, and a pulp form of Modernism, which is termed ‘vernacular’ by Miriam Bratu Hansen (in a rejection of the term popular) (2000: 333). Hansen examines the distinction between these two forms of Modernism through a reading of the classic
Hollywood cinema, and in particular, our understanding of this cinema as *classic* (2000: 332-350). Schüfftan embraces classical forms of aesthetic representation, informed by an understanding of the canon of great artists, which can be understood as High Modernism and in opposition to mass culture. However, Schüfftan applies this aesthetic approach to the cinema, an art created by design for mass reproduction and mass consumption. He applies this artistic approach to a broad range of films, from those which handle Modernity for the youth of Berlin, such as *Menschen am Sonntag*, to those pulp films of the 1940s made on Poverty Row, which I shall read as examples of Exile Modernism, displaying the imprint of the divide of exile suffered by the filmmakers.

The influence of Rembrandt, therefore, has a far greater impact upon Schüfftan’s aesthetic than Expressionism, demonstrating how he is a perfect example of Vernet’s (1993: 7) argument that, ‘a good number of the directors and cinematographers of German or related origin who are often invoked have nothing in common with expressionism.’ I intend to rectify the assumption in film studies that Schüfftan hailed from German Expressionism, and demonstrate the far more complex development of Schüfftan’s cinematographic style. For as Elsaesser argues:

> Rather than subsume all the directors, stars and movie personnel in the general category of émigré, we would have to study, in each and every case, the precise reasons and circumstances that brought a German director to the United States. This is not only a condition of sound historical scholarship, but also a requirement for a fair consideration of every human fate that otherwise – even with the best of intentions – would remain hidden, blocked out and lost to history by such a blanket term. (2000: 429)

In this thesis I help to answer Elsaesser’s call, by adding to our understanding of the émigrés’ role in film history the case of Eugen Schüfftan.
Structure

The challenges of writing about cinematography have been numerous. As this thesis seeks to tread new ground, there is no great wealth of existing literature upon which to base my approach. Nick James has noted this fact, when highlighting the absence of any text on cinematography from *Sight & Sound*’s 2010 poll of the most inspirational film books: ‘Some whole subject areas […] get short shrift. Cinematography […] doesn’t seem to have an urtext to call its own’ (2010: 18). Therefore, there are bounds to be gaps in my approach, as I begin to explore ways in which the cinematographic style of a cinematographer can be discussed. Indeed, my early research followed a number of different approaches to addressing the career of a cinematographer, which were ultimately not conducive. For example, I attempted detailed statistical analysis, which proved to be reductive, and did not aid in arguing for the artistry of a cinematographic style. Genre was another approach, which again felt too limiting to the breadth and variety of a cinematographer’s career. These problems were compounded by a lack of availability of the majority of Schüfftan’s films (at the start of my research only around 10 of Schüfftan’s films were readily available on DVD). Another major obstacle was also a large cause for the undertaking of this thesis – the lack of information available on a cinematographer. My aim was to examine an undervalued key member of personnel, however a cinematographer such as Schüfftan has been so undervalued that there are no interviews with him, and nothing to suggest his artistic intentions. Furthermore, large biographical details remained unknown, largely surrounding Schüfftan’s prevention from the ASC upon his arrival in the US in the 1940s. Even *American Cinematographer* has failed to address Schüfftan’s work, despite his eventual admission into the American Society of Cinematographers, and his success at the Academy Awards in 1962. I began to understand why so few had undertaken the task of analysing cinematography.
A breakthrough of sorts occurred with the discovery of Schüfftan’s correspondence with Siegfried Kracauer (reprinted by Asper, 2003). Although much of the contents of these letters was anecdotal between friends, it nonetheless helped to fill some of the gaps in Schüfftan’s movements, and unfulfilled film projects. However, the major breakthrough of this thesis was a research trip to the film archives of Berlin and Paris. I was able to view a great number of unavailable films photographed by Schüfftan at the Bibliothèque du film, Paris, and the Deutsche Kinemathek, Berlin. Furthermore, the Deutsche Kinemathek is home to the archives of the Paul Kohner Talent Agency. This agency specialized in representing émigré film personnel in Hollywood, and provides a valuable resource on the conditions of exile for those newly arrived on the West Coast of the United States. The Eugen Schüfftan files in the Paul Kohner archive revealed the reality of the many challenges faced by Schüfftan. The wealth of information that I gained from this trip informed my approach thereafter. I came to realize that a great misunderstanding clouded Schüfftan’s work: that he was a cinematographer of German Expressionism. Schüfftan’s style was in fact informed and shaped during the processes of exile, and slowly developed to suit demand. To clarify this complex development of Schüfftan’s style I settled upon an approach which examines the full breadth of Schüfftan’s career, and discusses his approach to lighting each film. This allows the development of Schüfftan’s style to be revealed in accordance with the conditions of life for a cinematographer, and the demands and expectations of those around him. Crucially, by understanding how Schüfftan’s style had developed, I was then able to understand what Schüfftan’s lighting brought to a film’s meaning.

This thesis therefore has three main goals: 1) to foreground the role of the cinematographer, and to identify the development of Schüfftan’s cinematographic style over the course of his career; 2) to examine the conditions of exile upon the cinematographer, and to demonstrate how the process of exile has led to an oversimplification and mis-cognition of Schüfftan’s
style; 3) to demonstrate how films can be analysed, in a variety of manners, from the perspective of cinematography. The structure of my thesis aims to achieve all these goals. Its overarching structure is a comprehensive biographical overview, by far the most exhaustive to date, of Schüfftan’s career. This encompasses thorough research upon Schüfftan’s career in order to reinsert him into the narrative of film history, and a discussion of his lighting practices and their development throughout his career. As part of this study I also tackle the impact of his exile, and demonstrate both the challenges of his career in exile, and how his style has come to be misrecognised by film history.

The thesis is divided into four chapters, each of which comprises a stage in the career of Eugen Schüfftan. The biographical study accounts for one part of each chapter. To accompany the biographical study, a second part of each chapter comprises a closer case study of one or more of the films made by Schüfftan during that period. These case studies seek to illuminate a number of the films which Schüfftan has worked up, by examining them from the role of the cinematographer. More generally, through these case studies I aim to demonstrate how film studies may incorporate an understanding of the cinematographer’s contribution to more traditional approaches to film. Therefore, across these case studies are a variety of different approaches to filmic analysis, rather than a singular analytical approach. What they share is that in each case study I demonstrate how Schüfftan’s use of lighting impacts upon the meaning of the image and therefore the reading of the text as a whole.

Chapter I of this thesis tackles the years 1886 to 1933, addressing Schüfftan’s early life in Germany, and his first years as a cinematographer until his escape from Germany in 1933. However, before the events of this period are detailed, I turn first to address the single film Schüfftan is perhaps most famous for, despite not acting as cinematographer. Chapter I, Part One of this thesis deals with Schüfftan’s famous special effects invention, the Schüfftan Process, and its usage in Fritz Lang’s *Metropolis*. The process still represents Schüfftan’s
most significant achievement for many, and is largely the reason why his name may be known. The process launched Schüfftan’s career and its heritage stayed within him throughout. And yet, its actual design and function is rarely thoroughly understood. In this section, titled ‘The Technology and Aesthetics of the Schüfftan Process’, I set out to explain the process, by employing Schüfftan’s original patents, before then addressing the aesthetic results of the process in its most famous application, on Metropolis. I provide this analysis against the backdrop of Modernism, which dominated Berlin during the 1920s, and argue that Metropolis and the Schüfftan Process are both products of this period of Modernity. I thereby demonstrate how theorists of Modernism, such as those of the Frankfurt School, become insightful to a reading of the film and the process, in terms of the individual and his/her relationship to society. Chapter I, Part Two is titled ‘Smoke and Mirrors, 1886-1933’. This deals with Schüfftan’s early years in Weimar Germany as an inventor and cinematographer. Crucially, this part establishes that Schüfftan’s role in Weimar cinema was not as a cinematographer of German Expressionism. I demonstrate that he was in fact keenly interested in issues of realism, which he was exploring as part of his promising career with Ufa and his own (little known) directorial projects.

Chapter II addresses the second stage of Schüfftan career, between 1933 and 1947, in exile, first in Europe and then in America. Part One, ‘European Exile, 1933-1940’, deals with Schüfftan’s political exile from Nazi Germany and his movements throughout Europe to find work. Schüfftan found particular success in this period, alongside a number of other émigré technicians, in France. In this part I show how, in exile, Schüfftan gradually moved away from his interests in realism, towards a more stylized form of lighting. This occurred, it would seem, to fulfil the needs of European directors and producers who, through a process of mis-cognition, expected Schüfftan to provide the forms of lighting they had witnessed of the German cinema during the 1920s. Part Two continues this tale of exile to the United
States, covering the period 1941 to 1947. This forms the case study of the second chapter, titled ‘Exile Modernism on Poverty Row, 1941-1947’. This case study handles Schüfftan’s failure to be accepted into the American Society of Cinematographers, forcing him into Hollywood’s Poverty Row studios, where he relied upon the diasporic community of fellow émigré directors and producers to keep him in work. I discuss these low budget speedily produced films, made in the underbelly of Hollywood, as examples of Exile Modernism, a form of Modernism which tended to communicate the traumas and experiences of exile. To support this reading I also discuss how these films can be viewed in similar terms to Deleuze and Guattari’s description of minor literatures, involving processes of deterritorialization, collectivization and politicization. My case study is therefore divided into these three terms. The first section, ‘Deterritorialization’ examines the process of Schüfftan’s exile from Europe, and his further deterritorialization from the major Hollywood studios by the protectionism of the union. The section ‘Collectivization’ then examines the importance of collaboration amongst the diasporic community, with particular reference to Schüfftan’s collaborations with the director Edgar G. Ulmer, who kept him employed throughout most of the decade. Finally, in the section ‘Politicization’ I offer a close reading of one of Schüfftan’s Poverty Row films, *Hitler’s Madman* (Sirk, 1942), to demonstrate how the film can be seen as an example of Exile Modernism in the cinema.

The third chapter of this thesis turns its attention to the period 1948 to 1959. In Part One, ‘A Return to Work in Europe’, I address Schüfftan’s rather nomadic filmmaking experiences of the late 1940s and 50s. Having received American citizenship in 1947, but still unable to gain admittance to the union, Schüfftan returned to Europe, where he had found his greatest successes, safe in the knowledge that he could return to America. As I demonstrate, Schüfftan still encountered a great number of struggles in this period, and endured a restless lifestyle in his constant search for the next film project. The case study that forms Part Two
of this chapter, ‘The Cinematographic Representation of the Asylum Space’, looks in detail at Schüfftan’s lighting choices with regards to a particular space, that of the asylum, in Georges Franju’s *La Tête contre les murs/Head Against the Wall* (1959). I also argue that, with the aid of Schüfftan’s lighting, the film can be linked to contemporary discourses at the time on the treatment of the mentally ill.

The final chapter of this thesis, Chapter IV, is concerned with Schüfftan’s final years as a cinematographer, between 1960 and 1977. Part One, ‘An American Cinematographer’, details Schüfftan’s final acceptance into (one branch) of the ASC, allowing him to finally shoot films in America, albeit only in the New York area. This resulted in some of Schüfftan’s greatest successes, most notably in the form of his two collaborations with Robert Rossen, *The Hustler* (1961) and *Lilith* (1964). Schüfftan finally received recognition from the industry that had rejected him for so many years, in the form of an Academy Award for his work on *The Hustler*. This first part of my final chapter also details Schüfftan back-and-forth between New York and Paris for his collaborations with Jean-Pierre Mocky, and the fading of his career in the late 1960s as his eyesight was failing. Chapter IV, Part Two is the final case study of this thesis, and deals with Schüfftan’s abovementioned New York filmmaking (specifically on *Something Wild* (Jack Garfein, 1960), *The Hustler*, and *Trois chambres à Manhattan/Three Rooms in Manhattan* (Carné, 1965)). The case study, titled ‘Cityspace in the New York City Trilogy’, examines the three films for their shared use of the New York location, and for a similar intent of blending a dialectic of realism and stylization (something discussed by each of the three directors). I argue that Schüfftan’s dual interests in realism and more Expressionist forms of lighting make him the perfect cinematographer to create such effects for the films. Furthermore, I employ Edward Soja’s *Thirdspace* (1996) in order to mediate the complex dialectical tension between realism and stylization, and to
demonstrate Schüfftan’s cinematographic negotiation of the various spaces of the city, including interiors and exteriors.
Chapter I

Part One
The Technology and Aesthetics of the Schüfftan Process

Part Two
Smoke and Mirrors, 1886 – 1933
Part One

The Technology and Aesthetics of the Schüfftan Process

Introduction

In part one of this chapter I look back to the very foundations of Schüfftan's career in the film industry: the invention of his 'Schüfftan Process' and its famous application in Fritz Lang's Metropolis (1927). For although Schüfftan did not in fact act as cinematographer on Metropolis (this credit is taken by Karl Freund and Günther Rittau), the mirror process for filming miniatures in large scale which Schüfftan invented for use on Metropolis is a perfect microcosm of the tension between the technological and the aesthetic which exists in the work of any cinematographer of repute. Furthermore, a sound understanding of the technical processes involved in the 'Schüfftan Process' is imperative to this study, particularly considering that rather than his cinematographic work, it is this process which is still Schüfftan's legacy. It is the main reason why his name may still be recognised today (and is
therefore addressed by this thesis), despite the later acclaim and variety of his career as a cinematographer.

**The Technological**

Schüfftan filed the first application to patent his process, described as an 'Apparatus for Composite Cinematography' in Germany on May 9th 1923, with two subsequent patents applied for on March 1st 1924 ('Method and apparatus for producing composite motion pictures') and September 23rd 1924 ('System of taking photographic and cinematographic pictures'). Each was then later patented in the United States, respectively, on January 4th 1927, with patent number 1,613,201; on November 9th 1926, with patent number 1,606,482; and on October 5th 1926, with patent number 1,601,886. The process itself is described by Schüfftan in patent 1,601,886 as follows:

>This invention is concerned with improvements in the production of photographic and cinematographic takings at which objects of different scale are united within the camera and by means of a mirror to a picture corresponding picturally [sic.] and as to the scale of the picture parts to the conditions required, the unison by means of the mirror being effected by the mirror being provided with a mirror foil at its camera facing side and being made transparent or light permeable by the mirror foil being eliminated at certain places, so that one sees at the permeable places the object arranged behind the mirror, whereas the reflecting portion of the mirror reproduces as reflection the complement to the through-sight object. (Schüfftan, 1926)

Clearly it is necessary to clarify some of the convolutions of Schüfftan's complex invention. Essentially it is a process through which two separate elements of scale are combined within a single image. One element is usually a live action sequence, featuring movement and
actors, and the other is often a miniature set or a photographic backdrop. Through the Schüfftan Process, both elements may be filmed through one camera, uniting them in a single frame and giving the static element the scale required over the actors (see Figure 1. In the description which follows the numbering corresponds to those numbers listed on the diagram).

Figure 1: An example of the process entered with US patent 1,606,482.

The Schüfftan Process is an optical deception literally achieved through 'smoke and mirrors', as it is through the use of a mirror that the two separate elements are combined within the single film image. A mirror (51) is mounted in front of the camera lens (6), angled so that the miniature (53), beyond the lens's perception, is reflected on to the appropriate portion of the mirror, and magnified to the required scale (achieved through the proximity of the object
to the mirror). To combine this mirrored image alongside another scale of object, the live-action element, the appropriate portion of the reflective surface of the mirror is scratched away to leave clear glass (40), through which the second element of the final image may be performed (52). Finally then we have a single unified image, in one part filmed through clear glass before the camera, and in the other part reflected in a mirror from off-camera. A completed example of a Schüfftan Process shot can be seen in Figure 2, in which the upper portions of the set (above the open doorway) are in fact a miniature model.

![Figure 2: An example of the Schufftan Process from Metropolis.](image)

There are a few variations upon this basic principle which Schüfftan has highlighted in his patents. For one, he notes that it is immaterial whether it is the miniature which is reflected and the life-size scene which appears through the glass or vice versa (Schüfftan, 1926).
Furthermore, an image which has already been filmed may be projected to provide one of the elements of the final complete image, a technique which Schüfftan suggests would aid in the blending of the two distinct elements (Schüfftan, 1926).

It is worth briefly mentioning here one particular technological development in special effects shots of the 1900s which anticipated the invention of Schüfftan's process. Known as the 'glass-shot', it was in fact one of the earliest attempts in cinema to combine live action with a separate static element of a set during the production process. The technique was developed as early as 1905 and employed by Norman O. Dawn in 1907 on the set of *California Missions* (Fielding, 1985: 31). It involved a plate of glass placed between the lens of the camera and the set, with part of the glass painted upon to augment the existing full-scale set, which was filmed through the clear unpainted section of the glass. Such 'glass-shots' clearly anticipate the invention of the Schüfftan Process, through the division of the frame by glass, and the combination of two separate elements.

This is also the basic principle upon which matte shots would later be based. The matte shot was a development by Charles Assola, for which black cardboard was used to mask the part of the frame which needed to be painted. As Jane Barnwell (2004: 113) explains, the technician would then produce a counter matte, which protected 'the already exposed area while the painting was photographed, thus enabling the combination of action and sequence.' The benefit of such a technique was that the image could be completed in post-production, allowing for quick shooting which would not be delayed by waiting for the presence of the completed paintings.

The Schüfftan Process holds certain aesthetic advantages over both glass-shots and matte shots, in its ability to create more complex and accurately blended imagery. This is achieved through the use of miniatures, rather than a reliance upon *trompe-l’œil* painting.
particular, the natural sensation of depth and space created through the lighting of miniature sets, which is so effective in the resultant images of the Schüfftan Process (and will discussed later in relation to images from *Metropolis*), cannot be adequately recreated through the unavoidable flatness of painted backdrops. Furthermore, it is the use of the mirror that crucially allows the image of the miniature to be scaled up in relation to the live action. This successfully masks the use of a miniature set, creating a coherently composed image from two separate elements. Contrary to the time-saving benefit of matte shot techniques (preventing any delays during production), there are also clear benefits in being able to perceive how the completed image will appear at the time of filming.

The Schüfftan Process, once patented, achieved considerable success with uses in numerous films from across the globe. Schüfftan travelled to America in 1926, where he stayed for a year for the purpose of introducing the procedure and selling it to the American market. Schüfftan accomplished this by selling the rights to Universal Studios. During this period Schüfftan worked upon the film *Love Me and the World is Mine* (E.A. Dupont, 1926), in which he employed his newly popular process. Petrie (1996: 25) has noted of the British context:

> The [Schüfftan] process was used on a great many British films beginning at BIP, which initially bought the British rights, with Herbert Wilcox's *Madame Pompadour* (1927). Hitchcock employed it to great effect on *The Ring* (1927); *Blackmail* (1929) – for the British Museum sequence; *Rich and Strange* (1932), *Number Seventeen* (1932) and *The Man Who Knew Too Much* (1934). While Wilcox's regal biopic *Victoria the Great* (1937) was made entirely in the studio with the royal interiors recreated using the Schüfftan Process.

Despite this global success, it was in Germany, home of the most dominant and creatively fertile of film industries in the 1920s, and the birthplace of Schüfftan's invention, that the
process achieved greatest acclaim. Early experiments with the new invention were employed on Fritz Lang's *Die Nibelungen* (1924) (Schüfftan, 2003: 109). However, the film which heralded the new Schüfftan Process was Fritz Lang's *Metropolis* (1927), one of the most enduringly popular products of the Weimar period. An ambitious Ufa super-production with a budget of over six million RM, *Metropolis* tells the story of a futuristic city where a powerful class divide exists (Hake, 2008: 34). Beneath the city the workers are tasked with operating the machines which run the city, whereas above the ruling classes live in luxury. Freder (Gustav Fröhlich), the son of the city’s ruler (Alfred Abel), meets Maria (Brigitte Helm), and follows her to discover the horrors of the worker’s city. Freder is appalled at the truth of how the lifestyle of his class is sustained, and joins Maria and the worker’s plight. However, Freder’s father, Joh, discovers his son’s cause and the influence that Maria has over him, and so charges Rotwang (Rudolf Klein-Rogge) to create a robot in her image. As we shall see, the Schüfftan Process is evident in a variety of sequences filmed against the backdrop of the cityscape, with the bottom half of the frame tending to comprise of live-action and full size sets, and the upper portion created through the reflection of an off-camera miniature (see Figure 2 for example).

**The Aesthetics**

A number of recollections from craftspeople involved in the making of *Metropolis* have functioned to inform us of the practical working nature of the process, and have helped to identify the sequences in which it was employed. Günther Rittau (2000: 78-79), who acted as cinematographer on *Metropolis*, has noted:

> With the help of parts of sets and smaller-scale Schüfftan models, we created parts of the gigantic street scenes and the atmospheric scenes in the cathedral. During Schüfftan
shots, special attention has to be given to the way the camera is set up and to the lighting of the model sets. The visionary images of the Moloch machine, which were also made with the help of the mirror trick process, were particularly complicated to create.

Otto Hunte (2000: 80-81), who acted as art director, has also identified particular sequences in which the process was employed, and the sizable workload it entailed:

Most of the time and effort was taken up by the construction of the main road of Metropolis, at the end of which the new ‘Tower of Babel’ rises; the tower was meant to be 500 meters high and therefore could in no way be constructed in full size. I had to use a miniature model and represent the traffic passing through the street by means of a trick shot. […] The work took almost six weeks, and the result flits past the eyes of the spectator in twice six seconds.

Such information is of considerable importance because the process itself proved so successful it is no simple task to identify shots where the process has been employed. There are however certain compositional traits of Schüfftan Process shots which grant them a unique aesthetic value. Firstly, Schüfftan Process shots are necessarily static. The careful alignment of the camera, the mirror and the subjects of the shots prevents any possibility of camera movement. This restrictive factor presumably limited the long-term, wide-scale usage of the process in the film industry. Another aesthetic trait is the line of divide between the live action element and the miniature, the point of bisection between the reflective mirror and the clear glass. This line, as we shall see, is not always easily identifiable and does not form a straight divide, but rather can be a complex and intricate line which follows the edge of the miniature. Nevertheless, a division between two scales is present, causing the aesthetic effect of one portion of the frame being dedicated exclusively to set, and the other portion to the subjects. Furthermore, the set in miniature will tend to occupy the upper portions of the frame, as the process is used to create a sense of scale, often in buildings and other large
structures. Compositionally, obfuscation of the line of bisection is created by building up the lower parts of the set in full-scale, which allows the miniature version to more realistically blend with the set's higher reaches.

I will now illustrate the aesthetic effects of these compositional traits of the Schüfftan Process as it appears in two images from *Metropolis*: In the ‘Stadium of the Sons’ scene, and in a scene set in the city of the workers. The very nature of the Schüfftan Process is to position live action subjects in relation to space – not to place them within this space but to place them against a necessarily grand backdrop. This functions to communicate certain points about the status of that subject. *Metropolis* is a film which speaks of class divisions. As I shall demonstrate, the application of the Schüfftan Process, and its inherent divisions within the image, acts to support such a reading.

The Stadium of the Sons is an early example of the use of the Schüfftan Process in *Metropolis*. It is a sequence intended to display the privileges enjoyed by the upper classes of the Metropolis. The scene itself has been excised from many versions of the film but was fortunately restored by the Friedrich-Wilhelm-Murnau-Stiftung in 2001. It is also one of the few examples where original photographs exist which demonstrate how the final image was created. These have been reprinted by Minden and Bachmann in their collection on *Metropolis* (2000: 70-71). The complete image as it appears in the film shows young men from the upper part of the city, including Freder, on a race track. This comprises the bottom third of the frame and is the full-scale set which was used in the creation of the shot. The two thirds of the frame which exist above it show the high wall of the stadium, topped with athletic statues, and a large building at the end of this wall. This part of the image was created through the use of a miniature set, reflected to combine with the live action segment to result in the final image (see Figure 3).
Production images identify that the line of the divide between the live action and the miniature, though not evident in the final blended image, exists at the bottom of the columns which run down the wall (part of the wall was present as a full-scale set behind the heads of the actors).

The aesthetic result of the final coherent image functions to comment upon the status of the subjects who are present within the frame. The grandiose nature of the stadium and the ergonomic lines of the architecture suggest the wealth and relative comfort within which the subjects exist. However, the domination of humanity is still apparent through the juxtaposition of this frame, whereby humankind is miniaturized against its environment. The high wall of the stadium atop with statues contains the upper class within a field of play.
keeping out the workers beyond, but the upper classes are similarly prevented from a role in the city below. The upper classes are at play because technology keeps the working classes at bay. Both classes can therefore be seen to be dominated by the same impersonal power. In describing Herbert Marcuse's dominant argument in *One-Dimensional Man*, Tom Bottomore (1984: 39) comments that:

> What this analysis claims to show is that the two main classes in capitalist society – bourgeoisie and proletariat – have disappeared as effective historical agents; hence there is, on one side, no dominant *class*, but instead domination by an impersonal power ('scientific-technological rationality') and on the other side, no opposing *class*, for the working class has been assimilated and pacified, not only through high mass consumption but in the rationalized process of production itself.

Marcuse's argument demonstrates how technology functions to mute class voices from both above and below it, allowing both to conform within institutionalized frameworks. In the stadium image seen above, the dichotomy between *apparent* freedom and *actual* sublimation to the institutional order can be seen through the very act of play seen within the stadium walls. Roger Caillois (2001: 58) finds in play, 'simultaneously liberty and invention, fantasy and discipline.' He continues:

> All important cultural manifestations are based upon it. It creates and sustains the spirit of enquiry, respect for rules and detachment. In some respects the rules of law, prosody, counterpoint, perspective, stagecraft, liturgy, military tactics, and debate are rules of play. They constitute conventions that must be respected. (2001: 58)

So whilst these members of the upper classes appear to be enjoying freedom through their ability to play, they are also bound by the same social order with which technology governs the lower classes.
A further example of the Schüfftan Process appears after the Stadium of the Sons sequence, when Freder has been introduced to the horrors of life below his grand portion of the city. The image is Freder's first view of the city of the workers (see Figure 4). The frame is divided into two fairly equal portions, with the upper section again an example of miniature photography. However, in contrast to the previous example of the Schüfftan Process, here both portions of the frame feature movement. The lower portion of the frame, considerably lighter than above the divide, shows a work-room with various platforms, upon which the workers endlessly operate the machinery that keeps the city functioning. Above the divide, where miniatures were employed, the heavy machinery sits with various moving cogs and wheels. Continuity between the two aspects of the process has been achieved by the presence of large scaffolding which passes across the divide, helping to obscure the use of process photography.
In this example, while less dominant in terms of space in the frame than the previous example of the Stadium of the Sons, here the density of the miniature photography appears to weigh down upon the workers beneath. In fact, not only operating this machinery, the workers appear to be physically holding it up, holding up the divided frame. This physical exertion is in stark contrast to the image of physical exertion from the stadium scene. A direct comparison can be made between the statues on the stadium which have their arms raised to the clear sky, and this image, where the raised arms of the workers are weighed down upon by the machinery above. There is also a contrast between the two images in terms of composition of light. The lighting of the workers’ city appears, in many respects, in reverse to the lighting choices for the Stadium of the Sons. In the workers’ city the space above is notably darker, bearing down upon the workers, whereas the lightness of the sky above the
runners in the stadium creates a sense of freedom and space. There is also much greater depth in the Stadium of the Sons, where the ergonomic lines of the architecture create the sense of grandeur that the stadium requires. In the city of the workers however, the lower portion of the frame features a number of pillars which, as they recede into the distance, function to highlight the scale of the working environment. The upper portion of the frame lacks this same sense of depth, with the whirring cogs and belts all competing for space in the foreground of the image. This functions to construct the metropolis and its infrastructure as a monolithic entity against which individual workers cannot compete.

The theoretical application of the Schüfftan Process

Beyond the undeniable necessity of preserving the Schüfftan Process as an artefact of film history, viewing the application of the effect in *Metropolis* from the privilege of hindsight allows us to see how both the film and the process are bound up with discourses of Modernism – specifically the industrial-technological Modernism of ‘mass production, mass consumption, and mass annihilation’ (Hansen, 2000: 332). Filmed in Berlin in 1926, the film correlates to the period of German Modernity. Indeed, as Janet Ward (2001: 2) notes, ‘Germany of the 1920s offers us a stunning moment in modernity when surface values first ascended to become determinants of taste, activity and occupation.’ Berlin was witnessing great economic growth on the back of the world's most technologically advanced war, and artistic styles such as Dadaism and Cubism, and architectural styles such as Bauhaus were emerging. German cinema was similarly feeling the push of Modernity, creating large budget spectacles and constant innovations in film technology. Sociologists too were identifying such trends in Germany, with Siegfried Kracauer (1995) publishing his critique of Modernism, *The Mass Ornament* in 1927 (the year of *Metropolis'*s release), and Walter
Benjamin (reprinted 2009) releasing *One-Way Street* in the following year. Germany in the 1920s also saw the establishment of the Institute for Social Research in 1923, which would later become known as the Frankfurt School, comprising the most influential group of Modernist theorists.

In this respect, *Metropolis* and the Schüfftan Process can be seen as a product of this period of Modernity, and these Modernist theorists therefore become insightful to an understanding of the text and process. The importance of addressing the use of the Schüfftan Process in the film has been suggested by Andreas Huyssen, (1986: 68) who has noted that 'For his indictment of modern technology as oppressive and destructive, which prevails in most of the narrative, Lang ironically relies on one of the most novel cinematic techniques.' It is a novel cinematic technique. However, it should also be said that paradoxically it relies for its effect on the mirror, not therefore, the cinematic apparatus. For the camera merely provides the means by which this process may be viewed, rather than being fundamental to the creation of the final image. In this sense (contra Huyssen) there is a little irony in the method Lang has employed for his indictment of modern technology. The Schüfftan Process becomes the ideal *un*-cinematic and *non*-technological process for critiquing the ideology of technological Modernity.

The critiques which are made by Lang are against mass society and the advancement of technology, and it is precisely these elements of the *mise-en-scène* which the Schüfftan Process is used to reinforce. The mirrored section of the image captures the enlarged miniature of the city and lacks any human subjects. Individuals of the city are therefore captured in the live-action element of the Schüfftan Process, in the lower portions of the frame. The inherent division within the process means that the live action subjects of the image are not placed within an environment created by the miniature, but *against* it, creating
a tension within the shot which aligns to the Modernist reading of the individual and his relationship to mass society. In short, there is a sense that the city as created through this use of miniature is crushing the individual below. Modernist discourses in relationship to city spaces are most readily associated with Siegfried Kracauer and Walter Benjamin, who were both preoccupied with the metropolis in much of their writings. Graeme Gilloch (1996: 1) has identified the inherent paradox that rests at the heart of the individual's relationship to the city, as exemplified in Benjamin's own feelings: 'For Benjamin, the great cities of modern European culture were both beautiful and bestial, a source of exhilaration and hope on the one hand and of revulsion and despair on the other.' With a similar sentiment, in his 1930 essay *Screams on the Street*, Siegfried Kracauer steps closer to identifying this source of revulsion and despair, as a loss of individualism within the city space and the mass of society. He finds that:

> these streets lose themselves in infinity; that buses roar through them, whose occupants during the journey to their distant destinations look down so indifferently upon the landscape of pavements, shop windows and balconies as if upon a river valley or a town in which they would never think of getting off; that a countless human crowd moves in them, constantly new people with unknown aims that intersect like the linear maze of a pattern sheet. (Frisby, 1986: 142)

In these thoughts held by Benjamin and Kracauer, we are witness to a fearful loss of individuality against the rise of mass culture and the drive of Modernity in Weimar Germany, an existence where humanity becomes defined by mass actions, mass trajectories and mass ornaments. The representation of the city and of mass society as created by the Schüfftan Process is similarly bleak. Mass society is represented as technological, grandiose and inhuman, diminishing those who stand against it, across the divide. However, it is this divide that is crucial. It is both the divide between the individual and mass society and the divide
between two sections of the frame. The divide is the means by which the miniature sets encompass the grandiose nature of mass society and dwarf the individual in its wake. The divide is the mirror.

In discussing the relationship between the individual and mass society, it is necessary to establish how the mirror, the essential element to the creation of the Schüfftan Process, has long been understood in cultural terms in relation to the psyche. The connection between the mirror and the psyche comes to us as early as Greek mythology, in the tale of Narcissus. Upon the birth of Narcissus the seer Teiresias declared, 'Narcissus will live to a ripe old age, provided that he never knows himself' (Graves, 1960: 286). Now fully grown, Narcissus caused the death of Ameinius. This was avenged by the God Artemis, who cursed Narcissus to fall in love with whoever he first set eyes upon, but denied him the consummation of that love. However, before Narcissus was witness to any other living person he came across a spring. Kneeling to the water's edge, ready to quench his thirst, Narcissus cast his gaze into the still water and fell in love with his own reflection. As Robert Graves (1960: 287) explains:

At first he tried to embrace and kiss the beautiful boy who confronted him, but presently recognized himself, and lay gazing enraptured into the pool, hour after hour. How could he endure both to possess and yet not to possess? Grief was destroying him, yet he rejoiced in his torments; knowing at least that his other self would remain true to him, whatever happened.

The tale ends in tragedy when Narcissus kills himself as the only means by which he can consummate the love of his own image.

In light of both the cultural significance which the mirror holds to the psyche, and of Kracauer and Benjamin's writings on the relationship of the individual to the city, the mirror,
which exists to fragment the image, can be read more literally as a mirror that reflects society. This reflection functions against the subjects within the frame. In this respect the image of the city can be considered along the lines of Benjamin's notion of *Denkbilder*, or 'thought-images', the term Benjamin gave to a number of his texts which dealt with his impressions of various cityscapes. As Gilloch (2002: 164) has explained in relation to Benjamin's impressions of Moscow, 'The *Denkbilder* are imagistic miniatures which seek to pioneer new modes of urban representation, ones which capture the fluid and fleeting character of metropolitan existence.' There are two elements of the *Denkbilder* that are therefore important to this study and allow us to view Schüfftan Process shots as versions of *Denkbild*. Firstly, there is the idea that the city is represented by the individual as a thought-image, which in terms of the Schüfftan Process can be seen through the use of the mirror. The mirror, which stands between the subject and the city, can be perceived as a reflection of the individual's psyche. Secondly, there is the notion of 'imagistic miniatures', an individual's perception of the metropolis represented through one’s own microcosmic perception of the whole. Imagistic miniatures are similarly central to the Schüfftan Process, whereby miniature models act as a microcosm of a far grander spectacle, the metropolis, and are enlarged through the use of the mirror to reflect mass society's oppression of the individual.

Benjamin’s notion of the *Denkbilder* therefore allows us to understand the essential dichotomy that exists within the Schüfftan Process, of a divided frame, but one which nonetheless encapsulates both the individual, and that individual’s impression of the crushing force of the metropolis. Schüfftan will return, nearly 40 years later in his career, to the representational force of the city and its relation to the individual, in three key films set in New York City, the same city which acted as the visual inspiration for the city of *Metropolis*. I address these films, and the individual’s relation to the city, in Chapter IV, Part Two of this thesis.
The Schüfftan Process can play a crucial part in understanding the tension which is established between individualism and mass society in *Metropolis*. It is a process which is crucial to the representation of the city. Writing on the representation of cityscapes, Susan Hayward (2000: 23) has identified two images of the city:

There is, first, a city of our imaginings including a *repressed* city of our imaginings that is a certain type of body – a corporeality that is linked to our psyche (‘it's in there in our minds and it's real’); and, second, there is an invisibilised city of our suppressed imaginings, another type of ‘body’ – a corporeality that is linked to a fragmented social existentiality (‘it's out there in the world and it's real’).

The use of the Schüfftan Process allows for both of these representations of the city to be present, and in fact acts as a mediatory, not between the hand and the heart, as in the film's famous closing lines, but rather between an idealized city that exists within our minds, and between the suppressed city which is present in 'fragmented social existentiality.'

**Conclusion**

Anton Kaes (1993: 148) has noted that the reviews following the release of *Metropolis* described the film as an ‘Expressionist love story’. For Schüfftan’s part he had little to do with the Expressionist period of German cinema, merely providing the technology for *Metropolis*. He arrived at the Schüfftan Process from an artistic background, having studied painting and architecture, and as we shall come to learn during the course of this thesis, his later lighting would in fact be informed by the work of the Old Masters, rather than this period of German cinema. Despite the development of Schüfftan’s cinematographic style which will hereafter be discussed, and the acclaim that Schüfftan would receive in later years,
the Schüfftan Process and its use on *Metropolis* has nevertheless remained Schüfftan’s best known legacy.

Regardless of this legacy for Schüfftan, and the innovative significance of the Schüfftan Process, within less than a decade of its use on *Metropolis* it would become superceded by technological advancements. Raymond Fielding (1985: 68), writing in 1965, has noted the few attempts to retain the Schüfftan Process as a working procedure:

> Over the years, individual workers have developed their own special equipment for working with this process, including (a) segmented mirrors, whose surface is composed of numerous reflecting particles, the positions of which can be mechanically changed to conform to particular outlines, (b) special frames which allow for rapid alignment, and (c) supplementary optical systems which provide for sharp focus on reflected objects which are placed relatively close to the mirror.

Despite such developments, the Schüfftan Process remains a brief technological advancement which was quickly superseded in the mid-1930s, for cost effectiveness and ease of use, by back projection techniques and matte shots, despite the arguable aesthetic superiority of Schüfftan's invention over both. By this time Schüfftan had fled the Nazi regime in Germany and was already working as an experienced cinematographer in France, due in no small part to the reputation garnered by the Schüfftan Process, and in particular its usage in *Metropolis*, which had successfully functioned in alignment with the film's Modernist ideology.
Early years

Eugen Julius Schüfftan was born on 21st July 1886\(^2\) to a Jewish family in the city of Breslau, in Silesia, Germany (now Wroclaw, Poland). As we shall come to learn of Schüfftan himself, the city of Breslau experienced many shifting national identities throughout its history, being part of Poland, Bohemia, Austria and Prussia, before becoming part of Germany. Little is known of Schüfftan's early life before he entered the film industry. A brief biographical statement in Schüfftan's curriculum vitae\(^3\) reveals that he graduated from the Academy of Arts in Breslau, where he studied painting, working in impressionism, and within the Secession movement. He was also involved in architecture, working alongside the architect Hans Poelzig, a Professor at the Academy in Breslau, on colour design for several of his buildings (Asper, 2003: 4). Soon after his time at the Academy, as early as 1911, Schüfftan

\(^{2}\) Schüfftan's date of his birth is often quoted to be 1893, however, Schüfftan’s Curriculum Vitae held in his Paul Kohner agency file at the archives of the Deustche Kinemathek, Berlin, show the date of birth to be 21\(^{st}\) July 1886.

\(^{3}\) Undated from the Eugen Schüfftan file (2/2) at the Deutsche Kinemathek.
demonstrated an interest in the film industry by patenting his very first invention for the cinema, of which unfortunately, no greater details are now known. 4

When Schüfftan had reached the age of twenty-eight The Great War broke out across Europe. Schüfftan was enlisted to fight in France where he was wounded on the Front, and honourably discharged from duty with the Iron Cross (Asper, 2003: 4). Following his service in the war Schüfftan returned to his training in the arts, gaining employment as a set painter in theatres throughout Berlin.

The Schüfftan Process

Schüfftan soon moved from the theatres whole-heartedly into the film industry, becoming employed as ‘trick designer and technician in the Picture department Deulig of the Ufa, 5 the studio which dominated motion picture film production in Germany. It was here that Schüfftan was afforded the opportunity to continue his interest in new inventions for the film industry, allowing him to create an invention that would help to keep his career afloat for the rest of his life, through some extremely challenging times. This invention, first called the ‘Spiegeltechnik’, but soon to be more commonly known as the ‘Schüfftan Process’, was first devised by Schüfftan in 1923. 6 As already discussed, this process involves the use of a mirror where part was scraped away to leave clear glass, which is then positioned before the camera so that live action footage can be shot through the clear glass, and an off-camera miniature can be reflected, and magnified in the mirrored section. This allowed miniatures to be used instead of large sets, which could be successfully blended with a live action element

4 Undated biographical statement, Eugen Schüfftan file 2/2, Deutsche Kinemathek.
5 Undated biographical statement, Eugen Schüfftan file 2/2, Deutsche Kinemathek.
6 According to Schüfftan's own undated autobiographical statement in the Eugen Schüfftan file 2/2, Deutsche Kinemathek.
in the final image. The process was first employed in tests on a number of films, in *Die Nibelungen* (Lang, 1923-25), *Eifersucht* (Karl Grune, 1925) and *Walzertraum* (Ludwig Berger, 1925), before in 1925 Schüfftan participated in preproduction meetings with Fritz Lang to prepare the process for use in *Ufa*'s upcoming super-production *Metropolis* (1927) (Morgan, 2000: 289). It was the use of the process in this film in particular, which made Schüfftan's name such a recognised and respected force in film production, for producers proudly publicised the new innovations in film technology which were employed to represent the dystopian Metropolis.

The legacy of *Metropolis* endures to this day, with two notable discoveries made during the writing of this thesis granting a greater understanding of Schüfftan’s artistry. The first of these is the discovery in 2008 of an uncut version of the film in an archive in Buenos Aires. The find restores 25 minutes of footage long thought lost, including notable uses of the Schüfftan Process, such as the statue of Hel’s head. The second discovery is of Schüfftan’s own brief experiments with footage from the film. This was discovered by the artist Kurt Ralske in December 2010, in an unlabelled film reel at the archive of the F. W. Murnau Foundation, Germany. The footage highlights Schüfftan’s experimental approach to special effects, which were achieved by overlaying sequences through optical printing processes. The first two images below (Figures 5 and 6) show a shot reverse-shot from *Metropolis*. In the third image, from the experiments, the two shots from the film have been combined and transformed by Schüfftan (Figure 7). These experiments highlight not only Schüfftan’s innovation, but also an interest in the study of movement, and of film construction. In the example shown below, Schüfftan combines the two shots of the conventional shot reverse-shot structure within a single image.

---

7 Schüfftan explains this in a note written to Siegfried Kracauer, giving background on his career as part of Kracauer’s research for *From Caligari to Hitler* (2004) (Schüfftan, 2003: 109).
Figure 5: Metropolis, shot A.
Figure 6: Shot B (the reverse shot).
Hollywood, Take One

On the back of these preproduction meetings Schüfftan then left Germany for America, departing from Boulogne on the S.S. Deutschland on 21st November 1925, with the intention to sell the process to the Universal Pictures Corporation. Passenger manifests for the journey in fact show that the trip was paid for by Universal, and that his wife Marta Luise (known as Marlise) accompanied him. Another note of interest from these manifests is that Schüfftan lists his occupation at this time as ‘Painter’, a background which can later be seen through his textured approach to light in the development of a cinematographic style throughout the rest of his career. The S.S. Deutschland arrived into the port of New York on 30th November.
1925, bringing the Schüfftnans to America for their eleven month stay. During this time Schüfftan was able to gain an American patent for his process (described as a ‘System for taking photographic and cinematic pictures’) under the initial patent number of 1,601,886.

Whilst in America Schüfftan was also retained by Universal to work with his process on the film *Love Me and the World is Mine* (Dupont, 1927). The film, based on the novel *Hannerl and Her Lovers* by Rudolph Hans Bartsch, is set in Vienna in the years prior to the First World War. As might well be expected from this brief outline, Schüfftan was not in fact the only émigré to be working on *Love Me and the World is Mine*, which as a Viennese text was thought suitable as the first project for fellow German director E. A. Dupont. Dupont had signed a three year contract to work at Universal following the success of his previous German film *Variété* (1925), which had been made at *Ufa* during Schüfftan's stay of work. Despite his three year contract, *Love Me and the World is Mine* did not prove to be a successful experience for Dupont or the American critics, and his stay was even briefer than Schüfftan's. He left America in July 1926 to rekindle his career in London (Elsaesser, 2000: 375). Despite the disappointing results of *Love Me and the World is Mine*, unlike Dupont, Schüfftan enjoyed a remarkably successful trip, so much so that prior to his return he was inducted as an honorary member of the Hollywood Photoplay League, a forerunner to the various unions which would establish themselves in the American film industry.\(^8\)

Upon his return to Germany Schüfftan introduced another invention into the film industry, albeit one which achieved far less impact and of which little is now known. This invention was for use on Alfred Abel's film *Narkose* (1929) with the purpose of creating the dream sequences, and is described by Schüfftan as an optical printing device combined with his mirror trick process (Schüfftan, 2003: 109). Lotte Eisner (2008: 31) has tantalizingly

\(^8\) Curriculum Vitae, Eugen Schüfftan file 2/2, Deutsch Kinemathek.
described the sequences in which Schüfftan's technique was employed, noting that, ‘we see the images emerging in the unconscious of a young woman on an operating-table,’ and that Schüfftan created ‘an entire flash-back sequence contained in a drop of water.’

**Silence and sound: Menschen am Sonntag and Abschied**

1929 saw Schüfftan's first role as cinematographer, in the film *Menschen am Sonntag*/*People on Sunday* (Siodmak, 1930), which was in production in Germany from July to December of 1929, and released in the following year. The film was created through the collaboration of a number of important voices at the very beginning of their careers, who would all move on to impact Hollywood in various forms in later years: Curt Siodmak, Robert Siodmak, Billy Wilder, Fred Zinnemann, Edgar G. Ulmer, as well as Schüfftan. Whilst the film is commonly seen as a collaborative effort between these artists, Curt Siodmak has awarded particular credit to the work of Schüfftan and Robert Siodmak, noting that ‘only Robert and the cameraman Eugen Schüfftan were responsible for its completion.’ (Siodmak in: Fisher, 1991: 251) Siodmak (Fisher, 1991: 252) elaborates on this point, stating that ‘Robert and Schüfftan did what the French and Italians did thirty years later and called the “nouvelle vague,” or the – New Wave. Robert and Schüfftan never got the credit. They did all that years before the New Wave.’ Fred Zinnemann (1992: 14-16) has similarly highlighted the importance of Schüfftan’s role, crediting himself with little more than acting as Schüfftan’s assistant.

*Menschen am Sonntag* stands as an unusual example of German film production during this period for a number of reasons. For one, the film was an entirely independent production shot for small funds secured from Heinrich Nebenzahl, the founder of Nero Film, and the maternal uncle to the Siodmak brothers. It was therefore beyond the control of the *Ufa* studio, which heavily dominated all film output in Germany at the time. Furthermore, as Curt
Siodmak's words suggest, the film proved stylistically innovative in many respects, even at a time when Ufa's forays into new sound technologies were leaving the meager production values of Menschen am Sonntag far behind. As Thomas Elsaesser (2000: 433) explains, ‘Menschen am Sonntag and Abschied [similarly with direction by Robert Siodmak and cinematography by Eugen Schüfftan, made shortly after Menschen am Sonntag in 1930], which have little trace of expressionist lighting, function according to a quite different – if not diametrically opposed – aesthetic to both Expressionism and the Kammerspielfilm,’ which were the two dominant stylistic trends in the German industry at the time.

Menschen am Sonntag employed a level of realism uncommon in the time of the studio-bound super-productions made by Ufa. Schüfftan’s realist approach during the Weimar period is far removed from the ‘Culture of Light’ (as her book is titled) described by Frances Guerin (2005). Guerin’s (2005: xv) valuable contribution to the use of light in Weimar cinema finds that electrified light is used ‘to represent the transformation to a modern life fashioned by technological advance in 1920s Germany.’ She adds, ‘The films use light and lighting to envision the transformation of space, conceptions of time and history, modes of representation, and the pivotal role played by industrial entertainment in their midst.’ (Ibid.) Whilst very much a story of modern life in Germany, Menschen am Sonntag removes its young protagonists from the technological Modernity of Berlin, to rural location away from the Metropolis. The film sought to capture the everyday experiences of young Berliners, by tracing their activities on a care-free Sunday. The scenario is non-descript, avoiding the complex plot maneuvers of standardized narrative cinema, and sees two young men and two young women leave Berlin to spend their day-off together on the Nikolassee beach. It is not only the scenario which sought to provide a more realistic portrait of Berlin life. A number of stylistic choices similarly subvert the dominant studio modes of production. For example, the film stars only non-professional actors, and was filmed almost in its entirety on location.
Furthermore, production took place only on Sundays when the actors were not otherwise engaged at work. The filmmakers were keen to point out such facts to the audience. The subtitle of the film is, ‘A film without actors’, and the opening credits feature an intertitle which explains to the spectator that, ‘These five people appeared before a camera for the first time in their lives. Today they are all back in their own jobs.’

The subtitle demonstrates the approaches made to realism within the film, but also highlights another important facet of the film: the filmmakers' combination of ‘narrative, documentary, and avant-garde techniques to foreground the epistemological status of filmic reality as a construction’ (Hake, 2008: 41). The aspects of realism sometimes function to reinforce this foregrounding of cinema's constructed nature, and at other times is at odds with it, forming a complex engagement with how narrative film itself ought to be constructed. In one particular scene which emphasizes this, the hand of the cinematographer is clearly at play. The scene occurs on location at Nikolassee beach, when the holiday makers are captured enjoying their Sunday by the beach photographer. The filmic camera occupies the point of view of the still photography camera, viewing each character in turn in close-up as they gaze into the camera's lens. When each photo is taken, there is a freeze frame, representing the still photograph, and the exposure of the camera is adjusted to allow more light into the image, reducing the detail of the subjects' faces. Then after a short moment, movement returns to the image and the exposure returns to its previous level. By adjusting the exposure in this manner, for a 'shot within a shot', Schüfftan points toward the construction of cinematic representation, and the mediating effect of the camera to glamourize a subject in the resultant image. So despite being close-ups, the real interest of these images lies in the use of the camera, rather than the subject. Curt Siodmak has made the same point when celebrating the cinematographer’s role in Menschen am Sonntag, as part of a documentary celebrating the restoration of the film in 1997 (Weekend am Wannsee, Koll, 2000): ‘along comes the great miracle known as Eugen
Schüfftan. Schüfftan showed what could be done with a camera. The film was about the camera, not the actors.'

Figure 8: Menschen am Sonntag: A snapshot of a Sunday Afternoon.

The innovations pursued in this film ensured that the filmmakers involved were recognized for their achievements by Ufa and the other studios, and for Schüfftan propelled him into a career as cinematographer. The liberties Schüfftan enjoyed on Menschen am Sonntag were not ones he was soon able to relive, however, and as he explained in a correspondence to the film theorist Siegfried Kracauer, dated 28th February 1943, he failed to ascribe any great importance to his subsequent work in Germany during the 1930s, feeling himself to be little more than a cog in the mechanism of the German film industry (Schüfftan, 2003: 110).

In spite of these comments by Schüfftan, his second film as cinematographer, Abschied/Farewell (Robert Siodmak, 1930), bore heavily the influences of Menschen am
Sonntag. The film saw Schüfftan reunited with Robert Siodmak, as director of Abschied, although on this occasion the film was produced under the auspices of the Ufa film studio. Made from a script by Emeric Pressburger, Abschied, like Menschen am Sonntag before it, set out to recreate the realities of life in Berlin, albeit this time the realities of life in a Berlin boarding-house. In fact, the film is set entirely within the confines of the boarding-house, following Hella as she experiences a number of encounters with the male residents, before finally settling for Peter Winkler, a vacuum-cleaner salesman.

Abschied was Schüfftan's first experience of working as a cinematographer upon a sound production, which proved to be an important factor in the recreation of reality for Siodmak, who as Phillips (2004: 66) explains, found that, ‘the technical and aesthetic potential of “real cinema” similarly meant a conflation of the medium of sound film with the details of “real life”.’ However, despite the possibilities offered by sound, the technology had a marked impact upon the cinematographer. Cameras now lost their freedom of movement because they had to be loaded into glass booths to reduce the impact of the noise produced by the heavy technology. This seriously affected the concept of realism, as Petrie (1996: 21) has noted. Furthermore, Petrie (1996: 23) explains how sound technologies even affected the ability of the cinematographer to light the film: ‘Traditional arc lamps were too noisy, and were replaced by tungsten incandescent units. These lights weren't as bright, meaning a greater number needed to be used. However, this made the studio unbearably hot, and so the cinematographer was forced to shoot with less light and a much wider lens aperture.’

Indeed, thinking of Abschied alongside Menschen am Sonntag, which both purport to represent a form of reality but are divided by the boundary of sound, it is easy to see how the cinematographer’s task was heavily disrupted, causing Abschied, despite Siodmak's experiments with sound, to convey far less of a recreation of real life than Menschen am
Sonntag. The lighting techniques fail to appropriate the levels of realism to which the film aspires. There is a notable attempt made, through the use of on-screen light sources, such as lamps, and most commonly the light emanating through the frosted glass of the doors, however, the sources fail to be the key source of light in the film. The impact of sound is obvious, for it appears there are notably fewer lights employed than would be desired, with a spotlight favoured to light the principle actors of a scene. This tends to result in large portions of the set remaining unlit, with the actors being the subject of the spotlight. Without a use of backlights, the result is that the actors often merge with the background darkness of the set, which creates a flattening of the image, rather than a sensation of depth to which the cinematographer usually aspires. When set walls are strongly lit in the film, this tends to be because the actors are positioned close to the wall, and so they may use a shared light source, which therefore enforces realism.
Schüfftan’s lighting does attempt in places to appropriate realism, however, compared with Menschen am Sonntag, it is clearly the limitations of sound technology which have affected his work. Menschen am Sonntag was filmed almost entirely on location outdoors, whereas on Abschied, sound technology forced film production to remain in the studio, a fact in itself which detracts from realism. Another technique, that of deep focus, is attempted by Siodmak and Schüfftan to approach realism, but is similarly hampered by technology. On numerous occasions Siodmak places an object from the boarding-house set before the camera, shooting past this to the action beyond. This creates a sensation of the camera being hidden from the subjects, aspiring towards a deep-focus technique that Gregg Toland would achieve a number of years later on Citizen Kane (Orson Welles, 1941). However, the technology was not yet in
place to achieve this, and Schufftan was forced to shoot the object at the fore of the frame out of focus so that the action in the rear of the frame would be clear to the spectator.

**Beyond the sound barrier**

Following his work on *Abschied*, Schüfftan was employed as cinematographer on another Ufa production, *Das gestohlene Gesicht/The Stolen Face* (Philipp Lothar Mayring and Erich Schmidt, 1930), sharing the role with Werner Bohne. The film, the feature debut for its two directors Philipp Lothar Mayring and Erich Schmidt, is a detective story surrounding the theft of a famous painting from a gallery, which is confused throughout the narrative with a copy which has been innocently produced by an art student. This is not the only case of mistaken identity in the film, which also sees the identity of the police detective in charge of the investigation stolen in attempts to recover the painting.

Considering the film had only been made shortly after *Abschied*, the issues raised for the cinematographer by new sound technologies seem to have been quickly adapted to. The film opens with a lively montage set in a club, in which we see the waiters performing various outlandish tricks and a female cabaret routine, all constructed through a fast pace of editing and liberal camera movements, something which was not possible only months earlier. Lighting techniques had also seen improvement since *Abschied* under the dominance of sound. Far less contrast, and more standard lighting techniques are employed, such as key, side and filler lights, and a strong use of back lighting to give a sense of depth. Accent lights are also used to augment the *mise-en-scène*, for example, to illuminate the tables in the club. Accent lights are also powerfully used in the gallery which holds the famous painting, highlighting art hanging on the walls, a sculpture, and lighting the floor of the gallery to emphasize the depth of its space.
One particularly interesting lighting effect produced by Schüfftan occurs towards the end of the film, once the imposter of the detective has unmasked himself. He stands before a doorway, staring through the glass next to the frame, the full realization of his circumstances clearly weighing on his mind. He is filmed from the other side of the glass, looking beyond
the camera. His face has been lit by Schüfftan with a strong sidelight. This results in the casting of a small but distinct shadow of his profile on the door frame, highlighting his dual roles throughout the film, which have brought him to this outcome.9

The year of 1931 also saw Schüfftan turn his hand to directing on two occasions, enhancing the reputation he was already garnering through his brief experience as cinematographer. The first of these directorial credits is the film *Ins Blaue hinein/Into the Blue*, upon which Laszlo Schäffer performed camera duties. The film, a short comedy, is the story of a company director, his two assistants and the younger assistant's girlfriend, who abandon the failing business when it begins to struggle financially, opting instead to move in with Fritz, one of the employees, and a dog the group nearly hit as they flee. The group chooses to start a new business, grooming dogs, inspired by their canine acquaintance. When this also begins to struggle, the group gets the financial assistance it needs by claiming the reward for a missing dog.

*Ins Blaue hinein* had been thought lost, however it was recently discovered inside a film can donated to the French film archives of the Centre national de la cinématographie, by a collector in Holland. I was fortunate enough to view the newly discovered film at the Deutsche Kinemathek, Berlin, in August 2009, over a year before it finally premiered on 21 November 2010, as the opening film of an exhibition held by the Museum of Moving Art, New York. The exhibition, *Weimar Cinema, 1919-1933: Daydreams and Nightmares*, sought to dispel the perceived dominance of Expressionism in this period, to give a more comprehensive view of the wider output of German cinema during the Weimar years. For exhibition organizer Laurence Kardish, *Ins Blaue hinein* proved a perfect example of the many films produced in Germany besides Expressionism. ‘It captures,’ he notes, ‘the free-

---

9 I am unable to illustrate this scene with an image as I have only been able to study the film at the Deutsche Kinemathek, Berlin.
spirited essence of Weimar as opposed to the heavy, grotesque and macabre.’ (Peikert, 2010: 6)

Revising our understanding of German Expressionism’s role in film history is an important point for this thesis. Schüfftan would, in exile, come to be recognized as a cinematographer of the German Expressionist tradition. However, Menschen am Sonntag, Abschied, and in particular Ins Blaue hinein, demonstrate a markedly different, realist, tradition, one of observation and of humour. So, whilst the film could have been met with surprise by some upon its rediscovery, considering the film in the context of Schüfftan’s other work of the period, it is a clear progression of his artistic development. For although Schüfftan is widely connected to the movement of Expressionism, and whilst his later work would adopt a number of Expressionist tendencies, he in fact only provided technical processes for the Expressionist films of the 1920s, and his first roles as cinematographer, Menschen am Sonntag and Abschied, represent a clear break away from this style.

Similarly, although not entirely through the same techniques of realism, Ins Blaue hinein seeks to represent the freedom of youth in this period, particularly through the young employee and his girlfriend. For it is a carefree attitude that dominates, firstly at the level of narrative, which sees the gang abandon both their jobs and their car, all done with a smile across their faces for the liberation it has granted them. But Schüfftan also reflects this in his approach to filmmaking. A sense of motion carries the film forward throughout, with almost constant uses of pans and tracks, most notably in the extended sequences which show the gang driving in the run up to the crash. Schüfftan shoots out from the car as it passes down the road, cutting to shots of the sky through the trees as the car drives, all done with a shaky hand-held camera, and all clearly filmed outside of the studio. It is the same sense of accordance between the liberation of the characters in the narrative and the liberation of the
camera itself that would be matched almost 30 years later by Jean-Luc Godard in *À Bout de souffle/Breathless* (1959).

The crash itself continues with this sensation of movement. There is a fast pace of editing, between point of view shots from the dog looking at the approaching car, point of view shots from the car, tracking quickly towards the dog, then a shot of the dog running backwards from the car. This was created by having the dog chasing the car whilst reversing, then playing the film backwards. We then see a tracking point of view shot from the car as it heads towards a tree trunk, eventually engulfing the frame in darkness. The aftermath of the crash continues the sense of confusion, created through an abundance of point of view shots. Camera movement continues as we see panning shots of a bouncing wheel, which cuts to a panning shot of a rolling hat. This is effectively a jump cut, for both objects fill the same space of the frame, both in pan movements from right to left. We then see the legs of a running man, before the camera finally rests in stasis and the crash is fully resolved.

One further scene which displays the wit and invention of Schüfftan's directorial style occurs when the young employee runs from the car to pick up his girlfriend from her apartment. He runs past a large billboard to a fence overlooking the apartment windows. What follows is a classic shot-reverse-shot, albeit with a twist (see Figures 11-13). The first shot (Figure 11) sees the young employee looking up directly into the camera whilst whistling and calling for his girlfriend. In the reverse shot (Figure 12), Schüfftan then shows a large billboard which the young man has just passed, featuring a young woman in her dressing gown, who has just opened her shutters and is looming from the window. The third shot from this brief construction is from behind the head of the young man looking up to the window, where we see his girlfriend emerge from and wave in response, mirroring the image of the billboard (Figure 13). In the final image of this sequence, the girl is shown in her bathroom selecting
clothes for her trip. She holds a feminine dress against her body and looks into the camera lens, again reflecting the billboard image. However, she discards the dress and selects instead something more practical for her adventure (Figure 14). The second shot of this sequence is clearly positioned in response to the first, and comments on a number of issues such as consumerism, and even perhaps the scopophilic nature of the film camera. However, I would argue that the overriding discourse of these shots, in the context of the ‘liberated’ camera seen throughout the film, is to comment upon the constructed nature of the cinematic language, and so speaks of a desire towards a freer style of filmmaking, less burdened by the constraints of convention. It also represents a return to Schüfftan’s interest in dialectics, seen earlier in his experiments with footage from Metropolis.

Figure 11: *Ins Blaue hinein*. The young boy whistles up to his girlfriend’s apartment.
Figure 12: *Ins Blaue hinein*. The reverse shot. The responsive whistle we hear on the sound track from the girlfriend is matched by this image of a billboard.
Figure 13: *Ins Blaue hinein*. The next shot of this sequence shows the girlfriend waving from her balcony, matching the image of the billboard in the previous shot.
Figure 14: *Ins Blaue hinein*. The girlfriend matches the billboard girl’s gaze into the camera, before discarding the feminine dress and choosing something more relaxed for her adventure.

*Ins Blaue hinein*, particularly in the context of *Menschen am Sonntag* and *Abschied*, demonstrates the vibrancy of filmmaking during the Weimar cinema, beyond the perceived dominance of Expressionism. These three films in fact form a backlash of realism to the Expressionist style which had preceded it, and suggest the possibility of Schüfftan consolidating his abilities to become a strong directorial voice in the German film industry. Of course, the rise of the Nazi Party was to halt any possibility of an individual voice, particularly Jewish, within the German film industry, and was to send Schüfftan abroad where his directorial abilities were not proven to the studios, cementing his position as a cinematographer. The rediscovery of *Ins Blaue hinein* and its subsequent release on DVD in June 2011 by Criterion, as part of their *Menschen am Sonntag* package, provides an exciting
glimpse into the future that might have awaited Schüfftan, although, as we shall see, the development of his own unique style as a cinematographer is no less interesting.

The year of 1931 saw Schüfftan direct a second film, the Ufa production Das Ekel/The Scoundrel, which he co-directed with Franz Wenzler. Schüfftan also acted in his more usual role as cinematographer, alongside Bernhard Wentzel. In the film Max Adelbert plays Adalbert, an officious businessman who is no less officious in the treatment of his family. Adalbert is transformed however, through the influence of Quitt, his daughter's boyfriend. Much like Ins Blaue hinein, Das Ekel, with its comic tone, is far removed from the Expressionist style Schüfftan would come to be associated with. The film, a relic to Schüfftan’s lost future, has itself been sadly lost to history.\(^\text{10}\)

It would seem that Schüfftan's next film occurred as a direct result of his time on Das Ekel. As Loewy (2005) has recounted, in March of 1931 when Das Ekel was shooting under the production management of Bruno Duday at Neubabelsburg, Anatole Litvak was working in the same studio directing Nie wieder liebe/Never Love Again, with the help of Max Ophüls as assistant director. Ufa had just granted Ophüls his first assignment as director, a short film intended to be packaged alongside other Ufa screenings, and to be made under the supervision of Duday. The project was the unusually titled Dann schon lieber Lebertran/I'd Rather Have Cod Liver Oil, which was made from a script by Emeric Pressburger and Erich Kästner (the scriptwriters of Das Ekel). It also boasted cinematography by Schüfftan and Karl Puth. The film, it seems, has been completely lost, however Ronny Loewy (2005) has undertaken the task of compiling all known information on the film. Loewy found that the twenty-two minute long film was made with a budget of over forty-six thousand marks, and

\(^{10}\) Testifying to the disappearance of Das Ekel, following its discovery, Ins Blaue hinein has been heralded as Schüfftan’s only credit as director (Peikert 2010: 6).
that it was shot over six days during the first week of August, 1931. Loewy also reprints the following synopsis of the narrative, provided by Ophüls himself:

It's about children who, each evening, swallow their cod liver oil and say their prayers before going to sleep. One evening, when the room is quite dark, the youngest makes a rather daring prayer: he asks why it's always children who must obey their parents; wouldn't it be possible, once a year, to reverse the roles? The prayer goes up to Heaven: God is out, but St Peter is there, just about to fall asleep, and he asks himself why he, too, shouldn't grant a prayer. He goes into a machine room, full of complicated instruments, and exchanges the cards marked "parental authority" and "filial obedience." The child wakes up with a cigar in his mouth and dressed like a man. He gets up and sends his parents off to school. The parents have forgotten all they knew; they are incapable of the least effort and too awkward to manage any gymnastics; for their part, the children go to the office, have to cope with the tax collector and a worker's strike with all the attendant problems, and by the evening they are ready to demand that everything be put back as it was. . . . For three months they delayed releasing it because it wasn't really very good.

The most salient piece of information uncovered by Loewy however, is a recollection by Ophüls that, 'I was told years later that Eugen Schufftan [sic] was assigned with the order to take over immediately in the case of my failure' (Loewy, 2005). Whilst this was only a small-scale short film for Ufa, such a fact nevertheless shows the faith the studio held in the abilities of Schüfftan, who himself had had only brief experiences of directing. Of course such a fail-safe scenario was not in the end employed, which in hindsight was perhaps fortuitous for Schüfftan who (as we shall see) would go on to work with Ophüls again on numerous occasions in his subsequent career.

Schüfftan also worked on another Ufa production at this time, once again shooting alongside cinematographer Karl Puth on the film Meine Frau, die Hochstaplerin/My Wife, the Swindler,
under the direction of Kurt Gerron. The film was written by, amongst others, Phillipp Mayring, who had previously directed Schüfftan on *Das gestohlene Gesicht*, and starred Alfred Abel, the director of *Narkose*. The film was an early vehicle for popular actor Heinz Rühmann, who frequently adopted the role of male identity in crisis. In general, as Sabine Hake (2001: 95) has found, this meant the male in crisis displayed 'the markers of petit bourgeois mentality [...] without any social consciousness.' Hake cites *Meine Frau, die Hochstaplerin*, which dealt with 'the problems of modern marriage' as such an example.

In this same year Schüfftan also collaborated with the director Lupu Pick, on the final film before his untimely death in 1931, the German-French co-production *Gassenhauer/Street Song*, from which a French version was also produced, entitled *Les Quatre Vagabonds/The Four Vagabonds*. Multi-language versions (hereafter MLV) of films were a common phenomenon at this time in Europe, and Schüfftan would come to work upon a number of other such projects. They arose as a response to concerns amongst the national cinema industries of Europe about the dominance of American cinema in their markets. This led many during the post First World War years to call for a pan-European production industry which could stem Hollywood’s continuing ascendancy. The prospect of such an industry became known as ‘Film Europe’ (as opposed to ‘Film America’, before ‘Hollywood’ became synonymous with American cinema). Germany was by and large the instigator of attempts towards a Film Europe, and in particular one man, the prolific *Ufa* producer Erich Pommer. Pommer heralded Film Europe, and was responsible for the mutual distribution pact of 1924 between *Ufa* and the French distributor *Etablissements Auberts*. Pommer argued that, ‘European producers must at last think of establishing a certain co-operation among themselves. [...] It is necessary to create “European films,” which will no longer be French, British, Italian, or German films; entirely “continental films”’ (Thompson, 1999: 60). Other similar mergers followed such as the *Westi-Pathé* agreement, however it should also be noted
that Germany, the powerhouse of Film Europe, was not averse to courting the American industry when it suited them, as was shown by the famous Parufamet agreement.

One major outcome of this German-led drive towards a Film Europe was the MLV method of production. MLV’s arose along with the birth of sound in the cinema, when any possibilities of a pan-European production scheme needed to negotiate the many language barriers of Europe. With an audience unimpressed by attempts at dubbing and subtitling, which were then seen as anachronistic to the new possibilities offered to the medium by sound, the studios required a different approach. The MLV meant that a film would be shot simultaneously in any number of languages (most commonly German, French and English). Whilst the biggest polyglot stars of the film industry would sometimes act in every language version, other minor characters would most often be played by different imported actors. The illusion was to give the audience the impression that the film was the product of their own national industry, rather than a film produced in another country, by foreign technicians, which was then being circulated in different language versions across Europe.

MLV’s played an important role in the career of Schüfftan, as they offered him an early introduction to shooting with actors and sometimes technicians of other national industries, experience which would come in useful once he was forced into exile. In the case of Schüfftan’s first MLV experience, Gassenhauer and Les Quatre Vagabonds, both versions are sadly lost, however a contemporary review of the time by Rudolf Arnheim (of the German version) casts some insight. Arnheim (1997: 161) noted in particular Pick's novel innovations in sound: 'For instance, everyday instruments vary the refrain of a song: it sounds from the bellows of a prisoner through the prison walls, a vagrant whistles it, it penetrates the windows of a place of entertainment, spilling as muffled dance music into the street.' However, in spite of such techniques, ultimately Arnheim (1997: 161) found that whilst 'much is clever, not
much is conspicuous, and only the clean work of Schüfftan and Baberske, the two camera
people, deserves real recognition.'

By 1932, Schüfftan formed his own reaction to the increasing popularity and influence of
National-Socialism, and the personal danger this posed to him and his family as Jews, by
working upon what he described in his own Curriculum Vitae as, an 'election picture for the
Democracy Party in Hamburg against Hitler'. This year also saw Schüfftan work for Nero
Film on Die Herrin von Atlantis (G.W. Pabst, 1932), another bi-lingual epic which this time
saw shooting in German, French and English (the French language version was released as
L'Atlantide, and the English version The Mistress of Atlantis). Schüfftan shot the film
alongside Herbert Körner for the German version, and Joseph Bart for the French version.
The film was produced by Seymour Nebenzahl, head of Nero Film, and son to Heninrich,
who had provided funds to make possible the filming of Menschen am Sonntag.

The film, based on the novel L'Atlantide by Pierre Benoît, is the story of Foreign Legion
officer Saint-Avit, stationed at an outpost in the Sahara desert, who on hearing a radio
broadcast speculating that Atlantis could have been located in the Sahara, proceeds to tell his
own tale in flashback. He recounts about a time, years earlier when he and a colleague were
sent to investigate a number of disappearances in the desert, only to discover the lost city,
now ruled over by the deadly Queen of Atlantis, portrayed by Brigitte Helm of Metropolis
fame. This new version of Benoît’s novel sought to capitalize upon the success of Paris’s
Colonial Exposition of 1931, and a realization of cinema’s potential to bring to audiences
exotic locations which they would be unlikely to ever visit. As Pierre Sorlin (1991: 135)
explains, ‘the picture-houses were probably the only places where the French could observe
the colonial world. Films made them visualize countries and people that were previously
mere abstract nouns.’ However, despite the strong French themes of the film, all three language versions were in fact German productions.

To account for this peculiarity, figures published by Kristin Thompson (1999: 64) demonstrate the steady increase in the market share of German films released in France. In 1924 only 2.9 percent of the total number of films released in France were German, with an astonishing 85 percent of the market held by the American cinema, and a paltry 9.8 percent indigenous French films. Germany’s market share rose steadily throughout the decade, reaching a peak of 29.7 percent in 1929, and dropping down slightly in 1932, the year of *Die Herrin von Atlantis*, to 20.7 percent. Therefore the French market in particular could be viewed as a viable target for the German industry, where its films had already proven a success.

The film has received critical attention for the work done by set designer Ernö Metzner, who similarly to Schüfftan left Germany in 1933 on his own transnational trajectory. Metzner's writings have in fact revealed something of the working practices on *Die Herrin von Atlantis*, which as Bergfelder, Harris and Street (2007: 158-159) have noted, reveal that:

Metzner saw himself very much as part of a team of artistic equals, rather than simply as the executor of a directorial vision. Metzner does defer to Pabst as the initiator of some of the general ideas behind the films' designs, yet like his contemporary Herlth, he promotes and defends the values of close collaboration and exchange between director, cinematographer, and set designer, which had been the hallmark of the German studio system since the early 1920s.

With such a notion of equality in mind it is apparent that Schüfftan's contributions to the film deserve the same critical attention that has been afforded to Metzner for his work on set design.
The scale of this exotic story went far beyond the boundaries of the French studios where production was based, with extensive location shooting also taking place in the Hoggar mountain range of the Sahara (Bergfelder, 2007: 159). This re-enactment of North Africa on screen was the film’s greatest appeal, leading to Louis Delluc’s famous appraisal of the film, that its best actor was the sand (Wakeman, 1988: 326). To capture this landscape, far beyond anything he would have previously encountered in his life or his filmmaking experience, must surely have been a challenge to Schüfftan. Commenting upon Hollywood shooting practices of the 1940s, John Alton has noted a number of difficulties which can arise during desert location shooting. These include mirages, which affect the focus; dust, which can cause the camera equipment to malfunction; and the heat, which can affect the camera and the film (Alton, 1995: 133). Furthermore, these obstacles were likely to have been far more acutely experienced by Schüfftan, who, in 1932, was working with more primitive equipment than Alton. Once all these difficulties had been overcome, the problem of light still remained. For whilst Schüfftan was well-versed in location shooting from his experiences in Germany, those locations offered a far milder shooting climate. The problem of shooting a desert space is that such a barren landscape in such strong sunlight makes it difficult to register any definition of the image, in order to create an impression of depth and a three-dimensional sense of space. To combat this Schüfftan shot such scenes either in the early morning, or towards the end of the day, in order to maximize the length of the shadows. These shadows, stretching out across the frame, disrupt any sense of flatness of image that might occur from the pale sand in the heat of the day (see for example Figure 15).
Schüfftan’s subsequent film was a rather more straightforward project, acting as technical director on the film musical adaption of *Friederike*. The film was based on the operetta of 1928 written by Franz Lehár, and was directed for the cinema by the original theatrical director Fritz Friedman-Frederich. *Friederike* told the story of the young life of the legendary German poet Johann Wolfgang von Goethe, and his relationship with Friederike Brion, the daughter of a pastor. The play did not prove successful with critics, undoubtedly due to the frivolous approach towards one of Germany's most revered figures, but nonetheless, it was wildly popular with audiences at the time (Traubner, 2003: 259-260). Schüfftan's next project was to co-direct *Die Wasserteufel von Hieflau/The Water Devil of Hieflau* with Erich Kober, and with Herbert Körner as cinematographer, followed by another
German-French co-production *Zigeuner der Nacht/Gypsies of the Night* (*Coeurs Joyeux/Happy Hearts* for the French version), directed by Hanns Schwarz and Max de Vaucorbeil. *Zigeuner der Nacht* is to some extent a lament for silent cinema, with the protagonist of the film being a cinema projectionist of this era. The projectionist is played by Paul Heidemann in the German version and by Jean Gabin in the French version, making this film the first of three important collaborations between Schüfftan and Gabin.

Schüfftan's next film of 1932 was to be his last film project in Germany until long after the war, and so perhaps fittingly starred *Metropolis*'s Maria, Brigitte Helm, and was written by that film's writer and wife to Fritz Lang, Thea von Harbou. The film in question, *Der Läufer von Marathon/The Marathon Runner*, also saw Schüfftan reunited with the director E. A. Dupont for the first time since their collaboration together on *Love Me and the World is Mine* during their time in Hollywood, and was itself set in Los Angeles during the 1932 summer Olympic games. Described by Tim Bergfelder (2008a: 33-34) as a love triangle with a happy ending between the athletes of the games, the theme of the film seems completely at odds with the actual history of the 1932 Los Angeles Olympic games, which was entirely mired by the Great Depression. This resulted in a large number of athletes not participating because they could not afford transportation costs. Whilst the film did not prove a great success it would appear that Schüfftan maintained his reputation for reliability, with contemporary film critic Rudolf Arnheim (1997: 196) noting that 'director E. A. Dupont lacks the gripping strength of imagery of his film *Variety*, despite the camera art of Eugen Schüfftan.'

Schüfftan’s brief experience as a cinematographer in Germany between 1929 and 1933 had been a highly productive one. His baptism had been in realism, comedies and even musicals. Entirely absent are the Expressionist aesthetics for which Weimar cinema has been best
remembered. With this in mind, let us consider a number of quotes relating to Schüfftan’s later films, all of which stress, without questioning, his Expressionist background:

The photographer who realized Franju’s ghostly vision in *La Première nuit* was Eugen Shuftan, the experienced contributor to German expressionism who would create the atmospheres of *La Tête contre les murs* and *Les Yeux sans visage*. (Ince, 2005: 44)

*Le Rideau cramoisi* is visually highly accomplished – the great Eugene Schufftan was the cinematographer – revealing ‘a thoroughly expressionistic photography, an obviously Murnau-inspired sensitivity to the dramatic contrast of light and dark.’ (Bacher, 1978: 83-84)

Expressionist intent may also have been anticipated of the photographer of *The Robber Symphony*, Eugen Schüfftan. (Ede, 2008: 119)

[…] chief among them Kurt Courant and Eugen Schufftan. They had been intensely involved in the expressionist cinema, filming between 1920 and 1933. (Crisp, 1997: 377)

He [Franju] feels himself close to some of the expressionist films of Germany’s Golden Age […] his favourite cameramen, Fradetal and Schufftan, were both formed in that school.’ (Durgnat, 1967: 24)

This will be the first accredited American photographic assignment for Mr. Shuftan, whose list of credits constitutes a miniature history of European film trends, embracing German expressionism, early precursors of Italian neo-realism, pre-war French symbolic dramas and, most recently, “new wave” experiments. (Archer, 1960a)

As we have seen in this chapter, Schüfftan did not shoot a single film in Germany in the aesthetic of German Expressionism, which had already waned by the time of his introduction as a cinematographer. His artistic background, and his study of painters such as Rembrandt prior to his introduction to the film industry, would prove to be of far more relevance to his

---

11 Bacher is quoting from Ulrich Gregor.
later style. To explain the cause of the above misrecognition of Schüfftan’s style and background, we must turn to examine the development of his aesthetic in exile.
Chapter II

Part One
European Exile, 1933 – 1940

Part Two
Case Study: Exile Modernism on Poverty Row, 1941 - 1947

If you can’t go home, there is nowhere to go, and nowhere is the biggest place in the world – indeed, nowhere is the world.

Part One

European Exile, 1933-1940

Austria

On 30th January 1933 Adolph Hitler was appointed Chancellor of Germany, consolidating the political and military force of the Nazi Party. This put Schüfftan and other German-Jews in direct danger of persecution, forcing the exodus of a great number of film personnel from Germany, which would hugely impact upon the industries of Britain, France and America in particular. Nothing is known of how exactly Schüfftan and his wife Marlise succeeded in fleeing Germany in 1933, but the film project that saved their lives was *Unsichtbare Gegner*/ *Invisible Opponent*, another MLV which was released in France as *Les Requins du pétrole*/ *The Oil Sharks*, produced by Sam Spiegel and filmed in Vienna. It was the fortuitous timing of this picture’s filming in Vienna which removed Schüfftan and a number of other émigrés, including Spiegel and Peter Lorre, from Germany at this crucial moment in history.
Spiegel has recounted the story of his own escape from Germany to the production of *Unsichtbare Gegner* as taking place on 25th February 1933, after being warned by his barber that he shouldn't return home that evening:

He was a member of an S.S. Troop that was supposed to arrest and beat us up or kill us. We had no idea this was going to happen. I simply called [Oscar] Homolka and [Peter] Lorre and told them to get the hell out of Berlin and join me in Vienna a few days later. I went to a little suburban station in Berlin, took a local train to Leipzig, changed to a train for Vienna without an overcoat and without bags or anything, just with my script under my arm, because we had to pretend that we were just going into the country for the weekend so as not to be molested on the train. Lorre made it. Homolka made it with me on the same train. Josef von Sternberg was on that same train by accident, and Jascha Heifetz. Several weeks later we started shooting in Vienna. (Youngkin, 2005: 80)

Any thoughts of amnesty for those Jews working in the German film industry were soon quashed in a speech made by Joseph Goebbels, the minister of propaganda, on 28th March, soon after production had begun on *Unsichtbare Gegner*. For all his claims of encouragement and support from the Reich, in his speech Goebbels (2004: 157) nevertheless asserted that, 'public taste is not as it plays itself out inside the mind of a Jewish director. One cannot gain a picture of the German people in a vacuum. One must look at the face of the people and have oneself planted one's roots in the German soil. One must be a child of this people.' For whilst the Jews of Germany undoubtedly considered themselves planted in German soil, it is clear where Goebbels was drawing the racial divide.

The film itself, *Unsichtbare Gegner*, has become somewhat sidelined by the magnitude of events that surrounded its production. A thriller film, it told the story of a corrupt businessman's attempts to buy a failing oil company, through various murders and other nefarious activities. The film was not a success, and was even touted in the German press as 'an
unbelievable and unbelievably awful picture' (Youngkin, 2005: 80). Beyond that little is known of the film. Nevertheless, the personal story of German-Jews involved in the production of Unsichtbare Gegner continues, with the comments made by Goebbels in his speech soon realized when a boycott of German-Jewish filmmakers was implemented on 1 April 1933.

Schüfftan and his Jewish colleagues of Unsichtbare Gegner clearly could not return to work in Germany under such circumstances, and the Austrian industry was quickly tightening up due to its reliance on German production funds. As Horak (1996: 376) has noted, there was even 'a Jewish boycott [...] more or less in place in Austria as early as 1934.’ Politically, whilst the Austrian government was officially anti-Nazi, and had even banned the NSDAP on 19 June 1933, antifascist organizations were similarly prohibited (Palmier, 2006: 140) The situation was such that the Austrian writer Karl Kraus described to Bertolt Brecht the arrival of German émigrés in Austria as rats boarding a sinking ship (Warren, 2009: 38). Many émigrés opted to flee straight from Austria to America. However, the option chosen by Schüfftan and a number of others was France, undoubtedly picked for the strength of its industry, its proximity, and the vocal support in the French press for those Jews of the German film industry who had been ousted by the Nazi regime (Horak, 1996: 376).

**France**

Schüfftan was a known entity in France when he emigrated there in 1933, partly due to the reputation of his name, associated with his invention for Metropolis; partly due to the groundbreaking international success of Menschen am Sonntag, and also due, in part, to the numerous German-French co-productions upon which Schüfftan had worked. Nevertheless, the status and trust Schüfftan had built upon for his work as a cinematographer in Germany
was not present in his new home, and so the early part of Schüfftan's career in France tended to rely upon collaborations with other émigré filmmakers. This was true of Schüfftan's first film in France, *La Voix sans visage/Voice Without a Face* (1933), directed by the Austrian émigré Leo Mittler and starring the famous French tenor Lucien Muratore, in the role of a singer who has been accused of murder (Fryer and Usova, 2003: 151).

Similarly with his next film, *Du Haut en bas/High and Low* (G.W. Pabst, 1933), Schüfftan was reunited with a number of émigrés with whom he had previously worked in Germany, most notably the director G. W. Pabst and the set designer Ernö Metzner from *Die Herrin von Atlantis*, as well as Peter Lorre, directly on the back of *Unsichtbare Gegner*. Another important figure with whom Schüfftan was reunited on *Du Haut en bas* was Jean Gabin, who had acted in *Coeurs joyeux*, and was still some years off the mega-stardom he would enjoy following *La Bandera* (Julien Duvivier, 1936). *Du Haut en bas*, based on the play by Leslie Bush-Fekete, is essentially a comedy of manners set around the courtyard of a Viennese community and its various unique occupants, including Jean Gabin as a soccer player.

In accordance with the genre and the light-hearted nature of the film, Schüfftan keeps the film very brightly lit, using strong baselights, keylights and sidelights to create an evenly lit set, avoiding high contrast and strong shadows. This also fits with the setting of the film – a bright Viennese day, which pervades both interior and exterior aspects of the courtyard. This approach by Schüfftan also functions in alliance with Pabst's very mobile camera style, allowing the camera to move around the well-lit space without the movements of the shadows and the contrast needing to be similarly choreographed. Such movements are described by Koch (1990: 154) as, ‘The superbly graceful camera of Eugen Schüfftan.’ Certain shadows are however created – Schüfftan employs diffused light to cast gentle indistinct shadows, and in the exterior scenes, masques are used to create the effect of shadows caused by the leaves.
of the trees. This functions to add interest to the frame, without overpowering the image with a stylized use of lighting.

Such an approach to lighting is similarly true of close-ups, which are well lit from both sides of the face, with back lighting used to distinguish the subjects from the background. Such an approach is markedly different to how Schüfftan would choose to light Gabin when they would reunite some years later. This is in part because, as Gertrud Koch (1990: 153) points out of Du Haut en bas, 'The camera does not make Gabin into an erotic object' (see Figure 16). It is worth noting that this is largely because, at this time, Gabin was not yet the mythical icon of Poetic Realism he was set to become, a point which Koch fails to make in her reading of the film. For although Gabin, in Du Haut en bas, is constructed as a working-class hero, and is fetishized by many of the females in the courtyard precisely because of this fact, it is only later that the status of Gabin as an actor would largely affect the lighting choices made, as well as the mood of the film, allowing Schüfftan to codify him in more enigmatic terms.
Schüfftan's first project of 1934 was an adaptation of Henri Bataille's play, *Le Scandale/Scandal*. This was directed by France's wunderkind of the 1920s avant-garde, Marcel L'Herbier, who was now enjoying a string of successes based on literary adaptations. According to L'Herbier, his recipe for success in such adaptations was an emphasis of the cinematic over the theatrical (Andrew, 1995: 134). The scandal in question of this particular adaptation's title is the adultery committed by Charlotte against her husband Maurice, with the roguish Comte Artanezzo. The wife's unfaithfulness comes to light when a ring, which had been given from husband to wife, and then from wife to lover, resurfaces after Charlotte had claimed it lost.
Schüfftan’s contribution to *Le Scandale* was brief, shooting only the studio scenes during the first week of filming (Asper and Meneux, 2003: 153). Cinematography duties on the rest of the film were then completed by Christian Matras, who would later find success collaborating with Max Ophüls. This brief experience did nonetheless prove important for Schüfftan, as he would reunite with L’Herbier in 1937 for *Forfaiture/The Cheat*. Although Schüfftan provided only a minor contribution to *Le Scandale*, it is perhaps also worth noting that the film proved successful with critics, being described as ‘of high calibre’ and ‘worthy of serious thought’ (Matthews, 1934).

Schüfftan’s next film saw him reunited with fellow émigré Robert Siodmak, with whom he had started his career as cinematographer in Germany, on *Menschen am Sonntag* and *Abschied*. The film, *La Crise est finie/The Slump is Over*, is a musical comedy about a theatrical troupe which disbands, leaving half of the troupe resolved to mount their own performances in Paris. However, financial difficulties prove a far greater barrier than anticipated. Alastair Phillips (2004: 85-86) has described how the film, similarly to a number of other French films from this period, seeks to discuss class-based oppositions, and demonstrates how this is represented through the *mise-en-scène* (see Figure 17). In terms of lighting, Phillips describes how Schüfftan lights the scene in which the troupe lure and capture Bernouillin (who has been responsible for sabotaging their operation) in the theatre. Phillips (2004: 86) notes that the lighting suggests ‘the darkened and shadowy sense of menace’, and that ‘Schüfftan uses a minimum of identifiable light.’ In general, however, Schüfftan’s lighting choices predominantly accord to the light-hearted tone of the film. This moment is perhaps the briefest indicator towards Expressionist tendencies Schüfftan would soon begin to develop.
Figure 17: Bernouillin trapped in the theatre in *La Crise est finie*.

**Great Britain**

At this time in 1934 Schüfftan travelled to England to offer his expertise to a national industry also benefitting from the talents of a number of émigrés. The story of the influence played by European émigrés in the British cinema is an emerging one (Bergfelder and Cargnelli, 2008), and one to which I will add Schüfftan's brief role. Beyond simply professional opportunities, it is possible that Schüfftan chose Britain because his daughter, whom Schüfftan visited in London on numerous occasions during the 1950s, was already residing in the country. However, on the whole, Britain was not entirely welcoming to refugees of Nazism. It had accepted a mere 4,500 exiles by 1937, and was not a particularly
sought out destination, due to the economic crisis the country was suffering, meaning that exiles were even less likely to be awarded work permits (Palmier, 2006: 149).

In terms of the film industry, permits were not easily come by for émigré technicians in the British film industry. Tim Bergfelder (2008: 3) has noted the attempts dating from the early 1930s by the Association of Cine-Technicians 'to block and prevent the employment of foreigners in British studios (a policy that was primarily aimed at continental technicians).'

Consequently Schüfftan could only get a permit to work in Great Britain in connection with the Schüfftan Process, which had been bought by British National and was first used in the country on *Madame Pompadour* (Herbert Wilcox, 1927), before coming to popular usage with Alfred Hitchcock’s *Number 17* (1928) and *Blackmail* (1929) (Low, 2004: 246) (Bock, 1984: Schüfftan entry). These permit restrictions remained in place for much of Schüfftan's career.¹² His permit in place, Schüfftan's first film in Great Britain was *Irish Hearts* with the Irish director Brian Desmond Hurst, who had learnt the business under the tutelage of John Ford. The film, which is believed by some quarters to be the first Irish sound feature, is the story of a surgeon who fights a typhus outbreak, whilst at the same time fighting his own feelings for the two women in his assistance (McIlroy, 1994: 28). On Schüfftan's part, the film was praised in a review of 1936 for its 'beautiful photography' (Glancy, 1998: 63).

Schüfftan's second project in Britain was widely considered as an unmitigated disaster as an exercise in filmmaking, but would prove significant to the cinematographer’s later career development. The film was *The Invader* (Adrian Brunel, 1936, also known as *An Old Spanish Custom*), a low budget vehicle for Buster Keaton, who was hoping to launch a comeback. However, it was not Keaton, but rather his co-star Lupita Tovar who was to impact upon Schüfftan's life. Tovar had recently married the producer Paul Kohner, with

---

¹² This is confirmed by Schüfftan in a letter to Ilse Lahn of the Paul Kohner talent agency, dated 13th November, 1956.
whom she had first worked on *La voluntad del muerto* (Enrique Tovar Ávalos, 1930), the Spanish language version of the Hollywood horror *The Cat Creeps* (Rupert Julian and John Willard, 1930). When Kohner was to settle later in America he would set up a talent agency with the primary aim of representing the interests of émigré talents in the industry. It was Kohner who was to act as Schüfftan's agent throughout much of his Hollywood career, and it was upon *The Invader* that this relationship was first established. Fittingly, their first meeting on the set of *The Invader* was recalled by Schüfftan as a fond memory in response to a letter from Paul Kohner congratulating Schüfftan on his success at the Academy Awards in 1962.

Figure 18: Buster Keaton dances with Lupita Tovar in *The Invader*.

Schüfftan's third British project, *The Robber Symphony*, proved to be a particularly transnational affair. Filmed during 1935, *The Robber Symphony* was the brainchild of
Austrian director Friedrich Feher, and was conceived as an experiment in film music, whereby the action would be set to a pre-composed score (composed by Feher himself). The crew, besides Schüfftan as cinematographer, included Robert Wiene as producer, whom Feher had met on the production of Das Cabinet des Dr. Caligari/The Cabinet of Dr. Caligari (Wiene, 1920), and Ernö Metzner, the émigré set designer who had already collaborated with Schüfftan. These continental artists all combined their talents on The Robber Symphony, and a French language version titled La Symphonie des brigands, filming in studios in London, and filming on location in Mer de Glace, Nice, and elsewhere on the Côte d'Azur (Ede, 2008: 120).

Once again, Metzner has garnered critical attention for his set design (Ede, 2008), however, Schüfftan's role has been sidelined in comparison. Ede (Ede, 2008: 199) notes a surprising Expressionist style in Metzner's set designs, unusual for the artist. However, it is suggested that this influence is produced by Feher and in particular Schüfftan, 'well known for his love of chiaroscuro lighting.' It is important to stress here that this description of Schüfftan's early style is a misrepresentation, most likely propagated through the association between Schüfftan and his special effects process for Metropolis. As we know, Schüfftan did not start work as a cinematographer until 1929 on Menschen am Sonntag, and as we have seen, this and his other early films were a strong reaction against the Expressionist style of the 1920s. In fact, The Robber Symphony is one of the earliest examples of Schüfftan adopting an Expressionist style (see Figures 19 and 20). So in fact, it is an approach he adopts once he is already in exile. Nonetheless, it would become a style which he developed throughout the rest of his career in Europe and America, long after the close of the Expressionist movement of the 1920s, and his own initial reaction to it. So, if neither Metzner nor Schüfftan had (until this point) developed an Expressionist style, we must look for a cause for this aesthetic in The Robber Symphony, beyond simply the influence of Wiene and Feher. One particular cause for
this use of Expressionism could well be the particular stylistic trait of the film, being an experiment in setting a film to a pre-existing score. In this reversal, the set designer and cinematographer attempt to match the mood created by the score, through the particulars of their own art. In this sense, we can argue that Schüfftan's long association with Expressionist effects and chiaroscuro lighting came about as a result of his working with Feher on this film, and in particular the impact of Feher’s preexisting musical score. However Schüfftan may have been influenced to adopt such Expressionist tendencies, it is clear that this stylistic trait only emerged once in exile.

Figure 19: Dramatic flashes of light in *The Robber Symphony* create the effect of lightning.
After filming *The Robber Symphony*, Schüfftan returned briefly to Paris in the autumn of 1935 to work as cinematographer on *La Tendre ennemie/The Tender Enemy*, his second project with Max Ophüls, following their collaboration on *Dann schon lieber Lebertran* in 1931. The film is a social comedy set on the day of Line Dupont's engagement party, thrown for her by her mother Annette. Amongst the attendees are three uninvited guests, ghosts of Annette's former lovers, including her husband, the father of Line. The ghosts watch over the events of the day whilst reminiscing with each other about their time spent with Annette.
Before discussing Schüfftan's lighting technique in *La Tendre ennemie* it is worth noting that, beyond just lighting, Schüfftan was also responsible for the effects of the three ghosts who appear throughout the film. For as Schüfftan explained much later in his career, in a letter to his agency dated 13th November 1956, the cinematographer working in Europe was also charged with creating special effects, 'as the separation of special effects and camera work is not known in Europe in contrast to Hollywood. In Europe special effect departments don't exist.'

The ghosts are not presented in the film as opaque corporeal bodies, but rather as semi-transparent ethereal beings. There are two possible methods Schüfftan could have employed to create the transparent effect used for the ghosts. The first is through the double exposure of the film stock, rewinding the film used and re-exposing it with a new image. The second, and a strong possibility considering Schüfftan's heritage with the 'Schüfftan Process' and its similarities, is to place a piece of clear glass at a 45 degree angle in front of the camera. If the 'ghosts' are positioned in the correct position off-camera a reflection of their image will be reflected in the glass, appearing in the lens as superimposed over the set positioned directly in front of the camera.

---

13 Eugen Schüfftan file of the Paul Kohner archive, *Deutsche Kinemathek*. 
Figure 21: Schüfftan employs trick photography for ghostly effects in *La Tendre ennemie*.

Schüfftan further enhances the spectral qualities of the ghosts through his approach to lighting (see Figure 21). Regardless of which technique was employed by Schüfftan, double exposure or glass reflection, both allow the cinematographer to light the ghost separately to the set, as they are two separate elements before they are combined in the same image. As such Schüfftan has lit the ghosts more strongly in the second element of the image, the result being that they stand apart from the location they are in, seeming not to belong. This is particularly enhanced by the strong use of backlight which gives a glowing effect around the profiles of the ghosts. Such an effect is evident throughout the film, disconnecting the ghosts from the realm of the living, placing them within what we could term a Deleuzean ‘any-space-whatever’ of their own.
With such a technique in mind it is interesting to consider how Schüfftan chooses to light the characters who occupy the world of the living. The approach adopted by Schüfftan is in fact contrary to the style he has developed thus far in his career. He chooses not to employ a strong backlight to separate the subjects of the frame from the background set, which would create depth within the image. Rather, when filming the living characters Schüfftan avoids using backlights, favouring key and fill lights. The effect of this is that there is no strong definition between the characters and their background, somewhat flattening the image (see Figure 22). However, this serves a specific purpose in *La Tendre ennemie*, functioning to root the living into the space in which they live, literally making them ‘part of the wallpaper’, whereas the ghosts remain detached, backlit, residing in their any-space-whatever.

![Figure 22](image)

Figure 22: In *La Tendre ennemie* Schüfftan roots the living characters into the world through avoidance of backlighting.
Schüfftan's lighting and camera techniques, employed to create the impression of a flashback as the ghosts first remember their time with Annette, merit our attention. When this flashback first begins an effect of mottled spinning lights, travelling from left to right, passes behind the subject. A dissolve then signals the beginning of the flashback sequence and this spinning light effect continues throughout. This moving light effect is not clear to illustrate in a static image, however, the spotlights can be seen, cast against the background of the set, in Figure 23, below. In a film comprised of separate worlds – of the living and the dead – this lighting effect functions to differentiate the flashback sequences. Therefore, just as Schüfftan lighting technique differentiates the living from the dead, his lighting also differentiates between the present and memories of the past.

Figure 23: Schüfftan's spinning background lights signals the scene as a flashback.
Scenes worth noting for Schüfftan's lighting effects and camera techniques include the death of Annette’s husband, as well as the death of the third ghost, both of which are presented in flashback. In the death scene of the husband we see him dancing with his wife at a club, with the camera following their twists and turns around the dance floor, as you might expect of an Ophüls film. When the husband suddenly stops dancing and clutches his heart the camera also abruptly stops with him. It then suddenly performs a full 360 degree pan around its axis, before resting once again on Annette and her husband as he collapses to the floor and dies. The panning movement is performed at such a quick pace that nothing is visible except a blur until it has completed its motion. This functions to replicate in the spectator the sensation of giddiness and disorientation experienced by Annette's husband in the moment of his death, achieved through the apparatus of the camera itself. Schüfftan's techniques are equally as crucial to the death scene of the third ghost. Having received a letter from Annette he walks off along the quay, away from the camera. The water is in darkness, and only two beams of light (spotlights) shine across the pavement. When he has passed this second beam of light he is subsumed in darkness. The image begins to fade as a gunshot is heard over the soundtrack, signaling his suicide.

Novel use of lighting occurs during the flashback of the second ghost, Rodrigo the lion tamer, where the camera itself is drawn attention to. In the scene Annette and the lion-tamer ride together in the back of the carriage with the light appearing to originate from a position behind the camera. There is also a visible light source from the window on the opposite side of the carriage. We see Annette lean over and pull the blind down covering this window, slightly dimming the level of base light in the carriage. She then reaches towards the camera. When her hand has reached the top of the frame this action prompts a cut, suggesting that she has pulled down the blind positioned in the location of the camera, thus blocking the light source and causing darkness.
One indirect reason *La Tendre ennemie* is of particular importance, not only to Schüfftan’s own career, but to the history of French cinema, is that this was the first occasion on which Henri Alékan acted as Schüfftan’s camera assistant. Alékan worked under Schüfftan’s tutelage on numerous occasions during the 1930s after this initial collaboration, before Alékan became a cinematographer in his own right in the 1940s. He would go onto film, amongst many others, *La Belle et la Bête/Beauty and the Beast* (Jean Cocteau, 1945), *Anna Karenina* (Julien Duvivier, 1947), *Roman Holiday* (William Wyler, 1952) and *Wings of Desire* (Wim Wenders, 1986). Alékan has repeatedly asserted the influence of Schüfftan on his long career as a cinematographer:

Schüfftan initiated me into the secrets of his Art, which consisted of two principles: observation of composition and light in the Old Masters; transposition and application to the cinema of the rules this reveals. [...] For me, this experience was devastating, a revelation. The relationship between Schüfftan and his directors – Pabst, Carné – was astonishingly rich. At last I had an opportunity to escape from a milieu in which light was considered as a simple physical given, and to get to know a cameraman who had over many years mediated on the aesthetic and psychological problems of light. (Crisp, 1997: 377)

This quote, from Schüfftan’s most faithful apprentice, reveals the true source of Schüfftan’s photographic inspiration. Rather than the German Expressionist movement and the bold chiaroscuro effects to which Schüfftan is so frequently attached, his approach was actually informed by his formative artistic training. Amongst the Old Masters that Schüfftan studied, the figure that stands out as the most profound influence upon the cinematographer is Rembrandt (Elsaesser, 2000: 433).14 Schüfftan took from Rembrandt an interest in the tonality of light, and a subtle use of chiaroscuro effects, which is perhaps why he has become

---

14 Alékan also cites Gustave Doré, Léonardo da Vinci and Giovanni Piranèse as artistic models, perhaps due to his training under Schüfftan’s tutelage (Crisp, 1997: 379).
so conflated with Expressionism. However, there is a notable style to Rembrandt’s, and thereafter Schüfftan’s use of chiaroscuro. This is particularly noticeable in Rembrandt’s portraits, and therefore Schüfftan’s close-ups and medium close-ups. The effect is created by casting a strong source light against once side of the subject’s face, with a softer light cast upon the other side. In addition to creating a structured lighting of the subject, this results in an interesting interaction between shadow and light upon the dimmer side of the face, and Rembrandt’s trademark patch of light beneath the subject’s eye. In cinematic terms, this has become known as ‘Rembrandt lighting’ (now a common template for portrait photography), and is created by fixing a strong key light at a high angle on one side of the subject, and a softer fill light, at half the height, on the other side (Ferncase, 1995: 132). Schüfftan’s use of this technique dates back as early as Menschen am Sonntag, his first film as cinematographer. Whilst Rembrant lighting is used infrequently by Schüfftan on Menschen am Sonntag, as location shooting was favoured, resulting in less control of lighting, it can be seen in certain interior scenes (as in Figure 24, where the high angle of the key lighting casts shadows to the right).
Finally, in this mis-aligning of Schüfftan with Expressionism, Rembrandt lighting was a term first coined prior to this movement of German cinema. The term first arose in relation to film lighting in 1915, in California, by Cecil B. DeMille. DeMille was filming *The Warren of Virginia* and had borrowed theatre lights, with which he was able to create a particular effect. When the studio was unhappy with the results, DeMille dubbed the technique ‘Rembrandt lighting’, delighting the studio with the marketing possibilities this offered (Eyman, 2010: 93). This technique also became known as ‘Lasky lighting’, after the studio head, ‘and set the standard for motion picture photography between 1915 and 1918.’ (Birchard, 2004: 40) The tutelage of such techniques by Schüfftan and other German cinematographers to the cameramen of France would come to profoundly affect the French cinema of the 1930s and
40s. But first Schüfftan was to reunite with Max Ophüls outside of France, in the Netherlands, after a brief return to Britain.

The Netherlands (via Britain)

Following La Tendre ennemie Schüfftan returned to Great Britain where he filmed Children of the Fog (1935) under the direction of Leopold Jessner and John Quin. Jessner was a German theatre director and disciple of Reinhardt, and was an early proponent of Expressionist film alongside Paul Leni in the direction of Hintertreppe/Backstairs (1921). Like many others, Jessner was forced into exile when Hitler came to power in Germany in 1933, and attempted to forge a career for himself in British theatre, attempting two unsuccessful stage productions in London (Ritchie, 1996: 158). Turning to the cinema, Jessner established his own production company, Jesba Films, which produced Children of the Fog, set around the inhabitants of a bleak tenement on the London docklands. Much like Jessner's stage productions, the film was not well received in Britain and has been quickly forgotten by film history. In this history of Schüfftan however, Jessner’s Expressionist background stands as a further example of how Schüfftan came to adopt certain traits of the Expressionist style, despite the fact that the dominance of Expressionism in Germany had long abated.

Children of the Fog was Schüfftan's last film in Britain, where he had achieved little commercial or critical success but had experienced a profound impact upon his filmmaking style. Schüfftan's return to France was via Amsterdam where he was reunited with Max Ophüls. Ophüls had been working in postproduction on La Tendre ennemie, when an opportunity had presented itself from the Tuschinski family in the Netherlands, to make a film intended to be the pinnacle of the celebrations for the fifteenth anniversary of the
Tuschinski Theatre in Amsterdam. The project was to be *Komedie om Geld/The Trouble With Money* (Max Ophüls, 1936), a light-hearted comedy about the problems created in society by a strong desire for money. Shooting for the film began in mid-June, 1936, with a budget of 150,000 guilders, making it at the time the most expensive film ever to be made by the Netherlands (Beusekom, 2004: 61).

Besides Ophüls and Schüfftan, the rest of the crew and cast were comprised of local Dutch talent, a problem which proved difficult for Ophüls, for as Beusekom (2004: 65) has noted, he 'complained that making films in the Netherlands took him much longer than in France, due to the primitive working conditions and poor technical equipment available.' Such conditions would have greatly impacted upon Schüfftan's quality of work, affecting both his lighting and his camerawork. However, this would not be the last time that Schüfftan would be forced to adapt to smaller budgets and studios. Work on *Komedie om Geld* was unlikely to have been a pleasurable experience for Schüfftan, who as Ophüls' only friend and compatriot on set would have been compromised by the director’s repeated clashes with producer and financier Will Tuschinski, and his failure to integrate himself into the working practices of the small Dutch studio (Beusekom, 2004: 65). This is evident in the film, with Ophüls’ and Schüfftan’s struggle with the Netherlands industry manifesting itself in rather poor photography, particularly in comparison with the pair’s other collaborations. One such example is Schüfftan’s seemingly hurried lighting positions. His usual strong backlight is less in evidence, favouring instead a simple strong fill light, which offers little of the definition or interest of Schüfftan’s usual photography (see Figure 25).
Filming on *Komedie om Geld* was completed by the beginning of September. Ophüls returned to France to finish *La Tendre ennemie*, and Schüfftan also travelled to France for his next film projects, despite the Netherlands’s rather favourable attitude towards Jewish and political exiles (Palmier, 2006: 144). Both left behind the most highly anticipated film in the Netherlands film industry to disappear as a commercial failure, only a week after its triumphant release (Beusekom, 2004: 66).

Schüfftan's first film project following his return to France was *Mademoiselle Docteur* (1936), a collaboration with G. W. Pabst, the director of *Du Haut en bas*, one of Schüfftan's earliest films in France. The film is also known as *Salonique nid d’espions/Spies from Salonika*, and was also released as an English language version *Under Secret Orders*, under
the direction of Edmond T. Gréville. It is a spy drama which centres upon a female doctor who falls in love with one of her patients, a German Intelligence spy working from Salonika, Greece. As with Schüfftan's more recent efforts, Mademoiselle Docteur demonstrates a slowly developing Expressionist aesthetic influence, particularly through Schüfftan's chiaroscuro lighting. In publicity for Mademoiselle Docteur in 1937, Schüfftan went some way to explaining his working process:

I did my composition not only with the actor and the movement and the set; for me the value for composition is the light. Because the light must be at the point where the action is, so that the spectator knows where the action is. One picture changes to the next terribly quickly, so you have to be precise... when you look at a Rembrandt picture, mostly the light is not directly centered on the action; only in the neighborhood of the action. The action sort of continues the light. That’s what Pabst likes very much, and I always tried to do it for him. Immediately when he saw the first rushes he saw that what he wanted had come out. Lighting is the main thing. (In: Leyda, 1977: 419-420)

This quote once again emphasizes the painterly aspect of Schüfftan’s work, whereby similarities to the Expressionist style can be traced not from the movement of German cinema, but from Schüfftan’s artistic references, most notably Rembrandt. The technique of lighting described by Schüfftan is certainly evident in Mademoiselle Docteur. The lighting is notably directional, with a spotlight often cutting across the set and sometimes the body of the subject. In accordance with the method outlined by Schüfftan above, rather than providing a direct facial illumination, this technique allows for a gentle illumination of the face, allowing for a number of shadows to be cast across it. This creates a sense of intrigue around the characters fitting to the theme of the film. Through such a technique, Schüfftan, as suggested above, avoids making the faces of the subjects the brightest aspect of the frame, creating interest and depth in the image. This is evident in Figure 26, for which Schüfftan
casts his spotlight onto the body of the subject and the background set, allowing the face to be more gently illuminated. Furthermore, a light source from behind the window at the rear of the frame creates a sense of depth in the image. The strong use of spotlighting in the film also occasionally results in full body shadows cast along the walls of the set, a tendency which does recall Expressionism.

Figure 26: Schüfftan avoids casting his spotlight directly onto faces in *Mademoiselle Docteur*.

Certain lighting techniques used with regard to the face of the film's star, Dita Parlo, who plays the Mademoiselle Docteur, merit discussion. As might be expected, Schüfftan privileges the face of the female protagonist, with a stronger use of key lighting used than on other subjects, and with filler lights used to reduce shadow on her face. To augment Parlo's particular features, Schüfftan lights her mainly from above, with a focus around her eyes.
This functions to lower her cheekbones, thus enlarging the space around her eyes, making them appear larger and giving them prominence. This technique is combined with filler lights from below which reduce the possibility of any shadow, and functions alongside Pabst's choice to frame Parlo from above with great effect. Such a technique is used to startling effect in one particular scene, in which the camera pans back from a close-up on Parlo's face, her eyes lit as described above (see Figure 27a). Once the camera has panned back she is reduced to the bottom right of the frame, with the left hand side filled with the curtains which have billowed into the room. The menacing face of Monsieur Leo then appears superimposed in close-up over this billowing curtain, staring directly into the camera lens. He is lit similarly from above but from a much higher angle, which combined with a lack of filler light allows dark shadows to be cast across his furrowed brow and over his eyes, highlighting his role as a malignant threat in the film.

Such an approach to lighting Parlo's face continues throughout the film, in fact creating its own meta-narrative, beginning from the shot described above where a sense of innocence is created through this method of lighting her eyes. The next stage in this meta-narrative occurs in the latter parts of the film, when she escapes during the raid. Schüfftan employs the same lighting effect. However, combined with Parlo's performance and the efforts of other elements such as the score, this time her eyes make her appear maniacal, desperate to escape (see Figure 27b). Her bright white dress is also strongly illuminated by Schüfftan's lighting, enhancing the effect of fragility upon her character. Later, in her final escape from the crash site her face is in almost complete darkness, a stark contrast to the bright illumination of earlier scenes (see Figure 27c). Finally, the denouement to this meta-narrative of lighting techniques occurs at the very end of the film when the doctor is found to be in a mental institution (see Figure 27d). Now when she is filmed in close-up Schüfftan targets no light at her eyes, instead directing a spotlight at only the bottom half of her face. However, in the
darkness we can still see, through the gentle luminosity created by the spotlight, her wide eyes looking upwards, communicating not innocence or desperation, but emptiness and insanity.

Figure 27: Dita Parlow in *Mademoiselle Docteur*. Clockwise from top left: Figures 27 a, b, c and d.

So, it is with Schüfftan's own words in mind, alongside examination of films from this period such as *Mademoiselle Docteur* and *The Robber Symphony*, that we can begin to define a distinct Schüfftan style, albeit tailored to the specific subject matter of a given film. This developing style often bears the mark of Expressionism, though one which Schüfftan developed from his own study of painting and sculpture, rather than any direct training as part of German Expressionist cinema. It seems this arose because directors expected them from Schüfftan. As far as they were concerned, given his status as a former Ufa employee, he must be well-versed in Expressionist techniques. Even though this was not entirely the case,
Schüfftan, a struggling exile, had to adapt to their expectations if he was to survive. It was a labelling, if you will. It is as if, as a cinematographer hailing from Weimar Germany, Expressionist aesthetics were expected of Schüfftan in exile, and he was therefore forced to adopt them. Furthermore, we can see how the oversimplification of Schüfftan’s style in the writings that exist upon his films, through such shorthand as chiaroscuro and Expressionist, is an extension of the assumption made by the directors and producers who hired Schüfftan during this crucial point of transition in his style, away from realism, during the 1930s.

This developing style, dating for Schüfftan from the mid-1930s, can be said to constitute a fondness for chiaroscuro lighting (of the Rembrandt model), a strong use of backlighting to separate subjects from the background set, and a determination not to floodlight a subject’s face. Key lights were rather directed towards the background set, to create interest in the set and image by ensuring that this is where the brightest part of the frame is located. In terms of facial lighting, the Rembrandt effect is favoured by Schüfftan, except perhaps for female (in most cases) stars, where traditional soft focus glamour lighting is employed. More generally, these techniques can be viewed as an interest in creating a sense of depth, ensuring that light is used wherever possible to combat the two-dimensionality of the film image, and to create a sense of texture in the image that can be associated with a painterly style.

Schüfftan’s final film of 1936 saw him once again leaving France, this time traveling to Spain for a Ulargui Films production María de la O, with direction by Francisco Elias. Such a diverse set of national projects in such a short period of time since Schüfftan had first arrived in France reveals Schüfftan's desperation for steady work, and that he had yet to be entirely absorbed into the French industry, still relying on his émigré compatriots when working in France. For whilst continual employment is a struggle for any cinematographer, an émigré status certainly complicates the matter. María de la O in fact deals in its narrative with
national identities, telling the story of an American artist’s return to Spain where he had resided during his youth. When in Spain the artist befriends a young gypsy girl, whom he discovers to be his daughter. To save her from the destitution of her life, the artist buys his daughter from her gypsy tribe, taking her back to America with him to build a new life. He soon realises, however, that his daughter’s home is with her tribe in Spain, where she has been brought up. The film, which is rarely available, is little remembered besides the dancing of Carmen Amaya, who would, shortly after María de la O, move to America and cause something of a sensation with her flamenco skills (see Figure 28).

Figure 28: Carmen Amaya in María de la O.

Spain was enduring its own disturbing political situation which meant few exiles paused here to establish their new lives, although it was the path for many on route to America. Had
Schüfftan left Europe at this juncture he may well have fared better in Hollywood. Instead he returned to France, where many of his greatest successes were yet to come. His first project upon his return was another collaboration with Max Ophüls, *Yoshiwara*, which began production in February 1937. The appeal of the film to audiences, as with *Die Herrin von Atlantis* and *Mademoiselle Docteur* before it, was to be the exotic location of the film, being based around a house of Geishas in Japan at the turn of the century (even though, unlike *Die Herrin von Atlantis*, this faraway location was recreated entirely in the studio). The film deals with a Russian naval officer, Serge (Pierre Richard-Willm), and his love of a Geisha, Kohana (Michiko Tanaka), which is complicated by the jealousy of Ysamo (played by the legendary star of the silent screen, Sessue Hayakawa). Ysamo is an old friend of Kohana who had doted upon her before she became a geisha. The love between officer and geisha ends in tragedy when Serge entrusts Kohana with some vital documents after he has been wounded. Kohana is arrested carrying those documents and she is sentenced to death. Learning of Kohana’s fate Serge rushes back to save her, but dies of his own wounds before he can stop the firing squad.

Schüfftan’s approach to lighting in the early parts of the film is to support the set in its recreation of a Japanese location. A highly-lit space is created with little contrast or shadow in both interior and exterior scenes, which functions to recreate the brightness of the Japanese sun. Schüfftan creates such an effect through the strong use of key, side and fill lights, with little to no back or hard light used. This creates a general illumination of the set with little contrast, but also without the depth or interest of image for which Schüfftan was becoming known. This technique functions not only for the exterior scenes set in sunny Japan, but also largely for within the houses, whereby outdoor light softly illuminates the area through the fragile doors which encompass the set. As we know that Schüfftan has turned to painting and

---

15 The title of the film refers to the famous geisha district of Edo (now Tokyo).
sculpture for influence, it possible that this light palette for *Yoshiwara* was inspired by the classic Ukiyo-e genre of Japanese woodblock printing, which are characterized by a similarly soft hue, and which provide suitable lighting tones for the romantic elements of the narrative.

A more mundane explanation to this approach to lighting, lacking the contrast and specific lighting points, which we have seen associated with Schüfftan's style, could be to accommodate Ophüls's own working practices and particular style. Ophüls is known for his sweeping movements of the camera, for which he is best remembered in his later works, particularly those in collaboration with the cinematographer Christian Matras (Crisp, 1997: 396-397). However, such movements are also invariably seen in *Yoshiwara*. One such example occurs when the camera follows Serge as he rushes up the staircase of the Geisha house and along the corridor, before barging into a room on the sound of Kohana's screams, in order to save her from attack by another Russian crewman. To achieve such rapid and varied camera movements would require careful orchestration of the light movements, and so a general illumination of the set would reduce this complication. In this sense it could be said that Ophüls demonstrates a greater concern for the set design and the camera's ability to move around it, than with the cinematographer's ability to light the set. However, this does not detract from the fact that this flat-lighting has a narrative effect.

One scene which perfectly illustrates this, and which has proven to be of particular interest to critics, occurs when Serge describes what their life would be like if she were to return to Russia with him. Serge's descriptions are realised for Kohana in a vivid fantasy shared between the two lovers, transforming the set into a carriage ride through Europe, a sled ride, an evening at the opera, and dinner at a fine restaurant. Alexander Jacoby (2002) describes how the set design in this sequence functions to undermine the fantasy of the couple, and in fact reinforces the stark reality of their relationship:
Hero and heroine sit together in a mock carriage as painted backdrops of European holiday destinations are scrolled past mechanically by a hardworking attendant. There, in one of the most obviously Brechtian passages in Ophuls' career, the fake backdrops instantly cast doubt on their declarations of undying love, hinting that those romantic hopes may be as false and insubstantial as the reproductions of landscape that pass behind them. The technique is duplicated exactly in Yoshiwara's imaginary sleigh ride, where a table and chair are metamorphosed by special effects into a sledge which carries Serge and Kohana along in front of a paint-and-cardboard St Petersburg.

Schüfftan's approach to lighting this scene functions to support the subversion of the couple's fantasy created by the art design of Léon and André Barsacq. Schüfftan maintains the same level of lighting as the scene shifts to and from fantasy and reality, rather than changing it, which would have the effect of, literally, transporting the spectator into the fantasy experienced by the couple. By maintaining the same lighting levels, Schüfftan fixes the action in reality, suggesting like the art design, that this can never become more than a mere fantasy.

As the film progresses however, and Ysamo's jealously increases, Schufftan's approach to lighting begins to change, becoming more stylised, reflecting the psychological trauma of the love triangle. This is in part because the weather of the latter scenes has descended into a storm, allowing Schufftan to use accent lights and key lights more in accordance with his usual style. We see this, for example, when Kohana and Serge share a moment together, knelt on the floor, and Schüfftan’s accent light is invested with erotic value as it picks out their hands, highlighting them as they briefly touch.

A good example of a dramatic use of lighting by Schüfftan, which makes full use of the storm, occurs when Ysamo spies on Kohana and Serge through the semi-transparency of the door, only moments after Serge has been wounded. We see Ysamo's face dramatically
illuminated from above, with shadows cast across it. His body stands in silhouette, positioned against the brightness of the fog. Schufftan chooses to create dramatic effects in the storm through light rather than darkness, allowing the set to be obfuscated through the fog and for the subjects to be viewed as sinister silhouettes.

Figure 29: Sessue Hayakawa in *Yoshiwara.*

The film provided Ophuls with his greatest prewar commercial success in France, due most likely to the film’s exotic Oriental setting, and the melodramatic elements of the plot (Bacher, 1996: 37). However, it was precisely these aspects of the film which failed to impress critics, as well as the Japanese government and its film industry, who roundly disapproved of the film’s representation of their culture (Jacoby, 2002).
Schüfftan's next film was to be a significant one, if not for its quality, then because it was Schüfftan's first project under the direction of Marcel Carné, a director described by Dudley Andrew (1995: 175) as ‘poised to respond to the German cinema.’ 

Drôle de drame/Bizarre (1937) is a comedy set in (a decidedly French vision of) London, which was shot alongside Schüfftan’s camera assistant Henri Alékan. According to Claire Blakeway (1990: 134), a lack of depth of field is a distracting effect of Carné’s mise-en-scène in this film, one which is at odds with the stylistic approach of Schüfftan that I have outlined thus far. She notes that, ‘Carné acknowledged the shallow appearance of these shots, remarking that the view of the street looked rather like a painted background, but then he also emphasized that he was not seeking to make a realistic film.’ (Ibid.) Blakeway also finds fault with Schüfftan’s lighting:

> The two-dimensional impression was further exacerbated by the monotonous lighting effects, which evoked little variation in strength and contrast between the interiors and exteriors, often submerging character and setting in an unrelieved, crepuscular gloom. This said, however, the murky quality of the lighting (encouraged, no doubt, by Schüfftan’s involvement on Drôle de Drame) harmonised with the film’s black humour and the character’s obsession with murder. (Ibid.)

The lighting effects of Drôle de drame described by Blakeway, are in fact quite removed from Schüfftan’s favoured stylistic approach. There is indeed a lack of contrast in the lighting of the film, arising from Schüfftan’s decision to employ little backlight, however, such stylistic traits are quite unusual in terms of his career. Whilst Blakeway sees this as a shortcoming of the film, Carné and Schüfftan create an impression through the flat lighting of the theatricality of this piece. The rather two-dimensional feel to the film which Blakeway has identified can therefore be seen as a consequence of the farcical theme, which necessarily required a fairly unrealistic mise-en-scène. Furthermore, Carné’s unique mise-en-scène,
alongside an emerging trend in French set design, no doubt required a different approach from Schüfftan. These issues shall be developed in greater detail with regard to Schüfftan and Carné’s subsequent collaboration, which was soon to come in 1938 with *Le Quai des brumes*.

Schüfftan's next feature of 1937, *Forfaiture/The Cheat*, saw him not only reprise his working relationship with Marcel L'Herbier, director of *Le Scandale*, but also with the actor Sessue Hayakawa, who had starred as Ysamo in *Yoshiwara*. As with *Yoshiwara*, *Forfaiture* drew its appeal from its exotic setting, this time a small Chinese town (with Hayakawa, a Japanese actor, embodying a generic Oriental 'otherness' adequate for Western audiences). The film was a remake of Cecil B. DeMille's *The Cheat* (1915), which had proven extremely popular.

Figure 30: Schüfftan's 'murky' lighting in *Drôle de Drame*.
in France, inspiring its own opera, *La Forfaiture*, which opened in 1921, with lyrics by Paul Milliet and music by Camille Erlanger.¹⁶ However, it was clearly DeMille's original film which provided the inspiration for L'Herbier's interpretation, for Hayakawa's performance is actually a reprisal of the same role he had acted in 1915. As Jun Okada (2008: 368) rightly notes, ‘The remake was the result of a twenty-year dream harboured on the profound effect that *The Cheat*, and in particular, its star, had had on L’Herbier, and upon the burgeoning French film culture in 1916, when it played to resounding success in the Paris boulevard cinemas.’¹⁷

The story is that of a young French woman, Denise Moret (Lise Delamaré), who involves herself in charity work whilst her husband, Pierre (Victor Francen), works away. Denise soon finds herself in a gambling den where she loses all her money, leaving her with no other option but to accept an offer of money from Prince Hu-Long (Hayakawa), who has kept his eye on her since their first meeting. Denise changes her mind and decides not to keep the money. However, when she tries to return it to the Prince she discovers that she is now his property, a fact viscerally realised in the film when we see him brand Denise's flesh. In reaction Denise shoots and kills the Prince. However, it is Denise's husband Pierre who is arrested for the murder and who is put on trial. Just as the judge comes to find Pierre guilty, Denise confesses the true events to the court. Told by the judge that she has no proof, Denise dramatically pulls back her shirt to reveal the brand of Prince Hu-Long. Pierre is acquitted and has an emotional reconciliation with Denise at the close of the film.

¹⁶ This was in fact the first opera to be based upon a film (Miyao 2007: 25).
¹⁷ Indeed, this was a particularly formative moment for L'Herbier, just prior to his induction into the film industry in 1917, in the form of the *Section Cinématographique de l’Armée*. Besides the reprisal by Hayakawa of his original role, L'Herbier goes even further to communicate in his remake the profound influence of DeMille's original text. At the very start of the film an on-screen title references *The Cheat* as the source material, and the credits which follow actually appear over footage of Hayakawa in his original role from 1915.
From the very start of the film Schüfftan fully emphasizes the exoticism of the location. In the opening scene, when Denise's car is attacked by bandits, Schüfftan creates a very bright image, possibly through use of over-exposure, or possibly by utilizing the natural light of the location. In fact, the brightness of the image is such that, in a shot where the camera looks out across the desert horizon, the sky and the sand begin to blend into one another (see Figure 31). This is a different effect to *Die Herrin von Atlantis*, where Schüfftan filmed in the desert at either dusk or dawn, in order to give some definition to the image. In *Forfaiture*, the spectator experiences the same sensation of blinding light as would be experienced by the characters in that situation.

![Figure 31: In *Forfaiture*, Schufftan allows the horizon to blend into the sky, highlighting the brightness of the location.](image-url)
When the car carrying Prince Hu-Long arrives, shown in the reflection of Denise’s car, Schüfftan is able to contrast with the brightness of the location to great effect. The Prince is sitting in the back of the car, fully lit by Schüfftan from the left hand side of the frame, and is figured against a dark background with his shadow cast against it (see Figure 32). An air of mystery and enigma is created through this sudden shroud of darkness, aided of course by the exotic music, by Michel Michelet, over the soundtrack. The intrigue surrounding Prince Hu-Long is then emphasized by the reverse shot through the car of Denise who is doubly framed by both the car window and the doorway on the other side. This doorway forms a dark frame to the shot (see Figure 33). However, the light from the desert exterior forms a bright backlight to Denise. Such an effect, created by the brightness of the local sun, is further emphasised only a short time later, when the Prince returns Denise home. In this instance, there is a close-up shot of the symbol on the front of the Prince's car as he is driven away. The light catches this symbol, reflecting it into the lens of the camera as the car moves, creating a strong blinding effect. This adds to the sense of dread towards the Prince.
Figure 32: Sessue Hayakawa as the mysterious Prince Hu-Long in *Forfaiture*.
The mise-en-scène is strongly lit throughout the film, with Schüfftan using a very strong backlight when lighting subjects in order to give definition to the image in the face of such bright natural light. Even when the action moves away from location shooting, the effect of the bright sun is recreated by Schüfftan through the use of strong key and sidelights, and a strong backlight is also used in interior scenes. This is quite opposed to the ‘murky’ flat images ascribed to Schüfftan in Drôle de drame. The number of exterior scenes featuring this bright lighting become far fewer once Denise has lost her money, allowing for the lighting to reflect the psychological situation she is in, so much so that when the style and mood of the film shifts in the second half (becoming a courtroom drama showing the murder trial of Pierre Moret), Schüfftan's lighting eschews the exoticism of the location presented in the first half of the film, grounding Denise in the consequences of her actions.
Following his work on *Forfaiture*, Schüfftan was reunited with Robert Siodmak, who had last worked with Schüfftan upon *La Crise est finie*. The film was *Mollenard/Hatred* (1937), which was produced by Productions Corniglion-Molinier who had previously produced *Drôle de drame*, and saw Henri Alékan reprise his role as Schüfftan's camera assistant. In the film Harry Baur plays the eponymous Mollenard, Captain aboard a ship engaged in illegal arms dealing at the port of Shanghai. The ship catches fire, forcing the Captain to retreat home with his crew to Dunkirk, where they are received with a hero's welcome. However, Mollenard experiences difficulties readjusting to his old family life, thanks to mutual contempt that has grown between him and his wife (Gabrielle Dorziat). This even leads to his daughter (Ludmilla Pitoëff) escaping the home and throwing herself into the dock, where Mollenard must save her. The Captain is eager to return to his life at sea, however, this desire is thwarted when he suffers a debilitating heart attack, leaving him under the charge of his despising wife. The denouement of the film sees Mollenard's crew carry him from his bed and take him aboard ship, allowing him to die in peace at sea.

In addition to the émigrés Schüfftan and Siodmak, *Mollenard*'s crew also boasted the Hungarian set designer Alexandre Trauner, who had moved to France in 1929 to embark upon his career in film, and who had recently worked with Schüfftan on *Drôle de drame*. The film stands therefore as an example of émigré technicians who, with their own distinctive style, came to adapt to the demands of a foreign national cinema. We have already seen how Schüfftan, beginning with a strong sense of realism, began to incorporate aspects of an Expressionist style, in order to meet the expectations of his aesthetic outside of Germany. Siodmak similarly came to France intent on maintaining the realist aesthetic he had developed in Germany, proclaiming 'I hate operettas and vaudeville because they represent empty genres, sheer gaudy tinsel' (Andrew, 1995: 173). Nevertheless, through his time in France, Siodmak abandoned his earlier style of realism, adapting to the styles of the French
popular cinema. For Dudley Andrew (1995: 173), 'his eight French films take limited aesthetic risks, often falling back on standard French ploys: *mots d'auteur*, staged theatrical effects, and a heterogeneous structure aiming to please a wide variety of spectators.'

Whilst I shall argue that the aesthetics of *Mollenard* hold rather more interest than Andrew suggests, it is nevertheless true that these émigré artists had begun to make films of a notably French style. In the case of *Mollenard*, Alistair Phillips (2004:71) has noted that, despite the émigré crew, 'many of the reviews of *Mollenard* refer to its distinctively French character'. However, this is not to gainsay the fact that cross-fertilization was occurring here. Thus, whilst on the one hand, it is true to say that both Siodmak and Schüfftan had successfully incorporated their styles into the French industry, it was also a two-way process. Certainly, Schüfftan’s style had been indelibly changed in exile away from his realist practices, but also, Schüfftan and other émigré artists had profoundly affected the aesthetic of French cinema. So it is not simply that Schüfftan and Siodmak had adapted to French trends in *Mollenard*, but rather that such émigré artists were simultaneously shaping those trends.

Colin Crisp (1997) has authoritatively described how émigré cinematographers and set designers shaped the face of French cinema during the 1930s. As Dudley Andrew (1995: 176) has explained, ‘the look of French films would be altered far more from below, by the techniques of artisans, than from on high by directors.’ This seems primarily due to the degree of artistic training that had been afforded those who undertook what was seen as the ‘technical’ role of cinematographer. According to Crisp (1997: 376), most French cinematographers had ‘entered the profession from menial or, at best, technical positions, and this lack of artistic baggage was unquestionably one reason for the reluctance of directors […] to rate the cinematographers as highly as they themselves would have wished.’ German cinematographers arrived in France having experienced a much more active role in the
aesthetic construction of the image, though not always, as Crisp suggests in the case of Schüfftan, because they had been involved in the Expressionist cinema (1997: 377). Crisp emphasizes his point by quoting from a number of French cinematographers who have discussed the influence of the German exiles during this period. In particular they highlight how the school of mentoring, whereby a young trainee French cinematographer would assist in the work of the principal German cinematographer (as in the case of Alékan and Schüfftan), proved profoundly influential. Crisp describes how Louis Page, Henri Alékan, Maurice Barry, Claude Renoir, Robert Juillard, Roger Fellous, Marc Fossard and Alain Douarinou all benefited from the tutelage of émigré cinematographers (Alékan, Page, Barry and Fossard were all schooled by Schüfftan) (1997: 378).

According to Crisp, this influence was in the form of Expressionism, and whilst it is perhaps true that Schüfftan adopted these tendencies to comply with the ‘émigré school’ of cinematography, it is unfortunate that through a generalization of this émigré influence, his understanding of Schüfftan’s particular style and background is less nuanced. Mollenard is therefore an example of how Schüfftan had gained status as a cinematographer in France, and of how he was both transformed by the French industry, and how he had in turn helped to transform it. Further attesting to the status Schüfftan had garnered in the industry, he actually played a part in the advertising of new Eastman Kodak film stock in the French press (Phillips, 2004: 49).

Tendencies of this émigré school of photography and Schüfftan’s own features of lighting can be found throughout Mollenard, displaying a far more textured approach to lighting than was evident in the films of German Expressionism. Robert Siodmak (Elsaesser, 2000: 433) recalled this style when instructing the cinematographer Woody Bredell, on the set of his Hollywood film noir, Phantom Lady (1944):
I told him about my friend Eugen Schüfftan, with whom I’d made Menschen am Sonntag and Mollenard and who was a great admirer of Rembrandt. The theory that the eye instinctively moves away from the brightest point and seeks out the darkest seemed to impress Bredell. He began to study Rembrandt’s paintings.

We can see from this, not only the long-lasting legacy of Schüfftan’s photography, but also, once again, the influence of Rembrandt upon this style. Rembrandt’s theory of light, as described by Siodmak, can be seen in his classic painting ‘The Risen Christ Appearing to Mary Magdalene’ (1638) (Figure 34). In this image the subjects in fact occupy the darkest portions of the painting, only faintly illuminated by the glow of the sky in the background, which is the brightest part of the frame.
Whilst both have been classified as chiaroscuro, the differences between Rembrandt’s technique, and those displayed in German Expressionism are clear. The more simplified representations of German Expressionism seek to signify the madness of the protagonists through the angular use of high-contrast lighting. Schöfftan style of chiaroscuro, influenced by the techniques of Rembrandt, can be seen in an example from Mollenard in Figure 35, which offers a far more complex and painterly approach to light. A narrative is present.
within the image, through which the spectator’s eyes are directed by Schüfftan’s light. For example, Schüfftan ensures throughout that a spotlight falls on the back of the set, giving the subjects a softer level of illumination. These brighter lights create a divide between the male and female characters in the frame (which will be reinforced through the return of the patriarch, Captain Mollenard), and also highlight Mme. Mollenard’s bed in the rear, a strong reminder of the distance that has grown between her and her husband. We can see therefore that Rembrandt’s influence has resulted for Schüfftan in a more nuanced and carefully composed approach to lighting, offering greater representational complexity than was practiced during German Expressionism.

Figure 35: Rembrandt techniques in Mollenard.
The year of 1938 proved to be highly productive for Schüfftan, working on five productions across the year, and seeming to have finally cemented his place within the French industry. The first of these productions would prove to be the most important film to Schüfftan’s advancing career since the groundbreaking *Menschen am Sonntag*. Schüfftan, Alékan, director Marcel Carné, scenarist Jacques Prévert and production designer Alexandre Trauner were all reunited to work on *Le Quai des brumes/Port of Shadows*, a film set to become a classic of French Poetic Realism.

![Figure 36: Schufftan on set with the cast and crew of *Le Quai des brumes* (back row, fifth from left).](image)

The film stars Jean Gabin, who had risen to fame in the preceding years since his last collaboration with Schüfftan. Gabin plays an army deserter who has made his way to the port town of Le Havre with the intention of leaving the country. In Le Havre he meets Nelly
(Michèle Morgan), a young girl for whom he falls, and whom he must protect from the gang lead by the intimidating Zabel (Michel Simon).

The film has been understood as a classic example of French Poetic Realism, for which the cinematographer played a crucial role. The term can first be attributed to Jean Paulhan of La Nouvelle Revue Française, to describe the literary works of Marcel Aymé. It was when one of Aymé’s novels, La Rue sans nom/Street Without a Name (Pierre Chenal, 1934) was adapted to the cinema, that the phrase was first used to describe a style of cinema (Turk, 1989: 109).

Turk has outlined the traits which the phrase ‘Poetic Realism’ seeks to surmise:

Not reproducing reality so much as recreating it, stories in these films are anchored to defined social settings, but aim to convey ‘essential’ human truths that transcend social realities. Poetic realism undervalues a film’s direct links with the material world in order to explore the symbolic resonances which the world – when photographed – is capable of releasing. Through condensation, concentration, and delicate blending, these resonances form fields of evocative, connotative correspondences, resulting in the “suggestive magic” that Baudelaire believed must characterize modern poetic art. (1989: 109-110)

Thus symbolic resonances with the real, resulted, thanks primarily to décor and lighting, in what Crisp and Dudley Andrew have described as a heightened form of realism, which could be seen in a number of films of the 1930s French cinema (Crisp, 1997: 373). Andrew in particular, in his important work on Poetic Realism, Mists of Regret, traces the etymology of the term, and its development in criticism (1995: 11-19). The approach that the cinematographers and set designers of Poetic Realism followed was towards ‘a qualified
realism based on the isolation and tactful foregrounding of “essential” characteristic details.’ (Crisp, 1997: 373).  

Although lighting and set design were key components of Poetic Realism, Claire Blakeway, who was so critical of Schüfftan’s lighting for Drôle de drame, is equally dismissive of Le Quai des brumes. She claims (1990: 107), ‘Carné’s strengths did not lie in the lighting of these films.’ However, this is far from the general consensus. In stark contrast, Turk (1989: 106) argues that ‘Le Quai des brumes displays Carné’s gift for structuring light and shadow.’ Whilst Drôle de drame was lacking in Schüfftan’s usual style and quality, the same is certainly not true for Le Quai des brumes. In fact, Alékan has described how innovative lighting technology was introduced on Le Quai des brumes. This was in the form of a unique lamp of 2,000-watt strength, provided by Schüfftan, which in Alékan’s words produced ‘a highly directed luminous flux embedded in a diffused flux’ (Turk, 1989: 107) (see Figure 37). This apparent contradiction produced different effects for Alékan. Focussed spotlighting functions to anchor the subject into the real world, fixed in the passing of time, whereas diffused floodlighting creates a ‘psychophysiological climate’, in which subjects are left ‘doubtful in an ill-defined universe, unsituated in time.’ (Turk, 1989: 106-107) This reading by Alékan can therefore be linked to light source. Focussed spotlighting demonstrates a concrete definable source, and produces the same effect upon the subject. The indefinable source of diffused lighting uproots the subject into more abstract realm. Schüfftan’s lamp was remarkably able to combine both effects, without the undesirable side-effect of double shadows. As such, according to Turk (1989: 108), ‘the very tools of cinematography helped to convey the existential perplexity of Le Quai des brumes’s protagonists, caught in a configuration of time and space that is both all too manifest and all too obscure.’

18 In addition to Marcel Carné, other notable proponents of this style included Julien Duvivier (Pépé le Moko, 1937 and La Belle équipe, 1936), Jean Renoir (Le Crime de Monsieur Lange, 1936), and Jean Grémillon (Gueule d’amour, 1936).
Vincendeau (2007: 27) has described the lighting of Poetic Realism as, ‘a softened version of “Expressionist” lighting’. This is perhaps a more adequate way of describing the presence of Expressionist tendencies in France and the style of the émigré school. For example, Vincendeau (2007: 27) quotes from Pierre Chenal, the director of La Rue sans nom/Street Without a Name (1934), who requested from his cinematographer ‘contrasted effects without the exaggeration of German Expressionist films’. Tellingly, demands for Expressionist style effects were being made by French directors. This is no doubt why Schüfftan quickly abandoned his interest in realism. His stylistic approach in Le Quai des brumes, however, is far from pure Expressionism. Barry Salt (1983: 269) identifies consistent high key lighting effects throughout the film, the complete opposite of the expectations for an Expressionist style. In a statement which entirely undoes the mythical reputation of Schüfftan as a
cinematographer in the German Expressionist tradition, Salt (1983: 269) notes that, ‘In part this high-key effect seems to be a result of a certain tendency to favour very light-coloured sets, but it is certainly abetted by the lighting. Faced by such a set in anything but a comedy or a musical, an American cameraman would surely throw a few more shadows on it than Eugen Schüfftan does.’

Schüfftan's next project of 1938 saw him reunite with G. W. Pabst on Le Drame de Shanghaï/Shanghai Drama, following their collaboration on Mademoiselle Docteur. Schüfftan provided the Paris studio cinematography (with fellow German émigré Curt Courant providing cinematography for the exterior scenes shot in Saigon, standing in for Shanghai), with assistance by Alékan and Louis Page. Le Drame de Shanghaï continued the popular trend in French cinema for exotic locations, a direction Schüfftan was well versed in, following his work on films such as Yoshiwara, Forfaiture and Mademoiselle Docteur. And much like Mademoiselle Docteur, Le Drame de Shanghaï is a story of prewar political intrigue. In this instance, it is the Second Sino-Japanese War which forms the background of the story. Amidst this, Kay (Christl Mardayn), a nightclub singer, is part of a group of Russian refugees who are working for the Japanese. Kay decides she must leave in order to ensure the safety of her daughter. She is not lucky enough to escape, but manages to get her daughter to safety with the help of a journalist.

Schüfftan’s lighting for the film is akin to his lighting choices for Drôle de drame. There is little contrast in the lighting and a dark atmosphere dominates. Of course, as with Drôle de drame, this style suits the dark subject matter of the film. This trait is particularly associated with the central role of the film, Kay. It is perhaps unusual for a cinematographer to light a film’s leading lady with such dim illumination, eschewing the glamour lighting Schüfftan had used elsewhere for female stars. However, this represents the turmoil of Kay’s character,
dragged into the dark underworld of the ‘Black Dragon’ clan, and fearful of her daughter’s safety. This can be seen in Figure 38, in which Kay occupies the darkest portion of the frame, receiving less light that two minor character. Stronger light falls onto the table in the centre of the frame, corresponding to the Rembrandt effect. Schüfftan also chooses to give her no backlight, shrouding her in even further darkness. In contrast, Kay’s daughter represents the youthful promise of a bright new future, and as such receives stronger lighting levels from Schüfftan.

![Figure 38: Christl Mardayn receives little light from Schüfftan in Le Drame de Shanghai.](image)

Another of Schüfftan’s projects of 1938 was a further collaboration with Max Ophüls, *Le Roman de Werther*, an adaptation of the classic Goethe novel which was in production with Seymour Nebenzahl’s Nero Film, from 15th June until 30th September. In the film Werther
(Pierre Richard-Willm, star of *Yoshiwara*) and Charlotte (Annie Vernay) fall in love, however, unknown to Werther, Charlotte is already engaged to Albert (Jean Galland). When Werther comes to propose to Charlotte she is left with no other choice but to reveal her deceit and to marry Albert. Their relationship now over, Werther ends the film by taking his own life.

Schüfftan's responsibility in the production of the film was for studio cinematography (Fédote Bourgasoff and Paul Portier took over duties on location), and his lighting choices function to reinforce the opposing characters of Werther and Albert, through the spaces to which they are linked. Albert, the man who can provide financial assurance and social mobility for Charlotte, is located in a grand space frequently filmed by Ophüls from the lobby, an expanse punctuated by the resplendent staircase. Schüfftan’s lighting of this location functions to enhance the grandiose scale of the space through the use of visible light sources such as the large windows which are positioned above the staircase, functioning to heighten the ceilings and increase the depth of space to the set. Such depth effects are similarly achieved by Schüfftan through the Rembrandt technique of ensuring that the brightest point of lighting in the set is its rearmost point.

In stark contrast to this location, the bar patronized by Werther, who provides Charlotte with romantic excitement but can offer little financial security, is small, dark and unpleasant, with no natural light source. Schüfftan lights the set by casting key lights across the floor, ensuring very little light falls onto the walls. The effect of this is to limit the impression of space in the bar, reducing the height of the space and lessening the impression of depth, in order to create a far more claustrophobic sensation. By linking each of Charlotte's two romantic options to a differing social space, characterized visually by Schüfftan through his use of lighting, and through the production design of Eugène Lourié, Ophüls is able to
illustrate the stark contrasts between the two men, and the irreconcilable predicament Charlotte has positioned herself in.

Low-key lighting is favoured by Schüfftan in his interior scenes, augmenting the deceitful nature of Charlotte's relationship to Werther. In such scenes Schüfftan tends to avoid a strong use of backlight, allowing the subjects to blend into the background of the night. One interesting use of such lighting occurs when Werther visits Charlotte’s room, shouting for her behind her locked door. The room itself is in almost complete darkness, and we see her move across the room in silhouette, lit by the most minimal of light sources, adding to the sense of deceit and the danger of the situation.

Following on from this film, Schüfftan then completed two weeks of studio work on Jacques Constant’s betrayal narrative *Campement 13/Camp 13*, with the rest of the work completed by Nicolas Toporkoff (Asper and Meneux, 2003: 155). Schüfftan's final project of 1938 was *Trois valses/Three Waltzes*, for German émigré director Ludwig Berger, and with assistance from Paul Portier and Guy Delattre. Based on a popular operetta of the time, *Trois valses* starred Yvonne Printemps and Pierre Fresnay who had both appeared in the stage version. The film tells the story of the romantic tribulations of three generations of the same family. This begins in 1869 with Fanny, a famous ballet dancer, before advancing to the story of her daughter Charlotte, an operetta star, and ending in the present day with the story of Charlotte's daughter Franzi, a film actress. All three generations of this dynasty were portrayed by Printemps, and all generations of the male love interest by Fresnay. Building on the popularity of the musical, the filmed version proved to be highly successful (Traubner, 2003: 284), and Schüfftan was praised by the American press for his cinematography (Anon., 1939).
1939 would see the outbreak of war, however Schüfftan was able to work upon one further collaboration with Max Ophüls before this occurred. The film, *Sans lendemain*/*Without Tomorrow*, was filmed in January and February of 1939, with Schüfftan once more mentoring the French cameraman Paul Portier. The film is the story of Evelyn (Edwige Feuillère), a burlesque dancer in a nightclub who encounters an old flame, Georges (Georges Rigaud), who has experienced considerably more success during their time apart. In order to save face, Evelyn lies about her current occupation and the desperation of her lifestyle, instead positioning herself within the bourgeois lifestyle she longs to occupy. Evelyn and Georges fall in love again, forcing Evelyn to maintain her façade. However, as Georges tries to persuade Evelyn to come away with him to Canada, we learn that the break-up of their original relationship occurred because Evelyn was then already trying to hide her true life – her marriage to a criminal – which, at that time, had forced her to leave without explaining the truth to Georges.

Schüfftan’s approach to lighting his female lead, Feuillère, is contrary to the tendencies he normally displayed when lighting a lead actress. As with Christl Mardayn in *Le Drame de Shanghaï*, Feuillère is not lit in the same glamorous way as many of Schüfftan’s other actresses. Rather she is often shrouded in darkness, with little light illuminating her face. Schüfftan’s usual practice from this period was to employ a combination of key and side lights to fully illuminate the face, and filler lights to reduce shadows, in order to enhance the natural beauty of the actress. By using less light on the face of Feuillère, Schüfftan reflects the psychological state of her character, the sordid nature of her career and her deceit before Georges. Schüfftan’s method in lighting Feuillère is a strong use of baselight and backlights, but with no strong keylight. Schüfftan also employs soft focus in close-ups of Feuillère, creating a further lack of definition. The result of this is that the face of Feuillère is roundly lit, without great contrast or shadow (thereby not diminishing her natural beauty). However,
this is only dimly done (thereby reflecting the complexity of her character). Schüfftan’s approach to lighting Feuillère is enhanced by Laure Lourié’s costume design, which places Feuillère in a black throughout most of the film (see Figure 39).

As excellent example of how this lack of light is used to highlight Evelyn’s personal anxieties is the scene in which Georges drives her home for the first time. Not wanting Georges to see her true quality of life, Evelyn is forced to profess that a far grander house belongs to her, and she asks Georges to drop her off outside the gate. Evelyn nervously enters through the gate before hiding out of view around the side of the house. As she was sitting in the back of the car with Georges, nervously trying to plan her next move, she was filmed in close-up, with only a single band of light illuminating her eyes from the darkness, highlighting them as they flickered nervously back and forth. Then, once hidden around the corner of the house
waiting for Georges to leave, her image is barely visible, her silhouette only gently highlighted from an outdoor light at the front of the house.

There are a number of further dramatic scenes where lighting becomes crucial to an understanding of Evelyn’s motivations. Key amongst these is the climactic scene of the film in which Evelyn is confronted by the manager of the nightclub and lighting is prominently employed to create a sense of threat. Evelyn stands in the centre of the shot in front of a wall, whilst the manager is positioned off-screen shouting at her, his shadow visibly cast onto the wall next to her. As he becomes more animated he moves closer to her, moving into view on the left of the frame, and thus moving his shadow forward, now ominously positioned directly over Evelyn. Finally, the progressive lighting effect reaches its climax when the manager moves forward once more, this time directly in front of Evelyn, blocking her from view. This creates a feeling of violence, by positioning his back to the camera lens, which prompts a suggestive cut away from the action.

The outbreak of war in September 1939 stalled Schüfftan's career considerably and profoundly affected the lives of all exiles residing in France. These refugees soon became seen as possible enemies, and were instructed to attend internment camps, where they would be processed and categorized. The largest example was the Colombes stadium, which held 20,000 people. Consequences could be as dire as a stripping of recently awarded French citizenship, and a forced return to Germany. It was a horror described by the exile writer Lion Feuchtwanger as The Devil in France (1941), the title of his memoir of his internment at the Les Milles camp. Although attendance for most was voluntary (in an attempt not to displease the host nation), the émigrés, those who had sought refuge from Nazism, could never have expected the squalor and ill-treatment they would receive (Palmier, 2006: 436-442). The exile novelist Hermann Kesten highlighted this distressing injustice: ‘And so
France is starting its war against Hitler with a war against the enemies of Hitler who took refuge in France. Such victories gained over the victims of tyrants make this kind of victor the tyrant’s next victim.’ (Palmier, 2006: 437)

Schüfftan was interned at this time in a camp in the South of France, likely to be the military camp of Graveson in the Bouches-du-Rhône department of France, established during the First World War, or one of the many camps opened on the Southern border with Spain, created to receive refugees from the Spanish Civil War. Fortunately Schüfftan spent only a short time in the camp as it was believed he was willing to support the French army.

Such personal and national traumas clearly limited Schüfftan's filmmaking prospects. Schüfftan remained in France for the immediate future where he was able to film L'Émigrant/The Emigrant (Léo Joannon) and Les Musiciens du ciel/Musicians of the Sky (Georges Lacombe) during 1939. The latter reunited Michèle Morgan and Michel Simon following Le Quai des brumes. Schüfftan’s final work as a cinematographer in France (for the time being) was to complete the photography of De Mayerling à Sarajevo/From Mayerling to Sarajevo for Max Ophüls in the first months of 1940 (Asper and Meneux, 2003: 156). At this time of war, the film told the story of the outbreak of the First World War following the assassination of Franz Ferdinand in Sarajevo. Once the Vichy régime took control of France in July 1940 Schüfftan was fortunate enough to avoid detention until he was able to flee the country, a point where many other Jews residing in France (particularly in the Northern Zone) were less lucky.

19 On De Mayerling à Sarajevo Schüfftan was charged with completing the studio photography of Curt Courant and Otto Heller. It is possible that these two émigré cinematographers fled France before the completion of the film. Robert LeFebvre had been responsible for location shooting.
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Schüfftan’s arrival in the United States in 1941 and his subsequent failure to be accepted into the union saw the cinematographer working throughout the decade upon a number of independent productions outside of the major studios, where he could find greater leniency regarding his unlicensed practice. These independent productions (termed Poverty Row) proved a popular means of dodging union restrictions. As Kerr (2003: 114) has noted, the frequent night shoots of these low-budget films, perfectly ‘suited those employees who sought to avoid IATSE [International Alliance of Theatrical Stage Employees] overtime bans’. Schüfftan was one of many exiles who gravitated towards this area of film production, if they lacked the correct permits, or if they were yet to prove themselves to the studio bosses. The sheer number of émigrés working amongst these minor productions meant that an émigré
filmmaking community could be facilitated in California, sustaining the careers of many exiles in Los Angeles. In this chapter I will discuss Schüfftan’s work on these Poverty Row films of the 1940s. I shall argue that his work in this context can be perceived as examples of what Bahr (2007) has termed Exile Modernism, itself an outcome of Modernist theories travelling West at a time when many of Modernism’s key thinkers were forced to flee their native Germany (often emigrating to the USA), as I shall now go on to explain.

In the wake of Hitler’s rise to power in 1933, the intellectual moment of German Modernism was severely challenged. Bahr (2007: 12) argues that the effect was to tear the competing strands of modernism into three categories: Fascist Modernism, Leftist Modernism, and a Modernism of the social individual, all of which had some presence in exile. Under Hitler the latter two categories more or less vanished from the German context, while the first, Fascist Modernism, prevailed. Exile Modernism is a term used by Bahr, following a framework established by Russell A. Berman in his text ‘The Rise of the German Novel’, to refer to those intellectuals who fled to America, and whose exile writings were informed by the various experiences of exile, and by the failure of democracy from which they had fled. Thus for Bahr, this period of Exile Modernism, which followed the 1933 crisis, plugs the gap between the high period of Modernism in the 1920s, and Modernism's late period of the 1950s and 60s.

Though necessarily divergent, following the split of Modernism in 1933, there are a number of traits which identify works of Exile Modernism. Strong themes amongst such works are narratives which foreground the traumas of the exile’s homeland. The true events of the Czech town of Lidice are one such example, which inspired works of Exile Modernism in various artistic forms, and is addressed at greater length later in this case study. Thomas Mann’s *Docktor Faustus/Doctor Faustus*, one of the key examples of Exile Modernist
literature (*Exiliteratur*), also addresses the horrors committed by the Nazi Party in the author’s homeland of Germany. Mann’s novel updates the classic story of Faustus to Twentieth-Century Germany. The story is narrated by Zeitblom, a friend of the Faustus character, a composer called Leverkühn. Zeitblom narrates Leverkühn’s tragedy during the years of the Second World War, drawing parallels between Leverkühn and the rise and fall of the Nazi dominion. As Bahr (2007: 21) explains, ‘A continuing discussion of the horrifying consequences of anti-Semitism was necessary since […] Christians and Jews alike felt they needed to come to understand the catastrophe so that their escape and survival did not become meaningless.’ In addition to highlighting the Nazi atrocities from which he had fled, Mann also creates a fracturing and layering of narratives, through which parallels to the author’s real life experience of such events are reinforced through the presence of an in-text author, Zeitblom.

Exile narratives which mirror those of the author, and subsequently create a complex relationship to the host nation, also constitute examples of this Exile Modernism. Alfred Döblin’s *Schicksalsreise/Destiny’s Journey* (originally published in 1949) is one such example of an exile narrative. Döblin’s work is an autobiographical account of the eight years following his exile from his native Germany, tracing his journey first to France, then his subsequent exile to America. For its part, the US also played a complex role in the works of other Exile Modernist writers. One of the most famous of Exile Modernists, Bertolt Brecht, provides a fine example of this complex relationship in his various poetic works written once in exile in California. Brecht (2003: 100-103) veers from comparing his new home of Los Angeles to Hell in *Nachdenkend über die Hölle/On Thinking About Hell* (1941), to defending the values of American democracy in *Der demokratische Richter/The Democratic Judge* (1942).
Bahr (2007: 21) describes the characteristics of works of Exile Modernism as follows: 'Among the formal features of exile modernism, the most obvious is the avoidance of closure. Exile modernism privileges open-ended narrative construction. Paradox, ambiguity, and uncertainty – common features of modernism generally, but now exacerbated by the experience of forced migration – became the litmus test of exile modernism.' Bahr is referring more explicitly to the presence of Modernism in literature (arguably it is more easily identifiable within single author texts). Nonetheless we can argue for its presence in the American film industry within the independent productions, where many filmmakers were afforded less industrial control, and which were a gravitational point for a number of émigré filmmakers and craftspeople who could not break into the studio system. As part of such Poverty Row productions, these émigrés found themselves working in less than ideal conditions, making films of low productions values, which, despite these conditions of exile, nonetheless bear the hallmarks of Modernism.

Schüfftan was a prominent element amongst the émigré community that produced such independent film. Of the eleven films Schüfftan made in California during the 1940s, only one of these, *The Dark Mirror* (Robert Siodmak, 1946), was produced by a major studio (Universal). Schüfftan had no role over the cinematography of this film, instead taking charge of the visual effects. The presence of fellow émigré Robert Siodmak as director, one of Schüfftan’s earliest collaborators, is also notable. All of the other ten films Schüfftan worked upon during this period were independent productions (mostly run by émigré producers), although in a few cases the films reached such a standard that they were bought by a larger studio for distribution.

By positing Exile Modernism in American cinema as existing in the terrain of these independent productions, we can understand how those artists involved have suffered the
effects of deterritorialization from both their homeland and from the dominant locales of filmmaking in California (the major studios), and why they therefore collectivized to make films, which in some manner subverted more dominant Hollywood practices, in order to speak of their exilic experience. Furthermore, this approach gives renewed attention to a collection of films which have long been viewed simply as an inferior product to the Hollywood studio output of the 1940s, and allows us to consider them in a different light.

As a critical framework to explore Schüfftan’s works of Exile Modernism, in the following case study, I shall adopt, as Bahr (2007: 19) has done for German exile literature, Deleuze and Guattari’s concept of minor literatures. Bogue (2005: 110) describes this concept as follows:

Deleuze and Guattari argue that in a minor literature “language is affected with a high coefficient of deterritorialization”, everything “is political”, and “everything takes on a collective value”; hence, they conclude, “the three characteristics of minor literature are the deterritorialization of language, the connection of the individual to a political immediacy, and the collective assemblage of enunciation.

Corresponding to this description, this case study is divided into three sections, ‘Deterritorialization’, ‘Collectivization’, and ‘Politicization’, but firstly, these terms, and Deleuze and Guattari’s concept of ‘the minor’, require further elucidation.

Deleuze and Guattari’s concept of the ‘minor’ results from their writings around minor language and minor literatures. The minor is a key concept in Kafka: Toward a Minor Literature (Deleuze and Guattari, 1986), in which they argue that experimentation and variation upon a ‘major language’ (in the case of Czech author Kafka, his adoption of German), creates a new function of language which can be understood as minor literature. This process of subverting dominant language forms is understood by Deleuze and Guattari
as a deterritorialization of that language, and is in a constant play of de- and re-territorialization from that major discourse. As Bogue (2005: 111-112) explains, ‘When language users subvert standard pronunciations, syntactic structures or meanings, they “deterritorialize” the language, in that they detach it from its clearly delineated, regularly gridded territory of conventions, codes, labels and markers. Conversely, when users reinforce linguistic norms, they “territorialize” and “reterritorialize” the language.’

The processes of deterritorialization and reterritorialization of language are only one element of Deleuze and Guattari’s understanding of the minor. Collectivization is also identified as an important element, whereby in a major literature, ‘authors seek to develop a unique voice and express themselves as individuals,’ compared to the complimentary minor literature in which its authors ‘efface themselves and articulate collective voices, specifically, those of the minorities whose identities are determined through asymmetrical power relations.’ (Bogue, 2005: 113) Politicization therefore arises from these dual processes of deterritorialization and collectivization, resulting in a literature in which everything is therefore political due to the collective of minoritarian voices which ‘contest and undo the power relations immanent within the dominant, major usage patterns of a language.’ (Ibid.)

The role of the minor in cinema is also a brief concern for Deleuze in Cinema 2: The Time-Image (2005: 209-215). For Deleuze, the primary example of the minor in film is ‘Third Cinema’, a strongly experimental and political form of cinema developed by Third World filmmakers, such as Lino Brocka, Glauber Rocha and Chahine Nasserism. Verevis (2005: 166-167) has interpreted Deleuze’s minor cinema by noting that, ‘a minor cinema (a national cinema) is not singular, but shaped by complex and multiple connections established between local and international forces and conditions.’ However, aligning the minor to the national is problematic because it suggests a singular global film ‘language’ in which there is a major
discourse (presumably Hollywood narrative cinema in this framework). The minor therefore becomes national variations/subversions/resistances of, and to, this dominant discourse, denying dominant and resistant forms of filmmaking within a national cinema, and variance of such trends across national cinemas. This chapter seeks to identify a form of minor cinema within the site of the dominant filmic discourse, Hollywood narrative cinema, in the same manner in which Kafka’s writing was found by Deleuze and Guattari to be a particular transformation of the medium of the German language.

The purpose of applying Deleuze and Guattari’s concept of the minor to Schüfftan’s films of the Poverty Row studios is to highlight the ways in which, through the processes of deterritorialization, collectivization and politicization, the various émigré casts and crews informed their film projects with the heritage of their exile experience, thus bringing them to bear the hallmarks of Exile Modernism. However, such films would not normally be associated with Deleuze and Guattari’s notion of the minor under their strictest definition of the term. The link is problematized by the industrial practices of Hollywood studio cinema, in which these exiles can arguably not be said to be deterritorializing themselves from the major discourse, when their presence in the Poverty Row studios was for the hope of finding a path into the major studios. These filmmakers and technicians were aspiring in such productions to achieve the standard of the larger productions, rather than to subvert and contest these forms. However, this provides a rather productive tension in the context of industrial Hollywood filmmaking practices. For here it is the industry which controls the dominant discourse that determines the processes of deterritorialization and reterritorialization of the various émigré artists and the films they produce, which ultimately resulted in a collectivization of émigré voices in the Poverty Row studios and a politicization of their products. It is the practices of the major studios and their unions that controlled the artistic talent within their film productions, preventing technicians such as Schüfftan from
union membership, which displaced him onto Poverty Row. Similarly, it is also the major studios that at times chose to reterritorialize the film products of Poverty Row. For example, *Hitler’s Madman*, which shall be discussed at length later in this case study, was an independent production which was bought by a major studio and subjected to studio reshoots for a wider distribution.

When exile film productions which more precisely adhered to Deleuze and Guattari’s concept of the minor were attempted, their success was prevented by the industrial practices of the major studios. An example of this is the film *Captain Koepenick* (Richard Oswald, 1931), based upon the play by Carl Zuckmayer, which was an attempt to create, from the outset, a pure example of German exile cinema. Quoting the original playwright, Moeller (1985: 124) has explained the failure of the project:

> According to Zuckmayer in a letter to this writer, from then on “the rights … resided with Richard Oswald who was to film the play in Hollywood utilizing German exile personnel exclusively. Notwithstanding [the renowned actor] Basserman … the director failed to find a distributor.” Thus, success was not possible in the U.S. for purely German exile projects.

In order to locate examples of Exile Modernism, we must therefore look to those areas of film production in which German personnel did find some success, at least in securing work: Poverty Row.

This case study is divided therefore into three sections, which follow Deleuze and Guattari’s description of minor literature quoted above. In the first of these, ‘Deterritorialization’, I outline the events, on both a grand scale and a personal level, which led to Schüfftan’s deterritorialization from his filmmaking home in Europe, and which led him to a new host-land in the form of the United States of America. This section also demonstrates a further process of deterritorialization experienced by Schüfftan and his fellow émigrés, the
marginalization from the major studios to the peripheries of filmmaking culture in Los Angeles. The second section deals with the act of ‘Collectivization’ amongst the émigré community as a result of the process of deterritorialization. Here I shall take as example Schüfftan’s most productive collaborations during this period, with the director Edgar G. Ulmer. Finally, the third section, ‘Politicization’, addresses two key films from this period, *Hitler’s Madman* and *Bluebeard*, as products of Exile Modernism that communicate the traumas and anxieties of the émigrés following their experiences of exile, examining in what ways they can be said to have influenced the dominant trends of the major studios.

1. Deterritorialization

Schüfftan’s opportunity to leave France came in 1941, when he was fortunate enough to secure a Visa from the emigration office in Nice on 6th January, during a month when the occupying Germans briefly lifted the embargo on exit visas that had been in place since September 1940, and which had effectively cost the philosopher Walter Benjamin his life.\(^{20}\) From Nice, Schüfftan and his wife travelled through Spain to Portugal, where at the port of Lisbon on 15th April they boarded the S.S. Nyassa which transported the couple to a new life in America. Schüfftan’s fortune in obtaining these visas should not be overlooked considering the lateness with which they were applied for and the Vichy governance of the Southern half of France at the time. Perhaps surprisingly, it is also quite possible that Schüfftan would have preferred to continue filmmaking in France, given the lateness with which he fled the country.

\(^{20}\) Walter Benjamin attempted to cross the border to Spain in September 1940 on a visa made out in Marseilles, only to find that officials had closed the border that very same day. That night, Benjamin committed suicide (Heilbut, 1997: 38).
The assistance of HICEM\textsuperscript{21} should be acknowledged, for immigration documents from the port of New York show that this organization, which specialized in the emigration of European Jews, paid for the couple’s travel costs. Many other émigrés were less lucky and were forced to remain in danger in France or to attempt to enter America illegally.\textsuperscript{22} In fact the tightening up of US immigration policy at this time is thought to have cost between 20,000 and 25,000 lives between mid-1940 and mid-1941 (Heilbut, 1997: 39).

The couple were perhaps persuaded by the allure of America, not only because of the danger of their situation in France, but also because a number of their émigré companions who had fled Germany at the same time had already left France for America. As with some of the other film personnel émigrés, having arrived in the port of New York on 25\textsuperscript{th} April, 1942, the couple immediately settled in the city, rather than taking the trip across country to Hollywood on the West coast. Part of Schüfftan's delay in moving to Hollywood was perhaps because he was able to secure his first film project after arriving in New York, on the Julien Duvivier film \textit{Tales of Manhattan} (1941), for which Schüfftan took an uncredited role for the location shooting on the streets of New York (the rest of the cinematography is credited to Joseph Walker). The film, based on a play by Ben Hecht, follows a cursed tailcoat through its various owners and details the misfortunes that ensue. It is likely that Schüfftan's role on the film was secured by fellow German émigré Sam Spiegel (credited as S. P. Eagle) who acted as producer. Such émigré contacts would prove imperative for Schufftan to ensure he remained in employment for the rest of the decade.

Another likely reason for Schüfftan's initial settlement in New York is the bond that Schüfftan and his wife Marlise had established with the film critic and theorist Siegfried

\textsuperscript{21} HICEM was formed through the merger of HIAS (Hebrew Immigrant Aid Society), the ICA (Jewish Colonization Association) and Emigdirect.

\textsuperscript{22} It is likely that Schüfftan's application for a visa was assisted by his cousin Peter O. Shuftan who was already resident in the United States (Asper, 2003: 6).
Kracauer, and his wife Lili. The two couples met aboard the S.S. Nyassa on route to America and quickly forged a friendship based upon their shared experiences of exile and similar interest in the film industry. The Kracauers remained in New York upon arrival as this was the heart of the publication trade in America (The Frankfurt School had established itself in exile as a part of Columbia University), and so it is probable that the Schüfftans chose to remain close to friends in this new land.

Paul Kohner was Schüfftan’s American agent, but he too knew how difficult it was to gain entry into the American Society of Cinematographers (ASC), and thus further employment. Kohner began his film career in America in the 1920s where he caught the eye of Carl Laemmle who sent Kohner to Berlin where he was the head of production for Universal's operations in Germany. With the Nazi's rise to power Kohner returned to America where he continued to work as a producer until he opened a talent agency in California in 1938. Kohner's agency became a haven and a rescue centre for a great number of Jewish exiles desperate to escape Europe, including amongst many others, Max Ophüls. For it was essential before a Visa could be granted that the emigrant had a contract, a condition of work upon his or her arrival in America. Kohner was instrumental in establishing such contracts for Schufftan and many others.

Schüfftan had arrived in his new host-land on a promise of work from the producer Arnold Pressburger (who would work with Schüfftan on many subsequent occasions). However, it soon materialized that Pressburger was unable to honour his contract until Schüfftan had gained access to the ASC, with union membership being a legal requirement for any cinematographer wishing to work on US soil. In assuaging Schüfftan's concerns over the

\[23\] A point made in a letter from Kohner to Schüfftan dated 17th July 1941 and held in the Paul Kohner files of the Deutsche Kinemathek.
Pressburger matter, Kohner was also able to explicitly explain the problems at hand, in the following correspondence dated 3rd July, 1941:24

Of course, you should not feel bitter about Pressburger, because Pressburger probably had the best of intentions and did not know how extremely difficult it is to get into the A.S.C. Naturally there is nothing that a man like Pressburger, who is only an independent producer, can do in this matter. Only the strongest intervention can be of any assistance, and I have this intervention in Darryl Zanuck, who will try to get you in. Mind you, this is not certain, but there is a chance. It has nothing to do with money. The A.S.C is closed for membership and only if a producer strong enough insists that he must have you, can you possibly get in.

The above quotation serves to show just how critically Schüfftan found himself on the periphery of things. Not only had he been deterritorialized from his successful filmmaking career in Europe, Schüfftan was now also being marginalized from the major filmmaking studios of Los Angeles, where the independent producers with whom Schüfftan would soon be working held no sway. Even with the intervention of Darryl Zanuck, one of the most powerful men in the movie industry, Schüfftan was still denied membership to the ASC. By the end of 1941 the Schüfftans had moved to Hollywood. Continuing union problems delayed any possibility for Schüfftan to work, allowing him instead to develop the various inventions he had brought over from France. However, by not being able to work as a cinematographer Schüfftan was unable to implement any of these inventions in the industry.

The Schüfftans lived in a cottage on Whitley Terrace, Hollywood, settling in Los Angeles along with approximately 10,000 to 15,000 others émigrés (of which roughly 70 per cent were Jewish) who came to the city between 1933 and 1941, as exiles from Hitler’s increasing stranglehold of Europe (Bahr, 2007: 3). The Schüfftans and the Kracauers (who had

24 From the Paul Kohner files held at the Deutsche Kinemathek, Berlin.
remained in New York City) remained friends for the rest of their lives, and it is the correspondence which exists between the two couples which illuminates much of their actions for the forthcoming years, and highlights the importance of establishing an émigré community in exile. Indeed, a year after the arrival of the S.S. Nyassa into the port of New York, the Schüfftans wrote to the Kracauers in honour of the date: 'All these days I was thinking of our journey with its light and shady sides but the light sides are paramount. We can be very happy here now and we do hope that everything will turn out to the best' (Asper, 2003a: 38-39).

Now residing in Hollywood, Schüfftan was still experiencing resistance to his application to the ASC. Therefore, whilst being prevented from working as a cinematographer in America Schüfftan was left with no other choice except to adopt other roles such as 'Technical Advisor', through which he could advise on cinematography, and would on occasion take complete control of this role, while another technician would be credited for the work. Schüfftan's first Hollywood contract was for two weeks of work as 'Technical Director' for the R-F Motion Picture Corporation remake of the recent Soviet film *The Girl from Leningrad* (Viktor Eisymont, 1941). The contracts for this engagement show that Schüfftan was initially retained for filming between August 15th and October 15th 1942 for a fee of $500, however a delay in the filming allowed Schüfftan to be released for work on Douglas Sirk's *Hitler's Madman* on October 20th 1942. 25 Production did move ahead with *Hitler's Madman* and this became Schüfftan's first Hollywood venture since *Love Me and the World is Mine*. *The Girl From Leningrad* was left an unrealised project.

*Hitler’s Madman*, based upon the true-life massacre of the people of the Czech town of Lidice, will be addressed in the final section of this case study. As I shall explain it is a fine

---

example of Exile Modernism. However, it is worth noting in this section on deterritorialization the interference of a major studio, forcing upon this independent production the effects of de- and re-territorialization. After completion of Hitler’s Madman the film was screened to MGM (a common occurrence for Poverty Row productions, as a major studio could assure the producers a wider release, and the major studios could enjoy success with only a minor investment) who decided to purchase the film. However, rather than simply distributing the film they also chose to perform reshoots in the early months of 1943. For example, a new ending to the film was added at the request of studio-head Louis B. Mayer, in which the murdered men of Lidice directly address the camera and recite the lines of Edna St. Vincent Millay’s poem about the Lidice massacre. The original powerfully ended with the massacre. Mayer’s interference on this scene has resulted, for Gemünden, in a typical example of a Hollywood ‘emotionally charged narrative’, which has the explicit aim of securing audience identification. Gemünden (1999: 70-71) argues:

In accordance with Sirk’s up-front strategy to address American viewers through identification in order to persuade them of the necessity to make war against Germany, the film does not shy away from showing the Nazi’s brutal retaliation for Heydrich’s death. […] However, the closing scene of the film (reshot by request from Louis Mayer who bought the film from Nebenzahl) quickly abandons this realist mode by stylizing the villagers into martyrs whose sins will be forgiven and whose memory will live on. It is obvious, then, that the more historically accurate elements of the Heydrich assassination stand side-by-side with entirely fictitious [Sic.] scenes, such as the incident of Heydrich provoking the priest in Lidice […]. Historical accuracy is clearly secondary to advancing an emotionally charged narrative.

I shall address the background to the film and the important processes of identification later in this case study. Nevertheless, this quote makes clear the aesthetic and narrative
discontinuities of the film, between realism, and a more subjective form which strives for audience identification. But more crucially, this additional ending led to a lack of aesthetic and narrative coherence. This influence by the major studio amounts, therefore, to a deterritorialization and reterritorialization being enforced upon the film. It is this tension between the major studios and the independent productions which produces effects of deterritorialization and marks this film as an example of minor cinema.

Ultimately however, it is perhaps Schüfftan’s aesthetics which are most damaged by the interference of the studio. It is almost impossible that Schüfftan would have been allowed anywhere near the studio for the reshoots considering his lack of union membership, and most likely the duties of all the independent crew would have been taken over by MGM’s studio crew. Furthermore, the fact that the production was not taken in full seriousness by MGM is suggested by Schindler’s rather scathing assessment, that 'Hitler's Madman seems to have been written, shot and edited by lesser MGM employees who, for some kind of wager, did the whole thing from start to finish wearing blindfolds.’ (1979: 67)

Unsurprisingly, life for the Schüfftans in these early years in Hollywood did not seem entirely happy. A combination of Eugen Schüfftan's effective relegation to the minor production companies because of his failure to be admitted to the ASC, and their position in Hollywood as European exiles, did not make the couple entirely warm to their new life in Hollywood. A letter from Marlise Schüfftan to the Kracauers in New York City, dated 21st August 1942, illustrates the many frustrations affecting the lifestyle of the émigré in Hollywood:

It is not so easy here to make friends, and if you meet nice people, they live on the other end of Hollywood. The distances are enormous. We are so near to the ocean but we poor e.a. [enemy aliens] are not allowed to go to the beach. Thanks Heaven we have our little
garden, our terrace with the beautiful view and the mountains so that we have not so much to suffer under the 5 miles zone. And in the evening we have people here very often or they come to see us over the phone. Much worse than the curfew itself is the pity of the Austrians. (Asper, 2003a: 42-43)

The Schüfftans’ status as ‘enemy aliens’ was the result of the Japanese attack upon Pearl Harbor and the declarations of war between Japan and the United States. To protect their tactical military areas from Japanese subterfuge, an executive order was passed to remove peoples heralding from nations at war with the United States from these areas, which included parts of California. Some 120,000 Japanese Americans were removed from their homes to one of ten ‘war relocation centers’, however, the vagueness of the executive order also placed those émigrés of Italian and German origin in similar danger. The possibility of removing these peoples to similar camps was considered. Instead, their status as ‘enemy aliens’ resulted in a daily curfew from 8pm until 6am, and travel restrictions of 5 miles from their homes, unless for the purposes of work. The ‘pity of the Austrians’ referred to by Marlise Schüfftan was because the Austrians were not considered to be enemy aliens, rather the first victims of Hitler’s Germany (Bahr, 2007: 90-91).

Bahr (2007: 10-11) also suggests that German émigrés may have felt more at home in the high-rise Modernism of New York, more reminiscent of the period of High Modernism in Berlin from which many were forced to flee, rather than the garden-city of Los Angeles, which was yet to leap skyward. Furthermore, New York created a greater sense of community for the émigrés, with the publication of local exilic newspapers such as Aufbau, and the welcoming of German intellectuals to the academic institutions of New York, in particular Columbia University, which became affiliated with the famous Frankfurt School (Bahr, 2007: 4). However, from Marlise’s comments it would seem that the views and
greenery of Los Angeles at the time were in fact a welcome distraction from the punitive restrictions placed upon them as German nationals.

Unable to find work from the major studios and having to rely upon his émigré colleagues operating in the smaller production houses, Schüfftan completed two projects during 1943, *A Voice in the Wind* (Arthur Ripley) and *It Happened Tomorrow* (René Clair). As Bosley Crowther’s following *New York Times* review of 1944 demonstrates, Schüfftan called upon his experience of the French Poetic Realism of the 1930s for the aesthetic of *A Voice in the Wind*: the producers 'have drunk deep at the well from with the French cinematic impressionists fetched salt water prior to 1939. For this gloomy and spectral endeavor to catch the essence of beauty sadly lost is a grim exercise in visual discords, in human anguish and jangled moods.' (Crowther, 1944) *It Happened Tomorrow* also bore the mark of Schüfftan’s career in Europe, comprising as it did a number of émigrés in the crew, including Arnold Pressburger as producer, Fred Pressburger as editor, Swiss costume designer René Hubert, Schüfftan's frequent collaborator Ernö Metzner, and the popular French director René Clair. However, it is important to point out that the fact of employing these émigré artists for the creation of a notably Hollywood product, demonstrates that these self-same deterritorialized émigré producers and craftspeople involved in the production were keen to integrate themselves, to reterritorialize, into the popular genres and modes of production in Hollywood. Viewed in this light, *It Happened Tomorrow* should be seen as a success for those involved, for despite its independent production values, as with *Hitler’s Madman*, it was picked up for distribution by a major studio, in this case United Artists. Here, another product of deterritorialization was once more reterritorialized by a major Hollywood studio. In this instance no re-shooting occurred, proving that in this case the production was able to reproduce the ‘genuine’ all-Hollywood article.
In December 1943 production began on Schüfftan's next film, *Summer Storm*, which was once again directed by Douglas Sirk and produced independently for Angelus Pictures by Seymour Nebenzahl. The film, based upon Chekhov's novel *The Shooting Party*, was received well by critics at the time of its release, with *Variety* noting that the 'Production layout and technical contributions are topnotch throughout, especially photography' (Walt, 1943). We can therefore see that whilst he should have been gaining a reputation in Hollywood for the high quality of his work, due to the on-going struggle with the ASC, Schüfftan was unable to gain the recognition he deserved (Archie Stout received the cinematography credit for this film), having to continually rely upon fellow émigrés and to remain outside of the major studios so that he might try his hand at cinematography in subterfuge.

Schüfftan then began work upon the first of a number of collaborations with the director Edgar G. Ulmer, all of which were made on Poverty Row, without the facilities of the major studios. The five films Ulmer and Schüfftan made together in this brief three year period (1944-1946) are given due attention in the second section of this case study, in which they form an example of the processes of collectivization upon which these émigrés relied. Amongst these collaborations with Ulmer, Schüfftan made his final film with Douglas Sirk, *A Scandal in Paris*, based upon the extraordinary memoirs of the Napoleonic-era French criminal Eugène François Vidocq, which was once again an independent production by Arnold Pressburger.

By the end of 1945 the Schüfftans were once more in contact with their friends the Kracauers, in celebration of the coming New Year. The letter, written by Marlise, is particularly enlightening as to the personal consequences of her husband’s problems with the ASC:
I must say poor Eugene had a tough time with me beside his other sorrows. The difficulties with the Union are awful and he has not yet the permit. Nevertheless he was working in 8 pictures here together with an American cameraman, of course that's not the same. We hope after having our “citizenship” they will take him as a member. In the next days he is starting in a picture with Rob. Siodmak as a kind of production supervisor. It is a big picture “The dark mirror” with Oliva [sic] de Havilland and will take several months. Thats not so bad. Eugene has several offers for Paris but we did not yet decide what to do. (Asper, 2003a: 64)

In the end Schüfftan declined such offers from Paris at this point, presumably imagining it would damage any remaining prospects for his admission to the ASC, and perhaps still too close to the horrors of the Second World War. Instead, production moved ahead on Robert Siodmak's *The Dark Mirror*, which began filming early in 1946. This project was Schüfftan's only film made during this period for one of the major studios, Universal, though this of course meant that he could not contribute to the cinematography. Instead Schüfftan returned to his other prominent role within film production, trick photography, which dated back to his earliest introduction to the industry (that has been examined in Chapter I, Part One).

Ultimately Schüfftan would leave filmmaking in the US in 1947, after finally receiving his American citizenship. In this time he had entirely failed to build a career for himself in the major Hollywood studios, thanks to the protectionism of the industry. Instead he was marginalized to the Poverty Row studios, where he relied upon the assistance of his émigré colleagues, but could still not receive full credit for the work he had completed.

2. Collectivization

26 With the intention of aiding his application for American citizenship Schüfftan anglicized his name, becoming Eugene Shuftan.
Schüfftan's film projects of the 1940s, made whilst in exile in the US, largely conform to a body of films that Jan-Christopher Horak (1996: 373-389) has termed 'German exile cinema', an identifiable body of work created by the various directors, producers, writers and craftspeople working in exile. For Horak (1996: 374), these films demonstrated 'a continuation of the democratic principles of German cultural life, as it had developed before Hitler's rise to power.' Central here to Horak's conception of German exile cinema is the process of collaboration amongst exile artists. This process of collaboration can be seen as the collective voice of German exile cinema, which sought, as we have seen in the case of *It Happened Tomorrow*, to speak to the major Hollywood studios.

This sense of collaboration is nowhere more emphatically apparent than in the case of Schüfftan's various projects during the 1940s. From a total of eleven films made by Schüfftan in Los Angeles during this period, ten were made under the direction of European émigrés, and nine of these films were directed by German filmmakers in exile in the US (namely Douglas Sirk, Edgar G. Ulmer and Robert Siodmak). The existence of a German exile cinema was a crucial factor in Schüfftan's ability to continue work in the US, where he was closed out of the major studios for his failure to be accepted into the ASC. He was rendered reliant upon his former associates of filmmaking in Weimar Germany (Sirk and Ulmer in particular) who were working on Poverty Row, on the margins of film production in Los Angeles, to supply him with work. In Schüfftan's case therefore, Horak's conception of German exile cinema goes far beyond a means of production or aesthetic sensibility, and was in fact a necessity for the continuation of his existence in exile.

Horak's German exile cinema, whilst aiming to identify a particular body of films, cannot be conceived of as a genre in the same terms as, for example, the western or the comedy genre, which adopt particular codes and conventions within their aesthetics and narratives so that
they may be understood more clearly by audiences at the point of reception. Instead, German exile cinema rather describes the economic and social conditions behind the production of these films (certainly one element in the understanding of genre), but with few narrative or aesthetic consistencies between films which can be decoded at the point of reception (although, as the third part of this case study demonstrates, Exile Modernism reveals itself in a number of these texts, in various terms, including narrative and aesthetics). Therefore, Horak (1996: 379) has described German exile cinema not as a genre, but rather as an entity which 'must be viewed as a cinema of genres, governed by particular political and economic conditions of production.' 'A cinema of genres' certainly describes Schüfftan's exile films of the 1940s, which are comprised of thrillers, melodramas, a war film, a comedy and a musical.

Perhaps the most important and productive of Schüfftan’s exilic collaborations during this period were with the German director Edgar G. Ulmer, with whom Schüfftan had first worked in Germany on his earliest film as cinematographer, Menschen am Sonntag. The pair collaborated on a total of five films together between the years 1944 and 1946. The first of these was Bluebeard, made at the Poverty Row studio Producers Releasing Corporation (PRC), as all but one of their collaborations would be. In all likelihood Schüfftan's presence on Bluebeard is not unconnected to his earlier work on Hitler's Madman, a film which Ulmer was supposed to direct, but which he abandoned following disagreements with the producer Seymour Nebenzahl (Mank, 1994: 274). As we know filming began for Bluebeard on 31st May 1944 and was completed only 6 days later following the tightest of schedules (Mank, 1994: 278). An insight into the working conditions and ethos at PRC has been offered by Gregory Mank, who describes the studio lot as:

a never-never-land of cinema schlockmeisters who recorded with secondhand equipment, shot with allegedly recanned film tossed away by the majors, and cranked out a 54-minute Western (so the legend goes) in two days on a budget of $8000. In 1944, PRC
was going full force, releasing 39 films – more than MGM's 30, Paramount's 32, 20th Century-Fox's 26, or Warner Bros.' (1994: 19)

Such a situation must surely have proven difficult for Schüfftan, however it is important to note, as Kerr has done, that the technology used by the Poverty Row studios largely matched that of the majors:

The B units, throughout the 1940s and as late as the mid-1950s, employed the same basic equipment as their big budget rivals, including Mitchell or Bell and Howell cameras, Mole Richardson lighting units, Moviola editing gear and RCA or Western Electric sound systems. Such economics as B units practised, therefore, were not related to fixed assets like rents and salaries but to variable costs like sets, scripts, footage, casual labour and, crucially, power. (Kerr, 2003: 115)

Schüfftan was thoroughly versed in coping with tight budgetary constraints, given his experience on many of his European productions. This is also an example of how the independent production houses relied heavily upon the influx of émigré talent unused by the major studios. Small production houses such as PRC followed the model established by the major studios and pushed mass production to the utmost level of productivity but without the means of the majors. The strain this put upon the completed films is evident in the extremely low production values of (in this case) the Ulmer films. We can also see this in the historically inaccurate costumes of *A Scandal in Paris*, set during the life of Eugène François Vidocq (1775-1857). In all appearance, stock costumes had been reused by the minor studios across this film, as well of course as any number of projects. So long as they bore the slightest resemblance of historical flair, rather than undertaking the costly and timely task of commissioning historically accurate costumes they would suffice.27

---

27 See Hayward (2010) for descriptions of the appropriate French fashions of the period.
The collective of émigrés in the minor studios therefore attempted to efface their voice in imitation of the major studios, however budgetary constraints forced artistic innovation which revealed Exile Modernism in other more interesting ways. Shirley Ulmer, wife of Edgar, has provided the following illuminating comment, leaving us in no doubt as to how these constraints would have been dealt with by Schüfftan:

On *Bluebeard*, Jockey Feindel, the camera operator, was actually given the cameraman credit, because he was in the union. But it was Eugene Schüfftan [sic], one of the greatest cameramen who ever lived, who really was the cinematographer. [...] Our union wouldn't let him in, even though he was a top cameraman from Austria. So Edgar used him a lot, anonymously, on our PRC pictures, and we had to have a union cameraman on the set. [...] But it was driving him crazy – because he couldn't take credit for his work. (In: Mank, 1994: 279-280)

It is gratifying to hear of Schüfftan being spoken about in such reverent tones by Shirley Ulmer, who was both a friend and a colleague, having worked as script supervisor on *Bluebeard*, and upon Ulmer's subsequent collaborations with Schüfftan.

Despite the frustrations which must have occurred, considering the limitations upon the production, and Schüfftan's annoyance at being unable to take credit for his work, the cast and crew of *Bluebeard* produced what was described in the February 7th 1945 *Variety* review as, 'one of the best picture to come out of the PRC production mill.' (Sten, 1945) This is undoubtedly due in no small part to the careful pre-production planning that went into the project ahead of the brief shooting schedule, in order to maximize the productivity of this period. Shirley Ulmer has described their working method, explaining that, 'There was rehearsal in advance, so that when we can on the set, the cameramen knew what every shot

---

28 This is of course an error for Schüfftan was born and raised in Germany.
was,' and that, 'We had been rehearsed to death before we ever hit a set, so there was never any correction – we were ready to go, like a stage play.' (In: Mank, 1994: 278)

Such forethought certainly proved successful, for the cast and the crew were able to use the technological and financial limitations of the PRC backlot to their advantage. For Schüfftan, minimum illumination was key, and functioned not only to preserve money but also to stylistically recreate the seedy underside of a Parisian life populated by murderers and prostitutes (see Figure 40). Barry Salt has identified that lower levels of illumination (compensated for by over-exposure of the film stock) was a common technique in the 1940s by which to reduce shooting costs, and was even employed as a matter policy by a number of the major studios (1983: 288). A consequence of the budgetary constraints is what can perhaps be considered to be the single film in Schüfftan’s career most influenced by the stylistic traits of German Expressionism. This is also evident in the set design, which embraced its limitations to create clearly artificial, angular designs, to reflect the madness of the protagonist. This is despite the fact that, in a rare close reading of the film, Steffen Hantke (2008: 181-194) fails to make any mention of Expressionism, Schüfftan or exile. He in fact describes the bold lighting style of the film as ‘stylistic excess’, and a ‘stylistic quirk’ (2008: 118). Bluebeard proved to be Schüfftan's only project of 1944, however his next film would see him immediately reunited with Edgar Ulmer.
Strange Illusion began shooting early in 1945, and saw Schüfftan once again take the reins of cinematography, despite union member Philip Tannura receiving the credit, as confirmed by Ulmer (McCarthy and Flynn, 1975: 401). Once again filmed with PRC over what was likely to be an equally frenetic shooting period, cast and crew combine to tell the story of Paul (Jimmy Lydon) who suffers from a recurring nightmare in which he relives his father's death in a road traffic accident, and sees his mother falling in love with a new man that has come into their lives, Brett Curtis (Warren William). Paul believes his dream to be prophetic and is convinced that the two separate images in his dream are in some way connected – that Brett may well have caused his father's death. Paul turns out to be correct and is able to save his mother from Brett, and reveal the truth of the past in which Brett did indeed murder his
father. Perhaps the most emblematic shots of the film occur during the dream sequences shown at the start and the end of the film. Heavy smoke fills the set giving the image an ethereal quality in which the characters seem to float rather than walk. Similarly to *Bluebeard*, Schüfftan offers a heavily stylized approach which functions to conceal the budgetary constraints of the film.

The Ulmer-Schüfftan partnership was obviously proving a success for both parties, as well as for PRC who welcomed yet another collaboration later in 1945, for *Club Havana*. As is the case with Schüfftan's previous two Ulmer projects, the accredited cinematographer (in this instance Benjamin Kline) became the camera operator whilst Schüfftan acted in his role of cinematographer, though clearly such an arrangement could not have allowed complete freedom for Schüfftan (McCarthy and Flynn, 1975: 402). *Club Havana* was filmed in four days (DiPaolo, 2004: 42), an impressive feat even by Ulmer's standards, particularly considering the film's affinity to the lavish Hollywood production *Grand Hotel* (Edmund Goulding, 1932). The club is set in a popular social hub, in which socialites gather to be seen as much as anything else. The film blends murder, mystery and music around this location, as it follows a set of six characters throughout the evening.

Yet another Ulmer vehicle followed shortly for PRC, with a production period which was once more completed in an astonishingly short time between July and August 1945. Ulmer's own unique version of the Monte Cristo legacy, *The Wife of Monte Cristo* sees Edmund Dantes (Martin Kosleck) ride once more in 1832, and seek vengeance alongside his wife, the Countess Haydee (Lenore Aubert). When the Count is injured, Haydee becomes his stand-in, maintaining the illusion as the mysterious 'Avenger'. The film, which boasts surprisingly
lavish sets and costumes for a PRC production, also has a complex use of lighting from Schüfftan.\textsuperscript{29}

Schüfftan, as we have seen from much of his work in France, once again favours a more muted key light and a strong use of back light in \textit{The Wife of Monte Cristo}. This creates a sense of depth in the image, strongly distinguishing the subjects from their backgrounds. Furthermore, throughout the film Schüfftan avoids casting key lights directly upon the faces of the subjects, allowing them only to be illuminated from a prominent key light cast upon the set. However, the usage of such techniques in \textit{The Wife of Monte Cristo} has further relevance, for such diminished key lighting and such a dominant back light results in often leaving the subjects of the image in silhouette. These stylistic choices function in accordance with the narrative of \textit{The Wife of Monte Cristo}, with the silhouette effect supporting the hidden identity motif imperative to the adoption of 'The Avenger' role by the Countess. Such a technique reaches its peak near the climax of the film, in which the Count fences with the police chief. Long-shots of the dueling pair see them in relative darkness against their surroundings, becoming only more generously lit during medium close-ups and close-ups.

Schüfftan’s final project with Ulmer was also his final film to be shot in Los Angeles during this period, \textit{Carnegie Hall}. However, despite this being an Ulmer-Schüfftan collaboration, Schüfftan did not act as cinematographer, instead taking his credited role for 'Production Technique'. This is likely to be due to the subject matter of the film, for Edgar Ulmer has commented that, 'you can tell by the cameraman I had on the picture if I took a picture very seriously or not. For my serious pictures I always had Schuftan' (McCarthy and Flynn, 1975: 401). Therefore, for this light-hearted celebration of New York musical theatre it would seem that Ulmer assumed Schüfftan to be inappropriate, suggesting the degree to which Schüfftan

\textsuperscript{29} Schüfftan is credited with the role of Production Supervisor, though Ulmer has confirmed that he was in fact responsible for the cinematography (McCarthy and Flynn, 1975: 401).
had become unavoidably associated with the stark and dramatic lighting styles of the Expressionist movement, even amongst his émigré colleagues. Such an assumption on the part of Ulmer ignores the variety of Schüfftan's technique, and his successful lighting in comedies such as Du Haut en bas (1933) and La Tendre ennemie (1935). Nevertheless, Schüfftan did receive credit for his production design on Carnegie Hall. The critic Jack D. Grant, in a review for The Hollywood Reporter dated 27th February 1947, commented that, 'in working entirely at the Hall, the production had to be pre-designed, and for this achievement, an unusual credit goes to Eugen Shuftan.'

These five films upon which Schüfftan and Ulmer united their talents speak of the dependence upon a collective filmmaking community of exiles at this time, and mark Schüfftan’s most significant cinemomatographic impact during this period, in spite of the marginal position these films held in relation to the major studios. The most memorable film of this collaboration, Bluebeard, also forms a focus of the final part of this case study, as it is not only indicative of the importance of deterritorialization and collectivization apparent in the émigré film productions, but it also a notable example of Exile Modernism in terms of its themes and aesthetics, marking a politicization in this text which completes an understanding of these minor productions as part of a notable and unique body of exilic work.

3. Politicization

Hitler’s Madman

The very first film made by Schüfftan in California was Hitler’s Madman (Sirk, 1942), an Angelus Pictures production which provides an excellent example of how these films may be discussed as products of Exile Modernism. The film is based upon the true story of the
Lidice massacre, an atrocity carried out by the Gestapo in response to the actions of two Czech resistance fighters who had been trained in Britain, and who parachuted back into the Czech Republic to carry out acts of resistance. The crucial act in question occurred on May 27th 1942, when they assassinated the Nazi Reichsprotektor Reinhard Heydrich by throwing a bomb into his car as he drove through the Czech countryside. Nazi reprisals were swift, with Hitler demanding the complete destruction of any village known to have harboured resistance fighters, which involved murdering the men of the village, sending the women to a concentration camp, the 'Germanization' of the youth, and the burning of the village to the ground. Lidice was immediately targeted for its reputation for supporting the resistance, and on June 9th, the day of Heydrich's funeral, 199 men were murdered, and 195 were abducted to concentration camps. Unlike other atrocities committed by the Nazis which were censored by the party, they in fact publicized their actions upon Lidice as a warning to others who harboured resistance fighters.

In turn, the story became a useful propaganda tool for the Allied forces, and the town of Lidice became celebrated and commemorated across the world. For example, a fundraising organization was started in Britain, called 'Lidice Shall Live', with the aim of raising funds to assist in the rebuilding of Lidice after the war, and towns and villages around the world renamed themselves Lidice in memory of the massacre, such as a suburb of Mexico City and a neighbourhood of Illinois. The story of Lidice also made an artistic impact. It was turned into three different film adaptations, a British version by Humphrey Jennings called The Silent Village (1943), and two Hollywood films made with a strong influence of exilic voices: Fritz Lang and Bertolt Brecht's Hangmen Also Die! (1943), and Hitler's Madman. There were also musical compositions in memory of Lidice, as well as Edna St. Vincent Millay's poem 'The Murder of Lidice', which is quoted in part at the end of Hitler's Madman.
The purpose of outlining the true events which occurred at Lidice, and the cultural impact which these actions inspired, is to highlight the relevance of this story being made in two distinct films (Lang’s and Sirk’s), and both by émigré crews in Hollywood. For in fact, *Hitler's Madman* was not only Schüfftan's first film project since his arrival on the West Coast, it was also to be the first Hollywood film project of director Douglas Sirk, who had fled Hitler's Germany rather later than most, in 1937, and was produced by Seymour Nebenzahl, who had been a prominent producer at Ufa until he was forced into exile by the Nazis. In fact, Nebenzahl had already established something of an anti-Nazi stance with his production company Nero Film for Fritz Lang’s *M* in 1931, even before he had fled Germany. In addition to the émigré cinematographer, director, and producer European exiles could also be found heavily influencing the script of the film, and its score.

The presence of such a large number of exiles on such a narrative, for what for many was their first Hollywood film, stands in some ways as a reflection of their own position as exiles to their new host nation, through a narrative which had already proven to strike a chord with the country. The choice of project was undoubtedly a sagacious decision on the part of the many émigrés involved, for the story of Lidice had a profound impact upon the American people (perhaps because of its reportage by émigré members of the media) as a symbol of Nazi brutality. Furthermore, as Horak (1999) has noted, this impact was such that Stern Park, a suburb of Chicago, even elected to change its name to Lidice. In this sense, Lidice, a town eradicated from its homeland, became displaced into a New World, that received it kindly for the traumas and injustice it had suffered.

There is a strange irony then for the numerous émigrés who worked on this film, but who for their part had failed to receive such an honorific welcome, who struggled for work in a saturated market, and met distrust and prejudice based on their threat to American jobs and
their associations to the homeland (Sirk for instance was distrusted for having made films in Germany, although he has maintained that he 'had acquiesced to a film career in Nazi Germany only because he saw it as the only way of legally emigrating from Germany with his Jewish wife, Hilda' (Horak, 1999)). So through the retelling of the tale of Lidice the numerous émigrés involved in the production could remind audiences of the persecution they would have suffered had they not emigrated from Germany and France. The film also registers the cultural significance of their acceptance into America, which the American public should not betray. Furthermore, through this narrative, the émigrés could disassociate themselves from any affiliation – be it real or perceived through their otherness – to the atrocities carried out by the Nazi Party.

In terms of the film itself we can see a number of ways by which it displays the traits of Exile Modernism. The most obvious element of Exile Modernism, and a point which for its obviousness will not be dealt with further here, is that the narrative retells an event that recounts the full horrors from which many of the crew on the film had fled. A more subtle trait of Exile Modernism is the characterization of the various Nazis within the film. The most prominent Nazi characters within the film are Himmler, the madman of the title (Heydrich), and finally, as colluders with the system, the mayor and his wife (the Bauers). This array of characters in itself displays the hierarchy of the Nazi chain of command, but there is also a degree of humanization afforded to some of these characters. Mayor Bauer is first shown gorging himself at the dinner table as an appeal is made to him to act on behalf of the townspeople to save a young man, Bartonek, who had been arrested by the Gestapo the previous evening. Bartonek's wife pleads with Bauer to help, asking him 'who is going to feed my children?' as Bauer takes a mouthful from his large plate of food (shown in full glory by Schüfftan's camera over Bauer's shoulder), and Mrs. Bauer enters, telling her husband that their two children will shortly be returning home. Mrs Bauer’s humanity is evident through
her appeals to her husband help Bartonek. However, once Mrs Bartonek has left, he declares, 'I'm not going to stick my neck out for those Czechs,' taking once last large mouthful of food before the scene ends. The marking of Bauer as the fat bourgeois through the juxtaposition of Schufftan’s shots is strongly reminiscent of the techniques of Soviet Montage cinema. Bauer's monstrousness is soon tempered when we learn of the death of his own two sons, and witness the mayor break-down with his wife. He is also humanized by the helplessness of his behaviour – sobbing and begging – as he is arrested by the Gestapo following the assassination of the hangman.

The hangman, however, the film's arch villain and the madman of the title, remains monstrous throughout. Even on his death bed, when Himmler tells him that he is dying for his Führer, he responds, with Schüfftan's light cast dramatically across his face: 'I don't want to die, I'm not going to die for the Führer or anyone else. I want to live. You'll face death one of these days too Himmler, you and your Führer. All of you will face death. All of you. We'll lose, the Russians will win. The Poles, the British, the Czechs, the Americans, will win. You'll be the only ones to lose.' It is a scene which highlights the folly of Nazi ideology, and Heydrich’s realization that neither he, nor anyone else, has died for any good cause.

The ambiguity of characterization afforded to the Bauers is uncommon in the Hollywood tradition of black and white heroes and villains, fixing the film within the Exile Modernism tradition of complex human relations, reflecting the uncertainty with which the émigrés must regard the host and homelands. This ambiguity of characterization would later become a strong trait of the film noir, which the émigré contingent of Hollywood would be strongly connected. Such ambiguous characterizations are also true of the townspeople, in particular the hermit who is viewed with suspicion by the resistance group, and is positioned within the film as a possible Nazi informer. His true motives are revealed when he is shown to aid the
resistance, shooting down the two Nazis who arrive on the scene of Heydrich's assassination, allowing the resistance fighters to escape. This range of characterizations can be understood as part of the film’s political message, which reflected the distrust many of the émigré practitioners, including Sirk and Schüfftan, were subject to in their new hostland.

Collectivization is also an important feature of the narrative of this film, and as I explained above it is an important element of Deleuze and Guattari's description of minor literatures, a concept which I have ascribed to the minor production companies (and their output) which harboured émigré talent as the heartland of Exile Modernism in the cinema. The resistance to the Nazi occupation in this film is only facilitated through the regular meeting of the collective townspeople of Lidice in the woods outside the town. Schüfftan's camera reinforces this dependence upon the collective through his camera movement, in which pan movements occur from within the circle of discussion, highlighting the different people present, and the importance of each member to the collective. In contrast, in the Nazi meetings Schüfftan's camera is more restrained, remaining at a fixed position from some distance, outside of the circle of discussion. Anton Kaes (1993a: 105-117) has described Weimar cinema as a form of Modernity which sustains the traumas of World War One, just as this reading has demonstrated how these Poverty Row films bear the heritage of exile. For Kaes (1993a: 117), ‘World War I had lasting repercussions which imprinted themselves even in those cultural productions that do not overtly deal with the war. War psychoses and traumas underlie most of, if not the entire, cultural production of the Weimar Republic.’ Kaes find that this is manifested through total mobilization against a given threat, for example the townspeople in Fritz Lang’s M (1931). Indeed, Kaes’s assessment of ‘mobilization and Modernity’ in M could almost have been written about the mobilization of the townspeople in Hitler’s Madman: ‘In M, an entire city mobilizes itself in order to identify the unknown criminal and bring him under control. Both the underworld and the police are determined to
wage an all-out war in which every resource is activated and differences in class and social status are disregarded.’ (1993a: 114)

In terms of Schufftan’s use of light, he employs a number of techniques to disguise the low production values of the film, and in fact the enforced restrictions of the project produce a greater aesthetic result than those scenes which were later re-shot for the film by the MGM contract crew. One such example I wish to highlight are the scenes which take place in the woods, where the townspeople of Lidice gather for resistance meetings. In these scenes a great deal of shadow, produced from the leaves of the trees, is cast over the subjects in the foreground of the frame, whilst in the background fog is employed, with a strong backlight shone through to create the effect of a dense fog in the woods. This background creates a strong sense of depth for the location, whilst in fact disguising what was likely to be a rather limited set. Similarly, casting shadows through branch-shaped masques creates the impression of a much more detailed and expensive set than was actually employed. Disguising the set was in fact key to the success of the scene, for as I have described above, the camera was required to move quite freely around the set, the limitations of which, if not lit properly, would have been quite clearly evident. The effect employed by Schüfftan also adds to the dramatic effect of these scenes, for it suggests that anyone could be lurking amongst the fog and spying on these secret meetings (the hermit is shown doing just this, which adds to the ambiguity of his motivations). A further example of how Schufftan successfully disguised the low production values of the film is the tendency use low angle shots. The effect of this is to angle the camera towards the arc lights, allowing the top two thirds of the frame to be strongly illuminated with a minimal use of light. As we shall see, this effect of illumination to disguise the production values is reversed for the darker psychological themes of Ulmer’s films. In fact, Schüfftan’s clever use of lighting to disguise the budgetary constraints could not be replicated by the studio cameramen during re-shoots,
resulting in aesthetic and thematic discrepancies in the film. This is particularly noticeable in a number of scenes involving the hermit in his cave, in which the comedy of the scene is at odds with the sombre tone of the rest of the film, and the lighting lacks the depth of Schüfftan’s techniques, demonstrating the failures of reterritorialization.

*Hitler’s Madman* provides an excellent case study for Exile Modernism amongst these independent productions, largely due the obvious narrative relevance of the film to those artists who made it. However, most of the exile films which Schüfftan worked upon during the 1940s display traits of Exile Modernism, regardless of their narrative or genre. *It Happened Tomorrow* (Clair 1943), for example, was a romantic comedy led by the émigré producer Arnold Pressburger which told the story of a newspaper journalist during the mid-1900s who kept finding the following day’s newspaper in his pocket, allowing him to get scoops ahead of his colleagues. Events become more complicated however when the reporter reads of his own death in the next day’s paper. There is little about the film at face value which cries of Exile Modernism, but the narrative can be read as a discourse over the wartime anxiety of not knowing what the next day will bring. The film directly addresses the desire to see a certain future, albeit through the narrative of a romantic comedy, and even makes clear this analogy in the final title of the film, which reads, ‘Make it happen tomorrow, buy bonds and stamps today!’

*Bluebeard*

A consistent pattern amongst this collection of films is that six of the eleven exile projects involving Schüfftan are set in Europe, from where many of the exile artists had fled their homes. However, they do not all directly address the traumas taking place in Europe, as do *Hitler’s Madman* and *A Voice in the Wind* (Ripley, 1943), rather a number of the films, such
as *Bluebeard* (Ulmer, 1944) *A Scandal in Paris* (Sirk, 1945) and *The Wife of Monte Cristo* (Ulmer, 1946) feature an historical setting, demonstrating a return to a familiar pre-trauma Europe. As we shall see in the case of *Bluebeard* however, an unfamiliar, uncanny element pervades the narrative.

Whilst *Bluebeard* is not as obvious an example of Exile Modernism in terms of narrative in the way that *Hitler’s Madman* is for its direct foregrounding of the horrors occurring in Nazi Europe, Ulmer’s film nonetheless provides a strong example of Exile Modernism in a number of other, perhaps more subtle, ways. In Ulmer’s adaption, the French folktale of *La Barbe bleue* is set in a Belle époque era Paris, where the puppeteer and painter Gaston Morel (John Carradine) preys upon the women who have posed for his portraits. The film opens to find a city gripped by fear of when the Bluebeard will strike next, when a police sign is displayed announcing another murder, reminiscent of the introduction of Hans Beckert (Peter Lorre) in *M*. Morel is soon introduced as a figure in silhouette, who strikes fear into a group of girls making their way home at rather too late an hour, before Schufftan’s light reveals the face of Carradine in close-up, and the girls breathe a sigh of relief, as Gaston is known to them. This scene, like many in the film, is shot predominantly in darkness, with light used only to illuminate the faces of the actors, or other important aspects of the frame. This technique is one of high contrast between light and dark, and one which more than many of Schüfftan’s other films can be linked back to the high contrast lighting techniques of the German Expressionist movement of the 1920s with which Schüfftan was so often (if incorrectly) associated, and too the currently popular *film noirs* of Hollywood.

Such a play of light and dark does act in accordance with narrative, and in particular with the contrasts in the character of Gaston. For he is an outwardly debonair individual, popular as an artist, whereas internally he is consumed by rage and trauma that leads him to murder his
various female engagements. This very premise, of Paris consumed by fear with its occupants afraid to venture out at night, can be linked to the occupation of Paris by Nazi forces. Furthermore, the idea that Morel is trusted by the girls despite being Bluebeard, simply because he is known to them, is a trait of Exile Modernism already established in *Hitler's Madman*, where the Nazi characters were variously characterized. This undermining of apparent knowability suggests an unknowability of people’s motivations, be they exiles of countrymen.

The relevance of reading the film in such a manner is soon enforced by the film itself, as a cinematic metaphor is created through Gaston Morel’s puppet show. A frame within the cinematic frame is created through a miniature proscenium arch, within which the action of the puppet show unfolds, as the spectators both diegetic and non-diegetic look on. This is even taken further by Schufftan and Ulmer, who film the puppets in close-up, with shot reverse-shot techniques, in the same manner that the subjects of the film are shot. The central female protagonist of the film, Lucille, is part of the audience to this play, and is deeply moved by the action that unfolds. Following the play, her romantic meeting with Morel is shot against a frame which is reminiscent of the theatre frame that surrounds the puppets. Furthermore, the puppet opera which Morel is staging in this scene is of *Faust*, a story which would soon provide a prominent example of Exile Modernism in literature in the form of Thomas Mann’s novel, *Doctor Faustus* (1947), and which was already the German national story since Goethe’s version of 1808. In fact, using a similar device to Bluebeard of framing a narrative within a narrative, the story of Mann’s version of Faust, Leverkühn, is narrated by his old friend Zeitblom between the years 1943 and 1946, during which time Zeitblom details Leverkühn’s life alongside the rise and fall of Nazi Germany.

Even before the publication of *Doctor Faustus*, Thomas Mann was lecturing on the myth and
drawing direct parallels to the situation in Germany. On May 29\textsuperscript{th}, 1945, after Germany had surrendered the war, Mann delivered a lecture on Faustus in which he claimed, ‘A lonely thinker and searcher, a theologian and philosopher in his cell who, in his desire for world enjoyment and world domination, barters his soul to the Devil – isn’t this the right moment to see Germany in this picture, the moment in which Germany is literally being carried off by the Devil.’ (Bahr, 2007: 244-245) He continued: ‘There are not two Germanys, a good one and a bad one, but only one, whose best turned into evil through devilish cunning. Wicked Germany is merely good Germany gone astray, good Germany in misfortune, in guilt, and ruin’ (Bahr, 2007: 243). Taking this comment as indicative of the complex dialectics of Exile Modernism, we can interestingly apply it to Ulmer’s \textit{Bluebeard}.

The impression of a ‘good Germany’ and a ‘bad Germany’ is evident in the title character, who embodies this dichotomy by being a popularly known artist and member of the society, whereas unbeknownst the society at large, Morel is in fact the murderous Bluebeard. Of course, Mann’s proposal that there is no such simple dichotomy dividing the nation between good and bad is embodied by Morel, for these two opposing characterizations are present within a single person, obliterating the simple dichotomy and suggesting a far more complex degree of characterization, a fact borne out by Morel’s internal struggle between his love for Lucille, and his overwhelming desire to kill, which results in his refusal to agree to paint her. Morel’s confusing relationship to Lucille then results in his attempt to strangle her when he realises she has betrayed him, a shift in character caught by Schufftan’s camera in extreme close-up on Carradine’s face, highlighting his wide-eyed anger as he attempts to rid the world of his latest complication. In a comparably allegorical reading of another of Ulmer’s films, \textit{Detour} (1945), Isenberg also identifies evidence of the context of exile in the film’s main character, through the characteristics of rootlessness and displacement (Isenberg also identifies a tension between European Classicism and American Modernism in the film’s
sound track, a fracturing of styles which can be understood alongside the Exile Modernisms discussed in this chapter) (2008: 67-71).

Ultimately, this duality of characters within the sole body of Gaston Morel results in a complex set of motivations as well as false perceptions of his personality, which we have already witnessed in the complex representation of the Bauers in *Hitler’s Madman*. It is an important trait of Exile Modernism therefore, evident from *Hitler’s Madman* to *Bluebeard*, to Thomas Mann’s *Doctor Faustus*, that characters who represent the oppressors are not simply evil figures, but are afforded greater characterization and often internal struggles regarding how they should act. Indeed, how else could those souls who had been forced into exile from their homeland begin to reconcile the uprising of such a force for evil in their own country?

**Conclusion**

Both *Hitler’s Madman* and *Bluebeard* form strong examples of Exile Modernism in various manifestations, and yet should not necessarily be viewed as a separate or unique category from the output of the more major Hollywood studios. For in fact, the various traits of Exile Modernism, as demonstrated by the various films of this case study, share many similar elements with the emerging *film noirs*, which would provide a vastly successful formula for Hollywood throughout the 1940s and 50s.

The émigré influence upon *film noir* has been strongly contested by critics, with some finding the heritage of German Expressionism in the moody aesthetics of these films, reinforced by the ubiquity of German émigré directors on these projects (Bould, 2005), whereas other critics have re-evaluated the formation of this film-type to note that aesthetic similarities are evident in the American cinema of the 1930s, and the gangster film stars of this period such
as James Cagney and Edward G. Robinson prefigured the anti-heroes of the film noirs of the 1940s (Elsaesser, 2000: 424). Edward Dimendberg’s (2003: 113-143) approach, in his exploration of film noir spatiality, is perhaps more productive. Rather than tracing genealogies, he argues for an understanding of Weimar cinema and film noir as presenting ‘parallel modernities’, which allows us to conceive ‘the film cycle as productive of new modes of cultural and spatial representations, rather than merely a parasitic recipient of other discourses. Similarly, it admits film as a domain in which the experience of exile can be recognized and negotiated by film spectators and critics.’ (2003: 123) If we are to identify a role for the émigrés in the formation of the Hollywood film noir, I would concur with Elsaesser and suggest that it does not exist in some form of aesthetic pre-history of the style evident in German Expressionism. Circumstances are certainly more complicated, as we have seen from Schüfftan’s evolving style. Rather, the traits of Exile Modernism were absorbed by the studios through the influx of émigré directors and crews, and through the products being made by émigré collectives on Poverty Row. For after all, the callous if charismatic gangster of the 1930s Hollywood cinema who ultimately finds his redemption in death at the end of the film is not the same as the stars of film noir, whose motivations and intentions, like those of the exile cinema I have addressed above, remain ambiguous throughout. If Exile Modernism had any influence at all on the major studio productions it was to quash the black and white perceptions of right and wrong, to introduce ambiguity and uncertainty to the narratives and stars of the major films of the 1940s and 50s.

This case study has discussed Schüfftan’s independent film projects made in exile in the US during 1940s as a body of work which display, in varying degrees across the various films, examples of Exile Modernism. These films demonstrate the processes and traumas of exile which were experienced by the various émigré directors, stars and crew, including Schüfftan, who comprised these productions. This is not necessarily to suggest that they represent a
coherent body of films. On the contrary, there is an astonishing variety of genres, aesthetics and themes which mirror the variety of styles and techniques evident in the Hollywood studio cinema of the time. Rather I’d argue that these films have a coherence in terms of the economic standards of the Poverty Row studios, and share a sociological background in the experience of exile, shared by the various exilic cast and crew who were forced to gravitate towards these marginal spheres of filmmaking, experiences which were made most evident in the two films addressed in the ‘Politicization’ section of this case study.

The framework which this case has followed is based upon a description of minor literatures made by Deleuze and Guattari, using the concepts of deterritorialization, collectivization and politicization, which seems vastly appropriate to describe these independent productions and the role emigration played in their construction, made on the margins of the great filmmaking powerhouses of the major studios. However, ‘minor’ is of course also a highly problematic term, not only in its own right, but also for describing these films in particular. For despite the vastly different economic background of films produced by Hollywood studio productions and independent productions, and the different attitudes to filmmaking offered by the collective émigrés in these smaller productions, both nonetheless attempted to address the same filmgoing public. The notion of a major/minor dichotomy (unhelpfully reinforced by the ubiquitous term ‘major studios’ against which the independent productions are automatically figured as inferior), in which two systems operate in opposition to each other simply cannot exist, for as this chapter has shown, the Hollywood studio system was imitated by PRC, and the circulation of cast and crew between the major studios and independent productions was common, albeit not as frequent as some, such as Schüfftan, would like. In the case of Schüfftan he worked for Universal on The Dark Mirror, and that film’s director Robert Siodmak found immediate success with the studios without having to experience the smaller productions upon which many of his émigré colleagues were forced to cut their teeth.
Indeed, such was the success of PRC and other such independent productions at imitating the larger studio model, a number of films (most notably *Hitler's Madman*), were transformed from minor independent productions to major studio products. Further reinforcing the process of exchange between the major and the minor, Gerd Gemünden (2008) has addressed the films of one the classic Hollywood cinema’s greatest proponents, Billy Wilder, in light of his exile, and the confrontation with Modernity. Gemünden (2008: 9) argues that, ‘the experience of exile would force Wilder to square an imaginary America with the real thing, but even though that process entailed personal hardship and disillusionment, it did not change his belief in the cinema as a vehicle for modernization and the democratization of society.’ Gemünden (*Ibid.*) also finds that Wilder, through his exilic ‘accent’ (borrowing from Naficy), ‘is indebted to a version of modernism that tries to overcome or undo [the Great] divide. Wilder’s cinema follows an aesthetic that challenges that divide by blending high and popular culture, art and artefact.’ In his appraisal of Wilder’s ability to cross this divide, Gemünden (*Ibid.*) turns to Hansen’s theory of vernacular Modernism, which I have previously addressed in this thesis in relation to Schüfftan’s application of classical lighting techniques to his filmmaking.

These émigrés were not outwardly attempting to create a different form of cinema, unique to their collective, but were in fact attempting to imitate the successful studio formula, to reach the attention of these studios and their audiences. However, as this chapter has demonstrated, through the very process of exile, which forced many of them to experience the processes of deterritorialization, collectivization and politicization, films were produced which necessarily reflected the recent traumas of the émigré collective. However, as we saw, the exile films cannot be viewed as a separate entity to the major studio productions. Indeed, in their reoccupation, or reterritorialization, many became absorbed by the Hollywood studios in the form of *film noir*. 
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Chapter III

Part One
Travelling Light: A Return to Work in Europe, 1948 - 1959

Part Two
Case Study: The Cinematographic Representation of the Asylum Space
Following his work with Robert Siodmak on *The Dark Mirror*, it would seem that a taste of larger studio productions left Schüfftan tired of smaller budget films and the lack of freedom they – and work in America – offered him. Offers from Paris, where Schüfftan could work – liberated from the constraints of the ASC and once again be recognised for his brilliance as a cinematographer – clearly were now more appealing to him. One project remained for Schüfftan in the United States, reuniting him with Ulmer for *Carnegie Hall*, a celebration of classical music. Schüfftan did not, however, act as cinematographer, instead taking his credited role for ‘Production Technique’. Edgar Ulmer has given us clear indication as to why Schüfftan did not act as cinematographer when he comments that, ‘you can tell by the cameraman I had on the picture if I took a picture very seriously or not. For my serious pictures I always had Schuftan’ (in: McCarthy and Flynn, 1975: 401). Therefore, for this light-hearted celebration of New York musical theatre it would seem that Ulmer assumed
Schöfftan to be inappropriate, suggesting the degree to which Schöfftan had become unavoidably associated with the stark and dramatic lighting styles of the Expressionist movement, even amongst his émigré colleagues. Such an assumption on the part of Ulmer ignores the variety of Schöfftan’s technique, and his successful lighting in comedies such as *Du Haut en bas* (1933) and *La Tendre ennemie* (1935). Even if Ulmer had not trusted Schöfftan’s variety, this would be tested for the cinematographer in the late 1940s and 1950s, when it was necessary for him to turn his hand to photographing a whole host of different genres in a variety of nations.

As an indication of Schöfftan’s weariness of union blackballing, he wrote to his friend Siegfried Kracauer on February 24th 1947, asking the writer to give him the option on a film treatment he had written based on the life of composer Jacques Offenbach. Schöfftan intended to turn the treatment into a musical film, seeing the opportunity to move into the field of producing. Nothing came of this endeavour, although the very same letter notes that the Schöfftans had finally been awarded their American citizenship: ‘Friday, Febr. 28 the great day arrives where we become citizen, after all we deserve it. Due to “friendly neighbours” our affair was a little “cloudy” but now everything is settled and the sun is coming out. I should say it is not very agreeable’ (Schöfftan in: Asper, 2003a: 71).

With the newfound freedom granted by the pending citizenship, Schöfftan felt able to accept a job on a production in Mexico called *Women in the Night* (William Rowland), arranged in the final months of 1946. The film marked the beginning of what can be considered a rather nomadic (to the extent of seemingly schizophrenic) period in the career of Eugen Schöfftan, in which he travelled between France, Spain, Italy, Switzerland, Canada, Mexico and New York for his filmmaking projects, and performed his duties upon a wide variety of different genres. It was a period characterized by the Schöfftans in 1950 as ‘a real gipsy life [sic.]’ (in:
Asper, 2003a: 89), and can be seen as a consequence of their failure to settle in any country thus far. Having survived the Nazi terror in Europe, even the United States had failed to offer Schüfftan the opportunities he expected. This chapter sets out to address this rather unsettled time in the Schüfftans’ lives, and examines Schüfftan’s shifting stylistic approaches across the many nations and genres he worked in, before he finally found some direction at the end of the 1950s through his collaborations with Georges Franju.

**Nomad’s Land**

The lure of film production beyond the United States borders was that it finally allowed Schüfftan to have full control over cinematography. For the first of these films, *Women in the Night*, in a letter to the Kracauers, Marlise Schüfftan noted a number of difficulties which this caused her and her husband, whom she affectionately refers to as ‘Shiffy’:

> I am a straw-widow due to the fact that there would have been [sic] many difficulties for me to cross the border. Shiffy had to fill out a lot of sheets for his re-enter permit which they had to go to Washington before he could leave Tuesday a week ago. Yesterday they started shooting I am so happy that he is the first cameraman and can dictate as he likes. (Schüfftan in: Asper, 2003a: 69)

The film is the story of a group of women from the various Allied nations who are studying at the University of Shanghai. They are arrested on an unjustified charge of murder of a German officer and are used by the Germans as sexual slaves to satisfy their Japanese allies. The German and Japanese plot is complicated, however, by the presence of a number of spies amongst the group of girls. Schüfftan’s first chance for around seven years to dictate as he would like and take full charge of the cinematography saw him opt for a strong use of the stylistic techniques that we know he had come to favour, such as Rembrandt lighting. In this
film Schüfftan avails himself of at least two Rembrandt lighting techniques. First is Rembrandt’s classic composition of lighting faces, which we have seen Schüfftan employ throughout his career. This is particularly evident in mid-shots of the German officers such as Von Meyer (Gordon Richards), whereby shadow is cast across one side of the face, leaving Rembrandt’s classic triangle of light under the eye (see Figure 41).

Schüfftan’s other established techniques are also apparent throughout, such as a more diffused lighting and softer focus for the female characters, which creates a contrast between the innocent female victims, and the harder lighting of the German officers. The second Rembrandt technique favoured by Schüfftan in the film is to create depth in the *mise-en-scène*. This is achieved by casting a bright spotlight onto the background set, away from the

Figure 41: Rembrandt lighting in *Women in the Night.*
subjects of the frame (Figure 42). This creates a form of narrative in the image, whereby the viewer’s eye is drawn from the brightest point of the set in the background, across the subjects of the frame in the foreground. We have seen Schüfftan employ both of these Rembrandt techniques previously in his career, however it is highly significant that when, for the first time since 1940, Schüfftan is afforded the opportunity to take full control of cinematography, he reverts to these techniques as his stylistic core.

Figure 42: Schüfftan employs Rembrandt's depth techniques in Women in the Night.

Having failed to make any headway with Kracauer's treatment of Offenbach, once his American citizenship came through, Schüfftan chose to pursue projects outside of the United States, having presumably relished the creative freedom that Women in the Night had offered him. The Schüfftans therefore continued their nomadic journey by travelling to Rome in the
Autumn of 1947, marking Schüfftan’s first return to European filmmaking since he had fled to America at the start of the decade. Rather, it would have marked Schüfftan’s return to European filmmaking, had the project not been beset with delays, resulting in the film eventually being cancelled before filming had even begun (it is not known what the failed project concerned).

From Rome, Schüfftan's next project saw him head to Montreal, Canada, in the summer of 1948. Explaining to the Kracauers their reasons for being in Canada, Marlise wrote that her husband 'has a contract here for 6 months, the Renaissance Studio, the only one here in town, is brand new und [sic] he has to build it up in American style' (in: Asper, 2003a: 73). Therefore, despite having spent only around five years working on Poverty Row, Schüfftan was considered to be an expert in the construction of the American studios. There is not a little irony involved here, with Schüfftan being deemed by non-American studios to have the relevant expertise of an American cinematographer. However, it would lead to him making a number of American-influenced films in Europe throughout the 1940s and 1950s. At one point, cruellest of ironies, this supposed status as an American cinematographer briefly proved to be something of a barrier to finding work in France.

What was initially a 6 month contract in fact saw Schüfftan remain in Canada until 23rd February, 1949, although he did not work upon any film productions during this time, being only responsible for establishing the set-up of the studio. A number of opportunities presented themselves to Schüfftan, including an offer from Orson Welles to shoot his version of Othello in Paris, an unrealised Abel Gance film entitled La Tragédie divine, and work on Jean Renoir's film The River, which was to shoot in India. Most fascinating of all was the possibility of a reunion with Marcel Carné on La Marie du Port, a film to star Jean Gabin.

30 Had Schüfftan come to work on The River, this would have marked his first use of Technicolor. Cinematography was ultimately provided by Renoir’s nephew, Claude Renoir.
None of these projects materialized for Schüfftan, and the unrealised opportunity of reprising a working relationship with Carné and Gabin came as a particular blow. In a letter to the Kracauers dated August 31st 1949, Marlise Schüfftan wrote that 'Shiffy didn't [sic] get the permit for the Carnet-Gabin picture, although the contract had been signed by both parts. The Syndicat could not give the permit – even if it wanted – because they were afraid too many American cameramen would come to France where so many are out of work’ (in: Asper, 2003a: 82). It is a bitter irony that Schüfftan, one of the most celebrated cameramen to have worked in France – in large part due to Le Quai des brumes – was unable to reunite with the creative team behind this successful film because he was now viewed to be an American cameraman, although Hollywood had never permitted him to act in such a role. As a European exile Schüfftan was unable to shoot pictures in America, and as American exile Schüfftan was similarly prevented from working in France. However, such problems did not prevail for long, and from 1950 onwards Schüfftan would begin a prolonged period of work as a cinematographer throughout Europe, including France. As for La Marie du Port, having failed to secure Schüfftan as cinematographer, Carné turned to Schüfftan’s former protégé Henri Alékan.

Schüfftan's migratory experience of work in the late 1940s was only a taste of the transitoriness he was set to undergo during the 1950s, working on projects throughout Europe, as well as in Canada. For having been forced into exile first from Germany and then from France, Schüfftan had now effectively been exiled back to Europe by a restrictive Hollywood system which still would not allow him to operate freely. As early as 1949 the Schüfftans were already tiring of their return to a nomadic lifestyle. Marlise Schüfftan wrote to the Kracauers on August 31st 1949, addressing such concerns: 'Travelling is very interesting but after nearly 1 ½ year you get tired a little. Sometimes I'm longing for a little house, at least 4 walls to around me [sic], not always living in hotel rooms and things in the
suit cases and trunks' (in: Asper, 2003a: 83). Compounding such problems was Eugen Schüfftan's poor health, diagnosed as a low red blood count during a visit to his daughter in London. His condition had become so drastic that he was relying upon regular liver injections. It is worth noting that such a migratory lifestyle had already proven too much for certain exiles, such as the novelist Stefan Zweig and his wife, who committed suicide together in Brazil in 1942, after many years of nomadism following their exile from Germany in 1934. A note left in the wake of their actions explained their reasoning: ‘After one’s sixtieth year, unusual powers are needed in order to make wholly new beginnings. Those that I possess have been exhausted by years of travel’ (in: Heilbut, 1997: 44). By the time of 1949 when Marlise was voicing her complaints of a nomadic lifestyle and of her husband’s health problems, Eugen had already passed his sixtieth year. Fortunately, whilst extremely challenging, their lives in exile never became as drastic or as tragic as the Zweigs.

Having settled for a time in Paris due to the various opportunities that had been presented to Schüfftan, his health fortunately improved and he was able to begin work in the first months of 1950, on a bi-lingual production titled Gunman in the Streets for US release, and Le Traqué for the French market. Frank Tuttle took directorial charge of the American version, whilst responsibility for the French version fell to Boris Lewin. The French version has been largely forgotten, leaving the American version to be remembered as an American film. It was, however, produced entirely by the French production company ‘Films Sacha Gordine’, and shot entirely in France. It has been remembered as an American film because the French production looked to the American film noir for inspiration. Indeed, the film’s noir intent is marked by Frank Tuttle, the director of the English language version, who is best known for the film noir, This Gun for Hire (1942). The choice of Schüfftan as cinematographer for a production such as this is hardly surprising, not least because of his knowledge of both French and English, but also because the various lighting techniques employed on his
collaborations with Edgar Ulmer which lend themselves well to the *film noir* sensibilities of a production such as *Gunman in the Streets*. He was also used to such complex transnationalisms as a French product imitating an American style.

The predominantly French cast of both productions was led by the American actor Dane Clark, and French star Simone Signoret. Clark had himself recently appeared in a number of American *film noirs*, including *Moonrise* (Frank Borzage, 1948), *Without Honor* (Irving Pichel, 1949), and *Backfire* (Vincent Sherman, 1950). Clark plays Eddy Roback, an American gangster on the run in Paris, and Signoret his ex-mistress, Denise, whom Clark impresses upon for money in order to cross the border to Belgium.

Figure 43: The atmospheric photography of *Gunman in the Streets* recalls *Le Quai des brumes*. 
The moody fog-bound atmosphere of Schüfftan’s lighting recalls his photography of *Le Quai des brumes*, which has itself been seen as a precursor to the American *film noir* (Vincendeau, 2007: 26-27) (see Figure 43). Indeed, there are also a number of plot points and stylistic elements which recall *Le Quai des brumes*, suggesting that the film could have been an influence upon *Gunman in the Streets*, or that Schüfftan could have created a stylistic consistency between the two films due to the similar plots. For instance, Eddy Roback, like Jean in *Le Quai des brumes*, is an army deserter, and similarly, both characters are seeking to flee the borders of France (though in Roback’s case, this is due to his criminal gangster activities). This overlap between the two films can also be seen in the visually inventive opening to the film, in which we see the interception of Eddy’s police van by the mob reflected in a window in a nearby shop (see Figure 44). Ricochets smash the glass window of the shop, and then the bottles inside the window, obscuring our view of the action in the mirror. This recalls Carné’s predilection for framing action in mirrors, and through doorways, an effect which is dotted throughout *Le Quai des brumes*. 
However, the overriding influence on the film is the American film noir which it sought (and succeeded, given that is now remembered as an American production) to imitate. In this sense, *Gunman in the Streets* shares an affinity with a group of French gangster films of the 1950s, by the likes of Jules Dassin, which all looked to the American cinema as their influence (Vincendeau, 2007: 35).

The French industry of the 1950s (where, if anywhere, Schüfftan was most settled during this turbulent period) offered more varied opportunities to Schüfftan than had the same industry of the 1930s, or the Hollywood of the 1940s, allowing him to experiment in genres and styles beyond those of the psychological dramas with which he had become so closely associated. Such an opportunity presented itself to Schüfftan following the completion of *Gunman in the*
Streets in April 1950. The film in question was *Les Joyeux pèlerins/The Happy Pilgrims*, a musical comedy directed by the Turkish born actor Fred Pasquali, which marked a complete shift from the moody atmosphere of *Gunman in the Streets*. Filming took place between September and November 1950, both on location on the Côte d'Azur and in the studios of Paris, in order to tell the story of Lui-même (Aimé Barelli) and his band members, who are taking a pilgrimage to Rome. The story takes an unusual turn when a bomb explodes and the whole cast suddenly find themselves in Heaven. This particular scene was created by Schüfftan through the use of superimpositions giving the image an ethereal and unreal quality (see Figure 45). This use of special effects techniques also links back to Schüfftan’s earliest introduction to the film industry with the Schüfftan Process, and his continuing interest in special effects throughout his career.

Figure 45: Heaven in *Les Joyeux Pèlerins*.
Schüfftan's next project, another comedy, was to prove a significant one, both culturally and personally. *Le Banquet des fraudeurs/The Smugglers' Banquet* was one of the earliest European bi-lateral productions following the war which involved West Germany, with production taking place between August and October, 1951 (Bergfelder, 2005: 61-62). In this case a West German and Belgian co-production, *Le Banquet des fraudeurs* was similarly interested in crossing borders within its narrative, taking a satirical look at smuggling across the Franco-German customs border. In fact, the film was written by Charles Spaak (one of France’s top scriptwriters of the period), whose brother was the president of the European Council. For Schüfftan, this was his earliest opportunity to reconnect with a nation and an industry he had been forced to flee from so many years previously. Of course, the war and the subsequent dissolution of the nation into the Democratic West and the Communist East had changed the face of Schüfftan's homeland and the industry within which he had spent his formative years beyond all recognition.

Despite the relative freedom that Schüfftan was experiencing following the effective censorship of his art in America, he was still keen to return to America if he could guarantee work as a cinematographer. After all, it was now a decade since he had arrived on American shores and first been denied admission to the union. In the time that had passed following the end of the war, immigration to America had eased and Schüfftan had become a US citizen. However, in a letter dated 24th January 1951, Elizabeth Dickinson of the Paul Kohner agency wrote to Schüfftan stating that she had 'discussed the possibility of your chances here. At the moment the situation does not look too good and you can be sure the Union would not act favorably if we asked. Curt Courant is still without work after his long fight and your cases

---

31 Curt Courant's story is certainly analogous to that of Schüfftan's. He began his career in Germany where was highly productive until the rise of the Nazis. From Germany he emigrated to Britain and then Paris, where he shot *The Man Who Knew Too Much* (Hitchcock, 1934), and like Schüfftan was a key figure to the aesthetic of Poetic Realism for shooting *La Bête humaine* (Renoir, 1938). He also worked with Schüfftan on films in France such as *Le Drame de Shanghai*
are similar. This ongoing situation of the union blocking him continued therefore despite Schüfftan’s American citizenship. This is perhaps why Schüfftan proves to be such a dislocated subject during this period, being unable to make films where he would choose, and even being subject to restrictions by the French film industry (as was the case for Carné’s *La Marie du port*).

These problems with the American industry were perhaps fortuitous, for this period of work in Europe ultimately proved to be highly productive for Schüfftan, who was able to enjoy his newfound freedom to act in the role of cinematographer on a variety of different projects and thereby leave a credited legacy. Furthermore, he was working once more in France, a country which had always acclaimed his greatness. Remarkably at this late juncture in his career, Schüfftan was also afforded the opportunity to direct a film, his first since *Das Ekel* in 1931. The film was *L’Hôtel-Dieu de Beaune*, a documentary short about the famous hospital in Beaune, for which Schüfftan was recognised in 1951 with the ‘Prix du Tourisme Français’. This choice of project on the part of Schüfftan demonstrates his continuing interest in realism, upon which he had founded his career in cinematography, but which (as we know), had become side-lined by the expectations placed upon him for Expressionism.

On Boxing Day, 1951, *Le Rideau cramoisi/The Crimson Curtain* moved into production, a short film for Alexandre Astruc, who had recently moved into directing having previously worked as a film critic. The film was based upon the short novel by Barbey D’Aurevilly and told the story of a Napoleonic soldier whose sexual encounter with the daughter of the family with whom he has been billeted has disastrous consequences. The film proved a success

---

32 From the Paul Kohner files at the Deutsche Kinemathek, Berlin.
when shown out of competition at the 1952 Cannes film festival, and would find a theatrical release in 1953 under the title *Les Crimes de l'amour*, when paired with another forthcoming Schüfftan project, *Mina de Vanghel*. However, it would seem that Schüfftan's own uniquely developed style still could not break the shackles of his past (mis)association with German Expressionism, with Ulrich Gregor noting of the film in 1957 'a thoroughly expressionistic photography, an obviously Murnau-inspired sensitivity to the dramatic contrast of light and dark.' (Bacher, 1978: 84) Though delivered in praise, such a comment is a misleading representation of the complex development of Schüfftan's own style, in which the sensitive use of chiaroscuro lighting is a result of balancing this technique alongside his formative experience in realism and the atmospheric lighting techniques employed during Poetic Realism. To ascribe the lighting techniques used in this film to a single director and his work in Expressionism is therefore a diminution of Schüfftan's own nuanced style.

Production was completed on *Le Rideau cramoisi* in January 1952 after a brief six day shoot, and Schüfftan rapidly moved on to another French project, *La Putain respectueuse/The Respectful Prostitute*, which began filming in March, 1952. Schüfftan's presence on this production is perhaps in part thanks to Alexandre Astruc's role as writer on this adaptation of Jean-Paul Sartre's original play. It tells the story of Lizzie (Barbara Laage), a prostitute who is witness to the murder of a black man at the hands of Fred (Yvan Desny), the white son of a senator (Marcel Herrand). The only other witness is another black man whom Fred attempts to frame by persuading Lizzie to give evidence which states that he had attempted to rape her.

Although a French film based upon a French play, *La Putain respectueuse* is embedded in an American context in that it deals with race relations and the prejudice of American law enforcement. In adherence to the narrative therefore, the directors Charles Brabant and
Marcel Pagliero have attempted to create an American style of film, to which presumably Schüfftan, with experience of the American industry, would have been an essential element. This was helped by the casting of Barbara Laage in the starring role of Lizzie, who had recently failed to ignite a film career in America. Her experience as a Parisian theatre actress struggling to break into film was chronicled in *Life* on 3rd June 1946, which, among other things, noted her American style (Leen, 1946: 107). Following the success of this article, Laage was brought to America by agent William Morris, in order to woo producers (also chronicled by *Life*) (Anon., 1946). The starring role of *The Lady from Shanghai* (Orson Welles, 1947) was in fact written for Laage, however, for some reason the part was awarded to Rita Hayworth and Laage returned to France having failed to establish a Hollywood film career.

*La Putain respectueuse* presents a deliberate play on this Hollywood construction of beauty, to which Laage’s *Life* articles attest so well. On the one hand Lizzie fulfils the stereotype of the ‘dumb blonde’ that was currently being propagated in Hollywood in the form of Marilyn Monroe. Laage wears exaggerated make-up, as can be seen in Figure 46, and in the early stages of the film even speaks in a squeaky high-pitched voice, reminiscent of Lina Lamont (Jean Hagen) in *Singin’ in the Rain* (Stanley Donen and Gene Kelly, 1952), which was released during the filming of *La Putain respectueuse*. This functions to make comment upon societal presumptions and prejudices. At the start of the film Lizzie is therefore presented as a rather ridiculous characterization. However this outward appearance is intended to feed into our presumptions and prejudices, in order to create a greater impact as we come to learn of Lizzie’s moral integrity. For whilst Sartre’s play has been remembered for its racial politics, the play and the film also highlight the injustices that are enacted upon

---

33 Pagliero was a product of Italian Neorealism, having acted in Rossellini’s *Roma, città aperta/Rome, Open City* (1945), and directed *Roma città libera/Rome Free City* (1946).

34 Hayworth was Welles’ then wife, though their relationship fell-apart soon after the release of *The Lady from Shanghai*. 
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Lizzie for her profession. Lizzie stands up for what she believes to be right, despite being seen by the Senator and his family as morally bankrupt. The key to Schüfftan’s lighting of Lizzie in fact lies in the title of the film, *La Putain respectueuse*. Schüfftan aids in this construction of Lizzie’s character by employing classic female star lighting at the beginning of the film, in particular a strong use of back light, and a high angled key light on Laage to emphasize her high cheek bones. However, as the film continues Schüfftan’s lighting techniques of Lizzie become more complex, reflecting our greater understanding of Lizzie and we begin to see beyong her constructed image. This new lighting structure for Lizzie can be characterized through a greater use of shadow and low-key lighting (suggesting the complexity of her character), and a greater use of soft-focus for emotional empathy from the spectator.

![Figure 46: Barbara Laage in *La Putain respectueuse*.](image-url)
Schüfftan completed work on *La Putain respectueuse* in May. His next project was another radical shift in style and genre, in what was proving to be the most erratic period of Schüfftan’s career. From making a film about racial politics based on a Sartre play, Schüfftan then worked upon the biblical epic *Le Chemin de Damas/Road to Damascus*, which began filming in June. The film was directed by Max Glass, who was well known as a writer during the 1920s and 30s in Germany, but who was forced to leave at a similar time to Schüfftan, moving primarily into producing in France. Michel Simon stars in this biblical epic, depicting the events surrounding the conversion of Paul. *Le Chemin de Damas* stands as unusual example in the French context, of an attempt to replicate the Hollywood successes of the sword and sandal epics. There is somewhat of a pattern developing in the 1950s therefore, of Schüfftan working upon American-influenced projects in France. These films can be viewed as a consequence of the Blum-Byrnes agreement 1948, which allowed American studios to flood the French market at a time when audiences were eager for American films following the war (Hayward, 2005: 24-25). Such American-influenced products can therefore be seen as an attempt by the French market to appropriate the American success. As for Schüfftan, similarly to *La Putain respectueuse* and *Gunman in the Streets*, his presence on *Le Chemin de Damas* could be due to his time spent in Hollywood, and the will of the directors to appropriate an American genre, even though the historical epic was not a genre that Schüfftan had experience of during his time in America.

Following this Schüfftan worked on *Mina de Vanghel*, a short film directed by Maurice Clavel and Maurice Barry, which represented yet another shift in genre for the cinematographer. Based upon the novella by the French author Stendhal, the film tells the story of Mina, who falls in love with a married man. In an effort to get close to him she takes a job as a servant in the household, but after she has seduced him and they spend the night together Mina commits suicide. The film was released alongside the thematically similar
short *Le Rideau cramoisi* (also shot by Schüfftan) in the following year under the title *Les Crimes de l'amour*. The year of 1952 had seen a degree of settlement for the Schüfftans, with a number of filmmaking projects based in France. However, this came to an end in the winter of 1952 when the Schüfftans were on the move once more, this time to Zurich for the film *Die Venus vom Tivoli/Venus of Tivoli*, under the direction of Leonard Steckel, an Austro-Hungarian better known for his acting, and who had in fact acted a part in *Unsichtbare Gegner* in 1933, under the gaze of Schüfftan's camera. The film follows the time spent by a young actress in Switzerland, before she must leave for South America.

Shooting on *Die Venus vom Tivoli* ran until February of 1953, at which point Schüfftan moved to Rome for the production of *Ulisse/Ulysses*, where he stayed until the start of December. This was Schüfftan’s biggest film for some time, perhaps even his biggest to this date, although his role was rather less involved than unusual. Rather than cinematography, Schüfftan was hired to work on ‘Special Photographic Effects’, a return to his very first introduction to the industry with the Schüfftan Process. *Ulisse* was a large-scale super-production for Lux Films by the producing team of Carlo Ponti and Dino De Laurentiis, who were keen to bring the European 'Art' film to a wider mainstream audience, and saw an adaptation of Homer's *The Odyssey* as their opportunity to achieve this. Once again, this project had a strong flavour of the transnational, between European and American filmmaking. The film was made under the direction of Mario Camerini with a predominantly European crew. However, this was headlined by the American cinematographer Harold Rosson, and the otherwise Italian cast starred the American actors Kirk Douglas and Anthony Quinn. Even the Italian script was nuanced by the American screen and playwright, Ben Hecht. This cross-fertilization sought to both target European audiences and appeal to American distributors.
Rosson’s presence on *Ulisse* as cinematographer rather than Schüfftan is perhaps due to his celebrated use of colour, for which he won his first Academy award on *The Wizard of Oz* (Victor Fleming, 1939). Schüfftan’s failure to be admitted into the ASC in the 1940s, which had forced him to work in the smaller studios of Poverty Row, prevented him from being trained in colour photography when Technicolor was first being introduced by the major studios. If Schüfftan had not already been inextricably linked to a chiaroscuro style of photography, this lack of training or access undoubtedly sealed his fate as a black and white cinematographer. This is yet another way in which the protectionism of the American union had adversely affected Schüfftan’s career.

Alternatively, it is possible that Schüfftan was never intended to be any part of the production of *Ulisse*, but when consulted briefly for the film on how to use certain effects techniques, Schüfftan’s insight became invaluable to the production. In a letter dated 13th November, 1956, to Ilse Lahn (his contact at the Paul Kohner agency), Schüfftan laments the drive amongst producers to hire cheaper, inexperienced craftspeople, however offers a point on which Lahn may be able to find him future work:

> Of course one asks for young people in the film business but there are many problems where one needs my experience. It happens very often that they want an information how this or that problem is to solve. So you can sell me always when there are problems in the production technic [sic]. I am always to their disposition even I don't get the job. Of course one is more or less obliged to give me the job and more safe if one does so. The same happened with “Ulyss”.  

It seems therefore that Schüfftan’s initial advice for the production turned into a full contract, which saw him work in Rome on the special effects, of which there are numerous examples

---

35 Correspondence dated 13th November, 1956, from the Eugen Schüfftan file of the Paul Kohner archive, held at the *Deutsche Kinemathek*, Berlin.
in *Ulisse*. Principal among them is the encounter between Ulysses and his men with Polyphemus, the cyclops. It is highly likely that Schüfftan would have been involved in such an effect, based upon combining two different scales within a single image, given his pedigree with the Schüfftan Process (see Figure 47). Although not credited for cinematography, it would seem that Schüfftan considered his contribution and assistance to Rosson’s work enough to express his role as cinematographer as well as special effects advisor in his curriculum vitae.\footnote{From the Eugen Schüfftan file of the Paul Kohner archive, held at the Deutschn Kinemathek, Berlin.}

![The cyclops in Ulisse.](image)

*Ulisse* would provide an unusual legacy in the history of the cinema, when ten years after it was filmed, Jean-Luc Godard would mount a cinematic attack against the industry and his
producers, in his film *Le Mépris/Contempt* (1963), which plots an attempt to film a version of *The Odyssey*. Carl Ponti, a producer of *Ulisse*, was amongst the producers of *Le Mépris*, who had attempted to guide Godard away from his vision into a more commercially viable product. In the film Godard offers a deep satire of the American-style of doing film business, in particular through the tensions between producers, looking for a commercial product, and the director (played by Fritz Lang), who is struggling to make an ‘art film’.

Schüfftan was retained in Italy during 1954 for his next project, a stark contrast to the epic scale of *Ulisse*. The film, titled *Una parigina a Roma/A Parisian in Rome*, was a co-production between the West German company Copa-Filmgesellschaft and the Italian production company Rivo-Film, which followed a bi-lateral co-production agreement that had been established between West Germany and Italy in 1953, in the wake of a similar agreement between West Germany and France in 1951 (Bergfelder, 2005: 62). The film was shot in Italian by the German director Erich Kobler, and starred two popular Italian leads, the comic actor Alberto Sordi and the actress Anna-Maria Ferrero, with *La Putain respectueuse*’s Barbara Laage completing the main cast. Schüfftan’s photography lacks the definition and intricacies of his usual style, favouring a general illumination of the set, as opposed to the structured chiaroscuro lighting model Schüfftan usually employed, of strong key light, soft fill, and strong backlight. Although it is important to note that a genre such as the romantic comedy hardly required the same psychological depth and detail of lighting that Schüfftan excelled in providing (as we saw with *Drôle de drame*).
Later in 1954 Schüfftan continued his migratory experience by returning to France to film another co-production, between France and Germany, made possible by the above mentioned agreement. The film was *Marianne de ma Jeunesse*/*Marianne of My Youth* (*Marianne* for its German release), based upon the novel by Peter von Mendelssohn set in a boys private school. Production on *Marianne de ma Jeunesse* ran between August and November 1954, under the direction of the acclaimed French director Julien Duvivier. However, Schüfftan's role was not his usual one of cinematographer, rather this duty was performed by Léonce-Henri Burel who had worked as a cinematographer in France since 1914, including a credit on *Napoléon* (Abel Gance, 1927). Following his work on *Marianne de ma Jeunesse*, Burel would go on to achieve success in his cinematography with Robert Bresson. Schüfftan instead performed his other regular duties on special effects throughout this production.
During this period of work Schüfftan’s lighting choices can be characterized as rather uneven, a consequence of the wide variety of genres that he had been asked to work upon. The late 1930s in France and the 1940s in America had seen a predominance of work upon psychological dramas, as Schüfftan began to nuance his artistically-influenced style. Edgar Ulmer best exemplifies this pigeon-holing of Schüfftan’s style, who as we have seen previously in this chapter, employed Schüfftan only for his more dramatic works. The late 1940s and 1950s saw Schüfftan abandon the security of his collaborative work, leading to him accepting roles on films of a variety of genres and in a variety of industries. This variety accounts for the inconsistencies in his lighting, and what can be considered as inexperience in working in genres such as comedies (which he had not encountered since the 1930s). We can also attribute these challenges to the working life of a cinematographer, struggling from one project to the next. In order to stabilize his career Schüfftan soon sought work in the new medium of television, although as we shall see, this offered its own fresh challenges.

**Television**

Schüfftan’s output stalled somewhat over the next few years, as he attempted to reconnect with the American industry, and to utilize the new medium of television by mounting his own European/American bi-lateral productions. These included a television series of *King Arthur’s Knights of the Round Table*, a film called *Noa Noa* about the travels in Tahiti of the artist Paul Gauguin, and *Lady of Portofino*, a film which was to star Shelly Winters and to be directed by Harry Horner. This project reached the stage of Schüfftan having a contract drawn up. This contract reveals that the picture was due to start shooting in Italy on 15th
April 1955, with Schüfftan on a wage of $550 per week plus expenses. Ultimately none of these mooted projects were in fact realized, although one other unusual project, *The First 99* (also known as *American Whisky*) did emerge for Schüfftan during this period. *The First 99* is a short film directed in 1956 by Joy Batchelor, of the married animation duo Halas & Batchelor, best known for their version of *Animal Farm* (1954). The film comprised part live action and part animation, and was made from a script written by Batchelor and Tom Orchard, who had previously worked together on the scripts for the Marshall Plan film *Shoemaker and the Hatter* (1949) and *Animal Farm* (1954). The blend of mediums is not the only interesting factor of this film, for this is the first film on which Schüfftan is credited with colour cinematography (no doubt informed by his recent special effects work on the lavish colour production of *Ulisse* (1953)). Little is now known of the film, but personal correspondence with Vivien Halas, daughter of Halas and Batchelor, and Jim Walker who helped to establish the Halas & Batchelor collection, has revealed some details of the script. According to Jim Walker:

> The pre-title sequence reads: Four Roses Distillers Company Presents (fades to title American Whisky). The opening of the film is in a documentary format and shows a building site and the expansive view of a city as a construction lift goes up (I suspect that the view is of New York).

Furthermore, Schüfftan’s colour work proved to be a great success with Louis de Rochemont and other members of the crew. In a letter to Schüfftan dated 18th June 1956, Tom Orchard wrote the following kind words:

---

37 This is revealed in correspondence from Ilse Lahn of the Paul Kohner talent agency to Eugen Schüfftan, dated 24th January 1955. This letter is held in the Eugen Schüfftan files of the Paul Kohner archive, Deutsche Kinemathek, Berlin.

38 Correspondence dated 18th June 1956, available from the Eugen Schüfftan files of the Paul Kohner archive, Deutsche Kinemathek, Berlin.
This is a note of appreciation for the job you did as Director of Cinematography on *The First 99*, produced for the House of Seagram. Everyone who has seen it rejoices in the color photography and especially in the lighting of the difficult interior situations.

Quite in addition to the technical and professional qualifications you brought to our production your unfailing good humour and marked co-operative spirit. It was a pleasure to work with you and I hope there will come an opportunity when we can do so again.

Unfortunately, such an opportunity to work with these filmmakers did not arise again. Nevertheless, Schüfftan’s work on this production demonstrates not only his desire, but also his ability to work in colour. He had been almost entirely prevented from working in this medium by his problems with the ASC, and the close association that had been forged for Schüfftan with black and white photography. *The First 99* became one of only few opportunities for Schüfftan to work in colour. It would undoubtedly have been a pleasure for Schüfftan to receive such a kind commendation from Tom Orchard, a stark contrast to the unsavoury relationships which would emerge with the crew on his very next production.

The production in question saw Schüfftan continue to pursue avenues beyond cinematic film production. Schüfftan, like a number of other cinematographers, was acutely aware of the benefits of long-term employment on a successful television series. Schüfftan’s eventual introduction to television dates back to his time working for the Producers Releasing Corporation (PRC) in the 1940s. PRC had been established by the brothers Sam Newfield and Sigmund Neufeld, with Sam becoming a prolific director for the organization. The head of production during Schüfftan’s tenure was Leon Fromkess, who in the early 1950s moved full-force into the fledgling industry of television. In 1952 he set up Television Programs of America (TPA) alongside Edward Small, which produced *The Adventures of Ellery Queen* (1954) and *Lassie* (1954), amongst many others.
Schüfftan had been discussing the possibility of working in television with Fromkess as early as 1954, when a European-American co-production of *King Arthur’s Knights of the Round Table* was a strong prospect.\(^3^9\) This fell through, but another opportunity arose in 1956, when Schüfftan entered into discussions with Fromkess about another project, *New York Confidential*, to be based upon the 1955 film of the same name (directed by Russell Rouse).

In a letter to Fromkess dated 23\(^{rd}\) May 1956, Schüfftan revealed that he had still been involved in inventions, and felt that his latest maybe of significant use to *New York Confidential*: ‘I think that I can be very useful for your Television series. Especially with my new process I am able to bring the takings of the street in New York together with the takings in the studio in such a manner that you don't lose any time with the actors in the street. Perhaps you will say one did this before but my process is absolutely new.’\(^4^0\) However, as with King Arthur, *New York Confidential* failed to get off the ground (though Fromkess would eventually realize the project – albeit with little success – in 1959). Thankfully, Fromkess’s next television venture did reach production, and Schüfftan was hired as the cinematographer. The series was *Hawkeye and the Last of the Mohicans*, based on the work of James Fenimore Cooper, and starring John Hart as Hawkeye and Lon Chaney in the role of Chingachgook. Schüfftan moved for production on 2\(^{nd}\) July 1956, to Toronto, a city in which he had been instrumental in establishing a film studio a decade earlier.

Production on the series did not get off to a successful start, for it was immediately hit by delays which postponed the start of filming until 30\(^{th}\) July. Filming eventually began on *Hawkeye*, however the situation did not improve for Schüfftan, who was subject to hostility from the series director, Sam Newfield, and its producer, his brother, Sigmund. In the

\(^3^9\) Discussed in a correspondence from Ilse Lahn of the Paul Kohner talent agency, dated 10\(^{th}\) October 1954. Available from the Eugen Schüfftan file of the Paul Kohner archive, Deutsche Kinemathek, Berlin.

\(^4^0\) Correspondence from Eugen Schüfftan to Leon Fromkess dated 23\(^{rd}\) May 1956. Available from the Eugen Schüfftan file of the Paul Kohner archive, Deutsche Kinemathek, Berlin.
following correspondence to his agent Ilse Lahn, Schüfftan discusses the strained relationship on set:

Sam Newfield has not the intention to learn anything from me, because he cuts me out if a creative work is in the question. If there are any suggestions from me he doesn't listen, so I have nothing to contribute to the picture than my technic. [sic]

At the moment I am on better terms with Sam. Anyhow I did some real positive things for TV series, a fact which will never be acknowledged by Newfield freres because they are afraid I would get a too good name in the Fromkes-Small group. 41

Newfield was keen to have Schüfftan replaced by an inexperienced English cinematographer, who would save Leon Fromkess money and who would be forced to demure to Newfield’s directorial control. For it would seem that Newfield resented Schüfftan’s renown and experience, and viewed all the benefits which Schüfftan brought to the production as undermining his role as director. Chief amongst these benefits was an invention of Schüfftan’s, which increased the productivity of the exterior crew immensely. Schüfftan explained the benefits of his invention to Ilse Lahn in a letter dated 17th October 1956:

I am sure the company here would got have rid of me if not the following had happened. The weather here changes permanently, about 40-80 times from sunshine to gray weather. The picture has ca. 80% exteriors and I found the way, with or without sunshine, that means in gray weather, to shoot with artificially replaced light, one thought this for impossible. For this reason they cannot discharge me so easily. Several pictures have already been delivered and the photography as well very well accepted. 42


42 Correspondence from Eugen Schüfftan to Ilse Lahn dated 17th October 1956. Available from the Eugen Schüfftan file of the Paul Kohner archive, Deutsche Kinemathek, Berlin.
Further emphasizing the success of this process, Schüfftan reveals in the same letter that another production company shooting a television series in Montreal lost three weeks of shooting due to weather conditions, whereas the begrudging Sam Newfield lost not a day of shooting on *Hawkeye and the Last of the Mohicans*. It seems that if there was one thing that Schüfftan had learned from his nomadic/schizophrenic period of work during the 1950s it was adaptability.

![Image](image)

Figure 49: Schufftan was able to maintain constant light levels on *Hawkeye and the Last of the Mohicans*, despite the changeable weather conditions.

By Christmas of 1956 Schüfftan was back in New York, having left the production on bad terms after filming only nineteen episodes. Schüfftan perhaps got the last laugh over Sam Newfield and Leon Fromkess on this unsavoury affair, thanks to his agent Ilse Lahn, who wrote the following to him on 22nd February 1957:
Today the trades carried reviews of the first LAST MOHICAN segment and the reviews were terrible. The only kind word the critics have to say is about your camerawork […] I also wired Leon in Toronto rubbing this in a little and saying that your contribution evidently was greater than he had been led to believe as the reviewers' evaluation of it is an unbiased one and they rarely go out of their way to praise the camerawork of a show they otherwise consider bad.43

A New (or Old) Direction

After completing work on *Hawkeye* there were a number of opportunities open to Schüfftan, who despite his mistreatment had not entirely abandoned the idea of working in television. Amongst these possibilities was a French television series, *Paris Herald*. Schüfftan was also keen to contact Edgar Ulmer in the early months of 1957 for the possibility of a reunion. Neither of these options materialized, and Schüfftan instead left New York for Paris in the spring of 1957, where he was to stay until August, for work on *La Première nuit/The First Night*, a short film for the director Georges Franju. This would be the first of three collaborations with Franju at the end of the 1950s which would provide some stylistic consistency to Schüfftan’s work, following a disjointed decade during which Schüfftan had been hopping around Europe and Canada to perform his duties on a wide variety of differing genres. This was therefore a fresh break for Schüfftan, but also a return to his established practices of photography, which he had developed during the 1930s in Europe, and the 1940s in America.

Georges Franju, alongside his friend Henri Langlois, had been the founding fathers of the Cinémathèque Française in 1936, which was concerned with the preservation of cinema.

43 Correspondence from Ilse Lahn to Eugen Schüfftan dated 22nd February 1957. Available from the Eugen Schüfftan file of the Paul Kohner archive, Deutsche Kinemathek, Berlin.
Franju’s own cinema emerged in the following decade, when he began his filmmaking career with a series of documentaries, primarily concerned with the effects of modernity and human brutality to animals. By the time Franju came to work with Schüfftan he had already completed thirteen such documentary projects, however, *La Première nuit* was set to be his first foray into fiction filmmaking. This *court métrage* is a wordless film which follows the night spent by a young boy (Pierre Devis) inside a Métro station, after he had been locked in when following a mysterious girl (Lisbeth Persson). The boy dreams throughout the night of fleeting ghostly encounters with the girl in the Métro.

The film succeeds in balancing both Franju’s documentary past and the eerie atmospheres he would develop in his later feature length productions. Kate Ince (2005: 44) has noted of the film that, ‘an unmistakably documentary interest in the Métro’s architecture and the movement of its trains is inextricably melded to a storyline about adolescent desire and subterranean mystery. The photographer who realized Franju’s ghostly vision in *La Première nuit* was Eugen Shuftan, the experienced contributor to German expressionism.’ As I have argued throughout this thesis, Schüfftan’s style was never rooted in German Expressionism. In fact, through an understanding of Schüfftan’s early interest in realism, plus his painterly interests, and his later stylistic developments, we can see how Schüfftan is perfectly placed to capture the balance of Franju’s ‘documentary interest’ and ‘mystery’ narrative (foreshadowing *La Tête contre les murs*, which is addressed in part two of this chapter).

These two rather dialectic approaches to filmmaking are separated in the narrative, of which the first half follows the young boy in the Métro station, and the second half traces his dream once he has been locked inside. These dialectics of style in Schüfftan’s work are addressed later in this thesis in Chapter IV, Part Two, with reference to a number of films shot by Schüfftan in New York City, however I shall briefly expand on this style here. The
documentary interest in architecture described by Ince can be seen in the first half of the narrative through the lighting and framing. Natural light sources seem to be favoured, in order to highlight the construction of the architectural space. The dream-space sees a shift in style to two approaches of a more exaggerated form of lighting. The first of these more stylized forms of lighting can be seen in the close-ups of the dream-space. In these close-ups Schüfftan offers a softer, more diffused use of light (particularly in the shots of the ghostly girl, see Figure 50). The second of these stylized approaches can be seen in the mid-long shots and long shots, which display a high contrast use of lighting, and intense use of shadow (see Figure 51). Due to the use of this high contrast lighting in parts of the dream-space, it is therefore unsurprising that the lighting style of this film has been connected to techniques of German Expressionism, which also sought to explore a character’s psyche through light. The exaggerated forms of lighting can be seen as a consequence of the deeply subjective dream sequence. Indeed, the high-contrast chiaroscuro lighting of long-shots described above is much harsher than the nuanced techniques that Schüfftan had developed following the practices of Rembrandt. It is perhaps this effect which has mistakenly led Ince to connect Schüfftan’s career to German Expressionism, rather than exploring his own unique stylistic development.
Figure 50: Schufftan employs a soft diffused light in the close-ups of the dream sequence in *La Première nuit*. 
Upon completion of La Première nuit Schüfftan returned to his base in New York. From here he began to pursue projects with his agent Ilse Lahn, in February and March of 1958. Despite the success of his work and the high regard he was held in by his colleagues, Schüfftan nevertheless had not worked as the cinematographer on a major film since Le Quai des brumes in 1938, and he was sorely seeking a comeback. Schüfftan hoped for the possibility of a reunion with Fritz Lang or Billy Wilder, as they had both returned to Europe to shoot films, however nothing materialized. Instead, another Franju project presented itself to Schüfftan, which was to be Franju’s first feature length fiction film. Whilst still hoping to be hired again by Leon Fromkess (as this would have proven more lucrative), Schüfftan nevertheless accepted the role as cinematographer on La Tête contre les murs/Head Against the Wall. Schüfftan commented of the project prior to shooting, that ‘[it] certainly will make
me a good reputation and I hope directors [such] as [Anatole] Litvak, Wilder, Sirk etc. will have no objections that I work for them in Europe.⁴⁴ The film that Schüfftan believed would make him such a good reputation tells the story of François (Jean-Pierre Mocky), whose disturbing behaviour results in his father interning him in a psychiatric hospital. The doctors of the hospital are torn between how best to treat François, with classical or modern techniques. Meanwhile, the reluctant patient resolves to escape the hospital alongside fellow inmate Heurtevant (Charles Aznavour). Their attempt fails, and results in the suicide of Heurtevant. François tries once more to escape, and this time succeeds, taking refuge with his girlfriend Stéphanie (Anouk Aimée). Clearly the asylum setting was crucial to the film, and therefore Franju chose to shoot the film on location in the Psychiatric Hospital of Dury. The creation of this asylum space through Schüfftan’s cinematography forms the focus of the second part of this chapter. As Franju explains, the asylum had a significant effect upon the cast and crew during shooting:

I insisted on shooting in an actual mental hospital so that everyone would be in the atmosphere. We were in it for six weeks, and it comes over in the film. Cameramen, technicians, actors, we all lived as a community in their community. We hardly emerged from it. We returned to Paris on Saturdays . . . we stayed in a hotel, and incidentally if we’d slept in the asylum, we’d still be there. (In: Durgnat, 1967: 70)

Raymond Durgnat (1967: 70), in whose book the above quote is printed, also notes that a few people in particular were affected by the mental hospital: ‘The atmosphere was so oppressive that on their first visit Anouk [Aimée] and Schuftan [sic] were in tears, and, in the course of shooting, Franju had to take to his bed for a few days.’

Whilst still in Amiens shooting *La Tête contre les murs*, Schüfftan was avidly pursuing another avenue of employment. Universal studios were set to employ him for one of his special effects techniques, on a proposed version of *Gulliver’s Travels*. Whether this technique was new, or simply a revision of the groundbreaking Schüfftan process is unclear, though it is known that Universal was keen to cut out many months of post-production work which would delay the release. As the director Jack Sher explained to Schüfftan in a letter dated 23rd May 1958, ‘our script involves split-screen work, miniatures, the use of mock-ups and other standard tricks that are extremely costly. If your process can eliminate the necessity for six months of special printing after the picture is photographed, I know that we will be extremely interested.’ This turned out to be another missed opportunity for Schüfftan, although Jack Sher did succeed in bringing *The 3 Worlds of Gulliver* to the screen in 1960. Instead, Schüfftan remained in Europe once *La Tête contre les murs* had completed shooting in July 1958, taking a rare trip back to Germany. In Munich he successfully sold the process he had developed when working on *Hawkeye and the Last of the Mohicans* to three German television stations. Schüfftan had perhaps chosen Germany for the sale of this process because, as he revealed to Ilse Lahn in a letter of 13th November 1956, he saw great similarity between the constantly changing weather conditions of Canada and that of North Germany.

Having returned to New York for Christmas, Schüfftan was soon back in Paris in February 1959, where he had been employed by Georges Franju once more to film his next project, *Les Yeux sans visage/Eyes Without a Face*. The film followed Franju’s steady move away from documentary filmmaking. This was Franju’s second full length fiction film, and it co-opted many of the tropes of the horror genre. The spectral quality of Schüfftan’s lighting of the

---

45 Correspondence from Jack Sher to Eugen Schüfftan, dated 23rd May 1958. Available from the Eugen Schüfftan file of the Paul Kohner archive, Deutsche Kinemathek, Berlin.

dream sequence in *La Premiere nuit* was fully emphasized in *Les Yeux sans visage*, making full use of Schüfftan’s brooding, atmospheric use of light. The film also developed Franju’s interest in madness. The story is that of Dr Génessier (Pierre Brasseur), a surgeon whose daughter, Christiane (Edith Scob), has suffered extreme facial scarring in a car accident. Génessier covers Christiane’s face in a plain white mask and keeps her hidden inside the house. Keen to recapture his daughter’s former beauty, the Doctor kidnaps other young women, and attempts an experimental surgery whereby he removes the skin from their face and attempts to graft it on to his daughter.

I discuss the affinity of Schüfftan’s lighting style to the direction of Franju in the subsequent chapter on *La Tête contre les murs*, and so will concern myself here only with a specific, memorable image from *Les Yeux sans visage*, the masked face of Edith Scob, by way of illustrating the extraordinary fluidity of Schüfftan’s lighting and camerawork. For Ince (2005: 106), faciality is central to Franju’s creation of horror: ‘Eugen Shuftan’s photography of Franju’s imagery of faces, masks and facelessness haunts more powerfully than any drama of looks, perhaps simply because of the subliminal hold that facial form has on spectral perception.’ Deleuze and Guattari have discussed faciality in terms of semiotic systems, principally significance and subjectification, which suggests how the lack of face in *Les Yeux sans visage* can function to create horror. They state, ‘Significance is never without a white wall upon which it inscribes its signs and redundancies. Subjectification is never without a black hole in which it lodges its consciousness, passion, and redundancies.’ (2004: 186) The face becomes the site of interface for these two systems, and becomes a necessary tool for decoding signifiers in verbal communication (*Ibid.*). Deleuze and Guattari also draw film lighting into this debate, noting that, ‘In film, the close-up of the face can be said to have two poles: make the face reflect light or, on the contrary, emphasize its shadows to the point of engulfing it’ (*Ibid.*). As I have demonstrated in this thesis, Rembrandt lighting, Schüfftan’s
favoured technique in facial lighting, in fact combines these two poles. One half of the face is flooded with light, while the other is shrouded in darkness. Indeed, despite the Expressionist lighting effects that have been identified by others in *Les Yeux sans visage*, Schüfftan avoids high contrast lighting of Christiane when she is wearing the mask (see Figure 52). This highlights the plasticity of Christiane’s mask, and her lack of expression. In terms of Deleuze and Guattari’s comments, her mask is simply a white wall, upon which nothing can be inscribed. Schüfftan retains this approach to lighting when Christiane has received a face transplant. In doing so, the suggestion through lighting is this new face is no better able to convey meaning than the blank mask.

![Figure 52: Les Yeux sans visage: Schüfftan avoids high contrast lighting of Christiane when she is wearing the mask.](image)

The occasion when Schüfftan’s lighting approach to Christiane does alter is when she removes her mask and is seen by the young girl who has been kidnapped. Here the horror of her scarred face is seen for the first time. Schüfftan emphasizes the out of focus image
through a use of low level lighting, with a beam cast across her eyes. Gone is the white wall, the black hole has taken over and consumed the face. Subjectification is all that is left.

Figure 53: Christiane (Edith Scob) without her mask in *Les Yeux sans visage*.

*Les Yeux sans visage* has received renewed attention recently, thanks to Pedro Almodóvar’s homage to the film in his recent *La piel que habito/The Skin I Live In* (2011), which is similarly the story of a doctor who keeps a young girl hostage and in a white mask, as a test subject for the new skin he has created. In interview, Almodóvar has naturally acknowledged the influence of Franju: ‘I thought a lot about Georges Franju’s *Eyes Without a Face*, which offers a very lyrical brand of horror. At one point I even considered making *The Skin I Live In* as silent cinema, in black and white, in the style of Fritz Lang or Murnau – although I pulled back as I didn’t think it would be very commercial. I did, however, spend months thinking about it’ (in: Delgado, 2011: 22).

The late 1940s and 1950s had proven to be a challenging period of work for Schüfftan, in which he was largely unable to develop his distinctive style, thanks to the many various
genres he worked upon. He had faced many frustrations in his migratory experience, and had even sought a move into the television industry in the hope of securing more regular work. Nonetheless, towards the end of this period Schüfftan did get back on track through his collaborations with Georges Franju, with whom he was able to return to his established stylistic tendencies. This would lead to a hugely successful period of work for Schüfftan in the 1960s, in both France and America.
Part Two

Case Study
The Cinematographic Representation of the Asylum Space in La Tête contre les murs (Franju, 1959)

Introduction

In this case study I will address Schüfftan’s lighting choices for a particular state of mind and a particular space; madness and the asylum. It is unsurprising to realize that a number of Schüfftan’s films deal with madness, having considered the conditions of his development as an artist already in this thesis. The expectations of Schüfftan in exile as a cinematographer, hailing from Germany at the end of the Weimar era, were for the celebrated visuals of the German Expressionist movement, pushing Schüfftan in an aesthetic direction away from his previous artistic choices of realism. The formulation of such a visual style was therefore necessitated by the types of projects which Schüfftan was being offered – the psychological narratives of Poetic Realism in France, followed by visual precursors to film noir in the form of the PRC thrillers Schüfftan shot on Poverty Row alongside Edgar Ulmer, when unable to gain membership to the ASC. It was therefore the conditions of Schüfftan’s exile – both in
terms of the expectations formed about him, and in terms of his stalling career that pushed him into Poverty Row – which pigeonholed him as a cinematographer primarily of psychological dramas, a limitation which seemed only to increase throughout his career as he perfected the art of black and white cinematography and of visualizing narratives of intrigue and madness, of disreputable characters and squalid locations. Amongst an abundance of such narratives, a number deal in particular with the theme of madness.

One particular film deals with this theme in relation to the asylum space: *La Tête Contre les murs* (1959) directed by Georges Franju. It is my intention in this chapter to discuss, through close textual reading, how Schüfftan uses his techniques of cinematography to visually create the space of the asylum setting, how his lighting functions in accordance with the narrative and how his lighting may further function to reveal the psychological torment of the protagonist. Furthermore, I will demonstrate how Franju’s theme functions to comment upon the state of the French nation, and contemporary practices in the treatment of the mentally ill. During the course of this case study I shall also draw parallels with *Lilith* (Rossen, 1963), a later American film photographed by Schüfftan under the direction of Robert Rossen, which similarly deals with an asylum setting.

*La Tête contre les murs* (1959) was the second collaboration between the French director Georges Franju and Schüfftan, following their work together on the *court métrage La Première nuit/The First Night* (1958). It is the story of a rebellious young man, François (Jean-Pierre Mocky), whose father seeks to discipline him and reassert his control over him by placing him within the confines of a mental institution. François has done nothing to demonstrate any mental illness, rather the asylum is employed in the penal sense, to punish François and to correct his behaviour, and as a way for the father to avoid bringing shame to the family name (for reasons that will become clear later). There is no oscillation between reason and madness in François’s mind, but instead a gradual decline in his sense of self, as
he is repeatedly caught in his attempts to escape and slowly conditioned to the impenetrable structures of the institution. The film acts as a critique of archaic psychiatric treatments which were still prevalent in France, when the country stood poised to adopt more humanitarian practices. Its concern with the French asylum system would anticipate wider concerns held by the French nation, exemplified by the anti-psychiatry movement, and in particular, Michel Foucault.

**Context**

Foucault’s attack on the institution of the asylum targets the basic premise of institutionalization, even laying blame with the very treatments that had radically reformed the system at the turn of the nineteenth century. Prior to this revolution, institutions which dated from the fourteenth century acted not for the care and rehabilitation of the mentally ill, but rather for the detainment of these individuals from the rest of civilized society, resulting in methods of torture and other bodily degradation upon the inhabitants. It is also important to note that the mentally ill were not the only peoples corralled in such a way, being housed alongside other degenerates of society such as the homeless and petty criminals. Bedlam in Britain, the most famous example, and other such institutions that had emerged, operated entirely through the public sector, which gave rise to such poor conditions for the mentally ill, and the disregard for any attempt at rehabilitation or treatment.

In the French context, it was not until the end of the seventeenth century that the government intervened and established two hospices in Paris that housed such perceived reprobates. Men were contained at Bicêtre, and women at the Salpêtrière. As Edward Shorter (1997: 6) explains:
These hôpitaux généraux were not hospitals but custodial institutions that attempted no pretense of therapy. Although both Bicêtre and the Salpêtrière came increasingly to house the insane, until the late nineteenth century they retained their character as hospices rather than psychiatric hospitals. Both retrospectively were known as scenes of horror, the inmates being regularly flogged, bound in chains, and subjected to stupefying hygienic conditions.

However, a revolution soon came for asylums and the treatment of the mentally ill, through Philippe Pinel. Pinel was appointed the operation of the Bicêtre hospice in Paris in 1793, and it was here that he would advance his theories of treatment of the mentally ill through therapy rather than degradation. Pinel’s most defining moment came in 1793 at Bicêtre, when he is thought to have first cast the shackles from his inmates, a symbolic gesture which profoundly advanced the belief in ‘moral treatment’ of the mentally ill. That gesture, now commonly remembered as le geste de Pinel, has since been proven a myth. Pinel’s associate Pussin was the first to achieve such a gesture in 1797, once Pinel had already departed Bicêtre (Wiener, 1994). Pinel’s reputation was nevertheless cemented by a book he published in 1801, in which he took his experiences at Bicêtre and then the Salpêtrière to propose a new approach to the incarceration of the mentally ill.

Pinel proposed this new ‘humane’ approach to treatment through therapy, which he termed traitement moral, soon translated as ‘Moral Treatment’. This approach would become instrumental in institutional reform of asylums across the Western World. This treatment nonetheless relied upon the institutional nature of the asylum in order codify the moral laws of wider society to effect a re-orientation to social boundaries.

However, despite being the country that had pioneered Moral Treatment, a model which relied upon the infrastructure of the asylum, the French state failed to implement its practice and to establish asylums nationwide. Such abject failures on behalf of the French state
resulted in a lack of provision for the increasing numbers of mentally ill who were being diagnosed by the advances in psychiatry. The rise of admissions in France proved equally dramatic: ‘By 1911, the 14 pavilions of the Sainte-Anne asylum in Paris, originally designed in 1867 for 490 patients, housed 1,100. When Vaucluse asylum in nearby Epinay-sur-Orge opened in 1869, it was slated for 500 patients; by 1911 it had over 1,000’ (Shorter, 1997: 47). Curiously however, it was not the failures of the state but rather their perceived omnipresence in mental health care which sparked the greatest backlash to the institution of the asylum. This occurred in the 1960s with the anti-psychiatry movement, whose greatest proponent was perhaps the French sociologist and historian Michel Foucault.

A primary belief of the anti-psychiatry movement was that institutionalization robbed the patient of humanity and individuality. Distressing examples of this were widespread in the twentieth century with the rise of electroconvulsive therapies and lobotomies, which both caused physical damage to parts of the brain in order to subdue patients. Aiding in these calls for deinstitutionalization was the invention of certain drugs which could calm patients and permit their reintroduction to society. The first of these drugs set to revolutionize psychiatry and the asylum system was chlorpromazine, discovered by the French surgeon Henri Laborit. Two further psychiatrists Jean Delay and Pierre Deniker carried out more extensive trials of the drug and worked to popularize its usage across the French mental health system. Quoting Caldwell, Edward Shorter (1997: 250) has noted the rapid success of chlorpromazine within the French system, so much so that by May of 1953:

“the atmosphere in the disturbed wards of mental hospitals in Paris was transformed: straightjackets, psychohydraulic packs and noise were things of the past! Once more, Paris psychiatrists who long ago unchained the chained, became pioneers in liberating their patients, this time from inner torments, and with a drug: chlorpromazine. It accomplished the pharmacological revolution of psychiatry.”
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Therefore the true advantage of drugs such as chlorpromazine was that it allowed patients to be reintegrated into society, without the necessity for the secularizing form of the institution, offering the possibility of self-medication. The rise of new drugs therefore offered an alternative, and emerged at a time when wider society was becoming increasingly troubled by the archaic forms of asylums and their practices, a fact which would be translated into cinematic representations of asylums such as those in *La Tête contre les murs* and *Lilith*, and which would be strongly pronounced by the anti-psychiatry movement of the 1960s.

The calling card for the anti-psychiatry movement was the publication of Michel Foucault’s *Folie et déraison: Histoire de la folie à l’âge classique/History of Madness* (more commonly reprinted in the abridged version *Madness and Civilization*) in 1961. Foucault’s criticisms of the institutionalization of society spoke to a culture who feared for the rights of their mentally ill, particularly considering the traumas currently being experienced during the Algerian war. In a chapter of particular relevance to this study, ‘The Birth of the Asylum’ (Foucault, 2006: 229-264), Foucault leveled his criticism against those founding fathers of the therapeutic asylum, Philippe Pinel and his English counterpart, William Tuke. Men who had been so praised for their humanitarian efforts to safeguard the mentally ill within their institutions, were now facing criticism for causing the order of the system and the horrors it had produced over the succeeding decades. Terming this widespread institutionalization of madness as ‘the great confinement’, Foucault accused the founders of Moral Therapy of establishing a ubiquitous model which was to set in motion the processes of segregation: ‘It is in the walls of confinement that Pinel and nineteenth-century psychiatry would come upon madmen; it is there – let us remember – that they would leave them, not without boasting of having “delivered” them’ (Foucault, 2006: 36). For Foucault, *le geste de Pinel* was not of freedom, but rather of control and confinement. Foucault’s text is of relevance to this case study in that it points to the two conflicting approaches to psychiatric treatment prevalent in the 1950s.
in asylums: Moral Therapy versus controlled drugs. As we shall see, these two approaches are similarly represented in the film in terms of the narrative, with the aid of Schüfftan’s cinematography.

Based on a novel of the same name by the French author Hervé Bazin, the film production of *La Tête contre les murs* germinated as a project for the young actor Jean-Pierre Mocky, who hoped the film could be his first project as director. However, as Mocky has detailed (Durgnat, 1967: 69), financiers balked at his youth and inexperience, forcing him to locate another, more experienced director, and to take instead a lead acting role for himself. Jules Dassin was considered, as was Marcel Camus and Alain Resnais, however none of these options materialized, leaving the documentarist Georges Franju to ultimately claim the role of director. Franju came to the project having made a series of successful short documentary films, and had only recently delved into fiction with *La Première nuit*. *La Tête contre les murs* was to be his first feature length fiction film.

Production of the film began in May 1958, and consisted largely of location shooting for the asylum setting at the Hospital Philippe Pinel (named after the founder of Moral Treatment) in the town of Dury, near Amiens. The asylum itself first opened its doors to patients on 17th October 1891.47 Built upon 34 hectares of land, the design of the asylum followed loosely
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47 On August 22nd, 1884, after it was decreed that a new mental asylum should be created for the Somme department, Emile Ricquier was granted duties as architect, and was instructed to follow the suggestions that had been laid forth by the psychiatrist Jean-Baptiste-Maximien Parchappe de Vinay. Construction of the Dury asylum began on 10th April 1886. Once it had opened few changes beset the asylum until the outbreak of the Second World War. The occupation of the area by the Germans on 19th May 1940 forced a nurse at the asylum, Mlle. Frances, to evacuate the patients on 29th May 1940, relocating them to a variety of different institutions. Despite the efforts of Mlle. Frances, a great number of patients died during the traumatic evacuation. Once Allied forces had reclaimed control over the area of Dury the asylum was employed as a military depot until July 1946, before finally reopening as an asylum in 1948. The 1950s saw a de-emphasis upon the institutional aspect of asylums, as the advent of new drugs began to reshape mental health care worldwide, and a conscientious effort came in 1956/57, to re-address the prison-like feel to the asylum.
Jeremy Bentham’s panopticon model,structuring the buildings around a central courtyard, in the centre of which stood the chapel. Thus the use of the Dury asylum in 1958 for *La Tête contre les murs* is of clinical historical interest in that it stands out as emblematic of the more archaic approach to mental illness.

The month in which production began on *La Tête contre les murs*, May 1958, was also a moment of major political upheaval to the French nation. The Algerian War with France had been continuing since 1954, and on 13th May 1958, a *coup d’état* organized by a number of Gaullist supporters took power of Algiers, demanding that General Charles de Gaulle be instated as President of the French Republic. By the end of the month, on 29th May, President René Coty confirmed that the Fourth Republic was crumbling and made moves to pave the way for the ascension to power of de Gaulle. De Gaulle’s conditions were for a new constitution, which would form the Fifth Republic, and to receive special emergency powers for the first six months of his return. The new constitution had ‘the aim of strengthening the powers of the Presidency and of the executive at the expense of parliament,’ (McMillan, 1985: 159) and could therefore be seen as a loss for democracy.

Both the horrors of the Algerian War and the political turmoil of de Gaulle’s return to power overlap with the production of *La Tête contre les murs*. The changing face of psychiatry, still too controlled by archaic methods, and the political issues surrounding Algeria, are transposed into the film through the struggle of an individual (François) versus the institution. I will address here how this struggle is visualized, particularly through the lighting choices of Eugen Schüfftan, and how the individual/institution dichotomy is but the first of many in the film. My analysis of the film is divided into three sections, each of which correspond loosely to a different visual space within the narrative. The first of these addresses the opening
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48 Later discussed by Foucault in *Discipline and Punish* (Foucault, 1991).
sections of the film, which largely take place outdoors during François’s freedom. The second part focuses upon the central bulk of the film, set in the asylum space. Finally, I turn to the closing scenes of the film, when François’s setting changes to the cityspace.

**Freedom**

The opening sequence of the film positions the narrative very firmly in a contemporary late-1950’s setting (at the epicenter of great scientific and political change). During a brash opening credits sequence Schüfftan’s camera captures the movements of our protagonist, François, as he rides his motorbike across an area of wasteland (practicing motocross, as he later explains49). The camera moves freely, following the direction of François, occasionally even panning behind trees which block our view. In these instances Schüfftan does not adjust the focus to sharpen our view of the leaves which have appeared in the foreground, rather his camera remains intently focused upon François. These unsmooth camera movements and imperfect focus speak to the documentary tradition of Franju’s filmmaking, as well as Schüfftan’s own tendencies towards realism at the outset of his career, on films such as *Menschen am Sonntag*. The documentary sensibility of the camera in the opening moments of the film also functions to reinforce the idea that this film’s narrative will offer a truthful and realistic representation of the contemporary state of the asylum system. Jean-Pierre
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49 Motocross also positions the film in a contemporary setting. Whilst having begun in the 1920s and gaining popularity in Britain during the 1930s, did not become widely popular across Europe until the 1950s, which saw the Paris-based Fédération Internationale de Motorcyclisme create the European Championship in 1952. A previous incarnation of a national competition hosted in 1947 by the Netherlands saw only three nations able to muster a team to enter, and this did not include France. Thus François’s interest in motocross is clearly a distinct product of the 1950s (Youngblood 2010).
Mocky would himself, when talking about the film some years later, describe it as ‘an accurate documentary on psychiatric homes.’

The contemporary setting of the film’s narrative in these opening moments is best set by the leather jacket worn by François (Figure 54). A list of contemporary influences including Marlon Brando in The Wild One (Laszlo Benedek, 1953), James Dean in Rebel Without a Cause (Nicolas Ray, 1955), Elvis Presley, and Johnny Halliday all signify not only his rebellious nature, but also the character’s sense of independence and freedom. This is supported by the freedom of Schüfftan’s camera movements in the opening sequence, reflecting the independence of the character, and placing him within an environment that is

---

50 From an interview with Jean-Pierre Mocky on the Eureka Masters of Cinema DVD of La Tête contre les murs.
open and freeing. The independent spirit of François’s character is therefore immediately linked with an exterior and expansive space. This theme continues throughout the opening scenes of the film. When François visits his friends, they are enjoying a party on a boat, an interior space which is arguably more connected with the natural environment. We see for instance, one of his friends swimming in the dark waters, a natural extension of the deck of the boat. Conversely, when François visits his father’s house with the intent to steal some money, it is nighttime, and François traverses the exterior grounds of the mansion with ease. It is the interior of the house and its confinement which ultimately proves dangerous for François (not the dark or the nighttime), when his father enters, illuminates the room, and discovers his son’s crime. As we can see then, light also plays a key role in the construction of François’s character. Just as he is at home in the freedom of expansive spaces, he is equally comfortable in darkness, in which every space can become expansive, protecting those individuals within it. This is evident repeatedly in these opening scenes. The opening sequence of François on his motorbike occurs at dusk, with the subsequent scenes of François at ease with his friends occurring at night. It is the luminosity of his father’s entrance which finally consigns his son to his fate.

During the robbery François has burned sensitive court papers which his father, a judge, should never have removed from the court room. In order to save his own reputation, the father avoids a juridical course of action, instead having his son committed that night to a hospital for the mentally ill. Our first view of the asylum is from the car which drives François to his fate. The scene opens with Maurice Jarre’s thunderous percussion sounds accompanying a striking point of view image, positioned from inside the moving car as it travels alongside the outer wall of the institution (Figure 55). Schüfftan’s lighting decisions for this image make it particularly remarkable. The shot is enveloped in almost complete darkness, except for a small beam of illumination representing the glare of the car’s
headlights cast against the wall. This is an anxious, uncomfortable image, an impression enhanced when considering the unnatural lighting positions used. The angle of the beam of light, cast upwards and across, could not possibly be the natural product of the car’s headlights. The realization of this fact functions to add a sense of the uncanny and to enforce the menacing nature of the shot. Such a sense of unease is partly the result of the tension in styles which has emerged, between the realism of the opening sequence, and a more stylized use of lighting seen subsequently. Kate Ince (2005: 71) finds in these moments the same despair and aesthetic menace found previously in *film noir*, and attributes this influence upon the film to Schüfftan:

Central to the creation of sinister *noir* atmospheres in [*La Tête contre les murs*] is the contribution of his German-born director of photography, Eugen Shuftan [sic.]. A contemporary of Fritz Lang’s, Shuftan worked in German silent cinema and extensively in Hollywood from the 1920s on, often on fantasy films or films featuring crime. Even more importantly, he was a leading director of lighting and photography for the poetic realists of late 1930s France […]. Shuftan worked, in other words, at the heart of the two European cinema movements that may legitimately be regarded as precursors of American *film noir*.

I would argue, however, that this is a simplification of the complex evolution of Schüfftan’s lighting style. It is perhaps more productive to view Schüfftan as the perfect companion to Franju for his combination of realism, and the more Expressionist influenced lighting techniques he developed only once in exile (which can in fact be linked back to Schüfftan’s study of Rembrandt). Furthermore, Ince overlooks Schüfftan’s American films of the 1940s, which as I have demonstrated in chapter two, more directly demonstrate how Schüfftan’s exilic style in Poverty Row influenced the major studios in terms of *film noir*. Furthermore, the high-contrast chiaroscuro lighting effects which Ince finds to be an influence from *film
noir are not present throughout the film, for much of the film’s action takes place during vivid daylight in the asylum.

The examples Ince tends to cite as influenced by noir occur in settings outside of the asylum, although as I have argued, unusually this use of darkness at the start of the film (one which is tied to an expansive space, rather than the confines of darkness seen in traditional film noir) tends to provide a comfort to François. This generates a contrast with the bright illumination of the asylum once he is interned, which functions to provide greater horror by creating a sense of constant visibility and containment. It is a dichotomy between lightness and dark which is echoed by the dichotomy between nature and the built environment of the institution. Even in the case of this doom-laden image of François’s drive to the asylum, it is the uncanny use of light breaking through the darkness which makes the image so uncomfortable.
In the subsequent shots to the opening sequences we see the car (transporting François) enter through the gates of Dury asylum. Only the tall gates to the asylum are lit by Schüfftan, granting them an imposing impression and leaving the rest of the location in darkness, suggesting the dominating power of the asylum walls as a point of containment (whereby containment is once more connected to light). From a shot within the grounds of the asylum we see the car pass through the gates, and the camera pans around to follow the path of the car as it drives down the long driveway towards the main asylum buildings. The streetlamps which highlight the driveway emphasize the length of the path and give contrast to the (freedom of) darkness which exists beyond the glow of the streetlamps.
Confinement

A fade-in from the driveway reveals our first glimpse within the asylum, in which the walls themselves become our immediate focus. Schüfftan’s camera fixes itself upon a bare white wall of the asylum, with a light fixture giving the only differentiation to this image (the light bulb itself is contained within its own glass cage). By focusing so immediately upon the plain white walls of the asylum, and the lights which will illuminate these walls throughout the film, Franju and Schüfftan explicitly present us with the correlation between luminosity and containment, and foreground the clinical, impersonal attitude which dominates the institution.

The shot continues as the camera slowly pans, following the path of a wire which runs down the wall from the bottom of the light. At the end of this downward panning motion a bed is revealed, within which a robed François begins to stir. François sits up, and is visibly unnerved as he orientates himself to his new environment. Schüfftan’s camera corresponds by slowly panning backwards to gradually reveal his surroundings. He leaves the bed and begins to walk down the ward, where we see a row of identical bodies, each lying motionless in their beds. What this shot truly reveals is the full clinical impersonal horror of François’s new environment. The camera moves from a plain white wall, which could be any wall anywhere, to eventually reveal an entire domain to which François has been admitted, a domain which envelops everything within it with the same plain white conformity evident in the opening image. François wears plain white hospital robes and is barely definable, thanks to Schüfftan’s lighting (a lack of backlight), from the plain white walls of the institution. So whereas Schüfftan would normally eagerly pursue a sense of depth within the image, through the use of backlights and shadows, here he has purposefully flattened François (via his robes).
into the walls of the asylum, suggesting the institutional conformity which is ascribed upon him, and the loss of his individuality.

We are then witness to François’s first experiences of the asylum, when he meets his fellow inmates over breakfast. François is first introduced to Colonel Donnadieu, whom he is told was ‘given shock treatment in 1918, relapsed in 1930 and 1945.’ Querying the relevance of the 1930 date, François learns that this occurred in Morocco, where Colonel Donnadieu was presumably stationed as part of the French protectorate. This had begun in 1912 and ended in 1956, giving Morocco independence once more only, a matter of years before production began on *La Tête contre les murs*. These comments link postwar and colonial trauma with madness, and suggest a subtext based upon another French Colonial operation, the war in Algeria which had been underway since 1954.

A high level of French censorship surrounded the Algerian war, a result of the state of emergency declared in 1955 and subsequently in 1958 (the latter as part of de Gaulle’s emergency powers). So rather than explicitly criticizing this hugely unpopular war, we could be justified in reading, through the references to the World Wars and colonial Morocco, a link between the heterotopic space of the asylum and this hidden war. Michel Foucault (2010) terms the psychiatric hospital a ‘heterotopia of deviation.’ He describes these spaces as ‘counter-sites, a kind of effectively enacted utopia in which the real sites, all the other real sites that can be found within the culture, are simultaneously represented, contested, and inverted. Places of this kind are outside of all places, even though it may be possible to indicate their location in reality.’ The asylum as heterotopia acts as a space beyond society, separating those who deviate from the functioning society, and therefore also acting as a space of censorship. The unknowable, unquestionable war in Algeria therefore links to the unknowable madness of the inhabitants of the asylum, in particular Colonel Donnadieu.
The reference to the shock treatment enacted upon Donnadieu can also be seen as an allusion to the Algerian crisis, and the ‘clean’ torture tactics which were being widely employed. In fact, electrotorture was a particularly French brand of persecution, used by the police as early as 1931. As Darius Rejali (2009: 407) explains, ‘the French in particular pioneered the dominant form of electric torture for forty years, torture by means of a field telephone magneto.’ Such techniques of ‘clean’ torture were widely employed by the French in the Algerian war. Parallel to this, ‘clean’ treatments dominated mental health care during the twentieth century, barbaric treatments of the mentally ill, including shock therapy and lobotomies, which functioned to nullify the personality of a patient. It was these treatments in particular that had contributed to the anti-psychiatry movement, and wider calls for deinstitutionalisation. Both the army and the asylum employed these ‘clean’ techniques as tools of control and order.\footnote{Kristin Ross (1999) has discussed the clean torture techniques employed in Algeria as a parallel with the modernization taking place within French homes of the 1950s. Such parallels, largely involving clinical kitchen and bathroom spaces, can clearly be extended to the clinical space of the asylum.} Adam Lowenstein (2005: 43) has drawn similar parallels between the tactics of torture employed in Algeria, and the vision of the medical environment in Franju and Schüfftan’s subsequent collaboration, \textit{Les Yeux sans visage}.

Allusions to war were an established method of argument within the movement of deinstitutionalization, particularly during the postwar years, with those returning from the trauma of war bringing to public attention the widespread existence of mental illness. Accompanying the photo-exposés that had so aided the cause of deinstitutionalization was a discursive link between war trauma and psychiatric treatment. Erb (2006: 48-49) has noted that comparisons were made to concentration camps, to the Nazi euthanasia programme, and to restraint methods as torture. These comparisons were made to cause outrage, however Franju links the asylum space to more recent censored traumas, enacted by France.
These issues of an ‘unseen’, censored war are also articulated in the film in the form of the next patient introduced to François. He is described as ‘a rare specimen who pretends to be blind. He’s only blind so he can see clearer.’ These lines are suggestive of the censorship clouding the reality of Algeria, and point once more to a discursive subtext of the film. For although it could not be clearly outspoken in the film, this specific conflict is, nevertheless, apparent in numerous ways through parallels drawn with the patients of the asylum.

Similar parallels with postwar trauma, although not with Algeria, were made in the source novel by Hervé Bazin, upon which the film was based. The novel, published in 1949, was positioned to speak to a culture still entrenched in the traumas of two World Wars. This is apparent even before Bazin’s narrative begins, in the dedication of the book to Milo Guyonnet, who is described as a ‘volunteer in the Great War, patient at Saint-Maurice and at Villejuif (Henri-Colin); captain in the Liberation Movement, in which he met his death in 1944.’ So as we can see, Franju presents a film which acts not only as a critique of the asylum system in France, but which also, through closer reading, offers a subtext that highlights the many traumas which were currently being enacted in Algeria, which could not be explicitly spoken of in France. And as we shall continue to see, this prime text and its subtext – which both function to criticize institutional structures – are supported by the lighting choices of Eugen Schüfftan, whose own personal traumas of exile, including a brief period spent in a French concentration camp, can be read into this tale of repression and anxiety.

Such a reading is further emphasized when considering the generational dichotomies which exist within the film, most notably those between François (Jean-Pierre Mocky) and his father (Jean Galland), François and Dr. Varmont (Pierre Brasseur), and between the two doctors of the asylum, Varmont and Dr. Emery (Paul Meurisse), a point to which I shall now turn. By
sectioning his wayward son at the Dury asylum, François’s father effectively passes the baton of patriarchy to another institutional order, the asylum (rather than the family). Let us not forget that François’s father is a judge, part of another institutional order, and it was François’s interference with this institution, the burning of court papers, which resulted in his internment at Dury. The absence of François’s father from the asylum does not however signal the dissolution of the patriarchy. Rather this role is replaced by another equally stern father, Dr. Varmont. Tellingly, François’s father and the doctor act as friends when the father visits to assess his son’s progress. This explains how François came to be sectioned so easily, without the involvement of the police. Dr. Varmont’s is not a nurturing patriarchal role, but rather one which attempts to instill in François conformity to the institutional order. It is a doubling of the dose of patriarchy, one which is suggestive of the symbolic patriarchal return of de Gaulle to power, complete with his greater Presidential authority and a tightening of civil liberties.

The dichotomy between these two generations and their attitudes to this order is served well by Schüfftan’s lighting, and is particularly evident during the scene in which Dr. Varmont and François converse following the patient’s first escape attempt. The scene is structured as a typical shot reverse shot between doctor and patient, the juxtaposition of which makes apparent the different lighting techniques employed by Schüfftan for each character (see Figures 56 and 57). Firstly, there are differences in framing between the two characters. François is viewed in close-up, whereas we are positioned slightly more distanced from Varmont, in a medium close-up, creating a greater emotional connection between the spectator and François. There is also a notable flatness of tone in the image of Varmont, with his white hair and his white hospital robes blending into the plain wall behind him. Varmont casts no shadow upon this rear wall, generating a lack of depth in the image. In contrast is the shot of François, whose dark hair and costume set him apart from the plain white
bedclothes. He also leaves a shadow, which defines his own image against that of his surroundings. Schüfftan has created this effect by lighting François from the right hand side of the image, using little fill light on the opposing side of the face, thus casting a dark shadow which differentiates him from the asylum bed. The meanings produced by these lighting choices and their juxtaposition in this scene position the doctor as part of the institutional framework, by literally blending him into the walls of the asylum, and François as someone who resists this institutional order, and whose place does not exist within it.

Figure 56: Dr. Varmont looks down on his patient.
Schüfftan’s lighting choices also add emotional depth to the scene, generating sympathy for François, and leaving the spectator aghast at the impersonal nature of his incarceration. This is achieved through Schüfftan’s use of an eyelight. Its use is quite evident in the image of François, enhancing the emotion of his performance. In stark contrast to this is the shot of Dr. Varmont, who enjoys no such eyelight. Another cinematographer, John Alton (1995: 104), described the effect of not using an eyelight: ‘The result is dull eyes, which look like a dark night, or a shut door. [...] In place of a brilliant eye, there is a dark hole, an empty socket. This gives the person in the picture the expressionless cold look of a statue.’ This is
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52 An eyelight is an additional reflector light positioned in such a way so as to reflect in the eyes of the subject. Although not bright enough to add to the exposure of the image, it serves to add emotional depth and to enliven the face in such shots.
the effect created by Schüfftan’s refrain from employing an eyelight for the doctor, which is further enhanced by his fixed stare directly into the lens of the camera, through the lenses of his own glasses.

Examining the scene further, the contents of their discussion enforces this reading of Schüfftan’s lighting. Firstly, Dr. Varmont, representing the old-style of treatment, clarifies to François the reason he has been incarcerated, citing the destruction of the (institutional) documents as the primary cause. He says, ‘You burnt documents that didn’t belong to you. A pointless act of destruction. Why did you do that? That “why” is what differentiates a doctor from a judge. If you can answer that question, you’re free to go. If you cannot, you leave me no option but to draw my own conclusions.’ Here we see Dr. Varmont attempt to differentiate himself from François’s father, the judge, perhaps in an effort to communicate with him more rationally. However, his differentiation is made rather inconsequential by his insistence on ‘why’, on the necessity to ascribe reasons for actions to a codified social order, and the reliance upon cause and effect, upon which both he and the judge rely.

The discussion quickly turns to François’s father, with the patient explaining, ‘I wanted to hurt him, destroying what was dearest to his heart’, undoubtedly the patriarchal order and the legal institution. From here the dialogue addresses the reason for François’s hatred of his father, and he begins to describe the events surrounding his mother’s death. He explains how as a young child of eight he witnessed from his bedroom window his father arguing violently with her near the pond. The father would later explain to François that his mother had committed suicide by jumping in the pond, and was alone at the time, a fact which François knows to be untrue. Having sedated François, silencing his revelation, Varmont leaves the room whilst saying to the unconscious patient, ‘only sick people dream of escaping. I don’t try to escape, do I?’ This suggests that those who don’t conform to the institution and dream
of a freedom beyond societal boundaries must be sick, whilst the sane can only be deemed such as long as they function within a strict adherence to the structures of society. Having left François’s room, Dr. Varmont fully dismisses the patient’s shocking disclosure about the actions of his father with the Freudian dismissal to another doctor, ‘a prime example of father hatred.’

The content of this discussion between doctor and patient reemerges later in the film, when François’s father visits the hospital to see his son. Dr. Varmont queries François’s father about the events surrounding the mother’s death. When he explains that it was suicide, Varmont asks about the inquest which must have occurred, to which the father responds, ‘questioning, an autopsy, no suicide case ever escapes slander.’ There is a subtext within these discussions which suggests that the father may have been able to cover up his wife’s death, precisely due to his standing as a judge, and his position within the institutional order. An act reminiscent of the great corruption which has, years later, occurred between the father and the doctor: the covert admission of François to a mental institution.

This generational divide between the doctor and the young patient (reflected by the dichotomy between freedom and the institution) forms a critique of the asylum system and a desire to reform it from the stagnant practices of the old guard. Such a discourse equally forms a comment upon the Algerian war, previously alluded to by the story of Colonel Donnadieu. The notion of freedom and individualism is represented through the generation of post-war youth, which is contrasted with an older generation that had been active in such conflicts, and whose submissiveness to authority resulted in part in the collaboration with a German enemy occupier. The representation of this older generation through Varmont and François’s father is one which conforms to the governing institution, and to the state. Therefore, through this mode of representation, they also stand for collusion with the crimes
and censorship enacted by the French state during the Algerian war. As Adam Lowenstein (2005: 43) has commented, ‘because the Algerian War goes to the very heart of French national identity […], it makes sense that it was understood at the time through the lens of that other recent battleground for French identity, the Occupation.’ However, the question emerges why François does not refer to his military service, for he would have been called up to serve at age 18. In light of the generational dichotomy in the film, it is possible that François’s wayward, nomadic lifestyle had seen him skip military service, although this is never made clear. This is the true crime for which the older generation, in the form of his father and Dr. Varmont, seek to punish him. Consider also the role of the younger physician of the asylum, Dr. Emery. Emery’s youth endows him with a freedom from the institutional modes of the asylum entirely at odds with Dr. Varmont. Emery, in his youth, stands for a belief in the deinstitutionalization of patients, thoughts which were soon to be articulated by the anti-psychiatry movement of the 1960s. As Erb (2006: 50-51) has noted, this dichotomy is similarly present in other films that tackle the treatment of the mentally ill, such as The Snake Pit. This film reflected the reality of the divide within the American Psychiatric Association, which included a group known as ‘Young Turks’ who sought to reform the system.

**Freedom and Confinement**

Such a dichotomy between freedom and confinement goes beyond the desires of Dr. Emery to free his patients from the constraint of the asylum walls, and becomes a major part of the film’s narrative during the final scenes, when François has successfully escaped from the institution and attempts to navigate himself through the nightlife of Paris. The cityscape acts as a third space, offering neither the complete freedom of the expansive landscapes from the
early scenes of the film, nor the abject confinement of the asylum walls. An early establishing shot of the location soon highlights the many differences between the asylum and the city. Bright lights and plain walls have been replaced dark corners, only permeated by the glare of neon advertising lights (synonymous with Modernism\textsuperscript{53}) (Figure 58). By acting as a Modernist space, the city is also a space representative of the social order, and thus no safer an environment for François than the asylum. François has escaped to darkness, however this is no longer the comforting darkness of the countryside, but rather a darkness in which lurks the full horrors of film noir. François enters a billiard parlour and finds his way through the poolrooms to a gambling hall beneath the main building, where crowds of people watch and bet on roulette.

\textsuperscript{53} Neon lighting was a turn of the century invention, which came to full prominence in the 1920s and 1930s thanks to the Frenchman Georges Claude. As Lucy Fischer has explained in her essay ‘The Shock of the New’ (2006: 19-37), this electrification of lighting is central to an understanding of modernism, and to an understanding of film as an essentially modernist art form.
Such images, of the verticality of the city exteriors, and of the introspective nature of these hidden city spaces populated by the ne’er-do-wells of society, are central amongst Schüfftan’s oeuvre, and demonstrate how crucial this particular technician can be considered to the overall aesthetic of the city in this film (which would be fully realized in his later films, addressed in chapter four). Present is both an impression of the city as a Modernist space, seen in Schüfftan’s work as early as Metropolis, and the dark visuals of the city, evident in Schüfftan’s reinvention of Expressionism with a more painterly approach, perfected during his time spent in exile. These images of the city in La Tête contre les murs also prefigure an aesthetic progression in Schüfftan’s career, seen in his New York films of the 1960s. Here
Schüfftan has created a view of the city as more threatening to François than even the asylum itself, enveloped in a darkness that is no longer comforting to him.

François visits his girlfriend Stéphanie and reveals how uncomfortable he feels in the city by discussing plans to flee. The city and the asylum therefore offer different experiences to François, but the same conformity, the same loss of individualism when faced with societal constructs. The Moral Treatments propagated by Philippe Pinel (which are followed in the film by Dr Varmont), were after all centred on the prospect of reorienting patients to society through the totalizing replication and application of the institutional order within an asylum. This filmic discourse spoke to wider societal mistrust of the asylum system in France, which included calls for deinstitutionalization, and acts in anticipation of the views Michel Foucault (*Madness and Civilization*, 2006), who would soon vocalize these issues as part of the anti-psychiatry movement in the 1960s. The asylum functions to treat patients by creating a microcosm of society, which is then extrapolated in the film by maximizing that microcosm to the full city space in the final scenes. The failure of this approach is made most explicitly in the film through the suicide of Heurtevent. In this sense we can see a clear link back to the critiques made by the German Modernist theorists of the Frankfurt School in the 1920s of mass society and the inherent loss of individualism in the city.

The final realization of François’s true loss of freedom in *both* the asylum and the city space arrives in the closing moments of the film. When two asylum workers attempt to locate François by visiting Stéphanie, he decides he can remain no longer, and that he cannot subject Stéphanie to his life on the run. Slipping out of her door, he makes his way down the stairs of the building. This is captured in stark chiaroscuro lighting (Figure 59). Schüfftan casts a strong level of light from the centre of the stairwell, sending the long shadows of the
stair rails and François across the wall. This creates a disconcerting image in which the bars of the stairwell against the shadow of François form a reminder of his perpetual confinement.

The two asylum workers await their prey at the bottom of the staircase, grabbing François out of the dark in an image shot from Stéphanie’s point of view, looking down from the top of the stairwell. Grabbed from either side, François screams and looks up directly towards the camera in a plea for help. François is then dragged from the building and taken to a car waiting outside to return him to the asylum. The final shots repeat that same unusual image of the car’s headlights against the outer walls of the asylum grounds, followed by the car driving through the asylum gates. It is an identical recurrence of the shots from François’s first admittance to the asylum near the start of the film, and recalls the horror created in the final shots of *Dead of Night* (Basil Dearden et al., 1945), when the audience reaches the terrifying realization that they are bound up in a repetition of events. Kate Ince (2005: 72) similarly ascribes to the darkness of the opening and closing scenes of the film ‘a circle of confinement characteristic of the most claustrophobic and doom-laden *film noir*.’ Erb (2006: 58) describes the denouement of therapy narratives from this period as characterized by a ‘recovery of origins moment,’ and a ‘purging of madness.’ *La Tête contre les murs*, and *Lilith*, both revert this trajectory. They show sane men entering an asylum to be, by the end, conditioned as insane. This brings to mind the ‘snake pit’, the horrific ‘therapeutic act’ which lent its name to Anatole Litvak’s film of 1948. It was thought that throwing a patient into a pit of snakes would shock them back into sanity. In the case of *La Tête contre les murs* and *Lilith*, the sane are shocked into insanity.
It is worth recalling here that this discussion of *La Tête contre les murs* began by addressing the documentarist aspects of Schüfftan’s opening shots of the film, as a way of grounding the film in a real and contemporary setting. However, these final moments, with their explosion of horror, are at complete odds stylistically with those opening scenes. Schüfftan, with his origins in realism on *Menschen am Sonntag*, and his incorporation of an Expressionist aesthetic later in his career on films such as *The Robber Symphony* (Fehér, 1935), is perfectly placed to employ both of these disparate styles within a single film. His lighting takes us, across the course of the film, from a sense of the real and of the now, into a nightmarish realm of injustice and horror, made all the more terrifying by the film’s roots in reality.
The actions of the final moments would also have delivered a resonance beyond the stylistic achievement of Schüfftan’s lighting, awakening memories of occupation, surveillance and fear experienced during the reign of the Vichy government. Such night-time ‘snatch and grab’ raids were not uncommon in Paris during the occupation to purge the city of its Jewish population and other members of the resistance, such as the Vel d’Hiv roundup in Paris on the 16th and 17th July 1942. The image of dark suits lurking in the shadows at the bottom of the staircase, deceptively tricking François, is not only an example of a film noir influence, but also recalls for the spectator the realities of such acts. Franju warns against a French society so ready to conform to such institutional orders, and appeals to a national guilt built upon the conformity of the occupied nation.

Conclusions

In a review of the film from 1959, John Adams (1959: 56) finds fault with the film, for despite the aesthetic achievements, ‘the stylishness very rarely expresses the real potential of Franju’s material, and instead of a film which demonstrates his passionate anarchism, denouncing society as seen in the microcosm of an insane asylum, we have only elegant Guignol.’ I would disagree, and suggest the stylistic achievements of the film successfully underpin the narrative, and function to create a discourse which does indeed denounce society and its many institutions.

As this reading demonstrates, La Tête contre les murs remains a complex text abundant with contradictions and dichotomies. But perhaps the most telling quote about the issues presented within the film comes from Franju himself (2009: 42), who in describing the filming process and the appropriation of a documentary style, suggests how a more stylized, emotional approach may have permeated its borders:
Thankfully, when we’re rolling, we see things in an external way. We have so many mechanical, material concerns – all those permit a certain distance. But outside of the job, the contact with the mentally ill was intolerable – in any case for me – maybe because I get so close to them. Anouk Aimée, she was crying when she saw the crazy woman, and the old Shuftan [sic.] too.

It should perhaps come as no surprise that Schüfftan was so emotionally affected by the suffering of the mentally ill within this institution, and the experience of filming *La Tête contre les murs* on its grounds. Schüfftan had experienced his own institutional terrors whilst working in exile in France during the 1930s. As a German, following the outbreak of the war Schüfftan was interned at a French concentration camp until he could prove himself willing to fight for the French army. Once released, Schüfftan was lucky enough to escape the country and find safety in America, although an uncertain future welcomed him in terms of work prospects. Thus, the dramatic flourish during the final moments of *La Tête contre les murs* resonates with an artistic mind doubtless tormented by the horrors enacted upon him by various institutions, and the continuing traumas of his life as an émigré, of not belonging and with a future never certain. Although in Schüfftan’s case, his future was yet to welcome his greatest successes.
Chapter IV

Part One
An American Cinematographer, 1960 – 1977

Part Two
Case Study: Cityspace in the New York City Trilogy
Following his work on *Les Yeux sans visage* Schüfftan returned to Canada once more, for *The Bloody Brood*, Julian Roffman’s low-budget thriller around the beatnik culture. The film told the story of Cliff (Jack Betts), who is investigating the death of his brother, who he believes had been murdered by a beatnik gang led by Nico (Peter Falk, in one of his earliest film roles). The film was shot for a mere $100,000 over just 16 days. The shift in quality and budget between Schüfftan’s work with Franju and *The Bloody Brood* is reminiscent of the shift for Schüfftan between his work with French Poetic Realist filmmakers in the 1930s, and the confrontation he experienced with the working practices of Poverty Row. Of course, the former shift was necessitated by far grander life-threatening circumstances. Schüfftan’s return to Canada at this juncture, when he was enjoying enormous success in France, demonstrates his desire to make films that would reach a wider, English language audience.
In 1960 Schüfftan was finally able to break through in the American industry as a cinematographer. He achieved this when the local 644 New York branch of the union permitted Schüfftan entry, allowing Schüfftan to work as a cinematographer in the New York state area. Once Schüfftan was a member of the union, Jack Garfein was then able to hire him for *Something Wild*, which was shot on the streets of New York City. Schüfftan was then also able to shoot two subsequent films on location in New York City, *The Hustler* (1961) under the direction of Robert Rossen, and *Trois chambres à Manhattan/Three Rooms in Manhattan* (1965), which reunited Schüfftan with Marcel Carné. This trilogy of New York films forms the focus of greater discussion of the second part of this chapter, which addresses Schüfftan’s construction of the cityspace. In this first part of this chapter I address the other films made by Schüfftan during this period, which saw him largely alternate between French and American filmmaking. I also address key events such as his acceptance into the American Society of Cinematographers, and his eventual recognition from the American industry in the form of an Academy Award.

Between Schüfftan’s New York films the cinematographer also returned frequently to France, for three collaborations under the direction of Jean-Pierre Mocky who had starred in *La Tête contre les murs* and was now forming part of the French New Wave. These collaborations began with *Un couple/A Couple* in 1960, which dealt with the problematic marriage of a young couple. Pierre (Jean Kosta) has lost interest in sex with his wife, Annette (Juliette Meyniel), but tries to maintain the social conventions of marriage. Annette tries to reignite their relationship, but ultimately it she who walks out for another man. This focus upon the young couple in *Un Couple* can be seen as an aspect of the French New Wave narrative. In terms of Schüfftan’s lighting, the film mixes comedy and drama, and so the lighting technique is similarly a mix of light, highly lit sets, and astonishingly dark exteriors (see Figure 60). This can also be seen as a consequence of French New Wave approaches to
filmmaking, such as a newfound interest in location shooting. This dependence of location shooting is far removed from Schüfftan’s long experience of studio filmmaking, in French Poetic realism, and on Poverty Row in the 1940s, but links directly back to his earliest introduction to cinematography on *Menschen am Sonntag*, and his more recent location work for television with *Hawkeye and the Last of the Mohicans*. In *Un Couple*, a dichotomy therefore emerges between the representation of the relationship in exterior scenes, which present the couple in the real world (where their dramatic encounters are demonstrated through Schüfftan’s low-key lighting), and the studio based interiors, in which the couple are detached from reality in a highly lit constructed space. Similar dichotomies in the representation of relationships exist in the films which form the New York City trilogy, and will be addressed at greater length in the second part of this chapter.
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Figure 60: The dark exteriors of *Un couple*.

After work on *Something Wild* and *The Hustler* in New York (developed in the next part of this chapter), Schüfftan returned to France to reunite with Mocky on *Les Vierges/The Virgins* in 1962, which starred Charles Aznavour who had acted alongside Mocky in *La Tête contre
les murs, and who was also strongly associated with the New Wave following his role in François Truffaut’s *Tirez sur le pianiste/Shoot the Pianist* (1960). As with *Un couple*, the film similarly shares the New Wave concern with young relationships, following five young women and their struggles with their different first relationships.

In 1962 Schüfftan received a nomination for Best Black and White Cinematography for *The Hustler* from the Academy Awards, but due to the filming of *Les Vierges* in Paris Schüfftan was unable to attend. Instead, a Mr Austin of the ASC represented Schüfftan at the ceremony, as a condition of his union membership, rather than his long term agent, Ilse Lahn, whom Schüfftan would have preferred. And so it was that on 9th April 1962, in the Santa Monica Civic Auditorium, California, Shelley Winters and Vince Edwards announced Eugen Schüfftan as the winner of the Academy Award for Best Black and White Cinematography. Howard Keel, a Hollywood star with whom Schüfftan had never worked accepted the award on his behalf, saying ‘I don’t know where he is’, whilst Mr Austin, an envoy of the union that had prevented Schüfftan from working freely for so many years, sat in the audience as his representative. If these facts do not speak enough of the complete disinterest the Hollywood industry bore Schüfftan, then it is also worth noting that Schüfftan’s name was misspelt by 20th Century Fox on all press and publicity materials for *The Hustler* (as Gene Shufton), making it surprising that Schüfftan was ever able to win an award. Such problems, surrounding what should have been the most celebrated moment in Schüfftan’s career, crystallize the years of disregard Schüfftan had met with since his arrival in Hollywood over twenty years earlier.

One further incident concerning the Academy Awards also highlights this disregard for Schüfftan. Lotte Goslar (1998: 84-85), the émigré dancer and mime artist who had known Schüfftan from the time of his first arrival in New York and Hollywood, details the time she travelled with Schüfftans to the Academy offices to collect the Academy Award, once
Schüfftan had returned from France. Her words, for their poignancy, are quoted here at some length:

When we arrived the doors were locked, and it took quite a while before a rather unfriendly woman, who scrutinized us suspiciously, opened one. ‘What do you want?’ she growled.

‘My Oscar,’ said Shufti.

‘What’s your name?’

‘Shuftan.’

‘How do you spell it?’

‘S-H-U-F-T-A-N.’

‘First name?’

‘Eugen.’

‘Your identification?’

Shufti showed her his passport. ‘OK,’ said the dragon. ‘Wait here.’

‘Here’ was a small entry hall without any chairs. After quite a while she returned and gave Shufy something wrapped in old newspaper that could have been a large whiskey bottle someone tries to hide from a landlady or, from the police. Shufy took it in triumph. ‘Let’s live it up!’ he said. So we all went to a little coffee shop on the Sunset Strip and had coffee and doughnuts. His wrapped-up Oscar was sitting right next to him on the bench, and when he saw a young man at the next table staring at his ‘bottle,’ he started spinning a fantastic tale, in which a drunkard steals the ‘bottle,’ finds out to his great disappointment that it is only a dumb statue, and throws Oscar in the river. I think of the glamor and the hoopla that surrounds the Academy Awards. Then I remember this great humble and witty man, with the face of a friendly owl, who made history with the magic of his camera in many unforgettable films, being happy like a child and seeing the humor of it all! How we loved him!!! How we all loved him!

Further emphasizing the disparity between the pomp of the Academy Awards, and the reality of the working life of a cinematographer, Schüfftan was also at the time chasing payment
from King Brothers Productions for *Captain Sindbad* (Byron Haskin, 1962), a Hollywood/West German co-production shot in Munich. Schüfftan was hired as cinematographer, but remarkably left not long into production when he was subject to anti-Semitism on set, to be replaced by Günther Senftleben. Schüfftan cites the root cause of this anti-Semitism as the American producers, Frank and Herman King.54

Following his success at the Academy Awards Schüfftan reunited with the director of *The Hustler*, Robert Rossen, for *Lilith*, in the spring and summer of 1963, which was shot on location in Maryland. At the same time, Schüfftan was attempting to mount his own production, which was to be titled *A Different Drum*, but which also went under the working title of *Men, Women and Motors*. Schüfftan was to act as associate producer, with Robert Victor as producer, and the film was to be shot in the autumn of 1963 in the south of France, with part European financing. László Benedek, most famous for directing *The Wild One* (1953) was mooted to direct, and Schüfftan hoped to get Susan Kohner (daughter of Paul), Hardy Krüger and Steve McQueen to star. McQueen passed on the project, and its plans fell apart thereafter.

However, Schüfftan’s work on *Lilith* was to prove another success. It is the story of Vincent (Warren Beatty), an army veteran who returns to his home town of Stonemont and finds a job at the local sanitarium, Poplar Lodge. Amongst the patients is the enigmatic Lilith (Jean Seberg). Vincent is encouraged to care for her as he seems to be successful in drawing Lilith out. However, he begins to become transfixed by her and soon their relationship has evolved beyond simply that of carer and patient. By the end of the film, the relationship between Lilith and Vincent has become so intense and complex that the lines between sanity and insanity have become blurred, and ultimately Victor turns to one of the doctors for psychiatric help.

54 Correspondence dated 26th June 1962, between Schüfftan and Ilse Lahn.
As with *La Tête contre les murs*, *Lilith* is linked to an actual asylum space, namely the Chestnut Lodge sanitarium, which was built in 1890 and had operated as a sanitarium since 1910, in the Washington D.C. suburb town of Rockville, Maryland. The original source novel of *Lilith* was written by J. R. Salamanca, who had worked at the Chestnut Lodge facility and based his novel upon his experiences at the institution. In a rather un-cryptic fashion he renamed the town to Stonemont, and the asylum to Poplar Lodge. The film adaptation retains these minor changes. A number of scenes for the film were shot in Maryland, but the primary location was not the Chestnut Lodge, but rather the pre-Civil War Killingworth mansion on Long Island, owned by the Taylor family.

The architectural divergences between the Taylor estate and Chestnut Lodge, divided by a number of centuries, are therefore immediately apparent. And despite attempts by Rossen to tie the Taylor estate to the supposed setting of Chestnut Lodge, there is little aesthetically similar between the two buildings. One built prior to the Civil War with an aesthetic emphasis upon its homeliness (see Figure 62, and Figure 63 as an example from *Lilith*), compared with the other constructed in the late 19th Century, standing much taller and appearing more intimidating. It is hard now to believe that the building (Chestnut Lodge) began life as a hotel rather than as an asylum (see Figure 61 below). If there is one similarity which has emerged from this comparative history, it is the importance of the wider grounds to both, the excess of many acres of outside space which exist upon both sites. The Taylor family at the Killingworth mansion enjoyed 79 acres, the work of landscape architect Ferruccio Vitale and his associates Brinckerhoff and Geiffert during the 1920s, whilst Chestnut Lodge continued to amass land throughout the century.
Figure 61: The Chestnut Lodge, inspiration for *Lilith*’s Poplar Lodge.

Figure 62: The Killingworth Mansion, Long Island, the location for the Poplar Lodge.
The film was released to mixed reviews. Schüfftan’s photography also met with a mixed response. For Lawrence Quirk (1990: 94), ‘Eugen Shuftan’s photography is fussy, overly preoccupied with lambent but inessential nuances and details, and it commits, moreover, the sin of calling too much attention to itself and distracting from the dramatic and acting values, if any.’ In fact, Schüfftan’s photography matches the complexity of the film, with many different shifts in tones and moods. The film is at times a love story and at others a psychological drama on the verge of horror. One of the film’s stars, Jean Seberg, noted this complexity and subtlety of representations in Lilith, using a metaphor of the camera: ‘The sanitarium is not a snake pit and Lilith does not have a screaming case of insanity. She’s like a camera lens going slightly in and out of focus.’ (Seberg quoted in: Gardner, 1963) Like the schizophrenia of Lilith, Schüfftan’s lighting can similarly be characterized as schizophrenic. The many faces of Lilith are mirrored by a myriad of techniques in terms of Schüfftan’s lighting (see Figures 64-66). At times Schüfftan presents Lilith as an enigma, by using a soft focus lens and gauze to further soften the image, and to obfuscate the image of Lilith (Figure
At other times Lilith is presented as romantic through the use of a stronger key light, highlighting Seberg’s golden hair, combined with fill lights to reduce shadow (Figure 65). Elsewhere the full madness of Lilith is revealed (Figure 66). Here Schüfftan returns to full chiaroscuro effects, by using a key light from a low angle to cast shadows across the face. We can attribute such effects wholly to Schüfftan, as we know he was given free range by Rossen, who cared little for the film’s visuals. As Cohen (1965: 5) has noted, ‘Rossen is interested primarily in story and acting and not in the photography as such.’ Confirming this, Rossen chose to film Lilith in continuity, something which benefits the actors, but is a greater challenge for the technical crew (Gardner, 1963).

Figure 64: The enigma of Lilith.
After the completion of *Lilith*, Schüfftan again returned to France, this time for his final collaboration with Jean-Pierre Mocky. This was for *La Grande frousse/The Big Scare* (also known as *La Cité de l’indicible peur*, 1964), a comedy of rather different order than their
previous collaborations. It is a black comedy, starring the comic actor Bourvil as an inspector who becomes embroiled in a murder mystery in a strange provincial town of France. Schüfftan was then reunited with Marcel Carné for *Trois chambres à Manhattan*, which was filmed in the studios of Paris, and on location in Manhattan. This was perhaps the last important moment of Schüfftan’s career.

**Final Years: 1966-1977**

Following completion on *Trois chambres à Manhattan* Schüfftan worked upon only two further films. The first of these, *Chappaqua* (1966), was directed by Conrad Rooks, and is a ‘trip film’, a semi-autobiographical account of the director’s attempt to free himself of drug addiction. Befitting the theme, the film features a variety of techniques to reproduce this drugs culture, including a mix of colour, black and white, and sepia photography. Flashbacks, hand-held camera motions and the sitar soundtrack by Ravi Shankar also combine to create an impression of psychedelia. Schüfftan’s presence on this film at the age of 80 demonstrates his continuing interest in taking risks and his forward thinking in terms of film production. Sadly however, Schüfftan’s experience on *Chappaqua* was not a successful one. Rooks has discussed the issue in rather cruel terms in an interview from 2006: ‘The film itself started out with a typical high-tech crew, and then we find out we’ve got a blind cameraman. And anyway, Robert Frank’s footage is so much more interesting than Schüfftan’s, that finally we just had to give up on that and just let Robert go [on].’

Clearly Schüfftan could not continue his career with failing sight, and so made only one further film, which alongside *Chappaqua* provided a rather ignominious end to his tumultuous career. The film was the entirely forgotten *Der Arzt stellt fest.../The Doctor Says*  

---

55 Available as an extra feature on the Dutch DVD release of *Chappaqua* from ‘warped vision’.
(Aleksandar Ford, 1966), a Swiss abortion documentary, which was re-cut and re-packaged for American release as an exploitation film. It once more demonstrates Schüfftan’s unflinching desire to remain current, but nonetheless provides a rather sad end to Schüfftan’s career. The European cameraman who couldn’t work in America, who became the American cameraman who couldn’t work in Europe, who became the cameraman who won an Academy Award but was never allowed full access to the union, finally became a blind cameraman.

At the time of his retirement Schüfftan had been suffering ill health for approximately twenty years. With this in mind, it is remarkable that he had continued work until the age of 80. Schüfftan and his wife settled for retirement at their home on West 71st Street, New York, the city where their close friends Siegfried and Lili Kracauer still resided. Sadly, in November of that same year, 1966, Siegfried Kracauer passed away. His wife followed in 1971. Even less is known of Schüfftan’s years in retirement than of his years struggling in the film industry.

In 1975, Schüfftan became the first recipient of the Billy Bitzer Award, which had been created in honour of the pioneering cinematographer known for his work with D.W Griffiths. Bitzer had originally set up the New York union which evolved into the 644 division which finally allowed Schüfftan membership. It was this union branch which established the Bitzer Awards and honoured Schüfftan in 1975.

Schüfftan was again honoured in March 1977 at a screening and discussion of Menschen am Sonntag, held at the Deutsches Haus at New York University, and organized by Kathinka Dittrich van Weringh. The elderly Schüfftan and his wife were in attendance, as was the eminent New York film critic Susan Sontag (Dittrich van Weringh, 2003: 148-150).
Only a few months later, on 6\textsuperscript{th} September 1977, Eugen Schüfftan died in the DeWitt Nursing Home, New York, at the age of 91. He was recognized by an obituary published by The New York Times on 12\textsuperscript{th} September. Kathinka Dittrich van Weringh has recalled attending Schüfftan’s funeral on the Upper West Side of New York, the city the Schüfftan had eventually come to know as home. According to Dittrich van Weringh, only 10 to 15 people were in attendance (2003: 150).
Eugene Shuftan, 91, Cameraman
And a Pioneer in Optical Effects

Eugene Shuftan, a pioneering cinematographer who won the Academy Award in 1961 as cameraman for Robert Rossen's "The Hustler," died last Tuesday in the DeWitt Nursing Home. He was 91 years old.

Born in Breslau, Germany, he was a painter and designer who entered filmmaking as an optical-effects designer in the expressionist era of German silent films. In 1924 he invented the "Shuftan process" by using mirror images of miniature sets against a real background to create a monumental effect. It was used in "Die Nibelungen" and Fritz Lang's "Metropolis."

Mr. Shuftan was cameraman for Robert Siodmak, Max Ophuels and G. W. Pabst in German and later in French films. Perhaps his most widely known film was Marcel Carné's "Quai des Brunnes" (Port of Shadows), remembered for its mysterious foggy effects.

Mr. Shuftan came to the United States in 1939, but was slow to win assignments from American filmmakers, working mostly in France in the 1950's.

Surviving are his wife, the former Marlese Althaus of 1060 Amsterdam Avenue, and a daughter, Ruth Mathews of London.
Part Two

Case Study
Cityspace in the New York City Trilogy

Passion for architectural space cannot be dissociated from passions for light.

- Peter Greenaway (Kruth, 1997: 73)

Introduction

As we know, Schüfftan made his major breakthrough in the film industry, in 1927, by creating a special effects process which contributed to the successful realization of the vast futuristic cityscape of Fritz Lang’s *Metropolis*. In this film the city became a vision of Modernity in its most dystopian form, enforcing a total uniformity of society. Schüfftan’s films from the 1960s addressed in this chapter, *Something Wild*, *The Hustler* and *Trois chambres à Manhattan*, all filmed on location in Manhattan, mark the first time in Schüfftan’s career since *Metropolis* that the city comes to play such a major representational
role. In Chapter I, Part One of this thesis I examined the construction of cityspace through the use of the Schüfftan Process; this present case study, which deals with Schüfftan’s end of career films, will address the construction of the cityspace in terms of his lighting and camera movement. In the forty years separating these two periods there is a significant shift in terms of the representation of cityspace, and its relation to the films’ central protagonists, and as such this trilogy of films merits special investigation.

In relation to the cultural concept of the ‘city’, Shiel (2001: 1) has noted that, ‘the cinema has long had a striking and distinctive ability to capture and express the spatial complexity, diversity, and social dynamism of the city through mise-en-scène, location filming, lighting, cinematography, and editing’. This case study sets out to examine this cinematic representation of the cityspace through three films, which were all products of industrial circumstance for their cinematographer, following his admittance into the ASC. Schüfftan’s final acceptance into the local New York branch of the ASC allowed him to be part of this collection of films, which all have in common their filming location of New York City, a location described by Bruno as, ‘intrinsically filmic’, and, ‘Photogenic by way of nature and architecture.’ (1997: 46) Furthermore, the nature of shooting a film in New York, rather than the dominant filming locale of Los Angeles, would suggest that the film would make a virtue of its New York setting. As I shall argue, all three films do this, creating a realism effect which allows Schüfftan to bring out the full nature of the city as both welcoming and dystopian.

Before turning to this trilogy of films, however, it is worth recalling that a first return to the representation of the city, for Schüfftan, and a possible shift in representation, can be found in La Tête contre les murs, Georges Franju’s film of 1958, filmed not long before Schüfftan’s return to American filmmaking with Something Wild. As we saw, François escapes the
confines of the asylum (addressed more fully in the preceding chapter), and flees to Paris, at night. However, Franju and Schüfftan create a dystopian representation of the City of Light, characterized through garish neon lighting, gambling houses hidden from polite society, and police lurking in the dark recesses of the city. I will identify similar dystopian tendencies in the films which form the focus of this chapter, however, as we shall see, they also display a more well-rounded, multi-faceted view of the city.

I mentioned, in the previous chapter, one of Schüfftan’s earlier films, *The Bloody Brood* (Julian Roffman, 1959). This film also displays a return to representations of the city, and is a first reintroduction for Schüfftan back to North American filmmaking (it was made by the Canadian production company Meridian Film in Toronto). The action of the film takes place entirely within the confines of a city which throughout, is not defined. In opposition to Schüfftan’s *cinécities* of the 1960s which make a virtue of their location, in *The Bloody Brood* we can only understand the space of the city through an understanding of where it is not – it is not Los Angeles, and it is not Brooklyn (Ellie is known as Brook, because she is from Brooklyn, suggesting that the setting of the film is elsewhere). The cityspace represented is equally deceptive, being constructed entirely on set, and almost entirely of interiors. Absent are any iconic structures of the city which shape our perception of the space (as is present in the 1960s films). Instead, Schüfftan and Roffman create a *non-space* of the city, preventing the spectator from creating a mental structure of the city, enforcing the dystopian nature of the spaces these characters occupy, and their exclusion from acceptable society. Nonetheless, this representation shares some traits with the key city trilogy of films of the 1960s; however, by making virtue of their New York location, those later films create a more complex construction of the cityspace.
Constructing Cityspace: Theories of Reading

Much of the analysis that follows will address the construction of the city in spatial terms. The cinematographer’s task (particularly in black and white photography) is to create the impression of a three dimensional space, albeit displayed on a two-dimensional image. As with painters such as Rembrandt (Elsaesser, 2000: 433), who as we know influenced the lighting techniques of Schüfftan, an impression of space is created through a careful use of light. Inappropriate or improper light effects can result in a flatness of the image, whereas an understanding of light and lens focuses results in depth and roundness of image.

An instructive voice by which we may talk about the city in spatial terms is provided by Edward Soja in Thirdspace (1996). Soja defines the theoretical interpretations of the cityspace as a trialectics of space, three distinct spatial models which shall inform this analysis of the cityspace in Something Wild, The Hustler and Trois chambres à Manhattan (Soja, 2000: 10). Soja explains the first of these approaches as follows:

From what I described as a Firstspace perspective […], cityspace can be studied as a set of materialized ‘spatial practices’ that work together to produce and reproduce the concrete forms and specific patternings of urbanism as a way of life. Here cityspace is physically and empirically perceived as form and process, as measurable and mappable configurations and practices of urban life. (Ibid.)

A Firstspace perspective is therefore an attempt to define the ‘reality’ of the city, to accurately map its layout and the concrete formations of its structure. For the purpose of my analysis I interpret Firstspace as an attempt to represent the ‘reality’ of the city through location shooting, and the role this space plays as a concrete presence and backdrop to characters’ lives. Firstspace is present on each of the three films through the use of extensive location shooting, and through attempts by Schüfftan’s camera to display the objective nature
of this space. A straightforward example of Firstspace would be an establishing shot, such as that which occurs in *Trois chambres à Manhattan*, which reveals that our protagonist François has left his native Paris and is now located in New York. The Manhattan skyline is revealed to the spectator, and such concrete structures are interpreted as a location of the character’s actions (see Figure 69).

![Figure 69: We’re not in Paris anymore: An establishing shot of the New York skyline (an example of Firstspace).](image)

In terms of Soja’s concept of Secondspace, the city becomes a site which bears the projected fears and anxieties of the protagonists:

> From a Secondspace perspective, cityspace becomes more of a mental or ideational field, conceptualized in imagery, reflexive thought, and symbolic representation, a *conceived* space of the imagination, or what I […] describe as the urban imaginary. (2000: 11)
In each of the three films Secondspace, the urban imaginary, is characterized as a perception of the city as dangerous, as a realization of the characters’ fears of their displacement from society. In this sense the city becomes a dystopian space, embodying anxieties of identity and individualism, and forcing characters into dangerous situations in the dark underbelly of the city, hidden from civilized society. For example, in *Something Wild*, the dramatic rape of Mary Ann which occurs at the beginning of the film is conducted by a faceless man, within the confines of a city park. Despite being an act of human sexual violence, enacted in a location displaced from the city proper (the park), our protagonist’s perceptions of the city alter dramatically after the event. The city becomes Mary Ann’s urban imaginary, and she feels threatened by it wherever she turns. The image of the city is characterized by darkness and rain, a reflection of Mary Ann’s trauma. It is as if this act were committed by the city itself, not the man who truly enacted the crime (see Figure 70).

---

56 Secondspace, the urban imaginary, is not always necessarily dystopian. In other texts it can be understood, for example, in terms of memory: of London and fog, or of Paris as the city of love.
Thirdspace is Soja’s final spatial perspective:

*Everything* comes together in Thirdspace: subjectivity and objectivity, the abstract and the concrete, the real and the imagined, the knowable and the unimaginable, the repetitive and the differential, structure and agency, mind and body, consciousness and the unconscious, the disciplined and the transdisciplinary, everyday life and unending history. (1996: 57)

Thirdspace is therefore the combination of both First and Secondspace, embracing their dialectic oppositions for the production of a greater understanding of the cityspace. In terms of this analysis, it is understood as the outcome of the use of both First and Secondspaces, in terms of the tensions which arise between the reality of the concrete city and the dystopian impressions of the city. This can be understood in terms of the outcome of each film. In the
conclusion of each film the characters have come to gain new understanding of their roles within society and in the city. This, as we shall see in the conclusion to this case study, can be seen as the outcome of the mediation between the First and Second-spatial perspectives throughout the three narratives.

In what follows, I shall seek to demonstrate how these three spatial perspectives operate in Schüfftan’s three New York films. The case study has been divided into three sections. The first of these sections introduces each of the films addressed, noting how Schüfftan came to work upon each film because of the unique traits he offered the directors, and thanks to his newly found ability to work in the United States. This section then addresses the role of New York City in location filmmaking during the 1960s. This is followed in the second section by a discussion of the stylistic approaches adopted by each director, for each director has discussed their approaches to filmmaking in terms of very similar language – notably objectivity/subjectivity, reality/poeticism – which inform the First and Secondspace analyses of each of the three films. The final section takes a closer look at the films, demonstrating how each constructs the cityspace in terms of both First and Secondspace perspectives. The conclusion seeks to demonstrate, by addressing the conclusion to each film, how a Thirdspace has been realized. This analysis is structured by addressing the major spaces which are present, urban interiors, urban exteriors, and non-places, demonstrating how the three films vary and comply in their representations of these shared spaces.

The Films

*Something Wild (Jack Garfein, 1961)*
Having tried and failed to build a successful career in Hollywood during the 1940s, thanks to the protectionism of the ASC (despite Schüfftan’s American citizenship, granted in 1947), Schüfftan had returned to work in Europe during the 1950s, and was achieving a certain degree of success from projects with Julien Duvivier, Alexandre Astruc and Georges Franju. However, Schüfftan was ‘saved’ for the American film industry by the director Jack Garfein, who approached Schüfftan to photograph *Something Wild* (1961), a film which tells the story of the complex relationship between a young woman who has been raped, and her ‘rescuer’.

The film is a brutal tale in which Mary Ann, a young college student played by Garfein’s wife Carroll Baker, is raped one evening on her walk home through New York. Following the attack, Mary Ann attempts to continue her life as normal. However, she has become distant and uncomfortable around people, struggling to communicate with her family. She runs away from her home and her college life, instead renting a boarding-house room and finding a job in a cheap convenience store. This change of scene does not improve Mary Ann’s life, as she is bullied at work for being distant towards her colleagues, and she struggles at home with the flirtatious lifestyle of her fellow boarder, Shirley (Jean Stapleton).

Consumed by despair with her life, Mary Ann heads to the Manhattan Bridge where she attempts to take her own life. However, before she can jump she is pulled back and saved by Mike (Ralph Meeker). Mike takes Mary Ann back to his flat near the bridge and, consoled by the comfort of strangers, she agrees to stay with him until she has recovered. However, relations between the two do not remain so congenial. Mike returns home drunk one night and tries to embrace the vulnerable Mary Ann. Still disturbed by her horrific experience Mary Ann fights off Mike, kicking him in the face, causing him to pass out. Mary Ann tries to escape but finds herself locked in the apartment. When Mike comes to consciousness the next morning he finds he has lost the sight of one eye, which he believes was the result of his
drunken evening in the bar, rather than his tussle with Mary Ann. Mary Ann is desperate to leave Mike, be he won’t free her from his apartment, keeping her locked inside throughout the days when he goes to work. He has become dependent upon her, and needs her to be dependent on him.

Throughout Mary Ann’s imposed tenure in Mike’s apartment he continues to try and seduce her. This leads to an argument in which Mary Ann finally reveals to Mike that it was she who caused the damage to his eye. Mike storms out of the apartment, leaving the door open and thus giving Mary Ann the opportunity she needs to escape. Having freed herself of Mike’s claustrophobic love, Mary Ann finally begins to find contentment with herself as she roams the city, rediscovering the wonder of life. It is this realization of her own sense of self which leads her back to Mike’s apartment, where they finally fulfil their complex love. The conclusion of the film is set a few months after these events, when Mary Ann’s mother receives a letter from her absent daughter, explaining where she now lives. The mother rushes to the apartment where she finds Mary Ann and Mike, who are now married and expecting a baby. In the final lines of the film the distraught mother asks, ‘What’s happened?’ Mary Ann replies, ‘What’s happened has happened, Mother,’ before mother and daughter finally reach acceptance and embrace each other.

Schüfftan was recommended for the project by the stills photographer Sam Shaw who, like Schüfftan, also specialised in black and white photography. Shaw was best known for his work with film stars, particularly in the form of studio publicity (a task which he also undertook for *Something Wild*). In particular, he will forever be remembered as the man who photographed Marilyn Monroe stood over a subway grate, her skirt blown up above her waist. Schüfftan, despite his age (73), responded enthusiastically to the script and to what he described as a ‘modern’ story, and agreed to participate on the film (Johnson, 1963: 41). In
essence, this contract brought about the end of Schüfftan’s blacklisting from working as a cinematographer in the American film industry, as he was permitted membership by the Local 644 East Coast branch of the union, allowing him to act as cinematographer in the New York area, where *Something Wild* was due to shoot. Schüfftan’s presence in the city for filming in fact made *The New York Times*. The writer (Archer, 1960a) describes Schüfftan as ‘one of Europe’s top “mood” camera men’, and notes that, ‘This will be the first accredited American photographic assignment for Mr. Shuftan, whose list of credits constitutes a miniature history of European film trends, embracing German expressionism, early precursors of Italian neo-realism, pre-war French symbolic dramas and, most recently, “new wave” experiments.’ In his emphasis upon Schüfftan’s successful European career, the author fails to note Schüfftan’s long and frustrating years of work in America, which have been well documented in this thesis. Nevertheless, Schüfftan’s return, or arrival, was marked by this newspaper.

*The Hustler (Robert Rossen, 1961)*

Despite being poorly received by American critics, *Something Wild* did reintroduce Schüfftan to the industry that had rejected him during the 1940s, marking the first in a series of films for Schüfftan which were all set and filmed in New York, the area where he was permitted to work. For the next of these films Schüfftan was afforded an introduction by Garfein to the director Robert Rossen, who was searching for an accomplished black and white cinematographer to shoot his next picture. A talented cinematographer was necessary to compensate for Rossen, who had little eye or care for the image, concerning himself instead with narrative, a result of his long experience as a scriptwriter (Cohen, 1965: 5). Garfein recommended Schüfftan to Rossen, for what would become the cinematographer’s most
celebrated success, *The Hustler* (1961), shot on location in the pool halls of New York City (Archer, 1961). It was for his photography of this film that Schüfftan won his one and only Academy Award, a rather symbolic victory awarded from the institution which had prevented him from working freely for so long. As already noted, of all ironies, in Schüfftan’s eagerness to work, he found himself shooting in France for Jean-Pierre Mocky at the time of the ceremony, and was unable to accept the honour in person.

*The Hustler* starred Paul Newman as ‘Fast’ Eddie Felson, the eponymous hustler, who travels to New York City to challenge ‘Minnesota Fats’ (Jackie Gleason), supposedly the finest pool player around. The pair play throughout the night, with Eddie’s hubris rising with every game he wins and with every drink he takes, the bets steadily increasing all the while. After a marathon 25 hour pool session, a drunken Eddie loses everything and Fats calls an end to their game. Ashamed, Eddie runs from his hustling partner Charlie (Myron McCormick), and meets Sarah (Piper Laurie), another down-and-out, in a bar. The two soon fall for each other, and live together in Sarah’s apartment, rarely interacting with the outside world. Eddie slowly descends back into the seedy world of pool hustling, replacing Charlie with Fats’s manager Bert (George C. Scott), who begins to stake his games. After a big victory for Eddie and Bert, Eddie decides to walk home to Sarah. Bert arrives earlier, and sexually harasses Sarah, who despises the world within which Eddie operates. When Eddie returns he finds that Sarah has committed suicide, writing the words ‘PERVERTED’, ‘TWISTED’, and ‘CRIPPLED’ in lipstick on the bathroom mirror, before taking her own life. The film ends with Eddie challenging Fats to one final game of the pool. This time Eddie is the victor, and when confronted by Bert for his share of the winnings, Eddie, in the film’s final moments, refuses, and walks out of the pool hall.
At this time Schüfftan was working between France (for his collaborations with Jean-Pierre Mocky) and New York. His Academy Award success for the cinematography of *The Hustler* immediately reunited Schüfftan with Rossen for the director’s next film, *Lilith* (1964). This film has been briefly discussed in part one of this chapter, and will play no further part in this case study of the films which were shot on location in New York City (*Lilith* utilized suburban locations, namely Long Island, and Rockville, Maryland, as opposed to the cityspace).

*Trois chambres à Manhattan/Three Rooms in Manhattan (Marcel Carné, 1965)*

Having made *Something Wild* and *The Hustler* on locations in New York City, and having received acclaim for his work on Rossen’s *The Hustler* and *Lilith*, Schüfftan came to the final film of this ‘New York trilogy’, *Trois chambres à Manhattan/Three Rooms in Manhattan* (Carné, 1965). The film combined Schüfftan’s dual interests of European and American filmmaking, being a French production by *Les Productions Montaigne*, which filmed on location in New York City, as well as on sets in France. The film is also notable for reuniting the cinematographer with Marcel Carné, the director responsible for one of Schüfftan’s greatest successes, *Le Quai des brumes*, some twenty-seven years earlier (see Figures 71 and 72). An adaptation of Georges Simenon’s 1945 novel, *Trois chambres à Manhattan* is the story of François (Maurice Ronet), an actor who moves from Paris to New York when his wife leaves him. In New York, François finds a job for a television company. Traversing the city one evening, François meets Kay (Annie Girardot) in a bar, and the lives of the two lost souls soon become entwined. The pair begins living together in a hotel room, before rapidly moving into François’s apartment. However, their blossoming relationship soon stumbles when François discovers that Kay is married, with a wealthy family living in Mexico,
including an ill daughter whom Kay needs to visit, and furthermore, that she is in New York because she ran away from her family with a gigolo.

Figure 71: Schüfftan on set with the cast and crew of *Le Quai des brumes* in 1938 (back row, second from right).
Figure 72: Schüfftan on set with Marcel Carné and the cast of Trois chambres à Manhattan in 1965 (far left).

Whilst Kay is away visiting her daughter François becomes jealous, convincing himself that he will be treated the same way she treated her husband. François goes out for dinner with his boss (O. E. Hasse) and June (Margaret Nolan), a beautiful young actress from the company. François takes June home and sleeps with her in the bed he shared with Kay. With her daughter recovering, Kay telephones that night from Mexico, and senses something is wrong from François’s awkwardness. She rushes home, and is confronted with the truth by François. Kay storms out, but François chases after her and convinces her to forgive him. The film ends as the pair leave their apartment for the last time and walk out into the city, their futures awaiting them.
The three films addressed here formed part of an emergent East Coast filmmaking scene of the 1960s, which would continue to grow until it was most fully exploited by the likes of Woody Allen and Martin Scorsese in the 1970s. Demonstrating the successful growth of New York as a site for feature film production was *The New York Times*, which throughout the 1960s regularly featured reports upon current filmmaking projects, in and around New York. These reports were provided for *The New York Times* by the journalist Eugene Archer. Archer in fact supplied a set report for each of the three films addressed in this chapter, offering insightful information regarding the practices of location shooting, and the stylistic intentions of each director. One such fact which is revealed through Archer’s writings is that New York film production tended to centralize around Manhattan, best utilizing the most famous landmarks the city has to offer. To illustrate this point, the following map of Manhattan Island highlights a number of the location sites employed by each of the three films (see Figure 73).
Further attesting to the city’s keenness to promote film production are two articles of 1965, also published in *The New York Times*. The first of these, ‘City is Promoted as Movie Locale’, reveals the news that five major film productions have, ‘obtained technical clearance and a guarantee of citywide cooperation’ (one of which was *Trois chambres à Manhattan*) (Anon., 1965). A statement by the Department of Commerce and Industrial Development, also quoted by the author, reiterates that ‘all city agencies are giving the producers the fullest assistance.’ (Anon., 1965) To further pave the way for film production, a second *New York Times* article, ‘Film Unions Here Set Up Amity Unit’, reveals that a smooth process of resolving disputes between union members and film production companies was being established in the city. For the union, the Local 52, it was imperative to, ‘strengthen and improve the relationship between management and labor in New York movie production and to foster and encourage filmmaking in the city.’ (Thompson, 1965)  

The prominent use of location shooting in New York also invites an interest in the use of exteriors. Indeed, the use of exterior locations, and the *degree* of their use is an important
point of interest in each of the three films. As the pie charts overleaf show (see Figure 74), the use of exterior locations was, for *The Hustler*, negligible, for *Trois chambres à Manhattan*, notable, and for *Something Wild*, considerable. In *Something Wild* and *Trois chambres à Manhattan*, the city locations provide a living, breathing space, which mirrors the evolving psychological state of Mary Ann, and the developing relationship of François and Kay. In *Trois chambres à Manhattan*, this sense of a corporeal city is literally brought into being when the couple observe steam rising from the city’s subway grates, as if the city were breathing. *The Hustler* is comprised almost entirely of interior locations, enhancing the intensity and claustrophobia of Eddie’s lifestyle as a hustler, and his relationship with Sarah. Only approximately six and a half minutes of the 127 minute long film are exterior shots, and, at its most intense, we experience almost 40 minutes of interior scenes before we receive the brief respite of an exterior space. Whilst exterior locations are given greater representational space in *Something Wild* and *Trois chambres à Manhattan*, nonetheless interior locations dominate in a similar way, and provoke an intense sensation of cabin fever.
Figure 74: Piecharts demonstrating the degree of interiors and exteriors in each of the three films.
As I shall go on to demonstrate, however, it is the very expansiveness of the city exteriors that ultimately serves to reinforce the sense of claustrophobia of the interiors, which underscore François and Kay’s increasingly stifling relationship, and Mary Ann’s imprisonment in Mike’s apartment (explored further in the section ‘Cityspaces’). This is particularly true of *Something Wild*, for which an astonishing 33% of the film is comprised of exteriors, compared to only 5% and 13% for *The Hustler* and *Trois chambres à Manhattan* respectively. The degree of time spent by Mary Ann in exterior locations functions to enhance the degree of her claustrophobia when she is trapped in Mike’s apartment, and struggles to see through the window in order to get a glimpse of life continuing around her outside. This claustrophobia then in turn leads to the powerful emotion of Mary Ann’s escape, as she is able to rediscover the city with a new appreciation for life.

In addition to this dialectic between interiors and exteriors in the three films, it is also worth noting that the degree of location shooting for interior scenes varies between films. In the case of *Something Wild*, all scenes for the film, both interiors and exteriors, were filmed on location. In comparison, for *The Hustler*, Rossen employed some use of sets for interior scenes, despite his outspoken dislike for studio filmmaking (‘I have a horror for studios!’ (Noames and Rossen, 1967: 21)), and for *Trois chambres à Manhattan*, Carné relied upon an extensive use of sets, and all interiors for the film were shot in studio in Paris. These factors are relevant to the issues of ‘realism’ and ‘poeticism’ ascribed to each of these films, and discussed in section two of this case study.

**The Name Game**

It is unsurprising that Schüfftan was chosen to act as cinematographer in each of these films, considering each director’s outspoken desire to capture both elements of realism and
expression. This desire to achieve a dialectical style in the films’ aesthetic, so consonant with Schüfftan’s style, in fact marks the culmination of the various different approaches to the image established throughout Schüfftan’s career. Combined are his early interests in realism, displayed on Menschen am Sonntag and Abschied, where he rejected Expressionism, and his subsequent more expressionist approach to the image which he developed once in exile, to meet (as I explained in Chapter II: Part One) the expectation for cinematographers of a German prewar background.

This dialectical approach is perhaps no clearer than in Something Wild. Speaking on the set of the film, Garfein described his approach as follows:

We aren’t trying for a documentary approach. [...] We want to handle it more subjectively, through our heroine’s eyes. Something violent happens to her at the beginning of the film, and this makes her look at the city as an ugly, hostile place. Later, after being locked up for months, she goes outdoors again, and this time the city seems open and friendly. What our photography has to capture is not just the moods of the city, but those of the girl. (Archer, 1960)

Despite Garfein’s insistence, in this quote, upon subjectivity, realism was nonetheless integral to his concept of the shooting style, and was clearly impacted upon through the use of real locations in the city: ‘By shooting on actual locations in the city, the visual essence of what might happen to Mary Ann on those streets, when walking through those neighborhoods, adds to the tension of the film.’ (Johnson, 1963: 40) We can see in these quotes how Garfein was keen to capture both Firstspace and Secondspace. There is a tension between these two quotes which reflects the dialectic tension between First and Secondspace. The city for Garfein is at once presented as ‘reality’, and also a subjective space which reflects the moods
of Mary Ann. We shall see below how this tension later provides a productive outcome, in terms of a Thirdspace.

Robert Rossen has discussed, in very similar terms, his stylistic approaches to filmmaking, when in discussion with Jean-Louis Noames of *Cahiers du cinéma*:

> It is not a matter of a servile reproduction of reality. Rather it will be necessary to capture things as they are and modify them so as to give them a poetic significance. Furthermore, it matters little whether you call it poetic or not; what matters is that in this way something situated beyond and above life be delivered, and that thus one should feel what one deeply thinks. To reach, if you will, through the objective become universal [*sic.*]. But those terms are problematic. What is objective? What is subjective? The subjective becomes the objective in many cases…” (Noames and Rossen, 1967: 23-25)

It is notable that both Garfein and Rossen employ similar language to describe their approaches to filmmaking, with both discussing issues of subjectivity. It is precisely Rossen’s description that ‘The subjective becomes the objective in many cases’ which I shall endeavor to define later on in this chapter, as an example of Soja’s concept of the three spaces.

In an attempt to define the correct terminology to describe this stylistic approach outlined by Rossen, Jean-Louis Noames responds to his statement by tentatively terming this cinema, ‘réalisme fantastique, fantastic realism, meaning by that a great objectivity enriched by a poetic dimension.’ (Noames and Rossen, 1967: 25) Now might seem an appropriate juncture to introduce Carné and his renowned Poetic Realist style. However, I shall address this issue shortly.
Noames’s term ‘fantastic realism’ was in fact a concept introduced by *Cahiers du cinéma* critics some years earlier than when Rossen’s interview was conducted in 1966. The first to develop the term, borrowing from the literary critics Jacques Bergier and Louis Pauwels, was Fereydoun Hoveyda, in an article entitled ‘*Cinéma vérité, or Fantastic Realism*’, published in 1961, two months after the release of *The Hustler*, although Rossen’s film receives no mention (Hoveyda, 1992: 248-256). Instead, Hoveyda applies the term to the cinema of the documentary filmmaker Jean Rouch, and in particular his film made alongside Edgar Morin, *Chronique d’un été/Chronicle of a Summer* (1961). Morin described *cinema vérité* as a cinema which ‘overcomes the fundamental opposition between fictional cinema and documentary cinema […] you have to make a film which has a total authenticity, as real as a documentary but with the content of a fictional film – that is, the content of subjective life, how people exist.’ (Hoveyda, 1992: 249) Hoveyda extends beyond this definition, to develop the concept ‘fantastic realism’, to describe this dialectical aesthetic in which ‘The impossible becomes possible, and a door opens on a world which is far more interesting than the façade that the neo-realists construct for us.’ (1992: 251)

Similar territory is approached in a later edition of *Cahiers du cinéma*, by Jean-André Fieschi in his article, ‘Neo-neo-realism’, first published in 1963 (1992: 271-275). Fieschi argues, ‘It is axiomatic that every good film, whatever its point of departure, encounters along its way both realism and the fantastic’ (1992: 272). Fieschi’s article aims to assess ‘what the probable or desirable evolution of modern cinema will be’, by addressing ‘the young French cinema and the young Italian cinema’, paying particular attention to Vittorio De Seta’s *Banditi a Orgosolo/Bandits of Orgosolo* (1964) (1992: 271-272). Fieschi reaches the conclusion that, ‘it is the way De Seta effects a shift from an initial didacticism (critical
realism) to an aesthetic sublimation of this (poetic realism) that makes him interesting’ (1992: 273-274). The term can therefore be similarly ascribed to the filming practices of Robert Rossen and Jack Garfein, who both maintained an interest in combining elements of realism, ‘enriched’, as Noames (1967: 25) suggested, with ‘a poetic dimension.’

*Realisme poétique/Le fantastique social*

Having set out the discourses of realism and subjectivity which overlap in the comments of Garfein and Rossen, and which lead into the critical concept of ‘réalisme fantastique’ developed by the writers of *Cahiers du cinéma*, we can see how they derive from Poetic Realism (a term outlined in Chapter II, Part One), which I feel has been an implicit presence in much of the above discussion. Carné himself entered into this ‘name game’, this attempt to apply the appropriate critical term. Speaking in 1972, later than both the release of the three films addressed in this chapter and the critical dialogue employed by *Cahiers du cinéma*, Carné unwittingly draws himself ever closer to the discourses surrounding *Something Wild* and *The Hustler*. Carné distances himself from the term poetic realism, stating:

> I must say in all sincerity that I don’t like the rubric *realisme poétique*. Calling me a realist doesn’t make me happy. It’s perhaps precise; but if so, then I can’t be very proud of myself. Because in my opinion I have interpreted reality just a little. Even when I make realistic films, I can’t help believing that a personal vision was involved. The category I prefer, even if it is pretentious, is Mac Orlan’s celebrated phrase, *le fantastique social*. I think that the fantastique social is what shapes *Le Quai des brumes*, which is closer to the fantastic [*le fantastique*] than to a poetic realism [*un realisme poétique*]. (Turk, 1989: 110)

Turk responds to this statement by noting that, by ‘rejecting the term *realisme poétique* on the grounds that it trivializes the extent to which he “interpreted” or poeticized reality, Carné
implies that he takes pride in the visionary, escapist aspects of his films. But his proposed substitution, *le fantastique social*, denotes the same two concepts: reality and fantasy.’ (1989: 111) These are the precise words offered by the *Cahiers* critic Jean-Louis Noames to Robert Rossen, as an attempt to describe his approach to filmmaking.

Carné, however, was not viewed fondly by the publication which shared his terminology. He became, for those young critics of *Cahiers*, the quintessential example of *le cinéma du papa*, against which the likes of Truffaut and Godard sought to rebel. Furthermore, there is a sense in the comments made by these critics, that Carné is being punished for his fall from grace, because his early works (those which are understood within the Poetic Realist canon), were so revered by the *Cahiers* critics. The general consensus for *Cahiers* was that Carné was not a *metteur en scène*, but merely a *metteur en images*, and therefore the success of his earlier works was the responsibility of the scriptwriter, Jacques Prévert (Turk, 1989: 392). A vitriolic attack led by Truffaut resulted in various critics declaring Carné, ‘a confused spirit’ (François Truffaut), as a man with ‘nothing to say’ (Eric Rohmer), as the maker of ‘execrable work’ (François Mauriac) (Turk, 1989: 391-392).

By the time of the release of *Trois chambres à Manhattan*, the hangover of this attitude could still be felt. Reviewing the film for *Cahiers*, both Jean-André Fieschi, who two years previously had discussed *réalisme fantastique*, and André Téchiné, described *Trois chambres à Manhattan* as, ‘The latest failure of Marcel Carné’ [*Le nouvel échec de Marcel Carné*], even going as far as to declare, ‘This is not a film’ [*Ce n’est pas un film*] (1965: 52).

It is a testament to the dominance of the *Cahiers* discourse and the revisionism of their writings that Carné’s later films are so readily dismissed. The truth of the matter reveals a filmmaker still enjoying great success with the wider public and critical press, and who could even be found comparable in certain terms to the *nouvelle vague*. *Les Tricheurs/The
Cheaters was declared the best French film of 1958, the same year as the New Wave explosion, by various polls and prizes, and was the highest grossing box office success of that year (Turk, 1989: 400). Furthermore, despite obvious oppositions between ‘the Carné Touch’ and the nouvelle vague, Turk has found a number of comparisons between Les Tricheurs and the approach of the nouvelle vague directors, even suggesting that the success of Carné’s film paved the way for this onslaught of young pretenders. He notes, ‘Like the most popular New Wave productions, Les Tricheurs’s concern was youth. Its treatment of sex was explicit. Its extras were mainly non-professionals. Its music was the American jazz […] Above all, young and relatively unknown actors portrayed its protagonists.’ (1989: 401) Carné himself proclaimed it as an influence upon the nouvelle vague, and even Truffaut noted its importance (Turk, 1989: 401).

All three films and their directors therefore share the same discourses of production, of an interest in combining the seemingly dialectical terms of realism and poeticism. Attempts to account for the combination of such dialectics have resulted in the critical terms réalisme fantastique, réalisme poétique and le fantastique social which I have outlined above. Crucially, not only have all three directors discussed their interest in combining the dialectic of realism and the poetic, but all three also chosen Eugen Schüfftan, whose career had balanced an interest in realism with the development of more expressive forms of lighting, to act in the role of cinematographer. There is one further term to be explored, the name of an invention which during the 1950s became synonymous with issues realism, particularly for the Cahiers critics who valorized its possibilities. Of the trilogy of New York films, this would be used exclusively upon The Hustler.

CinemaScope
The introduction of CinemaScope in by Twentieth Century Fox with the release of *The Robe* in 1953 (Henry Koster) was seen as the bright new future for cinema. CinemaScope, an anamorphic lens able to capture an image nearly twice the width of the established ratio (approximately 2.66:1, compared to the ‘Academy’ ratio of 1.37:1), began its life as a French invention by Henri Chrétien. Chrétien’s invention dates as far back as the mid-1920s, around the same time Schüfftan was perfecting his own process. His patent, first registered in France in 1927, and in the United States in 1928, was titled, ‘Process for taking or projecting photographic or cinematographic panoramic views or views extending in height,’ but was better known in its first guise as the ‘Anamorphoscope’ (Chrétien, 1931). Interestingly, Chrétien’s invention originally intended to provide the option of both greater width, and greater height of the film image. He explained the necessity of his invention in the abstract of his patent: ‘The proportions universally adopted for the screens for cinematographic projections: height 3/width 4, are incompatible with a suitable presentation of certain sceneries, such as panoramas (which require a certain width) interiors of churches, high monuments (which require a greater height).’ (Chrétien, 1931) Even at this early stage, Chrétien’s invention sought to achieve a more accurate reproduction of reality through human perception. The desire to capture panoramic vistas which would mirror the breadth of human perception speaks of a desire towards *reproduction* rather than *representation*, a discourse which would be supported by Twentieth Century Fox studios many years later.

Chrétien’s invention remained unused until the process was bought by the President of Twentieth-Century Fox, Spyros Skouras in late 1952, in an attempt to compete with the rise of television, and to find a low-cost alternative to Cinerama productions. Cinerama had clumsily required the use of three cameras during production and three projectors during exhibition, for the creation of the widescreen image. After spending a few months perfecting the process, CinemaScope was announced to the world on February 2nd, 1953, with Skouras
and Darryl F. Zanuck proclaiming it to be an important technological development to the cinema, comparable to the transition to sound. They were also keen to highlight the three-dimensional effect achievable from the process, and of particular relevance here, the significant advancement it offered in realism (Pryor, 1953: 17). It seems that it was ‘realism’ that in fact became the ‘buzz word’ in Fox’s aggressive marketing strategy for their new system. Fox explained their new process in one of a number of informative guides produced for potential exhibitors:

CinemaScope is a completely engineered system for the practical presentation of wide screen pictures combined with true stereophonic sound and so designed as to provide the greatest approach to realism in motion picture story telling which has yet been achieved. This realism is possible because the CinemaScope scheme permits using lenses during the photography which gives the most natural perspective; the angles of view in the presentation of CinemaScope approach that to which we are accustomed in life and the effect of stereophonic sound is to assist in bringing the performance to the stage or area before the audience. (Sponable, 1953)

However, despite Fox’s keen pursuit of realism, both visual and aural, responses to CinemaScope amongst critics were mixed (not helped by the apparently poor standard of Fox’s first CinemaScope picture, The Robe), with one of its biggest detractors being Sight & Sound in Britain, and the greatest exponent of the new technology’s possibilities being Cahiers du cinéma in France. The essential element in common amongst the Cahiers critics and the articles they wrote on CinemaScope, is the potential offered by this new technology for realism. One such example is François Truffaut (1985: 274), who argued that ‘If you agree that every stage of perfection must of necessity be an effective increase in realism, then CinemaScope is a stage in that perfection’. The introduction of CinemaScope also influenced film style in certain other ways. Bordwell, Staiger and Thompson (1985: 361) have
demonstrated how CinemaScope films employed lengthier shots, with the new technology encompassing more within the image, creating less need for cut-aways (although Barry Salt’s statistical style analysis suggests that CinemaScope merely arrived at the peak of average shot lengths which has been steadily increasing throughout the 1940s and 50s (1983: 317-318)).

Whilst CinemaScope and colour were seen as the new technologies by Hollywood to sell realism to their audiences, such was the expense of the combination of the two new mediums that many film industries, when they did elect to shoot in CinemaScope, opted for black and white photography. So by the 1960s, black and white was either being employed due to cost restrictions, or as a clear aesthetic choice. As a consequence of Schüfftan’s inability to work for the US studios during the 1940s, a key period when studio technicians were being trained in the use of colour, Schüfftan was not experienced in colour photography. Now at last this handicap became a positive, and he was sought out for his mastery of the black and white process. Thus Garfein and Rossen, who were both restricted by low budgets, turned to Schüfftan for his experience in black and white photography, and in Rossen’s case this was combined with the new CinemaScope lens. This therefore explains Schüfftan’s presence upon each of these three films as a black and white specialist.

Cityspaces

It is now timely to turn to and examine dominant cityspaces evident in each film. These have been divided into three general spatial types. Firstly, urban interiors, which encompass spaces such as bedrooms and bars. Secondly, urban exteriors covers spaces including the parks present in each of the three films, and the bridge which plays a crucial role in *Something Wild*. Finally, non-places (Augé, 2008) examine those spaces which do not
conform to the above categories, because they are not sites which are traditionally invested with meaning. These spaces, such as bus terminals and hotels, come to play a key role in each film, where the protagonists struggle to find their roles within society. The representation of these spaces contributes to the creation of either a First or Secondspace in the films. This creates dialectical tensions that lead to each character’s new understanding of the city at the end of each film, which can be understood in terms of Thirdspace. This will of course be demonstrated through the photography of Schüfftan, the man tasked with reproducing these spaces in visual terms.

Urban interiors: Bedrooms, bars and pool halls

The traumatic experience of Mary Ann’s rape in *Something Wild* immediately manifests itself in the character’s movements, as she travels home and sneaks to her bedroom. During these shots we see Mary Ann cling to the edges and the corners of spaces she passes through, as if trying to disappear into the city, or to feel connected to the concrete spaces of the city in order to ground her sense of self. For example, when Mary Ann sneaks into her house, she makes her way up the stairs to her bedroom by clinging her body to the wall. Then, most distressingly, once in her room Mary Ann takes a blanket from her bed, shrouds herself in it and cowers in the corner of her bedroom. Mid-shots dominate throughout this scene, demonstrating a resistance by Schüfftan’s camera to get too close to the traumatized subject. Also, Schüfftan does not employ a strong use of backlight, which would function to separate Mary Ann from her background and give a greater sense of depth to the image. This lack of backlight allows Mary Ann to recede into the image and to cling to the walls which provide her comfort.
These sequences showing the aftermath of the attack are strikingly reminiscent of \textit{Psycho} (Alfred Hitchcock, 1960), a film contemporaneous with \textit{Something Wild}.\footnote{\textit{Psycho} went on release on June 16\textsuperscript{th} 1960, just before filming began in New York for \textit{Something Wild}, on July 25\textsuperscript{th} 1960.} The viscous stabbing of Marion Crane (Janet Leigh) in the shower in \textit{Psycho}, punctuated by Hitchcock’s visceral editing, and the brutal rape of Mary Ann in \textit{Something Wild}, are shocking and powerful in their brevity and their lack of visualization of actual violence. In \textit{Psycho}, Hitchcock’s clever construction means we never see the knife pierce the body, and in \textit{Something Wild}, the image of Mary Ann about to be raped fades to black, as if in shame for Mary Ann, only returning once the act has been committed. The aftermath scenes are just as powerful for the amount of time and detail granted to the ‘clean-up’ operations. Tension never abates as we see Norman Bates (Anthony Perkins) fastidiously clean down the bath tub and dispose of Marion’s body, and the full graphic horrors of Mary Ann’s traumatic experience are realized when we witness her scrubbing her own body down in the bathtub, as Schüfftan’s camera highlights the cuts and bruises that torment her body. We then see her carefully cutting the clothes she had been wearing into small threads, to be flushed down the toilet, again in a dispassionately restrained distant mid-shot. This is also akin to \textit{Psycho} and the scene of Marion Crane disposing of her scraps of paper down the toilet.

Schüfftan’s approach to lighting these shots of Mary Ann in the bathtub of her family home is particularly interesting. His light glistens on the bare wet back of Mary Ann, creating a tension between what is a sexualized body and also a damaged body, suggesting that it is this sexuality which caused the attack. The lighting to Mary Ann’s face is equally as contentious. The make-up around her eyes is smudged and blurry, making them look oversized, and her face shines in the same way as her back from the combination of the water she is washing in and Schüfftan’s unforgiving light. The ultimate result is that, in these shots, Schüfftan skillfully makes Mary Ann’s appearance become reminiscent of a porcelain doll. This image
directly addresses the male gaze, suggesting that it is the rapist’s perception of her facile
beauty, viewing her as nothing more than an object, which caused her to be attacked.

Once Mary Ann decides she can no longer face her parents and her previous life, she runs
away from her family home and sets up a new life for herself, by renting a cramped room in a
boarding house and finding her own job at a discount convenience store. Garfein (Johnson,
1963: 40) was keen to recreate such spaces on screen with the use of actual locations, a point
which speaks to the observational tendencies of the film and the craft required in terms of
Schüfftan’s use of the camera. There is no truer example of this than Mary Ann’s boarding
house room, which is so cramped that the camera can only remain in a fixed point, with
Schüfftan able only to pan up and down (see Figure 75). This exiguity of course functions to
reinforce the cramped claustrophobic nature of Mary Ann’s new residence. For by choosing
to shoot in actual interiors there is a lack of space to position large cameras and other
equipment required for filmmaking. The effect of these cramped conditions is also a natural
creation of more shadows, and thus there are great chiaroscuro lighting effects achieved by
Schüfftan, reminiscent of the classic images of German Expressionism. One particular
example is the staircase which Mary Ann must ascend to reach her room. Shadows dominate
this space, cast up the wall by both the bodies that traverse it, and the banisters which follow
the path of the stairs. It recalls in aesthetic terms the moment of horror in Nosferatu (F.W.
Murnau, 1922) when the vampire ascends the staircase and approaches his victim. In these
scenes, Secondspace again dominates. We understand everything from Mary Ann’s
subjective point of view, so that all spaces, her room, the department store where she works,
and even the city, become claustrophobic and/or intimitating spaces.
In fact, despite being set in an expansive city, much of the film, from the rape of Mary Ann at the start, through until her realization of her own sense of self towards the end of the film, is set amongst such claustrophobic spaces, even in the streets of New York. Examples are the trees amongst which Mary Ann is raped, the subway train which becomes so busy and claustrophobic that it causes her to pass out, her boarding room, and even the store in which she works. For whilst the convenience store is a large and open space, the *mise-en-scène* is extremely claustrophobic. There are so many shelves and products throughout the store that the camera cannot see to the back, and the space is actually so contained that Mary Ann’s colleague must push past her whilst she is working, causing her extreme discomfort (Mary Ann is unable to cope with any form of human contact since her brutal attack, and clings to the walls once more when she is cruelly bullied by her colleagues). As Mary Ann’s condition
worsens, making it impossible for her to now find her place in society, Schüfftan’s framing of her becomes tighter. This can be witnessed in the scene in which Mary Ann’s neighbour is raucously entertaining a gentleman next door. Mary Ann has just fled back to her bedsit after being jostled around by her colleagues at work, and is now clearly uncomfortable at the sound of overly familiar human contact next door.

Interior locations provide a claustrophobic space for the introverted characters of each of the three films, from which the exterior locations, and particularly those of the parks, may or may not act as a release. In *Something Wild*, Mike imprisons Mary Ann in his apartment for much of the second half of the film, giving neither the protagonist, nor the spectator, respite from this claustrophobic space. For a total of forty-three minutes Schüfftan’s camera does not escape this interior space, save to gaze longingly, alongside Mary Ann, at the outside space beyond the barrier of the window and its bars. The construction of this interior space by Schüfftan’s light and camera, and by the set design (of a location set, rather than studio), enhances this sense of oppression (see Figure 76).

As we can see from my approximate representation of this space in the diagram below, the layout of the room anticipates that of *The L-Shaped Room* (Bryan Forbes, 1962), which similarly explored the young female’s role in society. Mary Ann’s part of the apartment is surprisingly spacious compared to Mike’s, in which his bed is contained in cramped vicinity to all other necessities of home life; oven, sink and a small dining table. This living arrangement excludes Mary Ann from the domestic sphere of the home, making Mary Ann a prisoner, not only from the outside world, but also from the comforts of home life. Mary Ann

---

58 *The L-Shaped Room*, based on the novel by Lynne Reid Banks, tells the story of Jane (Leslie Caron), who is pregnant but unmarried, and moves into a rather squalid boarding house. In her time at the boarding house Jane comes to know the various unusual individuals who occupy the other rooms, and begins to date Toby (Tom Bell), until he discovers that she is pregnant. When she goes into labor the residents of the boarding house all help Jane to the hospital, where she gives birth and reconciles with Toby, before leaving the boarding house and returning home to France.
does not spend time in this area, except for when Mike invites her in with his attempts to impress her, by making her breakfast, and cooking her dinner. Crucially, when Mary Ann’s mother finds her daughter at the end of the film, Mary Ann is shown comfortably interacting with Mike in the domestic sphere, holding a pot of tea in her hand. Mary Ann’s bed has become a sofa, covered in scatter cushions, upon which one of their mutual friends sits.

![Figure 76: A diagram of Mike's apartment.](image)

For a greater understanding of how Mike’s apartment functions as part of Mary Ann’s withdrawal from the city, we can turn to feminist readings of cityspace. Such readings have found that public spaces are traditionally coded as masculine, ‘which implies and encodes the invisibility of women in the urban, their presence always problematic and transgressive’ (Mahoney, 1997: 171, reading Gillian Rose). Thus a feminist reading of this film could lead us to think that the narrative is expressing the idea that only an understanding of the urban as the masculine domain makes clear the dangers which present themselves to Mary Ann during the course of the film. Mary Ann is ‘punished’ for her presence in the masculine domain through her rape, and this is why Mike must remove Mary Ann from the masculine urban
space, imprisoning her until she understands her role within the domestic sphere, hidden from
the masculine urban environment. I would argue however that rather than encoding feminist
reading Mahoney suggests, the radical director Garfein creates a dystopian vision of the city,
in the manner of subjective Secondspace impressions.\(^5\) It is this dystopian vision of the city,
following her rape, which Mary Ann is unable to cope with. By removing her from the city,
Mike does not necessarily remove her from the masculine space, but the dystopian space. It
is her prolonged removal from this space which allows Mary Ann to emerge into the city, as
if rebirthed with new life, to see the city in its rather more mundane reality. So the apartment
acts as both a claustrophobic Secondspace, and a purgatorial Secondspace for Mary Ann,
from which a Thirdspace finally becomes possible when she is released into the city.

In *The Hustler*, conversely, the city is entirely coded as a masculine space, which prevents the
female body from being an active presence in this urban environment. The urban interiors,
like *Something Wild*, act as Secondspaces which reflect the anxieties of Sarah and Eddie.
Beyond her brief presence in a city bar and a restaurant, within the city Sarah is only seen in
domestic spaces (her apartment and the Louisville house). In terms of the lighting of
Schüfftan and the production design of Harry Horner for Sarah and Eddie’s apartment, both
seem keen to hide the fact that the location is actually a rather large space. They endeavour
to hide this fact, in order to create a sense of claustrophobia. Horner achieves this by creating
a very busy *mise-en-scène*, in which the set is cluttered with all manner of props. Schüfftan
reinforces this effect by creating a cluttered lighting effect, casting spotlights around the busy
set. He is careful, however, to avoid his usual technique of casting the brightest light onto the
rear of the set. By avoiding this Schüfftan creates less depth in the image and creates the
impression of a more claustrophobic space.

\(^5\) Garfein’s radical pedigree is demonstrated by his first film, *The Strange One* (1957), which was
subjected to heavy censorship for its veiled references to homosexuality in an American military
academy.
To highlight Sarah’s absence from the urban environment, she is seen in a brief exterior shot, in which she leaves a convenience store with her groceries, and crosses the street to her apartment building. She ventures out alone only in close proximity to the homestead, and remarks of her groceries to Eddie upon her return to the apartment, ‘I got enough so we won’t have to leave the house till Tuesday.’ Despite discussing how she has been out at work, this is not an environment we witness Sarah in, instead we see her confining herself to the apartment, venturing out only long enough to maintain their confine inside for as long as possible. As I shall later discuss, Sarah does briefly find respite from her claustrophobia when she and Eddie visit the park, and she is able to confess her love for Eddie.

Eddie in fact comes to mirror Sarah, having been feminized by his failure in the masculine sphere of the billiard hall (Secondspace). Thus, like Sarah, he confines himself to the domestic space. When he does attempt to reenter the urban-masculine environment he is physically damaged by the men of the pool hall, who break his wrists, disabling his body like Sarah’s, and forcing him to return to the domestic feminine sphere. This confinement of the feminine body ultimately results in Sarah’s suicide. This occurs in the narrative as a reaction to Bert’s aggressive sexual behavior towards her. It seems the act is also triggered by her distress at Eddie’s successful return to hustling. Eddie’s return to the pool hall can also be seen as his break from the domestic sphere he had been confined to with Mary Ann, and his return to the masculine-urban environment which she cannot be a part of. Sarah marks her suicide by using a symbol of her femininity, her lipstick, to write onto the bathroom mirror the words ‘PERVERTED’, ‘TWISTED’ and ‘CRIPPLED’, an indictment of either herself, or of Eddie’s hitherto failed masculine body. These domestic interiors can therefore be understood as the spaces where the characters take refuge from their fears of the Secondspace city, the urban-imaginary, beyond. Their inability to recognize the city in Firstspace terms, as it truly is, forces them to hide, and to create a space of claustrophobia. These claustrophobic
interiors for the most part ultimately force our characters back out into the world to view the city anew. However, for Sarah, this containment and anxiety leads to her suicide.

_Trois chambres à Manhattan_ is the film which demonstrates this discourse of a codified masculine space to the least degree. Kay is a dominant presence in the public spaces of the city, being familiar with the staff and patrons of the bars and diners she frequents. This is because Kay acts as a sexual threat to the masculine spaces. She has acted promiscuously twice (once by leaving her husband for the gigolo, the next time by leaving the gigolo for François), and this threat ultimately leads François to distrust her and to sleep with another woman. Kay does however, spend considerable time, alongside François, in domestic spaces, in particular the three bedrooms of the film’s title. These scenes offer a recreated glimpse of the sights and sounds of New York through the bedroom windows, which function in opposition to the realism of the exterior scenes shot on location in Manhattan.

These opposing methods in the representation of space mean we can interpret these spaces in different ways. The recreation of New York we glimpse at through the bedroom windows becomes a personal projection of this space by Kay and François, who have their own existence, their own ‘pure space’, contained within the confines of these bedroom walls (the Secondspace), devoid of the reality of the world beyond (the Firstspace). Kay and François are often filmed looking out from the bedroom windows (often during arguments), suggesting a desire to break from the confines of their relationship and find new freedom in the city beyond. Schüfftan reinforces this temptation with the world beyond through his use of lighting. He choose to cast strong light in through the windows, casting light on the side of the face closest to the city, and leaving the other side of the face in shade. This recalls Schüfftan technique of Rembrandt lighting, however in these instances it is created using an identifiable light source.
In addition to domestic interiors, there are other examples of urban interiors which reinforce our characters’ relations to society. The most remarkable example is the space particular only to *The Hustler*; the pool halls, which function as the space of play. The sport of pool is the subject matter of the film, however is really little more than a device to explore the addictive and troublesome aspects of Eddie’s personality. This device warrants some exploration therefore, as does the space afforded to it and the way in which it is lit and shot. Let us begin with the concept of the pool hall as a space of play. Roger Caillois (2001: 6) has described ‘play’ as follows: ‘In effect, play is essentially a separate occupation, carefully isolated from the rest of life, and generally is engaged in with precise limits of time and space.’ He continues, ‘In every case, the game’s domain is therefore a restricted, closed, protected universe: a pure space.’ (2001: 7) For pool, and for *The Hustler*, this pure space of play is the pool hall.
As if to assent that the pool hall is a pure space, ‘carefully isolated from the rest of life,’ is the preclusion of a female presence. Seemingly, this is a rule of the game, and an extension of the masculine-urban which seeks to confine female bodies to the domestic sphere. The one occasion when a female body does enter this space, when Sarah finds that Eddie has returned to that world, immediately precedes her suicide, with Burt’s harassment of her seemingly becoming a consequence or a punishment for her intrusion into the field of play.

In fact, every problem faced by Eddie and Sarah seems to be the result of the space of play bleeding into ‘real life’ beyond, and life intruding upon the game. This blurring of what should be clearly delineated boundaries, results in a number of Eddie’s problems. Meeting Sarah and choosing to walk away from the table results in Sarah setting up an oppositional space, her apartment, and more particularly, her bedroom, which is isolated from the rest of life, and host to a rather different form of play. Sarah’s removal from the wider cityspace is highlighted by Schüfftan’s extreme close-up of the apartment door, as Sarah sits waiting for Eddie to return from the pool hall. Clearly, Eddie must choose. He is punished when he plays at a new pool hall and overtly hustles the patrons. He has broken the rules of the sport and in doing so has tainted the pure space of play by bringing in the world beyond. In retaliation, Eddie’s wrists are broken, an act which is obscured from clear view by taking place behind a frosted glass window. Schüfftan casts a backlight from behind the glass, casting the figures as dramatic silhouettes as they attack Eddie’s body. It is an act we interpret solely through Schüfftan’s use of light, which creates a form of shadow play to convey the violence enacted upon Eddie. This act prevents him from reentering the space of play, and the thick plaster casts on his arms act as trophy-reminders of his subversive actions to the outside world.
Even Eddie’s initial loss to Fats is the result of outside influence from the world beyond the space of play. Eddie is successfully beating Fats throughout the night, but it is the result of Eddie’s constant alcohol consumption (brought in from outside), which causes Eddie to lose. This is also evident from the detritus of reality which taints the pool hall. The scene was shot on location at Ames billiard hall, however production designer Harry Horner was responsible for creating a more authentic sense of squalor. As Eugene Archer (1961), reporting on location at Ames billiard hall, explained: ‘Except for the pool tables, the entire second-story hall has been remodeled, with a cracked-paint job, knee-high spittoons, cigarette butts strewn across the old wooden floor and a series of picturesque signs adorning the walls.’ Therefore, the actual location used, Ames, felt either ‘too real’, or ‘not real enough’. Ames was too pure a space of play to reflect the merging of these two worlds which are in Eddie’s psyche. What is created instead is the hyper-real, something more real than real, a redesigned location that conveyed a state of mind as well as a physical space. Whilst we can consider this conjuncture as coming close to the same reality which concerned the set designers and directors of Poetic Realism, we can also argue that this space, once entered into by Eddie, also shifts from a real Firstspace to Soja’s concept of Secondspace.

Whilst enforcing this level of realism with his use of CinemaScope, Schüfftan’s use of this lens also functions to undermine one of the major discourses established for the possibilities of this technology, again introducing a dialectical tension into the meaning of the space. In my earlier analysis of CinemaScope, I highlighted how, alongside advances in realism, the lens offered new possibilities for expansive panoramas and vistas. The epic film therefore stood the most to benefit for the breadth and scale CinemaScope offered (demonstrated by *The Robe*, the first film to be shot in CinemaScope). In fact, for Rivette, this new sense of breadth adds, ‘room for air to circulate,’ compared to the ‘oppressive sensation of narrowness’ witnessed in the dimensions of the established frame. (1985: 276)
However, in *The Hustler* we are not privy to such sweeping panoramas, and instead, throughout much of the film, we are confined to the low-ceilinged second floor of Ames billiard hall. Schüfftan demonstrates his mastery of lens technology by creating an entirely contrary effect to openness. Here the CinemaScope lens does not highlight the excessive breadth of the image, but rather draws attention to the narrowness of the film frame, creating a surprisingly claustrophobic effect. When Schüfftan does draw attention to the breadth of the image, it is to reflect the dimensions of the pool table, reinforcing this as the pure space of play (see Figure 78).

![Image of a pool table in *The Hustler*](image)

**Figure 78:** Schüfftan’s employs the CinemaScope lens to capture the dimensions of the pool table in *The Hustler*.

As we have seen, urban interior spaces play a crucial role in each of the three films discussed. They function to contain and remove, often female, bodies from the city society. They exist in dialectic opposition to the city outside. In all three films the protagonists choose to remove themselves from their perception of a Sojaen Secondspace society, and to hibernate within such claustrophobic spaces (this is slightly more complex in *Something Wild*, as we have seen, due to her complex relationship to her saviour/captor, Mike). It is a perception of the city as the urban-imaginary of a threatening dystopian space which forces our characters into
hiding from their anxieties, which are embodied beyond the walls of these confining domestic spaces. Schüfftan’s lighting reinforces this reading throughout, by constructing claustrophobic and containing space. This claustrophobia is achieved through a busying of the *mise-en-scène* and purposeful resistance of depth in the lighting. Whilst urban interiors dominate the three films, it is also necessary to address the urban exteriors, those spaces from which for the most part our protagonists hide.

**Urban exteriors: The bridge, the streets and the parks**

Perhaps the most notable use of urban exteriors, and of the Manhattan location, is in *Something Wild*, when Mary Ann seems to contemplate suicide on the Brooklyn Bridge, before she is saved by Mike. The scene begins as Mary Ann leaves her boarding house following her distressing previous night there. Schüfftan’s camera captures Mary Ann walking along the sidewalk in a long shot from a high angle position, looking down upon the protagonist. The positioning of the camera here creates the impression of observation and therefore of objectivity in relation to Mary Ann. It is a shot which is linked far more to actuality traditions than to a subjective camera approach. We are observing Mary Ann from afar, the camera’s movements motivated by Mary Ann’s. The camera positions Mary Ann within her environment, rather than perceiving the environment as she sees it. This use of the camera to create an objective view introduces us into the concept of Firstspace. This sensation of realism continues in the next shot as we see Mary Ann walking, past homeless people asleep on park benches, and the camera pans around to follow her movements, revealing the Manhattan Bridge.

The next shot however, transitioned to by a dissolve, transforms us to a subjective view, with Mary Ann stumbling towards the camera as the camera slowly pans backwards, mirroring her
movement along the bridge. We are physically closer to Mary Ann in this shot, in a mid-shot, and we are far closer to her emotionally. In spite of the realism of the environment we have seen Mary Ann located in during the previous Firstspace shots, this more subjective use of the camera demonstrates the distress Mary Ann is in, experiencing anxiety from all of her surroundings. These shots provide a subjective, Secondspace understanding of Mary Ann in relation to her surrounding space. The dialectic combination in this scene of both Firstspace and Secondspace shots creates a tension, oscillating between an objective and deeply subjective view of Mary Ann and her understanding of the cityspace which surrounds her. This dialectical tension points towards a resolution in Thirdspace, which will allow for a fuller understanding of the character of Mary Ann, however this resolution does not occur until the end of the film, when Mary Ann is released back into the city from Mike’s apartment.

This blending between objective and subjective shots continues, as we cut to an extreme long shot from a fixed point on the bridge, watching Mary Ann walking along, before returning to a medium close-up of her distressed face as she stumbles forwards. Our subjective connection to Mary Ann reaches a new level, however, when Garfein cuts to a shot from Mary Ann’s point of view when she looks into the waters beneath, as she leans off the bridge. Schüfftan’s camera then fixes itself closely to Mary Ann’s back, as she leans forward ready to jump. Finally Mike’s hands enter the frame, pulling Mary Ann back from danger, prompting a violent camera movement which follows Mary Ann’s fall to the ground. The camera then cuts back to a more objective position, viewing Mary Ann lying on the ground in a long shot, as Mike looks over her. These alternating techniques of subjectivity and objectivity place the spectator in a unique position concerning Mary Ann’s character, allowing us to be both emotionally connected to her character, and critically distant. This remains important,
particularly by the end of the narrative, when we must question the choices which Mary Ann has made in her life.

The choice of the river as method of suicide should also not be overlooked. As Katherine Shonfield (2000: 147) has explained, ‘The odd thing about a river as a “centre” of an already uncontainable, undelineated city, is that the river is also by its nature just that: uncontainable and undelineated. It is literally unfixed and never the same.’ This ‘unfixed’ city which Shonefield describes is exactly the New York City of *Something Wild*, constantly evolving and changing in its moods and atmospheres, to reflect the condition of Mary Ann. The river, with its violent movements of change, is therefore an unsurprising choice for the location of Mary Ann’s suicide attempt. Mary Ann fears the city, and the bridge stands as a symbol of transition, able to transport Mary Ann out of Manhattan and into Brooklyn. But it is perhaps Mary Ann’s sense that she is unable to change the course of her life which prompts her not to cross the bridge, but to remain upon it, and to consider her suicide. Her almost hypnotic gaze which is cast into the torrent of water beneath the bridge seems to suggest to her that it is the quickest route away from the city, able to rapidly flush her away, as if a waste item of the dystopian city. This bridge scene also comes to form a narrative bridge. It occurs at almost the halfway point of the film, and signals the possibility of removal of Mary Ann from the dystopian cityspace, before she is allowed at the end of the film to reemerge into the city and to view it anew.

There is however a sense of catharsis connected to the natural spaces which exist within the built environment of the city, which I shall now explore further in connection to the park space, present in all three films. The city park acts as a space of release and escape in each of the three films addressed in this chapter. In *Something Wild*, the natural space within the city environment is at once the location which hosts Mary Ann’s trauma, which awaits her suicide
attempt (the river), and which ultimately releases her to the beauty of the city and its possibilities. Schüfftan was tasked here with countering Mary Ann’s previous perception of the city as lurid and dangerous, to now show it as a space of beauty and opportunity. As Mary Ann (having escaped from the apartment) awakens to a New York morning in surroundings similar to those within which she was raped, Schüfftan’s approach is diametrically opposed to that which he employed before. Schüfftan now floods backlight through the leaves of the trees, suggesting their beauty rather than the opportunity they provide for concealment. The park here, as in *The Hustler* and *Trois chambres à Manhattan*, becomes the Thirdspace, the product of the tension between the dialectic of Firstspace and Secondspace which occurs in the other spaces of the films, and which finally allows the subjects of the film to understand their role within the city in greater clarity.

In *The Hustler*, the park space visited by Eddie and Sarah is *beyond* the city, allowing the couple to escape the cityspace entirely. This escape acts as a moment of respite for the couple, coming after their continual arguments in Sarah’s small flat, and Eddie’s frustration at his two broken wrists. This shift in space is marked by Eddie, who upon leaving the apartment building looks up towards the sky, seemingly amazed (see Figure 79). The couple are framed in a midshot, allowing space around the characters for Schüfftan’s lighting to flood the pale concrete of the city, in order to give the spectator the same sensation of brightness that Eddie is experiencing. It is a rare exterior scene in the film, and an even rarer *daytime* exterior scene. We get the impression that this is the first time Eddie has experienced daylight in some time, and as the audience we share that relief, having been confined to the same dark interior spaces as Eddie. This sense of freedom is further reinforced through the sense of space in the framing of the image, enhanced by the width of the CinemaScope lens. Eddie and Sarah’s time spent together in this scene results in the most frank and honest discussion the couple share throughout the film. Eddie explains, with great love, his passion
for pool, not to hustle or humiliate others, but to demonstrate how great the game can be at its best. It is this environment, and this speech, which prompts Sarah to confess her love to Eddie, words which he cannot reciprocate.

Figure 79: Eddie emerges from the apartment and strains his eyes as he looks up to the sky.

The park in *Trois chambres à Manhattan* is similarly host to the most frank of discussions between the couple, François and Kay. Immediately prior to this scene François has attempted to leave Kay, by sneaking out of their hotel room whilst she is still asleep. It is the sight of steam escaping the city’s subway grates, which the pair had marveled upon earlier, which prompts him to return. Later that morning, as the couple sit on a bench in Central Park overlooking the Manhattan skyline, Kay summarizes the escapist role the city park plays in these three films. She observes, ‘after all these clubs, after all these bars, we can still get a little fresh air, a little sun, a little clarity, for our final walk.’ François queries her ‘final walk’ comment, and Kay explains that she realizes that they are breaking up because he has paid the hotel bill. François explains his motivations and the couple return to the streets of the city. The park acts as a release from the city, and a backdrop for the couple to speak frankly at this, the breaking point of their relationship, allowing them to resolve their issues and
move forward anew (see Figure 80). The sequence is shot from a low angle, allowing light from the daytime sky to flood the image, creating a stark contrast to Schüfftan lighting of the interiors. Furthermore, the low angle, by pointing up toward the open sky, creates a sense of space and freedom that the couple lacked in the hotel room.

Figure 80: Kay and François use the backdrop of Central Park to discuss the state of their relationship.

The ‘clarity’ described by Kay is precisely what these urban park environments provide for the characters in these three films, allowing, in The Hustler and Trois chambres à Manhattan, the couples to understand their relationships, and each other, with a greater depth, and in Something Wild, allowing Mary Ann to reclaim her own sense of identity, which was so brutally taken from her in the park at the start of the film, and by her capture in Mike’s apartment.
As Mary Ann leaves the cover of these trees we see her framed against the misty early morning city skyline, which we then also see reflected in the rippling waters of the duck pond, creating an ephemeral view of the city quite at odds with the dark intimidating spaces which Mary Ann experienced previously (Aaron Copland’s majestic score should also be acknowledged in the creation of such effects). A strong side and back light are employed by Schüfftan for Mary Ann in these shots, creating a glow around her character which reflects her sense of viewing the world anew as she jaunts through the park, amazed at the simplest of things such as a cyclist passing her on the path. Drunks passed out on the street during thunderous rain and bullying colleagues are replaced by horses and carriages in the park, congenial old ladies who wish Mary Ann a good morning, and friendly excitable school children. Here we are firmly located in the Thirdspace, a view of the city created through a dialectic view of the city, a fusion of subjective and objective views, throughout the film.

Non-Places: Bus terminals, subways and hotels

The various spaces discussed above are places which are invested with meaning by the protagonists and by society – bedrooms and parklands for example. However, another form of space holds a strong presence in each of the three films, one which is not traditionally invested with meaning. These spaces are what Marc Augé terms non-place, spaces of transition which do not hold meaning for those who pass through them. Augé’s classic examples of non-places are airports, supermarkets, hotels and motorways (2008: 63). Emer O’Beirne (2006: 38) describes non-places as, ‘those urban, peri-urban, and interurban spaces associated with transit and communication, designed to be passed through rather than appropriated, and retaining little or no trace of our passage as we negotiate them.’ It is important to note here the differentiation between space and place. Here space is the
encompassing term applicable to any area, whilst place is specifically a space in which its inhabitants must invest meaning. *Space* is therefore a more abstract definition, whilst *place* is more definite (Augé, 2008: 66). Grammatical usage reinforces this meaning, with *place* more associated with the personal or possessive pronoun (‘my place’/‘that’s its place’), whereas *space* can be more associated to the definite or indefinite article (‘the parking space’/‘a parking space’).

Non-places play a crucial role in these films, as the characters, unable to find their roles within society, tend to gravitate towards these spaces which others merely pass through, as if Eddie, Mary Ann, or François are trying to pick up the debris of meaning left by others as they negotiate these non-places. Sites of transport are one of Augé’s exemplars of the non-place, and are present in both *The Hustler* and *Something Wild*. In both of these films, these non-places play a key role in our understanding of the relationship between the protagonist and the city. In *The Hustler*, Eddie meets Sarah in the bus terminal, the gateway of the city to that which exists beyond (the bus terminal is a classic example of such a space). In this non-place we see a number of passengers alighting from a bus, and walking directly through the terminal to the city beyond – the space is not occupied by these characters for more than a few moments, and holds no meaning for them. It is precisely because the bus terminal is a non-place that Eddie and Sarah, two characters who have been unable to find their roles within society, gravitate towards it. Sarah is a habitual presence in this space, for which she is marked in her otherness by her damaged female body (she displays a limp throughout the film, perhaps a physical manifestation of her psychological damage), and Eddie shares this with her because of his inability to conquer the masculine-urban space of the pool hall. They choose to occupy a space which others merely pass through, on their way to a more meaningful destination.
What for most is a non-place, becomes for Sarah and Eddie a place which reflects their own existential absence of meanings. This fact is highlighted in O’Beirne’s reading of Augé, which finds non-places to be, ‘manifestations and above all agents of a contemporary existential crisis, a crisis of relations to the other, and by extension a crisis of individual identity constituted through such relations.’ (2006: 38) The bus terminal becomes Eddie’s new home. He stores all his belongings in a locker, and he uses the bathroom to freshen up, as if it were his own, whilst a shoe-shine man sleeps in the background, oblivious that anyone should choose to occupy such a space. Schüfftan lights this non-place by emphasizing the strong artificial light sources. An example can be seen in Figure 81, where the long bars of electric light suggest the cold reality of the space Eddie is choosing to use as his home. By emphasizing such light sources, Schüfftan highlights that this is a merely functional space, intended only to be passed through. Both characters also display an understanding of how this space ought to function. Sarah establishes a thin pretense that she is waiting for a bus (she says that she has been at the terminal since four o’clock and is waiting for a bus which leaves at eight o’clock), but leaves when Eddie falls asleep, to return to the city where Eddie will later rediscover her. When Eddie awakens, he is surrounded in the café by a new crowd of people, the next set of fleeting passengers passing through the terminal.
A rather different representation of transport is given in *Something Wild*, although still one which contributes to our understanding of Mary Ann. The mode of transport here is the New York subway, which Mary Ann rides soon after her rape (see Figure 82). Mary Ann is jostled around the tightly filled commuter train, until eventually the experience becomes overbearing, so that when, finally, she is released onto the platform, she collapses to the floor. The subway, like the bus terminal in *The Hustler*, is also presented as a non-place. A consequence of Mary Ann’s rape is her inability to negotiate the non-place in the same manner as other passengers. We see those other passengers join and disembark the train, jostling Mary Ann whose fixed position is not recognized. When she does eventually disembark, Mary Ann passes out on the platform of the subway station, as if her loss of identity has come to overwhelm her in this non-place. This was filmed on location, and with the use of genuine commuters who mixed with the extras and were entirely unaware that a film was being shot. Garfein therefore allows for an accurate representation of a non-place being negotiated, by genuine commuters passing through the subway, the normality of which functions to highlight Mary Ann’s inability to function appropriately within such a space.
Schüfftan emphasizes Mary Ann’s distress through extremely tight framing on the subway train, in which Mary Ann is almost entirely obstructed from our view by the many passengers who compete for space.

Figure 82: Mary Ann struggles amongst the commuters on the subway.

That Schüfftan was fully aware of the powerful representative possibilities that the subway train could hold for Mary Ann is evident from both his previous experience of shooting the atmospheric mirage of the Paris Metro in Georges Franju La Première nuit (1958), and from Eugene Archer’s anecdote from the set of Something Wild: ‘the company waited for twenty-minute intervals between takes for a subway train to arrive on a distant elevated track for an atmospheric fillip. “When we saw the rushes,” Mr. Justin [producer] commented wryly, “we couldn’t even see the train in the darkness.”’ (Archer, 1960) Clearly in this instance,
Schüfftan had striven a little too far to create the appropriate atmosphere. However, Schüfftan was also keen to fulfill Garfein’s wishes, and to temper this stylization with a degree of actuality. In the instance of Mary Ann’s subway experience Schüfftan employed an old Mitchell sound camera (likely the ‘newsreel camera’, or the ‘blimped newsreel camera’, the most ubiquitous models since their introduction in 1932), to capture Mary Ann’s distress with a certain degree of realism (Johnson, 1963: 41).

Another form of non-place is the hotel. In *The Hustler* Eddie and Sarah stay at a hotel when they visit the Kentucky Derby, and a hotel is the first location which plays host to Kay and François’s blossoming relationship in *Trois chambres à Manhattan*. In each case the hotel is a prime example of the non-place, a site which embodies how the protagonists have found themselves unable to find a functioning role for themselves within society.

The first use of a hotel in *The Hustler* is seen directly after Eddie’s loss to Minnesota Fats, before he ‘moves in’ to another non-place, the bus terminal. The hotel in *The Hustler* embodies Eddie’s transitory lifestyle, the nature of his business in moving from town to town trying to hustle money. However, in this instance, even the non-place of the hotel is invested with too much meaning for Eddie. Directly opposite Ames pool hall, he cannot help but be reminded of his humiliating defeat, and the cohabitation of the hotel room with his business partner Charlie reinforces the fixity of Eddie’s identity, an identity he no longer wants, and which he seems intent to lose by progressing to a further non-place, in the form of the bus terminal. Schüfftan’s lighting of the hotel room highlights the temptation of the pool hall for Eddie. As he moves around the room, the flashing neon light from the pool hall opposite glows on Eddie’s face, illuminating him in the dim hotel room, as if beckoning for him to return.
The second time we see Eddie inhabit a hotel room is near the end of the film, with Sarah, upon his visit to the Louisville Derby as the nefarious Bert coaxes Eddie back in to his hustling ways. This hotel room acts as the site of Bert’s abuse of Sarah and her subsequent suicide in the bathroom. Schüfftan’s lighting of this bathroom conforms to his previous lighting of the non-place of the bus terminal. It is rather cold, harsh lighting, reinforcing the functionality of this space. It is therefore significant that her suicide is enacted in the bathroom of the hotel room, a non-place which reflects Sarah’s sense of loss, whereby the developing stability of her life with Eddie is removed by his return to the hustle. We can therefore see the return of the non-place of the hotel room as part of the cyclical nature of the film’s narrative. Eddie’s hustling activities and the ever-changing hotel rooms that accompany it are shown at the start of the film and return at the end, and this dystopian sense that Sarah, and Eddie, will never be able to break from this destructive cycle results in her decision to take her own life.

The hotel room in *Trois chambres à Manhattan* is the first of three rooms noted in the film’s title which span the course of Kay and François’s relationship. In fact, despite both characters admitting to having their own apartments, and living alone (although Kay’s situation is more complicated as we come to learn), they opt for the Hotel Sherman as the location to commence their romance. This exterior was shot on location on 302 West 47th Street, outside the Hotel Sherman which has since been replaced by the Econo Lodge (see Figure 83). This does not appear to be a choice of luxury for the couple. In fact Kay seems to assume that François will take her to his apartment, but François’s reluctance results in a glance across the road to the Hotel Sherman, rather ungraciously located next to the ‘Samicraft Lighting Co.’, which Kay confirms with a resigned ‘sure, why not?’ Confirming the rather sordid nature of this arrangement, Kay comments of the staff in the foyer, ‘I can smell whiskey, they must have been drinking.’
I have discussed with regard to the park spaces how Kay and François reach a crucial point in their relationship in Central Park, resolving their issues and allowing them to move forward. It is worth noting here that is the Hotel Sherman from which they flee, the host site of their faltering relationship. The non-place of the hotel allows François to devoid himself of the identity which is connected to him through his apartment. This gives him the freedom to attempt to leave Kay, by paying for the hotel room and not returning. Kay does not know where his apartment is, the hotel being the only shared font of their relationship. François is able to disavow the existence of the relationship from the wider social existence he inhabits in his apartment, by leaving it behind in the non-place of the hotel. François however, changes his mind, and the couple resolve their issues in the park space. Describing their time spent together within the hotel room, Kay tells François, ‘You made love as if it was suicide,’
demonstrating how this hotel has acted as a non-place similar to that of *The Hustler*, which was host to Sarah’s suicide.

As if to emphasize that their relationship in the hotel room had been entirely built on sex, Schüfftan filmed the scenes with a strong key light cast upon the bed, often making it the brightest part of the frame. Significantly, it is at this juncture in their relationship, after their prolonged existence within the non-place has driven them to breaking point, that François decides to take Kay back to his apartment, and to introduce her to the rest of his life. He says, ‘The place I’m taking you to, it’s less ugly at night.’ They can welcome daylight at last in their relationship, just as Mary Ann is released into daylight at the conclusion of *Something Wild*.

**Conclusion**

That Schüfftan should find success and acclaim with these three films is fitting. Through their similarities and differences each of these films forms the culmination of various different approaches and techniques to the moving image perfected by Schüfftan throughout his illustrious career. This case study began by noting that *Metropolis*, Schüfftan’s introduction to the film industry, was his first visualization of the city, and that the three films discussed here, which arrived towards the end of Schüfftan’s career, present a return to such representations. It is appropriate therefore to compare such representations, which span almost forty years. This is best achieved by addressing the denouement of each film. In *Metropolis*, the divided society is resolved at the film’s close, with Freder uniting his father Joh, the leader of the city, with Grot, a foreman who had led the revolt. As Freder combines their hands, the title appears, ‘The mediator between head and hands must be the heart!’ R. L. Rutsky (2000: 218) argues of this conclusion that the technologies of *Metropolis* are
dystopian, and that it is only when these dystopian technologies ‘can be “mediated” and synthesized that a utopian technology becomes possible.’ It is a dystopian city, which, once unified transcends to a utopian society.

Through this case study I have similarly highlighted that the Secondspace subjective representations demonstrate a dystopian perception of the city. However, the 1960s films present a rather different outcome. Rather than resolving into a unified singular society, as occurs in *Metropolis*, the protagonists resolve their loss of identity (which had produced the image of the dystopian city), to find a new sense of individualism, and to move forward in to the city anew. In the case of *Something Wild*, Mary Ann has resolved her issues, allowing the dystopian city to disappear, resulting in new possibilities for her. We therefore find Mary Ann at the end of the film, following her cathartic return to the city, happily married to Mike, no longer trapped by the city, or by Mike’s apartment, but content. Therefore, from the objectivity of Firstspace and the dystopian subjectivity of Secondspace, results a fresh Thirdspace, an understanding of each character’s individual identity. This is also true for the other two films.

*The Hustler*, for example, presents Eddie’s final pool match against Minnesota Fats, in the wake of Sarah’s suicide. He stands alone, without either of his partners (Charlie or the manipulative Bert), and defeats Fats. When Bert challenges for his share of the winnings as his business partner, Eddie defiantly refuses him, in memory of Sarah. Eddie walks away the victor, and leaves the pool hall with what seems to be a new sense of self. He departs Ames pool hall, leaving behind this underside of the city, to emerge back in to society with a fresh start, at last controlling his own destiny. The final shot is of Eddie walking from the hall, on the threshold of his new beginning, leaving Bert, Fats and the camera behind. *Trois chambres à Manhattan* presents a similar conclusion. Having battled throughout the film with their
insecurities, and hiding themselves from society in the various bedrooms of the title, the relationship finally breaks down when Kay finds out that François had acted unfaithfully. He chases after her and they argue on the stairs, before finally realizing how anxieties had driven their actions throughout. Resolving their issues, the pair makes a fresh start, not by returning to the insular world of the bedroom, but by leaving. ‘Not inside,’ Kay says, ‘I’d prefer to leave it behind.’ Instead, they step out in to the city in daylight, with, like Mary Ann and Eddie, a new sense of identity. Whilst the city in Metropolis, which presented fears of Modernity, found the comforting conclusion of unity through utopia, the characters in these 1960s films all dispel those fears of the dystopian city, allowing them instead, not to find comfort within the whole, but to discover a new sense of self.

The city of New York comes to play as important a role in these three films as it did in Schüfftan’s career. The city which is host to such complex representations of characters, and the variety of spaces they inhabit in Something Wild, The Hustler, Trois chambres à Manhattan, is also the city which finally offered Schüfftan a celebrated welcome to American cinematography, some twenty years after he had arrived on those shores. In this sense, it is hardly surprising that Schüfftan’s photographic representation of New York City is so complex.
This study of cinematography was inspired by the realization that Eugen Schüfftan was a little known name, despite having contributed to the aesthetic of a wide variety of important works of film. My first aim was to understand why such a figure had been so overlooked by film history. I soon realized that the field of cinematography as a whole has received little attention, beyond interviews and ‘how to’ guides. The various challenges that I have encountered during the course of researching and writing this thesis are a testament to why so little literature exists on this key figure of filmmaking. The crucial challenge was how best to write about the work of a cinematographer, when so little groundwork exists in this field. I soon realized that this dearth of writing on cinematography is symptomatic of wider trends in film studies that have focused on the director, and of an historical approach in the industry that had positioned the cinematographer as a technician, rather than an artist. I set out to rectify such oversights and misunderstandings, by using the case of Eugen Schüfftan to bring
renewed attention to the cinematographer and his artistry, and to demonstrate how an understanding of cinematographic style can benefit wider filmic analysis. As Schüfftan’s story is also one of exile, I also set out to show how his treatment during exile is symptomatic of the disregard for the cinematographer’s artistry. My intention was to explore how this cinematographer of German Expressionism exported this style to influence the various national industries and film movements he became a part of. It was only during the course of researching this thesis that I came to realize that I had fallen foul to the same misrecognition of Schüfftan’s style as many others who had discussed the cinematographer, and that Schüfftan’s roots were not in Expressionism but in realism and the study of the Old Masters. Rectifying this misunderstanding and highlighting the true complexity of the development of Schüfftan’s cinematographic style became all the more pressing.

In the introduction to this thesis I elaborated upon the challenges that faced me in the research and writing of this thesis. I also outlined the existing literature on cinematography and its inadequacy for providing a comprehensive understanding of the development of a cinematographic style. In Chapter I, I then explored the early years of Schüfftan’s work in Germany in the late 1920s and early 1930s, including his famous special effects invention, the Schüfftan Process, and his early interests in realism. In Part One of this chapter I investigated the Schüfftan Process, which still remains Schüfftan’s most famous legacy. I examined the development of the process through Schüfftan’s original patents, and addressed how the process functioned. I then turned to a discussion of the most famous example of the use of the Schüfftan Process, on Fritz Lang’s *Metropolis*. I explored how the function of the process in fact reinforces Lang’s critique of mass society and Modernity.

In Part Two of this chapter I addressed Schüfftan early life, and his introduction into the German film industry as a cinematographer. As I demonstrated, this was in the form of realism, on films such as *Menschen am Sonntag*, *Abschied* and in particular, Schüfftan’s
directorial short, *Ins Blaue hinein*. In this section I outlined the early development of Schüfftan’s cinematographic style, which was largely concerned with realism, rather than the stylization of German Expression to which Schüfftan was later linked (despite that movement having already passed by the time of Schüfftan’s first film as cinematographer).

In Chapter II of this thesis I examined Schüfftan’s experience of filmmaking in exile between 1933 and 1947, in both Europe and America. In Part One of this chapter I addressed the period 1933 to 1941, which followed Schüfftan’s exile from Germany and his subsequent career of filmmaking in Europe. In this part of the chapter I demonstrated how Schüfftan displayed the artistic influence of the Old Masters through his photography. Through approaches to lighting informed by Rembrandt’s techniques of casting light upon faces and creating depth in the image, Schüfftan began to demonstrate a coherent approach to his photography. I also discussed how this artistic influence to Schüfftan’s lighting became conflated with Expressionism, and how Schüfftan began to adopt aspects of an Expressionist style (informed by Rembrandt’s techniques), in order to conform to the misunderstanding of him as a cinematographer who heralded from German Expressionism. I therefore offered a far more complex understanding the development of Schüfftan’s style and its relationship to Expressionism, which crucially, occurred only once he was in exile. I then addressed how Schüfftan achieved great acclaim within the French industry, as part of a cohort of other technicians who had emigrated from Germany, and came to influence a new wave of young French cinematographers. I noted how the influence of such technicians can be seen in the films of Poetic Realism, for which *Le Quai des brumes* is Schüfftan’s contribution.

Part Two of this chapter is a case study of Schüfftan’s work in exile in America between 1941 and 1947. The basis of this case study is Schüfftan’s rejection from the American Society of Cinematographers, which forced him to make a number of films for the Poverty Row studios of Hollywood, where a number of other exiles had also gravitated. I addressed
in this section how these exile-dominated films of Poverty Row can be understood as examples of Exile Modernism, a form of Modernism which arose due to the exile of many writers and theorists of Modernism, following Hitler’s rise to power in Germany. Works of Exile Modernism can be understood as products of exile which communicate the traumas and politics of that experience. In particular, I examined Schüfftan’s films from this period in accordance with Deleuze and Guattari’s criteria for minor literature; deterritorialization, collectivization and politicization. By following Deleuze and Guattari’s approach I sought to demonstrate how these exile-dominated productions of Poverty Row can be understood in relation to the major studios of Hollywood, in terms of processes of deterritorialization and reterritorialization (which were forced by the major studios upon both personnel, and the films they made, such as Hitler’s Madman). I also addressed how collectivization became essential to the survival of the exiles in the film industry, which I demonstrated in terms of Schüfftan’s work through his collaborations with Edgar G. Ulmer, and how the products of these exiles in Poverty Row came to be understood in terms of film noir.

In Chapter III I turned to Schüfftan’s work in the period 1947 to 1959, following his decision to leave behind his struggle to be accepted into the American Society of Cinematographers. In Part One I offered an overview of this period of rootlessness for Schüfftan. I characterized this as a time when Schüfftan became a rather nomadic figure, filming in a variety of genres in a variety of national industries, following an extended period of conformity of style in which Schüfftan had worked primarily upon psychological dramas since the late 1930s. I suggested that Schüfftan lost a coherent sense of style during this period, as a consequence of the diversity of film genres he was working upon. I demonstrated this by addressing Schüfftan’s photography of the comedy film Una Parigina a Roma, which revealed a flatness of lighting uncommon in Schüfftan’s work, but which recalled Schüfftan’s previous struggles in lighting the comedy genre (he had been criticized for his lighting of both The Invader and
Drôle de drame, which was discussed during the course of this thesis). I also noted a particular tendency during this period of the 1950s for Schüfftan to be employed upon European films heavily influenced by American approaches to filmmaking. Such examples I provided were *Gunman in the Streets*, *Le chemin de Damas*, and *La Putain respectueuse*. I characterized this trend as an unusual response to Schüfftan in the wake of the Blum-Byrnes agreement, as an American cinematographer, despite having never been admitted into the union. In this section I also addressed Schüfftan’s adaptability by working in television and inventing new techniques to combat the problems of changeable weather during location shooting, even though his presence on set was not warmly received. Finally I demonstrated how Schüfftan’s style regained its old coherence in a series of collaborations with the director Georges Franju at the end of the 1950s. I characterized Franju as the perfect complement to Schüfftan’s filmmaking approaches, for his dual interests in realism and stylization.

For the second part of this chapter I employed Franju’s *La Tête contre les murs* for a case study which provided a close textual reading of how Schüfftan’s lighting reinforced Franju’s critique of the asylum system in France. I examined how this polemic arose at a time of growing unrest of the archaic treatments associated with the Moral Treatment approach to psychiatry, which resulted in the anti-psychiatry movement, of which Michel Foucault (2006) was a leading proponent. I examined Schüfftan’s lighting of the space of the asylum, and how a dichotomy is created between the elder Dr Varmont and the younger Dr Emery, who stand for the two poles of psychiatric treatment at the time. Furthermore, I also demonstrated how Schüfftan and Franju’s interests in realism function to locate this critique of the asylum in reality at the start of the film, and highlighted how Schüfftan’s perceived Expressionist lighting in the film is in fact far more complex. The dark exterior spaces of the film function to provide comfort to François, whereas the brightly-lit environment of the asylum leaves François with no place to hide.
The fourth and final chapter of this thesis examined Schüfftan’s work from 1960, until his death in 1977. In the first part of this chapter I discussed Schüfftan’s eventual acceptance into one branch of the American Society of Cinematographers, and how he thereafter maintained a cinematographic career between New York and France. I addressed how Schüfftan’s work in America was to provide him with the greatest successes of his career, and how whilst in France Schüfftan collaborated on three films with Jean-Pierre Mocky, who formed part of the New Wave of young French directors. In this section I also highlighted a story of Schüfftan’s greatest success, which nonetheless perfectly encapsulates the disregard for Schüfftan by the American industry, and how overlooked his role as cinematographer had been. I addressed Schüfftan’s recognition in the form of an Academy Award for his cinematography of The Hustler. However, he was unable to attend the ceremony and was unable to have a personal representative in his place. Then Howard Keel, who accepted the award on Schüfftan’s behalf, dismissively commented, ‘I don’t know where he is’, and when Schüfftan did attempt to collect his award he was confronted with the full indifference of the Academy and the industry that had prevented him from working for so many years. Finally I addressed Schüfftan’s final films and his sad and inglorious exit from the industry due to his failing sight at the age of 80, and the closing years of his life before his death in New York in 1977.

The second part of this final chapter formed a case study of the three films shot by Schüfftan in New York City (Something Wild, The Hustler and Trois chambres à Manhattan), following his acceptance into the New York branch of the American Society of Cinematographers. In this case study I established how each film shared a similar dialectic interest in both realism and stylization. I explored how this dialectic, and an understanding of Schüfftan’s lighting of the cityspace, can be understood in terms of Edward Soja’s concept of First-, Second-, and Third-space (1996). I demonstrated these spaces by addressing
Schüfftan’s lighting of interior spaces, which included bedrooms and pool halls, his lighting of exteriors, including streets scenes and park spaces, and finally non-places. My understanding of the non-place followed Marc Augé’s (2008) example of places in modern society which exist to be passed through, such as bus terminals and hotels (which are two examples I addressed). I addressed how the city in each of these three films, as with Metropolis at the outset of Schüfftan’s career, acts as the host of characters’ anxieties and of their loss of identity. I demonstrated how Schüfftan’s lighting functioned in accordance with this reading, perfectly balancing the contrasting approaches of realism and stylization that he had developed throughout the course of his career.

In this thesis I have provided the most comprehensive account of a largely forgotten, but hugely important, figure: Eugen Schüfftan. Not only is this the first such detailed and sustained analysis of the work of Eugen Schüfftan, it is also, to my knowledge, the first such exhaustive study of the development of a cinematographer’s style, across his/her career. I have uncovered unknown details of Schüfftan’s career and life in exile, and have traced the development and evolution of Schüfftan’s style, forcing us to revise our grasp of that style and the films that he worked upon. Most crucial is an understanding that Schüfftan was not a cinematographer of German Expressionism, but rather a cinematographer whose interests were rooted in realism, and also in a painterly approach that was inspired through his study of the Old Masters. Most notable is Rembrandt, from whom Schüfftan founded his lighting structures.

Establishing Schüfftan’s true early experiments in realism (even demonstrated through his directorial debut, Ins Blaue hinein) and his painterly artistic influences, opens up the question of how Schüfftan has come to be understood as an Expressionist. This directly addresses the complex matter of exile, and how it affected the style of those who were forced to endure it. For Schüfftan, Expressionism was his ‘historical imaginary’ (Elsaesser, 2000). The mis-
recognition of Schüfftan in exile as a cinematographer of the Expressionist tradition led to him developing more stylistic approaches to the image, and the misunderstanding that has therefore ensued in film studies has led to an oversimplification in the appreciation of his style. Rectifying this misunderstanding has widespread ramifications for each of the films Schüfftan photographed, forcing us to rethink, for example, the artistic influences of *Le Quai des brumes*, which has been understood as an important example of the Poetic Realist style. A consideration of Schüfftan’s heritage and the development of his style also allows for a greater understanding of Georges Franju’s filmmaking practices, and his dialectical interest in both realism and forms of stylization. If this lack of comprehension of cinematographic style has been true of Eugen Schüfftan, then we must surely endeavour to gain a fuller understanding of all those craftpeople and artists who cast light upon the film image. Particularly pressing are those cases of exile cinematographers, who as we have seen from this thesis, were more susceptible to a mis-recognition of style. I have endeavoured to demonstrate through the various case studies of this thesis how fresh meanings can be gleaned from the film text through an understanding of the overlooked, yet crucial, role of cinematographer.

The major outcomes of this thesis have been to give due recognition to an important cinematographer who has been overlooked for too long, and to achieve this by tracing the development of his style throughout his career. I have offered a new understanding of Schüfftan’s approach to the image that is based upon painterly influences, and rectifies the common misunderstanding of Schüfftan as a cinematographer of German Expressionism. Schüfftan’s struggles in exile that I have explored during this thesis function to reinforce how the cinematographer has been overlooked throughout film history and in the study of film. By treading new ground in this exploration of a cinematographer’s work I hope to have demonstrated the importance of addressing cinematographic style and the need to gain a
greater understanding of cinematography and how a cinematographer’s style can impact upon a film text. It is time for cinematography to step out of the shadows.
Appendix

Filmography of the Works of Eugen Schüfftan

*Menschen am Sonntag/People on Sunday* (1929)
Schüfftan: Cinematography
Directed by Robert Siodmak
Filmstudio Berlin

*Abschied/Farewell* (1930)
Schüfftan: Cinematography
Directed by Robert Siodmak
Ufa

*Das gestohlene Gesicht/The Stolen Face* (1930)
Schüfftan: Cinematography
Directed by Philipp Lothar Mayring & Eric Schmidt
Ufa

*Dann schon lieber Lebertran/I’d Rather Have Cod Liver Oil* (1931)
Schüfftan: Cinematography
Directed by Max Ophüls
Ufa and Kurz-Spielfilm
**Ins Blaue hinein/Into the Blue** (1931)
Schüfftan: Direction
Cinematography by Laszlo Schäffer
Prisma Produktion

**Gassenhauer/Street Song** (1931)
Schüfftan: Cinematography, with Robert Baberske
Directed by Lupu Pick
Deutsches-Lichtspiel-Syndikat

**Les Quatre Vagabonds/The Four Vagabonds** (1931)
Schüfftan: Cinematography, with Robert Baberske
Directed by Lupu Pick
Exclusivités Jean de Merly

**Das Ekel/The Scoundrel** (1931)
Schüfftan: Direction and cinematography
Direction with Franz Wenzler
_Ufa_

**Meine Frau, die Hochstaplerin/My Wife, the Swindler** (1931)
Schüfftan: Cinematography, with Karl Puth
Directed by Karl Puth
_Ufa_

**Die Herrin von Atlantis** (1932)
Schüfftan: Cinematography, with Herbert Körner
Directed by G.W. Pabst
Nero Film

**L’Atlantide** (1932)
Schüfftan: Cinematography, with Joseph Bart
Directed by G.W. Pabst
Société Internationale Cinématographique

**The Mistress of Atlantis** (1932)
Schüfftan: Cinematography
Directed by G.W. Pabst

**Friederike** (1932)
Schüfftan: Technical Direction
Directed by Fritz Friedman-Frederich
Cinematography by Werner Brandes & Werner Bohne
Indra-Tonfilm

Die Wasserteufel von Hieflau/The Water Devil of Hieflau (1932)
Schüfftan: Direction, with Erich Kober
Cinematography by Herbert Körner
Erich Kober-Filmproduktion & Tobias Melofilm

Zigeuner der Nacht/Gypsies of the Night (1932)
Schüfftan: Cinematography
Directed by Hanns Schwarz & Max de Vaucorbeil
H. M.-Film

Coeurs Joyeux/Happy Hearts (1932)
Schüfftan: Cinematography
Directed by Hanns Schwarz & Max de Vaucorbeil
Pathé-Natan

Der Läufer von Marathon/The Marathon Runner (1932)
Schüfftan: Cinematography
Directed by E.A. Dupont
Matador Film

 Unsichtbare Gegner/Invisible Opponent (1933)
Schüfftan: Cinematography, with Georg Bruckbauer
Directed by Rudolf Katscher
Sascha Filminindustrie AG & Pan-Film-GmbH

Les Requins du pétrole/The Oil Sharks (1933)
Schüfftan: Cinematography, with Georg Bruckbauer
Directed by Henri Decoin

La Voix sans visage/Voice Without a Face (1933)
Schüfftan: Cinematography
Directed by Leo Mittler
Vandor Film

Du Haut en bas/High and Low (1933)
Schüfftan: Cinematography
Directed by G.W. Pabst
Société des Films Sonores Tobias

_Le Scandale/The Scandal_ (1934)
Schüfftan: Cinematography, with Christian Matras
Directed by Marcel L’Herbier
Ayres d’Aiguiar & Euréka Films

_La Crise est finie/The Slump is Over_ (1934)
Schüfftan: Cinematography
Directed by Robert Siodmak
Nero Film

_Irish Hearts_ (1934)
Schüfftan: Cinematography
Directed by Brian Desmond Hurst
Clifton Hurst Productions

_The Invader_ (1934)
Schüfftan: Cinematography
Directed by Adrian Brunel
British and Continental Film Productions

_The Robber Symphony_ (1935)
Schüfftan: Cinematography
Directed by Friedrich Feher
Concordia Films

 _La Symphonie des brigands_ (1935)
Schüfftan: Cinematography
Directed by Friedrich Feher
Concordia Films

_Le Tendre ennemie/The Tender Enemy_ (1935)
Schüfftan: Cinematography, with assistance from Henri Alékan
Directed by Max Ophüls
Eden-Productions

_Children of the Fog_ (1935)
Schüfftan: Cinematography
Directed by Leopold Jessner & John Quin
Jesba Films

**Komedie om Geld/The Trouble with Money** (1936)
Schüfftan: Cinematography
Directed by Max Ophüls
Cinetone

**Mademoiselle Docteur/Under Secret Orders** (1936)
Schüfftan: Cinematography
Directed by G.W. Pabst
Romain Pinès & Films Trocadéro

**María de la O** (1936)
Schüfftan: Cinematography
Directed by Francisco Elías
Ulargui Films

**Yoshiwara** (1937)
Schüfftan: Cinematography
Directed by Max Ophüls
Les Films Excelsior & Milo-Films

**Drôle de drame/Bizarre Bizarre** (1937)
Schüfftan: Cinematography, with assistance from Henri Alékan
Directed by Marcel Carné
Productions Cornélius-Molinier

**Forfaiture/The Cheat** (1937)
Schüfftan: Cinematography
Directed by Marcel L’Herbier
Société Cinéma du Panthéon

**Mollenard** (1937)
Schüfftan: Cinematography, with assistance from Henri Alékan
Directed by Robert Siodmak
Productions Cornélius-Molinier

**Le Quai des brumes/Port of Shadows** (1938)
Schüfftan: Cinematography, with assistance from Henri Alékan  
Directed by Marcel Carné  
Ciné-Alliance

_Le Drame de Shanghai/Shanghai Drama_ (1938)  
Schüfftan: Studio cinematography, with assistance from Henri Alékan. Location cinematography by Curt Courant  
Directed by G.W. Pabst  
Lucia Films & Gladiator Films

_Le Roman de Werther_ (1938)  
Schüfftan: Studio cinematography. Location cinematography by Georges Stilly, Fédote Bourgassof  
Directed by Max Ophüls  
Nero Film

_Campement 13/Camp 13_ (1938)  
Schüfftan: Cinematography, with Nicolas Toporkoff, and with assistance from Henri Alékan  
Directed by Jacques Constant  
Société des Productions Cinématographiques F.C.L.

_Trois valses/Three Waltzes_ (1938)  
Schüfftan: Cinematography  
Directed by Ludwig Berger  
Sofror Films

_Sans lendemain/Without Tomorrow_ (1939)  
Schüfftan: Cinematography, with assistance from Henri Alékan  
Directed by Max Ophüls  
Ciné-Alliance & Inter-Artistes-Films

_L’Émigrante/The Emigrant_ (1939)  
Schüfftan: Cinematography, with assistance from Henri Alékan  
Directed by Léo Joannon  
Société des Films Vega

_Les Musiciens du ciel/Musicians of the Sky_ (1939)  
Schüfftan: Cinematography, with assistance from Henri Alékan  
Directed by Georges Lacombe  
Régina
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De Mayerling a Sarajevo/From Mayerling to Sarajevo (1940)
Schüfftan: Studio cinematography, with Curt Courant & Otto Heller. Location cinematography by Robert LeFebvre
Directed by Max Ophüls
British Unity Productions française

Tales of Manhattan (1941)
Schüfftan: Location cinematography, with studio cinematography by Joseph Walker
Directed by Juiilen Duvivier
Boris Morros, S.P. Eagle & 20th Century Fox

Hitler’s Madman (1942)
Schüfftan: Uncredited cinematography. Credited as Technical Director
Directed by Douglas Sirk
Angelus Pictures & MGM

A Voice in the Wind (1943)
Schüfftan: Uncredited cinematography. Credited as Technical Advisor
Directed by Arthur Ripley
Rudolph Monter Production

It Happened Tomorrow (1943)
Schüfftan: Technical Director
Directed by René Clair
Cinematography by Archie Stout
Arnold Productions

Summer Storm (1944)
Schüfftan: Uncredited cinematography. Credited as Technical Consultant
Directed by Douglas Sirk
Angelus Pictures

Bluebeard (1944)
Schüfftan: Uncredited cinematography. Credited as Production Design
Directed by Edgar G. Ulmer
PRC

Strange Illusion (1945)
Schüfftan: Uncredited cinematography
Directed by Edgar G. Ulmer
PRC

*A Scandal in Paris* (1945)
Schüfftan: Production Supervisor
Directed by Douglas Sirk
Arnold Productions & United Artists

*Club Havana* (1945)
Schüfftan: Production Supervisor
Directed by Edgar G. Ulmer
PRC

*The Wife of Monte Cristo* (1946)
Schüfftan: Uncredited cinematography. Credited as Production Supervisor
Directed by Edgar G. Ulmer
PRC

*The Dark Mirror* (1946)
Schüfftan: Trick Photography
Directed by Robert Siodmak
Universal International Pictures

*Carnegie Hall* (1946)
Schüfftan: Credited for Production Technique
Directed by Edgar G. Ulmer
PRC

*Women in the Night* (1947)
Schüfftan: Cinematography
Directed by William Rowland
Southern California Pictures S.A.

*Gunmen in the Streets* (1950)
Schüfftan: Cinematography
Directed by Frank Tuttle
United Artists
**Le Traqué** (1950)
Schüfftan: Cinematography
Directed by Boris Lewin
ProSaGor

**Les Joyeux pélerins/The Happy Pilgrims** (1950)
Schüfftan: Cinematography
Directed by Alfred Pasquali
Union Cinématographique Lyonnaise

**Le Banquet des fraudeurs/The Smugglers’ Banquet** (1951)
Schüfftan: Cinematography
Directed by Henri Storck
Frankfurt a.M. & Teve Film

**L’Hotel-Dieu de Beaune** (1951)
Schüfftan: Direction
Technifilm

**Le Rideau cramoisi/The Crimson Curtain** (1952)
Schüfftan: Cinematography
Directed by Alexandre Astruc
Argos Films & Como Films

**Mina de Vanghel** (1952)
Schüfftan: Cinematography
Directed by Maurice Barry
Argos Films & Como Films

**La Putain respectueuse/The Respectful Prostitute** (1952)
Schüfftan: Cinematography
Directed by Charles Brabant & Marcel Pagliero
Films Agiman & Artès Films

**Le Chemin de Damas/Road to Damascus** (1952)
Schüfftan: Cinematography
Directed by Max Glass
Films Max Glass & Films Fernand Rivers

*Die Venue vom Tivoli/Venus of Tivoli* (1952)
Schüfftan: Cinematography
Directed by Leonard Steckel
Gloriafilm AG

*Ulisse/Ulysses* (1953)
Schüfftan: Special Effects
Directed by Mario Camerini
Ponti-De Laurentiis & Lux Film

*Una parigina a Roma/A Parisian in Rome* (1954)
Schüfftan: Cinematography
Directed by Erich Kobler
Rivo-Film

  *Begegnung in Rom* (1954)
  Schüfftan: Cinematography
  Directed by Erich Kobler
  Copa-Filmgesellschaft

*Marianne de ma Jeunesse/Marianne of My Youth* (1954)
Schüfftan: Special Effects
Directed by Julien Duvivier
Filmsonor & Regina Films

  *Marianne* (1954)
  Schüfftan: Special Effects
  Directed by Julien Duvivier
  Royal-Produktionsgesellschaft & Allfram-Film

*The First 99*
Schüfftan: Cinematography
Directed by Louis de Rochemont
Louis de Rochemont Associates
**Hawkeye and the Last of the Mohicans** (TV) (1957)
Schüfftan: Cinematography
Directed by Sam Newfield
Incorporated TV & Normandie Productions

**La Première nuit/The First Night** (1958)
Schüfftan: Cinematography
Directed by Georges Franju
Argos Films

**La Tête contre les murs/Head Against the Wall** (1958)
Schüfftan: Cinematography
Directed by Georges Franju
Société Films Sirius, A.T.I.C.A. & Elpénor Films

**Les Yeux sans visage/Eyes Without a Face** (1959)
Schüfftan: Cinematography
Directed by Georges Franju
Champs-Élysées Productions & Lux Films

**The Bloody Brood** (1959)
Schüfftan: Cinematography
Directed by Julian Roffman
Meridian Film

**Un Couple/A Couple** (1960)
Schüfftan: Cinematography
Directed by Jean-Pierre Mocky
Balzac Films, Disci, Tamara, Paris Overseas & Arès

**Something Wild** (1960)
Schüfftan: Cinematography
Directed by Jack Garfein
Prometheus Enterprises

**The Hustler** (1961)
Schüfftan: Cinematography
Directed by Robert Rossen
Rossen Enterprises

Les Vierges/The Virgins (1962)
Schüfftan: Cinematography
Directed by Jean-Pierre Mocky
Boréal Films, Balzac Films, Stella Films

Captain Sindbad (1962)
Schüfftan: Cinematography, replaced by Günther Senftleben
Directed by Byron Haskin
King Brothers Productions

Lilith (1963)
Schüfftan: Cinematography
Directed by Robert Rossen
Centaur Enterprises

La Grande frousse/The Big Scare (1964)
Schüfftan: Cinematography
Directed by Jean-Pierre Mocky
A.T.I.C.A., S.N.C., Productions Raimbourg

Trois chambres à Manhattan/Three Rooms in Manhattan (1965)
Schüfftan: Cinematography
Directed by Marcel Carné
Montaigne, F.C.M.

Chappaqua (1966)
Schüfftan: Cinematography, replaced by Robert Frank
Directed by Conrad Rooks
Winkler Film

Der Arzt stellt fest…/The Doctor Says (1966)
Schüfftan: Cinematography
Directed by Aleksander Ford
CCC Filmkunst, Fono-Film, Praesens-Film
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