

ESF Exploratory Workshop on

**European cinema's transnational  
history: Exile and Migration Patterns  
across Europe's film industries,  
1933-1945**

Southampton (UK), 9-11 July 2012

Convened by:  
*Tim Bergfelder<sup>Ⓣ</sup> and Valeria Camporesi<sup>Ⓜ</sup>*

---

**SCIENTIFIC REPORT**

---

## 1. Executive summary

### *General picture: Practical Organisation and General Arrangements:*

The workshop was held at the University of Southampton over three consecutive days from 9-11 July 2012. In the weeks and months leading up to the event, delegates had been advised on travel arrangements by the organisers and accommodation was provided in two hotels in walking distance from the workshop venue. Participation numbered eighteen people from thirteen countries. There were two last-minute cancellations: one from the ESF representative, and one from the delegate from Poland, both due to illness; nevertheless in the latter case the absent delegate managed to send his presentation in electronic form, which was copied and circulated among the attending participants. In most cases, delegates arrived either on the first day of the workshop, or a day in advance, and they left on the last day of the event, or a day later, depending on individual circumstances and destination. Where delegates arrived at Heathrow or Gatwick airports, a pick-up service to and from Southampton had been organised. The local organiser, aided by a local administrator, provided individual assistance pertaining to accommodation and travel arrangements, as well as more general advice and support during the three days (including help with photocopying, telephone queries, etc.). The workshop itself took place in a spacious, well-equipped lecture theatre at the University's Avenue Campus, which provided the appropriate facilities for PowerPoint presentations, screenings of film clips, and a conducive environment for focussed and intense discussions. The fact that the workshop took place outside of normal University semesters and the compact nature of the Avenue Campus building ensured an intimate and quiet experience. An IT support staff member was on call to provide technical support where required, although in the event there were very few and no insurmountable problems. The workshop consisted of a series of morning and afternoon sessions, which were broken up by comfort breaks, during which coffee, tea, and other refreshments were served. Lunch was provided in a location on-campus by one of the University's official catering firms, and consisted of a buffet selection. The sessions on the first two days ran from 9 or 10 in the morning and had been scheduled to wrap up by 17.30, but ran slightly over, owing to the intensity of the discussions. On both days a communal workshop dinner was organised at two local restaurants, with pre-arranged transport to and from the delegates' accommodation. These more informal occasions, alongside the conversations during the designated breaks, facilitated a relaxed and friendly atmosphere throughout and permitted additional informal interaction; all the delegates reported to the local organiser during and after the event how much they had enjoyed the convivial and mutually supportive ethos of the workshop. On the third and final day, the workshop concluded by mid-afternoon.

### *Summary of scientific objectives and agenda of the meeting, including overall conclusions:*

The structure of the workshop was designed to maximise the potential for cross-national dialogue, but also to develop in a logical and productive manner. Thus, the workshop began by outlining the main theoretical and conceptual frameworks for subsequent discussions in three separate presentations, focussing on theoretical definitions of 'exile', on models and approaches pertaining to 'historiography', especially as it pertains to cinema history, and by looking at some parameters from migrations studies research. These broader conceptual discussions were followed by themed and culturally clustered sessions. Across the whole workshop, delegates featured case studies that encompassed examples from the UK, Germany, Austria, Switzerland, France, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Portugal, the Netherlands, Sweden, Finland, Denmark, Yugoslavia, Romania, Italy, Poland (circulated paper only, see above), and Spain.

As set out in the programme of the workshop, the first aim of the workshop was to consider how a topography of film exile in the 1930s and 40s could be constructed that would be more multi-directional and complex than has been previously argued in the existing academic

literature. To this end, the first task was to de-centre the standard paradigm of focusing exclusively on German-speaking exiles to Hollywood. Hence the selection of papers that looked specifically at inter-European routes, exchanges, and influences. In terms of approaches, the workshop was deliberately inclusive in incorporating a range of different perspectives and emphases, from micro-level research on individual biographies of film professionals to the analysis of production strategies, vertical and horizontal structures of industrial integration, technological advances, and market preferences, but also cinema-going habits among 'ordinary' exiles. The extent, richness and diversity of these interactions that the workshop uncovered across the individual presentations did indeed justify this de-emphasising of Hollywood, and opened up an expansive field of research, much of it still to be discovered and charted. It became clear that the legacy of film migration from and to a number of European countries during this period has been barely addressed so far, and that the subject remains marginalised in several countries. The initial assumption, that the topic deserves much more intensive and in-depth further study and is of direct relevance not only in revising our perception of a period on film history, but also in understanding patterns of cross-cultural influence and exchange within Europe more generally, was agreed upon by all the delegates. A second challenge for the workshop was to interrogate the category of exile as an exclusive explanatory model, and moreover to challenge a mode of periodisation that links inter-European modes of film migration exclusively to the years 1933 (Hitler's rise to power) and 1945 (the end of World War II). In this respect, delegates were encouraged to broaden their historical spectrum by taking into account industrial patterns, frameworks, and modes of migration that preceded and followed on from the historical parameters as indicated in the workshop title. There was nearly unanimous consensus among the delegates over the inadequacy of the standard conventions of historical periodization, with various alternatives being offered in discussions by participants. The majority of delegates felt that the appropriate starting date for the project in question should be placed in the 1920s instead of 1933, and that the end point of a particular pattern of migration should be set at 1948, rather than 1945. At the same time, some delegates insisted on the need to preserve the notion of the uniqueness of Jewish persecution during the Nazi era across Europe. Indeed there were many discussions over the compatibility of the terms 'exile' and predominantly economically motivated patterns of 'migration' in understanding the developments during the period under investigation. The third major envisaged objective of the workshop consisted of problematising the notion that cinema in Europe (and culture more generally) can only be read through the lens of the 'national'. In this respect, delegates were invited to discuss the ways in which patterns of migration have an impact on cultural developments that can often not be contained by national boundaries. The final major objective was to raise awareness of the need to rediscover and survey the material traces of film exile (films, documents, and ephemera). To this end the workshop was designed to discuss curatorial priorities and policies of national archives and institutions, as these impact on the reconstruction and preservation of exile histories. The invitation of delegates with a background or active involvement in curatorial or archival issues was meant to enrich and augment a purely theoretical/academic perspective on the matter. The resulting discussions that brought academic and archival perspectives together proved one of the most productive elements of the workshop with the potential for important initiatives and projects in the future in terms of cataloguing, preservation, and promotion of previously under-represented cinematic legacies.

The workshop concluded with a series of broader discussions on possible avenues towards a more formalised network of scholars and film archivists, and strategies for grant applications, publication plans and other activities that are meant to carry the workshop's aims into the future. During the concluding session, the delegates identified a number of shared areas of interest that had emerged during the event, and which required further investigation as a collaborative project (see section 3 for more detail).

## 2. Scientific content of the event

### *Monday, 9 July: Morning Session: Conceptual Issues*

The Monday morning session consisted of three papers designed to set a broad conceptual framework to stimulate parameters for subsequent discussions.

Tim Bergfelder's paper, 'Problems of definitions of Exile', started by outlining the difficulties he had experienced working on a previous research project relating to exile film personnel to the UK, and how the lives and professional trajectories of exiles could be properly accounted for. He said it was particularly important to address the question where the work of exiles is located, and how it is prioritised (or not) within specific national cultural discourses and narratives. Bergfelder referred to a number of recent interventions and publications, and in particular the recent rise of the paradigm of 'transnational culture/cinema' that might complement or supersede the dominant perspective of understanding the developments during this period through the lens of 'exile'. With specific reference to the period under investigation, Bergfelder proposed to conceive of migration patterns in the film industry as multi-directional and not necessarily as always ideologically consistent, and also strongly dependent on industrial and technological developments that run side by side but can also sometime be asynchronous with political events. Bergfelder also suggested questioning the received wisdom of seeing 1933 as an exclusive watershed in the migration patterns of film personnel during this period.

Valeria Camporesi's paper, 'Questions of Historiography', introduced what she described as 'tentative routes to a new approach to the history of cinema in Europe'. Drawing on the insights of scholars including Richard Maltby, Pierre Sorlin and Gian Petro Brunetta among others, she proposed a form of cinematic and cultural historiography that should be 'authentically global' and that should refocus its attention from purely nationally centred aesthetic evaluation towards issues such as commercial and political exchanges between national film industries, the diachronic study of multilingual activity, and truly comparative cross-national cultural analysis. With reference to previous interventions by Hagener and Bergfelder, Camporesi argued for a 'rhizomatic' history of European cinema where notions of liminality and marginality are becoming more attenuated. With regard to the period under investigation, the tension between economic and political determinants and motivations needed specific analysis. Camporesi suggested it was still uncertain whether the 1930s should be primarily remembered as a period of transnational endeavour or a decade that marked European cinema's 'adjustment to the Hollywood model'. In her conclusion, she proposed to conceptualize "European cinema" not on the basis of some kind of collective identity, but as the by-product of industrial strategies which are normally removed from vision by the very evidence of Hollywood superpower'.

Judith Thissen's paper, 'Patterns of Migration and migrant entrepreneurship', proposed to approach mobile film personnel in the period under investigation primarily as 'migrants'. Drawing on theoretical insights from migration studies, she argued for the explanatory potential of the notion of immigrant entrepreneurship as a way of understanding some of the patterns in trans-European cinema movements from the 1920s to the 1940s. Outlining definitions for 'immigrant agency', co- and non-coethnic interaction, and the distinction between 'innovative' and 'conservative' migration, Thissen also suggested that the notion of mixed social embeddedness could be productively applied to the patterns in this case. In other words, as Thissen argues, 'rather than isolating the host society (foregrounding a national perspective), I suggest that the host society (country of post-migration settlement) is regarded as an integral part of a transnational, global network'. To illustrate her approach, Thissen referred to the case of twin brothers Erwin and Curt Hirschberg, two cinematic entrepreneurs, whose career in film distribution and exhibition traversed their original home in Breslau across Prague, and The Hague. The paper concluded on the call to study in detail the specific push as well as pull factors that determined where mobile film personnel from the 20s to the 40s went and how successful they became.

A lively discussion developed after the three papers, with delegates adding specific information and relating comments to their own national contexts. Although there was a broad consensus regarding the problems of periodization that all three speakers had alluded to, either directly or indirectly, some delegates voiced concern not to conflate issues of exile and migration too readily. Another important point made was the significant difference in migration patterns according to different professional categories (i.e. the very different experiences of actors, directors and screenwriters who tend to be more reliant on language versus technical professions such as art directors and cinematographers who often prove to be more mobile).

#### *Afternoon Session 1: Revisiting the Issue of Exile*

In his opening paper of the afternoon session, Malte Hagener's paper considered specific patterns in the narratives of exile films, concentrating on two case studies from two different cultural contexts, the Portuguese comedy film *Gado Bravo* (1934), directed by exile director Max Nosseck and featuring exile actors Olly Gebauer and Sigfried Arno, and *Komedie om Geld* (Netherlands, 1935) directed by exile director Max Ophuls. Professor Hagener argued that exile productions often only indirectly dealt with the subject of exile, displacing this focus instead onto narratives concerning tourism and modernisation, as in the case of *Gado Bravo* and *Komedie om Geld*. In his conclusion, Hagener proposed that the history of exile must look towards the past (the 1920s with its multiple trans-European contacts and exchanges) as much as towards what followed after 1933.

In the subsequent presentation, 'Exile Audiences', Erica Carter suggested that discussions on film exile often concentrated on the activities and careers developments of exiles working in the film industry, but tended to neglect to consider how film and film-related consumption (magazine, star fandom, etc.) featured in the everyday lives of ordinary exiles and refugees during this period. Drawing on the case of Anne Frank and the memories of immigrant women working as domestic helpers in the UK in the late 1930s and 40s, Carter proposed that the engagement with patterns of film reception (as opposed to an exclusive focus on economic and technological developments and/or the aesthetic merit of exile productions) could help in opening up the debate further.

In the ensuing discussion of both papers, the opening up of a perspective towards exile audiences was considered particularly productive even if the focus did not always match the concerns of standard exile histories. Equally, the focus on broader cultural projects (such as modernisation) within the remit of exile narratives was recognised among many delegates as operating in similar ways in different contexts.

#### *Afternoon Session 2: Austria and Switzerland*

Christian Cargnelli began his talk, 'Film exile in Austria in the 1930s', with a brief statistical summary, outlining the distribution patterns in Austrian cinema between 1933 and 1938, that is the period after the German film industry introduced racially motivated employment policies and until the definitive 'Anschluss'. He recalled some of the most prominent names that moved from Germany to Austria. Cargnelli documented the increasing pressure Germany exerted over Austria to prevent the continued employment of exiles. The remainder of the paper focussed on individual case studies, including performers such as Joseph Schmidt, Felix Bressart and Otto Wallburg, and Richard Tauber and Paul Graetz, whose career continued in the UK. Cargnelli concluded on questions of 'authenticity' and internationalism in the way German refugees began to occupy Austrian stereotypes, which then could be exported once more in a more global arena.

Yvonne Zimmermann's paper on 'exile and culture in Switzerland' argued that Switzerland profited immensely from emigrants and repatriates between 1933 and 1945. She outlined how exiles in some cases (for example the producer Lazar Wechsler) explicitly contributed to a project of 'national spiritual defence'. She pointed to the irony that 'Swiss cinema has never

been more national in topic and scope and more international in cast and crew than between 1933 and 1945'. Differentiating between distinct types of immigrants (permanent, temporary) as well as returning émigrés, Zimmermann homed in on a number of individual case studies.

The relevance of the contribution by smaller nations within larger discursive formations on exile cinema was picked up in the discussion after the two papers, and found broad agreement among the delegates, many of whom added specific examples from their respective national contexts. The seeming contradiction that an emphasis on the specific of national identity is often a by-product of exile and migration creative production was also debated and identified as an important area of investigation.

#### *Tuesday, 10 July 2012: Morning Session 1:*

Pierre Sorlin's paper, 'Russian, Germans, Hungarians: Some Air in French Studios' reiterated the crucial influence that exiles and émigrés from various European countries exerted on the French film industry in the 1930s, arguing that their contribution was 'fundamental'. Particularly emphasising the work by cinematographers such as Curt Courant, Eugen Shüfftan, and art directors such as Alexander Trauner, Sorlin asked whether their creative input should trigger a discussion over whether 'authorship' in French cinema of the 1930s should be primarily assigned to directors, or to creative personnel such as these.

Alastair Phillips continued in his paper, 'Specific Trajectories of French Film Exile', with an investigation of exile influence in the 1930s, drawing on the research that led to the publication of his monograph *City of Darkness, City of Light* (2003). Arguing against the notion of a single line of influence and interference in cross-cultural exchanges, Phillips preferred the idea of a rebus or a helix in understanding the constitutive dynamic of mobile film personnel in this period. Phillips also argued to consider the importance of the attraction of specific cities (such as Paris) in the creative trajectories of individual exiles. Choosing the French career of Robert Siodmak as an example, Phillips' paper concluded by relating the specific narratives and development of the 1930s and 1940s to more conceptual notions of exile, migration and travel, drawing here on the insights by scholars such as James Clifford and Hamid Naficy.

In the discussion following the two papers, attention was drawn towards the reliability of autobiographical sources (Robert Siodmak's memoirs were particularly problematic in this respect), and the need to conceive of artistic production in more collaborative frameworks than simply individual endeavours.

#### *Morning Session 2:*

The next two papers shifted the perspective towards case studies from Central Europe. Györgyi Vajdovich's paper on the developments in Hungary reminded the workshop that here the trigger for widespread and complex processes of migration was in the first place the upheaval of the First World War, and that the trajectories of the most prominent Hungarian film exiles originate in this earlier period. Touching on case studies including Mihály Kertész (the future Michael Curtiz), Alexander Korda, Béla Balázs, Géza von Bolváry, and István Székely (the future Steve Szekely), this paper mapped the complex changes within Hungarian society and film industry across the period in question.

Petr Szczepanik's paper on the Czech situation outlined some broader parameters for the context of exiles in and out of the country, before focusing in detail on one profession – cinematographers, who proved to be particularly mobile. Drawing on examples including Otto Kanturek, Jan Stallich, Vaclav Vic, Otto Heller, and Franz Planer, the paper argued for a industrially motivated explanation for the migration patterns of these professionals, and highlighted their engagement with entrepreneurial activities. Cinematic case studies touched upon include the Austro-German colour-film production *Wiener Mädeln* (1944), directed by Willi Forst and shot in Vienna and the Barrandov studios in Prague by Czech cinematographer Jan Stallich.

The two papers illustrated for the delegates the important position of Central European countries such as Hungary and Czechoslovakia as 'hubs' and 'hinges' in broader migratory movements and routes. The discussion also raised the importance of individuals such as film critics and theorists (such as Balázs), whose relationship to the industry was often more tenuous than in the case of other creative professions (directors, actors, etc.), but who nevertheless acted as influential facilitators and communicators within broader networks. In this respect, critics working for exile publications and organisations in various countries also had a very crucial function.

#### *Afternoon Session 1*

Tytti Soila's paper was concerned with discussing the situation in Sweden and Finland, pointing out in the first instance the intense inter-Scandinavian patterns of migration, but also the relative paucity of Jewish migration into Sweden and Finland after 1933. With the exception of a few isolated and unusual cases, very few émigrés came to Sweden. On the other hand, a significant amount of Swedish personnel pursued their own pathways of transnational mobility – especially to Germany – during this period. The paper insisted that in attempting to map wider economical and cultural patterns, one should not disregard the value of personal testimonies and trajectories.

Focusing on developments in Denmark during World War II, Lars-Martin Sorensen's paper demonstrated the ambiguous political circumstances by drawing attention to the 1942 Danish film *Afsporet*, produced by a film team that consisted of a male leading actor who was a resistance fighter, a Jewish leading actress, a pro-German Danish director, and a cinematographer who was a member of the SS. The paper then outlined different periods and contexts, taking into account a number of Danish personnel who had previously worked in the German film industry who returned to Denmark after 1933 (Asta Nielsen and Max Hansen are prominent examples). Sorensen also mentioned the exile of Danish artists to Sweden, while also drawing attention to the number of workers who migrated to Germany during World War II.

The Scandinavian case studies opened up a very distinct and often multi-faceted variation to the patterns in other European countries. It also raised the necessity to think in the future about other spheres of exchange (for example within the Eastern Baltic, e.g. between Finland and Russia) that so far has fallen under the radar of narratives more concerned with central and Western European developments. Moreover, the Swedish and Danish case studies also demonstrated the existence of a 'reverse traffic' – with occupations vacated by exiles in the German-influence sphere being taken over by immigrants from Scandinavia.

#### *Afternoon Session 2*

Nevena Dakovic's presentation on multiple migration patterns and cross-cultural exchanges in Serbian cinema began by arguing that a transnational dimension can be traced back to the origins of the industry, citing the 1904 production of *The Coronation of the King Peter I/Krunisanje kralja Petra*. Her paper then outlined several trajectories of film professionals of Serbian origin (Zvonimir Rogoz, Ita Rina, Ivan Petrovic) and their nomadic career trajectories across different European countries, before analysing the way in which Serbia as a narrative imaginary featured in films made during World War II in the Soviet Union, Nazi Germany, and Britain.

Dominique Nasta's presentation introduced a range of migrant film personnel from Romania, and their different routes into exile, especially (but not exclusively) to France. Nasta put particular emphasis on the importance of established networks and contacts, and the influence of specific artistic communities, allegiances, friendships, and family relations. Nasta also demonstrated the variety of professions and creative contexts in which Romanian émigrés can be found.

The two papers on Serbia and Romania provided an additional element to the network of routes that the workshop had uncovered by this point. The nexus Bucharest-Paris emerged as a significant trajectory, while the Serbian case suggested a more uneven, rhizomatic network.

*Wednesday, 11 July 2012 : Morning Session*

In the first of two papers on Italy, Francesco Bono argued that the topic of exile into the Italian film industry is a largely neglected subject, nor has there been much research into the transnational dimensions of Italian cinema, with exceptions such as Franco-Italian co-productions of the 1950s or the Spaghetti westerns of the 1960s. On the other hand, one of the most productive periods of exchange has been overlooked - that between Germany and Italy in the 1920s, and another boom in international exchanges in the 1930s. Bono chose *Casta Diva* (1935) as an example of a distinctly transnational Italian film that stylistically and professionally oscillates between Rome and Vienna: directed by the Italian Carmine Gallone, it had an international cast, was scripted by the exile writer Walter Reisch, and was remade into a British production.

In his paper, Francesco Pitassio aimed to problematise notions of 'migration', cinematic style', and periodisation, drawing on a detailed case study of two directors, Max Neufeld, and Géza Radványi. Neufeld's migration extended from Germany and Austria to Italy and Spain, while Radványi's career encompassed Germany, his native Hungary, France, and Italy. Apart from their individual career trajectories, these two directors also illustrate for Pitassio how the question of film migration is intertwined with the question of stylistic trends, in particular the distinction between generic entertainment and social realism.

Valeria Camporesi's introduction of the Spanish case proposed a historical framework that commenced in 1929 (shortly before the end of Primo de Rivera's dictatorship) until 1950. Covering different political circumstances, including the Civil War, Camporesi's paper charted the ambiguous political allegiances of exiles and refugees working in the Spanish film industry during these years. Among her case studies were figures such as the cinematographer Heinrich Gärtner/Enrique Guerner and the screenwriter/director Ladislao Vajda; a film example outlined in some detail was the 1936 film *Maria de la O*, photographed by exile Eugen Shüfftan. At the same time, her paper pointed out the fact that the same period saw many artists emigrating from Spain, including Luis Bunuel, and Francisco Elias.

The ensuing discussion returned to the question of periodisation, and the importance of the 1920s as a foundation on which future migration patterns were based. Pitassio's paper opened up the possibility to rethink postwar developments – for example the move towards social realism, in the context of pre-war and wartime transnational patterns. This was seen as a very promising and productive way forward.

*Panel Discussion : "Curatorial Questions of Exile"*

In the panel discussion, moderated by Bergfelder and Camporesi, two of the delegates most directly associated with curatorial and archival work, Sorensen and Bock, were invited to talk about their experience, and to comment on the papers of the previous days in the light of their own professional expertise. Sorensen gave a brief introduction into the activities of the Danish Film Institute, followed by Bock, who reported on the initiatives of the Hamburg-based CineGraph, an institution that has contributed to exile research for several decades, and that has promoted film exile through retrospectives, conferences, publications, and online databases. Both speakers admitted the difficulties in aligning the visibility of exile production with a more nationally focussed emphasis.

*Concluding Discussion on follow-up activities/networking/collaboration*

This content and outcomes of this discussion are covered under the following item, and are also referred to in the executive summary above.



### **3. Assessment of the results, contribution to the future direction of the field, outcome**

One of the principal objectives of the workshop was to expand and share knowledge about exile and migration patterns in the 30s and 40s. The inclusion of several delegates and presentations from countries only rarely covered in the existing literature, and the additional expertise provided by archival/curatorial professionals, facilitated this expanded perspective. The workshop highlighted some very distinct patterns (e.g. the Scandinavian situation versus Central Europe, the peripheral but nevertheless significant developments in countries such as Spain and Portugal). At the same time, it also became clear that the delegates shared a number of very similar concerns and interests in terms of methodology, and the need to establish cross-national links and expertise in order to determine in what ways exiles can contribute to a given regional/local corpus of films. More generally, the delegates recognised that a collective and inter-connected revisionist history of exile cinema could contribute important insights into broader concerns, such as the shape and direction of European history and culture and the notion of cultural heritage. The concluding discussion consequently identified a range of desiderata for follow-up activities that the group could address. These were centred on the following emerging research objectives:

- To draw up a more accurate timeline for the developments that supersedes or complements previous forms of periodisation (1933-1945).
- To formulate (taking into account the very different situations in different parts of Europe) a theoretical framework for defining and distinguishing shifting patterns of migration from the political/existential condition of 'exile'.
- To establish a clear topography (routes and maps) of migration and exile patterns in the period under investigation. This could take the form of a Digital Humanities-type project, possibly in conjunction with colleagues from cultural geography.
- To distinguish and account for the differences between professional patterns and private trajectories. In the first instance this would require a thorough analysis of industrial infrastructures and modes of production across European film industries, in the second instance it demands an engagement with the sociology of 'everyday life'.
- To study specific networks of exile and migration which develop along professional, ethnic, intellectual, or diasporic lines. To take particular note of exile publications in this contexts.
- To describe and analyse the narratives of nation and the (ex-)territorial aesthetics that emerge in periods of exile production, as well as its influence on particular genres and movements (poetic realism, neorealism etc.)
- To study the patterns of influence and legacies by exile personnel (on professional practices, industrial structures, technological development, etc.)

The workshop delegates discussed a number of possible avenues for future activity. This included the plan to submit a proposal for a ESF Research Networking Programme, and/or to draw on national funding sources (the German DFG, the AHRC and British Academy and Leverhulme Trust in the UK). Some delegates had experience on submitting bids to the Framework programme and other European funding bodies, and offered advice in formulating a new bid around some of the areas identified above.

Several of the delegates also have established links with publishers in various national contexts. Hence the idea was mooted of developing the workshop proceedings with added commissioned articles on other national contexts into a comprehensive book project, or alternatively approach peer-reviewed academic journals in the field. In the short-term (until mid-Autumn 2012) a more informal email discussion list maintains the dialogue among the delegates. Following the approval of the Scientific Report by the ESF, an extended hard copy of the report to include abstracts and PPTs will be circulated among the delegates. The plan is to identify a smaller core group of delegates who take the project of the workshop forward with a view of establishing the group (and potential newcomers) into a more permanent transnational research network. This is expected to commence in mid-Autumn (November) 2012, with a view of submitting applications, publication proposals, etc. in 2013.

## 4. Final programme

### Monday, 9 July 2012

- 10.00-10.30 *Coffee / Tea/ Registration*
- 10.30-10.40 **Welcome by Convenor**  
**Tim Bergfelder** (University of Southampton, UK)
- 10.40-11.00 **Presentation of the European Science Foundation (ESF)**  
**José María Faraldo Jarillo** (ESF Standing Committee for the Humanities, SCH)
- (In the absence of the ESF representative, a PowerPoint presentation provided by the ESF office was presented and briefly discussed)
- 11.00- 12.30 Morning Session: Conceptual Issues**
- 11.00- 11.20 **Presentation 1 "Problems of Definitions of Exile"**  
**Tim Bergfelder** (University of Southampton, UK)
- 11.25- 11.45 **Presentation 2 "Questions of Historiography"**  
**Valeria Camporesi** (Universidad Autonoma de Madrid, ES)
- 11.50- 12.10 **Presentation 3 ""Patterns of migration and migrant entrepreneurship""**  
**Judith Thissen** (Utrecht University, Netherlands)
- 12.10-12.30 **Discussion**
- 12.30-14.00 *Lunch*
- 14.00- 17.30 Afternoon Session: Revisiting the Issue of Exile**
- 14.00- 14.30 **Presentation 1 "Exile Narratives"**  
**Malte Hagener** (University of Marburg, Germany)
- 14.30- 15.00 **Presentation 2 "Exile Audiences"**  
**Erica Carter** (King's College, London, UK)
- 15.00- 15.30 **Discussion**
- 15.30- 16.00 *Coffee / tea break*
- 16.00- 16.30 **Presentation 3 "Film Exile in Austria in the 1930s"**  
**Christian Cargnelli** (University of Vienna, Austria)
- 16.30- 17.00 **Presentation 4 "Exile and Film Culture in Switzerland"**  
**Yvonne Zimmermann** (University of Zürich, Switzerland)
- 17.00- 17.30 **Discussion**
- 19.00 *Dinner*

## Tuesday, 10 July 2012

- 09.00-12.30**      **Morning Session**
- 09.00-09.30      **Presentation 1 "Russians, Germans, Hungarians: Some Air in French Studios"**  
**Pierre Sorlin** (University Paris III-Sorbonne nouvelle, Paris, France)
- 09.30-10.00      **Presentation 2 "Specific Trajectories of French Film Exile"**  
**Alastair Phillips** (University of Warwick, Coventry, UK)
- 10.00-10.30      **Discussion**
- 10.30-11.00      *Coffee / Tea Break*
- 11.00-11.30      **Presentation 3 "Hungary and Exiles"**  
**Györgyi Vajdovich** (Eötvös Lorand University, Budapest, Hungary)
- 11.30-12.00      **Presentation 4 "Exile and Czechoslovakia: Travelling Cinematographers"**  
**Petr Szczepanik** (Masaryk University, Brno, Czech Republic)
- 12.00-12.30      **Discussion**
- 12.30-14.00      *Lunch*
- 14.00-17.30**      **Afternoon Session**
- 14.00-14.30      **Presentation 1 "Sweden"**  
**Tytti Soila** (University of Stockholm, Sweden)
- 14.30-15.00      **Presentation 2 "Denmark"**  
**Lars-Martin Sørensen** (University of Copenhagen/Danish Film Institute, Copenhagen, Denmark)
- 15.00-15.30      **Discussion**
- 15.30-16.00      *Coffee / Tea Break*
- 16.00-16.30      **Presentation 3 "Yugoslavia"**  
**Nevena Dakovic** (University of the Arts, Belgrade, Serbia)
- 16.30-17.00      **Presentation 4 "Migration and Romania, 1920-1940"**  
**Dominique Nasta** (Université Libre de Bruxelles, Belgium)
- 17.00-17.30      **Discussion**
- 19.00              *Dinner*

## Wednesday, 11 July 2012

- 09.00-12.30**      **Morning Session**
- 09.00-09.30      **Presentation 1 "Exile and Migration in the Italian Cinema of the 1930s"**  
**Francesco Bono** (University of Perugia, Italy)

09.30-10.00	<b>Presentation 2 "Migration, Style, and Eras: The case of Max Neufeld and Géza Radvanyi"</b> <b>Francesco Pitassio</b> (University of Udine, Italy)
10.00-10.30	<b>Presentation 3 "Spain"</b> <b>Valeria Camporesi</b> (Universidad Autonoma de Madrid, ES)
10.30-11.00	<b>Discussion</b>
11.00-11.30	<i>Coffee / Tea Break</i>
11.30-12.30	<b>Panel Discussion : "Curatorial Questions of Exile"</b> <b>Tim Bergfelder</b> (University of Southampton, UK) <b>Valeria Camporesi</b> (Universidad Autonoma de Madrid, ES) <b>Hans-Michael Bock</b> (CineGraph Hamburg, Germany) <b>Lars-Martin Sørensen</b> (University of Copenhagen/Danish Film Institute, Copenhagen, Denmark)
12.30-13.30	<i>Lunch</i>
13.30-15.00	<b>Discussion on follow-up activities/networking/collaboration</b>
15.00	<i>End of Workshop and departure</i>

## 5. Final list of participants

1. Organiser: Tim Bergfelder (University of Southampton, UK)
2. Co-Organiser: Valeria Camporesi (Universidad Autónoma de Madrid, Spain)
3. Hans-Michael Bock (CineGraph, Hamburg, Germany)
4. Francesco Bono (Università degli Studi di Perugia, Italy)
5. Christian Cargnelli (Universität Wien, Vienna, Austria)
6. Erica Carter (King's College London, UK)
7. Nevena Dakovic (University of Arts, Belgrade, Serbia)
8. Malte Hagener (Marburg University, Germany)
9. Dominique Nasta (Université Libre de Bruxelles, Brussels, Belgium)
10. Alastair Phillips (Warwick University, UK)
11. Francesco Pitassio (Università degli Studi di Udine, Italy)
12. Tytti Soila (Stockholm University, Stockholm, Sweden)
13. Lars-Martin Sørensen (Danish Film Institute Copenhagen, Denmark)
14. Pierre Sorlin (Université Paris III Sorbonne nouvelle, Paris, France)
15. Petr Szczepanik (Masaryk University, Brno, Czech Republic)
16. Judith Thissen (Utrecht University, Netherlands)
17. Györgyi Vajdovich (Eötvös Loránd University, Budapest, Hungary)
18. Yvonne Zimmermann (University of Zürich, Switzerland)

**6. Statistical information on participants** (age bracket, countries of origin, M/F repartition, etc.) The statistics to be provided under section 6 can also include repartition by scientific specialty if relevant.

*A. Age Bracket:*

20-40 years of age: 2

40-60 years of age: 14

60+: 3

*B. Countries of Origin\*:*

UK: 3 delegates

Germany: 2 delegates

Italy: 2 delegates

Austria: 1 delegate

Belgium: 1 delegate

Czech Republic: 1 delegate

Denmark: 1 delegate

France: 1 delegate

Hungary: 1 delegate

Netherlands: 1 delegate

Poland: 1 delegate\*\*

Serbia: 1 delegate

Spain: 1 delegate

Sweden: 1 delegate

Switzerland: 1 delegate

(\*Note: Country of origin here refers to academic 'home' of delegate, not ethnic background.)

(\*\*Absent due to illness, paper was circulated)

*C. Male/Female Gender Balance:*

M (10); F (8)

*D. Scientific expertise:*

Bergfelder: German cinema, British cinema, theories of exile, film history

Camporesi: Spanish cinema, film history, film industries

Bock: archival and curatorial practices, German cinema

Bono: Italian and Austrian cinema

Cargnelli: film exile, Austrian cinema

Carter: German cinema, audiences

Dakovic: Serbian and Balkan cinema

Hagener: European modernist film movements, Portuguese cinema, Dutch cinema

Nasta: European cinema

Phillips: French cinema

Pitassio: Italian and Czech cinema

Soila: Swedish, Finnish, and Scandinavian cinema

Sørensen: Danish cinema, film archives

Sorlin: French, Italian, and European cinema

Szczepanik: Czech film history, film industries

Thissen: Dutch cinema, migration studies

Vajdovich: Hungarian cinema

Zimmermann: Swiss cinema, avant-garde film