

## Money talks: the logorrheic masquerade in two films from 1934

Phil Powrie [p.powrie@surrey.ac.uk]

*School of English and Languages, University of Surrey, Guildford GU2 7XH*

In the early 1930s there were a number of financial scandals, involving fraud and corruption at the highest levels, as talented individuals played unregulated markets at the expense of small savers. The best known of these involved the banker Marthe Hanau --whose story was later told in *La Banquière* (Francis Girod, 1980)-- and Alexandre Stavisky (the subject of Alain Resnais's 1974 film). The scandals led to several plays, two of which were made into films in 1934: *Ces messieurs de la Santé* (Pierre Colombier, starring Raimu) and *La Banque Nemo* (Marguerite Viel, starring Victor Boucher). The two films have several common features: a charismatic and garrulous male lead as the unscrupulous banker, who tricks those around him into investing their savings unwisely. This is done with help of a female assistant. She seduces the men sexually, while the banker seduces them with words. The culmination of each film is investment in (imaginary) minerals in foreign lands. This paper will show how the films' currency is the seduction of erotic and exotic dreams beneath which there is literally nothing: what circulates, masquerading as something, is the power of words in a spectacular star performance.

**Keywords:** *La Banque Nemo*; *Ces messieurs de la Santé*; Raimu; Victor Boucher; money; logorrhoea

In the early 1930s there were a number of financial scandals in France, involving fraud and corruption at the highest levels, as talented individuals played unregulated markets at the expense of small savers. The best known of these involved the banker Marthe Hanau – whose story was later told in *La Banquière/The Lady Banker* (Francis Girod, 1980) – Albert Oustric, and Alexandre Stavisky (the subject of Alain Resnais’s 1974 film).<sup>1</sup> The scandals led to several plays, two of which were made into films in 1934. By common accord, in 1934 and since then, these films have been judged mediocre; but in 1934 they were highly topical and as a result very popular. My concern in this article is not an aesthetic judgment, but an analysis of the way in which star performance intersects with a manipulative use of words. This will require some political and historical scene setting.

In *La Banque Nemo/[Nemo Bank]*, directed (unusually) by a woman, Marguerite Viel, Gustave Lebrèche<sup>2</sup> (Victor Boucher), who has a dubious past, rises from cashier to assistant director of the Banque Nemo, partly by seducing the wife of the director, Monsieur Nemo. He persuades the director to go on a business trip to Moscow, and in his absence speculates on non-existent mineral deposits in Djellalabad. He uses the scandal that follows to oust the director, and take over the bank. Lebrèche is subsequently snared by Larnoy, a corrupt cashier who had been imprisoned for stealing 10,000 francs from the cash register, and whose place and mistress Lebrèche had taken to worm his way to the top (the steps he climbs on the poster of the film illustrate his rapid rise to the top; see Figure 1). Lebrèche manages

---

<sup>1</sup> On Resnais’s *Stavisky*, see Beylie, 1974; Busi, 1975; Greene, 1999, pp. 50-59; Andrew and Ungar, 2008, pp. 15-51; Wilson, 2009, pp. 123-30.

<sup>2</sup> In the play his name is spelt Labrèche, a spelling used by magazines reviewing the film. In the film, however, he is very clearly called Lebrèche, which is the spelling adopted in this article.

to avoid prosecution thanks to the network of powerful politicians whom he has cultivated with the help of his mistress.

[INSERT FIGURE 1 HERE]

Figure 1: The poster for *La Banque Nemo* (courtesy of notrecinema.com).

In *Ces messieurs de la santé*/[*The Gentlemen from the Santé Prison*] directed by Pierre Colombier, Tafard (Raimu), a banker imprisoned for fraud, escapes from prison and takes a job as a night watchman in a corset shop. He becomes indispensable to the family that owns the business as he modernises it. He trades in all sorts of commodities, including weapons, and launches a share scheme for non-existent mines, bringing considerable wealth to the family who rely on his acumen without questioning it. He finally re-establishes a bank that is on the point of crashing at the end of the film.

The two films have several common features. There is a charismatic and garrulous male lead as the unscrupulous banker, who tricks those around him into investing their savings unwisely. His female assistant seduces powerful men sexually, while the banker seduces them with words. The culmination of each film is investment in fraudulent projects abroad. In the first part of this article, I will place the films in their socio-political, historical and cinematographic contexts. In the second part I shall argue, using work by Michael Tratner and Jaime Hovey, that the films' currency is the seduction of erotic and exotic dreams through logorrhoea,

beneath which there is literally nothing: what circulates, masquerading as something, is the power of words in a spectacular star performance.<sup>3</sup>

I shall briefly outline the main financial scandals of the late 1920s and early 1930s before considering the plays and the films of the plays that thinly fictionalised them. Marthe Hanau (1886–1935) founded a newspaper in the mid-1920s, *La Gazette du franc*, which gave financial advice, and promoted the shell companies of her business partners. She also established a company giving financial advice, *Agence Interpresse*. She issued bonds at 8% in a Ponzi scheme, defrauding thousands of small investors. When the banks began to investigate, she managed to avoid detection by bribing politicians, but was eventually arrested for fraud in late 1928. She went on trial in 1932, during which she revealed the names of corrupt politicians, and later that year wrote a newspaper article on the darker side of financial speculation, quoting extracts from a leaked police file on her, for which she was again arrested. Imprisoned for three years in July 1934, she committed suicide in 1935.<sup>4</sup>

Albert Oustric (1887–1971) established a financial empire of some 17 companies during the 1920s, trading mainly in textiles, floating them on the stock exchange, and speculating in American style. The 1929 crash led to criminal bankruptcy and an 18-month prison sentence in 1932 at La Santé prison, a month before Hanau's trial started. He left prison on medical grounds, returning to his own bank as an employee (Jankowski 2002, 69), a situation recalled in *La Banque Nemo*.

---

<sup>3</sup> I should point out that the term 'masquerade' is a well established concept within the gender paradigm in Film Studies (see Doane 182 and 1988–1989), but that I am using it in a different sense, as will become apparent.

<sup>4</sup> On Marthe Hanau, see Gautier 1933 and Desanti 1968. Unlike the Stavisky Affair, there has been considerably less scholarly work on Hanau and Oustric, so the account given here should be seen as allegations rather than fully substantiated facts.

Like Hanau, he was protected by politicians. The commission of enquiry set up to investigate him was led by a prominent politician, Raoul Péret, who was Minister of Justice in André Tardieu's second cabinet (March–December 1930). It was revealed that Péret had been a close associate of Oustric in the early 1920s, and had facilitated some of Oustric's dealings. The scandal led to a prison term for Péret, and the collapse of Tardieu's government.

The most famous scandal was the Stavisky Affair. Alexandre Stavisky (1886–1934) was a conman who was arrested for fraud in 1926, but became a respectable businessman, partly through the protection of prominent politicians, amongst them the Minister for the Colonies (and previously Minister of Justice) Albert Dalimier. As a result of this he managed to evade a prison term, and was put on bail seventeen times. He set up a fraudulent Ponzi scheme with bearer bonds in the early 1930s with the deputy Mayor of Bayonne who was jailed for two years in late 1933. Stavisky fled to avoid prison, and died as result of a presumed but much contested suicide before he could be brought to justice in January 1934. Right-wing parties used the affair to destabilise the Radical government of Camille Chautemps, leading to riots.<sup>5</sup> The Affair played a significant part in bringing together previously warring left-wing factions that went on to constitute the first socialist government in 1936, the Popular Front.

---

<sup>5</sup> Unlike the Hanau Affair, the Stavisky Affair has remained a source of fascination in French culture. It generated a significant number of books in 1934 and 1935: Almeras 1934; Bortchy 1934; Justicier 1934; Kessel 1934; Lenglois 1934; Menais 1934; Pigaglio 1934; Rochefer 1934; Aymard 1935; Delamarque 1935; Détrez 1935. There was renewed interest at the time of Resnais's film: Charlier and Montarron 1974; Lorenz 1974. But there have been other books since then: Bon 1999; Fitère 2000; Jankowski 2000 (translated into English in 2002). See also Passmore 2005 for further work in English.

### From plays to films

In the general climate of distrust of high finance, it is hardly surprising that playwrights produced satires that referred transparently to these scandals. They, and the films of the plays, are part of an anti-parliamentarian streak in France's social and political culture.<sup>6</sup> *Ces messieurs de la Santé* was written by Paul Armont, who had begun his career as a playwright in the early 1900s, with over twenty plays to his credit before this one. It was co-written with Léopold Marchand (Armont and Marchand 1931). The two of them had already co-written a play in 1924, *Le Tailleur au château/The Tailor in the Castle*.<sup>7</sup> *Ces messieurs de la Santé* opened at the Théâtre de Paris in April 1931, starring Raimu. *La Banque Nemo* was written by Louis Verneuil (Verneuil 1931; see Gauteur 2007). Although Verneuil had like Armont begun his career in the early 1900s, unlike Armont he was a well-known playwright of the 1930s, with a profile as high as Sacha Guitry. He wrote some eighty plays and was the screenwriter for a large number of films, amongst them *Tout pour l'amour/[All for Love]* (Henri-Georges Clouzot, 1933) and *Avec le sourire/With a Smile* starring Maurice Chevalier (Maurice Tourneur, 1936). *La Banque Nemo* opened at the Théâtre de la Michodière in November 1931, starring Victor Boucher, who was at the time director of the theatre. The two plays were on the Paris stages in between Hanau's two incarcerations (1928, 1931), and a few months after Oustric was arrested in November 1930.

Stavisky died in January 1933. An interview with Marguerite Viel, the director of *La Banque Nemo*, reveals that the rights for the play had been acquired by Tobis

---

<sup>6</sup> Jean-Pierre Jeancolas calls these films 'films de droite', or right-wing films (Jeancolas 1983, 136).

<sup>7</sup> Later adapted for the screen as *Love Me Tonight*, with Maurice Chevalier and Jeannette Macdonald (Rouben Mamoulian, 1932).

Films in October 1933, and the film was shot 9 February–15 March 1934 (Anon. 1934a, 6), just after the parliamentary crisis of the 6 February 1934. The coincidence was remarked upon in the popular film magazines, here in relation to *Ces messieurs de la Santé*:

Long before the [Stavisky] ‘Affair’, Pathé-Nathan had listed Léopold Marchand’s amusing play in their production schedule. Its opening in the Marivaux [Theatre] coincided with curiously parallel events. Statements that might only have seemed amusing, given current events, take on a delicious irony and double meaning much enjoyed by the public. (Nat 284, 246)

*La Banque Nemo* was indeed so topical and close to the bone that twenty minutes of footage of the meeting of the Council of Ministers was censored, because it was taken to refer to the scandals mentioned above. A short piece in *Le Courrier cinématographique* of 1934 advertises an uncensored showing of the film, making the link with Stavisky very clear: ‘The censor has deleted one fifth of the film, and if we can show it you today uncut it is because this showing is entirely private. The reason for censorship is the overly direct allusion to the events of 1934 known as the Stavisky Affair’.<sup>8</sup> It is a key scene where the cabinet of ministers meets to discuss the scandal in which they are becoming increasingly embroiled. The President of the Council in what purports to be a fictitious country explains that Larnoy, previously

---

<sup>8</sup> Anon., ‘Mr Louis Verneuil contre la censure cinématographique?’, *Le Courrier cinématographique*, 28 avril 1934, cited in Montagne 2007, 37. See also Python 1975 and 1977. The currently available DVD of the film in the René Chateau collection (EDV1102, 2012) has restored a little over eight minutes of this scene (1:12:24–1:21:09).

employed at the Banque Nemo, has given him a confidential report originally from the Minister for the Colonies, a report that indicates fraud:

Mr Lebrèche recently set up a project dealing in cocoa. It's a company with a capital of hundred million, which is proposing to grow cocoa. The shares have had a great success on the stock market. It would appear, according to reports from official and important persons whose judgment we have no reason to doubt that the cultivation of cocoa in the territory concerned is simply impossible. Mr Lebrèche has launched a fictitious product that's cashing in millions.

The scene goes from outrage and the condemnation of Lebrèche to support for him, as the implications of the scandal for Ministers' careers become clearer. The Minister for the Colonies is criticized for giving Lebrèche a 6000-hectare concession of bush-land at favourable rates, and even more for the leaking of the confidential report. The President of the Council suggests he should resign. He points out that the public may assume that the Minister let Lebrèche have the report as part of a shady deal leading to the concession, especially when it becomes clear that his subordinates advised against the concession. The Minister for the Colonies says that if his head should roll, then others should also assume responsibility; after all, he adds, the Minister of Finance allowed the flotation, and the President of the Council himself defended Lebrèche in court six months previously. As one of the Ministers ruefully says after this exchange, to the amusement of all, 'if we carry on like this, the whole Cabinet will end up resigning. It's not fair. I've been a member of parliament for fifteen years, and this is the first time I've been a Minister'. Vauquelin, another Minister, who has just been courting Lebrèche's mistress, comes in late and insists on punishing all fraudsters, until he is told that the affair concerns his friend Lebrèche. He launches

into a passionate speech where he says that the Ministers' desire to sacrifice themselves by resigning is noble, but misguided (see Figure 2). It is more noble, he suggests, to stay in office, so as to avoid the collapse of the bank and the dire social consequences to which this would lead:

[INSERT FIGURE 2 HERE]

Figure 2: Vauquelin's impassioned speech in *La Banque Nemo* (courtesy of René Chateau Vidéo).

You're all honest men, but you've made a few mistakes, and Mr Lebrèche's misfortunes have suddenly given you the opportunity to atone for them. Your consciences push you to seize this opportunity. I understand you only too well. A magnificent feeling of justice has overwhelmed you. To ensure that this reckless banker doesn't escape justice, you want to sacrifice yourselves, you want to resign. This is quite frankly sublime! But stop and think for a moment. You should resist these dizzy heights of honesty. If we arrest Lebrèche tomorrow, what's going to happen? 500,000 customers – these are your fellow countrymen – will rush to his bank. It will be panic, poverty, and suicide. Let me ask you this, gentlemen: before thinking of oneself, surely it is more noble to think of others? Faced with the certain distress of thousands of individuals, shouldn't you renounce this wish to sacrifice yourselves, this voluptuous desire for atonement which is tormenting you? When you consider the advantages and disadvantages of Lebrèche's arrest, I am advocating to you the superhuman effort of remaining silent, of not saying anything to anyone about our mistakes. In a word, gentlemen, I want you to prevent the misfortunes that your desire for martyrdom would inevitably bring!

Seemingly more relieved than swayed by this preposterous pseudo-religious rhetoric, the Council bursts into thunderous applause.

[INSERT FIGURE 3 HERE]

Figure 3: The official portrait in the Council of Ministers from *La Banque Nemo* (courtesy of René Chateau Vidéo).

The parallels between current events and the film was entirely coincidental, if uncannily close. The film's location is apparently not France. The official portrait in the Council chamber is not the French president (see Figure 3). The director herself points this out in a piece protesting against the censorship of the scene: 'Look at the décor. On the right, the portrait of a king, and a completely fictional coat of arms... It doesn't place the action in France' (Anon. 1934a, 6). The official titles referred to are not recognizably French. The Royal Prosecutor ('Procureur du Roi') of Verneuil's play, too close perhaps to the real Public Prosecutor ('Procureur de la République'), was changed to the rather odd-sounding function, in French at least, of Grand Prosecutor ('Grand Réquisiteur') (Pithon 1974, 10), which has intimations of the Spanish Inquisition. But these precautions of the scriptwriters were of little use when the Council of Ministers sequence recounts that the Minister of Finance has rubber-stamped the flotation of one of Lebrèche's fictional companies, and the Minister for the Colonies has communicated compromising documents to him. These fictitious events were uncomfortably close to actual events: the Minister for the Colonies in

Chautemps's cabinet, Albert Dalimier, was the most severely compromised politician in the Stavisky Affair, and Eugène Raynaldy, the Minister of Justice, had been, just like in the film, accused of rubber-stamping fictional stocks. Nonetheless, the author of the play, Louis Verneuil, pointed out how absurd it was to censor the film when the play had been in the public domain only a few years before (see Anon. 1934a, 6).

Indeed, Verneuil finishes his intervention with a very tongue-in-cheek gibe:

Let's assume the film is supposed to be located in France. Given that the Council of Ministers in *La Banque Nemo* is composed of a bunch of corrupt scoundrels, how could an official organism such as the film censor, dependent on the Ministry of the Interior, claim some resemblance between the characters in the film and those charged in the last few years with the governance of France? Or let us assume that the film is located in a country other than France. Then the censor should be proud to let the public see just how the government of another country is so morally inferior compared to ours. (Anon. 1934a, 6)

These two films echoed the three scandals I have mentioned: political protection of fraudulent financiers who take people's savings to invest in non-existent ventures. But they did no more than echo them, and were generally felt to be rather mild satires. One reviewer wrote of *Ces messieurs de la Santé* that it was 'an intelligent, but alas, a much too gentle satire' (Cohen 1934, 28). Another wrote of *La Banque Nemo*: 'In vain do you seek the tendentious or even ironic tone that might have justified the famous ban of the censor. On the contrary, the tone is perfectly benign' (Anon. 1934b, 18). No less a figure than Marcel Carné wrote a withering one-page article on the censorship of the film. He considered the film to be 'a satire, not very substantial, not very wicked', and proceeded to ridicule the censorship: 'A government must have completely lost any sense of the ridiculous to have taken

measures likely to provoke widespread hilarity amongst sensible people' (Carné 1934, 8).

Despite the films' tameness, both were listed amongst the best films of 1934 by readers of the popular weekly *Pour Vous* (see figures given in Crisp 2002, 301). This, to judge from comments by spectators reported in *Pour Vous*, was less because of the aesthetic value of the films, which were deemed to be too much like filmed theatre – one of the major issues in early 1930s film criticism for theorists and spectators alike, and an issue to which I will return – than their topicality, and more obviously the star turns of the leads.

The two films starred the same leads as the plays, Raimu and Victor Boucher respectively. *Ces messieurs de la Santé* was directed by Pierre Colombier (see Binet 2003). During the 1930s Colombier tended to direct films of successful plays, whose primary object was to showcase the leads. He worked with George Milton on *Le Roi des resquilleurs/The King of the Gatecrashers* (1930) and *Le Roi du cirage/The Shoeshine King* (1931), with Raimu on *Charlemagne* (1933), *Théodore et Cie/Theodore and Company* (1933), *L'École des cocottes/School for Coquettes* (1935), *Le Roi/The King* (1936), as well as *Ces messieurs de la Santé*, and with Fernandel on *Ignace* (1937). The director of *La Banque Nemo* was that rarity until the 1980s in French cinema, a woman, Marguerite Viel. She had co-directed an adaptation of a Georges Feydau farce, *Occupe-toi d'Amélie/Take Care of Amélie* (with Richard Weisbach, 1932). Although credited as sole director of *La Banque Nemo*, she was 'supervised' by Jean Choux, according to the film's credits, although it is by no means clear what this might have meant. Whether reasonably well known, such as Colombier, or relative unknowns, such as Viel, the directors were

considerably less important than the stars, however. Both Raimu and Boucher were stars of the theatre.

Raimu was a successful stage actor during the 1920s.<sup>9</sup> The coming of sound made him a star in the cinema, largely as a result of Marcel Pagnol's *Marius*, performed on stage in 1929, and followed by the film version in 1931, directed by Alexander Korda. Raimu's stardom was consolidated a year later by the second part of Pagnol's film trilogy, *Fanny* (Marc Allégret, 1932). By the time of *Ces messieurs de la Santé*, Raimu was one of France's top stars, the film being very much a vehicle for his talents, with the other actors completely over-shadowed, including Pauline Carton – a well-known character actress – as the owner of the corset shop. As one correspondent put it in the regular reader's letters column in *Pour Vous*, 'Raimu eclipses everyone else, you don't even notice the second roles' (Périnet 1934, 4). Another reader ruefully suggests that Raimu might be one of the saving graces of an otherwise mediocre film, as 'he is quite simply unique: his presence saves the film [...] Even in a mediocre film he manages to do astonishing things' (Sigaux 1934, 16). Critics agreed; a review in *Candide* tersely pointed out that 'the film rests entirely on Raimu' ('Raimu supporte tout le poids de l'ouvrage'; cited in Lacotte 1998, 120), and a British review of the film, which was showing at the Academy film theatre in London, had this to say:

---

<sup>9</sup> Raimu has remained a popular star since his death in 1946, particularly with regard to his many films with Marcel Pagnol, as can be seen from the following books published: Régent 1951; Périsset 1972; Brun 1982; Lacotte 1988; Castans 1999; Jelot-Blanc 2010; Djemaa 2011; Nohain-Raimu 2014.

No more delicious piece of acting could be imagined. His cynical humility as night watchman, his gentle playing on the weaknesses of the *patronne* and her family, the philosophic melancholy with which he receives the advances of the various women whom he has enriched, and the intermittent flaring up of a violent energy are first-rate. He makes every situation entirely credible. (M. 1934, 14)

The ‘flaring up of violent energy’ is demonstrated in an almost surreal sequence when the corset shop is investigated by the Commissioner of Police, who has been tipped off that Tafard is trading in military hardware. When the Commissioner arrives with his squad, Tafard poses initially as a humble accountant, gradually winding himself up into a tirade, by turns campily sarcastic and furiously shouting. He quotes the penal code, browbeating the Commissioner into retreat:

Tafard: Commissioner, by what right are you doing this?

Commissioner: What?

Tafard: You breeze in here as if you owned the place, you’re full of frowns and scowls, you turn nasty, and all without a warrant.

Commissioner: I’m proceeding with enquiries.

Tafard: Well you could be a bit more polite about it. Oh, I know, I know: you meet Monsieur Hector, a naïve young man, Madame Génissier, a paragon of virtue, Monsieur Amédée, a simpleton, and here we go, you start turning the screws. Let me be the one to give you the information you need. Yes, we did indeed buy machine guns. But there’s more. Today Madame Génissier ordered two Soviet tanks, ten Manchester bombers, and a submarine from the Trieste shipyard. You tell me, Commissioner, why should Madame Génissier not buy these minor items? What if she wants to park a couple of tanks on her garden lawn, are you going to stop her?

Commissioner: Are you making fun of me?

Tafard: Me, oooh really... Commissioner, let me remind you of paragraphs 1, 2, 3, of the law of 14 August 1885 concerning the trafficking of unarmoured devices that I believe you are confusing with article 1 of the law of 24 May 1834 on the seizure of weapons.

Commissioner: It's not about that!

Tafard: It's not about that?! Well, then, arrest us, Commissioner, arrest us! And tomorrow, yes tomorrow, I'll contact the Minister! I wonder how he'll feel about it! And I suggest,

Commissioner, that if you haven't yet learnt how to pick up the pieces when things go wrong, you'd better learn quickly.

Commissioner: Look here, don't get carried away. The Ministry for Foreign Affairs is very concerned!

Tafard: Not my problem! My papers are in order! The forms have been filled by the suppliers. The only thing that hasn't been signed is our daily logbook. Here it is. Would you like to sign it Commissioner? That way you won't have wasted your time.

The American novelist Henry Miller perceptively describes this aspect of Raimu's style in an appreciation he originally published in 1938, and which applies accurately to the sequence above: 'The wrath of Raimu is magnificent; there is something Biblical, something godlike about it [...] His violence is slow in accumulating; it gathers like a storm-cloud and breaks with devastating fury, only to clear as quickly as it came' (Miller 1941, 51, 53).

[INSERT FIGURE 4 HERE]

Figure 4: Raimu in the sequence with the Police Commissioner from *Ces Messieurs de la Santé* (courtesy of René Chateau Vidéo).

The problem with Raimu's performance is that it shifts the focus of the film away from social satire, and thereby the critique of the finance world, to a star turn by a *monstre sacré*. We wait expectantly for the next outburst, the next melodramatic shift of tone, the drawing up of the body, and the extraordinary use of eyes and eyebrows (see Figure 4). We hang on to every word to detect the subtle inflections that the transcription and translation above cannot possibly render. Colin Crisp suggests that the film constructs a guilty delight for the spectator in Tafard's rise (Crisp 2002, 74–75). Comments by *Pour Vous*'s readers support this view. One writes that Raimu 'has completely changed the sense of the film; it was a satire, and he turns it into farce (*bouffonnerie*). Tafard the banker makes us laugh, makes us laugh too much [...]. He remains funny and sympathetic when he ought to disgust us' (H. 1934, 16). It is less the issue of a betrayal of the satirical intention that interests me here, however; it is much more the way in which words are used as an instrument of obfuscation. I shall return to this below, after considering similar processes in *La Banque Nemo* with a very different star, the less earthy and more suave Victor Boucher.

By comparison with Raimu, Boucher is now largely forgotten, but he too was a popular stage actor, and had, like Raimu, acted in a number of films prior to *La Banque Nemo*, including Robert Siodmak's *Le Sexe faible/Weaker Sex* (1933). He went on to star in ten films until his death in 1942, with, amongst others, directors such as Sacha Guitry (*Faisons un rêve/Let's Have a Dream*, 1936; *Ils étaient neuf célibataires/Nine Bachelors*, 1939) and André Berthomieu (*L'Amant de Madame Vidal/[Madame Vidal's Lover]*, 1936; *Le Train pour Venise/The Train for Venice*, 1939).

One of the better scenes, and one which illustrates Boucher's qualities as an actor, is when he advises the director that he should commit suicide, repeatedly and apparently regretfully offering him a revolver to do just that (see Figure 5). Nemo retorts that he will turn Lebrèche in, but Lebrèche reminds him that he has been acting on the director's authority, and that it is therefore the director who is liable. Boucher remains, as he does throughout, the perfect gentleman in his behaviour and his speech, protesting how sorry he is that he has brought dishonour onto the bank and its director. He hands the revolver to the director (see Figure 5), and his words tumble out in an obsequious patter, with the comical stumblings for which he was well known:

Lebrèche: This is for you, Director.

Nemo: Me?! Are you going to kill me now?

Lebrèche: Oh no, Director, but it might be you who thinks of it once you know everything. Because you know nothing yet, Director. While you were away, I was offered a marvellous opportunity. I accepted it, and I'm afraid it might well mean that you end up in prison.

Nemo: What opportunity?

Lebrèche: The draining of the Lake of Djellalabad.

Nemo: You accepted that?

Lebrèche: Aaah, it looked like such a golden opportunity, Director, but unfortunately the newspapers don't seem to share my confidence. Have a look.

Nemo: The newspapers? (quoting) 'A huge swindle'.

Lebrèche: Yes, that's it, that's it, Director.

Nemo: 'The banker Nemo will be arrested'.

Lebrèche: Yes, as I said, yes.

Nemo: 'Draining a lake of 60,000 square kilometres to extract hypothetical treasures'.

(whispering) Hypothetical?

Lebrèche: Yes, mmm, yes.

Nemo: ‘This is the most recent brainwave of the banker Nemo, that unscrupulous adventurer’.

(stands abruptly) Right!

Lebrèche: Where are you going, Director?

Nemo: To see the Grand Prosecutor!

Lebrèche: You’re turning yourself in?

Nemo: No, I’m going to lodge a complaint against you.

Lebrèche: (incredulous) Against me? Director, look, I know I’ve made mistakes, but I’m nothing but your authorised representative, not your associate. I signed in your name, that’s all. The Nemo Bank is you, I don’t exist. Listen, the Commissioner came, and it’s you he wanted to see. Mind you, I plucked up all my courage and gave him my name, my title. He just didn’t want to know. He said he’d come back when you were here. I can assure you Director (handing him the revolver), there’s only one solution, and this is it.

Nemo: Stop annoying me with your revolver!

Lebrèche: And when I think that it’s me who did this to you, Director (sobbing), me, your most devoted employee....

[INSERT FIGURE 4 HERE]

Figure 5: Lebrèche offers Nemo a revolver so that he can commit suicide in *La Banque Nemo* (courtesy of René Chateau Vidéo).

It is interesting to compare contemporary views for the two actors, in this case comments by a critic and a reader of *Pour Vous*. Lucien Wahl, one of the main critics working for the magazine, writes that Boucher’s ‘naturalness is real naturalness (we know how in films as on stage naturalness are visibly fabricated; [he] manages to

produce simple truth in his originality)' (Wahl 1934, 7). While a reader writes: 'What ease, what experience in his gestures, in his intonation, and what knowledge of himself he has, too visible a knowledge even!' (Chéray 1934, 4). Raimu is seen as, well, just Raimu, in other words a star; Boucher is seen as a consummate actor, well-honed actorly skills making him 'natural'. Raimu has depth, indeed hidden if melodramatic depths, unpolished; Boucher is seen as more contained, more surface-like, more polished. In both cases, however, what matters is words. As Wahl writes, 'words are the main element' of *La Banque Nemo* (Wahl 1934, 7). It is to the matter of words and what they might mean for us in this context that I now turn.

### **Words as currency**

One of the enduring debates of the 1930s was the film v filmed theatre debate, forcefully represented and articulated by René Clair and Marcel Pagnol respectively. As Susan Hayward writes, 'Clair and Pagnol's polemical debate is the one most often cited today as *the* debate of the 1930s' (Hayward 2005, 141). The phenomenon of 'canned theatre' (Temple and Witt 2004, 95) has been amply discussed elsewhere (Abel 1988; O'Brien 2005). I would like to extend this research with archival work, citing comments made by readers in their letters on *La Banque Nemo* (comments by readers on *Ces messieurs de la Santé* focus almost entirely on the way the film is dominated by Raimu, as mentioned above). Readers were very aware of the filmed theatre debate, as the following extracts from some of their letters in the 'La Parole est aux spectateurs' ('From our readers') section demonstrate:

*Banque Nemo?* Filmed theatre (Illisible 1934, 7).

It's filmed theatre of course [...] it's no more than cackle (*caquetage*) (Theresa 1934, 7).

The actors talk rather too much (Mad Dulau 1934, 7).

A really good play, very sharp... but it's not good cinema [...] an excellent play for the blind (Chéray 1934, 4).

In what follows I would like to move beyond the historical debate to consider the link that can be made between money and words, given that these films are about both, and to triangulate both with the focus on the strong male lead. To that end, I will refer to work by the cultural historian Michael Tratner whose *Deficits and Desires: Economics and Sexuality in Twentieth-Century Literature* correlates economic and sexual theory so as to explore the link between, amongst other issues, literary style and prevailing attitudes in changing economic landscapes.

Using Foucault amongst others, Tratner shows how there are parallels in the 1920s and beyond between the circulation of money and the circulation of desire:

Economic and sexual discourses in the mid-twentieth century moved far from the nineteenth-century logic of saving, replacing it with the logic of circulation. Instead of slowly building up the self by labouring, saving, and restraining impulses, people were encouraged in the new credit economy to indulge economic desires by temporarily borrowing, as a way of keeping money circulating. Similarly, they were encouraged to indulge sexual desires, even without actual relationships, by borrowing fantasies, images, and stories from the already-produced social stockpile, to keep libido circulating. (Tratner 2001, 3)

Tratner extends this parallel to show how it affects identity, which can never be fixed, but is always circulating, just like money: 'Property itself becomes a consumable; and one's own properties, one's character traits, become consumables as well. One is always more than one is, always acquiring new properties and throwing away old ones, never settling on a certain set of properties as truly one's own' (Tratner 2001, 35). Tratner's concern is to link this to stream-of-consciousness novels such as

*Ulysses* or the work of Virginia Woolf. I would like to link this point to the garrulousness of the conmen in these films, who, like their victims, constantly shift in language and status thanks to the money that they circulate.

The conman succeeds thanks to a double seduction: through his use of language, as we have seen, and by the employment of a woman who seduces other powerful men through her body. Caught between the two are the hapless fall guys who are conned because they do not understand either the opportunities or the operations of modern capitalism. The principles of capitalism that the fall guys do not understand are circulation and distance: they do not understand how money circulates, and its objects of investment are so remote from the context of their daily life – whether they are weapons in a corset shop in *Ces messieurs de la Santé*, or minerals in foreign lands in both films – that they come to trust the fast talker, who fuels their greed for money.

The fact that the schemes set up by the conmen rely on distant materials is instructive. The fall guy in *La Banque Nemo*, Larnoy, is imprisoned for stealing 10,000 francs, which he uses to buy a coat for himself, after initially wanting to buy a coat for his mistress. We *see* the object of desire, the fur coat; indeed the object is constructed as an object of desire through careful shot-reverse-shot editing. But the object of desire for the other characters is generally not seen, because it is either more money or materials in foreign lands. Unlike the coat, these distant objects are deferred in space and time, like desire itself. The unreality of the objects of desire leads to a gap, which is filled only by the words of the conman.

This intra-diegetic process is paralleled by the meta-diegetic process for the spectators of the film. It is precisely the words of the conman that we and the characters in the films come to desire. The whole point is to revel in their bravura

verbal performance, which is one of the reasons why readers' letters concerning *Ces messieurs de la Santé* focus so heavily on Raimu's performance, rather than on the issue of filmed theatre. Raimu was a star, Boucher merely a well-known actor. Raimu's performance effectively transcends the theatrical framework because it becomes in itself theatrical, while Boucher merely renders the theatrical text effectively. In both cases, however, their power both as characters within the narrative, and as performers for spectators of the film, resides in their ability to persuade and convince, to engender trust in those they are swindling, through their words. Their words become like a drug; the characters and the spectators want more.

The conman's patter encourages cynicism in relation to political and financial processes. Tafard's assistant asks Tafard what he is supposed to be selling, to which Tafard responds: 'Tu vends du vent! ('You sell smoke and mirrors!', literally 'wind'). What is sold is quite literally nothing, and it is this nothing that circulates, like wind, through the words of the conman. As a consequence, morality, however one might conceive it, has no chance. In *La Banque Nemo* there is some heavy-handed moralising at the end of the film by Larnoy, who has been constructed as an unlikeable character from the very beginning. He is something of a misanthrope, always grumpy, and increasingly devious in his actions. Right at the end of the film, when it is clear that Larnoy has failed to incriminate Lebrèche, because Lebrèche's incrimination would lead to the fall of the government, Larnoy gives us the moral in a brief sequence. He is shot alone, with a slight low angle, and there is no décor (see Figure 6). This has an oddly contradictory effect. On the one hand, it is almost as if the moral is being emphasised, with Larnoy as mouthpiece. On the other hand, precisely because of the *mise en scène*, it is as if the moral is being bracketed as somehow separate from the main concerns of the film: 'In today's world if you steal a

handkerchief, you'll go to jail straightaway. It's only when you steal 100 million or more that you can take what belongs to someone else with impunity. No-one bothers you then, and people give you condescending respect'. Given the way that Larnoy is constructed throughout the film as unlikeable, we are tempted to say in response to this: so what? If the moral of the film is not Larnoy's self-evident point about power relations, then what is it?

[INSERT FIGURE 6 HERE]

Figure 6: Larnoy and the 'moral' of *La Banque Nemo* (courtesy of René Chateau Vidéo).

Anti-parliamentarian cynicism is only part of the answer, I would suggest. There is clearly pleasure to be had in the spectacular performances of the leads, as I have mentioned above. It is the nature of that pleasure that I would like to focus on at this point. In *A Thousand Words: Portraiture, Style, and Queer Modernism*, Jaime Hovey, like Tratner, addresses the shift from the nineteenth century to the modernism of the twentieth. In Chapter 2, 'Talking Pictures', her concern is to explore the phenomenon of characters who talk for the pleasure of talking, and in so doing constitute themselves as subjects within a spectacular space in the most literal sense: they make spectacles of themselves and engender pleasure for themselves, for the other characters who watch and listen to them, and for the reader or spectator. As the title of the book suggests, Hovey's concern is a version of camp, reclaimed for sexual-political ends: 'Staging one's self hearing one's self chatter can [...] be seen as

a strategy that helps speakers refuse inscription in sexual difference; adopt a non-normative, deviant position in relation to the normative and castrating demands of the look; and invest objects with subject-constituting powers' (Hovey 2006, 49). While both Raimu and Boucher arguably engage with camp as part of their performances in these films, this is not the major focus of the films or the plays that led to the films, unlike Hovey's choice of texts (for example, Wilde's *The Picture of Dorian Grey* for painting, and Alan Crosland's 1927 film *The Jazz Singer* for song). As part of her argument, however, Hovey talks about the pleasure of logorrhoea for the talker, and the pleasure that listeners both intra-diegetic and meta-diegetic might take in the pleasure of the talker. It is this aspect of her work that I want to focus on rather than the reclamation of a non-normative space:

Logorrhoeic modernism watches itself talking, takes great pleasure in its own performance, and suggests the perversity of this pleasure by insisting that it circulate as the spectacle of its own pleasure, already framed for an audience constructed as an in-crowd of participants. The pleasure of the talker taking pleasure in herself, and the audience taking pleasure in this pleasure, is then circulated as the foremost pleasure of art. (Hovey 2006, 51–52)

The key idea here is circulation. The torrent of words that constitute the conman's stock in trade functions as a machine to create pleasure. It is a pleasure formed not by what the words mean, but by the fact of their existence, their 'torrent-ness' as it were; in a word their performativity. The words perform pleasure: the pleasure of the conman speaking, and the pleasure of his listeners listening.

I draw two conclusions from this and what I have already said, which could be badged under a single word: vacuity. The first conclusion returns us to the idea of circulation, and Tratner's observations about logorrhoea and identity. Individuals who

remain themselves fail, because modernity is about circulation and the evacuation of fixed positions.<sup>10</sup> In that sense these films articulate not just cynicism and disengagement at the socio-political level, but a deeper zeitgeist at a philosophical level.

The second conclusion returns me to Hovey's observations about verbal performance. It has less to do with identity perhaps than it has to do with the desire for emptiness and the emptiness of desire. The profits the conman promises in these films are an illusion given a semblance of reality by his words. His words constantly circulate around something that can only exist by its absence. Desire for the profits accumulated from non-existent money is always deferred and unrealisable. What remains is nothing but vacuous words, 'wind' as Tafard says. What his listeners want, what we want, is wind. It has all been a performance, a pleasurable performance undoubtedly, but one from which meaning is evacuated, or rather whose meaning lies only in its performance, and whose horizon, like desire's horizon, is always further, always out of reach. The conman constructs an erotic and exotic dream whose foundation is his power in assembling desires through his use of words; a logorrheic masquerade.<sup>11</sup>

### **Notes on contributor**

---

<sup>10</sup> Although it is not material to my argument in this article, it may well be that the concept of logorrhoea within verbal performance and its relation to the modern could be extended more broadly to the advent of 'filmed theatre' in the French cinema in the 1930s.

<sup>11</sup> I would like to thank Ginette Vincendeau for alerting me to the work of Diane Gabrysiak on these and other films. Gabrysiak's PhD thesis is a remarkable analysis of the use of money as a thematic in film across and range of national cinemas (Gabrysiak, 2006).

Phil Powrie is Professor of Cinema Studies at the University of Surrey. He has published a number of books mainly on French cinema: *French Cinema in the 1980s: Nostalgia and the Crisis of Masculinity* (1997), *Contemporary French Cinema: Continuity and Difference* (ed., 1999), *Jean-Jacques Beineix* (2001), *French Cinema: An Introduction* (2002), *The Trouble with Men: Masculinities in European and Hollywood Cinema* (ed., 2004), *The Cinema of France* (ed., 2006), *Changing Tunes: The Use of Pre-existing Music in Film* (ed., 2006), *The Films of Luc Besson: Master of Spectacle* (ed., 2006), *Carmen on Film: A Cultural History* (2007), *Composing for the Screen in Germany and the USSR: Cultural Politics and Propaganda* (ed., 2008), *Pierre Batcheff and Stardom in 1920s French Cinema* (2009), *French Cinema* (ed., 4 vols, 2014). He leads the Association for Studies in French Cinema and is the chief general editor of its journal, *Studies in French Cinema*. He is Chair of the British Association of Film Television and Screen Studies.

### **Filmography**

*Amant de Madame Vidal, L'*, 1936, André Berthomieu, France.

*Avec le sourire*, 1936, Maurice Tourneur, France.

*Banque Nemo, La*, 1934, Marguerite Viel, France.

*Banquière, La*, 1980, Francis Girod, France.

*Ces messieurs de la Santé*, 1934, Pierre Colombier, France.

*Charlemagne*, 1933, Pierre Colombier, France.

*École des cocottes, L'*, 1935, Pierre Colombier, France.

*Faisons un rêve*, 1936, Sacha Guitry, France.

*Fanny*, 1932, Marc Allégret, France.

*Ignace*, 1937, Pierre Colombier, France.

- Ils étaient neuf célibataires*, 1939, Sacha Guitry, France.
- Love Me Tonight*, 1932, Rouben Mamoulian, USA.
- Marius*, 1931, Alexander Korda, France.
- Occupe-toi d'Amélie*, 1932, Marguerite Veil and Richard Weisbach, France.
- Roi des resquilleurs, Le*, 1930, Pierre Colombier, France.
- Roi du cirage, Le*, 1931, Pierre Colombier, France.
- Roi, Le*, 1936, Pierre Colombier, France.
- Sexe faible, Le*, 1933, Robert Siodmak, France.
- Stavisky*, 1974, Alain Resnais, France/Italy.
- Théodore et Cie*, 1933, Pierre Colombier, France.
- Tout pour l'amour*, 1933, Henri-Georges Clouzot, France.
- Train pour Venise, Le*, 1939, André Berthomieu, France.

### **Works cited**

- Abel, Richard. 1988. *French Film Theory and Criticism 1907–1939*, 2 vols.  
Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Almeras, Lucette. 1934. *Ce que je sais...les huit derniers jours de Stavisky par un témoin*. Paris: Raoul Saillard.
- Andrew, Dudley and Steven Ungar. 2008. *Popular Front Paris and the Poetics of Culture*. Boston, MS: Harvard University Press.
- Anon. 1934a. "La Banque Nemo devant la censure." *Pour Vous* 285: 6.
- Anon. 1934b. "La Banque Nemo." *Cinéma* 15: 18.

- Armant, Paul and Léopold Marchand. 1931. *Ces messieurs de la Santé: pièce en trois actes et six tableaux*. Paris: *La Petite Illustration* 575/Théâtre 280 (25 July).
- Aymard, Camille. 1935. *La véritable affaire Stavisky: lettres à mes jurés*. Paris: Les propos de Spartacus.
- Barancy, A.-P. 1934. "La Banque Nemo devant la censure." *Pour Vous* 285: 6.
- Beylie, Claude. 1974. Alain Resnais, Jorge Semprún et *Stavisky*." [interview] *Écran* 27: 37–47.
- Binet, Frédéric. 2003. *Pierre Colombier: deux décennies dans le cinéma français (1920-1939)*. Lille: Atelier National de Reproduction des Thèses.
- Bon, Denis. 1999. *L’Affaire Stavisky*. Paris: De Vecchi.
- Bortchy, Eugène. 1934. *300 000 kilomètres avec Stavisky*. Paris: Plon.
- Brun, Paulette, 1982. *Raimu*. Nice: A.Lefevre.
- Busi, Frederick. 1975. "Alain Resnais's *Stavisky*: The Beginning of the End." *The Massachusetts Review* 16 (4): 799–806.
- Carné, Marcel. 1934. "La Banque Nemo fermera-t-elle ses guichets?" *Cinémagazine* 3: 8.
- Castans, Raymond. 1999. *L'impossible Monsieur Raimu*. Paris: Fallois.
- Charlier, Jean-Michel and Marcel Montarron. 1974. *Stavisky: les secrets du scandale*. Paris: Robert Laffont.
- Chéray, Jean. 1934. "La parole est aux spectateurs". *Pour Vous* 312: 4.
- Cohen, Georges. 1934. "Ces Messieurs de la Santé." *Cinémagazine* 1: 28.

- Crisp, Colin. 2002. *Genre, Myth and Convention in the French Cinema 1929–1939*.  
Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Delamarche, Léon. 1935. *Qui a laissé faire Stavisky?* Dijon: Jobard.
- Desanti, Dominique. 1968. *La Banquière des années folles*. Paris: Fayard.
- Détrez, Alfred. 1935. *Dossier d'histoire: L'Affaire Stavisky*. Paris: Paillard.
- Djemaa, Pascal. 2011. *Raimu: l'imortelle voix du cinéma français*. Gémenos: Autres temps.
- Doane, Mary Ann. 1982. "Film and the Masquerade: Theorising the Female Spectator." *Screen* 23 (3–4): 74–88.
- Doane, Mary Ann. 1988–1989. "Masquerade Reconsidered: Further Thoughts on the Female Spectator." *Discourse* 11 (1): 42–54.
- Dulau, Mad. 1934. "La Banque Nemo." *Pour Vous* 311: 7.
- Fitère, Jean-Marie. 2000. *Stavisky: scandale dans la République*. Paris: Acropole.
- Gabrysiak, Diane. 2006. "The Representation of Money in Film: Gold, Paper, metal and Electronic." PhD Thesis, University of Warwick.
- Gauteur, Claude. 2007. *À propos de Louis Verneuil (1893–1952)*. Biarritz: Séguier.
- Gauthier, Laurent. 1933. *Marthe Hanau et le secret des dieux: essai sur le rôle de la finance internationale dans la crise économique*. Joinville-le-Pont: François.
- Greene, Naomi. 1999. *Landscapes of Loss: The National Past in Postwar French Cinema*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.
- H., G. 1934. "La parole est aux spectateurs". *Pour Vous* 317: 16.

- Hayward, Susan. 2005. *French National Cinema*. Second edition. London/New York: Routledge.
- Hovey, Jaime. 2006. *A Thousand Words: Portraiture, Style, and Queer Modernism*. Columbus: Ohio State University Press.
- Illisible. 1934. "La Banque Nemo." *Pour Vous* 311: 7.
- Jankowski, Paul F. 2000. *Cette vilaine affaire Stavisky*. Paris: Arthème Fayard.
- Jankowski, Paul F. 2002. *Stavisky: A Confidence Man in the Republic of Virtue*. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press.
- Jeancolas, Jean-Pierre. 1983. *15 ans d'années trente: le cinéma des Français 1929–1944*. Paris: Stock.
- Jelot-Blanc, Jean-Jacques. 2010. *Pagnol et Raimu: l'histoire vraie*. Monaco/Paris: Alphée-J.-P. Bertrand.
- Justicier, Jean-Pierre. 1934. *L'emploi du milliard de Stavisky ou les voleurs volés*. Paris: Vérité.
- Lacotte, Daniel. 1988. *Raimu*. Paris: Ramsay.
- Leduc, Édouard. 2011. *Une affaire d'état: le dossier Stavisky*. Paris: Publibook.
- Lenglois, Paul. 1934. *Vie et mort de Stavisky*. Paris: Denoël et Steele.
- Lorenz, Paul. 1974. *Les trois vies de Stavisky*. Paris: Presses de la cité.
- M., R. 1934. "Ces Messieurs de la Santé." *The Spectator* 5540: 286.
- Menais, Georges-Paul. 1934. *L'Épargne et les problèmes de l'heure: L'Affaire Stavisky, la protection de l'épargne, la discipline de l'or*. Paris: Gruby.

- Miller, Henry. 1941. "Raimu." In *Wisdom of the Heart*, 47–62. New York: New Directions. Originally published in *T'ien Hsia Monthly* [Shanghai], August 1939, 4: 22–34.
- Montagne, Albert. 2007. *Histoire juridique des interdits cinématographiques en France (1909–2001)*. Paris: L'Harmattan.
- Nat, Philippe. 1934. "Ces Messieurs de la Santé." *Cinémonde* 284: 286.
- Nohain-Raimu, Isabelle. 2014. *Raimu, un grand enfant de génie*. Paris: Le Cherche midi.
- O'Brien, Charles. *Cinema's Conversion to Sound: Technology and Film Style in France and the U.S.* 2005. Bloomington: Indiana University Press,
- Passmore, Kevin. 2005. "The Construction of Crisis in Interwar France." In *France in the Era of Fascism: Essays on the French Authoritarian Right*, edited by Brian Jenkins, 151–199. New York and Oxford, Berghahn.
- Périnet, Henri. 1934. "La parole est aux spectateurs". *Pour Vous* 318: 4.
- Périsset, Maurice. 1972. *Raimu*. Paris: Denoël.
- Pigaglio, René. 1934. *La vérité sur les derniers jours de Stavisky*. Paris: Presses Alpha.
- Pithon, Rémy. 1974. "En attendant Resnais." *Écran* 278: 9–11.
- Pithon, Rémy. 1975. "Le scandale Stavisky et la censure du cinema: l'affaire de *La Banque Némó* (1934)." *Études de lettres* 8 (2): 29–52.
- Pithon, Rémy. 1977. "La censure des films en France et la crise politique de 1934." *Revue Historique* 258 (1): 105–130.
- Régent, Roger. 1951. *Raimu*. Paris: Chavane.

- Rochefer, Henri. 1934. *Stavisky n'est pas mort*. Paris: Éditions du secret.
- Sigaux, G. 1934. "La parole est aux spectateurs". *Pour Vous* 317: 16.
- Temple, Michael and Michael Witt, eds. 2004. *The French Cinema Book*. London: British Film Institute.
- Theresa. 1934. "La Banque Nemo." *Pour Vous* 311: 7.
- Tratner, Michael. 2001. *Deficits and Desires: Economics and Sexuality in Twentieth-Century Literature*. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press.
- Verneuil, Louis. 1932. *La Banque Nemo: pièce en trois actes et six tableaux*. Paris: *La Petite Illustration* 579/Théâtre 300 (4 June).
- Wahl, Lucien. 1934. "La Banque Nemo." *Pour Vous* 297: 7.
- Wilson, Emma. 2009. *Alain Resnais*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.