


---



# Psychoanalysis, Cinema, History: Personal and National Loss in René Clément's *Forbidden Games*

Esther Rashkin

**Abstract:** What facilitates the psychic process of grieving a traumatic loss, and what happens when that process is blocked? *Forbidden Games* is, on one level, an intimate film about childhood trauma. When viewed from a psychoanalytic perspective informed by concepts such as introjection and pathological mourning, however, it emerges as a complex allegory that reflects, through its narrative and filmic elements, on the sociocultural and historical dynamics of France's troubled response to the loss of its identity as a democracy during World War II. The film also reflects on the even more shameful history of the rise of French anti-Semitism under the Vichy regime and France's history of silencing or repressing the drama of its willing collaboration with the Nazis' Final Solution. Private trauma thus screens public, political trauma as Clément's film becomes both a medium for sociocultural commentary and a memorial to loss that could not be buried or mourned.

**Keywords:** allegory, anti-Semitism, blocked mourning, Collaboration, depersonalization, introjection, memorialization, self-cure, trauma, Vichy

Since its premiere in 1952, René Clément's *Forbidden Games* (*Jeux interdits*) has been praised for its honesty, simplicity, and unwavering evocation of the emotional pain suffered by children exposed to the violence of war (Arlaud 1952; Ebert 2005; Egly 1958; Kast 1952). The film has received numerous awards including an Honorary Academy Award for Best Foreign Language Film and the Golden Lion for Best Picture at the Venice Film Festival, where the jury lauded it for "having known how to raise up, with a unique lyrical purity and an exceptional expressiveness, the innocence of childhood over the tragedy and desolation of war."<sup>1</sup> These well-deserved accolades notwithstanding, this article argues that *Forbidden Games* is neither as simple nor as straightforward a meditation on childhood war trauma as it might first appear. On the contrary,

the film is a complex, multidimensional allegory that also speaks, albeit in allusive, ciphered form, about the psychoanalytic process of mourning, the national trauma of France's willing collaboration with Nazi Germany, and the pernicious flourishing of French anti-Semitism during the Vichy regime. The film's rather quaint opening credit sequence visually announces from the outset that the film must be read allegorically.

A leather-bound volume in the form of a child's storybook, whose cover is embossed with the image of a young boy and little girl (who clearly resemble the film's child protagonists), fills the screen. A woman's hand moves into the frame, opens the book cover, and slowly turns the pages, some of which are illustrated with pastoral scenes or flower designs and on which are written the names of the producer, screenwriters, actors, cinematographer, and other crew members (Figure 1). As the last page bearing the director's name fills the screen, there is a quick fade-out/fade-in from the storybook to a deep focus establishing shot of a line of cars crossing a bridge in the French countryside. Overlaying the shot, as if embossed on the image like the boy and girl on the leather cover, are the words "Juin 1940" (June 1940). Via these signifiers of writing, reading, and literariness, the credit sequence thus calls attention—as allegory always does—to the fact that the viewer must look between, beneath, and beyond the lines of the film's apparent narrative to expose the multiple layers of signification inscribed within it. This is similar to how one must read beyond the literal plot lines of children's stories and fairy tales to identify their veiled meanings and messages.



Figure 1. A woman's hand turns the pages of the storybook.

My approach to interpreting the film allegorically consists of three parts. I begin by examining the film's overt theme of parental loss to show how artificial rituals of burial and memorialization are constructed in response to an inability to engage in the psychic process of mourning. Next I explore how the film simultaneously stages and comments on France's postwar struggle to come to terms with its collaboration with the Third Reich and the loss of its identity as a democratic Republic. I conclude by delineating how the film cryptically embeds within it the shameful saga of Vichy's active participation in the deportation and extermination of France's Jews. Psychoanalysis thus serves as both a subject of my inquiry and also as a lens through which the film's obscured narratives about collective and personal trauma can be brought into focus, and through which the links between intrapsychic experiences and their sociohistorical and political contexts can be traced and elaborated.

### **Psychic Trauma and the Empty Mouth**

The film spans four days—from 17 June to 20 June 1940—when over two million Parisians fled the Nazi invasion of France and occupation of Paris, heading southward in cars, horse drawn carts, and on foot in what became known as “the exodus.” When the car of five-year-old Paulette's parents stalls on the road during an air raid and Paulette's dog flees, Paulette runs after him. Her terrified mother and father catch up with her just as a Messerschmitt strafes the road, killing both parents and the dog. Physically unharmed, Paulette wanders the countryside cradling the dead pet in her arms. She is discovered by eleven-year-old Michel and taken in by his farm family, the Dollés. Together, the children begin a secret game of interring small animals and insects in a corner of the old mill, which they transform into a burial ground complete with crucifixes and cardboard tombstones. When Michel's father learns that the two children have been stealing crosses from the village cemetery in which he has just buried his son Georges (killed by a horse fleeing the same strafing that killed Paulette's parents), he flies into a rage, astonished by what the children have done. At the end of the film, when the police arrive to take Paulette to an orphanage and Michel's parents ignore his pleas that she be allowed to stay with them, Michel returns alone to the mill and destroys the cemetery he and Paulette built. The film's last sequence shows Paulette in close-up, in an apparently dissociative, catatonic state, surrounded by refugees in a Red Cross center. When she hears a woman call out to someone named Michel, she thinks it is her playmate and walks toward the voice. As she cries out plaintively for Michel and then for her mother, the camera pulls back in a final shot to show her gradually disappear amid the mass of people in the hall.

To understand what brings Paulette to this depersonalized, psychotic state of psychic disarray, it is helpful to review some of Nicolas Abraham and Maria

---

Torok's pivotal writings on normal and pathological mourning. Influenced by Ferenczi's work on introjection and seeking to clarify the differences between normal and pathological mourning they felt Freud had obscured in "Mourning and Melancholia" (1917) and the "Ego and the Id" (1923), Abraham and Torok (1972) drew essential distinctions between introjection and incorporation. Namely, they reconceived introjection as the process of normal psychic development in which the ego assimilates libidinally charged objects and object relationships—including relationships

***The subject's ability to symbolize or convert loss into language that can be shared in a communal context is crucial for the introjection of loss and the process of normal mourning.***

marked by traumas of loss—and reorganizes itself topographically as it grows to include these objects and traumatic experiences. The subject's ability to symbolize or convert loss into language that can be shared in a communal context is crucial for the introjection of loss and the process of normal mourning. Abraham and Torok (1972) linked this capacity for verbalization to the infant's earliest relationship with the mother, which they called the "dual unity." Faced with the maternal object's alternating presence and absence, the infant strives for separation and individuation, responding to the absence of the mother (initially experienced as the breast) first by crying and sobbing, then by words spoken to the mother, and ultimately by words that replace the (absent) mother.

relationships marked by traumas of loss—and reorganizes itself topographically as it grows to include these objects and traumatic experiences. The subject's ability to symbolize or convert loss into language that can be shared in a communal context is crucial for the introjection of loss and the process of normal mourning. Abraham and Torok (1972) linked this capacity for verbalization to the infant's earliest relationship with the mother, which they called the "dual unity." Faced with the maternal object's alternating presence and absence, the infant strives for separation and individuation, responding to the absence of the mother (initially experienced as the breast) first by crying and sobbing, then by words spoken to the mother, and ultimately by words that replace the (absent) mother.

*The absence of objects and the empty mouth are transformed into words; at last, even the experiences related to words are converted into other words. So the wants of the original oral vacancy are remedied by being turned into verbal relationships with the speaking community at large. Introjecting a desire, a grief, a situation means channeling them through language into a communion of empty mouths. . . . Since language acts and makes up for absence by representing, by giving figurative shape to presence, it can only be comprehended or shared in a "community of empty mouths." (Abraham and Torok 1972: 128; translation slightly modified)<sup>2</sup>*

The idea that the introjection of a loss is marked by its conversion into language shared in a communal setting underlies my understanding of Paulette's psychic deterioration, particularly if this conversion is considered alongside Torok's contention that introjection "works entirely in the open by dint of its privileged instrument, naming" (Torok 1968: 114). The work of introjection has a public dimension. It involves the psychic process that allows a loss to be talked about, to receive a name, and thereby come to exist as lost *outside* the subject. Naming, and its various forms of memorialization and commemoration, is thus the privileged means of sharing a drama of loss with the community. It implies engagement in the constructive act of personalization that

---

opens the way to psychological growth as the individual re-forms and refashions her or himself in terms of the language of loss. If Paulette is left in a radically depersonalized state at the film's end, it must somehow be related to her failure to name or express her loss in language, which obstructs the process of introjection and suspends normal mourning.

Indeed, from the film's beginning, Paulette is unable to speak about the events on the road or tell anyone her full name. When she first meets Michel she reveals her first name and that her mother and father are dead, but she says nothing about how they died. When Monsieur Dollé brings her into the house and repeatedly encourages her to "tell us all about what happened," she remains silent, even as family members pepper her with questions about the war, the bombing, where she is from, and her last name. Something apparently interferes with her ability to put her drama into words or express feelings related to her loss. Although one could ascribe her response to shock and the limited verbal and cognitive capacities of a five-year-old child, the narrative invites a more nuanced, psychoanalytically complex reading of Paulette's reaction. Before going to bed the night of her arrival, she hears Michel's older brother, Raymond, casually explain that there were not enough coffins for the seventeen people killed on the road that day, leaving the villagers to "dig a hole and hop! in they go, like dogs." That night, Paulette cries out for Michel, telling him that she wants to return to her "mama and papa on the bridge." When Michel gently explains that they are not on the bridge anymore but in a hole, she responds, first with surprise and then delight, by repeating Raymond's explanation—"In a hole? and hop! in they go, like dogs?"—and then asking if it is "because of the rain, in a hole? So they won't get wet?" Paulette's desire to see her parents, her concern that they be protected from the rain, and her thought that they might be buried "like dogs" reveal that her mother and father are, in some sense, still alive for her and not yet dead or buried in a "hole like dogs," because of course they are not dogs.

Her attempt to bury her dead dog in a hole the next morning reinforces this idea. Obligated to abandon her parents where they were killed, Paulette was never able to say goodbye or physically inter them. Raymond's metaphorical equation of dogs and people provides her with an unconscious means of invoking the brutality of this separation and its psychic consequences. The act of burying her dog becomes a literalization of Raymond's figure of speech. It is a concrete way of simultaneously expressing her inability to bury psychically her mother and father and her desire to do so. The consequences of this failure to inter her parents are revealed moments later when Michel joins Paulette and proposes that they build a cemetery for her dog. Explaining that a cemetery is where you put the dead so "they can all be together and won't get bored alone," Michel finds a dead mole to keep her dog company.<sup>3</sup> Paulette suddenly reveals a startling enthusiasm for interring animals: "We'll need

---

more,” she says passionately, “and some cats.” Caught up in her excitement, Michel responds, “and hedgehogs, and lizards.” Urgently, Paulette insists, “and horses and cows.” Smiling, Michel says, “and rattlesnakes.” Increasingly agitated, Paulette begs, “and lions,” so that when Michel adds, “and tigers,” she pleads, trembling, “and people!” Creating a cemetery of dead animals becomes for Paulette an expression of her need to bury her parents and “see them as dead” so that she can detach herself from them and begin to introject and mourn their loss. At the same time, fashioning a miniature burial ground tacitly expresses her desire to join with others (Michel and presumably the “bereaved survivors” of the dead animals) in a communion of loss and collective display of grief that would facilitate recognition of her identity as “one who mourns” (Figure 2).

Paulette’s creation of a cemetery for animals thus functions as a symptom of the blockage to mourning erected by the physical inability to bury her parents, and as a tacit expression of her psychic need to transcend that blockage. The film’s psychoanalytic subtlety comes in part from its juxtaposition of Paulette’s powerlessness to perform this burial, which would identify her as an orphaned mourner, and the ease with which the Dollés bury and mourn Georges, a civilian casualty of war like Paulette’s two parents. While Paulette does not know how to pray for her parents, never cries over their death, and never physically buries them, Michel recites prayers for Georges, the Dollés weep when he expires, and the family members perform all the appropriate rites of interment and memorialization. They solemnly walk to church behind

*Figure 2. The cemetery Michel and Paulette build in the old mill.*



the hearse Monsieur Dollé builds; they attend a mass; they follow a cross-carrying altar boy to the cemetery where the village priest presides over Georges's burial; and they return to the cemetery the following Sunday to plant flowers on his grave. Paulette's and the Dollés's experiences of ritual observance could not be more different, a fact underscored by the Dollé cousin who, looking at the tranquil countryside, notes that "you'd never think there was a war going on here," adding reassuringly that at least Georges "will have a Christian burial."

If the ceremonies marking Georges's death highlight the absence of similar rituals for Paulette's parents, they nonetheless serve as a model for mourning and the introjective process that spurs Paulette's efforts to imitate these communal practices of bereavement. The theft of fourteen crosses from the tombs in the village cemetery, the eagerness to plant them on the graves of the animals and insects she and Michel have collected and buried, and the uncomprehending and compulsive recital of prayers taught her by Michel, allow Paulette to create a simulacrum of the mourning ceremony she has witnessed that testifies to her inability to actually mourn her loss and initiate the process of intrapsychic reconstruction that would accommodate it. At the same time, making name cards to place as tombstones at the foot of each animal and insect grave symbolically speaks of her need literally to name the dead—to convert her loss into language and fill her empty mouth with words about loss.

Paulette's games of burial and grieving can thus be understood as attempts at self-cure or auto-analysis through which she tries to heal herself by mimicking recognized rites of mourning. Inadequate to effect a cure, these games serve instead as a defensive mechanism for stabilizing herself emotionally and retaining a partial ego-core in the face of ego-threatening trauma. Michel functions as the catalyst for this stabilization. Although he has no understanding of the psychic configuration of Paulette's distress and performs no analysis, he is able to empathize with her suffering because of his own loss, and he responds to her unstated need to grieve through his love and support. By virtue of his ability to identify with her loss, he establishes a therapeutic (although nonanalytic) alliance with Paulette that provides her with a sense of constancy and permanence and thereby helps her preserve intact what remains of her identity as "Paulette."

Had their games continued, Paulette may have begun to make verbal connections between the creatures buried in the cemetery and her unburied parents, eventually giving voice to the therapeutic inadequacy of her ludic imitations of mourning and to her desire to grieve for her mother and father. It is possible that Michel, drawing upon his own experience of loss and mourning and his empathic abilities, would have taken her to see the bridge where her parents died or the "hole" in which they were buried. She might have

---

planted a cross on either site, recited a prayer, or committed some other act of remembrance as a way to transition from simulated to authentic grieving, and from an unintegrated, empty compulsion to repeat a burial gesture to a filling up of the loss of her parents by mouthing words about loss. If thoughts of her mother and father were gradually put into language and shared with others, the lengthy process of memorialization would begin, her ability to state the family name would likely return, and she would at last be able to initiate the process of detaching herself from the parents who bore that name in order to gradually assume her new identity as an orphan.

Tragically, the adults in the narrative foreclose this outcome. Although the Dollés are quite tender and loving toward Paulette, they are preoccupied by the loss of their own son, are reluctant to let the war intrude on their lives any more than it has, and have no real understanding of the young girl's emotional needs. They demand that she be quiet when she cries out, stop her from making wooden crosses in the attic with Michel, and insist on reporting her to the police for fear they will be accused of "stealing her." The psychic damage wrought by interrupting her creation of simulacra of burial and of separating her from the unconditionally loving and empathic Michel becomes clear when the police arrive to take her to an orphanage. Asked her name, Paulette responds "No!" Asked if her parents were killed in the bombardments, she again says, "No!" When Madame Dollé coaxes her to speak and implores, "Your name is Paulette what? Paulette what?" She responds, "Dollé," adding sorrowfully, "I want the same name as Michel." Paulette's answer points to the intimate bond she has formed with her friend and to her desire to belong to a family with parents. Above all, however, it is symptomatic of her inability to put into words her identity as the "daughter of the dead" whose family name she has relegated to silence. If Paulette assumes the Dollé name as hers, it is because she has lost her own identity and now defines herself, as the name "Dollé" signifies, as someone "afflicted by sadness" that nonetheless escapes explicit verbalization.<sup>4</sup>

Michel does not suffer the same kind of affliction. Heartbroken as he is, he will likely be able to grieve the loss of his friend. After Paulette is taken away, he erects a monument to her memory by placing her necklace, which she had draped over one of the crosses in their cemetery, in the nest of the owl he told her would live one hundred years and who will now watch over it. And although he destroys their burial ground and despairingly throws the crosses they collected into the stream, he weeps as he watches the police drive Paulette away. Michel will certainly suffer great sadness and feel strong anger toward his parents in the days, months, and perhaps years to come. But he will also likely be able to express those feelings, eventually put into words his loss and its significance for him, and return to the memorial he has constructed for Paulette in order to grieve for her in the company of the vigilant, ageless

---



owl. Unfortunately, Paulette's fate is far less promising, as the film's final sequence illustrates.

As she sits, virtually catatonic, on a bench inside the Red Cross hall before being transported to an orphanage, she hears a woman in the crowd cry out, "Michel! Michel!" Paulette stirs suddenly, turns toward the voice, murmurs aloud, "Michel, Michel," and walks toward the woman who embraces a man, presumably named Michel, for whom she has been searching. With a look of dismay Paulette follows her, murmuring "Mama!, . . . Mama!" and disappears into the crowd as the camera pulls back in an ascending crane shot that makes her appear increasingly small and ultimately invisible. Paulette's disappearance, however, is not just visual but also psychological. Plunged into a radically dissociative state by the loss of her second family, unable to realize that "her" Michel cannot possibly be in the hall, and knowing neither who nor where she is, Paulette is propelled toward a name that represents her sole post-traumatic source of hope and support, and toward the "mother" whom she has never recognized as dead.

At the film's end Paulette has thus become a tragic *mutilée de guerre* or psychic "war-amputee" who is unable to integrate her identity as irrevocably severed from her parents. Heard in this context, the *jeux interdits* of the film's title refer not only to the children's forbidden games of simulated grieving, but also to the interdiction enacted upon Paulette's reconstruction of her *je* (rhymes with *jeux* and means "I") or identity by the failure to introject and psychically bury and mourn her loss. The film's title, in sum, speaks tacitly of the depersonalizing, annihilating fate of the subject when attempts to convert loss into language are prohibited and when the intrapsychic maneuvers necessary to refashion the self in terms of loss are interdicted or blocked.

From its opening sequence to its last, *Jeux interdits* is about the obstacles that prevent filling the empty mouth with language that speaks of loss so that psychic survival and growth can occur. Clément visually conveys the theme of emptiness and the challenge of verbalizing trauma in an image from the opening sequence in which a woman looks skyward toward the falling bombs with her mouth wide open as she screams in horror (Figure 3). (This sequence is framed in a low angle shot that mirrors the low angle shots of terrified, open-mouthed women fired upon by the tsar's troops in the Odessa steps sequence of Eisenstein's *Battleship Potemkin* [1925].) Clément repeats this image (from a different

Figure 3. A woman screams open-mouthed as bombs fall.



angle) moments later when Paulette's mother screams as she is hit by strafing bullets and collapses, open-mouthed, beside Paulette. The empty mouth as signifier of traumatic loss is thus visually inscribed and intertextually reinforced from the very beginning of *Forbidden Games* as the film tells the tale of how the mouth might have been filled with the language of bereavement, and how psychic catastrophe can result when it remains empty.<sup>5</sup>

### **Fatricidal Warfare and France's Unmourned Loss**

Paulette's saga of loss and depersonalization, which so movingly illustrates the kind of psychic damage children in war can experience, is only one dimension of Clément's highly allegorical work. The need to read another narrative in the film—one involving the internecine political struggles fought within France during the war—is initially suggested by the scene depicting Paulette's first evening with Michel's family. With Paulette nestled in his lap, Monsieur Dollé reads aloud from the daily newspaper *La Montagne*, which reports that the military situation has suddenly worsened on all fronts although "Our troops' resistance continues to be agile and effective" (*La résistance de nos troupes restent souple et efficace*). This positive description of French military resilience—which viewers in 1952 would recognize as a distortion because army defenses, by mid-June, had been largely shattered and vast numbers of troops were in retreat—is visually undermined by the headline that Dollé does not read but that we see in a slightly obscured over-the-shoulder shot: "The cabinet of Paul Reynaud resigns. Pétain forms a new one" (*Le Cabinet Paul Reynaud démissionne. Un Ministère Pétain lui succède*) (Figure 4). This oblique visual cue places the scene on the evening of 17 June 1940, since Marshal Philippe Pétain replaced Paul Reynaud as prime minister of the Third Republic on the night of June 16 (Jackson 2003: 137–38). At the end of the film, a close-up of Paulette's Red Cross identification tag, bearing the train number and destination of the convoy she is about to board, shows the date of June 20. The film thus takes place during the critical four days when the French government relocated to Bordeaux, Pétain called for the devastated French military to cease fighting, and Paris and most of northern France were occupied by German troops. It precedes France's official surrender to Germany two days later and the momentous events of July 10 when the National Assembly voted the official demise of the Third Republic, arrogated to Pétain full legislative as well as executive authority, empowered him to revise the constitution and replace the republican guarantees of "Liberty, Equality, and Fraternity" with the reactionary, nationalist themes of "Work, Family, and Fatherland," thus paving the way for Pétain's establishment of the pro-Nazi, anti-Communist, anti-Semitic Vichy regime known as *l'État français* or French State.

Alongside Paulette's traumatic loss and depersonalization, the casualties of war represented in the film can be said to include the defeated French

---



Figure 4. An oblique shot of the newspaper headline.

Armed Forces, the Third Republic, and France's identity as a liberal democracy. This is underscored when Francis, the elder son of the neighboring Gouard family whose name includes the word "France," returns home, still in uniform, and explains that he deserted the routed French army because "there were no more leaders, no more English, no more nothing." (The English military, along with tens of thousands of French troops, had by then retreated to Dunkirk from where they were evacuated to England as the Germans advanced.) His father retorts that "In 1918, we didn't run," an allusion to the Second Battle of the Marne in which French troops held fast and finally repelled the Germans, forcing them to surrender and to sign the Armistice on 11 November 1918. This reference to the victory of the French army and the Third Republic underscores their mutual demise on 22 June 1940, when France signed the Armistice with the Third Reich and agreed to be divided into occupied and free zones. These losses of army, Republic, and a democratic national identity demanded, as did Paulette's parents, to be buried and mourned. Like the obstacles placed in the way of Paulette's attempts to grieve, however, the history of post-Liberation France is a history of obstructions erected in the path of the nation's burial and memorialization of its traumatic losses.

***Alongside Paulette's traumatic loss and depersonalization, the casualties of war represented in the film can be said to include the defeated French Armed Forces, the Third Republic, and France's identity as a liberal democracy.***

The principal architect of these obstructions was the nation's new "father," the leader of Free France, Charles de Gaulle. The pattern for de Gaulle's interdiction of mourning was established on 25 August 1944, the day Paris was liberated. Georges Bidault, chair of the National Council of the Resistance, asked de Gaulle to officially proclaim the Republic. De Gaulle's answer set the tone for the national response to the defeat. "The Republic," he replied "has never ceased to exist. Free France, Fighting France, the French Committee of National Liberation have, by turns, embodied it. Vichy always was and still is null and void. I myself am the President of the government of the Republic. Why should I proclaim it?" (de Gaulle 1956: 650; translation slightly modified). According to de Gaulle, the Republic need not be resurrected because it had never died. There was no need to recognize and mourn its disappearance because it had always been present.

Seven months later, in remarks commemorating Flag Day of 1945, de Gaulle pursued this revision of French collective memory by representing the two World Wars as one continuous conflict: "France is gaining a clear idea of what needs to be done to repair the damage wrought by this war, begun some thirty years ago. . . . In the moral realm, seeds of dissension subsist and must be eliminated at all cost. We have paid dearly for those seeds, sown by countless internal conflicts and coupled, of course, with repeated invasions, for our domestic battles have never failed to invite quick foreign intervention."<sup>6</sup> Historian Henry Rousso has noted that this totalizing view of the two World Wars as an uninterrupted, "thirty-year war" enabled de Gaulle to blur the national memory of Vichy's collaboration with Nazi Germany while locating France's internal factionalism and Republican/Pétainist schisms within a history of foreign invasion traceable to the Kaiser (Rousso 1991: 17). It allowed de Gaulle to design a collective memory that diminished the intensity of France's fratricidal conflicts and established a continuity with the victorious Third Republic of World War I, thereby obscuring the loss of that Republic and of France's post-revolutionary democratic tradition. Obfuscated by this narrative reorganization, France's internecine struggles pitting resisters against collaborators and communists against fascists were left unburied and unmourned, an idea suggested in the film by its most startling and controversial sequence in the village cemetery.

When Monsieur Dollé discovers that the cross from his son Georges's freshly dug grave is missing, he concludes that the Gouard family must have stolen it, because Michel had earlier suggested that they were guilty of taking the crosses he himself had removed from the hearse his father built for Georges. Dollé exacts revenge by destroying the cross on Madame Gouard's grave. When Monsieur Gouard sees this, the long simmering and unexplained enmity between the two families erupts. Gouard attacks Dollé and both men, shoving and hitting each other, fall into an unmarked empty grave

---

where they fight until stopped by the village priest who, lamenting this shameful display, reveals Michel to be the thief. This grave scene was sharply condemned by several critics when the film premiered as a grotesque insult to France's Christian values and to the nobility of the French peasantry. Other critics welcomed the scene as mildly comic relief from Paulette's tragic story.<sup>7</sup> Whatever the religious or political perspectives underpinning these responses, they all focus on the spectacle or acting out of the enmity between the two families and ignore completely—as have virtually all other commentators of the film—the fact that no explanation is ever given for the festering hatred between the Dollé and the Gouard. (There is a brief exchange in which Gouard reminds Dollé that he got a medal for saving Dollé's grandmother from drowning, a boast Dollé dismisses by retorting that she was already dead when Gouard pulled her from the water. Far from explaining the families' hatred for each other, however, this macabre bit of dialogue only adds to its mystery.)

I argue that this lack of explanation, which has allowed viewers to be distracted by the concrete here and now of the narrative and its comically grotesque displays of two families at war, has a purpose. It invites us to look beyond the surface drama of feuding neighbors to read it as an allegory of France's shameful, fratricidal struggle between collaborators and resisters that was left psychically uninterred in an unmarked, open grave as the battle over the memorialization of France's war involvement was fought out in the immediate postwar years. This historical parallel is reinforced by the film's evocation of another famous cemetery struggle in which the personal screens the political: Hamlet's fight with Laertes in Ophelia's open grave as the two men play out the fratricidal hatred and disputed succession that ultimately tears a kingdom apart. It is also supported by another Shakespearean reference to warring families and divisive politics—*Romeo and Juliet*—as Francis Gouard and Michel's sister, Berthe Dollé, are forbidden lovers who must meet in secret in defiance of their battling families' opposition.

More forceful than any literary reference, however, is Clément's use of shifting camera angles to visually illuminate the historical allegory played out in the cemetery. After Gouard and Dollé fall into the grave and family members gaze down at them, ironically commenting on how healthy they look for two dead men, Clément cuts to a low angle shot from the bottom of the grave looking up at Francis Gouard, the army deserter, and Raymond Dollé, exempt from service for dubious medical reasons, who lean over the open pit and argue about who of the two is the real deserter (Figure 5). Clément then cuts to a high angle shot of Dollé and Gouard fighting in the grave below (Figure 6), followed by a low angle shot looking up from the grave at the priest who has just arrived, and then back to the men in the grave who, hearing the priest identify Michel as the cross thief, finally stop fighting.



*Figure 5. Low angle shot from the grave of Francis and Raymond arguing.*



*Figure 6. High angle shot of Dollé and Gouard fighting in the grave.*

---

The next image (Figure 7) is a medium shot of Dollé's and Gouard's heads popping up from the grave to find Michel, followed by a long shot of the two men trying to climb out of the open pit to chase him. The argument between Francis and Raymond, whose hovering presence over the grave is magnified by the low angle shot, reverberates with the vexing question of who among the French truly resisted the Germans—a question that loomed large over France in the postwar years. At the same time, when Dollé and Gouard suddenly forget their struggle and rise from the grave to pursue Michel (the “real” enemy), they personify how France “forgot,” repressed, and left unburied and unmourned the civil war that tore it apart, and how de Gaulle rewrote history to deny the nation’s sense of loss and

repress its fratricidal struggle by recasting both as a minor interlude in France’s long republican fight against imperialist Germany. There were, of course, many reasons for de Gaulle to minimize the treachery of Vichy and the painful demise of the Third Republic, including a strong desire to aid the process of national healing and reunification. The crucial issue—in terms of immediate postwar French history and its inscription in and allegorization by Clément’s film—is that the national response to the impediments erected to mourning the Third Republic and France’s col-

laboration with Nazism consisted in what were essentially ritual games or simulacra of mourning in which fictions or substitutes were buried in lieu of what had actually been lost. The substitute constructed by de Gaulle and perpetuated to varying degrees by his successors in the Fourth Republic was what Rousso has called the “Gaullist resistancialist myth” (1991: 18).

This myth portrayed France as a nation that resisted the Nazis from the beginning of the war, and it is illustrated, in part, by the dearth of French monuments to the military dead of World War II, especially when compared to the numerous plaques commemorating those killed in the Resistance. Burying and memorializing the dead of the Resistance in postwar France becomes a symptom of the inability to bury and put into language the trauma of the Collaboration and the loss of French democracy, just as Paulette’s burial of animals and insects marks her inability to bury her parents, transform their unspeakable loss into words, and begin the grieving process. Sadly, however,



*Figure 7. Dollé and Gouard rise from the grave.*

the specters of France's civil war—like the ghostly patresfamilias locked in internecine conflict who rise as if the living dead from an open grave—lived on to torment and haunt the nation well into the last years of the twentieth century. Thus, decades after the premiere of *Forbidden Games*, the French government agency (ORTF) then responsible for all radio and television broadcasts refused to televise Marcel Ophüls's monumental *The Sorrow and the Pity* (*Le Chagrin et la pitié*, 1971). The agency had partially funded the film but its depiction of French collaborators presented a stinging and largely unassimilable counternarrative to de Gaulle's construction of France as a nation of resisters.<sup>8</sup> In the 1990s, years after the scandal of *The Sorrow and the Pity*, France was split again over attempts to bring to trial three of Vichy's most notorious collaborators (René Bousquet, Paul Touvier, and Maurice Papon). The nation struggled, in the face of a persistent resistanthist myth and the failure to bury and mourn the losses wrought by the Collaboration, with fears of the words that might return from the repressed and reveal still unspoken details of the Vichy period as they were inevitably shared in a national communion of empty mouths.<sup>9</sup>

### **Ciphered Anti-Semitism and the Jewish “Exodus”**

Through a personal saga of childhood trauma and depersonalization *Forbidden Games* conveys the tale of a nation's traumatic loss of its democratic identity. But there is another question of loss and denial in the film that I want to address: the Jewish question. To do so, I return to the theme of “exodus” announced by the film's opening sequence and marked as allegorical by the storybook credits that fade into the scene of throngs of French fleeing the Nazis. Rereading this sequence allegorically brings to mind the biblical exodus of the Jews from Egypt and their pursuit by Pharaoh's army. It also recalls the roughly 5,000 Jewish refugees from the Holocaust who, in 1947, attempted to immigrate from France to Palestine aboard *Exodus*, but were intercepted and eventually forced to return to Germany by the British navy.<sup>10</sup> And it evokes the Jewish “exodus” that preceded this incident: the deportation of France's Jews eastward to their extermination.

The issue of Jewish identity in *Forbidden Games* has been raised by several critics who claim that Paulette must be Jewish because she does not know who Christ is, what a crucifix means, or how to recite Catholic prayers (Benson 2005: 211; Ebert 2005: 2; Respaut 2002: 48). This conclusion is too hasty and too concrete. After all, Paris was home to many free thinkers who did not observe rituals of any religion. A five-year-old raised in such a family would likely respond the way Paulette does. This said, there *are* elements in the film that can be viewed, however obliquely, as ciphered references to the drama of Vichy's anti-Semitism and enthusiastic collaboration with the Nazis' Final Solution. That these references are ciphered and also framed by the covers of a

---



child's storybook, associating them with allegorical genres such as fables, fairy tales, myths, and legends, should come as no surprise. I believe that Clément (whether consciously or more probably unconsciously) *had* to treat the drama of Vichy's anti-Semitism and collaboration with the Nazi's extermination of the Jews in a tacit, allegorical manner because to have made this drama more explicit risked exposing the film to government censorship. This is precisely what happened to Alain Resnais's *Night and Fog* three years later when censors demanded that Resnais remove a shot of a French gendarme standing guard at the Vichy internment camp at Pithiviers from which Jews were deported to Auschwitz.

One highly determined yet ciphered reference to anti-Semitism in the film is the poster we see on the wall in the opening sequence as the camera lingers on the dead bodies of Paulette's parents lying in front of it (Figure 8). The picture of a man in a turban next to an exotically bejeweled masked woman announces a performance by "The Masters of Mystery: Professor Olaf and His Medium, Mademoiselle Givrialda" (*Les Maîtres du Mystère: le professeur Olaf et son Médium Mlle Givrialda*). The poster's orientalized images and text and its alien sounding names evoke spiritualism, sorcery, and the nomadic, unrecog-

Figure 8. *The Masters of Mystery* poster evokes anti-Semitic discourse.



nizable foreigner—all signifiers deployed in anti-Semitic discourse to mark the Jews as dangerous nonbelievers and wandering aliens with the power to control minds and corrupt innocent Christians through perverse ritual practices. The fight in the cemetery reinforces the poster's evocation of anti-Semitic rhetoric. As Dollé and Gouard exchange insults before falling into the open grave, Gouard twice calls Dollé a "vampire." After the two men learn that Michel stole Georges's cross and Gouard helps Dollé climb out of the grave, Dollé runs after Michel with the others, leaving Gouard stuck in the grave shouting: *Bande de fumier!* (Pack of dung!). These insults, unremarkable in themselves, merit a closer look in the context of my analysis. After all, accusations of vampirism are a major theme in the long history of anti-Semitic rhetoric. They range from the medieval blood libel, alleging that Jews sacrificed Christian children and drank or used their blood for making matzo, to nineteenth-century depictions of Jews as rapacious bankers who controlled the world economy and sought to suck it dry; from Nazi and Vichy propaganda depicting Jews as blood thirsty leeches and filthy vermin immune to the pestilence they spread to portrayals of Jews as actual vampires who would suck the blood of Poles and other innocent people.<sup>11</sup> At the same time, we hear in Gouard's comical and seemingly innocuous *bande de fumier* echoes of the *fætor judaicus* or "Jewish stench," which was part of medieval anti-Semitic lore and was alleged to be so overpowering that, centuries later, German scholars under Hitler pursued research to discover its biological origins (Poliakov 1955: 317).

The two gendarmes (military police recognizable by their cylindrical caps called *kepi*) who come to take Paulette away are also part of the film's unspoken narrative about anti-Semitism. During the war, gendarmes participated in rounding up Jews living in France and transporting them to French internment camps where gendarmes served as guards and, in some cases, administrators. They also played a key role in the deportation of France's Jews to Nazi death camps, where approximately 76,000 were killed. Though I am not suggesting that such a fate awaits Paulette, the image of gendarmes taking her away, combined with the scene in the Red Cross hall where a Catholic nun ties a name tag bearing her train convoy number around her neck and assures her that she is being sent to a place with other children where she "will be very happy," eerily resonate with the subterfuge perpetrated by the Nazis. With the aid of the Vichy regime, Jews were loaded into train convoys and told they were being "resettled in the East" when in fact they were headed for the gas chambers.

Finally, the image of the Catholic nun complements an earlier scene in which the village priest, discovering Paulette alone in the countryside and learning that she is staying with the Dollés because her parents are dead, has her recite a prayer for them and then rides off on his bicycle. The priest's neglect of the little girl and myopic focus on her saying a prayer that she clearly

---

does not comprehend brings to mind the French Catholic Church's notorious passivity in the early years of Vichy's collusion with the Nazis' genocidal project. Although numbers of clergy protested and actively worked to save Jews (some at the cost of their own lives), the majority did little to resist Vichy's actions. This fact was underscored by the remarkable public apology, offered on 30 September 1997 by Bishop Olivier de Berranger of the Saint-Denis diocese, which encompasses the site of the Drancy internment camp from which tens of thousands of French Jews were deported to Auschwitz. The Bishop asked forgiveness for the clergy's failure to intervene from 1940 to 1942, and acknowledged that "silence in the face of the Nazis' extermination of the Jews was a failure of the French church [which] bears the responsibility of not having offered help immediately, when protest and protection were possible and necessary" (Bitterman et al. 1997; Cohen 1997).

*Jeux interdits* is therefore a title that not only speaks of the obstacles preventing the healthy development of Paulette's identity or *je*. It also visually recalls and acoustically resonates with the traumas of the *Juifs interdits*—the banned or forbidden Jews—who were prevented by the anti-Jewish laws Vichy enacted in October 1940 from owning property, working in certain professions, and entering public places such as parks and children's playgrounds (Figure 9), and who were ultimately forbidden from living at all. Thus, though the claim that Paulette is Jewish is not supported by the film, the tragic fate of France's Jews and Vichy's active collaboration in their extermination *are* in-



Figure 9. "Playground Reserved for Children, No Jews Allowed" © CDJC.

scribed in the film's overdetermined language and images. In this respect, Clément's *Forbidden Games* can be considered a kind of gravesite for the Jews of France whose ashes were dispersed without burial by the chimneys of the crematoria, and whose emaciated corpses were dumped in mass pits or holes like dogs. Just as Paulette buries animals and insects in a cemetery because she is unable to bury her parents, Clément's film becomes a cinematic memorial or sepulcher that allegorically bears witness to those who still had no cemeteries or monuments to their memory in the France of 1952. It is an artistic work that, when read through a focused psychoanalytic lens, reveals how film can function as a medium through which the psychic needs of individuals and nations to mourn traumatic loss can be visually and verbally conveyed, and how the tragic effects of obstructing or forbidding their mourning process can be transmitted and projected through a seemingly simple story about two children in a time of war.<sup>12</sup>

---

**Esther Rashkin**, Ph.D., LCSW, is Professor of French and Comparative Literary and Cultural Studies and Adjunct Professor of Modern Dance at the University of Utah. A former Fellow of the American Psychoanalytic Association, she also maintains a private practice in Salt Lake City. She has published extensively on the intersections between psychoanalysis and literature, film, popular culture, history, and ideology. In her books, *Family Secrets and the Psychoanalysis of Narrative* (1992) and especially *Unspeakable Secrets and the Psychoanalysis of Culture* (2008), she argues for the importance of psychoanalytically informed close reading as a critical dimension of ideological critique. She also proposes a new "psychoanalytic cultural studies" that emphasizes the pivotal contributions psychoanalysis can make to the study of culture and to the exposure of ideologies.

### **Acknowledgments**

The author thanks Karen Edwards and Colette Gaudin for their insightful comments and suggestions during the writing of this article. Earlier versions of the article were presented at conferences of the American Psychoanalytic Association, the Association for the Psychoanalysis of Culture and Society, and the International Conference on Narrative.

---

## Notes

<sup>1</sup> “Pour avoir su élever à une singulière pureté lyrique et une exceptionnelle force d’expression, l’innocence de l’enfance au-dessus de la tragédie et de la désolation de la guerre” (cited in the film scenario published in *L’Avant-Scène Cinéma*, p. 7; author’s translation). The Academy Award was “Honorary” because “Best Foreign Language Film” was not yet an official category in the annual competition. Among other prizes, the film also won the New York Film Critics’ Circle Award for Best Foreign Film and the Grand Prix Independent at Cannes in 1952. It should be added that the film’s initial reception was not unanimously positive. A number of critics attacked it as anti-Catholic, sacrilegious, and blasphemous, including Queval (1952) and François Truffaut (1954) who, in his famous essay, skewered what he called the *tradition de la qualité* in cinema and especially the screenwriters of *Forbidden Games* and other films of the period: Jean Aurenche and Pierre Bost. Other criticism concerned the film’s depiction of French peasantry.

<sup>2</sup> Abraham and Torok, French analysts of Hungarian origin, trained at the Paris Psychoanalytic Society and practiced and published together for twenty-five years until Abraham’s death in 1975. Torok continued to publish and practice until shortly before her death in 1998.

<sup>3</sup> For accuracy, I have modified here and elsewhere the English translation provided on the DVD of the film.

<sup>4</sup> *Dollé* or *dolé*, the past participle of the old French verb *doler*, meaning “sad, afflicted” (Dauzat 1980: 205).

<sup>5</sup> Abraham and Torok’s extensive theoretical writings have focused primarily on clinical conceptualization and treatment. I have written extensively on their theories in relation to other analysts and theoreticians, including Freud and Lacan, and have been concerned with expanding on their ideas and extending them into the realms of literary, film, and cultural analysis. In the process, I have emphasized how the important distinction they make between introjection and incorporation has major implications for rethinking the intrapsychic constellations that form when healthy processes of ego development are impeded or blocked. I have also elaborated how understanding the etiology and workings of incorporation in its various forms and manifestations—including the crypt, cryptonymy, preservative repression, endocryptic identification, and the phantom—has enabled me to formulate new ways of reading texts and new theories of narrative generation. For an extended analysis of Abraham and Torok’s metapsychological theories, see “For a New Psychoanalytic Literary Criticism: The Works of Abraham and Torok,” in *Family Secrets and the Psychoanalysis of Narrative* (Rashkin 1992: 13–48). For an analysis of another text involving blocked mourning, introjection, and the conversion of loss into language, see “Devouring Loss: A Recipe for Mourning in Isak Dinesen’s ‘Babette’s feast,’” in my *Unspeakable Secrets and the Psychoanalysis of Culture* (Rashkin 2008: 25–46). Abraham and Torok’s most important essays on introjection and incorporation include “Mourning or Melancholia: Introjection versus Incorporation” (1972), “The Illness of Mourning and the Fantasy of the Exquisite Corpse” (1968), “‘The Lost Object—Me’: Notes on Endocryptic Identification” (1975), and “Notes on the Phantom: A Complement to Freud’s Metapsychology” (1975), all in *The Shell and the Kernel*. See also their lengthy elaboration of incorporation as crypt in their rereading of the Wolf Man case in *The Wolf Man’s Magic Word: A Cryptonymy* (1976).

<sup>6</sup> From a speech delivered in Paris on 2 April, 1945, quoted in Rousso 1991: 17.

<sup>7</sup> Among those condemning the film’s depiction of the cemetery scene, see Fumet (1952) and Truffaut (1954). Those appreciative of the film’s dark humor include Arlaud (1952) and Chauvet (1952). Occupying a middle ground, Ed Benson (2005) argues that the film, through its scornful portrayal of the peasants, plays out a postwar tension between the urban and

the rural as it stages an emergent desire among the French to flee “from the countryside to the nation’s cities, and especially to its capital” (208).

<sup>8</sup> After Ophuls finished the film with funding from other sources, the ORTF declined to obtain rights to it. Although the film was shown in a few Paris theaters in 1971, the ORTF effectively prevented its being shown on French television until 1981 (when the Socialist Party came to power), long after its dissemination in other European countries and the United States.

<sup>9</sup> René Bousquet, chief of the Vichy police, was murdered just before going on trial in 1994 for “crimes against humanity” and, specifically, for his active participation in the Final Solution and role in organizing the deportation of 60,000 Jews from France to their deaths in Nazi camps. Paul Touvier—a local leader in the Lyon Militia who worked under the notorious Klaus Barbie and participated in hunting down, torturing, and killing numerous Jews and Resistance members—was convicted of crimes against humanity in April 1994, although the actual charges were limited to his ordering the execution of seven Jewish hostages after members of the Resistance killed Philippe Henriot, the Vichy chief of propaganda. Touvier was sentenced to life in prison and died there in 1996. In 1998, sixteen years after evidence was first presented showing Maurice Papon’s active involvement in the deportation of Jews to concentration camps from the Bordeaux region where he was a Vichy official, Papon was brought to trial and convicted of complicity in Nazi crimes against humanity. Sentenced to ten years in prison, he died at age ninety-six after serving less than three. The complexity of all three cases—the postwar distortion and concealment of the men’s involvement in the Collaboration, their favorable treatment by key members of successive post-1945 French governments, and their protection by high ranking clergy in the French Catholic Church—haunted France through the 1990s, and arguably still does today. See Golsan (2000).

<sup>10</sup> For more on the infamous odyssey of the *Exodus*, see Brenner 1997: 37–39 and Segev 1993: 129–35.

<sup>11</sup> Among the numerous works on anti-Semitic rhetoric, see especially Dundes (1991) and Poliakov (1955).

<sup>12</sup> For more on the ways in which psychoanalysis can reveal ideologies such as anti-Semitism, racism, and colonialism that are concealed or encrypted in works of film and literature, see the introduction to *Unspeakable Secrets and the Psychoanalysis of Culture* titled “Vexed Encounters: Psychoanalysis, Cultural Studies, and the Politics of Close Reading” (Rashkin 2008: 1–24). For analyses of literary and film works that expose how these works function as concealed political allegories and that focus especially on decrypting hidden Jewish identities and unspoken narratives of anti-Semitism, see chapters 2 through 5 in *Unspeakable Secrets and the Psychoanalysis of Culture*. Chapter 5 exposes how Villiers de l’Isle-Adam’s seemingly harmless theatrical play about occultism is in fact a virulently anti-Semitic drama about the pernicious presence of Jews in late nineteenth-century France that proposes, in cryptic and heretofore unseen ways, its own horrifying Final Solution to this “Jewish problem.”

## References

- Abraham, Nicolas. [1975] 1994. “Notes on the Phantom: A Complement to Freud’s Metapsychology.” Pp. 139–56 in *The Shell and the Kernel*. Trans. N. Rand Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Abraham, Nicolas, and Maria Torok. [1972] 1994. “Mourning or Melancholia: Introjection versus Incorporation.” Pp. 125–38 in *The Shell and the Kernel*.
-

- . [1975] 1994. "The Lost Object—Me': Notes on Endocryptic Identification." Pp. 139–56 in *The Shell and the Kernel*.
- . [1976] 1986. *The Wolf Man's Magic Word: A Cryptonymy*. Trans. N. Rand. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Arlaud, R.-M. 1952. "Tribune libre autour de *Jeux interdits*." *Revue internationale du cinéma* 14: 65–69.
- Benson, Ed. 2005. "The Screen of History in Clément's *Forbidden Games*." *Literature Film Quarterly* 33 (3): 207–16.
- Bitterman, Jim et al. 1997. "French Catholics Apologize for World War II Silence on Jews." CNN. October 1. <http://www.cnn.com/WORLD/9710/01/france.catholics/> (accessed on 27 July 2008).
- Brenner, Michael. 1997. *After the Holocaust: Rebuilding Jewish Lives in Postwar Germany*. Trans. Barbara Harshav. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Chauvet, Louis. 1952. "Jeux interdits." *Le Figaro* (May 14): 7.
- Clément, René. 1962. *Jeux interdits* (scenario). *L'Avant-Scène Cinéma* 15 (May): 4–46.
- Cohen, Roger. 1997. "French Church Issues Apology to Jews on War." *New York Times*, October 1, section A, 1.
- Dauzat, Albert. 1980. *Dictionnaire étymologique des noms et prénoms de France*. Paris: Larousse.
- De Gaulle, Charles. 1956. *The Complete War Memoirs of Charles de Gaulle*. Vol. 2: *Unity*. Trans. Richard Howard. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Dundes, Alan, ed. 1991. *The Blood Libel Legend: A Casebook in Anti-Semitic Folklore*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Ebert, Roger. 2005. "*Forbidden Games*: A Child's-Eye View of Horror." December 18. <http://rogerebert.suntimes.com/apps/pbcs.dll/article?AID=/20051218/REVIEWS08/512180301/1023/> (accessed on 4 July 2008).
- Egly, Max. 1958. "Jeux interdits." *Image et son: revue de cinéma* 114 (July): 20–21.
- Freud, Sigmund. [1917]1957. "Mourning and Melancholia." *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud*. Trans. James Strachey. 14: 243–258. London: Hogarth Press.
- . [1923] 1961. "The Ego and the Id." *Standard Edition* 19:1–66.
- Fumet, Stanislas. 1952. "Tribune libre autour de *Jeux interdits*." *Revue internationale du cinéma* 14: 65–69.
- Golsan, Richard J. 2000. *Vichy's Afterlife: History and Counterhistory in Postwar France*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- Jackson, Julian. 2003. *The Fall of France: The Nazi Invasion of 1940*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kast, Pierre. 1952. "Le jeu de grâce des petits anges." *Cahiers du cinéma* 13 (June): 64–67.
- Poliakov, Léon. 1955. *Histoire de l'antisémitisme*. Vol. 1. Paris: Calmann-Lévy.
- Queval, Jean. 1952. "Jeux interdits." *Mercure de France* 315 (July 1): 505–8.
- Rashkin, Esther. 1992. *Family Secrets and the Psychoanalysis of Narrative*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- . 2008. *Unspeakable Secrets and the Psychoanalysis of Culture*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Respaut, Michèle. 2002. "Jacques Doillon's *Ponette*: The Perennial Mourning Child." *Literature and Medicine* 21 (1): 45–55.
- Rouso, Henry. 1991. *The Vichy Syndrome: History and Memory in France since 1944*. Trans. Arthur Goldhammer. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Segev, Tom. 1993. *The Seventh Million: The Israelis and the Holocaust*. Trans. Haim Watzman. New York: Hill and Wang.

- Torok, Maria. [1968] 1994. "The Illness of Mourning and the Fantasy of the Exquisite Corpse." Pp. 107–24 in *The Shell and the Kernel*. Trans. N. Rand. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Truffaut, François. 1954. "Une Certaine tendance du cinéma français." *Cahiers du cinéma* 31 (January): 15–29.

## Filmology

- Clément, René. 1952. *Forbidden Games (Jeux interdits)*. France.
- Eisenstein, Sergei. 1925. *Battleship Potemkin (Bronenosets Potyomkin)*. USSR.
- Ophüls, Marcel. 1971. *The Sorrow and the Pity (Le Chagrin et la pitié)*. France.
- Resnais, Alain. 1955. *Night and Fog (Nuit et Brouillard)*. France.
-