
EMERIC PRESSBURGER (Imre Józef Pressburger 5 December 1902, Miskolc, Austria-Hungary—5 February 1988, Suffolk, England)

The Archers—the film company organized by Powell and Pressburger to produce films they wrote and directed and produced—made 14 feature films: One of our Aircraft is Missing (1942), The Life and Death of Colonel Blimp (1943), A Canterbury Tale (1944), I Know Where I’m Going! (1945), A Matter of Life and Death (1946), Black Narcissus (1946), The Red Shoes (1948), The Small Back Room (1949), The Elusive Pimpernel (1950), Gone to Earth (1950), The Tales of Hoffmann (1951), Oh...Rosalinda!! (1955), The Battle of the River Plate (1956), and Ill Met by Moonlight (1957).

ROGER LIVESEY (25 June 1906, Barry, Wales—5 February 1976, Watford, Hertfordshire, England, cancer of the bowel), who appeared as lead and character actor in 34 films, first appeared on stage (according to his IMDB bio) “as the office boy in Loyalties at St. James’s theatre in 1917. He has since played in everything from Shakespeare to modern comedies. He played various roles in the West End from 1920 to 1926. He toured the West Indies and South Africa the returned to join the Old Vic/Sadler's Wells company from September 1932 until May 1934. In 1936 he appeared in New York in the old English comedy The Country Wife and also married Ursula Jeans whom he had known previously in England. At the outbreak of war Roger and Ursula were among the first volunteers to entertain the troops before he volunteered for flying duties in the R.A.F. He was turned down as too old to fly so went to work in an aircraft factory at Desford aerodrome near Leicester to 'do his bit for the war effort.' He was chosen by Michael Powell to play the lead in The Life and Death of Colonel Blimp (1943). This was shown in New York and established his international reputation as a brilliant character actor. He continued playing many theatrical roles during his film career from 1935 until 1969.” His first screen appearance was in The Four Feathers (1921); his second was in East Lynne on the Western Front a decade later. He began doing regular film work in 1935 with Midshipman Easy and Lorna Doone. Some of his other films were as the 1st player and Gravedigger in Hamlet (1969), the Shepherd in Oedipus the King (1968), the Drunken Parson in The Amorous Adventures of Moll Flanders (1965). He also appeared in Of Human Bondage (1964), The Entertainer (1960), A Matter of Life and Death (1946), and Rembrandt (1936).

DEBORAH KERR (30 September 1921, Helensburgh, Scotland) acted in 54 theatrical and tv films. Biography from Leonard Maltin’s Movie Encyclopedia: “Perhaps the screen epitome of ladylike British reserve, this beautiful star was Oscar-nominated a whopping six times in 12 years and never once won. Yet few film performers have accumulated as many meritorious movies to their credit. A former ballet dancer who also acted on stage before making her screen debut opposite Rex Harrison and Wendy Hiller in Shaw's Major Barbara (1941), Kerr achieved stardom early in her career. British director Michael Powell gave the actress one of her best roles, that of a Catholic nun trying to run a mission school in the Himalayas, in Black Narcissus (1946), and it brought her to the attention of MGM, which signed her up immediately. (The promotion for her first Hollywood movie instructed Americans thusly: "Deborah Kerr-rhymes with Star!") Although her dominant screen "image" is that of an elegant, refined and possibly reserved British woman, Kerr played a wide variety of roles, and went decidedly against type as the American adulteress in From Here to Eternity.
(1953), in which she shared a famous smooch in the surf with Burt Lancaster. She was a charming-if unusual-match for Clark Gable in 
The Hucksters (1947, her Hollywood debut), a plucky heroine in 
King Solomon's Mines (1950), a credible Lygia in 
Quo Vadis? (1951), an 
effective Portia in 
Julius Caesar (1953), an utterly unflappable Anna in 
The King and I (1956, with Marni Nixon providing her 
singing voice), an elegantly witty woman who shares a shipboard romance with Cary Grant in 
An Affair to Remember (1957), a 
shipwrecked nun forced to contend with the scruffy marine Robert Mitchum in 
Heaven Knows, Mr. Allison (1957), the real-life Sheilah Graham, in love with F. Scott Fitzgerald in 
Beloved Infidel (1959), a govenness haunted by her surroundings in 
The Innocents (1961), to 
name just a few. She never gave a bad performance. She was Oscar-nominated for 
Edward, My Son (1949), From Here to Eternity (1953), 
The King and I (1956), Heaven Knows, Mr. Allison (1957), Separate Tables (1958), and 
The Sundowners (1960). She has lived for many years in Switzerland with her husband, author Peter Viertel, occasionally agreeing to make a TV movie or miniseries. In 1994 she received an honorary Academy Award.”

ANTON WALBROOK (19 November 1900, Vienna—9 August 1967, Garatschhausen, Germany, heart attack). Bio from Leonard Maltin’s Film Encyclopedia: “It is difficult to conjure up the memory of this distinguished-looking Austrian actor without seeing Lermontov, the tyrranical ballet impresario obsessed by his ballerina in Powell and Pressburger's 
Red Shoes (1948), one of the screen's unforgettable masterpieces. Walbrook's stern, chiseled countenance made him a natural to play suave continentals, some of whom barely concealed latent cruelty or lust; even his sympathetic characters often seemed cold and aloof. Born into a family of circus clowns, he 
broke with long-standing tradition and left the sawdust behind to act on the stage. He played bits in a few silent films during the 1920s, but 
came into his own during the 1930s with starring roles in 
Viktor und Viktoria, Waltz Time in Vienna (both 1933), 
Maskerade (1934, aka 
Maskerade in Vienna and 
The Student of Prague (1935), among others. In 1936 he played Jules Verne's 
Michael Strogoff in a lavish, multinational production purchased for American release by 
RKO's Pandro Berman, who brought Walbrook to Hollywood to 
reshoot dialogue sequences with an English-speaking cast. The final product, seamlessly assembled, was released as 
The Soldier and the Lady (1937); it is a seldom-seen, underappreciated film. Walbrook, eschewing his native country to avoid the increasing Nazi menace, 
settled in England, where he played Prince Albert to Anna Neagle's 
Queen Victoria in 
Victoria the Great (1937) and Sixty Glorious Years (1938). By this time his command of the English language was considerable, and he was extremely effective as the husband in 
Gaslight (1940), a concert pianist in 
Dangerous Moonlight (1941, which introduced the "Warsaw Concerto"), a German-speaking 
Canadian settler in 
49th Parallel (1941, aka 
The Invaders Roger Livesey's adversary in 
The Life and Times of Colonel Blimp (1943), and 
a Czech resistance leader in 
The Man From Morocco (1944). In the years following his 
Red Shoes triumph, Walbrook appeared in 
Max Ophuls' 
La Ronde (1950, as the master of ceremonies) and 
Lola Montes (1955, as the King of Bavaria), as well as 
Vienna Waltzes (1951), On Trial (1953), Saint Joan (1957), and 
I Accuse! (1958).”

from Emeric Pressburger 
The Life and Death of a Screenwriter. 

C.A. Lejeune a contemporaneous reviewer for The Observer 
called The Life and Death of Colonel Blimp “possibly the most 
controversial film produced in this country during our entire 
screen history.”

The film was not distributed in the USA until after the war, when 
it was handled by United Artists. The distributors foresaw 
difficulties selling the long, narratively complex film to the 
American public and launched a publicity campaign trying to sell 
it as a ribald tale of a lusty old soldier....What is more, they cut the 
film by somewhere between 30 and 60 minutes. The result was a 
court case. The Archers persuaded Rank to sue Charlie Chaplin and 
Mary Pickford, owners of United Artists, for 
‘misrepresentation’. ...Although the suit against UA was 
successful, it did not prevent others from taking similar liberties with the picture. 
Blimp’s history is ignominiously littered with 
drastic edits. For forty years it was impossible to see the film as its 
makers had envisaged it. Even in Britain, Rank was soon issuing a 
two-hour version. The complex flashback structure was the first 
thing to go. Only in 1983 did the British Film Institute restore the 
film to its uncut glory. Two years later it enjoyed a successful 
reissue in London and elsewhere. The critics were startled that such a 
masterpiece should be almost unknown to them. It was 
hailed as ‘the greatest British film’. In America the respected critic 
Andrew Sarris called it ‘the British Citizen Kane’, adding that he 
preferred it to Welles’ film ‘for its deeper understanding of 
women.’

Blimp is a rarity: a film that has hardly dated. But why is it 
still so watchable? Perhaps it is the unique combination of 
humanity and caricature, of satire and tender relationships, 
conviction and comedy, of realism and fantasy, of warfare and 
jaunty, ironic music. It is a movie packed with ambivalence. As 
one critic wrote recently: ‘It’s almost impossible to define this 
1943 masterpiece by Michael Powell and Emeric Pressburger. It 
was ostensibly based on a cartoon series that satirized the British 
class, yet its attitude toward the main character is one of 
affection, respect, and sometimes awe; it was intended as a 
propaganda film, yet Churchill wanted to suppress it; it has the 
romantic sweep of a grand love story, yet none of the romantic 
relationships it presents is truly fulfilled.’

Mark Dugid, “Fantastic Life,” from bfi online [http://www.bfi.org.uk/features/pilgrims/fantastic.html]:

If Twentieth Century cinema is characterised as a battle between ‘realism’ and fantasy, then 
Michael Powell and Emeric 
Pressburger, at least after 1943, allied themselves with the forces 
of fantasy. In this respect, they found themselves at odds with 
almost the entire British cinematic tradition, which helps to 
explain why their work largely fell out of favour with British 
critics until a National Film Theatre retrospective played a key 
role in reviving their reputation in 1978.

Like Alfred Hitchcock, Powell cut his teeth on silent films, and 
he carried into the sound era a strong sense of visual storytelling. 
Powell, too, eventually found himself in Hollywood, though some 
forty years later and on rather different terms. Born in 
Bekesbourne, near Canterbury, Kent on 30 September 1905,
Powell served his apprenticeship with arch stylist Rex Ingram and Harry Lachman before graduating, via still photography on Hitchcock's Champagne (1928) and Blackmail (1929), to directing a number of so-called 'quota quickies' - small-scaled, medium length films designed to help cinemas meet their legal obligations to show a proportion of British material.

Pressburger, born 5 December 1902, Mikolc, Hungary, was almost penniless when a published short story brought him into the German film industry as a scriptwriter, working on early productions by Robert Siodmak and Max Ophüls. He arrived in England in 1935, having fled Germany for France following the Nazis' rise to power in 1933. In 1938, he joined the Hungarian coterie of Alexander Korda, and like his compatriots he had much to invest in the dream of England as an outpost against tyranny and beacon of decency in a Europe turning to fascism. It was Korda too, who 'discovered' Powell, after his first substantial work, The Edge of the World (1937), and partnered the two for Spy in Black in 1939.

The duo spent the early part of the war making inspiring propaganda films, notably 49th Parallel (1941) for which Pressburger won an Oscar, although Powell's collaboration on the spectacular fantasy Thief of Bagdad, released in 1940, was an indication of their later direction. In 1942 they established their own production company, The Archers, with its distinctive target logo, and thereafter their films carried the label "Written, Produced and Directed by Michael Powell and Emeric Pressburger". It was all but unprecedented for a director to share credit in this way.

The Life and Death of Colonel Blimp (1943), a domestic success despite earning the displeasure of Churchill (who tried to ban it) marked the beginning of Powell and Pressburger's departure from realist orthodoxy, with its non-linear chronology and its use of the same actress - Deborah Kerr - to play the three women in the life of its hero. They went further with its follow-up, A Canterbury Tale (1944), which imbibed the Kent countryside with an almost pagan mysticism in its tale of three modern pilgrims pursuing a haphazard path to spiritual awakening. The film was their first flop, and an early sign that they couldn't depend on carrying either critics, audiences or industry along with their most ambitious explorations. Moreover, in its central conceit, the hunt for the 'glue man', a bizarre character who puts glue in young women's hair to deter them from fraternising with American troops, it sowed the seeds of the critical hostility that would emerge following Powell's Peeping Tom (1960).

In a similarly mystical vein was their second, and Powell's third, trip to the Scottish islands (following Edge of the World and Spy in Black), I Know Where I'm Going! (1945), a strange love story with supernatural overtones. Undeterred by the failure of critics and audiences to appreciate their increasingly individual vision, Powell and Pressburger turned an assignment from the Ministry of Information to make a film to further Anglo-American relations into their most extravagant fantasy yet. Memorably contrasting a monochrome afterlife with a real world of radiant technicolor, A Matter of Life and Death (1946) was a feast of cinematic invention, from the appearance of a camera obscura to the celebrated moving stairway to Heaven, to the closing of the huge eyelids as David Niven's romantic pilot succumbed to anaesthesia.

The pair continued to explore this new terrain of fantasy and their next film, Black Narcissus (1947), further estranged them from the British cinema establishment. Rebuilding a Himalayan palace on a Pinewood sound stage, the film was a sustained erotic tour-de-force detailing the conflicts of a group of English nuns beset by a hostile environment and an unruly local population, and featuring an extraordinary scene-stealing performance from the virtually unknown Kathleen Byron.

The ballet extravaganza The Red Shoes (1948) was a deceptively simple tale of a young dancer torn between love and her career, based on a story by Hans Christian Anderson. The film's centrepiece was a seventeen-minute ballet which is still perhaps the most concentrated imaginative sequence in British films. The Red Shoes was a high-water mark for Powell and Pressburger. They found themselves at odds with the industry, falling out first with Rank, then with Korda. They continued to make interesting films - The Small Back Room (1949) was an unexpectedly straight thriller, albeit with touches of fantasy, while Gone to Earth (1950) was a visually sumptuous, if flawed, rural melodrama. Tales of Hoffman (1951) attempted, with some success, to recapture the magic of The Red Shoes, and contained some stunning sequences; a further musical, Oh... Rosalinda!! was less satisfying.

By 1957 the two were pulling in different directions, and the partnership came to an end. In 1960, Powell scandalised critics with Peeping Tom, an intense study of a voyeuristic killer - a film cameraman who photographs his victims as they die by the sharpened leg of his tripod - portrayed with disquieting sympathy by young Austrian actor Carl Boehm. It was a highly sophisticated film, but despite being released in the same year as Hitchcock's Psycho - and arguably a better film - it was too much for a Britain yet to leave behind the conservatism of the 1950s, and it attracted universal condemnation, not least for a sequence in which Powell himself played the killer's father, with his own son playing the boy.

The backlash was such that much of The Archers' earlier work from A Canterbury Tale onwards was damned retrospectively for its supposed 'morbidity'. The film all but ended Powell's career: he managed to make a few more films, including two more with Pressburger, then languished in obscurity until Francis Coppola invited him to become 'director in residence' at his Zoetrope studios in the early 1980s. By the time of his death in 1990, however, Peeping Tom had been recognised as a masterpiece: as Powell ruefully commented in his autobiography, "I make a film that nobody wants to see and then, thirty years later, everybody has either seen it or wants to see it".

Despite their separation, Powell and Pressburger remained friends until the latter's death in 1988. Theirs was a truly complementary partnership: Powell was English through and through, but with an international spirit and an imagination which owed nothing to English reticence; Pressburger brought the insights of an outsider, and had a delight in the language and culture of his adopted home. Powell had a rich visual sense; Pressburger wrote dialogue crackling with wit and energy. Powell was exuberant and confident; Pressburger shy, but with a fierce intelligence. Above all, they were both tireless and inventive storytellers.

Powell's own favourite of their films, A Matter of Life and Death, struck a chord with a British public starved for fantasy and romance in the immediate aftermath of war. But the Archers'
films became too rich for British palates; audiences preferred American escapism, while the British film industry was more comfortable with smaller, realist pictures than the baroque - and costly - experiments of Powell and Pressburger. They left behind a set of films unlike anything seen before or since in the British cinema - at least five masterpieces among them - and a sense of what is possible in film that will continue to inspire well into the medium's second century.

**a Pressburger take on movie magic:** "I think that a film should have a good story, a clear story, and it should have if possible, something which is probably the most difficult thing - it should have a little bit of magic ... Magic being untouchable and very difficult to cast, you can't deal with it at all. You can only try to prepare some nests, hoping that a little bit of magic will slide into them." NYC 1980

*from The Life and Death of Colonel Blimp. Michael Powell & Emeric Pressburger. Ed. & w/ an Introduction by Ian Christie, Faber & Faber, London 1994*

The Life and Death of Colonel Blimp has had a career that would be unequal for any film, and must be unique in the history of British cinema. Conceived at the height of Word War II, when film industries throughout the world were producing either escapist entertainment or rousing propaganda — and often trying to combine these in the same film, with varying degrees of success — Blimp dared to raise awkward questions in a puzzling form: questions about the calibre of Britain’s military leadership and about its readiness for ‘total war’; about the history of German militarism and how this differed from Nazism. Worst of all, perhaps, from a contemporary standpoint, the only military action it showed was either ironic or downright ignoble.

‘What is it really about?’ demanded a contemporary critic, with an exasperation which valuably reminds us that this now-acclaimed film was and remains something of a conundrum. For a work based on a bitingly satirical conception, it proved remarkably benign, not to say romantic, about the English ruling class. And for all its length and decades spanned, we learn remarkably little about either Britain’s or Germany’s public history between 1900 and 1940. At a time when not only films but all kinds of public expression were required to be clear and positive in their meaning, Blimp’s greatest sin was to be open to different interpretations; to hint (as the same critic acutely judged) ‘that it has something much bigger to say.’ ...

The makers of Blimp did indeed feel they had something to say’ and knew that they had to find a original form. They had no previous experience of working in colour (then considered as much a new frontier as sound had been a decade earlier) and very little dealing with history. Innocent, more or less, of the conventions of such films, they set about creating ‘a crazy quilt of Technicolor’. The result, to their astonishment, ran almost three hours—an inadvertent epic.

In many ways it was to be the most personal film that Michael Powell and Emeric Pressburger would ever make. Personal, in the sense that they patched onto it so much of their own differing histories, making of its broad, simple story an allegory of their own improbable partnership in wartime Britain, as well as a thoughtful contribution to the armoury of wartime propaganda. Powell has described his own Edwardian English childhood in the richly evocative early part of *A Life in Movies*; and Kevin Macdonald’s forthcoming biography of Pressburger will greatly extend our understanding of how closely Pressburger drew on his immigrant’s experience, first of Germany and then of Britain, to create Theo’s pivotal ‘point of view’.

Because it grew from Powell and Pressburger’s own experience and concerns — the anecdotal starting point was a scene (eventually cut) in *One of Our Aircraft is Missing* in which an old crew member reminds his young comrades that he too was young once — the storm of controversy may well have come as a surprise to them. It should not have. From the point at which David Low’s ‘Colonel Blimp’ became the armature for their project, it could have been anticipated that this would attract hostility. Low’s iconoclastic cartoon character was described in his *Times* obituary as ‘a rotund, bald, fierce gentleman who formed the mouthpiece for the most reactionary opinions’. Running in Beaverbrook’s *Evening Standard* throughout the 30s, the Colonel was a scourge of establishment hypocrisy and self-interest. After the early reverses of the war, he had become a hotly contested symbol in the debate on Britain’s ability to withstand the Axis. The parliamentary debate of February 1942 which promised a new coordination of the war effort turned on Stafford Cripps’s claim that: ‘From now on we have said good-bye to “Blimpery”.’ ...

In the same year Robert Graves published an essay, ‘Colonel Blimp’s Ancestors’, prompted by the uncomfortable feeling that the British Army contained far too many pig-headed officers, leftovers from the First World War’. Little wonder that the new Secretary of State for War, James Grigg, showed so little sympathy for Powell and Pressburger’s project. The terms in which he wrote to Churchill, about its potential to ‘give the Blimp conception of the Army officer a new lease of life at a time when it is dying from inanition’, shows how sensitive officialdom was to the mere mention of Blimp.

All the more so, perhaps, because it seemed to many that Churchill himself embodied ‘positive’ Blimpish qualities.

To Powell and Pressburger, it seemed obvious that Blimpism was by no means wholly negative. On to Low’s swingeing satire, they had grafted other values: steadfastness, loyalty, gallantry, honour, hospitality. ...

Priding themselves on their up-to-date grasp of propaganda techniques, it seemed obvious to The Archers that, having analyzed the menace of Nazism in *49th Parallel* and celebrated the value of resistance under occupation in *One of Our Aircraft*, they should next commemorate the ‘death’ of Blimperey, by showing its embodiment literally defeated by the ‘new army’, even as he tries to cling on to the last vestiges of power in the Home Guard. A kind of ‘how we fight’, after their versions of ‘why we fight’; and something of a *mea culpa* for the years of appeasement.

The extent to which they underestimated official
Dear Wendy,

Reaffirm our responsibility as independent film makers.

One, we owe allegiance to nobody except the financial interests which provide our money; and to them, the sole responsibility of ensuring them a profit, not a loss.

Two, every single foot in our films is our own responsibility and nobody else’s. We refuse to be guided or coerced by any influence but our own judgment.

Three, when we start work on a new idea we must be a year ahead, not only of competitors, but also of the times. A real film, from idea to universal release, takes a year / Or more.

Four, no artist believes in escapism. And we secretly believe that no audience does. We have proved, at any rate, that they will pay to see truth, for other reasons than her nakedness.

Five, at any time, and particularly at the present, the self-respect of all collaborators, from star to prop-man, is sustained, or diminished, by the theme and purpose of the film they are working on. They will fight or intrigue to work on a subject they feel is urgent and contemporary, and fight equally hard to avoid working on a trivial or pointless subject. And we agree with them and want the best workmen with us; and get them. These are the main things we believe in. They have brought us an unbroken record of success and a unique position. Without the one, of course, we should not enjoy the other very long. We are under no illusions. We know we are surrounded by hungry sharks. But you have no idea what fun it is surf-bathing, if you have only paddled, with a nurse holding on to the back of your romper. We hope you will come on in, the water’s fine.

Emeric first had the idea of ‘Colonel Blimp’ last September. It sprang from a scene...no longer in the final edition. Let us show, he said, that Blimps are made, not born. Let us show that their aversion to any form of change springs from the very qualities which have made them invaluable in action; that their lives, so full of activity, are equally full of frustration. We will show his youth and his youthful dreams; and we will show, through his eyes, the youth of today: the changing world of the last forty years through the eyes of one unchanging man; a man who has fought in three wars with honour and distinction and has not the slightest idea what any of them were really about; a man, who, in his youth, fumblingly puts one woman on a pedestal; and when she jumps off into another man’s arms, is always trying to fill the vacant niche with women of the same size and shape. A comic, a pathetic, a controversial character. We went to see Low, his godfather and biographer. At first puzzled, then amused, finally enthusiastic, he promised his support....

The development of the characters became the important thing, the love-story of the three women, the completion of their circle of development (Emeric has a beautiful scheme for this), the relation of the young officer at the beginning of the film to events at the end, his relation to the third of the women, and a dozen fascinating problems which are rapidly being solved.

We have decided on ‘The Life and Death of Colonel Blimp’ and I am going to try to explain how we arrived at the decision so that you can share our thoughts and plans directly as you would if you were here to contribute to them.

I must, first of all, because we still don’t know one another well, reaffirm our responsibility as independent film makers.

One, we owe allegiance to nobody except the financial interests which provide our money; and to them, the sole responsibility of ensuring them a profit, not a loss.

Two, every single foot in our films is our own responsibility and nobody else’s. We refuse to be guided or coerced by any influence but our own judgment.

Three, when we start work on a new idea we must be a year ahead, not only of competitors, but also of the times. A real film, from idea to universal release, takes a year / Or more.

Four, no artist believes in escapism. And we secretly believe that no audience does. We have proved, at any rate, that they will pay to see truth, for other reasons than her nakedness.

Five, at any time, and particularly at the present, the self-respect of all collaborators, from star to prop-man, is sustained, or diminished, by the theme and purpose of the film they are working on. They will fight or intrigue to work on a subject they feel is urgent and contemporary, and fight equally hard to avoid working on a trivial or pointless subject. And we agree with them and want the best workmen with us; and get them. These are the main things we believe in. They have brought us an unbroken record of success and a unique position. Without the one, of course, we should not enjoy the other very long. We are under no illusions. We know we are surrounded by hungry sharks. But you have no idea what fun it is surf-bathing, if you have only paddled, with a nurse holding on to the back of your romper. We hope you will come on in, the water’s fine.

Emeric first had the idea of ‘Colonel Blimp’ last September. It sprang from a scene...no longer in the final edition. Let us show, he said, that Blimps are made, not born. Let us show that their aversion to any form of change springs from the very qualities which have made them invaluable in action; that their lives, so full of activity, are equally full of frustration. We will show his youth and his youthful dreams; and we will show, through his eyes, the youth of today: the changing world of the last forty years through the eyes of one unchanging man; a man who has fought in three wars with honour and distinction and has not the slightest idea what any of them were really about; a man, who, in his youth, fumblingly puts one woman on a pedestal; and when she jumps off into another man’s arms, is always trying to fill the vacant niche with women of the same size and shape. A comic, a pathetic, a controversial character. We went to see Low, his godfather and biographer. At first puzzled, then amused, finally enthusiastic, he promised his support....

The development of the characters became the important thing, the love-story of the three women, the completion of their circle of development (Emeric has a beautiful scheme for this), the relation of the young officer at the beginning of the film to events at the end, his relation to the third of the women, and a dozen fascinating problems which are rapidly being solved.

What gives the theme filmic force and originality in Blimp is the conception of a triple role played by the same actress. In a device which anticipates the theatrical disguises of The Tales of Hoffmann, we are seduced into sharing Clive’s fantasy of an ‘eternal recurrence’.

Like in the films of Ophuls (with whom Pressburger worked at the outset of both their careers), from La Signorina de tutti to Lola Montes, the Archers’ work offers a close engagement between the material and the means of narration. The dramatic shape and structure of the film clearly underpin its main theme. So, while circular repetition has an ironic or tragic connotation in Ophuls, here it serves to focus our attention as much on what is not being shown as on what is.

We have decided on ‘The Life and Death of Colonel Blimp’ and I am going to try to explain how we arrived at the decision so that you can share our thoughts and plans directly as you would if you were here to contribute to them.

I must, first of all, because we still don’t know one another well, reaffirm our responsibility as independent film makers.

One, we owe allegiance to nobody except the financial interests which provide our money; and to them, the sole responsibility of ensuring them a profit, not a loss.

Two, every single foot in our films is our own responsibility and nobody else’s. We refuse to be guided or coerced by any influence but our own judgment.

Three, when we start work on a new idea we must be a year ahead, not only of competitors, but also of the times. A real film, from idea to universal release, takes a year / Or more.

Four, no artist believes in escapism. And we secretly believe that no audience does. We have proved, at any rate, that they will pay to see truth, for other reasons than her nakedness.

Five, at any time, and particularly at the present, the self-respect of all collaborators, from star to prop-man, is sustained, or diminished, by the theme and purpose of the film they are working on. They will fight or intrigue to work on a subject they feel is urgent and contemporary, and fight equally hard to avoid working on a trivial or pointless subject. And we agree with them and want the best workmen with us; and get them. These are the main things we believe in. They have brought us an unbroken record of success and a unique position. Without the one, of course, we should not enjoy the other very long. We are under no illusions. We know we are surrounded by hungry sharks. But you have no idea what fun it is surf-bathing, if you have only paddled, with a nurse holding on to the back of your romper. We hope you will come on in, the water’s fine.

Emeric first had the idea of ‘Colonel Blimp’ last September. It sprang from a scene...no longer in the final edition. Let us show, he said, that Blimps are made, not born. Let us show that their aversion to any form of change springs from the very qualities which have made them invaluable in action; that their lives, so full of activity, are equally full of frustration. We will show his youth and his youthful dreams; and we will show, through his eyes, the youth of today: the changing world of the last forty years through the eyes of one unchanging man; a man who has fought in three wars with honour and distinction and has not the slightest idea what any of them were really about; a man, who, in his youth, fumblingly puts one woman on a pedestal; and when she jumps off into another man’s arms, is always trying to fill the vacant niche with women of the same size and shape. A comic, a pathetic, a controversial character. We went to see Low, his godfather and biographer. At first puzzled, then amused, finally enthusiastic, he promised his support....

The development of the characters became the important thing, the love-story of the three women, the completion of their circle of development (Emeric has a beautiful scheme for this), the relation of the young officer at the beginning of the film to events at the end, his relation to the third of the women, and a dozen fascinating problems which are rapidly being solved.

from The Life and Death of Colonel Blimp, A.L. Kennedy
BFI London 1997

It’s a film about desires repressed in favour of worthless and unsatisfying ideals. And it’s a film about how England dreamt of itself as a nation and how this dream disguised inadequacy and brutality in the clothes of honour.
Perhaps of all the Powell and Pressburger creations, Blimp came closest to reaching the unreachable and catching it in the spaces between its words. It is almost insanely bent upon dealing with the most delicate, intangible and subjective elements of time and character. This is a film about loss and longing, about creating the impossible and then setting it beyond your grasp. This is a film about home and the meaning of home, the meaning of self. This is a film which lies in the most human ways but tells remarkable, human truths. Here, to quote from Lermontov in The Red Shoes, ‘time passes by, love passes by, life passes by’, in a way which is more poignant and savagely forgiving, more melancholy, troubling and revealing, than almost any other cinematic work I have encountered.

To begin with Clive means that I must begin with Roger Livesey; not the first choice for the title role and paid significantly less than the other two leads. Originally, Laurence Olivier was meant to play Clive and he was enthusiastic about his involvement, although the letters from him on his interpretation of the Colonel suggest that it might have been a mildly catalysmic influence on the film. Olivier’s coldly visible intelligence and black edge would have toppled the script into the realms of heavy-handed satire, while his personal dash could have made the romantic plotline either ludicrous or too minor to have any meaning.

Roger Livesey, on the other hand, was and still is ideal. Blimp gave him arguably his finest hour as a screen actor, and without him the Clive Candy we know today would be almost unthinkable. Livesey gave the two dimensions of Low’s cartoon and the beautiful psychology of Pressburger’s script a three-dimensional presence of bluff charm and unassuming grace.

It is a matter of record that Churchill loathed Blimp with a passion remarkable for a man who was Prime Minister of a country at war and presumably somewhat pressed for time. ‘Pray propose to me the measures necessary to stop this foolish production before it gets any further. I am not prepared to allow propaganda detrimental to the morale of the Army, and I am sure the Cabinet will take all necessary action. Who are the people behind it?’

Pressburger knew Walbrook from their Ufa days in Germany. At that time Imre Pressburger had changed his name to the Germanic Emerich Pressburger and Walbrook was still Adolf Wohlbruck, a respected screen actor. Half-Jewish, a homosexual and a man of conscience, Walbrook was vehemently anti-Nazi. By 1939 he was establishing himself as an English-speaking actor in Britain. ... Pressburger put all his experience as an outcast [he was classed as an enemy alien throughout the production of Blimp], a refugee and a lover of impossible homes into the mouth of Theo, as played by another refugee. Theo is sensitive, cultured, intelligent, and irredeemably sad. Walbrook makes him hypnotic, vulnerable, subtle, and elegant. His voice is light, measured, still coloured with Walbrook’s Austrian accent, and carries a constant undercurrent of emotion. His movements are filled with a tender restraint. If the bluff, dogged Yorkshireman Livesey can stand for Michael Powell, then the quiet, wise Viennese Walbrook stands for Pressburger in an onscreen commemoration of their remarkable friendship.

Taken as individuals, people are equally complex and contradictory, but they can be regarded with forgiveness and compassion much more easily. Compassion is the key to the presentation of all Pressburger’s characters. He said of them himself, referring to The Unholy Passion, one of his novels, ‘As happens so often in life, none of the characters is really bad...they all have their reasons.’

Theo longs for a place in the world and for innocence. Clive has too firm a place and a dangerous innocence. Together, the men temper each other. By the end of the film, both of them have lost most of what they have, materially, but each has come much closer to carrying within himself the life, hope, and dignity that would be worth fighting for.

Their individual victories are set against a finale which is deeply ambivalent.

Buffalo Film Seminars Encore Performance
We’ve never repeated a film in the Buffalo Film Seminars, but we regularly get requests to do exactly that—either from people who missed a film when we presented it or people who would like to see a favorite film again. So we decided that in each series from now on we’ll include one film that we’ve shown before, and you’ll get to choose. From the list of films in the first eight series below pick ONE title you’d like to see again and either write the title on a slip of paper and give it to either of us, or (preferably) send an email to showitagain@buffalofilmseminars.com. Balloting ends February 29.

I: Spring 2000
William Wellman, The Public Enemy 1931
Lloyd Bacon, 42nd Street 1933
Frank Capra, It Happened One Night 1934
Leni Riefenstahl, Triumph des Willens/Triumph of the Will 1935
Sam Wood, A Night at the Opera 1935
John Ford, The Grapes of Wrath 1940
Billy Wilder, Double Indemnity 1944
Jean Cocteau, La Belle et la Bête/Beauty and the Beast 1946
Fred Zinnemann, High Noon 1952
Elia Kazan, On the Waterfront 1954
Orson Welles, Touch of Evil 1958
Arthur Penn, Bonnie and Clyde 1967
Martin Scorsese, Raging Bull 1980

II: Fall 2000
Jean Renoir, La Grande Illusion/The Grand Illusion 1937
Ernst Lubitsch, Ninotchka 1939

III: Spring 2001
Otto Preminger, Laura 1944
Alfred Hitchcock, Notorious 1946
Joseph Mankiewicz, All About Eve 1950
Stanley Kubrick, Paths of Glory 1957
Federico Fellini, La Dolce Vita 1960
Mike Nichols, Who’s Afraid of Virginia Woolf? 1966
John Schlesinger, Midnight Cowboy 1969
Bob Fosse, All that Jazz 1979
Connie Field, The Life and Times of Rosie the Riveter 1980
Peter Greenaway, The Cook, the Thief, His Wife & Her Lover 1989
Nikita Mikhalkov, Utomlyonnye Solntsem/Burnt by the Sun 1994

King Vidor, The Big Parade 1925
Mervyn LeRoy, Gold Diggers of 1933 1933
James Whale, Bride of Frankenstein 1935
Luis Buñuel, El Ángel exterminador/The Exterminating Angel 1962
Sergei Eisenstein, Ivan Groznyj I & II/Ivan the Terrible parts I & II 1943 & 1946
Vittorio De Sica, Ladri di biciclette/Bicycle Thieves 1947
Marcel Carné, Les Enfants du Paradis/Children of Paradise 1945
Robert Aldrich Kiss Me Deadly 1955
Sergio Leone, C’era una volta il West/Once Upon a Time in the West 1968
Peter Bogdanovitch, The Last Picture Show 1971
William Friedkin, The French Connection, 1971
John Huston, The Man Who Would be King 1975
Charles Burnett, Killer of Sheep 1977
Akira Kurosawa, Dersu Uzala 1974

IV: Fall 2001
Clyde Bruckman, The General 1927
George Pabst, Die Büchse der Pandora/Pandora’s Box 1929
Mervyn LeRoy, Little Caesar 1930
Ernst Lubitsch Trouble in Paradise 1932
Preston Sturges, Sullivan’s Travels 1941
Billy Wilder, Sunset Boulevard 1950
Henri-Georges Clouzot, Le Salaire de la peur/Wages of Fear 1953
Charles Laughton, The Night of the Hunter 1955
Alexander Mackendrick, Sweet Smell of Success 1957
Luchino Visconti, Il Gattopardo/The Leopard 1963
Bernardo Bertolucci, Il Conformista/The Conformist 1970
Nicolas Roeg, Don’t Look Now 1973
Terrence Malick, Days of Heaven 1978
Terry Gilliam, The Adventures of Baron Munchausen 1988

V: Spring 2002
Mervyn LeRoy, Little Caesar 1930
Michael Powell and Emeric Pressburger, I Know Where I’m Going 1945
Nicolas Ray, In a Lonely Place 1950
Akira Kurosawa, Rashōmon 1950
Satyajit Ray, Pather Panchali 1955
Jean-Luc Godard, À bout de souffle/Breathless 1959
Robert Rossen, The Hustler 1961
Stanley Kubrick Dr. Strangelove, or: How I Learned to Stop Worrying and Love the Bomb 1964
Josef von Sternberg, Der Blaue Engel/The Blue Angel 1930
Lindsay Anderson, If... 1968
Robert Altman, Nashville 1975
Martin Scorsese, Mean Streets 1973
Billy Wilder, Some Like it Hot 1959

VI: Fall 2002
F.W. Murnau, Sunrise 1927
Fritz Lang, M 1931
W. S. Van Dyke, The Thin Man 1934
Rouben Mamoulian, Queen Christina 1933
Jean Renoir, La Règle du jeu/The Rules of the Game 1939
John Huston, The Maltese Falcon 1941
Roberto Rossellini, Roma, città aperta/Open City 1945
Carol Reed, The Third Man 1949
Yasujiro Ozu, Tokyo monogatari/Tokyo Story 1953
Marcel Camus, Orfeo Negro/Black Orpheus 1958
Luis Buñuel, Belle de Jour 1967
John Cassavetes, Faces 1968
Sam Peckinpah, The Wild Bunch 1969
François Truffaut, La Nuit américaine/Day for Night 1973
Terry Gilliam and Terry Jones, Monty Python and the Holy Grail 1975

VII: Fall 2003
Buster Keaton Our Hospitality 1924
Fritz Lang Metropolis 1927
Howard Hawks Scarface 1932
Cedric Gibbons Tarzan and his Mate 1934
David Lean Great Expectations 1946
Jacques Tourneur Out of the Past 1947
Kenji Misoguchi, Ugetsu monogatari/Ugetsu 1953
John Ford, The Searchers 1956
Alfred Hitchcock Vertigo 1958
Jean-Luc Godard Le Mépris/Contempt 1963
Martin Scorsese Taxi Driver 1976
Peter Medak, The Ruling Class 1972
Andrei Tarkovsky Offret/The Sacrifice 1986
Jim Jarmusch Dead Man 1995
Pedro Almodóvar, Hable con ella/Talk to Her 2002

VIII: Spring 2004
Erich von Stroheim, Greed 1925
Lewis Milestone, All Quiet on the Western Front 1930
Fritz Lang, You Only Live Once 1937
Preston Sturges, The Lady Eve 1941
Michael Curtiz, Casablanca 1942
William A. Wellman, The Ox-Bow Incident 1943
Michael Powell and Emeric Pressburger, The Life & Death of Colonel Blimp 1943
John Huston, The Asphalt Jungle 1950
Stanley Donen and Gene Kelly, Singin’ in the Rain 1952
Fred Zinnemann, From Here to Eternity 1953
Akira Kurosawa, Kumonosu jo/ Throne of Blood 1957
Luchino Visconti, Rocco e i suoi fratelli/Rocco and his Brothers 1960
François Truffaut, Jules et Jim/Jules and Jim 1961
Sergio Leone, C’era una volta in America/Once Upon a Time in America 1984

The seven remaining films Buffalo Film Seminars VIII:
March 9 Stanley Donen and Gene Kelly, Singin’ in the Rain 1952
March 23 Fred Zinnemann, From Here to Eternity, 1953
March 30 Akira Kurosawa, Kumonosu jo/Throne of Blood, 1957
April 6 Luchino Visconti, Rocco e i suoi fratelli/Rocco and his Brothers, 1960
April 13 François Truffaut, Jules et Jim/Jules and Jim, 1961
April 20 Sergio Leone, C’era una volta in America/Once Upon a Time in America, 1984

Contact Bruce: bjackson@buffalo.edu
Contact Diane: engdc@buffalo.edu
To be placed on the Buffalo Film Seminars email list: addtolist@buffalo

The Buffalo Film Seminars are presented by the Market Arcade Film & Arts Center &

University at Buffalo, The State University of New York