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II :: Cinema and Animation
In 2000, Bernard Clarens published the only work to date that collects even a small portion of André Martin’s (1925–94) fundamental body of critical work. A third of the book (more than ninety pages) is dedicated to Norman McLaren and constitutes a veritable forgotten monograph. The entirety of the anthology, titled Pour lire entre les images (Reading between the images), such as it was conceived, also situates the intriguing and important place of animation cinema as an experience and an idea in the history of the twentieth century.1

Before his death in 2006, Clarens entrusted me with the articles and documents that he had systematically collected in hopes of publishing other volumes. I have therefore recently come to possess an archive solely devoted to André Martin, which I have named the Fonds Bernard Clarens (Bernard Clarens Collection) and presented publicly at a conference in January 2011 at the University of Picardie. I supplemented the archive with my own collection, which I began prior to 1990 in support of my doctoral thesis offering a preliminary reading of Martin’s comprehensive discursive production. And my collection was immediately enhanced, notably by the contribution of Pierre Hébert, an animator from Quebec as well as a true researcher in this case, who discovered important traces of the Canadian period of the French critic and researcher.2

The place of Norman McLaren throughout Martin’s writing can thus be grasped in its entirety. The Bernard Clarens Collection also brings to light another important director worthy of examination—not a distant contemporary like McLaren (temporally close, but spatially far from Martin) but a pioneer and fellow Frenchman: Emile Cohl (culturally similar, but temporally distant from the critic), who is better known by cinema historians today than he was during Martin’s time.3

It is possible, thanks to two sets of Martin’s writing—twenty-four
notations on the creator of Fantasmagorie (1908) and thirty-four studies and notations on that of Blinkity Blank (1955) — to write a page in cinematic history otherwise little examined by historians: the invention of animation cinema. This history is little known because of its peculiar resistance to the chronological imperative, and thus its failure to present (either in order or according to common logic) two chapters typically found in histories of animation cinema: those dedicated to so-called precursors, inventors, and pioneers, which never fail to leave a place for Cohl, and those dedicated to McLaren. I offer an overview of another history, that of the expression animation cinema, that is to say, an act of naming, a formative statement, to borrow a term recently introduced by a historian in another field. This linguistic act and its implementation in reality is based on the events of the 1950s—McLaren’s glory years, a fact that certainly had something to do with the possibility of such an invention — and yet it is simultaneously retrospective, oriented toward the rediscovery of pioneers. Within the system created by Martin, Cohl operates from a distance as an archaic model of singular invention, toward which McLaren’s modernity will return. In sum, what is at stake here is the affirmation that the birth of animation cinema should not be situated in the 1870s, 1890s, or 1910s but rather around 1955.

The Invention of Animation Cinema

The expression animation cinema appeared for the first time, at least in Martin’s writing (although I have yet to find any examples prior to his use of the term), in the body of a Cahiers du Cinéma article from July 1953: “Films d’animation au festival de Cannes” (Animation films at the Cannes festival). It is a report on the first specialized international meeting, organized by the Association française pour la diffusion du cinéma (French association for the promotion of cinema), which organized the “Journées du cinéma” (Days of cinema). The article is an explicit attempt to impose “this adventurous animation cinema which insists that a film . . . cannot be anything other than a work felt and arranged frame by frame.” In reading the article, it becomes clear that in the time and place in question, the use of the expression was not self-evident and represented a verbal problem that could not be resolved, even among cinema specialists: “At the international meeting of Cannes [in 1953], animation films, as always, disconcerted enthusiasts and made specialists misspeak. Once again, advertisements, press releases, technical specification sheets, blithely mixed everything
together, confusing marionettes and animated cartoons. As soon as animation film was being discussed, whether they were English or Japanese, translators no longer knew their language and gave in to the same incompetent Esperanto.” Here Martin addresses the cinephile community and clearly underlines the distinction between cinema and films, which thus reveals itself to be one of the historical markers of the invention: “Nevertheless, how can one love the Cinema so much, to what end can it serve to see ALL films, if one is incapable of seeing and following ALL Cinemas.”

Martin took up the expression again with more success the following year and subsequently in all his writings in the 1950s, until the name took hold in common speech, although with some difficulty, since it appeared pleonastic and complicated to commentators. With the third “Journées internationales du cinema d’animation” or “JICA” (International days of animation cinema) in 1960, the phrase became the official, institutionalized name of a grouping that had never been conceived of as such, because the films categorized under this rubric had previously been designated by a variety of expressions: animated cartoons, children’s films, trick films, puppet films, Chinese shadows (for silhouette films), and a few other variations.

Without having undertaken systematic international research—a task that would be impossible for me to do alone—I believe it is possible to locate this terminological dispersal on either side of a worldwide caesura that took place around the year 1955. It is not only a question of word-for-word translation. Even if there is little doubt that the French word animation has been exported directly to other languages, this fact is no more decisive than finding a “first occurrence” of the term. It is, rather, a question of knowing whether there was a spread, during the 1950s (or later) of three characteristics: (1) the use of a noun (animation in French and animation in English) in place of an adjective (animé in French, found in dessin animé, and animated in English, present in animated cartoon); (2) the association of animation with cinéma rather than with films (animation cinema in English); (3) the beginning of a rivalry between the new term and dessin animé (animated cartoon in English), when it is a question of defining a group of films broader than the genre of the animated cartoon, including nongraphic films that were regarded as more or less compositied or manipulated and in this way opposed to the typical recording style perceived as the norm; and (3b) the appearance of a new term, prise de vue directe in French, live action in English, to designate not all cinema but all cinema except for animation cinema.
The association implied by the term *animation cinema* was new because it suggested, beyond the technical correlation between the films, a grouping that might allow for organized screenings and the existence of a community of interest, of spectators (in 1960 the “JICA” were held in Annecy by the militant cinephiles of the largest film club in France) or of artists (the Association internationale du film d’animation [International Association of Animation Film] was created there the same year). To my knowledge, the oldest work that uses the term in its title is Italian, and it ends with a chapter on McLaren and an acknowledgment of the “Journées du cinéma”: *Il cinema di animazione, 1832–1956* by Walter Alberti. The progressive birth of innumerable specialized festivals in the world, and the country-by-country development of the Association internationale du film d’animation, rendered the progressive dissemination of the new expression possible.

**McLaren’s Invention**

From the first specialized public display of *animation cinema* in 1953, which took place then in the form of a thematic projection in a room of the Cannes festival, until the institutionalization of an autonomous festival in the city of Annecy in 1960, Martin himself composed the press releases, programs, and major reports in the French press. He was judge and jury, organizer and critic, almost a lobbyist for animation cinema.

In 1960 the name *animation cinema*, taken up repeatedly from that point on, still had not become established, nor had it entered into common usage: “Thus”—writes Martin again—“a new Festival has just appeared dedicated to animation cinema. This expression might upset the purists who feel it is an annoying pleonasm. Is cinema not inevitably the art of movement, of animation par excellence? Why organize another festival devoted, as it would appear to cinema-cinema or to animation-animation?”

Several historical facts pertaining to McLaren’s career played an undeniable role in the invention. The official position that he was offered by John Grierson in Canada (the creation of an “animation service” in 1942–43, soon after his arrival in 1941, when he was only a simple, unknown experimental filmmaker emigrating in the midst of a war) and what resulted from it in the following decade laid the groundwork for his career. It truly began to take off in the period from 1952 to 1958, which saw the successive release of *Neighbours, Two Bagatelles, Blinkity*
Blank, Rythmetic, A Chairy Tale, and Le Merle. It was the golden age of his filmography. In 1954 his film Two Bagatelles was screened at Cannes, and in 1955 a foundational moment occurred: Blinkity Blank was awarded the Palme d’Or for best short film. Finally, by entrusting, or abandoning, to Martin a few famous lines drafted on “invisible interstices” and “drawn movements”—lines that long served as a flag for the small world of animation—McLaren assured their global transmission in a few short years. Among other places, Martin had them reproduced in their calligraphic form (equal to an illustrated or filmed work) in the special edition of the journal of the French federation of cinema clubs, Cinéma 57, which was created exclusively in order to launch the new form of cinema as defined by the first JICA.12

One likely hypothesis is the historical influence of the film Neighbours on Martin (the film was released in 1952, the year he began writing about cinema). The use of pixilation following more classical techniques was also an invention and a rediscovery of practices used in the early days of cinema. Like animation cinema, pixilation (stop-motion animation of human beings) had always been there but had also been forgotten: it had no name.

Neighbours restored photographic recordings of human bodies to animation; that is to say, at least nominally, it reinserted live-action cinematography into the fabricated, artificial space of stop-motion animation. Pixilation historically brings our understanding of recorded cinema back to our understanding of drawn cinema.

Martin alone was in a position to take full stock of the paradoxes at play—and to allow himself to be submerged by them.13 Neighbours is not merely an example—it is not even paradigmatic of stop-motion animation cinema. It is the blind spot, the impossible space, or rather the utopian nonspace of the term animation cinema championed by Martin. The neighbors in this film, based entirely on doubling and reversal, are revenants because they bring about the return of animated photography (revenant is the first name in French for “cinema”), but also because animation cinema appears as a return of the first days. Cohl used pixilation at least in Le mobilier fidèle (His faithful furniture) (1910) and in Jobard ne ve pas voir les femmes travailler (Jobard doesn’t want to see women working) (1911).

What, precisely, did Cohl represent, in the age of McLaren, in the discourse of Martin?
Emile Cohl’s Invention

Fantasmagorie (1908)

The historian Christophe Gauthier has demonstrated that in France the early 1930s saw the discursive “invention” of precursors, in this way authorizing a rereading of cinema history that reverses the aesthetic genealogy accepted up to that point. French ancestors (primarily Georges Méliès, but also Max Linder) were found for the American directors Cecil B. DeMille and D. W. Griffith, in order to posit them as founders of world cinema as a language. Méliès was not only redeemed but became a founding father of cinema.

The history of animated cartoons that emerged throughout the 1930s, in particular through the dispute over attributing its invention to Cohl, was based on the same premises, adds Gauthier. The new decade began with an article rehabilitating Cohl, exactly contemporaneous to the Méliès Gala on December 16, 1929, and written by a co-organizer of the event, Jean-George Aurio. The conditions for the birth of Fantasmagorie in 1908 and Cohl’s beginnings at the Gaumont film company were discussed, notably in a series of articles in Comoedia in early 1936. And the year 1938 opened with the deaths of Cohl and Méliès, a few hours and a few kilometers apart, after difficult, almost miserable ends, which attest to a truly communal destiny. The idea of a possible commemoration of the anniversary of the “first animated cartoon” arose in part from this double coincidence: the concurrent death in 1938 (January 20 and 21) of two patriarchs with the same pointed white beard, and the affirmation of the 1908 birth of the new cinematic genre of the animated cartoon with Fantasmagorie.

The commemoration fell flat. A monument to Cohl and Méliès was conceived of and financed before the wars, following their simultaneous deaths, but it was never built. Twenty years later, after another world war and another postwar period, the year 1958 marked the fiftieth anniversary of Cohl’s alleged invention, although this memory was not yet truly visible outside of specialist circles. However, the difference twenty years after 1938 was that these specialists existed and the term animation cinema had been introduced. For these reasons, Martin attempted a media operation in the summer of 1958, more or less on his own, likely thanks to the space freed up in the journals during the season.
The Fiftieth Anniversary (1958)

Martin lead a campaign for the commemoration of August 17, 1908, the exact date of the first screening of Fantasmagorie in Paris, in three rather significant journals—Arts, Radio-Cinéma-Télévision, and Cahiers du Cinéma. His procedure can be summed up in three coherently articulated points: (1) the French would have fatally forgotten to commemorate in a dignified manner the anniversary of the worldwide birth, in their country, of the animated cartoon;¹⁸ (2) all the signs of the decline of the classic American animated cartoon, which had until then dominated world production, were in 1958 clearly perceptible and definitive;¹⁹ and (3) a renewal was already visible but, with a few exceptions, it was under way outside both France and the United States (see all the conclusions to the articles of the second stage). This transnational modernity, constituted by “young Czech, Canadian, Polish, Hindu or Yugoslavian productions” (the last words in the September 7 article in Radio-Cinéma-Télévision), or “happy Russian surprises” (the last heading in the May 18 issue of Arts), crossed borders, notably including the iron curtain of the cold war.²⁰

Finally, the legend to an illustration concisely sums up Martin’s three-part logic in which a central place is occupied by the reactivation of the national myth of a certain Cohl, worthy of international merit but forgotten by the state: “No celebration or homage for the Fiftieth Anniversary of the French Animated Cartoon. No more animated cartoon in the Americas. Yet frame-by-frame Cinema continues.”²¹

April 1953

A few years earlier, Martin’s first text published in Cahiers du Cinéma appeared, the manifesto for the “Journées du cinéma” (the principle behind these “days of cinema” was to wholly dedicate a provincial city to cinema for an intensive week), cosigned by Pierre Barbin and Michel Boschet. Although the text did not yet constitute a defense of animation, it already proposed screenings devoted to Cohl and Méliès, identifying them together by the same vivid term: “Makeshift screens, set up on street corners, offer impromptu showings of rapid and energetic films: phantasmagoria by Cohl or Méliès, illustrated poems by Paul Grimault.”²² But phantasmagoria is neither capitalized nor italicized in the original edition.²³ It is certainly a question of a reappropriation of Cohl’s title to make a lexical equivalent of trick films.
The Hundred-Year Anniversary (1977)

In 1977, that is to say twenty years after this period of invention, Martin wrote a small book at the behest of Raymond Maillet, an independent archival historian and the first Cohl specialist who was at the time director of the eleventh JICA in Annecy. Martin expresses in the book, retrospectively, and with more clarity, the place that his historical system accorded to Cohl. In the form of a fictive daily newspaper, the short work titled *Image par image* (Frame by frame) was placed under the following auspices: “Fondateur: Emile Reynaud. 100e année. Directeur : Emile Cohl” (Founder: Emile Reynaud. 100th year. Director: Emile Cohl). The coupling of Reynaud and Cohl is classic in the histories and accounts of animation enthusiasts. It creates a cinematic counterhistory through the use of wordplay, since it makes it possible to avoid placing any definitive birth of the animated cartoon or of the animation film in 1895: the first Emile preceded this threshold by fifteen years, a fact that the second was unaware of when his invention followed it by more than twelve years. In this historical panorama of French animation cinema, Martin left the task of writing the report on Cohl to the specialist Maillet, but he evoked elsewhere the filmmaker’s “seriousness” in his “responsibility to new combinations,” making the rather striking comparison between Cohl’s puppets and schemata taken from the notebooks of a contemporary, Ludwig Wittgenstein.

Anachronisms

Martin views Cohl as a pioneer. In this case, a solitary worker who values the everyday invention of new, expeditious techniques commensurate with one man, a singular island in an economy that could not assimilate him nor make him fit into its framework.

But a pioneer or, according to Martin, a “primitive,” is not the protagonist of a nationalist discourse on the past. Cohl was not, in himself, a patrimonial resource to be profited from, a treasure of French history or a genius who gave everything to the Americans. On the contrary, he was a present energy, a nonchronological event that returned in the current McLarenian moment of international creation, more precisely in its most advanced stage, which was geared toward the future of the art of animation, an art that invents new techniques consistent with a poetics and a concrete, expressive necessity. Regarding McLaren, Martin asserts in an article titled “N’oublions pas le mode d’emploi” (Let’s not
forget the owner’s manual): “In the same way, browsing through the reel of unreleased negatives of that other pioneer, Emile Cohl, I was not surprised to discover (notably in *Le peintre néo-impressionniste* [The neo-impressionist painter]) an example of that discontinuous animation which, forty-five years later, would impassion Norman McLaren when he had pushed his attempts at drawn-on-film animation to the limit with *Blinkity Blank*.”

The movement of an anachronistic history continued with a word from McLaren reported and commented on by Martin in January 1958: “When he saw himself ranked among the pantheon of avant-garde creators, Norman McLaren, more aware of origins, protested: ‘Put me, rather, with the rear-guard, after Cohl, Fischinger and Len Lye.’ In fact it was Emile Cohl who, long ago, first gave the example of solitary animation, of schematic drawing, and of analogical freedom in the development.”

In a more theoretical passage on McLaren, Martin evokes Stéphane Mallarmé and Paul Valéry to situate the “problem of the subject” specific to animation, the precise location where it moves away from the rest of cinema, all the while digging deeper into the central question (the philosophical basis of Martin’s contribution was to invent, for cinema, such an “outside thought”). Against “dramatic, oratory or comedic” contemporary cinema, McLaren sustains interest with purely abstract material “because movement is enough to make him happy.” And Martin adds: “Emile Cohl, possessed by the *demon of analogy*, also directed films of pure, perpetual movement *that had no beginning and no end*.” For our part, we could name this magnificent intuition that Cohl’s work offers to Martin “the demonic analogy.” Because, in effect, the realist strength of the movement of objects and bodies in animation constitutes an analogical force no less important than that of photomechanical reproduction (if animated images resemble each other to the point of passing from one to another imperceptibly, then they can just as well transform, in the spectator’s experience, into real bodies and objects). Paradoxically, this idea opposes the autonomy of an animation cut off from cinema; on the contrary, it comes full circle to locate a troubling effect at the edge of cinematographic realism.

Moreover, the fact that Cohl’s films have “no beginning and no end” recalls a more general question brought to light by Martin, one pertaining to community and cinematography: animation cinema’s capacity for national and chronological unmooring. One could say, effectively, that Martin’s specific ideological contribution can be located in the af-
firmation of the art of animation’s fundamental absence of chronological inevitability, and in the instinctive negation of the traditional history that went hand in hand, in his writing, with a refusal of geopolitics and established national borders. This study of his discourse reveals a temporality less subject to chronology, in order to return to Martin’s instinctive practice of a history that goes against the grain.

Notes

1. Clarens, André Martin. It is a remarkable critical anthology, accompanied by contextualization that gives several precise and original historical points regarding the history of French cinema culture. It brings together critical articles spanning, without exception, 1952 to 1965. Nevertheless, the collection represents less than a third of Martin’s complete works.

2. Martin published his first article in 1952 in L’Âge du Cinéma, and his last written publication known to date is an encyclopedia entry published in 1987 in L’encyclopædia universalis. After this date, a debilitating illness prevented him from working. In France, beyond his activity in film criticism in the 1950s (forty-nine articles in Cahiers du Cinéma between 1953 and 1960), and more occasionally in Radio Cinéma Télévision, France Observateur, Le Cinéma Chez Soi, Le Cinéma Pratique, Artsept, Cinéma Quebec, Images et Son, Banc-titre, and a few other locations, he was a general delegate of an association for the promotion of cinema subsidized by the state (the Association française de diffusion du cinéma), in which the current festival in Annecy has its origins. He was also present at the creation of the Groupe de recherche image (Image Research Group) in 1961 at the Office de radiodiffusion-télévision française (French Office of Radio-Television); was producer and director of animation films in association with Michel Boschet (with the company Les films Martin-Boschet); and then, in 1970–80, upon his return from a visit to Canada, was a research engineer at the Institut national de l’audiovisuel (National Audiovisual Institute), charged with reflecting on the future of images and in particular CGI. To this end, he contributed to the founding of Imagina in Monte Carlo in 1981. In Canada, after a first trip at the invitation of the festival in Montreal in 1961, Martin was brought on by Pierre Juneau in 1965 as the director of research services at the Canadian Radio-television and Telecommunications Commission, and he lived in Montreal from 1966 to 1974 with his family. He directed films there and prepared the International Retrospective of the Cinema of Animation that the Cinémathèque canadienne (future Cinémathèque québécoise) offered on the occasion of the 1967 International and Universal Exposition in Montreal; his fabulous giant synoptic chart “Origin and Golden Age of the American Cartoon from 1906 to 1941” was exhibited at this occasion. He conversed with Marshall McLuhan, whom Martin helped to introduce in France in a long article documented in Image et Son in 1965, and he made an unpublished series of recorded and transcribed interviews with Northrop Frye in 1968–69.
3. On Cohl, see Crafton, *Emile Cohl, Caricature, and Film*; and for recent French works, see Courtet-Cohl and Génin, *Émile Cohl*; Vignaux and Courtet-Cohl, *Emile Cohl*; and Vimenet, *Emile Cohl*.

4. See Dufoix, *La dispersion*, 14–28. These pages in particular offer a useful panorama of the diverse schools of thought—historical, philosophical, and philological—that have worked on a historical semantics that has proposed histories of the word. See also, in the artistic sphere, Roque, *Qu’est-ce que l’art abstrait?* Neither of these two studies ever anticipates a predefined object that would exist before its naming and the use that its interpreters would make of it. The first part of the work that came out of my doctoral thesis followed the same approach, interrogating the term *animation cinema*. See Joubert-Laurencin, *La lettre volante*, 35–68. In critiquing the reprisal of the Austinian notion of “performativity” by the French sociologist Pierre Bourdieu, which he judges erroneous, Stéphane Dufoix proposes the idea of the “formativity” of words to designate, in their progressive polysemic dispersal, their influence on reality when they are successful and widely revived in different places and times.


9. What followed this history is not the subject of this chapter, but it is notable that the definition and the delimitation of *animation* was followed by violent modifications: the end of the institutional restriction to frame-by-frame animation in 1980 by the Association internationale du film d’animation during the Zagreb festival (see Joubert-Laurencin, *La lettre volante*, 41–42), and the end of the trenchant break between animation cinema and live-action cinema as a result of the advent of the digital age (see Joubert-Laurencin, “Le cinéma d’animation n’existe plus”).


11. Before 1953 *animation* and *animated film* existed in specialized vocabulary. It is possible to follow the slow modification of the vocabulary in the revisions to the small volume *Technique du cinéma* in the scholarly paperback series of the Presses Universitaires de France, titled “Que sais-je?” written by Joseph-Marie Lo Duca, also the writer of the trailblazing book *Le dessin animé*. In the first edition (1943), the chapter “Technique du dessin animé” (“Animated Cartoon Technique”) aims to be prophetic (“Animated cartoons tend to evolve. The ‘one turn, one picture’ technique has just begun”) and proposes an initial rough classification of stop-motion films, described as a “branch of cinematography.” Lo Duca, *Technique du cinéma* (1943), 115. The return of the same classificatory table in Lo Duca’s specialized 1948 work is unchanged, as is the 1956 edition, but the 1971 edition adds a name to this “branch,” which is still not “animation cinema,” but “animation films” (113).

presented by Martin, is the following with underlining and the lapsus of the crossed out *that*: “Animation is not the art of **drawings**-that-move but the art of **movements**-that-are **drawn**. What happens *between* each frame is much more important than what exists *on* each frame. Animation is therefore the art of manipulating the invisible *that* interstices that lie between frames. Norman McLaren.”

13. In fact, Martin must have had a belated awareness, or perhaps was never able to see *On the Farm* (directed by McLaren in 1951), in which the word *pixilation* appeared for the first time in the closing credits, based on *pixie* or *pixilated*, a word found in a philological discussion in *Mr. Deeds Goes to Town* (directed by Frank Capra in 1936; the word appears ninety-four and ninety-five minutes in). Martin uses circumlocutions rather than *la pixillation* in 1953, and again in 1958. See Martin, “Films d’animation au festival de Cannes,” 39. And, exceptionally, one of his final encyclopedia entries in Passek, *Dictionnaire du cinéma*, “Animation (techniques de l)” (22–25), which is dedicated to the subject, manages neither to spell (he only puts a single *l*) nor to define the technique (he cites two animations of objects in two of Cohl’s films, whereas pixilation is defined, precisely, in opposition to the animation of objects, by the presence of human bodies in the field of vision).


17. On December 21, 1937, a few weeks before the death of the two French pioneers, the animated cartoon saw renewed interest worldwide with the American release of Disney’s *Snow White and the Seven Dwarfs* at Carthay Circle Theatre in Hollywood. On the film’s reception in France, see the indispensable, encyclopedic dissertation of Sébastien Roffat, “L’émergence d’une école française de dessin animé sous l’Occupation (1940–1944),” 116–28 and appendixes 7, 11, 12, and 15.


20. Martin, something of a legal activist, certainly thinks of animation and its festivals (the triangle Annecy-Zagreb-Ottawa of the 1960 to 1980s) as a means of saving the artists from the countries under the yoke of communism.


23. The original edition is *Cahiers du Cinéma*, no. 22 (April 1953).

24. The twenty-four-page pamphlet published on the occasion of the eleventh annual “Journées Internationales du Cinéma d’Animation: 14–18 juin 1977,” alongside the exhibition *Cent ans de dessins animés 1877–1977*, which was held at the Musée-Château d’Annecy, summer 77, Bernard Clarens Collection; it is not reproduced in Clarens, *André Martin*. The year 1877 represents when Emile Reynaud received the patent for the praxinoscope, which marks, according to Martin, who justifies this date on the first page, “not only the beginning of the idea of animated cinema but also the beginning of this very particular form of cinema in France.”

