*Introduction*

# PHOTOGRAPHS AS RUPTURE AND AFFECT IN GERMAN FILM

*Carrie Collenberg-González and Martin P. Sheehan*

As the building blocks of moving pictures, still photographs have been integral to cinema since its inception, and the relationship between these visual media has only grown more connected and complicated over time. Photographs have countless manifestations and connotations because the social relationship—the interaction between photographic practice, world, image, and user—represents what John Roberts calls "an endlessly englobing and organizational process in which representations of self, other, 'we,' and the collective are brought to consciousness as part of everyday social exchange and struggle."[1] The act of making a photograph, viewing it, or placing it into a new context (especially into a filmic context) has the potential to bring to "consciousness" certain "representations" of aesthetic, epistemological, and cultural realities that might otherwise go unnoticed.

Given this potential, photographic images often take on a disruptive function when encountered within a film's narrative. As artifacts outside cinema and the cinematic realities of film, photographs can function as visual representations of past realities that are reinserted into the present, thereby bringing attention to these past realities. As formal ruptures, photographs have an affective function that prompts action, thought, or emotion in a way that can inspire the construction (or destruction) of meaning, understanding, or feeling. When bodies encounter photographs in film, an intensity seems to pass into those bodies and inspire in them emotional, mental, or physical movement. This affective dimension can register as corporeal senses (vision and touch), memory, a recognition of the uncanny, a source of information

or evidence—not one more than the other but, rather, all at once and with infinite hermeneutic potential determined not just by subjective approaches, but also by the encounter between a subject and an object and the contexts in which they are viewed and by whom.

Photographic theory and film theory have a kind of sibling relationship: they share parts of their DNA and inform one another at times, yet they exist independently and sometimes clash. Emerging in the modern period, both media prompted similar concerns about form, content, affect, and representation, as evident in the work of prominent early twentieth-century philosophers and critics like Walter Benjamin and Siegfried Kracauer. Enlightenment and modern philosophy about aesthetics and representation, in turn, informed the work of midcentury and postmodern critics, including André Bazin, Roland Barthes, Susan Sontag, David Campany, Gilles Deleuze, Kaja Silverman, and others. Yet, despite this shared critical heritage, the relationship between photography and film and, in particular, photographs *in* film diverge in two crucial areas—a photograph's status as evidence and the stillness of photographic images. Campany, for example, argues that examples of photography in cinema most often concern the photograph's "complex status as evidence" because "the 'proof' of photography as memory or history is nearly always at stake."[2] He posits that viewing a photograph in film differs greatly from viewing that same photograph in real life: "Film tends to overstate the photograph's difference, while presenting that difference as if it were essence. We see the photograph exaggerated by those qualities that distinguish it from film: its stillness, its temporal fixity, its objecthood, its silence, its deathliness, even."[3] Campany's neat distinction echoes the concerns of his critical predecessors and suggests that the relationship between photographs *in* film hinges on the notion of rupture: that is, photographs in film disrupt foundational beliefs about as well as desires for truth, time, space, life, and death.

A prominent debate in the scholarly literature on photography and film concerns the relationship between stillness (photographs, stills, freezeframes) and motion (film).[4] Even the term *moving pictures* implies such a differentiation, which has only grown more fraught with the ascent of digital technologies. Eivind Røssaak established the stillness/motion distinction as a defining feature of photography in film in his 2011 volume of collected essays covering what he identifies as three phases in which this distinction developed and how it can be observed over time: "a turn to the *in-between*, a turn to history, and a turn to algorithms."[5] Other volumes explore the stillness/motion dynamic as well. Laurent Guido and Oliver Lugon, for instance, posit that much

twentieth-century scholarship on film and photography was informed by this dynamic even as "the two media ceaselessly crossed the boundary and blended these categories."[6] Similarly, Karen Beckman and Jean Ma argue "for the impossibility of watching the movement without simultaneously watching the stasis and the media that produce these effects."[7] "The hesitation between stasis and motion," Beckman and Ma observe, "actually produces an interval in which rigorous thinking can emerge."[8] The present volume also acknowledges the critical potential of stillness/motion, and many of the chapters in this volume rely on arguments defined by this distinction.

However, the critical power of stillness/motion seems to be located in the rupture of one or the other—that is, stillness is defined by its disruption of motion, just as motion is defined by its disruption of stillness. Photographic theory often deals in such binaries—not just stillness/motion, but also life/death, truth/fiction, past/present—and their inherent tensions that only become more compounded in film. But the critical moment is located in the disruption of the aforementioned binaries and the assumptions, beliefs, and dreams associated with them. Defining the use of photographs in film (and in general) as a rupture enables us to accept what we already know and what has captured our imagination since the beginning of their interaction—that is, despite representing radical breaks that mark the sudden end of one condition (i.e., motion) and the beginning of another (i.e., stillness), photographs problematize the borders that seem to separate the binaries, thereby bringing attention to these borders.

While the notion of rupture can also be applied to the transnational potential of cinema, it is central to a specifically German cinema and cultural history. For example, the numerous, radical breaks in German political history serve as the organizing principle of Sabine Hake's *German National Cinema*.[9] To be sure, in several contributions in this volume, the photographs in a particular film are explored in terms of their relationship to the film's historical, cultural context. Although a specifically "German" approach to photographs in film does not emerge across the volume, what the analyzed films do have in common is that the ruptures they depict are analogous to the historical and social context they represent that is itself defined by ruptures. The sudden disjuncture of time, space, memory, and narrative represented by photographs draw our consciousness and curiosity, but it is only in context that one can begin to make meaning from these frames and the ruptures they represent. Taking into account the reception of photographs, photographs in film, and the diegetic and national contexts of the films analyzed, the

social relations created by these ruptures are also significant. Several chapters in this volume explore how ruptures in assumptions of truth, time, life, and death are connected to (and impacted by) the body and inform specifically German relationships to understanding the past and resisting or accepting hegemonic narratives.

If we understand *affect* to mean the impact of an encounter between one body and another, then in the case of this volume, it can also refer to the encounter between a photograph and a film, between a photograph and those within the filmic reality, and between a photograph on film and its viewers. The role played by the spectator's body and mind is essential to understanding how cinema and photography intersect because the reception of both media depends on the aesthetic, cultural, social, and productive contexts in which they are deployed. "The body," Røssaak argues, "is not just the carrier of a personal history, but a storage site and an intensified receptive surface in a media-saturated society. Thus, the body belongs to a history of media and mediations."[10] How the meaning associated with these practices is constructed depends both on the mind and body, as well as their relationship to history. Because the acts of touching, looking at, creating, displaying, using, distributing, or manipulating photographs are often physical in nature, these acts necessarily engage the spectator's body.

Acknowledging the interaction between photographs and the spectator's body (including their experience and memory) paves the way for understanding the wide-ranging affective register of photographs in film. The body as a site of a personal connection to images must also be understood within the larger political context, which determines how images are used and received. Photographs *move* us, and while the viewer makes sense of the photograph, the photograph, in a way, also makes sense of the viewer and the contexts in which they encounter the image.

By exploring the use of photographs in German cinema from Expressionism to the Berlin School, this volume addresses the shifting formal and narrative roles that photographs can play in films. Each chapter investigates what is suggested within diegetic and extra-diegetic contexts when photographs are encountered in German films. Together, the chapters in this volume engage with and build on a multidisciplinary scholarship to demonstrate the effects of photographic rupture and affect in German cinema.[11] Hake defines German cinema itself as "a site of crises, ruptures, and antagonisms, but also of unexpected influences, affinities, and continuities."[12] These historical ruptures are analogous to the act of making a photograph and represent ruptures of continuity

on a number of levels, which are also related to established concepts in media studies like stillness/motion and to German cultural history that has itself been defined in terms of rupture over the years. When photography was invented, Susie Linfield asserts, the medium almost immediately "inspired a host of conflicts and anxieties in participants, critics and onlookers."[13] Given the tumultuous and violent record of twentieth-century German history, how it exploited representation for ideological violence, and the ethical and moral dimensions of creating images in general, it is hardly surprising that German films have a cautious relationship to images and photographs in particular. And yet, despite the photograph's ability to bear witness to history, their use in German film also transcends the confines of national cinema and culture and tells us more about the human condition in general.

*** 

Other edited volumes address the relationship between photography and cinema—or how photographs function within cinema—but none investigate this topic within a specifically German context. To address this gap in scholarship, we convened a seminar at the 2017 German Studies Association conference, where many of these contributions were first discussed. Although not exhaustive, the eleven chapters in this volume present diverse perspectives about how photographs work in both the most canonical and less well-known films throughout the last one hundred years of German film history. They are just as likely to share overarching trends about the multidimensional potential of photographs and their relationship to rupture, affect, memory, and the politics of representation as they are to contradict each other and to raise more questions. To be sure, this volume is not attempting to present a diachronic exploration of photographs in German film. We have arranged the chapters chronologically for the sake of convenience and to situate them within their historical moments that correspond to general eras of German national cinema. Like photographs themselves, the essays refer to specific historical moments while simultaneously inhabiting multiple temporalities that resist such categorization. If it were possible to achieve, we would have them all exist at once.

The first chapter highlights the significance of photographs in Zille films, an understudied yet popular genre in Weimar cinema that attempted to emulate the milieu and visual style of Berlin illustrator and photographer Heinrich Zille. Jason Doerre's "Layers of Exposure: The Photographic Approach in Gerhart Lamprecht's Zille Film *Slums of*

*Berlin* (1925)" examines *Slums of Berlin*, the first Zille film that is based on the artist's biography, features Zille himself in the opening scenes, and dissolves his illustrations into moving pictures. By drawing upon archival sources and the work of Siegfried Kracauer, Doerre argues that Lamprecht employs a photographic approach that merges the naturalism of Zille's work with strategies of New Objectivity in film. *Slums of Berlin* relies on the evidentiary quality of photographs to depict the faces and places of the urban poor in Berlin but offers no explicit solution to the problems that plague this milieu—struggles that the characters and Zille himself experienced. Born into the fifth estate, these figures also used photography as a means to a higher station, a vantage point from which they could critically examine, reflect upon, and share their experience. In a similar fashion, *Slums of Berlin* uses photographic dimensions to represent the lives of these characters and provide the viewer with the opportunity to inhabit and reflect upon the social conditions of Weimar Berlin between 1918 and 1933.

Josef von Sternberg's film *The Blue Angel* is one of the most well-known films of the late Weimar period that produced some of the most beloved and influential films in international cinema history. In "Objecting Objects: Photographs and Subjectivity in *The Blue Angel* (1930)," Martin P. Sheehan provides a new take on the film in his exploration of how photographic postcards exert an increasingly disruptive force throughout Sternberg's film. Drawn toward the tantalizing promotional photographic postcards of Marlene Dietrich's character, Lola Lola, numerous male figures assert a sense of agency and superiority over the images. However, Sheehan examines how the film juxtaposes instances of assumed control with assertive chaos that feature the photographs to challenge the ostensible subjectivity and upper-class hegemony of men. The images unravel the prevailing order or presumed reality and gain the upper hand by disrupting several aspects of the film's visual and narrative space: the presumed sanctity of the classroom, Professor Rath's superiority, and the conventional power dynamics between teacher and student and man and woman. In so doing, *The Blue Angel* illuminates what Siegfried Kracauer terms the "flood of images" (*Bilderflut*)—that is, the rapid increase of printed photographs in mass media periodicals that began to impact the social and political order during the Weimar period by threatening perceived notions of power, gender, and representation.

In the wake of World War II, so-called "Adenauer films" continued to display the acute understanding of the potentially persuasive and pernicious effects that still and moving images had during the National

Socialist period under the direction of Reich Minister of Propaganda Joseph Goebbels. Adenauer films—that is, postwar films produced between 1949 and 1963 when Konrad Adenauer served as the first Chancellor of the Federal Republic of Germany—attempted to navigate a post-National–Socialist world by delineating a path to normality while calling to bear witness. In "Before- and Afterlives: On the Stillness of Photographs at the Outset of Adenauer Cinema," John Davidson examines postwar films that use photographs to seek a mode of redemption through Christianity and reflect the attempts of Christian institutions that sought to refashion their role as moral arbiters in Germany. Examining films that reflect this attempt through their intermedial treatment of photographs and the formal problem of stillness posed in their relationship to finitude and death, his chapter argues that these films forecast a Barthesian understanding of photographs as both witnesses of lives that went before and vessels of death in a postreligious society. According to Davidson, these films employ dialogue and animation to combat the photograph's stillness and visually reassert the religious in the form of a cinematic afterlife. Davidson's analysis illuminates an important transition in this understudied period of German film history before the 1962 Oberhausen Manifesto that launched the New German Cinema.

The New German Cinema (1962–81) is known for departing radically from film conventions, for being concerned with and interrogating the past, and for refusing to accept the image of Germany as portrayed by the mainstream media in Germany and abroad. Stefanie Harris draws on this context in "Filming after Walker Evans: Wim Wenders' 'American Photographs' in *Kings of the Road* (1976)" by analyzing how Wenders' film incorporates the material and aesthetic structures of Evans' photobook *American Photographs* (1938). Translating Evans' photographic record of Americans during the Great Depression to his film, Wenders documents Bruno Winter and Robert Landers as they travel through border towns in West Germany and visit various movie theaters along the way. From the composition of the shots to their serial organization, Wenders creates a visual catalog of the everyday. He documents the film industry's decline as well as generational and technological change while simultaneously presenting and thus tenderly preserving the German postwar social condition. By reframing how photographs represent reality in a society flooded with commercial and industrial imagery, Harris argues that Wenders' incorporation of Evans' documentary style functions as a metaphor for critical inquiry and a model for criticism during a distinct political and

cultural moment in postwar West Germany that resists and reflects the American colonization of the West German psyche during this period.

In 1946, just one year after the end of World War II, the film studio DEFA (*Deutsche Film-Aktiengesellschaft*) was founded in the Soviet-Occupied Zone in East Germany. This studio became responsible for all East German films until it was officially dissolved in 1992 after the fall of the Berlin wall and Germany's reunification. Although films produced by DEFA are often understood to correspond to the studio's attempt to reeducate Germans and convey a unified image of East Germany that corresponded to the tenets of Socialist Realism, the DEFA Studio for Documentary Films (*DEFA-Studio für Wochenschau und Dokumentarfilme*) also produced experimental films by Jürgen Böttcher. In "The Transgression of Overpainting: Jürgen Böttcher's Radical Experiments with Intermediality in *Transformations* (1981)," Matthew Bauman outlines how Böttcher's trilogy of nonnarrative films uses photographs to provide a rare East German commentary on the intersection of painting, photography, film, identity, and resistance. Bauman argues that Böttcher's documentation of his artistic process—overpainting and reframing photo-postcards of art historical images that he then rephotographs and projects as diapositive slides onto various surfaces—challenges the perceived authority of representation in a repressive state. At the same time, Böttcher uses his role as a filmmaker to document (and thus reassert) his identity as his anarchic alter ego Strawalde, whose work was rejected by the state apparatus. By using photography as a bridge between his painter and film-maker personalities, Böttcher engages with and challenges Western conceptions of visual media and provides thoughtful responses to foundational texts of the field that challenge the orthodoxies imposed on the East German artistic community as much as they inspired avant-garde artists and filmmakers to follow in his footsteps.

German film history changed radically after the reunification of East and West Germany in 1990 and brought forth a new style of filmmaking, which Eric Rentschler dubbed the "cinema of consensus."[14] Rentschler uses the term disparagingly to lament the decline of the New German Cinema strategies in exchange for popular and conventional approaches to filmmaking and national identity. Although Rentschler locates these films between 1985 and the late 1990s, they were produced well into the twenty-first century. In "The Promise of Agency: Photographs and Value in *Tattoo* (2002)," Cynthia Porter outlines the conventional uses of photographs to drive the narrative and contribute to character development in Robert Schwentke's crime-thriller. Set in

the wake of the body art renaissance of the 1990s, *Tattoo* follows two Berlin homicide detectives as they investigate a series of crimes that are linked by one primary detail: each dead body they discover is missing a large swath of tattooed skin. Porter also delineates how digital photographs of the tattoos in the film respond to the value consideration of tattoos as art objects that can be viewed, bought, and sold. Her chapter is an example of the unwieldy potential of photographs that, on the one hand, comply with generic conventions of consensus films that audiences have come to expect and, on the other hand, speak to cultural practices that question boundaries and the politics of representation through photographs, in films, or on skin.

Rentschler's cinema of consensus also encompasses heritage films— lavish period films that draw their power by creating consumable pasts that ensnare the audience in the film's world through a spectacular mise-en-scène. While Lutz Koepnick's seminal article on German heritage films about the Holocaust anchored them in the 1990s, they continue well into the twenty-first century.[15] This volume includes two chapters that examine the use of photographs in German heritage films from different angles. The first, Reinhard Zachau's "Curating the Image: Visual Intertextuality in *The Baader Meinhof Complex* (2008)," investigates the intermedial references to literary and cinematic texts within the larger film about the early history of Germany's radical leftwing terrorist organization, the Red Army Faction (RAF). Zachau illustrates how the film broadens conventional limits of the heritage film genre by documenting strategies throughout the film to recall iconic press photos, nouvelle vague films, and paintings from Gerhard Richter's cycle *October 18, 1977*. The images examined in this chapter and their cinematic, literary, and aesthetic resonance subsequently blur any semblance of truth or history of the group, except the one that exists in the image itself and its exchange with the viewer. As such, *The Baader Meinhof Complex* can be understood as a heritage film that reminds and reinitiates a multigenerational and international audience into a complex visual heritage located at the convergence of violence, ideology, and representation and initiates a post-RAF mourning process for subsequent generations.

The second examination of heritage films investigates the photographic character of memory in three separate German films that respectively address the Holocaust, the GDR, and the Gastarbeiter period. Carrie Collenberg-González's "Re-Presenting German Heritage Films: Photographic Memory in *Aimée & Jaguar* (1999), *Good Bye, Lenin!* (2003), and *Almanya: Welcome to Germany* (2011)" shows how the story of each film

creates a self-enclosed world that is structured by photographs—either by reanimated flashbacks in *Aimée & Jaguar* that present Lilly Wust's memory of Felice Schragenheim, by the chiastic strategies employed with moving and still images of Berlin and Christiane Kerner in *Good Bye, Lenin!* that highlight Alex's coming of age and coming to terms with the death of his mother and the GDR, or through optically unconscious elements of family photographs and postmemory in *Almanya: Welcome to Germany*. Extending the work of Ulrich Baer, Collenberg-González shows how the structural similarities between photographs and trauma relate to German heritage films by using consensus-driven strategies to represent significant (and marketable) historical periods in twentieth-century Germany. The photographs in these films can thus also serve as an analogy for the representation of history and a processing of trauma that is specific to German national cinema.

In stark contrast to market-driven consensus films, the slower-paced Berlin School films of the early twenty-first century embrace a new film aesthetic that challenges conventional modes of seeing and interpreting the past, thereby evincing an embrace of transnational cinema. In "Imaging the 'Good Life': Destabilizing Subjecthood and Conceptions of the Normative Family in *Ghosts* (2005)," Simone Pfleger employs the work of Queer theorist Lauren Berlant to explore the role computer-generated photographs play in the film. Pfleger examines how director Christian Petzold challenges the fantasy of a "good life" depicted in a photograph—a life of connection for the film's protagonist within a nuclear family unit, grounded in cisgender heteronormativity. According to Pfleger, the film resists a redemptive reading of the images and thus critiques the oppressive presence (and persistence) of heteronormative familial structures, which reflect larger transnational and universal struggles that can certainly be found within German society but are not limited to it. As Pfleger concludes, the film encourages the audience to become active, critical participants in the viewing experience while negotiating their own investment in "good life" fantasies.

From Wiene's *The Cabinet of Dr. Caligari* (1920) to Jörg Buttgereit's *Nekromantik* series, the history of the horror film genre in Germany reflects the cultural anxieties that rose in response to national traumas. Although German horror did not develop at the same rate as the horror genre internationally, the global, environmental, and political crises since the turn of the twenty-first century have initiated an increased production in these types of films. In "Violence, Death, and Photographs: Capturing the (Un)Dead in *Rammbock* (2010)," Melissa Etzler illuminates the complex relationship that the use of photographs, cam-

eras, and flash units have within the zombie horror genre. Applying ideas by Roland Barthes, Friedrich Kittler, and Walter Benjamin, Etzler demonstrates how the instances of photography (both in analog and digital formats) elevate the film from a generic zombie tale about undying love to a critical and darker social commentary on German culture. Photographs, she argues, are used to manipulate memory, dominate others, control identity, and rewrite or immortalize the past in a desperate attempt to anchor the present. In this manner, *Rammbock* can be read allegorically as a commentary on modern warfare, violence, and *Vergangenheitsbewältigung* (coming to terms with the past).

In "Possible Archives: Encountering a Surveillance Photo in *Karl Marx City* (2016)," Anke Pinkert investigates the complex role photography plays in mediating personal and public memory. The intermedial relations between still and moving images throughout the film reveal how the indeterminacy of the archive destabilizes the self-legitimizing notion of the Stasi Records Agency (*BStU-Der Bundesbeauftragte für die Unterlagen des Staatssicherheitsdienstes der ehemaligen Deutschen Demokratischen Republik*) as the sole authority on East German life. *Karl Marx City* documents Petra Epperlein (the film's codirector and autobiographical subject) as she returns home to former East Germany and explores the Stasi Records Agency to determine whether her late father had served as a government informant. This chapter argues that the handling and placement of archival photographs demonstrate how photography in the film moves beyond the evidentiary in the production of personal and public memory, thereby illuminating slippages in the hegemonic control of visual records in the aftermath of historical erasure. Like many of the chapters presented in this volume, Pinkert questions the form, content, and context of images and raises questions about where and how memory is stored and the tension between personal and public memory.

As demonstrated above, many of the chapters in this volume explore the ruptures that photographs cause in the cinematic time of the film, the narrative, and the character and viewer's experience of time and memory. The characters and audience experience the use of photographs in film on an affective spectrum that *moves* them on various analytical, psychological, and corporeal registers. The chapters examine the role of photographs in German film from different perspectives—they cite their use to relate the viewer to the characters, to disrupt personal and political hegemonies and heteronormative paradigms, to represent fantasies of cultural or national identity, and to serve as structural analogies for trauma, violence, and *Vergangenheitsbewältigung*. In

the conclusion to the volume, "Toward a *Camera Ludica*: Agency and Photography in Videogame Ecologies," Curtis L. Maughan examines the various and ever-multiplying processes of photography that shape gaming culture in and beyond videogame worlds. In a discussion that links player agency to the 2017 game *Attentat 1942*, theoretical considerations of Game Studies scholars Sebastian Möring and Marco de Mutiis, and the works of media artist Thomas Hawranke, Maughan shows how the procedural and participatory essence of photography in gaming provides helpful footholds as photography and film become ever more complicated by digital media ecologies. Maughan's conclusion outlines the potential of video game studies to help imagine new perspectives that illuminate the role agency plays in the discussion of photographs and cinematic and digital media.

   As the first study of photographs in German film, this volume inevitably cannot claim to be exhaustive in terms of its contribution to debates on photography and cinema, in the conclusions that are drawn from examining photographs and their use in German cinema in the aforementioned chapters, nor in the analyses of German films that employ photographs. For example, it does not address some of the most iconic German films well known for their use of photographs, like *People on Sunday*, *The Legend of Paul and Paula*, *Redupers*, *Alice in the Cities*, *Run Lola Run*, and many others. It also does not include chapters that address the use of photographs in storyboards, promotional materials, and the distribution of German films, which would also be relevant. Nonetheless, we hope that the films analyzed in this volume demonstrate the significance of this formal question, and we are certain that the chapters herein promise to be a significant contribution to visual studies that will initiate further explorations of the photographs and German cinema.

<p style="text-align:center">***</p>

Although our initial task was to locate what is specifically "German" about the use of photographs in the films discussed in this volume, ascribing a national character to the diverse and multidimensional cultural work of photographs in German film remains a challenge. As Andrés Mario Zervigón writes in *Photography and Germany*, it is "just as difficult to designate a distinctly German photography as it is to define German identity as a whole."[16] Like Zervigón, we recognize the "problem of designation"[17] inherent in a project that attempts to draw connections between a nation and photographic media, or, in our case,

its intersection with national cinema. However, if Zervigón is correct that "photography as both an innovation and a way to make innumerable images helped construct notions of Germany and the German in the modern age,"[18] it has been productive to explore how photographs in German films are entangled within the inextricable relationship between identity and representation in the twentieth and early twenty-first centuries, even if the conclusions do not yield definitive results.

Germany's founding as a cohesive, modern nation and its subsequent grappling with identity coincide with the development of photographic and film technologies. Despite the illusion of stability and unity created by the unification of Germany into the German empire under Otto von Bismarck in 1871, the nation has over the years undergone volatile changes in its form (leadership, borders, political systems) and content (citizens, cultural production). From its inception in 1839, photography took on the role of documenting German nationalist fantasies in 1871, a role that continues today.[19] In 1895, almost twenty-five years after the 1871 unification of Germany, German brothers Max and Emil Skladanowsky presented their films at the Wintergarten Ballroom in Berlin, and French brothers Auguste and Louis Lumière projected their ten short films in Paris—marking what David Campany has called, "the first meeting of photography and cinema."[20] These dates serve to anchor the intersection of photography, film, and Germany in an origin story that began in the nineteenth-century and continued throughout the twentieth century. This intersection has subsequently informed modernity in historically specific ways that align with and reflect rapid technological changes in visual media, politics, and society.

Films are cultural products, and, as such, context is paramount. In *German National Cinema*, Sabine Hake explains that German films were created in a specific social, historical, and cultural context that absolutely must be acknowledged: "Thus positioned between the national and transnational, and the local and the global, film must be seen as an integral part of social and cultural history, with the myriad stories, characters, places, lineages, and sounds amounting to an imaginary archive of hopes, desires, ambitions, joys, anxieties, resentments, and what Siegfried Kracauer calls the 'daydreams of society.'"[21] Following Hake's assertion "that film must be seen as an integral part of social and cultural history," this volume does consider specific motifs in German film as responses to and reflections of their national context. However, whereas Hake approaches German film through a primarily historical lens, the chapters in this volume instead have the intermedial phenomena—the photographs and the films they appear in—at their core. Also,

while Hake follows a diachronic approach that "remains committed to the conceptual and didactic advantages of a master-narrative,"[22] this volume offers readers numerous case studies (of both canonical films and lesser-known works) to illuminate the myriad ways photographs in film might offer insight into German cultural products at critical points in the country's history from the Weimar Republic to a unified twenty-first century Germany.

Photographs in film pose a formal rupture that often initiates debate regarding stillness and motion. Consequently, this rupture creates an encounter with the viewer who reacts to the image and its formal constellations. This reaction, or affect, can take infinite forms and is dependent on the viewer, context, and history of the image and its use. As a tool employed in various genres to specifically German forms of *Vergangenheitsbewältigung*, photographs serve as ruptures that initiate moments of contemplation that show a character's complicit hand in using images to construct memory and how the character interacts with those photographic objects. How a character interacts with a photograph can suggest a conscious attempt to create (and thus control or combat) the past in the creation of a photograph. Alternatively, characters might dovetail a photograph's associative potential with manageable narratives that fit into desires of those characters while also reflecting the desire for a moment, if one is willing to accept that films reflect the culture in which they arise. In summary, the chapters as individual parts work together and demonstrate the significance of rupture and affect; they serve as analogies that allow us to imagine larger conclusions about the use of photographs in German cinema and their employment in the construction of meaning. In analyzing how photographs in film reflect concerns with historical and cultural ruptures, memory, and representation, we learn how these concerns can in turn inform our understanding of the image and celebrate the diverse approaches and conclusions drawn. Oliver Wendell Holmes called photographs a "mirror with a memory," and the use of photography in commemorative contexts is a trend that has survived the digital transition.[23] In many ways, the premise of the volume itself is part of a larger body of memory work that arises at a crucial moment in the gradual departure of analog photography in favor of the digital—that the work of art, the body, and the reception are also historically determined.

The twentieth century has brought forth generations of people and media that rely upon photographs to document, represent, tell stories, and remember—practices that connect and distinguish the twentieth century from preceding centuries. With time, we suspect that we will

gain more critical distance from the photographic practices of this period that will cast these photographic idiosyncrasies into relief. The widespread use of the Internet and digital photography have significantly altered photographic practices in the early twenty-first century. Given this break, even the contributions in this volume must be understood as timepieces that, like photographs themselves, maintain referents in the real but also reflect nostalgic tendencies to fetishize the photograph. As a type of magic object, the photograph allows us to transcend time, to inhabit multiple worlds and dimensions, and to create narratives that define the human condition, eternally caught up in the wake of revolutionary technological change. The focus on photographs and cinema in this volume might therefore also respond to the unconscious recognition that these two inextricably linked forms of visual media more clearly represent the past than they do the present. Ultimately, the chapters in this volume demonstrate that the use of photographs in German national cinema cannot be prescribed with any finality; instead, the contributions here limn the contours of German cinema at specific historical moments while simultaneously reflecting larger transnational trends that resonate across cultural and global lines, thereby telling us more about humanity's desire for agency than the media forms themselves.

**Carrie Collenberg-González** is Assistant Professor and Section Head of German and Director of the *Deutsche Sommerschule am Pazifik* at Portland State University. She has published on Heinrich von Kleist, German cinema, immersion instruction, and the aesthetics of terrorism. Her most recent articles include "Rape Culture and Dialectical Montage: A Radical Reframing of *People on Sunday* (1930)" in *Feminist German Studies* (2020) and "The Daisy Oracle: A New *Gretchenfrage* in Goethe's *Faust*" in the *Goethe Yearbook* (2021). She is coauthor of *Cineplex: German Language and Culture Through Film* (2014), and her coedited volume *Heinrich von Kleist: Artistic and Philosophical Legacies* is forthcoming.

**Martin P. Sheehan** is Interim Chair of the Department of Foreign Languages and Associate Professor of German at Tennessee Tech University. His research on dramatic form, performance, and photography has been featured in *Seminar*, *Archiv*, *Colloquia Germanica*, *Interdisciplinary Humanities*, and *Studia Neophilogica*. A member of the digital humanities research collective at Vanderbilt University since 2016, his current projects explore visual culture, disability in German dramatic comedy, and social network analysis.

# Notes

1. John Roberts, *Photography and Its Violations* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2014), 5.
2. David Campany, *Photography and Cinema* (London: Reaktion Books, 2008), 95.
3. Ibid., 96.
4. The emphasis on the relationship between stillness and motion is evident in the titles of many of the few available volumes on the subject, including *Between Stillness and Motion*; *Still Moving*; and *Between Still and Moving Images*. See Laurent Guido and Oliver Lugon, eds., *Between Still and Moving Images* (New Barnet, Hertz: John Libbey Publishing, 2012); Eivind Røssaak, ed., *Between Stillness and Motion: Film, Photography, Algorithms* (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2011); Karen Beckman and Jean Ma, eds., *Still Moving: Between Cinema and Photography* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2008). See also Garrett Stewart, *Between Film and Screen: Modernism's Photo Synthesis* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1999). Tom Gunning, "The 'Arrested' Instant: Between Stillness and Motion," in *Between Still and Moving Images*, ed. Guido and Lugon, 30.
5. Røssaak, *Between Stillness and Motion*, 14.
6. Guido and Lugon, *Between Still and Moving Images*, 3.
7. Beckman and Ma, *Still Moving*, 5.
8. Ibid.
9. Sabine Hake, *German National Cinema* (Hoboken, NJ: Taylor and Francis, 2013).
10. Røssaak, *Between Stillness and* Motion, 11.
11. It must be noted, however, that the chapters in this volume do not deliberately or directly examine rupture and affect; rather, when compounded and viewed in conversation with extant scholarship, their individual arguments and points of departure demonstrate the significance of these terms as a whole.
12. Hake, *German National Cinema*, 1.
13. Susie Linfield, *The Cruel Radiance: Photography and Political Violence* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2012), 13.
14. Eric Rentschler, "From New German Cinema to the Post-Wall Cinema of Consensus," in *Cinema and Nation*, ed. Mette Hjort and Scott MacKenzie (London: Routledge, 2000), 260–77.
15. Lutz Koepnick, "Reframing the Past: Heritage Cinema and the Holocaust in the 1990s," *New German Critique* 87 (2002): 47–82.
16. Andrés Mario Zervigón, *Photography and Germany* (London: Reaktion Books, 2017), 8.
17. Ibid., 9.
18. Ibid., 11.
19. For a more thorough account of the relationship between the German empire and photography, see Zervigón, "Photography and Nation, 1871–1918," in *Photography and Germany*, 47–81.
20. Campany, *Photography and Cinema*, 8.
21. Hake, *German National Cinema*, 1.
22. Ibid., 2.
23. Oliver Wendell Holmes, "The Stereoscope and the Stereograph," in *Soundings from the Atlantic* (Boston: Ticknor and Fields, 1859), 129.

# Bibliography

Beckman, Karen, and Jean Ma, eds. *Still Moving: Between Cinema and Photography*. Durham: Duke University Press, 2008.

Campany, David. *Photography and Cinema*. London: Reaktion Books, 2008.

Guido, Laurent, and Oliver Lugon, eds. *Between Still and Moving Images*. New Barnet, Hertz: John Libbey Publishing, 2012.

Gunning, Tom. "The 'Arrested' Instant: Between Stillness and Motion." In *Between Still and Moving Images*, edited by Laurent Guido and Oliver Lugon, 23–31. New Barnet, Hertz: John Libbey Publishing, 2012.

Hake, Sabine. *German National Cinema*. Hoboken, NJ: Taylor and Francis, 2013.

Holmes, Oliver Wendell. "The Stereoscope and the Stereograph." In *Soundings from the Atlantic*, 124–65. Boston: Ticknor and Fields, 1859.

Koepnick, Lutz. "Reframing the Past: Heritage Cinema and the Holocaust in the 1990s." *New German Critique* 87 (2002): 47–82.

Linfield, Susie. *The Cruel Radiance: Photography and Political Violence*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2012.

Rentchler, Eric. "From New German Cinema to the Post-Wall Cinema of Consensus." In *Cinema and Nation*, edited by Mette Hjort and Scott MacKenzie, 260–77. London: Routledge, 2000.

Roberts, John. *Photography and Its Violations*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2014.

Røssaak, Eivind, ed. *Between Stillness and Motion: Film, Photography, Algorithms*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2011.

Stewart, Garrett. *Between Film and Screen: Modernism's Photo Synthesis*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1999.

Zervigón, Andrés Mario. *Photography and Germany*. London: Reaktion Books, 2017.