Jürgen Böttcher: A Brief Visit

Strawalde

By Seán Allan

The beach is dominated by the figure of Aphrodite with her sphinx-like smile.[1]

The opening lines of *Das Urteil der Aphrodite* (*The Judgement of Aphrodite*, 1965), an early film project that remained unrealized, succinctly captures the provocative, enigmatic quality of Jürgen Böttcher's work as a filmmaker and painter. Born in 1931 in Frankenberg, Böttcher grew up in Strahwalde, a small village in Saxony close to the border between Germany, Poland and the Czech Republic, and the inspiration for the pseudonym, Strawalde, under which he has painted since the mid-1970s. In 1949, at the age of 18, Böttcher embarked on the study of painting at the Dresden Academy of Fine Arts, an institution dating back to the late eighteenth century whose illustrious alumni and former faculty include Kurt Schwitters, Oskar Kokoschka, George Grosz, and Otto Dix. Taught by Wilhelm Lachnit, an avant-garde painter whose works had been condemned by the Nazis as "degenerate," the young Böttcher was to explore ways of mediating his adolescent experience of World War II via contemporary developments in modernist aesthetics. Nowhere is this more clearly the case than in one of his early works, *Beweinung* (*Lamentation*, 1958), a painting prompted by the traumatic memory of his brother's death during the war. In the stylized tears of the mourning mother and the use of a predominantly gray-blue palette, the influence of Picasso and, above all, his anti-war masterpiece *Guernica* of 1937 are unmistakable.[2] But while Böttcher's painting is now part of Berlin's National Gallery collection, at the time of its completion it was severely criticized by functionaries in the East German Ministry of Culture, a reaction that was to set the tone for the reception of Böttcher's work for the next three decades.

To a large extent, the difficulties Böttcher experienced as a painter and filmmaker during the GDR's existence were caused by his failure to adhere to a conventional concept of socialist realist aesthetics in his work. As of the early 1950s, East German cultural policy was dominated by the ruling Socialist Unity Party's desire to promote a crude concept of socialist realism, in which, according the Statute of the Union of Soviet Writers issued in 1934, "the truthfulness and historical concreteness of the artistic representation of reality must be linked with the task of ideological transformation and education of workers in the spirit of socialism."[3] Regardless of whether they drew on the traditions of pre-war expressionism or sought to embrace contemporary developments in Italian neorealism, many East German writers and artists during the 1950s and early 60s found themselves accused of embracing "formalist tendencies" and an allegedly nihilistic view of social progress in their work. Writing under a pseudonym (N. Orlov) on 20-21 January 1951 in the *Tägliche Rundschau*, the daily newspaper published under the auspices of the Soviet Military Administration in occupied East Germany, the cultural theorist Vladimir Semjonovich Semjonov even went as far as to condemn Picasso for the departure from realist modes of painting in his recent work, arguing that "such formalist distortions constituted an utter waste of Picasso's talent."[4] That same year, the GDR leader Walter Ulbricht, addressing the Fifth Central Committee Conference of the Socialist Unity Party (the SED), declared: "We do not want

to see any more abstract paintings in our art academies. We need neither the images of moonscapes nor of rotting fish. The gray-in-gray painting, which is an expression of capitalist decline, stands in the sharpest possible contrast to life in the GDR today."[5]

After completing his training as a painter in 1953, Böttcher taught classes in drawing at Dresden's *Volkshochschule*, an adult education center open to people from a very diverse range of backgrounds. There his students included Peter Makolies, Peter Graf, Peter Herrmann, and Ralf Winkler (now better known as A. R. Penck), all of whom became established artists in their own right and, unlike Böttcher, eventually left the GDR for the West. During the early 1950s, Böttcher's interest in filmmaking was stimulated by developments in both Italian neorealist cinema and the cinema of the Soviet Union, including such films as Vittoria De Sica's *Umberto D.* (1952), Luchino Visconti's *La Terra Trema* (*The Earth Trembles*, 1948) and Alexander Dovzhenko's *Zemlya* (*Earth,* 1930). Increasingly conscious of the obstacles that stood in the way of his working and exhibiting as a painter—despite its limited potential to reach a mass audience, painting and the fine arts were, paradoxically, one of the most closely supervised areas of cultural production in the GDR—in 1955, Böttcher started to train as a filmmaker at the newly founded German Academy for Film (now: Academy for Film and Television Potsdam-Babelsberg). Looking back at this period in his life, Böttcher notes: "When it became clear that I would get nowhere with painting, I realized that the films of Rossellini and de Sica, as well as Dovzhenko, which I saw a lot of, reflected life pretty much as I saw it."[6] By 1960, he had been taken on at the DEFA Studio for Newsreels and Documentaries, the unit responsible for documentary film production in the GDR.

While Böttcher may have hoped that turning to film would offer him greater opportunities to engage with the modernist aesthetics of the Italian neorealists he so admired, such an approach, based as it was on a stark depiction of postwar social deprivation and the teasing out of contradictions in everyday life, ran directly counter to East German cultural policy. In an address to the second Film Conference of 3-5 July 1958, the GDR's Minister of Culture, Alexander Abusch, had attempted to nip such tendencies in the bud, arguing that "it must be clear to filmmakers in the GDR that the aesthetics of the Italian neorealists, intended as they are to expose the irresolvable antagonisms of capitalist society and to encourage the members of that society to rebel against it, are not appropriate for films set in a workers' and peasants' state... The use of critical realism cannot but leave us with a pseudo-representation of the new reality in which we live."[7] Accordingly, Böttcher's determination to seek out new ways of conveying the most complete picture possible of the protagonists of his films, including all their drives, passions, pleasures and worries meant that conflict with the state authorities was almost a foregone conclusion.

Böttcher's first documentary project as a regular employee of the DEFA Studio for Documentary Film was *Drei von vielen* (*Three of Many*, 1961/1989). The film focuses on the day-to-day lives of three of his friends—Peter Makolies, Peter Graf and Peter Herrmann—and explores their activity as amateur artists in their spare time. Looking back at the film from the perspective of 2011, it is not immediately obvious why it should have been

regarded as so controversial. In stark contrast to Böttcher's later documentaries, *Three of Many* has an explanatory commentary (delivered by the 24-year-old fledgling star, Manfred Krug) that seeks, quite sincerely, to highlight the aesthetic achievements and political engagement of the three protagonists. In the opening section of the film, we see Peter Graf, a truck driver by day, painting in his makeshift studio while listening to jazz and smoking, almost in the manner of a young Bertolt Brecht. Tempting though it is to dismiss Graf's paintings as kitsch (almost all of them feature the iconic IFA G5 truck that Graf drives at work in some shape or form), it is important to note that Böttcher's documentary never presents its subject matter in an ironic light. Rather, the film highlights a fundamental truth about painting (and indeed art generally); namely, that the creation of genuine works of art demands a sustained engagement on the artist's part with material with which he or she is intensely familiar. Accordingly, Graf's repeated efforts to integrate images of his truck into a series of classical and romantic landscapes represent an attempt to bring about a productive synthesis of art and life and contribute to the generally idealistic depiction of socialist life in the film as a whole. "His life wouldn't be worth living," the voice-over tells us, "without his work, painting and driving."

In its depiction of Peter Makolies, a sculptor deployed in the restoration of classical buildings damaged during the Allied bombing of Dresden, *Three of Many* introduces a new and radical perspective on artistic creativity, namely the concept of art as labor. For the sheer physicality of Makolies's efforts in transforming raw stone into a recognizable figure stands in the starkest possible contrast to bourgeois concepts of artistic "genius" and is portrayed as an activity with which his fellow workers at the construction site can easily identify. By the same token, Böttcher's film goes out of its way to argue for a conceptualization of art that, far from being at odds with conventional social and familial structures, has its rightful place within the home and the collective.

The fact that all the artists in the film are male is, perhaps inevitably, a symptom of the prevailing gender politics of the late 1950s. Nevertheless, as dated as it may seem from today's perspective, the film emphasizes the importance of Makolies's wife and child for his work and the desirability of Graf finding a suitable female partner. This is an attempt to portray the artist not as an "outsider" in society, but as a figure who belongs at the heart of mainstream life. Seen in this light, Graf's visit to the fairground, a twilight world of popular culture that bridges the divide between high culture and the everyday world of work, might be read as a socialist reinterpretation of the romantic artist's quest for a female muse. While the girl Graf ends up with is clearly a figure plucked from the ranks of the people, she is not lacking in exoticism, a fact underscored by the lyrics of the background music "Never on a Sunday," her fashionably modernist haircut and the obvious pleasure she takes in riding alongside him in the cab of his truck.

The third artist featured in the documentary is Peter Herrmann, a man employed by a newspaper to touch up lithographic plates. Here too the visual language of the film argues for a productive synthesis of life and art—as, for example, when we watch him painting and the contours of the stove in his living room merge imperceptibly with the canvas on his easel. Given that Herrmann's daytime job consists of preparing images at the pre-

production stage, it is perhaps fitting that, of all the case studies in the film, it is his that Böttcher uses to address the idea that art should not simply reflect beauty, but engage with the suffering of others and the violence that human beings inflict on one another. What inspires Herrmann's artistic creativity, the voice-over tells us, is love of life; "but part of this love is the representation of the unspeakable, lest it be forgotten." It is this principle that is enshrined in his painting of Patrice Lumumba, the first legally elected prime minister of the Democratic Republic of the Congo, who was assassinated in 1961 as the result of a plot hatched jointly by the US and Belgian governments. Moreover, as the discussions that take place at the house of another artist, Ralf Winkler (A. R. Penck) underline, all the artists subscribe to a concept of art that is socially and politically critical and that, through the juxtaposition of contrasts, invites the active engagement of the viewer.

Böttcher's documentary ends with the words: "They don't aspire to be great artists; they simply want to express what their friends and colleagues at work feel. They just want to be what they are—three of many." Insofar as it argues that artistic creativity is not simply an activity for a highly educated elite, but something to which all people might aspire, it seems hard to understand why the film should have been greeted with such hostility. Just two years earlier, at the writers' conference held at a chemical production plant in the town of Bitterfeld on 24 April 1959, the East German government had coined the slogan *Greif zur Feder Kumpel!* (lit. *Pick up your pen, comrade!*), in an attempt to encourage workers in factories and industry to produce their own art and literature.[8] Given the unavailability of reports submitted by the East German Ministry of Culture's Film Office outlining the reasons why the film was banned, it is not easy to be sure just why it was regarded as unsuitable for general release. Willi Zahlbaum, the director of the DEFA Studio for Newsreels and Documentaries, had originally approved the script at the pre-production stage and, following the test screening, had argued that the finished film should be licensed for general release. However, when representatives of the Film Office met and were unable to agree upon how to proceed, it was decided to refer the matter directly to Alfred Kurella, the East German Politburo member responsible for cultural affairs. In a letter dated 2 January 1962, Kurella acknowledged Böttcher's undoubted talent as a filmmaker, but banned the film on the grounds that "The content and underlying idea of *Three of Many* are both completely misguided."[9] It was not until June 1988 that the film was publicly screened for the first time (in Edinburgh), an event followed on 16 January 1989—some 27 years after its production—by the licensing of the film for general release in the GDR.

Looking back at events from today's perspective, it seems hard to understand what it was that so incensed the GDR cultural authorities. Böttcher himself has suggested that members of the Politburo objected to the neo-realist elements of the film and, in particular, its failure to portray both workers and their homes in a sufficiently idealized light.[10] However, as was so often the case with instances of film censorship in the GDR, it seems likely that the decision to ban *Three of Many* had more to do with events taking place off-stage than with the film itself. For all the artists featured in the documentary (and indeed Böttcher himself) had submitted paintings for the controversial exhibition *Junge Künstler* (Young Artists), which had opened at the Academy of Arts in

East Berlin in the summer of 1961. Although organized by Fritz Cremer, then the head of the Academy's department of fine arts, this exhibition had been singled out for particularly harsh criticism in the East German press because of the allegedly "formalist tendencies" of some of the works on display. On the occasion of his visit to the exhibition, Alfred Kurella is even reported to have personally removed a number of pictures he found particularly offensive.[11] In 1960, a similar exhibition in the Berlin gallery Konkret, also organized by Cremer, had been closed prematurely on similar grounds.

What both these exhibitions and Böttcher's documentary revealed was the existence of a vibrant grassroots art scene in the GDR—one which, precisely because of its amateur basis, was able to elude the Ministry of Culture's control. Accordingly, it seems highly likely that the banning of *Three of Many* was, paradoxically, prompted by the East German government's anxiety that an unforeseen consequence of their attempts to persuade ordinary people to take up art and writing would be the development of autonomous, and potentially oppositional artistic groups. While the ruling SED had hoped for the production of conventional works of socialist realism that would be discussed and displayed at the workplace, Böttcher's film served as an unwelcome reminder that, once the genie of artistic creativity had been let out of the bottle, the state would struggle to regain its existing grip on cultural production.

The controversy over *Three of Many* had repercussions for both the studio and Böttcher himself; Willi Zahlbaum, the studio manager, was removed from office and Böttcher had no choice but to "rehabilitate" himself through the production of a relatively conventional industrial documentary, *Ofenbauer* (*Furnace Builders*, 1962). While the positive reception of *Furnace Builders* went some way to restoring his standing in the eyes of the studio, Böttcher continued to look for ways of realizing his distinctive documentary aesthetic in a series of films about workers in the GDR. Evidence of this move towards a *cinema verité* style of documentary can be found as early as 1963 in *Stars*, a film in which female workers at an East German lightbulb factory express their opinions directly to camera. Looking back at the film, Böttcher noted, "I wanted people to see that these women—like many others of their kind—are all worthy of being loved. I wanted quite consciously to contrast them with those generally accepted ideas of beauty that are all too often extolled."[12]

This quest to challenge conventional concepts of beauty through the use of extended shots of static individuals in unglamorous settings was to become one of the distinctive features of Böttcher's documentary work. It is also discernible in his one and only feature film, *Jahrgang '45* (*Born in '45*), produced in 1965 but banned in the wake of the clampdown on filmmakers and artists following the Eleventh Plenum of the SED's Central Committee in December 1965. Indeed the protracted silences that punctuate *Born in '45* have their counterpart in the increasingly minimalist soundtracks of Böttcher's later documentary work. While the female protagonists address the camera directly in *Stars* (1963) and *Martha* (1978), in *Rangierer* (*Shunters,* 1984), a film depicting railway men at work at a marshalling yard on the outskirts of Dresden, there is neither voice-over, nor dialogue, but simply the background noise of industrial activity. At one level, the self-conscious

omission of any form of explanatory commentary is both an aesthetic strategy and a tacit critique of the conventions of GDR documentary filmmaking. Looking back at his work from the perspective of the post-unification era, Böttcher commented, "As soon as explanations were required, the censors and the authorities intervened. You always had to dress things up verbally. You always had to regulate things—and it was just terrible."[13] Through the use of a handheld camera and black-and-white film stock, Böttcher's non-interventionist style succeeds in conveying a wholly authentic representation of industrial labor—one which, through its sustained focus on the monotonous, backbreaking work carried out in the bleakest of conditions, treats the workers with dignity without ever lapsing into the conventional clichés of heroic socialist realism. At the same time, however, the voiceless soundtrack combined with extended sequences of snow-covered rail tracks and rolling stock shot from the middle distance give the film an abstract, mesmeric quality that, as Richard Kilborn has suggested, make it seem as though the movement captured on film has become "part of some elaborate, ritualized game."[14] Indeed, for all the apparent differences between a film like *Shunters* and Böttcher's next documentary, *Kurzer Besuch bei Hermann Glöckner* (*Hermann Glöckner: A Brief Visit,* 1984), there is a clear line of continuity between the motion of the freight wagons as they are guided through the complex maze of tracks and sidings, on the one hand, and on the other the abstract patterns traced by the 95-year-old constructivist artist in his studio.

In the years leading up to the production of *Shunters* in 1984, Böttcher had returned to the theme of artistic creativity and the role of art and the artist in the GDR. The film *Im Lohmgrund (In the Lohmgrund,* 1977)—the first production on which he worked together with cameraman Thomas Plenert—focuses once again on the sculptor Peter Makolies and the process of transforming nature into art, as a block of stone quarried from the site is slowly shaped by the artist's hand. With *Ein Weimarfilm* (*A Film about Weimar*, 1976), Böttcher turned his attention to the checkered past of Weimar, the emblematic centre of German classical culture in the late eighteenth century, but a location forever tarnished by memories of the Third Reich and the nearby Buchenwald concentration camp.

In 1981, however, with the production of the experimental triptych *Verwandlungen* (*Transformations*), Böttcher embarked on what was to be the most radical film project of his career. Made up of three short films—*Potters Stier* (*Potter's Bull*), *Venus nach Giorgione* (*Venus after Giorgione*) and *Frau am Klavichord* (*Woman at the Clavichord*)—the project as a whole offers a fascinating insight into Böttcher's creative work as an artist. Credited to his painterly alter ego, Strawalde, the films show him overpainting a set of postcard reproductions of renaissance pictures by Paulus Potter, Giorgione and Emmanuel de Witte. In each of the three twenty-minute films we watch as the original Renaissance image is constantly re-worked, re-contextualized and re-interpreted by Strawalde's brush and transformed into a bewildering variety of new forms to the accompaniment of an often avant-garde, atonal soundtrack. Perhaps the best clue to understanding what it is that underpins this enigmatic and, at times, surrealist work is to be found in an observation by the artist A. R.

Penck in 1990, in which he notes: "Dialogue is the essence of Jürgen's existence. He needs someone or something with which he can engage."[15] Seen in this light, Strawalde's postcard-paintings serve as a reminder that artistic creativity does not exist in a vacuum, but is a constant process of dialogue with existing artistic traditions. That is to say, the lovingly iconoclastic refashioning of these works of art reflects an understanding that, however much an artist may admire the great artistic achievements of the past, he or she must always resist the temptation to reproduce what is already there and must set out instead in a new direction, in search of his or her unique artistic identity. And while it is hard to think of two projects more different in stylistic terms than *Three of Many* and *Transformations*, each in its own way bears witness to a radical conception of the creative imagination as both a utopian space that knows no limits, and a site of resistance in the face of all forms of political repression.

The capacity of the creative imagination to resist and outlast the onslaught of oppressive political authority also lies at the heart of Böttcher's *Hermann Glöckner: A Brief Visit*. Born in Dresden in 1889, Hermann Glöckner worked as a textile designer before serving in the infantry during World War I. After studying at the Dresden Academy of Fine Arts from 1923 to 1924, Glöckner became increasingly fascinated with geometrical forms and constructivist approaches to art and, in 1932, became a member of the Dresden Secession. Condemned for the production of "degenerate" art during the Third Reich, after World War II Glöckner re-settled in the GDR, where his works were harshly criticized because of their "formalist" tendencies during the 1950s and early 1960s. Politically "rehabilitated" in 1969, Glöckner was awarded the highly prestigious National Prize of the GDR for artistic achievements in 1984.

Although Glöckner's biography spans some of the most turbulent periods in German history, the main focus of Böttcher's film is not the artist's firsthand experience of five very different political regimes, but the development of his creative practice over time. Indeed, more often than not Glöckner's responses to the filmmaker's questions about his biography are almost inaudible. And although some of the works Glöckner displays to the camera can be linked to the changing social and political contexts of his life, such as a geometrical abstraction resembling a Star of David, the film suggests that the key to understanding Glöckner's art lies elsewhere. Just as Böttcher's *Transformations* offer us a tantalizing glimpse into Strawalde's painterly imagination, so too the lingering gaze of Thomas Plenert's camerawork in *Hermann Glöckner: A Brief Visit* invites us to enter into the creative world of the elderly constructivist. And as we observe him painstakingly trace a series of abstract geometrical curves on blank sheets of paper, the fundamental contrast that lies at the very heart of Glöckner's work—the contrast between the curved forms of the natural world and the straight lines of constructed form—is revealed with increasing clarity. When the camera pans across the room, it is striking that almost all the models on display are sharp-edged geometrical forms, while the background of the studio against which they are set is littered with drawings of curves and spirals. In some cases, such as the revolving sculpture constructed from clothespins clipped to a spine-like central pole, straight lines and curves dynami-

cally combine in a relationship of productive synthesis. As the artist presents one work of art after the other to the camera, the viewer is left to reflect on the extent to which, like Leonardo da Vinci's celebrated *Vitruvian Man*, the essence of the natural world can be captured using the abstract categories of geometry. Indeed, Glöckner's biography might be seen as an odyssey through Euclidean geometry itself, a voyage of discovery that begins by embracing the line in its simplest form, as the shortest distance between two points, and ends with the elderly artist's enduring fascination with the literally infinite possibilities of linking two geometrical points via a series of curves.

The opposition between straight lines and curves is just one of a set of contrasts running through the film. Glöckner is dressed in black and white, his geometrical sculptures move in diametrically opposed directions, and even the film itself is shot partly in color and partly in black-and-white. Just as Strawalde's overpainting of the postcards in his *Transformations* project invites us to view the familiar from a range of contrasting perspectives, so too Glöckner plays with his abstract sculptures, turning them round and inverting them in a continual search for new ways of looking at them. What Böttcher's film brings out with extraordinary clarity is the way in which Glöckner's art encourages the viewer to embrace the geometry of nature and explore the ways in which—almost in the manner of Mark Rothko and the abstract expressionists—the use of abstract form and color might be seen as a means of communicating a set of transcendent truths. Indeed, there are moments when Glöckner's drawings of curves conjure up images of Arabic calligraphy and the quest to capture the absolute in abstract, non-mimetic modes of representation—an aspect of the constructivist's work that lends it a peculiarly romantic quality. The affinity between Glöckner's work and that of Böttcher himself is hinted at in the film's opening sequence, in which we are presented with images of the misty romantic landscape of the Elbe River near Dresden before the image of the city's "Blue Wonder," the Loschwitz cantilever bridge, finally comes into view. Yet the very form of this man-made construction serves as a reminder of the extent to which the worlds of geometry, mathematics and nature remain intertwined in an often enigmatic relationship to one another.

Twenty years after the fall of the Berlin Wall, Böttcher's films have lost none of their provocative quality, and his expansive documentary *Die Mauer* (*The Wall*, 1990)—precisely because of its non-interventionist aesthetic—remains one of the most eloquent cinematic representations of the infamous border between eastern and western Europe. Yet for all their undoubted authenticity, Böttcher's films can never be viewed simply as straightforward historical documents reflecting life in the former GDR; instead, they demand constant re-evaluation and reinterpretation. For, as he himself put it in a booklet produced in 1989 to accompany a retrospective of his work, "Documentaries have many more dimensions than some critics expect. They claim to be authentic, but they are also a poetic means of expression. They are objective and at the same time much more subjective than most feature films."[16]

***Seán Allan** is the co-editor, with John Sandford, of the groundbreaking 1999 volume on GDR film, entitled* DEFA, East German Cinema, 1946-1992 *(Berghahn); he is editing a revised and expanded edition of that volume which should appear in 2012. His current research on DEFA focuses on the East German* Künstlerfilme *and is the subject of recent essays on Konrad Wolf, Kurt Maetzig and Jürgen Böttcher. In addition to extensive publications on the 18th-century author Heinrich von Kleist, he has also written on the New German cinema and on representations of the GDR in post-*Wende *cinema.*

Notes

1 Jürgen Böttcher, "Das Urteil der Aphrodite. Konzeption zu einem Spielfilm," *apropos: Film 2000. Jahrbuch der DEFA-Stiftung*, Berlin: Bertz Verlag, 2000, pp. 28-34 (p. 28).

2 Cf. Eckhart Gillen, *Feindliche Brüder. Der kalte Krieg und die deutsche Kunst, 1945-1990*, Berlin: Nicolai, 2009, pp. 178-9.

3 Cited in: Andrei Sinyavsky [writing as Abram Tertz], "The Trial Begins" and "On Socialist Realism," trans. Max Hayward and George Dennis, and with an introduction by Czesław Miłosz, Berkeley: University of California Press, 1960–1982, p. 148.

4 N. Orlow, "Wege und Irrwege der modernen Kunst," *Tägliche Rundschau*, 20/21 January 1951. [Reproduced in: Elimar Schubbe, *Dokumente zur Kunst, Literatur- und Kulturpolitik der SED*, 3 vols, Stuttgart: Seewald, 1972, vol 1., pp. 159-70.]

5 Walter Ulbricht, "Zur Vorlage des Gesetzes über den Fünfjahrplan. Rede vor der Volkskammer 31.10.1951," *Neues Deutschland*, 1 November 1951. [Reproduced in: Schubbe, vol. 1, pp. 213-5.]

6 See the Goethe-Institut's short documentary in their KuBus series: *The Painter and Filmmaker – Jürgen Böttcher/Strawalde* (2004, 15 mins). A version with English subtitles is available at <http://www.goethe.de/kue/flm/prj/kub/flm/en3947235.htm>

7 Alexander Abusch, "Aktuelle Probleme und Aufgaben unserer sozialistischen Filmkunst: Referat der Konferenz des VEB DEFA Studio für Spielfilme und des Ministeriums für Kultur der DDR," *Deutsche Filmkunst*, 6.9 (1958), pp. 261-70 (p. 267).

8 For a report by Radio Free Europe looking back at the Bitterfeld initative from the perspective of 1969, see: <http://www.osaarchivum.org/files/holdings/300/8/3/text/25-5-188.shtml>

9 Alfred Kurella, Letter to Fehlig, 2 January 1962, [= SAPMO-BArch, DY30/IV2/2026/88].

10 See Jürgen Böttcher and Erika Richter, "Filmsplitter. Fragmentarisches über die Anfänge," *apropos: Film 2000. Jahrbuch der DEFA-Stiftung*, Berlin: Bertz Verlag, 2000, pp. 10-19 (p. 11).

11 See Kathleen Krenzlin, "Die Akademie-Ausstellung 'Junge Kunst' 1961. Hintergründe und Folgen." In Günter Agde (ed), *Kahlschlag. Das 11. Plenum des ZK der SED 1965*. Studien und Dokumente, Berlin: Aufbau, 2000, pp. 66-78 (p. 70).

12 Peter Zimmermann (ed.), *Deutschlandbilder Ost. Dokumentarfilme der DEFA von der Nachkriegszeit bis zur Wiedervereinigung*, Konstanz: UVK-Medien/Ölschläger, 1995, p. 162.

13 "Kunst und Kultur in der DDR" (Transcript of the Proceedings of the 35th session of the Bundestag Enquete-Kommission: "Aufarbeitung von Geschichte und Folgen der SED-Diktatur in Deutschland"), May 1993, p. 195.

14 Richard Kilborn, "The Documentary Work of Jürgen Böttcher. A Retrospective." In Seán Allan and John Sandford (eds), DEFA: *East German Cinema*, 1946-92, Oxford, New York: Berghahn, 199, pp. 267-82, (p. 275).

15 A. R. Penck in a conversation with Martin Rögener, 10 March 1990. The conversation is available (in German) at <http://www.strawalde.de/katAtex.htm>.

16 *Abenteuer Wirklichkeit*. (Booklet published by the Akademie der Künste – Abteilung Film- und Medienkunst and the press offices of ZDF and 3Sat to accompany a series of East German documentaries screened on German television in November and December 1989), p. 3.