

THE PROMISE OF CINEMA

**GERMAN
FILM THEORY
1907-1933**

**EDITED BY ANTON KAES,
NICHOLAS BAER, AND
MICHAEL COWAN**



UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA PRESS

University of California Press, one of the most distinguished university presses in the United States, enriches lives around the world by advancing scholarship in the humanities, social sciences, and natural sciences. Its activities are supported by the UC Press Foundation and by philanthropic contributions from individuals and institutions. For more information, visit www.ucpress.edu.

University of California Press
Oakland, California

© 2016 by The Regents of the University of California

For credits, permissions, and acknowledgments, please see page 639.
The editors and publisher are grateful to the copyright owners for permission to republish material in this book. Despite great efforts, it has not been possible in every case to locate all rights holders and estates. The editors and publisher apologize in advance for any unintended errors and omissions, which they will seek to correct in future printing. Please address all inquiries to: University of California Press, 155 Grand Avenue, Suite 400, Oakland, California 94612.

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS CATALOGING-IN-PUBLICATION DATA

Names: Kaes, Anton, editor. | Baer, Nicholas, 1985–editor. | Cowan, Michael J., 1971–editor.

Title: The promise of cinema: German film theory, 1907–1933 / edited by Anton Kaes, Nicholas Baer, Michael Cowan.

Other titles: Weimar and now ; 49.

Description: Oakland, California : University of California Press, [2016]. | "2016 | Series: Weimar and now: German cultural criticism ; 49 | Includes bibliographical reference.

Identifiers: LCCN 2015049570 | ISBN 9780520219076 (cloth : alk. paper) | ISBN 9780520219083 (pbk. : alk. paper) | ISBN 9780520962439 (ebook).

Subjects: LCSH: Motion pictures—Germany—History—20th century. | Film criticism—Germany. | Motion pictures—History—20th century. | Film criticism.

Classification: LCC PN1993.5.G3 P765 2016 | DDC 791.430943—dc23

LC record available at <http://lcn.loc.gov/2015049570>

Manufactured in the United States of America

25 24 23 22 21 20 19 18 17 16
10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

The paper used in this publication meets the minimum requirements of ANSI/NISO Z39.48–1992 (R 2002) (*Permanence of Paper*).

Contents

Acknowledgments	xiii
User's Guide	xv

Introduction	I
---------------------	----------

SECTION ONE. TRANSFORMATIONS OF EXPERIENCE

1. A New Sensorium

1. Hanns Heinz Ewers, <i>The Kientopp</i> (1907)	13
2. Max Brod, Cinematographic Theater (1909)	15
3. Gustav Melcher, On Living Photography and the Film Drama (1909)	17
4. Kurt Weisse, A New Task for the Cinema (1909)	20
5. Anon., New Terrain for Cinematographic Theaters (1910)	22
6. Anon., The Career of the Cinematograph (1910)	22
7. Karl Hans Strobl, The Cinematograph (1911)	25
8. Ph. Sommer, On the Psychology of the Cinematograph (1911)	28
9. Hermann Kienzl, Theater and Cinematograph (1911)	30
10. Adolf Sellmann, The Secret of the Cinema (1912)	31
11. Arno Arndt, Sports on Film (1912)	33
12. Carl Forch, Thrills in Film Drama and Elsewhere (1912–13)	35
13. Lou Andreas-Salomé, Cinema (1912–13)	38
14. Walter Hasenclever, <i>The Kintopp</i> as Educator: An Apology (1913)	39
15. Walter Serner, Cinema and Visual Pleasure (1913)	41
16. Albert Hellwig, Illusions and Hallucinations during Cinematographic Projections (1914)	45

2. The World in Motion

17. H. Ste., The Cinematograph in the Service of Ethnology (1907)	48
18. O. Th. Stein, The Cinematograph as Modern Newspaper (1913–14)	49
19. Hermann Häfker, <i>Cinema and Geography</i> : Introduction (1914)	51
20. Yvan Goll, The Cinedram (1920)	52
21. Hans Schomburgk, Africa and Film (1922)	55
22. Franc Cornel, The Value of the Adventure Film (1923)	56
23. Béla Balázs, Reel Consciousness (1925)	58
24. Colin Ross, Exotic Journeys with a Camera (1928)	60
25. Anon., Lunar Flight in Film (1929)	62
26. Lotte H. Eisner, A New India Film: <i>A Throw of Dice</i> (1929)	62
27. Erich Burger, Pictures-Pictures (1929)	64
28. Alfred Polgar, The Panic of Reality (1930)	66

29. Béla Balázs, *The Case of Dr. Fanck* (1931) 68
 30. Siegfried Kracauer, *The Weekly Newsreel* (1931) 70

3. The Time Machine

31. Ludwig Brauner, *Cinematographic Archives* (1908) 74
 32. Berthold Viertel, *In the Cinematographic Theater* (1910) 77
 33. Eduard Bäumer, *Cinematograph and Epistemology* (1911) 78
 34. Franz Goerke, *Proposal for the Establishment of an Archive for Cinema-Films* (1912) 81
 35. J. Landau, *Mechanized Immortality* (1912) 84
 36. Heinrich Lautensack, *Why?—This Is Why!* (1913) 86
 37. E. W., *The Film Archive of the Great General Staff* (1915) 88
 38. Hans Lehmann, *Slow Motion* (1917) 89
 39. Friedrich Sieburg, *The Transcendence of the Film Image* (1920) 92
 40. August Wolf, *Film as Historian* (1921) 94
 41. Fritz Lang, *Will to Style in Film* (1924) 95
 42. Siegfried Kracauer, *Mountains, Clouds, People* (1925) 97
 43. Joseph Roth, *The Uncovered Grave* (1925) 98
 44. Fritz Schimmer, *On the Question of a National Film Archive* (1926) 99
 45. Albrecht Viktor Blum, *Documentary and Artistic Film* (1929) 103
 46. Béla Balázs, *Where Is the German Sound Film Archive?* (1931) 105

4. The Magic of the Body

47. Walter Turszinsky, *Film Dramas and Film Mimes* (1910) 108
 48. Friedrich Freksa, *Theater, Pantomime, and Cinema* (1916) 111
 49. Carl Hauptmann, *Film and Theater* (1919) 115
 50. Oskar Diehl, *Mimic Expression in Film* (1922) 119
 51. Béla Balázs, *The Eroticism of Asta Nielsen* (1923) 122
 52. Friedrich Sieburg, *The Magic of the Body* (1923) 124
 53. Max Osborn, *The Nude Body on Film* (1925) 126
 54. Béla Balázs, *The Educational Values of Film Art* (1925) 130
 55. Leni Riefenstahl, *How I Came to Film . . .* (1926) 134
 56. H. Sp., *The Charleston in One Thousand Steps* (1927) 136
 57. Leo Witlin, *On the Psychomechanics of the Spectator* (1927) 136
 58. Lotte H. Eisner and Rudolf von Laban, *Film and Dance Belong Together* (1928) 139
 59. Fritz Lang, *The Art of Mimic Expression in Film* (1929) 141
 60. Emil Jannings, *Miming and Speaking* (1930) 142
 61. Siegfried Kracauer, *Greta Garbo: A Study* (1933) 144

5. Spectatorship and Sites of Exhibition

62. Fred Hood, *Illusion in the Cinematographic Theater* (1907) 147
 63. Alfred Döblin, *Theater of the Little People* (1909) 149
 64. Arthur Mellini, *The Education of Moviegoers into a Theater Public* (1910) 151

65. Anon., <i>The Movie Girl</i> (1911)	153
66. Anon., <i>Various Thoughts on the Movie Theater Interior</i> (1912)	154
67. Victor Noack, <i>The Cinema</i> (1913)	155
68. Emilie Altenloh, <i>On the Sociology of Cinema</i> (1914)	156
69. Resi Langer, <i>From Berlin North and Thereabouts/In the Movie Houses of Berlin West</i> (1919)	161
70. Milena Jesenská, <i>Cinema</i> (1920)	164
71. Kurt Tucholsky, <i>Erotic Films</i> (1920)	166
72. Herbert Tannenbaum, <i>Film Advertising and the Advertising Film</i> (1920)	168
73. August Wolf, <i>The Spectator in Cinema</i> (1921)	169
74. Kurt Pinthus, <i>Ufa Palace</i> (1925)	170
75. Karl Demeter, <i>The Sociological Foundations of the Cinema Industry</i> (1926)	172
76. Rudolf Harms, <i>The Movie Theater as Gathering Place</i> (1926)	174
77. Siegfried Kracauer, <i>The Cinema on Münzstraße</i> (1932)	175

6. An Art for the Times

78. Egon Friedell, <i>Prologue before the Film</i> (1912–13)	178
79. Anon., <i>The Autorenfilm and Its Assessment</i> (1913)	182
80. Ulrich Rauscher, <i>The Cinema Ballad</i> (1913)	184
81. Kurt Pinthus, <i>Quo Vadis, Cinema?</i> (1913)	186
82. Anon., <i>The Student of Prague</i> (1913)	188
83. Hermann Häfker, <i>The Call for Art</i> (1913)	190
84. Herbert Tannenbaum, <i>Problems of the Film Drama</i> (1913–14)	192
85. Will Scheller, <i>The New Illusion</i> (1913–14)	196
86. Kurt Pinthus, <i>The Photoplay</i> (1914)	199
87. Malwine Rennert, <i>The Onlookers of Life in the Cinema</i> (1914–15)	203
88. Paul Wegener, <i>On the Artistic Possibilities of the Motion Picture</i> (1917)	206
89. Ernst Lubitsch, <i>We Lack Film Poetry</i> (1920)	208
90. Fritz Lang, <i>Kitsch—Sensation—Culture and Film</i> (1924)	210

SECTION TWO. FILM CULTURE AND POLITICS

7. Moral Panic and Reform

91. Georg Kleibömer, <i>Cinematograph and Schoolchildren</i> (1909)	215
92. Franz Pfemfert, <i>Cinema as Educator</i> (1909)	219
93. Albert Hellwig, <i>Trash Films</i> (1911)	222
94. Robert Gaupp, <i>The Dangers of the Cinema</i> (1911–12)	223
95. Konrad Lange, <i>The Cinematograph from an Ethical and Aesthetic Viewpoint</i> (1912)	226
96. Ike Spier, <i>The Sexual Danger in the Cinema</i> (1912)	227
97. P. Max Grempe, <i>Against a Cinema That Makes Women Stupid</i> (1912)	230
98. Roland, <i>Against a Cinema That Makes Women Stupid: A Response</i> (1912)	232
99. Naldo Felke, <i>Cinema's Damaging Effects on Health</i> (1913)	234

100.	Karl Brunner, Today's Cinematograph: A Public Menace (1913)	235
101.	Richard Guttman, Cinematic Mankind (1916)	238
102.	Walther Friedmann, Homosexuality and Jewishness (1919)	240
103.	Wilhelm Stapel, Homo Cinematicus (1919)	242
104.	Kurt Tucholsky, Cinema Censorship (1920)	243
105.	Albert Hellwig, The Motion Picture and the State (1924)	246
106.	Aurel Wolfram, Cinema (1931)	247
107.	Fritz Olinisky, Film Bolshevism (1932)	249

8. Image Wars

108.	Paul Klebinder, <i>The German Kaiser in Film</i> (1912)	254
109.	Hermann Duenschmann, Cinematograph and Crowd Psychology (1912)	256
110.	<i>Der Kinematograph</i> , War and Cinema (1914)	258
111.	Anon., The Cinematograph as Shooting Gallery (1914)	259
112.	Hermann Häfker, <i>Cinema and the Educated Class: A Foreword</i> (1914)	260
113.	Hermann Häfker, The Tasks of Cinematography in This War (1914)	262
114.	Edgar Költch, The Benefits of War for the Cinema (1914)	266
115.	Karl Kraus, Made in Germany (1916)	267
116.	Anon., State and Cinema (1916)	269
117.	Johannes Gaulke, Art and Cinema in War (1916)	271
118.	Gustav Stresemann, Film Propaganda for German Affairs Abroad (1917)	273
119.	Erich Ludendorff, The Ludendorff Letter (1917)	275
120.	Joseph Max Jacobi, The Triumph of Film (1917)	277
121.	Rudolf Genencher, Film as a Means of Agitation (1919)	279
122.	Kurt Tucholsky, War Films (1927)	281
123.	<i>Film-Kurier</i> , Film in the New Germany (1928)	282
124.	Siegfried Kracauer, <i>All Quiet on the Western Front</i> (1930)	284
125.	Kurt Tucholsky, Against the Ban on the Remarque Film (1931)	286

9. The Specter of Hollywood

126.	Claire Goll, American Cinema (1920)	288
127.	Erich Pommer, The Significance of Conglomerates in the Film Industry (1920)	290
128.	Valentin, The Significance of Film for International Understanding (1921)	292
129.	Joe May, The Style of the Export Film (1922)	294
130.	Hans Siemsen, German Cinema (1922)	295
131.	Georg Jacoby, Film-America and Us (1922)	297
132.	Ernst Lubitsch, Film Internationality (1924)	298
133.	Georg Otto Stindt, Is Film National or International? (1924)	300
134.	Axel Eggebrecht, The Twilight of Film? (1926)	301
135.	Anon., The Restructuring of Ufa (1927)	304
136.	Carl Laemmle, Film Germany and Film America (1928)	305
137.	Billie Wilder, The First One Back from Hollywood (1929)	306
138.	Alexander Jason, Film Statistics (1930)	308

139.	A. K., Done with Hollywood (1931)	309
140.	Anon., Film-Europe, a Fact! (1931)	311
141.	Anon., Internationality through the Version System (1931)	312
142.	Erich Pommer, The International Talking Film (1932)	314

10. Cinephilia and the Cult of Stars

143.	Henny Porten, The Diva (1919)	317
144.	Kurt Pinthus, Henny Porten for President (1921)	319
145.	Robert Musil, Impressions of a Naïf (1923)	323
146.	Béla Balázs, Only Stars! (1926)	325
147.	Vicki Baum, The Automobile in Film (1926)	327
148.	Anon., Vienna Is Filming! (1926)	328
149.	Willy Haas, Why We Love Film (1926)	330
150.	Hugo, Film Education (1928)	333
151.	K. W., What Is Film Illusion? (1928)	335
152.	Hans Feld, Anita Berber: The Representative of a Generation (1928)	337
153.	Marlene Dietrich, To an Unknown Woman (1930)	338
154.	Max Brod and Rudolf Thomas, Love on Film (1930)	340
155.	Siegfried Kracauer, All about Film Stars (1931)	344
156.	Siegfried Kracauer, Destitution and Distraction (1931)	347
157.	Anon., In the Empire of Film (1931)	349

11. The Mobilization of the Masses

158.	Béla Balázs, The Revolutionary Film (1922)	351
159.	Siegfried Kracauer, The Klieg Lights Stay On (1926)	353
160.	Oscar A. H. Schmitz, <i>Potemkin</i> and Tendentious Art (1927)	355
161.	Walter Benjamin, Reply to Oscar A. H. Schmitz (1927)	356
162.	Lotte H. Eisner, The New Youth and Film (1928)	359
163.	Franz Höllering, <i>Film und Volk</i> : Foreword (1928)	361
164.	Béla Balázs, Film Works for Us! (1928)	362
165.	Heinrich Mann, Film and the People (1928)	364
166.	Ernst Toller, Who Will Create the German Revolutionary Film? (1928)	365
167.	Karl Ritter, Mass-Man in the Cinema (1929)	366
168.	Willi Münzenberg, Film and Propaganda (1929)	367
169.	A. A., World Film Report (1930)	368
170.	Lupu Pick, Individual and Montage (1930)	370
171.	Bertolt Brecht, The Threepenny Lawsuit (1931)	372
172.	Herbert Jhering, The Banned <i>Kuhle Wampe</i> (1932)	374
173.	Georg Wilhelm Pabst, Film and Conviction (1933)	375

12. Chiffres of Modernity

174.	Georg Lukács, Thoughts toward an Aesthetic of the Cinema (1911)	377
175.	Alfred A. Baeumler, The Effects of the Film Theater (1912)	381
176.	Hugo von Hofmannsthal, The Substitute for Dreams (1921)	384

177. Kurt Pinthus, <i>The Ethical Potential of Film</i> (1923)	386
178. Siegfried Kracauer, <i>A Film</i> (1924)	389
179. Siegfried Kracauer, <i>Film Image and Prophetic Speech</i> (1925)	391
180. Adolf Behne, <i>The Public's Attitude toward Modern German Literature</i> (1926)	392
181. Fritz Giese, <i>Revue and Film</i> (1928)	395
182. Walter Benjamin, <i>Chaplin in Retrospect</i> (1929)	398
183. Siegfried Kracauer, <i>Chaplin in Old Films</i> (1930)	400
184. Theodor W. Adorno, <i>Kierkegaard Prophesies Chaplin</i> (1930)	401
185. Walter Benjamin, <i>Mickey Mouse</i> (1931)	403
186. Ernst Kállai, <i>Painting and Film</i> (1931)	404
187. René Fülöp-Miller, <i>Fantasy by the Meter</i> (1931)	407
188. Ernst Jünger, <i>The Worker</i> (1932)	408

SECTION THREE. CONFIGURATIONS OF A MEDIUM

13. The Expressionist Turn

189. Bernhard Diebold, <i>Expressionism and Cinema</i> (1916)	415
190. Gertrud David, <i>The Expressionist Film</i> (1919)	420
191. J. B., <i>Expressionism in Film</i> (1920)	422
192. Ernst Angel, <i>An "Expressionist" Film</i> (1920)	424
193. Carlo Mierendorff, <i>If I Only Had the Cinema!</i> (1920)	426
194. Robert Müller, <i>The Future of Film</i> (1921)	433
195. Robert Wiene, <i>Expressionism in Film</i> (1922)	436
196. Walter Reimann, <i>An Afterword to Caligari</i> (1925)	438
197. Rudolf Kurtz, <i>Limits of the Expressionist Film</i> (1926)	440
198. Hanns Sachs, <i>The Interpretation of Dreams in Film</i> (1926)	443
199. Robert Breuer, <i>The Film of Factuality</i> (1927)	444
200. Henrik Galeen, <i>Fantastic Film</i> (1929)	447

14. Avant-Garde and Industry

201. Walter Ruttmann, <i>Painting with Time</i> (ca. 1919)	450
202. Bernhard Diebold, <i>A New Art: Film's Music for the Eyes</i> (1921)	452
203. Hans Richter, <i>Basic Principles of the Art of Movement</i> (1921)	454
204. Adolf Behne, <i>Film as a Work of Art</i> (1921)	457
205. Rudolf Arnheim, <i>The Absolute Film</i> (1925)	459
206. László Moholy-Nagy, <i>film at the bauhaus: a rejoinder</i> (1926)	461
207. Walter Ruttmann, <i>How I Made My Berlin Film</i> (1927)	463
208. Walter Ruttmann, <i>The "Absolute" Fashion</i> (1928)	464
209. Siegfried Kracauer, <i>Abstract Film</i> (1928)	465
210. László Moholy-Nagy, <i>The Artist Belongs to the Industry!</i> (1928)	467
211. Lotte Reiniger, <i>Living Shadows</i> (1929)	470
212. Hans Richter, <i>New Means of Filmmaking</i> (1929)	472
213. Walter Ruttmann, <i>The Isolated Artist</i> (1929)	474

214.	Hans Richter, <i>Avant-Garde in the Realm of the Possible</i> (1929)	475
215.	Anon., "Candid" Cinematography (1929)	476
216.	Lotte H. Eisner, <i>Avant-Garde for the Masses</i> (1929)	478
217.	Alex Strasser, <i>The End of the Avant-Garde?</i> (1930)	478

15. The Aesthetics of Silent Film

218.	Ernst Bloch, <i>Melody in the Cinema, or Immanent and Transcendental Music</i> (1914)	482
219.	Oskar Kalbus, <i>The Muteness of the Film Image</i> (1920)	485
220.	Albin Grau, <i>Lighting Design in Film</i> (1922)	487
221.	Hans Pander, <i>Intertitles</i> (1923)	489
222.	Béla Balázs, <i>The Close-Up</i> (1924)	492
223.	Fritz Lang and F. W. Murnau, <i>My Ideal Screenplay</i> (1924)	498
224.	Paul Leni, <i>Architecture in Film</i> (1924)	499
225.	Julie Elias, <i>Film and Fashion</i> (1924)	501
226.	Guido Seeber, <i>The Delirious Camera</i> (1925)	503
227.	Béla Balázs, <i>Productive and Reproductive Film Art</i> (1926)	505
228.	Fritz Lang, <i>Looking toward the Future</i> (1926)	508
229.	Karl Freund, <i>Behind My Camera</i> (1927)	509
230.	Lotar Holland, <i>Subjective Movement</i> (1927)	512
231.	Giuseppe Becce, <i>Film and Music</i> (1928)	515
232.	Béla Balázs, <i>Farewell to Silent Film</i> (1930)	517

16. Film as Knowledge and Persuasion

233.	Hans Hennes, <i>Cinematography in the Service of Neurology and Psychiatry</i> (1910)	520
234.	Oswaldo Polimanti, <i>The Cinematograph in Biological and Medical Science</i> (1911)	523
235.	Leonhard Birnbaum, <i>The Cultural Mission of the Cinematograph</i> (1912)	526
236.	Anon., <i>Cinema in the Light of Medicine</i> (1913)	529
237.	Julius Pinschewer, <i>Film Advertising</i> (1913)	530
238.	Bruno Taut, <i>Artistic Film Program</i> (1920)	532
239.	Wilhelm von Ledebur, <i>Cinematography in the Service of the Police</i> (1921)	534
240.	Arthur Lassally, <i>Film Advertising and Advertising Films</i> (1921)	537
241.	Edgar Beyfuss, <i>School and Film</i> (1924)	539
242.	Ulrich Kayser, <i>Industrial Films</i> (1924)	540
243.	Eugen R. Schlesinger, <i>Kulturfilm and Cinema</i> (1924)	541
244.	Dietrich W. Dreyer, <i>The Trick Film</i> (1927)	544
245.	Hans Cürliis, <i>Film Is Promotion</i> (1929)	545
246.	Karl Nikolaus, <i>Advertising Film and Its Psychological Effects</i> (1932)	546

17. Sound Waves

247.	Anon., <i>How Singing Pictures (Sound Pictures) Are Made</i> (1908)	549
248.	Herbert Jhering, <i>The Acoustic Film</i> (1922)	551

249.	Heinrich Strobel, Film and Music (1928)	552
250.	Walter Ruttmann, Principles of the Sound Film (1928)	555
251.	Siegfried Kracauer, Sound-Image Film (1928)	556
252.	Béla Balázs, A Conviction (1929)	559
253.	Ernst Hugo Correll, The Nature and Value of Sound Film (1929)	562
254.	Georg Wilhelm Pabst, Reality of Sound Film (1929)	563
255.	Carl Hoffmann, Problems of the Camera (1929)	565
256.	Walter Gronostay, Possibilities for the Use of Music in Sound Film (1929)	566
257.	Erwin Piscator, Sound Film Friend and Foe (1929–30)	567
258.	Rudolf Arnheim, A Commentary on the Crisis Facing Montage (1930)	569
259.	Edmund Meisel, Experiences in Composing Music for Sound Films (1930)	572
260.	Alfred Döblin, Only the Transformed Author Can Transform Film (1930)	574
261.	<i>Film-Kurier</i> , Fritz Lang: Problems in Sound Film Design (1931)	575

18. Technology and the Future of the Past

262.	Max Mack, The Conquest of the Third Dimension (1914)	578
263.	Max Skladanowsky, The Prehistory of the Bioskop (1916)	579
264.	Heinz Michaelis, Art and Technology in Film (1923)	581
265.	Béla Balázs, The Color Film (1923)	583
266.	S. E. Bastian, The Telefilm (1925)	584
267.	Herbert Jhering, Film and Radio (1925)	585
268.	Kurt Weill, Possibilities for Absolute Radio Art (1925)	586
269.	Eugen Schüfftan, My Process (1926)	589
270.	Arthur Korn, Why We Still Do Not Have Television (1929)	590
271.	László Moholy-Nagy, The Elements Once Again (1929)	592
272.	Erich Grave, The Third Dimension (1929)	593
273.	Ernst Steffen, Telecinema in the Home (1929)	595
274.	Frank Warschauer, A Glance into the Future (1930)	598
275.	H. Baer, The Color Film (1930)	600
276.	Rudolf Arnheim, Radio-Film (1932)	602
277.	Bernhard Diebold, The Future of Mickey Mouse (1932)	603
278.	Siegfried Kracauer, On the Border of Yesterday (1932)	607

	Bibliography	613
	Credits	639
	Index	641

INTRODUCTION

Even if the clattering of the film projectors disappears, there will be something—I firmly believe—that functions like cinema.”

Alexander Kluge, Cinema Stories (2007)

THE RISE OF DIGITAL MEDIA has provoked no shortage of debates about what cinema has been and will become. To some observers, film seems to be a thing of the past, an artifact of twentieth-century visual culture, a relic of the Fordist era with its industrial rhythms and distinct division of labor and leisure. Others point to cinema’s unanticipated afterlives in film festivals and retrospectives, compilation films and museum installations, online archives and virtual cinephilic communities. From the latter perspective, cinema is not so much disappearing as morphing into exciting new forms and hybrids, whose uncharted trajectories bear an uncanny resemblance to the cinema’s beginnings more than a hundred years ago. Looking back on the first decades of the twentieth century, we find a rich culture of theoretical speculation, as critics imagined the possible futures of what was then a “new medium.” In this book, we hope to give readers a sense of these diverse futures of the past by reanimating the *promises* once associated with cinema—both those that were realized and those, in Siegfried Kracauer’s words, that “history did not see fit to explore.”¹

The Promise of Cinema thus reconceives film theory as a field of possibilities, expectations, and propositions. Whereas scholars have conventionally viewed the corpus of “classical film theory” as concerned with defining the medium’s specific, essential properties, this book highlights the multiple *potentialities* that cinema represented for film theorists, whose writings, as Rudolf Arnheim suggested, referred “not so much to what *is* as to what *can be* or *ought to be*.”² Theorization of film, we contend, often occurred in the subjunctive rather than the indicative mood—one oriented toward an unknown, empirically unverifiable future that might diverge from all prior historical experience. In this regard, film theory exemplifies what Reinhart Koselleck has characterized as the modern period’s expanding chasm between the “space of experience” and the “horizon of expectation.”³ Reconstructing a wide-ranging set of debates from 1907 to 1933, this sourcebook offers a glimpse into cinema’s historical horizons, which were inseparable from the broader horizons of modernity as such.

1. Siegfried Kracauer, *History: The Last Things Before the Last* (Princeton, NJ: Markus Wiener, 1995), 6.

2. Rudolf Arnheim, “Preface to the 1957 Edition,” in *Film as Art* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1957), n.p. Emphases added.

3. Reinhart Koselleck, “‘Space of Experience’ and ‘Horizon of Expectation’: Two Historical Categories,” in *Futures Past: On the Semantics of Historical Time*, trans. Keith Tribe (New York: Columbia University Press, 2004), 255–75.

The German-speaking world was one of the leading sites for theorizing the promise of cinema in the early twentieth century, as names such as Arnheim, Béla Balázs, Walter Benjamin, Bertolt Brecht, Lotte Eisner, Kracauer, and Hans Richter attest. Despite translations of seminal works by these figures, however, we still have no collection of early German film theory to complement existing sourcebooks in English devoted to the Chinese, Czech, French, and Russian contexts.⁴ Assembling 278 texts, nearly all of which appear in English for the first time, this volume not only features lesser-known essays by the aforementioned figures but also situates their works within a much wider nexus of writings on film from the period—writings by a broad range of authors, including actors and filmmakers, journalists and philosophers, activists and government officials, doctors and educators, and many other voices that have come down to us only as “anonymous.”

• • •

The project of expanding “film theory” beyond established figures was both motivated and facilitated by the shifts in our media environment, where digital collections and online resources are affording us unprecedented access to a searchable, ever-growing archive of materials beyond traditional canons. But this decision to broaden the material base also underlies an implicit argument about how we should understand and approach film theory itself. Amidst recent debates across the humanities on the origins, history, and fate of theory,⁵ D.N. Rodowick has historicized the concept of film theory, arguing that the term’s common usage has tended to “superimpose retroactively a picture of theory on a complex range of conceptual activities that may not have characterized themselves as such.”⁶ For Rodowick, what is called “classical film theory”—unlike the semiotic and psychoanalytical theories of later decades—can best be understood as an open set of interrogations, which sought to comprehend a medium that was itself unsettling established aesthetic categories. While sharing Rodowick’s interest in reconceiving the history of film theory, we nonetheless diverge from his analysis in two notable ways. Whereas Rodowick seeks to replace the paradigm of “classical film theory” with what he calls an “aesthetic discourse”—one that extends from early studies by Vachel Lindsay and Hugo Münsterberg to the postwar writings of André Bazin and Kracauer—the present volume understands film theory as an entire network of discourses that approached film not only as a form of art and entertainment but also as a medium of culture, science, education, training, politics, philosophy, and governmentality. Furthermore, in contrast to Rodowick, who restricts his discussion mainly to well-known figures, we suggest that the contributions of so-called classical film theorists can best be read as part of a large and contentious culture of writing about film during the medium’s first decades.

Early writings on film were grappling with an acute medial transformation, one that was fundamentally challenging prior frameworks of experience and knowledge. Appearing long before film study and theory were institutionalized—that is, when commentators necessarily came from a wide range of educational and professional backgrounds—

4. See George S. Semsel, Xia Hong, and Hou Jianping, eds., *Chinese Film Theory: A Guide to the New Era* (New York: Praeger, 1990); Jaroslav Anděl and Petr Szczepanik, eds., *Cinema All the Time: An Anthology of Czech Film Theory and Criticism, 1908–1939* (Prague: National Film Archive, 2008); Richard Abel, ed., *French Film Theory and Criticism: A History/Anthology, 1907–1939* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1988); and Richard Taylor and Ian Christie, eds., *The Film Factory: Russian and Soviet Cinema in Documents 1896–1939* (London/New York: Routledge, 1988).

5. See, for example, Andrew Cole, *The Birth of Theory* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2014); Terry Eagleton, *After Theory* (New York: Basic Books, 2003); and Ian Hunter, “The History of Theory,” *Critical Inquiry* 32, no. 4 (2006): 78–112.

6. D.N. Rodowick, *Elegy for Theory* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2014), 71.

these writings were characterized less by systematic and exhaustive investigation than by speculative, heterogeneous, and open-ended exploration.⁷ Although known primarily for their book-length studies, Arnheim, Balázs, Eisner, and Kracauer all began as film critics in the 1920s, publishing hundreds of texts in newspapers and journals—texts that were passionately “in the moment,” responding to new films, emerging stars, technological and aesthetic developments, inaugural events, special screenings, censorship cases, economic crises, and political exigencies. Contributing to far-reaching and ever-shifting debates, these texts were adaptive and provisional in their approaches and styles of prose, lacking any fixed or dominant epistemological framework and engaging in a dynamic interplay with a medium that was itself *in statu nascendi*.

• • •

Reflecting this open-ended mode of early writing about cinema, Béla Balázs advanced the following understanding of “theory” in the preface to *Der sichtbare Mensch oder die Kultur des Films* (*Visible Man or the Culture of Film*, 1924):

Theory opens up the broad vistas of *freedom* for every art. It is the road map for those who roam among the arts, showing them pathways and opportunities, so that what appeared to be iron necessity stands unmasked as one random route among a hundred others. It is theory that gives us the courage to undertake Columbus-like voyages of exploration and turns every step into a freely chosen act.⁸

Setting aside the imperialist resonances of the phrase “Columbus-like voyages”—and the entanglement of cinema and colonial ideology is more than evident in Balázs’s contention that cinema will produce a “uniform type of the white race” throughout the world⁹—Balázs makes a remarkable argument here: far from uncovering inherent laws, “theory” is what first *enables exploration*, indicating the arbitrariness of current practices and revealing *alternative possibilities*. Theory is thus a “road map” not in the sense of a mathematical representation of organized space but rather in the sense of a creation of concepts that both liberates art and inspires its movement into unknown territories. This temporal structure—theory before rather than after the perfection of its object, theory as a facilitator of exploration rather than as a form of retrospective mastery—is something that Balázs shares with thinkers such as Kracauer, whose essay “Photography” (1927) would likewise attribute to consciousness the task of establishing “the *provisional status* of all given configurations.”¹⁰ But this interrogative gestus is also evident in the writings of countless other contemporaries across a wide variety of realms, whose theorization of cinema is similarly driven by what Robert Musil, in *The Man without Qualities*, famously called “a sense of possibility” (Möglichkeitssinn)—that is, a concern less with cinema in its current, often-compromised forms than with what it might become.

7. On this point, see also Francesco Casetti, “Theory, Post-theory, Neo-theories: Changes in Discourses, Changes in Objects,” *CiNéMAS* 17, nos. 2–3 (Spring 2007): 33–45; and “Roundtable on the Return to Classical Film Theory,” *October* 148 (Spring 2014): 5–26.

8. Béla Balázs, *Visible Man*, trans. Rodney Livingstone, in *Early Film Theory: Visible Man and The Spirit of Film*, ed. Erica Carter (New York: Berghahn Books, 2010), 3.

9. *Ibid.*, 14. In *Theory of the Film* (1948), Balázs would revise this passage, instead invoking “an international human type”; Balázs, *Theory of the Film: Character and Growth of a New Art*, trans. Edith Bone (London: Dennis Dobson, 1952), 45. See also Erica Carter, “Introduction,” in Balázs, *Early Film Theory*, xxxviii.

10. Siegfried Kracauer, “Photography,” in *The Mass Ornament: Weimar Essays*, ed. and trans. Thomas Y. Levin (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1995), 62. Emphasis in the original.

This is not to argue that we should make no distinction between dedicated film critics and writers from other professional spheres whose interest in cinema was motivated by other questions. For one thing, readers will quickly notice in the following pages how many of those other voices, particularly as they intersected with the so-called *Kinoreform* movement (see chapter 7), greeted film with ambivalence or even downright hostility, regarding the new medium as a symptom of the broader ills and pathologies of modern society. It bears emphasizing, however, that even as such commentators disparaged film's actual, commercially driven uses, most of them maintained a tacit investment in the medium's prospects, whether in the realms of art, politics, science, or education. And it is the wager of this book that every one of these overlooked texts contains insights that might be called "theoretical." While this concept of theory is rarely addressed as explicitly as it is by Balázs, it is always present in a dormant sense—for example, in Berthold Viertel's 1910 account (no. 32) of the German and Austrian emperors watching themselves on film, where cinema's ability to challenge political sovereignty ("Is one allowed to copy majesty so wantonly? Is it not too much for one moment to have two, no, four kings?") is no less palpable than it will be a quarter century later in Benjamin's "The Work of Art in the Age of Its Technological Reproducibility" (1936).

Early commentators adopted a variety of positions vis-à-vis cinema's present and future, its actual and potential uses, its dangers and utopian promise. But nearly all of them shared a fundamental sense that film was effecting and registering a revolution in virtually every area of life: the experience of space, time, and the body; the articulation of class, gender, and race; sexuality and social mores; the partition of private and public spheres; politics and forms of mobilization; the definition and functions of art; the ways that knowledge could be generated, applied, and disseminated; and the construction of "reality" itself. The debates here address cinema's role as both catalyst and seismograph of a host of massive and abrupt transformations that characterize German modernity: industrialization and urbanism; the emergence of a mass culture of consumption and distraction; the increasing precariousness of the cultural and intellectual elite; the multiple traumas of war, defeat, and the loss of colonies; failed revolution and new state-formation; and, finally, economic and political crisis. More than any other cultural form, cinema appeared as inextricably linked to processes of modernization, and the texts collected here view film as an indicator of the course that modernity was taking—and even as a signal of the paths that could yet be taken.

• • •

The temporal parameters of modernity are often contested, and the dates of the present volume deserve more precise explanation. While the "birth" of German cinema has traditionally been dated according to the first public screening of Bioskop films by the Skladanowsky brothers in Berlin's Wintergarten on November 1, 1895, most scholars today agree that such dates are at best heuristic placeholders and at worst misrepresentations of a medium that emerged from myriad technological, performative, and intellectual contexts. Such contexts were hardly rendered obsolete overnight, and some film historians have gone so far as to argue that the very term *cinema* is a misnomer for what, until shortly before 1910, was understood as the latest variation of long-familiar cultural forms and practices.¹¹ Thus, the awareness that cinema was becom-

11. André Gaudreault, "The Culture Broth and the Froth of Cultures of So-Called Early Cinema," in *A Companion to Early Cinema*, ed. Gaudreault, Nicolas Dulac, and Santiago Hidalgo (Malden: Wiley-Blackwell, 2012), 15–31.

ing a major and enduring force in public life—and consequently that something like a theory of this new medium was necessary—arose gradually and unevenly across different contexts.

For the purposes of this volume, 1907 offers a convenient starting date because it is the year when the first film journals were founded in both Germany and Austria. Among these journals, the earliest and most notable was *Der Kinematograph* (1907–35), published by Eduard Lintz in Düsseldorf. In its inaugural issue, on January 6, 1907, the editorial and publishing staff identified the publication as an “organ that reports on the latest achievements, shares information with a circle of interested parties on new technological developments, and also publishes important news from the realm of praxis.”¹² The commercial success of *Der Kinematograph* quickly led to the founding of additional journals devoted to film, among them the *Erste Internationale Film-Zeitung* (Berlin, 1907–20), *Kinematographische Rundschau* (Vienna, 1907–21), and *Lichtbild-Bühne* (Berlin, 1908–39). As such publications suggest, it was evident by this point that film *mattered*, and understanding what cinema could become was now firmly on the agenda of public discourse.¹³

In contrast, the ending date of our volume was dictated by wider political developments. The National Socialists’ seizure of power in 1933 forced countless Jewish and leftist film theorists to flee Germany, among them Arnheim, Benjamin, Brecht, Eisner, Kracauer, and Richter. (Balázs remained in the Soviet Union, where he had gone in 1931.) While these exiled figures would continue to write about film in new national and linguistic contexts, the German-speaking world, as Thomas Elsaesser and Malte Hagener note, “lost its pre-eminent position” in the international debate about film.¹⁴ Following the Nazi regime’s systematic appropriation of cinema for diversion, propaganda, and warmongering, the medium’s promise also appeared to have been irrevocably betrayed. At the height of its power in the 1940s, cinema had failed to engage with the Holocaust, as Jean-Luc Godard argues in his *Histoire(s) du cinéma*, stifling rather than enabling forms of resistance to the atrocities occurring across Europe. Not until a few decades later could one again invoke “German film theory,” now in relation to figures such as Alexander Kluge and Hans Magnus Enzensberger and journals including *Filmkritik* (1957–84) and *Frauen und Film* (1974–).

• • •

In order to offer a “road map”—to borrow Balázs’s term—through the period thus delimited, this book is divided into three sections of six chapters each. Arranged according to a loose and overlapping chronological progression, the sections all examine questions concerning cinema’s promise and possibilities. Section 1 brings together writings that sought to comprehend cinema’s imbrications with *transformations of experience*. Though disparate in their specific concerns, these texts all reacted to the sense that cinema was uniquely poised to register and assimilate myriad aspects of modern life. Chapter 1 examines cinema’s power to address the senses: to dazzle spectators with magical displays, jolt them with nervous thrills, or confound them with optical illusions. Recalling the

12. Redaktion und Verlag, “Geleit-Worte,” *Der Kinematograph* no. 1 (January 6, 1907).

13. See Anton Kaes, ed., *Kino-Debatte: Texte zum Verhältnis von Literatur und Film, 1909–1929* (Munich: DTV, 1978); Sabine Hake, *The Cinema’s Third Machine: Writing on Film in Germany, 1907–1933* (Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press, 1993); Helmut H. Diederichs, *Frühgeschichte deutscher Filmtheorie: Ihre Entstehung und Entwicklung bis zum Ersten Weltkrieg* (Habilitation, University of Frankfurt, 1996).

14. Thomas Elsaesser and Malte Hagener, *Film Theory: An Introduction through the Senses* (New York: Routledge, 2010), 2.

nineteenth-century visual culture studied by Jonathan Crary,¹⁵ all of these texts assume a thoroughly *embodied* spectator, one both fallible and eminently excitable. More often than not, “sense perception” meant vision, of course, and a number of texts included here attempt to work through the modes of “visual pleasure” (Serner, no. 15) offered by the new medium.

Chapters 2 and 3 consider the ways in which film was linked to shifting conceptions of space and time. Contemporary observers were fascinated by cinema’s ability to transport spectators to foreign and even extraterrestrial spaces, but they also pinned divergent hopes on the medium’s status as what Alexander Kluge would later call a “time machine”¹⁶—one able to record segments of time, fragment them through montage, and stretch or contract them through the techniques of slow motion and time lapse. These reflections on space and time are followed in chapter 4 by a set of texts examining what Friedrich Sieburg called “the magic of the body” (no. 52), that is, the heightened visibility and affective power of bodies shown on the silent screen. Chapter 5 presents a range of texts on film spectatorship and sites of exhibition, from early, working-class *Kientopps* (Döblin, no. 63) to erotic cinemas (Tucholsky, no. 71) to the gentrified picture palaces of the 1920s (Pinthus, no. 74). Chapter 6 concludes the section with a number of texts that consider cinema with respect to existing aesthetic norms, either by transforming the cinema into a form of art (e.g., the debates around the *Autorenfilm*) or by adapting the very definition of art to a modern age defined by speed, concision, and fragmentation (Friedell, no. 78).

Section 2 turns to questions of *film culture and politics*. Beginning with the Kinoreform movement, in which psychologists, educators, and moral leaders first sought to regulate film’s influence, especially over women and youth (chapter 7), the section goes on to examine cinema’s status vis-à-vis state power (chapter 8), from the “The German Kaiser in Film” (no. 108) through the propaganda battles of World War I to the censorship cases of the late Weimar Republic. Chapter 9 focuses on the precarious position of the German film industry in the face of Hollywood’s ever-increasing hegemony, and chapter 10 considers audience investment in the institution of cinema and its star system, highlighting the entertainment industry’s massive influence in Weimar democracy. Chapter 11 follows these discussions with writings on the roles cinema could play in mass mobilization, whether by socialist revolutionaries or by members of the emerging Nazi Party. Lastly, chapter 12 steps back to examine seminal reflections on film as a medium of philosophical thought, one that could facilitate broader insights into the modern condition.

Section 3 brings together essays that strove to comprehend various *configurations of the medium*, especially with regard to its evolving technological and aesthetic potentials. In chapter 13, we encounter discussions of expressionism, dream states, and the fantastic, all of which probe the possibilities of film as a modernist, anti-mimetic medium. Chapter 14 examines the discourse around the radical uses of cinema by the avant-garde as it made “absolute films” and entered into a fraught relationship with the film industry. In chapter 15, we examine aspects of silent film aesthetics, including set design, lighting, and camera technique. Chapter 16’s selections approach the cinema as an instrument of knowledge and persuasion in science, culture, and

15. Jonathan Crary, *Techniques of the Observer: On Vision and Modernity in the Nineteenth Century* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1990).

16. Alexander Kluge, “Zu einer Stein-Konstruktion,” in *Foto-Assemblagen*, ed. Udo Klückmann, Klaus Heinrich, et al. (Berlin: Medusa, 1979), 29.

commerce. We turn in chapter 17 to the major technological shift of the late 1920s: the advent of sound. Finally, chapter 18 assembles reflections on film technologies, their histories, and their possible futures. Resonating with recent studies in media archaeology, this chapter features early explorations of television, 3-D, color, and expanded cinema.

• • •

Providing a heuristic analytical grid, these sections and chapters represent an initial attempt to map a vast area of writing, much of which is still unexplored.¹⁷ While they could, of course, be read in any sequence, our division seeks to convey broad, if uneven, discursive shifts. The earliest writings on cinema were overwhelmingly concerned with film's role as a gauge of changing modes of experience. Writers from the Wilhelmine period sought to grasp the newness of cinema as a representational form, its ability to render modernity legible, and the challenge that its rapid and disjunctive aesthetics posed to the traditional arts. During the Great War, politics became an explicit and dominant concern, and commentators began to think intensely about cinema's relation to the masses, its potential as a tool of mobilization and political propaganda, and its role in forging national communities and collective identities. Finally, the 1920s, a decade in which film attained greater cultural legitimacy, saw efforts to define film's specific qualities and to forge a language and repertoire of aesthetic means (e.g., camera movement, montage) that would lend cinema a unique identity among the arts. At the same time, this decade of film history—one also marked by greater institutionalization and professionalization—witnessed the emergence of new forums for specialized thinking about film technologies, avant-garde experimentation, and cinema's uses in science, industry, and advertising.

This temporal division should not suggest that there was no media theorizing or political thinking before the First World War nor that the imbrications of cinema and modern experience became any less important in later years (a proposition refuted by Benjamin's work alone). Rather, we are acknowledging that specific sets of concerns moved to the fore at particular historical junctures. The three sections of this book trace large-scale shifts in film discourse, but they also include numerous texts that look backward and forward in order to call attention to the impossibility of confining any single mode of interrogation to rigid temporal parameters. Organized around historical debates or theoretical issues, the chapters in this volume present a full trajectory of responses to particular issues. Following Kracauer, one might refer to the series of texts in the various chapters as "sequences," that is, "successive 'solutions' of problems originating with some need and touching off the whole series."¹⁸ By arranging the texts into these discrete temporal "sequences" (rather than according to an overall chronology), we hope not only to render the volume's materials conceptually coherent and manageable for readers but also to acknowledge each historical moment's heterogeneity and *Ungleichzeitigkeit*

17. The archive for German writings on film in the period covered by this book is immense; in a 1930 brochure on German trade publications, Erwin Ackerknecht listed 160 film periodicals, about half of which are now available on microfilm. These titles include influential trade papers that appeared daily in the late 1920s, such as *Der Kinematograph* (1907–35) and the *Film-Kurier* (1919–45), as well as fan magazines that often stopped after just a few issues. In addition to these film-related publications, most newspapers (there were sixty daily papers in Berlin alone) and lifestyle magazines featured film reviews and articles about cinema. The present book can only offer a glimpse into the overwhelming mass of archival sources; most still await discovery.

18. Kracauer, *History*, 144. See also George Kubler, *The Shape of Time: Remarks on the History of Things* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1962).

(nonsimultaneity)—a concept theorized in the interwar years by German thinkers such as Wilhelm Pinder, Erwin Panofsky, and Ernst Bloch.¹⁹

Within the volume's eighteen chapters, all texts are introduced with editors' comments, which highlight their contributions to the theorization of cinema's promise and possibilities in the early twentieth century. Resisting any unifying generalizations, these comments signal some of the events, debates, and other immediate circumstances to which the authors were responding. Our interest in recovering the historical dimensions of the texts is matched, however, by a commitment to conveying their relevance today. Following Walter Benjamin's argument in *The Arcades Project* that "the true method of making things present is to represent them in our space (not to represent ourselves in their space),"²⁰ we forego any attempt at self-transposition into the past and instead analyze early-twentieth-century documents in dialogue with contemporary issues. Our hope is that the texts throughout this sourcebook will continue to gain new, unanticipated meanings, illuminating our ever-shifting media environment and its attendant theoretical concerns.²¹

• • •

With its dual temporal focus on the historicity and actuality of early-twentieth-century texts, the present volume seeks to contribute to understandings of German film theory in three major ways. First, it allows us to see the broader context in which cinema could appear to well-known theorists as a key cultural form of modernity. Alongside Benjamin's and Kracauer's analyses of cinema's "shocks" and "distractions," we encounter a vast array of writings on cinema and modernity from other commentators, such as government advisors, sociologists, or advertising theorists. In these writings, words like *tempo*, *nervousness*, *thrill*, *astonishment*, and *novelty* abound as efforts to understand the transformations of everyday life that modernity had wrought. If many of these texts strike us today as reactionary, others stand out for their euphoric tone. But the important point—and the one that becomes visible with sufficient historical distance and a large enough archival base—is that all the authors were observing the *same* phenomena. From Alfred Döblin's description of working-class audiences "spellbound" by the cinema's "white eye" in 1909 (no. 63) to Wilhelm Stapel's anxious observations on the revolutionary "homo cinematicus" in 1919 (no. 103) to Ernst Jünger's reactionary-modernist reflections on the new audience of mass types in 1932 (no. 188), the authors of nearly all the texts collected here understood film as a medium of modernity, one deeply implicated in the emergence and workings of twentieth-century mass culture.

Second, this expanded range of articles allows readers to better comprehend the cultural and linguistic specificity of writings by Balázs and other well-known theorists who were well acquainted with wider debates on cinema in Germany and Austria. Such debates have transnational ramifications, and one can draw links, for example, between the emergence of cinema reform movements in Germany and America; the rise of the avant-garde in Germany, France, and Holland; or the forging of a left-wing film culture

19. See Wilhelm Pinder, *Das Problem der Generation in der Kunstgeschichte Europas* (Berlin: Frankfurter Verlags-Anstalt, 1926); Erwin Panofsky, "Reflections on Historical Time," trans. Johanna Bauman, *Critical Inquiry* 30, no. 4 (2004): 691–701; and Ernst Bloch, *Heritage of Our Times*, trans. Neville and Stephen Plaice (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1991).

20. Walter Benjamin, *The Arcades Project*, trans. Howard Eiland and Kevin McLaughlin (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1999), 206.

21. On the goal of conveying both the historicity and actuality of film theory, see also Johannes von Moltke, "Out of the Past: Classical Film Theory," *Screen* 55, no. 3 (Autumn 2014): 398–403.

in Germany and the Soviet Union. Nonetheless, many of the epistemological framings of German-language debates were also informed by specific intellectual traditions such as *Kultur* (culture) and *Bildung* (education), both of which had been valorized and discussed extensively since the German Enlightenment. When Balázs titled his study *Visible Man or the Culture of Film*, for example, he understood the term *Kultur* according to a Germanic tradition linking *Kultur* to the idea of *Bildung* as the holistic cultivation of an ensemble of human faculties; it was precisely this organic notion of *Kultur* that the technological medium of film had seemed to threaten. Similarly, the Schillerian concept of aesthetic education arguably informed debates among German educators and psychologists about the effects of cinema on child development (see chapter 7); the efforts of the *Kulturfilm*, a German variant of documentary based on ideals of experiential education (chapter 16); and Balázs's 1925 speech to an annual conference of educators on the *Bildungswerte* (educational values) of film art (chapter 4, no. 54). The terms *Kultur* and *Bildung* provide just two examples of the many latent "protocols" of early German film theory, which become visible only when theoretical writings are reinserted into their cultural-linguistic context.

Third, the scope of this volume allows readers to see more clearly the ways in which early film theory was always already a form of media theory—one whose open, interrogative quality anticipates our efforts to assimilate "new media" today. Many of the key topics of contemporary media studies—animation, immersion and distraction, participation and interactivity, remediation and convergence, institutional and nontheatrical uses of cinema, amateur filmmaking and fan practices, democracy and mass media—were already part of early film-theoretical discussion and can be fruitfully teased out of the texts in this volume. Such thoughts and questions were not entirely new even in the 1910s and '20s; most of them can be traced back to the visual and media culture of the nineteenth century and even before.²² But our present environment of proliferating screens and media platforms allows these aspects of early film culture to come to the fore in new ways, revealing the latent futures harbored within archives. The present volume thus embraces an understanding of the contemporary moment that Thomas Elsaesser describes as an ever-shifting "enunciative position" from which the past is constantly reorganized in constellation with present concerns.²³ Eschewing any approach that assumes we know what the cinema is, has been, and will become, this volume features historical writings that explore cinema's manifold horizons—writings that suggest actual futures, as well as the many roads not taken.

• • •

Although the three categories outlined above—film and modernity, film and cultural context, and film and media theory—loosely correspond to our section divisions, each one also cuts across the book as a whole. This means, of course, that the form of the present collection is provisional, its categorizations necessarily tentative. Much as Aby Warburg perpetually reorganized his *Mnemosyne Atlas* in the 1920s, we have gathered, arranged, and

22. Siegfried Zielinski has been particularly insistent on this point. See his *Deep Time of the Media: Toward an Archaeology of Hearing and Seeing by Technical Means*, trans. Gloria Custance (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2006), 7–8. See also Erkki Huhtamo, "Dismantling the Fairy Engine: Media Archaeology as Topos Study," in *Media Archaeology: Approaches, Applications, and Implications*, ed. Huhtamo and Jussi Parikka (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2011), 44–45; and Jussi Parikka, *What is Media Archaeology?* (Cambridge: Polity, 2012), 13.

23. Thomas Elsaesser, "The New Film History as Media Archaeology," *CiNéMAS* 14, nos. 2–3 (2004): 75–117; here 78.

repeatedly repositioned the texts before settling on a working assemblage. In this regard, we have adopted the role of curators who place artifacts into creative constellations; while we suggest pathways through the book's immense archive of materials, we also encourage readers to establish their own links cutting across the various sections and chapters.

To offer one example: though many of the texts reproduced here embrace notions of artistic and medial "specificity" as part of an effort to legitimate cinema, one could also construct an entirely different genealogy of conceptualizing cinema in terms of intermediality. Such a trajectory would include all of the early efforts—palpable throughout chapter 1—to position cinema with respect to existing forms of visual culture, such as variety shows, naturalist theater, sports, the circus, amusement parks, and phantasmagoric illusions. But it would also include the myriad reflections of the avant-garde on cinema as a form of "painting with time" (Walter Ruttmann, no. 201) or "music for the eyes" (Bernhard Diebold, no. 202); experiments with film and modern dance (Rudolf von Laban, no. 58); writings on mixed media (Kurt Weisse, no. 4; Heinrich Strobel, no. 249); and efforts to position cinema with respect to emerging media such as radio (Herbert Jhering, no. 267; Kurt Weill, no. 268) and television (which Rudolf Arnheim discussed under the name "Radio-Film" in 1932; no. 276).²⁴

An anthology informed by a narrower definition of film theory might limit itself to discussions of medium specificity and "film as art," or to canonical theorists and texts. But in our era of expanded audiovisual media and their concomitant genealogies, we are aware that such a shared consensus can no longer—if it ever could—be taken for granted. Cinema is and was many things. It was defined and redefined by countless voices, projects, and relationalities. For any sourcebook seeking to understand what German film theory might mean for us today—what sorts of promises it still holds, "even if the clattering of the film projectors disappears"—it is imperative to take seriously the anonymous murmuring that subtended "classical film theory," lending it the expansive relevance and vitality that it always possessed.

24. On the intermedial concerns of classical film theorists, see Doron Galili, "Intermedial Thought in Classical Film Theory: Balázs, Arnheim, and Benjamin on Film and Radio," *Germanic Review* 88, no. 4 (2013): 391–99.