

**THE GENRES OF EUROPEANIZATION —
MOVING TOWARDS THE *NEW HEIMATFILM***

by

Yvonne Franke

B.A. equivalent, German Literature, University of Augsburg,
Germany, 2003

M.A., German Studies, University of Pittsburgh, 2006

M.A., German Literature, University of Augsburg, Germany, 2007

Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of
the Kenneth P. Dietrich School of Arts & Sciences in partial
fulfillment

of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

University of Pittsburgh

2013

UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH

DEPARTMENT OF GERMAN

This dissertation was presented

by

Yvonne Franke

It was defended on

April 10, 2013

and approved by

Randall Halle, Klaus W. Jonas Professor of German Film and Cultural Studies,
Department of German

John B. Lyon, Associate Professor, Department of German

Sabine von Dirke, Associate Professor, Department of German

Lucy Fischer, Distinguished Professor of English and Film Studies, Department of English

Dissertation Director: Randall Halle, Klaus W. Jonas Professor of German Film and
Cultural Studies, Department of German

Copyright © by Yvonne Franke
2013

THE GENRES OF EUROPEANIZATION — MOVING TOWARDS THE
NEW HEIMATFILM

Yvonne Franke, PhD

University of Pittsburgh, 2013

This thesis explores the contemporary tensions between home and travel in German film as they transform under the influences of Europeanization and globalization. It refrains from viewing the *Heimatfilm* as a separate genre that has been predominantly understood as a local principle, whose foil is the travel and road film as allegedly more vital and mobile engagements with geo-political developments. Instead, *Heimat* is the overarching principle of my dissertation with the goal of formulating the *New Heimatfilm* as a hybrid genre comprising elements from the rural, urban and road film that demonstrate a conceptual shift within German film. Therefore, the *New Heimatfilm* features mobility and dwelling as strongly intertwined with each other, and provides both local explorations and a larger transgressive and comparative perspective.

The theoretical framework I propose relies on theories of space, globalization, and genre, such as those developed by Michel de Certeau, Ulrich Beck, and Rick Altman. Similarly to the deterritorialization of *Heimat* in accordance with the Spatial Turn, I argue that *Heimat* also transgresses its conventional generic categorization. This is an unfinished process, since

we are moving towards the *New Heimatfilm*. The figure of movement, the *flâneur* as the modern figure par excellence, aids in this endeavor. Within the urban surroundings of Second Modernity, the conjunction of *Heimat* and the urban space brings forth a new form of *flânerie* that revitalizes both concepts.

There are burgeoning and ongoing discourses on *Heimat*, its new spatial configurations and European identity, but they remain separate. My dissertation views these concepts as intertwined and discusses the possibility of a European *Heimat* as further step within the conceptual shift of the *Heimat* discourse and *Heimatfilm* genre.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	ix
1.0 INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 <i>HEIMAT</i> DISCOURSES	1
1.2 THE CLASSICAL <i>HEIMATFILM</i>	7
1.3 <i>HEIMAT</i> IN THE NEW GERMAN CINEMA	12
1.4 <i>HEIMAT</i> AND MOBILITY	18
1.5 IMAGINING A EUROPEAN <i>HEIMAT</i> IN AUDIOVISUAL CULTURE	22
1.6 UNDERSTANDING EUROPE THROUGH THE <i>NEW HEIMATFILM</i>	27
1.7 STRUCTURE	35
2.0 NO HOME IN PLACE — REVISITING THE RURAL IN THE RECENT <i>HEIMATFILM</i>	38
2.1 THE “MODERN” <i>HEIMATFILME</i> OF HANS STEINBICHLER AND MARCUS H. ROSENMÜLLER	41
2.2 SHOWDOWN AT THE BAVARIAN MCVILLAGE — <i>HEIMAT</i> AND GLOBALIZATION IN THOMAS KRONTHALER’S <i>THE HYPOCRITES</i> (2001)	49

2.3	THE RURAL HOME IN THE BERLIN SCHOOL — VALESKA GRISE-	
	BACH'S <i>LONGING</i> (2006)	59
2.4	<i>HEIMAT</i> BETWEEN THE ALPS AND <i>PLATTENBAU</i> — TAMARA STAUDT'S	
	<i>WHERE THE GRASS IS GREENER</i> (2008)	66
2.5	OVERCOMING THE EXCLUSIVENESS OF PLACE	75
2.6	CONCLUSION	79
3.0	HOME IN THE CITIES — <i>HEIMAT</i> AND THE URBAN FILM	83
3.1	THE <i>KIEZ</i> AS <i>HEIMAT</i> — ANDREAS DRESEN'S <i>NIGHT SHAPES</i> AND	
	<i>SUMMER IN BERLIN</i>	87
3.2	ANGELA SCHANELEC'S <i>MARSEILLE</i> — HOME IN BERLIN OR EUROPE	103
3.3	POACHING HER OWN TERRITORY — TATJANA TURANSKYJ'S <i>THE</i>	
	<i>DRIFTER</i>	117
3.4	CONCLUSION	136
4.0	FROM THE HEATHLAND TO THE HIGHWAY — <i>HEIMAT</i>, THE	
	ROAD, AND TRAVEL FILM	140
4.1	GENRE HISTORY — <i>HEIMAT</i> AND THE ROAD FILM	145
4.2	HOW DO YOU IMAGINE BOUNDLESS SOCIALISM?	150
4.3	DETERRITORIALIZING <i>HEIMAT</i> — FROM <i>WENDEFILM</i> TO EURO-	
	PEAN FILM	156
4.4	TRAVELING EAST IN THE POST- <i>WENDE</i> FILM — ANDREA MARIA	
	DUSL'S <i>BLUE MOON</i> (2002)	159
4.5	LEGACIES OF THE NEW GERMAN CINEMA — HAYAT IN THE CITIES	170
4.6	WIM WENDERS' <i>KINGS OF THE ROAD</i> — “PAPAS KINO IST TOT” .	175

4.7 FATIH AKIN'S <i>THE EDGE OF HEAVEN</i> — <i>PAPAS KINO LEBT!</i>	179
4.8 CONCLUSION	189
5.0 CONCLUSION — EUROPE/<i>HEIMAT</i>/FILM	192
BIBLIOGRAPHY	202

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First and foremost, I would like to thank my dissertation advisor Dr. Randall Halle for all the years we have worked together on this manuscript, for his enthusiasm, sacrifices, constructive criticism, and for finding the right balance between patience and urgency. Dr. Halle is not only an exceptional advisor, who commits himself to his students regardless of the time zones he frequently travels to for his numerous projects. He also treats his students like “future colleagues,” which gave me a lot of confidence in my abilities and made my transition into the profession a smooth one. I took great pleasure from our collaboration and discussions, whether they were about our research, the future of German Studies, or simply about baking bread. I am very fortunate to be able to call Randall my *Doktorvater*, particularly because this German term carries the affection I wish to express.

I would also like to extend my thanks to each member of my dissertation committee, Dr. John B. Lyon, Dr. Sabine von Dirke, and Dr. Lucy Fischer for their assistance and invaluable feedback. My first semester at Pitt, my first stay in the US, was also a time of cultural, linguistic and academic acclimatization, and it was Dr. Lyon’s seminar on German Realism in particular, which bridged the gap between German and American academia for me. Furthermore, our small but well-connected department quickly turned into my new home. Dr. Fischer’s class on the American silent film was a true eye opener for me, both

in a literary and figurative sense. It aroused my curiosity about film, and subsequently I began working on German literature *and* audiovisual culture. Dr. von Dirke's contemporary literature and theory courses put current socio-cultural phenomena into perspective for me. I can count myself lucky to be a part of the Department of German that allowed me to grow personally and professionally. Without Dr. Klaus Post, coordinator between the German programs of Augsburg and Pittsburgh, who recruited me in the first place, I would not be here. He has my sincere thanks for bringing me aboard!

Parts of this research have been presented at various conferences and colloquia throughout the last three years. I thank my colleagues in German, Film, Cultural, and European Studies, for the interest they showed, the thought-provoking questions they raised, and our inspiring discussions. An Andrew Mellon Predoctoral Fellowship and a European Union Dissertation Fellowship from the European Union Center of Excellence/European Studies Center proved integral for the intermediate phases of dissertation writing. An Arts & Sciences Graduate Fellowship in Cultural Studies supported the final stages of this project.

I reserve special thanks for my dear friends: To my continuing idols Zsuzsa Horváth and Boryana Dobрева, who graduated before me. I learned a lot from them and I will always admire them for their accomplishments; to my partner in crime Katrin Montiegel, with whom daydreaming and deadlines at "Coffee Tree Roasters" were equally enjoyable; To Katrin Mascha and Gavin Hicks, who were always there for me whenever I had doubts, and who adopted me into their little family, and to Martina Wells and her encouraging words during our regular lunches — the three of you are next in line! To my colleague in Slavic Film Studies Olga Klimova, who kept me on track through our "doghouse" writing sessions at "Jitters." We all had countless discussions about our professions and each of you helped

me maintain my sanity throughout graduate school. Thank you so much!

I am dedicating this dissertation to my first *Heimat*, which is my family: My parents Brigitte and Bernhard Franke, and my sisters Sandra Weber and Anja Heyng, whose loving support through all of the ups and downs accompanied me during my long journey away from home. I am indebted to Judith and Edward Friedman, who gave me a home in my early dissertation phase. To Gabriele Eichmanns, who, during my final writing stage, kindly shouldered responsibility for our co-edited forthcoming volume *Heimat Goes Mobile — Hybrid Forms of Home in Literature and Film*.

Lastly, I wish to express my deepest gratitude to Richard Pelikan, my love and confidant, whose encouragement, patience, care, and editing skills during this whole endeavor were indispensable. I am very happy to have him on my side!

Yvonne Franke

Pasadena, CA

July 2013

1.0 INTRODUCTION

“Europa ohne Grenzen. Die Schranken hoch und jeder kann durchmarschieren wie er lustig ist. (...) Es fällt auf, dass Europa wirklich zusammenwächst, ein Land wird. Die Sprachen ändern sich, die Musik ist anders, Nachrichten sind auch verschieden, aber was heißt das schon? Die Landschaft ist dieselbe geblieben, erzählt immer wieder die gleiche Geschichte von einem alten Kontinent, der die Kriege satt hat. Gutes Gefühl, einfach fahren, an nichts denken, die Straße und den Geist der Geschichte einfach durch mich durchziehen lassen. Ja, hier bin ich zu Hause. Das hier ist mein Heimatland.”

Philipp Winter on his road trip from Frankfurt to Lisbon in Wim Wenders’ *Lisbon Story* (1994)¹

1.1 HEIMAT DISCOURSES

Images and discourses of home, of a *Heimat* that offer a sense of belonging have always been crucial to representations of identity. Traditionally, *Heimat* can be translated as home, homeland or homestead, and is strongly intertwined with an individual’s identity and sense of belonging. Accordingly, in April 2012, *Der Spiegel* had a special issue called “Was ist *Heimat*? Eine Spurensuche in Deutschland” (“What is *Heimat*? Seeking traces in Germany,”). For the first time, the magazine’s issue displayed thirteen different covers: eleven

¹“Europe without borders. The gates are open and everyone moves along just as he likes. (...) It seems like Europe is really growing closer. It becomes one country. The languages change, the music is different, and the news too, but that doesn’t mean much. The landscape remains the same and always tells the same story of an old continent that is tired of wars. It’s a good feeling to just drive and not to think of anything, to let the streets and the spirit of history simply pass through me. Yes, here I am at home. This is my home country.”

images for different German regions, one for Switzerland and one for Austria, all distributed in the respective districts. The reporters traveled through Germany and interviewed locals about their urban, rural, virtual and foreign *Heimaten*². With this regional approach, *Der Spiegel* intended to give “dem Leser ein Gefühl von *Heimat* (...) und jedenfalls ein Bild seiner Region” (“the reader a feeling of home (...) and at any case, an image of her/his region,” (*Der Spiegel* 15/2012, 5)(*Der Spiegel* 5). At first sight, this recent special attention towards *Heimat* may appear unusual for an opinion-forming news magazine that has a rich history of opposing hierarchical structures, such as they have been ascribed to the traditional *Heimat* concept. Already in 1984 *Der Spiegel* had a *Heimat*-themed cover with the heading “*Sehnsucht nach Heimat*” (“*Longing for Heimat*,” *Der Spiegel*, “Willkommen in Hollyroth” 1984)(*Der Spiegel*), which shows an idyllic image of Woppenroth in the Hunsrück that partially served as the fictive setting Schabbach in Edgar Reitz’ famous *Heimat* series (1981-2006). This *Spiegel* issue appeared shortly after the release of the first part of the trilogy that focuses entirely on the everyday life of the village community from the end of World War I until the 1950s. Although also containing a sympathetic article about the charming community of Woppenroth, whose inhabitants served as lay actors, *Der Spiegel* takes a critical stance towards this new interest in *Heimat*: “Das ist der Lindenbaum, unter dem Vater Staat und Mutter Natur einträchtig im Kreise ihrer Lieben beieinandersitzen und sich freuen, daß alles ist und bleibt, wie es immer war” (“That is the linden tree, under which Father State and Mother Nature are sitting in harmony in the circle of their beloved ones and are happy that things are and stay the way they have always been,” (*Der Spiegel*,

²Heimaten is the plural form. While mostly being used in the singular (which also indicates the classical understanding of the singular nature of the *Heimat* concept), the plural is still rarely used. However, the usage of Heimaten usually occurs within larger discussions of current reconsiderations of identity and belonging.

“Geh über die Dörfer!”). The relation to the *Heimat* Schabbach, like any German *Heimat* that is situated between nostalgia and criticism, has received extensive scholarly attention. However, *Der Spiegel* has not pursued these complex dimensions any further in the 1980s. In 2004, Stern sensed a newly evolving *Heimat* paradigm in the age of globalization, which no longer follows reactionary principles (Stern, 2004). When *Der Spiegel* launched another cover story about *Heimat* in 2012, it was not even on the occasion of a particular publication or release. Merely the overall sentiments concerning *Heimat* have changed. In times of increased mobility and an accelerated lifestyle in a globalized world, *Heimat* has cast its feathers, so even the socially critical *Spiegel* no longer frowns upon it, and instead suggests *Heimat* has to be regarded a central topic within a German-speaking context.

To a great extent, young second- and third-generation Germans, whose families migrated to Germany decades ago, fuel this development. Films like the guest worker comedy *Almanya – Willkommen in Deutschland* (*Almanya – Welcome to Germany*, Yasemin Şamdereli, 2011) and pop novels like Yadè Kara’s *Selam Berlin* (2003) and *Cafè Cyprus* (2008) express bittersweet cross-cultural reflections on *Heimat*. In this conjunction, three journalists from the leading German weekly *Die Zeit*, Alice Bota, Khuê Pham and Özlem Topçu, recently gave personal accounts of what *Heimat* means for them in their book *Wir neuen Deutschen – Wer wir sind, was wir wollen* (*We New Germans – Who We Are and What We Want*, 2012). For them, whose families came from Poland, Vietnam and Turkey, *Heimat* has first and foremost always been “ein so schwieriges, schmerzhaftes und sehnsuchtsvolles Ding, dass es uns schwerfällt, darüber zu reden, geschweige denn, Antworten zu geben” (“such a difficult, painful and longing thing, so it is hard for us to talk about it, let alone give answers,” 50).

The initial quote by Wenders’ character and the *Spiegel* issue, however, indicate that

current *Heimat* negotiations are not limited to foreigners living in Germany, naturalized Germans, and their descendants, but can also be challenging for Germans without a conscious history of migration. This is certainly related to the fact that electronic media and mass migration greatly impact the individual's self-understanding, with the result that "locality is no longer what it used to be" (Appadurai 11). The falling borders within the European Union give new momentum to the always-complicated relation with *Heimat*. This becomes noticeable through the negotiation of matters that were once left to the national terrain, but are now considered within the larger European context (such as politics and economics, but also cultural identity). Differing accounts, both from cross-cultural and solely German contexts, voice new and current questions: What happens when *Heimat* becomes a concept of plurality that transcends conventional understandings of place? How is German identity developing within a globalized and Europeanized context? How does cultural production contribute to answering these questions? Europeanization has been defined in various ways, such as "the emergence and development at the European level of distinct structures of governance" (Cowles, Risse, and Caporaso 3). In contrast, I employ the term considering the European integration process and its meaning for the construction of collective understandings and socio-cultural identification that are needed to create an individual's sense of pan-European identity and belonging as a European *Heimat*.

The *Heimatfilm* has been considered a stable genre and it is treated largely as a reactionary phenomenon. In his comprehensive work of the *Heimatfilm, No Place Like Home* (2006), Johannes von Moltke critically engages with the formula there is no place like home and how *Heimatfilme* after World War II influence current understandings of German national identity. With respect to increased movement due to the fall of (some) European

borders, globalization, traveling and hybridity within current German film, I want to invert von Moltke's approach. We can observe that within current *Heimatfilme*, some of them I identify as *New Heimatfilme*, there is actually *no home in place*. With this statement I do not invoke Marc Augè's concept of "Non-Places." According to his anthropological vantage point, "a space which cannot be defined as relational, or historical, or concerned with identity will be a non-place" (778). These "non-places" are also marked by transition, such as "driving down the motorway, wandering through the supermarket or sitting in an airport lounge waiting for the next flight to London or *Marseille*" (96). However, I argue that for the *New Heimatfilm* transitional spaces do bear decisive meanings and contribute to the formation of this new genre, as my analyses of the case studies will demonstrate. This will become most obvious within the final chapter, in which a strong relation between a deterritorialized *Heimat* understanding and traveling is examined. These homes may not be in place, and yet they are places within their specific socio-political and historical contexts. Place, transition and genre connect the current *New Heimatfilm* with its cinematic past.

My research differs from previous approaches to the *Heimatfilm*, because I approach it as a living and dynamically transforming genre, engaged with contemporary experiences of Europeanization and globalization. Rather than still suggesting stability, the spatially confined understanding of *Heimat* turned into a deterritorialized and hybrid concept full of tensions, capable of being located in multiple places and exceeding the classical *Heimatfilm* genre. Traditionally associated with the rural, *Heimat* now becomes located in the metropolis, or even in an experience of travel between the urban and the rural. To that effect, it seems that *Heimat* has to be discovered more and more through movement, which in audiovisual culture is currently expressed through genre hybridity. *Heimat* and its typical motifs of family and

belonging still and again are important, and yet contemporary German film negotiates with them very differently. My dissertation is structured into three places, or rather settings, in which *Heimat* in the global age is engaged with differently: rural, urban and road. These settings more or less adhere to specific genres: Rural to the classical *Heimatfilm*, urban in the sense of the 1920s German *Straßenfilm* (street film), and the road film. I present three different spatial approaches to *Heimat* in contemporary film, which show that *Heimat* is no longer contained only within one genre, the *Heimatfilm*. Instead, *Heimat*, despite or because of the global age, is revived in numerous ways.

In order to establish the spatial configurations of the *New Heimatfilm*, a phenomenon within the highly connected Second Modernity, we need to take a look back at First Modernity as primarily marked by the transition from an agricultural to an industrial society. Accordingly, John B. Lyon recognizes this connection and investigates the precursors of Second Modernity within 19th century literature. He speaks of the shift from a phenomenological understanding of “place” to an impersonal “space” that was widely perceived sense of a loss of place: “Germans were out of place” due to “the entanglement of politics and economy with place” (Lyon 6-7). Lyon refers to Yi-Fu Tuan, who differentiates between space and place along similar lines: “What begins as undifferentiated space, ends as a single object-situation or place (...) When space feels thoroughly familiar to us, it has become place” (Tuan 723). Time plays a vital role in Tuan’s theory, who states that “it takes time to form an attachment to place” (198), which corresponds to a traditional *Heimat* formation. To that effect, Second Modernity with its time and space compression through increased mobility and global interconnectedness would be deprived of its capability to form spatial bonds. However, Tuan also notes that “the quality and intensity of experience matters more

than simple duration” (198). How the spatial experience in the German film has changed is the focus of this dissertation.

In the light of the “Spatial Turn” and European expansion, there are new developments within the *Heimat* discourse and its depiction in German film. The overarching thesis for my exploration of *Heimat* through the case studies is that all of these developments are intertwined with each other and that they have resulted in the formation of a new German film genre the *New Heimatfilm*. To set this new genre in high relief, I will set it against a history of its antecedents, the classical *Heimatfilm* and the New German Cinema, in particular.

1.2 THE CLASSICAL *HEIMATFILM*

Although commonly associated with the 1950s, the *Heimatfilm* was not a novelty in the postwar era. It picked up on topics already present in the 1920s and 1930s, such as the family, nature, and love (Trimborn 21) and (Höfig 162). The *Bergfilme* (Mountain Films, most famously by Luis Trenker) with their atmospheric and often adventurous Alpine settings preceded the introspective landscapes of the classical *Heimatfilm* in postwar Germany. The rural, to a great extent spared destruction during World War II, was projected as an untouched space worth protecting and capable of providing protection. Using contrasting spaces as negative foils (usually the city and abroad), it is not surprising that the classical *Heimatfilm* usually comes to the conclusion “daheim ist es am schönsten” (home is best). Accordingly, in Luis Trenker’s *Der verlorene Sohn* (*The Prodigal Son*, 1934) it becomes obvious that the son should never have left his village in Tyrol for New York City. Upon

his inevitable downfall, he returns home and becomes a functioning part of his community again, and thus fully revives the biblical story.

The National-Socialist Regime took the glorification of home to the national level and used it for its shameless propaganda. Thus, the Third Reich marks a break with the depiction of *Heimat* as a space of innocence. It promoted its *blood-and-soil-ideology* through new twists to the *Heimat* genre in films like Veit Harlan's *Jud Süß (Jew Süß, 1940)* and *Die goldene Stadt (The Golden City, 1942)*. These films portrayed the alleged German "master race" in their superiority over groups like the Jews, Slavs and people of color. These films as with the general cultural production supported the racial paradigms propagated in Nazi Germany (Trimborn 21). However as a result the connection between *Heimat* and soil as the basic component of place has become part of critical observations. To that effect, in *A Nation of Provincials*, Celia Applegate sheds light on questions of historical continuities from a local perspective and the meaning of local patriotism for a German modernity (1990). In contrast, Peter Blickle's *Heimat. A Critical Theory of the German Idea of Homeland* (2004) and Elizabeth Boa and Rachel Palfreyman's *Heimat. A German Dream* (2000) show that *Heimat* creates a sense of restriction and exclusion.

Under the censorship of the allies, German filmmaking launched again after World War II with Trümmerfilme (*ruddle films*). They were the antithesis to the films of the Third Reich with their promotion of warfare. Related to Italian Neorealism, *ruddle films* depicted the aftermath: the everyday life with destruction, homelessness, war returnees, and questions of guilt and national identity. Rubble films were produced roughly between 1946 up to the founding of the Federal Republic in 1949. Significant examples are Wolfgang Staudte's *Die Mörder sind unter uns (The Murderers Are Among Us, 1946)* and Roberto Rossellini's

Germania Anno Zero (*Germany Year Zero*, 1948) that were both shot in the ruins of Berlin.

But if the rubble film was an antithesis, an attempt to seek confrontation with the recent past, the 1950s became the heyday of the classical *Heimatfilm* genre. It can be understood as a turning away from the depressing *rubble films*, and a turn to a desire for beauty and simplicity. It would have been disruptive in the classical *Heimatfilm* to show the implications of World War II with great clarity: the struggles of the young Federal Republic with the flood of German refugees from former Silesia, Pomerania, East-Prussia, the Memel Territory etc., the bombed cities, and the loss of the kind of national pride as part of the harsh postwar reality. In the 50s spectators sought a retreat into an ideal world, away from rubble and ideological complexities: “Der Zuschauer will im Kino nicht mehr die gleichen Trümmer sehen, die er gerade verlassen hat, sondern Visionen einer heiteren, zufriedenen Zukunft” (Koch et al. 69).³ Thus, the *Heimatfilm* presented the intact nature of the Bavarian, Swiss or Austrian Alps or the rolling heath instead, and the national focus switched back to the local rural and regional: the rural community that needs to be preserved from ignorant visitors from the city, intruders, and poachers. Despite these obvious tendencies that distracted from the problematic postwar reality, the classical *Heimatfilm* nevertheless has to be understood within its historical context. There was a desire to imagine a *Heimat*, especially a new *Heimat* among those, who lost theirs. The “increased value of home’ dates back to the immediate postwar years, when the physical infrastructure had to be reestablished, bombed cities had to be rebuilt, displaced persons needed to find shelter” (von Moltke 118). Beyond the physical Wohnungsnot (housing shortage), a feeling of uprootedness and homelessness

³“The spectator no longer wants to see the same rubble in the movie theater that he just left behind, but visions of a bright, content future”

prevailed particularly among the *Vertriebene* (expellees). Thus, the 1950s *Heimatfilme* stroke a nerve with the postwar audience. Von Moltke notes that films like Hans Deppe's *Grün ist die Heide* (*Green is the Heath*, 1951) or Wolfgang Liebeneiner's *Waldwinter* (*Winter in the Woods*, 1956) particularly focus on expellees, employ "a wistful tone of loss" (138) and "indulge in nostalgia for a lost *Heimat*" (139).

There have been controversial views of the relation between *Heimat* and its temporality. On the one hand, the *Heimatfilm* functioned as a retreat into a "schöne Landschaft, die glückliche Liebesgeschichte, Unterhaltung ohne Zeitnähe und die Konzentration der Interessen auf den privaten Bereich" (Höfig 72)⁴ an ideal world that is untouched by history and ideology. According to Höfig, these fixed categories within the *Heimatfilm* make its critical engagement with reality impossible (72). Hence, it simply embraced the 1950s modernity and engaged with the new comforts of the *Wirtschaftswunder* (*economic miracle*), such as emerging car brands and fashion (von Moltke 17). On the other hand, Jürgen Trimborn notes that the *Heimatfilm* is a contemporary witness, because it is "untrennbar mit der Zeitstimmung, dem Lebensgefühl und dem Selbstverständnis der fünfziger Jahre verbunden" (7).⁵ Accordingly, von Moltke takes a closer look at the "preferred genre of the *Wirtschaftswunder*" (18) and surfaces its close relation with German national identity formation since the 1950s.

The dichotomy between *Heimat* (classically the rural home) and *Fremde* (the unknown place, usually the city or abroad) structures the *Heimatfilm*. Hans Deppe's *Grün ist die Heide* (*Green is the Heath*, 1951) is considered the embodiment of the *Heimatfilm*. It closes with the line "Bleibe im Land und nähre dich redlich" ("Dwell in the country and earn

⁴"(...)beautiful landscape, the happy love story, entertainment without references to our times, and the focus on private matters."

⁵"(...)inseparably linked with the *Zeitgeist*, attitudes towards life, and the self-understanding of the 1950s."

your living honestly”). This phrase could serve as the guideline and motto of the 1950s *Heimatfilm*. Deppe differentiates between decent and unrespectable characters and draws a clear line between those who stay loyal to their *Heimat* and those who have to be either convinced or excluded.

Many *Heimatfilme* in the course of its history resolve with the main characters’ return back into the fold: In *Green is the Heath* the Silesian expellees are finally able and willing to settle in the Lüneburg Heath. And in Alfons Stummer’s *Der Förster vom Silberwald* (*The Forester of Silberwald*, 1954) Liesl leaves her modern city life behind and returns to her village. Thus, the classical *Heimatfilm* promotes the existence of only one true home and uses the elsewhere as a negative foil.

Although *Heimat* also functioned as a space that mapped patterns of mobility and displacement of the decade due to the resettlements of post-war refugees and traveling during the *Economic Miracle* (von Moltke 118), the classical *Heimatfilm* has been known as relatively homogeneous, as one that promotes stability, arrival, and abidance, rather than change, departure, and transition. This was certainly motivated by the desire of settling down, particularly for those who were uprooted from their *Heimat* during the final stages of the war and after. Fifty years after films like *Green is the Heath*, the *Heimatfilm* still is popular, but there is an ongoing reconsideration of spatial configurations. The fall of the Berlin Wall and the formation of the European Union heralded a new paradigm of space and movement. Explorations and representations of *Heimat* in the past two decades show fundamental changes from these classical conceptions. A decisive step in the development towards the current *Heimatfilme* was already taken during the New German Cinema, to which Wim Wenders belonged. I will give an overview of this essential precursor of present

Heimatfilme, particularly the *Critical Heimatfilm* branch within the New German Cinema.

1.3 HEIMAT IN THE NEW GERMAN CINEMA

In the 1960s and 1970s young German directors were highly critical of the idea of *Heimat* and the *Heimat* genre, especially due to its promotion of blood and soil ideology in the Third Reich. This generation, too young for having engaged with National Socialism and vital critics of their parents' generation, questioned the reactionary tendencies of the young Federal Republic in relation to the 1968 student movement. Accordingly, they rejected the escapist world the *Heimatfilm* propagated the ideal and apolitical and pushed towards opening the discourse about Germany's recent history of terror and continuities in the present.

In accordance with this emerging sentiment in the 1960s, a number of *Autorenfilmer* (who combined all modes of filmmaking and production) made films that problematized and challenged contemporary uncritical understandings of Germany and national film production. In 1962, a group of young filmmakers proclaimed: "Der alte Film ist tot. Wir glauben an den neuen" (qtd. in Rentschler 2).⁶ The motto of the press conference "Papas Kino ist tot" ("Papa's cinema is dead") expresses the generation's rupture with contemporary mainstream films even more strongly. It positions the older generation as producing films that ignore the recent German past and allow for no artistic innovations. The young filmmakers announced the decline of the conventional German film and the birth of the revolutionary New German Cinema, calling for "[f]reedom from the conventions of the established industry" to implement their "concrete intellectual, formal, and economic conceptions" (qtd. in Rentschler

⁶"The old film is dead. We believe in the new one."

2).

Although the *Autorenkino* mostly presented new forms apart from the popular genre film (particularly from the *Heimatfilm*), one branch within the New German Cinema picked up on the *Heimatfilm* and turned its critical lens on it. Films like Peter Fleischmann's *Jagdszenen aus Niederbayern* (*Hunting Scenes from Lower Bavaria*, 1971) or Volker Schlöndorff's *Der plötzliche Reichtum der armen Leute von Kombach* (*The Sudden Wealth of the Poor People of Kombach*, 1971) were referred to as the *Kritischer Heimatfilm* (*Critical Heimatfilm*), constructed as anti-*Heimatfilme* (von Moltke 32). These films turned the once comforting genre of the 1950s into a critical tool to observe the socio-political status quo of the young Federal Republic and were "explicitly meant to be viewed within the tradition that the *Autoren* were keen to subvert" (32). Most examples of the *Critical Heimatfilm* created a strong dichotomy between *Heimat* and *Fremde* as was the case in the classical *Heimatfilm*. Yet in contrast, *Heimat* in the New German Cinema was indicated as a site of conflict. Provincial narrow-mindedness served as a microcosm of larger socio-political reactionary tendencies within the Federal Republic. Leaving home, under these circumstances, was demonstrated as the only chance of survival.

Often the filmmakers chose a didactic approach to teach the audience about historical and socio-political circumstances, as in *The Sudden Wealth of the Poor People of Kombach*. It is set in the 1820s in Hesse, shortly after serfdom had been abolished in this *Landgrafschaft* (landgraviate). A group of day laborers decides to attack a post wagon that transports currency. Their poor living conditions, the numerous unsuccessful attempts, and the subsequent interrogations by the authorities are shown in great detail. The overall depiction is very didactic, the acting performed with a *Verfremdungseffekt* including dialogues and voice-

overs that are read from a written text. A voice-over reads a letter from a German immigrant in the United States, telling the ones who stayed at home about the paradisiac circumstances in the New World, accompanied by shots of the day laborers' arduous existence in Hussia. Schlöndorff makes it clear that the only chance these workers had was to leave their *Heimat*. Even when they eventually manage to attack the post wagon and share the wealth, they cannot enjoy their accomplishment for long. In a voice-over, a free man who emigrated to the United States, concludes:

The farmers could not use the money, because they only know their land. When they touch the land, they know if it is good for potatoes, for grain or for wine. But when they touch money, they do not know how to handle it. They cannot show it, because a poor man with money is suspect. And the farmer cannot go to another place, because his land will not follow him, and he fears what he doesn't know about. But I am free. I have no home or land to hold me. I can go wherever I want to. The New World is waiting for me (...).

The connection between *Heimat* and the soil as the basic component of place becomes obvious. This example of the *Critical Heimatfilm* as a part of the New German Cinema creates a strong dichotomy between on the one side the locality of *Heimat*, with its lack of hope for any meaningful social change, and on the other side having to leave and find a *Heimat in der Fremde* (home away from home). Hence, it stands in sharp contrast to the classical *Heimatfilm* in as much as it indicates the home as the source of all misery and lack of choice, because the day laborers' place of birth sealed their fate. Aiming to educate the viewers about the implications of "freedom" after serfdom, this *Critical Heimatfilm* has different motivations and goals than any traditional *Heimatfilm* or *New Heimatfilm*, yet marks a decisive station in the development towards the *New Heimatfilm*.

Another example of a critical engagement with *Heimat* within New German Cinema, is Edgar Reitz' trilogy programmatically called *Heimat* (1981-2006). This series offers par-

ticular reference to modernity, notions of time and space, and a critical investigation of community. In contrast to Wenders' road movie it eventually works towards reconciliation with the main character's *Heimat*, so that the communal conflicts finally get resolved. Hermann Simon's reflections and lifelong struggles to free himself of his rural and low origin in Schabbach (a fictive place in Rhineland-Palatinate) advance the plot. After having spent several years in Munich and having traveled as a successful composer, he finally returns to the Rhine valley and gets settled with his soul mate Clarissa in the house of Romantic poet Karoline von Günderrode (1780-1806). In her drive to express her troubled emotions the latter was restricted by her contemporary female code of conduct, stating "Die Erde ist mir *Heimat* nicht geworden" (qtd. in Gersdorff).⁷ In Hermann's feeling of confinement as a young man his life story is mirrored in Günderrode's biography. While there was in fact *no place on earth* for her, Hermann's odyssey between Schabbach, Munich and Berlin equals a similar *Heimatlosigkeit* (homelessness). Christa Wolf picked up the motif of lacking place in her novel *Kein Ort. Nirgends* (*No Place on Earth*, 1979). Only the *Heimkehr* (homecoming) to Schabbach makes Hermann aware of lacking a home. He buys the remaining timber frame of Günderrode's house and builds his home according to his ideas as an artist, and settles down. He invokes Martin Heidegger's theory of place and exemplifies the regaining of home during First Modernity.

According to Heidegger's essay "Bauen Wohnen Denken" ("Building Dwelling Thinking"), there is a "housing shortage" in modernity, however not in the sense of the lack of buildings: "The real dwelling plight lies in this, that mortals ever search anew for the nature of dwelling, that they *must ever learn to dwell*" (363). Individuals have lost their connection

⁷"The earth did not become a home for me."

to place and its complex structures and merely inhabit space, which means they do not make use of the full potential of place. Heidegger refers to the complexity of place as “a primal oneness of the four – earth and sky, divinities and mortals – belong together in one” (351). Hermann preserves an abandoned house and reconsiders his *Heimat* that used to own and confine him, and that he now literally rethinks and reconstructs, through which he ends the “plight” and begins to dwell. Hermann “gives thought” (363) to his homelessness, which includes the abstract idea and the construction through deeds as necessary components of being. For Heidegger, this being is constituted as an ongoing process of thinking that is strongly intertwined with mobility, as many of his titles show, such as *Holzwege (Off the Beaten Track, 1950)* or *Unterwegs zur Sprache (On the Way to Language, 1959)*. Only because of Hermann’s journeys is he able to come home and experience dwelling, a more conscious way of being. Reitz’s *Heimat* trilogy belongs to the *Critical Heimatfilm* branch of the New German Cinema, an important predecessor of the current *New Heimatfilm*. The series’ three parts, which are set in the rural (part one), the urban (part two) and eventually reconnect the drifting characters from different parts of the country again in the rural (part three) foreshadow various ways in which current German authors and directors approach the mobile *Heimat*. With the rural film (chapter two), the urban film (chapter three) and the road film (chapter four), my dissertation follows a similar itinerary.

Although all three parts of Reitz’ *Heimat* comprise an interaction of the locals with the implications of modernity, each part shows a different form of engagement with time and space. While *Heimat I* (Hermann’s young parents and his childhood in Schabbach) is still distant from modernity, *Heimat II* (Hermann’s studies and beginning career in Munich) makes it clear that the trilogy is moving towards an encounter with urban modernity.

Eventually, returning to Schabbach in *Heimat III* is no longer a merely dutiful visit back to the past (both in terms of memory and an old-fashioned lifestyle), but now his village is permeated by all implications of modern life. Yet, the display of modernity goes beyond the display of commodities (cars, household supplies and fashion) as was the case in many traditional *Heimatfilme*. Reitz has his main character revisit his *Heimat* after he has spent many years in the city. Accordingly, the three parts of the *Heimat* trilogy are set in different times and spaces: World War II depictions, Hermann's urban life as a young artist in *Heimat II*, and the German reunification and its aftermath. The narrative is occasionally interrupted by the inclusion of original footage, such as from the fall of the wall. The final part closes in the new millennium with the re-settlement in the old *Heimat* at the Rhine. Thus, Reitz's epic trilogy is a precursor of the *New Heimatfilm* that comprises vanishing generic borders, shows physical movement in different spaces, and renegotiates established lifestyles with contradictory ones. What nevertheless differentiates the *Heimat* trilogy from the current *New Heimatfilm* is the lack of commitment to an only home within the new genre. Further, the *New Heimatfilm* does not necessarily employ this lack of attachment as a "plight" in a Heideggerian sense, but is eager to explore a deterritorialized relation between home and travel.

The *Critical Heimatfilm*, as exemplified by Reitz' series, was only the beginning of *Heimat's* modification. Recent films show a significantly larger variety of forms than did the *Critical Heimatfilm* or certainly the traditional *Heimatfilm*. The latter stayed within the paradigm of given dichotomies, such as inside shelter and outside threat, the good community and the subordinate individual. For every problem the solution depends on the character's right choice. The *New Heimatfilm* challenges paradigms in which the solution is

only a stone's throw away. *Heimat's* development from a homogeneous to a more open genre already started during the New German Cinema in the 1960s. Thus, the ongoing changes of German film genres since the fall of the Berlin Wall and the opening of European borders relates back to the New German Cinema, in particular.

Space was already of great importance to the *Heimatfilm*, although the settings often seemed to be “a timeless, unchanging landscape” (King 133)(King 133). Yet, as we can see in *Green is the Heath* and many other examples, “its specific organization of space, as well as its appeal to tradition, can be historicized and is in fact meaningful only when considered within a political history of German space and place” (133). Since “the representation of European filmmaking is significant not only in terms of art cinema” and not to be limited to the urban space (132), by which King refers to the popular genre of the *Heimatfilm*, the *New Heimatfilm* partially finds itself in a similar position, with not all of its films enjoying serious critical attention. Its horizon is broadened now to European geopolitical matters.

1.4 *HEIMAT* AND MOBILITY

The *New Heimatfilm* takes mobility onto the next level, where Europe's falling borders provide an enlarged space for cinematic journeys. This is theoretically echoed in Arjun Appadurai's view of cultural activity that is also known as the social imaginary in an interconnected, globalized world. As he points out in his chapter on “Global Ethnoscapes,” cultural activity is highly influenced by the flow of mass-mediated images and communication between distant places via different channels, to which Appadurai counts the “ethnoscapes”

(the landscapes that mark the shifting world in which we live), the “mediascapes” (the distribution of electronic images and narratives), the “technoscapes” (the technologically transmitted interaction across previously impermeable borders), the “financescapes” (the flow of capital), and the “ideoscapes” (ideologies of states and counter-ideologies, expressed in national political cultures) (31). His approach provides a useful lens for my discussion of the films that present a tension between local and mobile *Heimat* constructions.

In periods of expansion, such as Europe has gone through since the collapse of the East Block and the beginning of the Eastward expansion, there is a tension between the need for a local belonging and the desire to leave affiliated circles, departing and arriving, dislocating and relocating. Accordingly, the generic representation becomes permeable, so that the *New Heimatfilm* has to be defined as a mixture of different genres while being deeply rooted within German film culture. This is a European matter that has an articulation within the German *Heimat* discourse. *Heimat* is no longer a shorthand for stasis, but operates on both sides of the classical binary oppositions space – time, place/local – space/global” (Eigler, ”Critical Approaches to *Heimat* and the Spatial Turn,” 34). According to Eigler, *Heimat* can no longer be considered a static concept, but a dynamic one instead that has to be recognized in its ability to open up to new spatial understandings that create connections rather than limitations.

Hence, motifs of mobility drive this new *Heimat* discourse with its tensions between home and travel. Historically, we have understood home and travel as antitheses: to travel is to be away from home. What happens when home becomes travel, when rather than viewing these concepts as incompatible they enter a fertile relation and revive each other? My dissertation explores the contemporary tensions between home and travel in recent German

film under the influences of Europeanization and globalization. Images of home, offering a sense of belonging have always been crucial to representations of identity. Decisively influential backdrops for these changing parameters are the fall of the Berlin Wall in 1989, the founding of the European Union in 1993 and its extensions since then (especially the Eastern extension in 2004) that not only led to the monetary union and the drawing together of European national markets, but also provided the geo-political reality as an enlarged realm of experience for EU citizens. In other words, the EU adds an antagonistic dimension through which its citizens orient themselves both within their national and transnational contexts.

From the middle of the fiscal crisis in Europe for instance, when many were questioning if the European Union would fall apart, Habermas noted that “[c]itizens are involved in a twofold manner in constituting the higher-level political community directly in their role as future EU citizens and indirectly in their role as members of one of the national peoples” (35). The social and cultural dimensions of this enterprise were closely related to this twofold political structure: According to Habermas’ perspective, citizens are still deeply rooted in their specific regions and nations as *Heimat*, but they are also sought to become world citizens. While this double bind is capable of challenging homogeneous concepts of a singular place of belonging, and thus useful for the burgeoning discourse on belonging to multiple *Heimaten*, it does not take the antagonism between a concrete place and the abstract idea of Europe into consideration. Not the “higher-level political communities” can pave the way to a sense of European togetherness, but cultural manifestations, such as film, because it offers images that operate on the larger European space.

As Wim Wenders’ *Lisbon Story* character Philipp Winter points out, reflections on home and travel no longer exclude each other or are pursued during the absence of one or the

other. Moreover, they are often presented as conditions for each other: Whoever wants to find home has to travel, or whoever travels ultimately deals with notions of home. In her book *Mappings* (1998) Susan Stanford Friedman sets traveling as a precondition for the genuine *Heimat* perception:

In terms of roots/routes symbiosis, experiencing identity as roots requires some figurative or material engagement of routes through a contact zone of intercultural encounter. Conversely, identity developed through routes involves an experience of leaving roots, of moving beyond the boundaries of “home.” (153)

According to Friedman, it takes “some form of displacement literal or figurative to come to consciousness. Leaving home brings into being the idea of home, the perception of its identity as distinct from elsewhere” (153). On a similar note, Peter Blickle defines *Heimat* as an imaginary space of reconciliation that can only be reached through displacement, because “to long for a *Heimat* and to perceive *Heimat*, we had to become mobile and homeless” (401). Hence, *Heimat* and travel are inseparably linked. Further, this creation of a consciousness of home through its absence has most famously been displayed in Victor Fleming’s fantasy film *The Wizard of Oz* (1939). Von Moltke, whose book title picks up on the film’s most famous line, creates the connection between this popular manifestation of home and the critical *Heimat* discourse.

To that effect, my project focuses on the contemporary search for home and identity, travel and displacement, as a sign of a fundamental shift of the cinematic representations of German and European space within national film production. With respect to the European idea, it has simply become more complicated to draw rigid borderlines on the European map, and accordingly, between genres and nations in European national cinema as well.

1.5 IMAGINING A EUROPEAN *HEIMAT* IN AUDIOVISUAL CULTURE

Whoever thinks of Europe, is unlikely to think of *Heimat*, because Europe's distinguishing feature is its symbiosis of its nation states as, more or less, separate geo-political and cultural entities. This widely established notion is strongly intertwined with the dichotomy between *Heimat* and *Fremde* (away from home). The fact that there are nations is historically inherent to Europe, but it proves simplistic to condense nations geo-politically to separate entities. Yet, in its cultural diversity lies its actual strength (Enzensberger, *Ach Europa!*). This diversity happens on a transnational and shifting basis and can no longer (or could it ever?) be kept inside its respective geographical boundaries. How do we link *Heimat* and Europe with this notion? Annegret Pelz' essay "Europa in die Karten geschaut" ("Looking over Europe's shoulders," literally "Looking into Europe's cards/maps") opens with a confirmation of the alleged contradiction between *Heimat* and Europa due to the oppositional relation between *Heimat* and abroad. She provides an overview of the mythologies on which "ein solcher Europäischer Heimatdiskurs" ("such a European *Heimat* discourse") is based (169). However, she actually does not discuss the relation between *Heimat* and Europe any further.

Despite its current fiscal challenges, Europe receives positive responses when looked at from a cultural perspective. The *FAZ* describes the development of a new sentiment as follows:

Die jungen Deutschen leben nicht in Deutschland, sie leben in Europa. Den meisten ist das nicht bewusst - ein erstes Anzeichen von Selbstverständlichkeit. Manche aber wollen es nicht wahrnehmen. Doch das Deutschland, in dem sie zuhause sind, ist längst kein Nationalstaat mit festen Grenzen und eindeutigen Eigenschaften mehr. (Hefty)⁸

⁸"The young Germans don't live in Germany, they live in Europe. Most people are not aware of that as

Regardless if this development is wishful thinking or not, its realization depends upon the imagination, which is inseparably connected with audiovisual culture. European films increasingly transgress the old national boundaries and open up new possibilities, both in terms of aesthetics and funding. Accordingly, films increasingly visually reflect these new socio-political parameters.

Film culture is both affected by geo-political developments and by economic changes on the levels of production and distribution, which causes it to reflect on these larger shifts considering film themes, narratives and hybridization of genres. An increasing number of European films are co-productions (Elsaesser 505). As Elsaesser points out, bi- or multi-lateral projects do not necessarily constitute multicultural or transnational narratives *per se*, but represent mostly “the countries with the strongest film cultural markets and best chances of export.” Often they are “part of the process of European integration (. . .), making the director the sole vehicle for connoting pan-European identity” (506). While I agree with Elsaesser’s notion of European co-productions’ limited potential of proposing a European identity, I turn my focus away from co-productions as bearers of a European imaginary. Instead, I consider local settings with broader views and border-crossing narratives as driving forces (in the most literal sense) for the envisioning of such an identity apart from a specific transnational film production. A European film may not immediately be able to imagine a comprehensive Europe, but nevertheless the local and regional are inextricably connected with processes of globalization and Europeanization (Appadurai 11). The films are discussed here from a German perspective and are situated within the tensions between local and global

first sign of implicitness. However, some don’t want to notice it. For the Germany, in which they are home, no longer is nation state with fixed borders and distinct characteristics.”

dwelling and mobility, visualizing a transgression of boundaries albeit being allocated to a specific regional or national entity. Both local and trans-local examples resemble a culture that is anything but monolithic. Therefore, the European film, respectively, can be grasped less through common denominators than through its multiplicity.

Randall Halle has noted that “[f]ilm proves to be the most significant marker of simultaneous economic and cultural transformations, a marker of globalization and transnationalism” (*German Film After Germany*, 169). Rather than presuming the homogeneous European film, the multiplicity of European film production reflects complementary and competing spaces and lifestyles of possible identifications inherent to Europe. Although they are strongly intertwined with each other, Halle distinguishes transnationalism from globalization and stresses the former’s ideational paradigm (in contrast to globalization’s primarily economic concern) and mediation and imagining of public spheres (28). Echoing Benedict Anderson’s basic principle of “imagined communities” (1991), Halle suggests the emergence of a “transnational aesthetic,” a reflection of geo-political and economic changes in contemporary audiovisual forms and narratives: “Films in the transnational era do imagine communities and they do so transnationally” and thus, the transnational aesthetic with its various forms and techniques taken from across national cinemas and temporalities “enriches the articulations of visual language” (Anderson 87). In contrast to Elsaesser, Halle takes film’s cultural participation into account that is part of my critical investigation.

To be sure, I do not mean to confuse the EU with Europe. With the recent accession of Croatia, the EU is an organization of currently 28 member states and Europe is a continent with 50 internationally recognized sovereign states. Obviously, there are many countries in Europe that are not members of the European Union. Some have no aspirations to

become a part of it (such as Russian, Switzerland or Norway), other are official candidates (e.g. Montenegro, Serbia and Turkey) or potential candidates (comprising Albania, Bosnia Herzegovina and Kosovo). Yet, Europe and the EU are inextricably linked concepts considering that Europe took on a more significant role in the imagining of the community. Thus, although current European filmmaking is influenced by post-1990 events that led to the formation of the EU, these effects have impacts beyond its borders. Non-EU (and sometimes non-European) countries participate in a more comprehensive and complex endeavor (considering their cultural, historical, economic, and political relations to the EU member states). Emir Kusturica's international co-production *Crna Mačka, Beli Mačor* (*Black Cat, White Cat*, 1998) from what used to be Serbia and Montenegro attest to that by imagining Europe from outside. Randall Halle points out that current processes of drawing together a European film market bring forth a "new form of complex connectivity" (20) that exceeds preceding international co-productions. Accordingly, "[f]ilm content begins to move into a transnational form of representation, an imagining of community markedly different from earlier international forms" (25). Such a community that operates on the same level as *Heimat* in the German context, a concept of belonging and identity, could accelerate a European identity.

Much research has been done on transnational film production and examinations of the post-1990 European film by employing multiple national angles: Thomas Elsaesser's *European Cinema* (2005) reaches out beyond Europe to investigate the competitiveness of independent national filmmaking in the wake of globalization. Wendy Everett's anthology *European Identity in Cinema* (2005) and Rosalind Galt's transnational approach in *The New European Cinema* (2006) provide broad overviews of European film production and focus on

selected case studies from different national productions considering the multiplicity of European identity. Galt particularly views both Europe's past and future through post-1990 film production and interweaves her close readings with political discussions and philosophical reflections. By discussing films from the post-Wall era that are set in the aftermath of World War II, she examines the staging of history. From this more contemporary perspective, this staging is informed by rethought values concerning memory and nostalgia. Christine Haase's *When Heimat Meets Hollywood* (2007) offers ways of understanding current German cinematic engagement with America. Lutz Koepnick and Stephan Schindler's *The Cosmopolitan Screen* (2007) employ the term "cosmopolitan gaze" that explores the globe as a symbolic topography. Their book traces German cinema's role in the global, transnational and cosmopolitan network. Randall Halle discusses shifts from national to European film production that also comprise shifts from strictly national to European concerns (*German Film After Germany* 2008) and explores Germany's role within these pan-European changes (2008). Katrin Sieg's *Choreographing the Global in European Cinema and Theater* (2008) explores German artists' critical engagement with the images and stories through which politicians and the media describe globalization and the EU.

My approach differs from these studies, because I specifically attend to German national film production, yet without forfeiting a larger European context. By focusing on recent expressions of *Heimat* and the *Heimatfilm*, which have traditionally been limited to German territory and genre, I identify the trajectory of *Heimat* from a monolithic and spatially confined into an open and plural concept. I am investigating how the "transnational aesthetic" manifests in specific case studies considering their generic frameworks and narrative angles, through which they imagine *Heimat* transnationally. In contrast to Halle's approach,

my dissertation focuses on the ideational implications of these material developments, most evident in shifts towards hybrid genres. Hybridity is understood as a flow across borders, e.g. cultural and ethnic boundaries, as (see Bhabha *The Location of Culture*), or borders defining disciplines and genres. We can understand the “transnational aesthetic” as a cinematic hybrid within German film production that revisits a classical genre with the result of bringing forth a new one. I am identifying the *New Heimatfilm* as a recent hybrid German film genre that is developing under the influences of Europeanization and globalization. These generic transformations indicate a triangulation of the opposition between home and travel in the new Europe that includes a reconceptualization of the dialectics. The motif of mobility drives the *New Heimatfilm* to surface shifts on the local and global scale. My analysis includes diverse films, both popular and critically acclaimed. I also trace the trajectory of postwar *Heimat* expressions and their critical encounters, such as in the New German Cinema and DEFA, as predecessors of the *New Heimatfilm*.

1.6 UNDERSTANDING EUROPE THROUGH THE *NEW HEIMATFILM* GENRE

As mentioned in the opening, *Heimat* has been revived as a progressive paradigm, although it seemed to have gained an outdated status along the way. However, in order to function as a useful lens for contemporary socio-political developments, it had to be reinvented in its relation to genre, place and space. *Heimat*, as we shall see, is no longer explored through an exclusive focus on a particular place, but emphasized in its extension to space that

transgresses national borders and includes the larger European terrain. *Heimat* is no longer confined to the rural, disconnected space of a Germany-specific First Modernity. To that effect, the classical *Heimatfilm* genre can no longer explore what has changed: How we attach to places, and how we consider European expansion as contradicting notions of home, or how new spatial relations fortify new forms of attachment, how we need to conceive our relationship to place and space anew in Second Modernity, in which these two are inseparably linked with each other.

One way of understanding what this evolving Europe is can be discovered by exploring how it is visualized in its multiple cinemas. My dissertation approaches this question through genre, and, more specifically, through German cinema as merely a vantage point towards answering this comprehensive endeavor. While *Heimat* is a German-specific concept, the desire for a particular local attachment seems to correspond with a larger European phenomenon. If other European nations show similar concepts that equal the German notion of *Heimat* or how their understandings of home exactly differ from it deserves more attention that goes beyond the scope of my dissertation.

Along with an increased mobility, the generic representation changes, so that the *New Heimatfilm* has to be defined as a mixture of different genres while being deeply rooted within German film culture. I am specifically exploring the visual cultures of urban and rural spaces as presented in film since the German reunification and the founding of the European Union. Traveling plays an important role as a sign of relationship to the world outside the narrowly circumscribed German notion of home. Thus, there is a strong connection to be found between *Heimat* and genres not commonly associated with this genre that usually promotes stability and settlement rather than mobility. Connected through shared motifs

and concerns, these contrasting generic concepts inform the *New Heimatfilm*.

Current *Heimatfilme* are not necessarily *New Heimatfilme*. Popular German filmmaker Marcus H. Rosenmüller successfully picks up on the classical genre in his Bavarian dialect films (his prankster comedy *Wer früher stirbt, ist länger tot* / *Grave Decisions*, 2006, is the most famous example in Germany), but without bringing *Heimat* considerations to a new level. Hence, I suggest breaking the *Heimatfilm* down into the components *Heimat* and film genre, which creates a discourse that goes beyond the German context and eventually formulates a new genre in an attempt to grasp Europe as an evolving entity: *Heimat* and the rural film, *Heimat* and the urban film, *Heimat* and the road film work towards the European *Heimatfilm*. Rather than a genre study, I am aiming towards the formulation of a conceptual shift currently happening within German film instead of establishing three relatively self-contained genres: the rural film (what used to be the classical *Heimatfilm*, which has become a too limiting term), the urban film (the German 1920s *Straßenfilm*/street film as defined by Siegfried Kracauer), and the road film (inspired by the American road movie, but brought to new levels in European filmmaking). In other words, I am not viewing *Heimat* against the backdrop of three classical genres, but I am presenting three appearances of the *New Heimatfilm* that are based within and across differing spaces.

Leo Braudy and Marshall Cohen point out that most commonly, films are categorized according to “fictional narratives,” which are “almost inevitably American” feature films, such the western, gangster film, *film noir*, or musical (*Film Theory and Criticism* 657). However, generic classification that clearly distinguishes one genre from the other marks certain difficulties and does not offer any form of universality due to overlaps and the uncertainty about the filmmakers’ and audiences’ awareness of generic conventions. Nevertheless, under-

standing a film usually depends on the recognition of its appropriate formal contextualization (658), which results in either an acceptance or subversion of it, either by the filmmaker or the viewer. In any case, most theories consider genres' participation in cultural life that is inextricably linked with them. To that effect, Leo Braudy references the musical's potential to punctuate the dull everyday life of the 1930s and 1940s. With a more timeless focus, Christine Gledhill emphasizes the function of genres for a social imaginary by exceeding the fictional realm and entering cultural considerations:

Genres are central to this process, because they provide public imagery as the building material for the construction of alternative, fictional worlds, while their overlapping boundaries and pool of shared images and conventions mean that they are ripe for reconstruction and retrospective imagination. (239)

Further, Gledhill notes that it is up to the critics to “create connections across generic boundaries” that bring forth “previously unperceived configurations and patterns” (239). Gledhill seems to pick up on Rick Altman's approach towards questioning the understanding of genre as a mere formal matter. On a similar note, Steven Cohan points out that we should remind ourselves of the fact that “genres do not reside within film texts as their DNA; rather, viewing through genre is a valuable and sense-making but far from totalizing reading strategy brought to film and thus not literally organizing it from the inside out” (227).

In his seminal study *Film/Genre* (1999) Altman revisits allegedly fixed categories of genre definition in Hollywood productions. He argues that genres have no singular origin, but are results of ongoing processes that work towards full codification (Altman 143). He provides a variable coordinate system that distinguishes between “semantic” and “syntactic” elements. The “semantic” components are a genre's general characteristics (such as the

scenery, characters or particular shots) while the “syntactic” elements comprise dynamic relations between these concepts that constitute the filmic text. Altman describes the process of genrification in linguistic terms through an “adjective-to-noun progression” that occurs across media: “*Narrative poetry*: the nature of *narrative*. *Scenic photography*: a *scenic* (...). *Serial publication*: a *serial*. *Commercial message*: a *commercial*. *Roman noir*, *film noir*: just plain *noir*” (51). He gives an example of the “substantifying process” with *film noir* that did not always claim a full generic identity. *Film noir*’s foremost characterization is its gloomy atmosphere that got adapted by different genres in French filmmaking (one example Altman points out to is Jean Renoir’s *La Bête Humaine*/*The Human Beast*, 1938), and was thus only used as a mode. It turned into the stand-alone “noun phrase” *film noir* only through its Hollywood appropriation during the 1950s, where “an American culture adept at making dark films (...) [was] entirely unaware that noir had ever been an adjective” (Altman 61).

However, one problem with Altman’s approach is that he does not come to a clear conclusion concerning his question about the stability of genres. He recognizes that genres are “not the permanent product of a singular origin, but the temporary *by-product* of an ongoing *process*” (54). Nevertheless, his linguistic approach works towards a finalized concept, the “substantification” (53). Further, his genrification process relies on the hierarchy between a superior genre (a noun) and an inferior quality (an adjective). He refers to the former as an “established, land-owning generic substantive” and to the latter as a “gypsy” (199). On the contrary, I will argue that genres stay in flux by further developing into several directions that do not necessarily entail a hierarchy. I will approach the discussions of the German case studies of the *New Heimatfilm* that may not necessarily appear as having a common

denominator, the substantified genre of the *Heimatfilm*. The films are taken from different established genres, informed by varying styles and differ considering their popular and art house appeal. In reference to Russian Formalism, Steve Neale points out that “[d]ominant genres and dominant devices within these genres are perpetually changed and displaced in a process of contestation and change” (201). Hence, the addition (the “gypsy”) is not only the adjective, as suggested by Altman, but the noun as well. This is particularly the case in my project that first of all brings attention to the famous *Heimatfilm* genre. Although it has been very successful in the 1950s and achieved some of the greatest box office successes of German film productions (e.g. *Green is the Heath*, 1951) it no longer attracts the younger German generation today. Yet, *Heimat* is still and again of importance for German identity, and so this substantified genre is no longer a dominant component *per se*, but can also co-exist with another component. “When the canonized’ art form reaches an impasse,” it enables “the infiltration of the elements of non-canonized art, which by this time have managed to evolve new artistic devices” (Erich 260). Such an impasse can be noted within the classical *Heimatfilm* genre, that may still entertain millions on public broadcasters during prime time, but that would not bring forth new aesthetic concepts, and thus becomes hybridized not only with adjectives (rural and urban), but also with other established genres (the urban film and road film). I will discuss in detail how in Thomas Kronthaler’s low-budget film *Die Scheinheiligen* (*The Hypocrites*, 2001) the classical *Heimatfilm* genre gets satirized and how this genre gains new momentum by means of presenting it as a Western.

The *New Heimatfilm* has not yet been substantified, but according to Altman “[w]hat we perceive as a mixture of pre-existing genres is often nothing less than the liquid lava of a new genre still in the creation process” (143). The formation of the *New Heimatfilm* genre

still needs to be completed as well. By following his principles considering German films and notions of *Heimat* on a larger European terrain, I extend his model by suggesting that the process of genre formation can take different routes, as in the formation of the *New Heimatfilm*. Starting from the nouns *Heimatfilm*, city film and road film as substantified genres, the *New Heimatfilm* progresses with an attachment of seemingly contradictory adjectives like rural or mobile. It combines these adjectives with the nouns *Heimat/city/road/travel/film* anew within a European context.

Further, the *New Heimatfilm* develops new dynamics out of old and new components, alongside current expansions taking place in the European Union, effecting a rising engagement with Europeanness. Altman demonstrates the relation between “[g]enre/nation,” stating that both “depend on constant conflict among multiple competing but related notions” (205). What the imagining of the community (also drawing on Anderson’s concept of imagined communities on the national level) and processes of genrification have in common, is a dialectical process within an already existing community or genre (206). Extending Altman’s hypotheses to German film production viewed against the European territory, genres help us think about transnational developments. Germany, and subsequently its film production, plays a significant role in current shifts within the *Heimat* discourse since reunification and the increasing influence of globalization that emerged in its wake. After forty years of separation, a people come together again as one nation, initiating a new debate about Germany’s role on a global scale. These changes affected the understanding of the German *Heimat*, mainly the way German citizens have viewed their relationship to a German nation-state since the end of World War II. Along with its new political and economic functions, its enlarged geographical space and new issues pertaining to East and West relations, the

Heimat discourse has been revived, and with its new cinematic representations, a discourse on Europe through its generic representations emerged.

German film rediscovers components of its formerly popular genre of the *Heimatfilm* and renegotiates with them in a constructive manner. I pointed out how during the historical overview of the classical *Heimatfilm* and the engagement with *Heimat* in the New German Cinema, *Autorenfilmer* either constructed *Heimat* as a negative space or that they avoided it completely. This occurred during Germany's phase of geographical restriction. Since the fall of the Berlin Wall and the beginning European expansion, we can note a new interest in *Heimat*, albeit in changed ways. We cannot simply dismiss it as a nostalgic yearning within a disorienting globalized world, because it would entail a limitation to a classical *Heimat* revival that offers escapism into bucolic settings. Rather, the *New Heimatfilm* references its historical predecessors and comprises seemingly contradictory elements taken from other genres. With the transgression of national boundaries and promotion of connections on the aesthetic and socio-political level, the compounds *Heimat* and film describe a dynamic relation that participates in the reality or imagination of a home within a European context, in "good" and "bad" ways. I develop Altman's connection between genre and nation further in conjunction with *Heimat* and Europe, two allegedly oppositional concepts that challenge notions of dwelling and being through mobility.

1.7 STRUCTURE

To chart the transformations of German film genres, my dissertation entails three body chapters, each dealing with a different locality, or rather setting of *Heimat* from which we can distill the characteristics in order to identify the overarching *New Heimatfilm* genre, connected by the spatial and physical motif of movement. At first glance, some of the case studies in chapter two, *No Home in Place — Revisiting the Rural in the Recent Heimatfilm*, seem to resemble the classical *Heimatfilm* the most. However, their directors revise the representation of *Heimat* in the new millennium and seek to break with the established patterns of the genre. In the third chapter, *Home in the Cities — Heimat and the Urban Film*, a reconsideration of the *flâneur* motif and Michel de Certeau's theory of practiced space are of importance. I relate his concept to the experience of the urban space as *Anti-Heimat* with the goal of reworking the mobile figure of the *flâneur* to bespeak contemporary representations. The fourth chapter, *From the Heathland to the Highway — Heimat, the Road, and Travel Film*, creates a full circle in the analysis discussing the link between the urban and the rural space as a matter of deterritorialized movement.

The films in chapter 2 resemble the classic *Heimatfilm* genre most due to their rural settings. It traces the trajectory of the *Heimatfilm* from the 1950s and critical encounters within the New German Cinema of the late 1960s and 1970s. The latter counts as an essential predecessor of *New Heimatfilme* today. The flipside of globalization is often the increasing demand of cultural independence and the search for an affiliation to a particular locality, a *Heimat*. In the past decade, an increasing number of films use settings and motifs that indicate a *Heimatfilm*, yet critically undermine it by questioning local dynamics and including

socio-political contexts. Thomas Kronthaler's *Die Scheinheiligen* (*The Hypocrites*, 2001), Hans Steinbichler's *Hierankl* (2003), Valeska Grisebach's *Sehnsucht* (*Longing*, 2006), and Tamara Staudt's *Nur ein Sommer* (*Where the Grass is Greener*, 2008) come from different cinematic traditions and represent local communities quite differently within the modern *Heimat* context.

Chapter 3 focuses on cultural and socio-economic dynamics of the city that both mark the urban *Heimat* and *Anti-Heimat*. The filmic examples undo the city's (mostly Berlin's) "readable surfaces" (de Certeau) of the familiar and yet changing and estranging surroundings. Andreas Dresen's *Nachtgestalten* (Dresen, *Night Shapes*, 1999) and *Sommer vorm Balkon* (*Summer in Berlin*, 2005), Angela Schanelec's *Marseille* (2004) and Tatjana Turanskyj's *Eine flexible Frau* (*The Drifter*, 2010) visualize the tension between urban dwelling and the struggle for a home in post- *Wende* Berlin due to gentrification processes within the new economy. In the city, movement is not only defined by a modern environment and its spectacles (e.g. by traffic and crowds), but also by the individual's modern perception, which is commonly expressed through *flânerie*. Schanelec and Turanskyj's films in particular deploy this motif in new, albeit different ways. While Schanelec's detached Berlin School film has her *flâneuse* observe the European city, Turanskyj's *flâneuse* turns her critical eye on gentrification and the new economy.

Chapter 4 revisits German film history again and investigates East-West relations before and after the fall of the Berlin Wall. In contrast to Wim Wenders' spatially confined road film *Im Lauf der Zeit* (*Kings of the Road*, 1976), Fatih Akin's Turkish German production *Auf der anderen Seite* (*The Edge of Heaven*, 2007) represents Europe as an enlarged realm of experience from a German and cross-cultural perspective. There is a dynamic relation

between home and travel within Europe's multiplicity that did exist already during the German-German divide, but that got unleashed with the disappearance of the Iron Curtain. Roland Oehme's DEFA film *Wie füttert man einen Esel?* (*How Do You Feed a Donkey?*, 1973) celebrates an extended Socialist *Heimat*. Andrea Maria Dusl's Austrian road film *Blue Moon* (2002), on the other hand, portrays the vanishing Eastern European home after the collapse of the Soviet Union as a traumatic experience.

2.0 NO HOME IN PLACE — REVISITING THE RURAL IN THE RECENT *HEIMATFILM*

A variety of films declare present themselves as modern *Heimatfilme*, but display conservative or even reactionary tendencies. However, the new level in the genealogy of the *Heimatfilm* is not to be found in those highly polished narratives as the TV station ZDF (Second German Television) is broadcasting them for prime time. Famous examples include *Forsthaus Falkenau* (*Forester's Lodge*, since 1988), *Die Bergwacht* (*The Mountain Watch*, since 2009) or family dramas like Walter Bannert's *Wieder daheim* (*Home Again*, 2008). The majority of these films do not consider *Heimat* in a progressive way. Yet, they express a still existing or new interest in *Heimat*.

If we still understand *Heimat* as a contained space, where one is bound by birth and childhood, we could definitely consider *Forester's Lodge* a valid example. Similar to the classical *Heimatfilm*, these productions use contrasting spaces to make judgments: the urban and abroad as negative foils, as depicted in *The Prodigal Son* (1934) and *The Forester of Silberwald* (1954). In *Green is the Heath* (1951) going abroad is marked as the wrong choice as well. Thus, the *Heimatfilm* has typically established as its central narrative conflict a confrontation between modernity and experiences of modernization on the one side, and rural setting as embodiment of traditional life on the other.

More progressive productions, despite still being set in rural areas, show communities that are no longer self-sufficient and that understand themselves as being part of broader global configurations. While the classical *Heimatfilm* usually stays down-to-earth and meets genre expectations, the *New Heimatfilm* opens itself up to the consideration of contradictory lifestyles and breaks with familiar patterns. Sometimes these lifestyles show up as already established characteristics within the community; at other times they provoke a conflict with the local status quo that the rurally set *New Heimatfilm* calls into question. The latter is influenced by the tradition of the *Critical Heimatfilm*, however, without necessarily drawing a gloomy picture of *Heimat*.

The *New Heimatfilm* does not necessarily appear as related to the *Heimatfilm* genre: sometimes it displays the visual cues (the motifs and setting, resembling the appearance of a traditional *Heimatfilm*), while it other times it is not recognizable as a *Heimatfilm* in the first place, but rather might be initially perceived as belonging to a different genre (e.g. the urban or road film). Here though, the subgenre of rural *New Heimatfilm*, discussed in this chapter, comes closest to what we would recognize as the *Heimatfilm* genre, because of its focus on a local community and visualization of a particular regional landscape as clear signposts. Nevertheless, the rural *New Heimatfilm* differs from the classical *Heimatfilm* to a great extent. The microcosm of the ideal world is disturbed by factors that increasingly occur since German reunification, the fall of the Iron Curtain, and the formation of the European Union, which all spur globalization processes and affect people's lifestyles.

Admittedly, there is no particular genre called "rural film." Rather, most of the films discussed in this chapter might as well be ascribed to the comedy, the romance, the *Heimatfilm*, and the documentary genres. It becomes obvious that the *New Heimatfilm* presents itself

with a variety of shapes and faces, comprising far more strikingly different filmic examples than the classical *Heimatfilm* ever did. In the *New Heimatfilm*'s non-didactic approach, its open structure and, most importantly, its mobility and possibility of *Heimat* as a comforting place, it differs from the *Critical Heimatfilm* of the 1960s and 1970s. Hence, while this new genre is strongly intertwined with its precursors, it is developing its own identity. In this chapter, the classical *Heimatfilm* genre influences most case studies, most notably through the rural settings, but not all of them. One film from the Berlin School marks an exception that, despite its rural setting seems to contradict both the classical and new *Heimat* formations. I consider it a step into another direction of the dialectical process of genre formation.

Thus, this set of case studies is best referred to as the rural film in its different appearances, presenting a variety of topics that are a mixture of old and new concerns in a mobilized world with its borders being in flux. The directors all share an interest in the filmic representation of a particular locality and its respective lifestyle. Further, their projects display different forms of regionalism, especially the usage of local dialects, mostly motivated by the directors' origin. I will discuss three examples that are commonly referred to as forms of the modern *Heimatfilm*, which simply means current productions that resemble the classical *Heimatfilm*. An additional example is not commonly associated with the *Heimatfilm* tradition.

While Hans Steinbichler's *Hierankl* (2003) and the oeuvre of Marcus H. Rosenmüller may appear like *New Heimatfilme* and are most commonly considered the most up-to-date takes on *Heimat*, I argue that they are not. Instead, less-known films belong to this evolving genre: Thomas Kronthaler's *Die Scheinheiligen* (*The Hypocrites*, 2001), Tamara Staudt's

Nur ein Sommer (*Where the Grass is Greener*, 2008), and Valeska Grisebach's Berlin School film *Sehnsucht* (*Longing*, 2006) serve as good examples for different paths within the rural *New Heimatfilm*. The latter one is difficult to categorize in terms of genre, but it adds another dimension to current rural *Heimat* visualizations. Although the *New Heimatfilm* responds to geo-political and cultural changes from the past two decades, it seems that its examples have not launched until the new millennium. Reasons for that might include that the fall of the Iron Curtain has not been foreseen, or that Germany was pre-occupied with what Ulrich Becks calls the "globalization shock" (*Was ist Globalisierung?*, 14), because discussions about it began in Germany rather late. Primary attention was given to issues related to reunification. However, in the wake of the fallen German-German border, the 1990s show an increase in the production of road films. As road films (in their substantified status, according to Altman), they nevertheless deal with notions of *Heimat*, which I will discuss further in chapter four.

2.1 THE "MODERN" *HEIMATFILME* OF HANS STEINBICHLER AND MARCUS H. ROSENMÜLLER

Hans Steinbichler's film *Hierankl* was his graduation project from the Film and Television Academy in Munich, but it was planned as a big project right from the start. At this time *Heimat* depictions have continued to thrive and explored new forms. Steinbichler's *Heimat* resembles a quite gloomy perspective on *Heimat*, which suggests a different adjective-noun-relation: the modern *Critical Heimatfilm*. The most important co-producers were the

public broadcasting authority in Bavaria (*Bayerischer Rundfunk*) and the Franco-German TV network *Arte*, a broadcaster that describes itself as a European culture channel. Starring Barbara Sukowa, whose performance is strongly associated with the New German Cinema (*Berlin Alexanderplatz* 1980, *Die bleierne Zeit/Marianne & Juliane* 1981, *Lola* 1981), it calls the alternative lifestyles in the 1970s to critical attention. Hence, *Hierankl* contains a political level unusual for a traditional *Heimatfilm*.

The film follows a young woman, Lene, on her way from Berlin back to her *Heimat* in a solitary Upper Bavarian grange called Hierankl, for the first time after ten years. As a 17-year old she left after a fight with her mother. Her father's 60th birthday appears to be an appropriate occasion for her homecoming. Already on the train, halfway home, she runs into her father and finds out about her parents' marital crisis. As soon as they arrive back home, it becomes obvious that her parents have lovers, the whole family suffers from various forms of trauma, and her relationship to her mother Rosemarie is still burdened from the past. When all of a sudden her parents' friend Götz shows up, her mother's past lover, Lene begins an affair with him. This exposes the family secret that Götz is Lene's father. The film ends in a scene of collapse. On an extradiegetic level, the disclosure of incest in this *unheimliche Heimat* setting functions as a comment on the classical genre that depicts home as an impeccable entity and, among other things, promotes the preservation of the family. Nevertheless, home in Steinbichler's film is a site, in which the repressed returns: Lene meets her estranged mother again, and Rosemarie, having her daughter and her past lover in the same place, is confronted with her guilt. According to Sigmund Freud, the *unheimlich* (uncanny) experience is what "leads back to what is known of old and long familiar" (220). Freud notes the linguistic and dialectic relation between *Heimat* and *unheimlich* that is

unique to the German language. Originally, *heimlich* meant “homely,” but its meaning shifted later to “[c]oncealed, kept from sight, so that others do not get to know of or about it, withheld from others” (223), as which they have ever since been perceived. After his linguistic and etymological investigation, Freud draws the conclusion that “*heimlich* is a word the meaning of which develops in the direction of ambivalence, until it finally coincides with its opposite, *unheimlich*. *Unheimlich* is in some way or other a sub-species of *heimlich*” (226).

If we transfer these psycho-linguistic principles to *Hierankl*, we can see how Steinbichler undermines the established viewer expectations of the classical *Heimatfilm* narrative: The motif of homecoming breaks with the traditional pattern and is no longer part of the closure. Rather, homecoming initiates the complications and advances the family’s decay. Through an encounter with the “old and long familiar,” which comprises the uncanny cases of adultery and incest, Steinbichler disassembles the classical *Heimatfilm*.

Hierankl is a modern *Critical Heimatfilm* that references German film history of the 1970s. The displayed polygamous relationship of Lene’s parents and the love triangle of the past between Rosemarie, Lukas, and Götz speak about a past of politically motivated student communities, promotion of free love, and the desire to undermine society. *Hierankl* presents its family problems as being strongly intertwined with notions of time rather than place, because it refers back to the past with both the political activities in the 1970s and Lene’s childhood. This contradicts current discourses on the spatial turn that “examine underlying notions of space and their relationship to temporal and social dimensions” (Eigler and Kugele 5). Thus, Steinbichler holds on to the “container concept” (Bachmann-Medick 2889) that considers *Heimat* a static place, a dominant notion within the *Critical Heimatfilme* of the

past. What used to be a sign of progress in the 1970s, has now turned into regression.

The setting in Steinbichler's *Hierankl* is easy to locate in Upper Bavaria, yet it could be set anywhere else, more so than most traditional *Heimatfilme* which still have to be understood within the politics of a particular place (King 133). In an interview Steinbichler says that the place functions like mere decoration that does not echo the narrative, "like in the home improvement magazine *Schöner Wohnen* (better living, equivalent to *Better Homes and Gardens* in the US)." Accordingly, during dramatic moments, the camera still applies a deep focus and captures a panoramic view of the setting, highlighting the beautiful surrounding and the soft colors of the setting sun. The landscape, the house and Josef Bierbichler as the only dialect speaker suggest a Bavarian setting, which is strongly associated with the *Heimatfilm*. However, the film targets the systematic destruction of all motifs that are at its core: love, family, and homeland, all revealed as dysfunctional. *Hierankl* not only destroys the idea of the nuclear family and its representation within the traditional *Heimatfilm*, it even openly ridicules the *Heimatfilm* genre. In one scene Lene's brother Paul rejects his father's attempt to learn about his son's problems, and Paul exclaims: "After all this isn't in a crappy *Heimatfilm*."

Furthermore, the characters are conceived to fit viewers' expectations of a psychological character sketch more likely than what is commonly associated with a *Heimatfilm*. *Hierankl* presents neurotic intellectuals instead of down-to-earth inhabitants. We know very little about their real-life circumstances. We only learn that Lene's father Lukas is or used to be a teacher, and he frequently quotes Goethe. This calls to our attention a real lack of information about the characters' exact occupation, and therefore their place within society. Such information would not be missing in a traditional *Heimatfilm* but here the characters

are rather positioned within the broader aesthetic discourses of the 1970s New German Cinema and a backlash to contemporary uncritical *Heimat* depictions.

This “modern *Heimatfilm*,” does not open in a typical way for this generic category. It is set at a Berlin train station among long-distance trains. Through Lene’s voice-over we learn that, depending on what train she chooses, one going to Berlin, the other towards Salzburg, she will either go home, i.e. to where she lives now or go to see her family i.e. not home. Following an impulse, she runs and gets on the train to Salzburg, hence choosing her family. With the landscape passing by, she makes some phone calls, which make even clearer how spontaneous her decision to travel to her childhood home is. In Rosenheim, she watches her father parting from his lover, and through their surprising encounter, we learn that Lene has not been home for thirteen years. After such a long time, she arrives with mixed feelings, including curiosity, childhood nostalgia, and defiance. *Hierankl* starts out as a travel film, visualizing movement through altering camera positions on the platform and the landscape passing by, before going over to the *Heimat* motif of homecoming that initiates the film’s increasing sense of confinement and seclusion from the world.

Here we see again how the *New Heimatfilm* tends towards the lack of narrative closure. *Hierankl* ends with Lene’s collapse after having learned that her new lover is her father. This news annuls her family almost completely, since she despises her mother and finds out that her father, whom she loves, is not her real father. Her cynical brother sums it up: “*Heimatfilm*. Somewhat close to the ending.” On a beautiful meadow Lene suffers from a nervous breakdown and the film ends with shots of snow-covered Hierankl during a different season. It remains unclear how the family will deal with this crisis.

Hierankl begins as a travel film, enters the scenery of a *Heimatfilm*, but it breaks several

conventions. The traditional *Heimatfilm* is closely related to the melodrama with its focus on love and the family; however psychology stays subliminal instead of open excess and hysteria as in the Hollywood melodrama. There is no Freudian “return of the repressed” in a classical *Heimatfilm*, no psychological dilemma, but rather a moral one. The poaching in *Green is the Heath* as an expression of the expellee’s pain about his lost *Heimat* is the most drama we get, and it is resolved by repression, by pulling himself together behind a closed door while the story shifts to his daughter and the foreigner as new couple. It seems like in *Hierankl* everything meaningful for a *Heimatfilm* is destroyed (love and the family), and the awareness of a *Heimatfilm* is part of the film’s self-reflexivity, expressing the family’s awareness of its devastated condition. This home no longer exists.

In *Hierankl*, the family is marked by alienation and aggression between Lene and her mother Rosemarie, Paul’s hatred of his father Lukas, a love-hate open marriage between Rosemarie and Lukas (both of them have lovers), but a strong bond between Lene and her “father” Lukas as well as between her and her brother Paul. During the film we learn that the old friend Götz was Rosemarie’s lover in the past, but not as far back as everybody would have wished. They had an affair when Rosemarie was already married to Lukas during which Lene was conceived. Thus, the relationship between Lene and Rosemarie shapes up as overshadowed by Rosemarie’s guilt with Lene as its first carnal sin. The guilt of the past along with the new Oedipal circumstance separates the “family,” and everybody remains shocked, confronted with the familiar, and thus with the uncanny within their *Heimat*.

Steinbichler refers to the generation of Rosemarie, Lukas, and Götz who all were politically active in the 1960s and 1970s. He highlights this generation as living the idea of free love, intellectual ideals, and anti-authoritarian structures. Barbara Sukowa (Rosemarie) and Josef

Bierbichler's (Lukas) appearances support the depiction of a generation of disillusioned and resigned activists of this political era and its implications for the hypocritical performance of a nuclear family. Both actors appeared in films of the New German Cinema, Bierbichler even in the *Critical Heimatfilm Servus Bayern (Bye, Bye Bavaria, 1977)*. Thus, the historical heritage of the *New Heimatfilm* from the *Critical Heimatfilm* is echoed in the casting of *Hierankl* and provides a critical frame of reference for the traditional *Heimat* concept.

Hierankl premiered at the Munich Film Festival, and it received overall positive critiques (see Giering). This television production brought Steinbichler several awards: The German Film Sponsorship Award and the Adolf-Grimme Award. *Hierankl* was the beginning of Hans Steinbichler's successful career and of his reconsideration of *Heimat*. His *Winterreise (Winter Journey, 2006)* was nominated for the German Film Award and made it to the preselection for the 80th Academy Awards in the category of Best Foreign Language Film. He contributed the short film *Fraktur (Gothic Print or Fracture)* to the omnibus project *Deutschland 09 (Germany 09, 2009)*, reminiscing the New German Cinema documentary *Deutschland im Herbst (Germany in Autumn, 1977)*. By intertwining *Heimat* with different genres, such as the highly staged psychodrama (*Hierankl*) and the travel film (*Winter Journey*), he explores new dimensions of the *Heimatfilm*.

Another director, whose *Heimatfilme* are generally understood as being cutting-edge is Marcus H. Rosenmüller. Yet, his film settings correspond with viewer expectations of the classical *Heimatfilm*. This is also demonstrated by the fact that his most "modern" films are set only in the relative contemporary, meaning in the 1990s despite being produced in the new millennium. Consequently, none of his characters (mostly children, adolescents and young adults) uses the Internet or cell phones (leave alone smart phones or tablets)

that have become intrinsically tied to a media-savvy generation. With very few exceptions, Rosenmüller's films do not engage with the outside world at all. Merely in his first two parts of his coming-of-age trilogy the main character, Kati, prepares herself for one year at an American high school, but eventually decides to stay home (*Beste Zeit/Best Times*, 2007). In *Beste Gegend (Best Place*, 2008) Kati and her best friend Jo want to go on a road trip around the world, but already at the border between Austria and Italy their car breaks down and Kati learns that her grandfather is passing away. They return home, and only Jo continues the trip at the end of the film. Thus, in his films Rosenmüller uses the classic opposition between *Heimat* and *Fremde* (places away from home).

The modern *Heimat* settings resonate well with a younger audience that is aware of the *Heimatfilm* tradition, but that would not be interested in watching 1950s *Heimatfilme* like *Green is the Heath* as belonging to "Papap Kino," or more accurately *Opas Kino* (grandpa's cinema). Nevertheless, *Heimat* evergreens like *Green is the Heath* play quite frequently on German daytime television. However, these films are primarily watched by an older demographic (or film scholars). Rosenmüller's films are considered the latest development within the *Heimatfilm* genre, however they are only new *Heimatfilme* in disguise, since they follow the traditional motto of home is best and do not add anything new to the genealogy of the genre. The only thing that is "new" about these local color films is a more contemporary setting, in which Bavaria still focuses on itself, however secluded from the rest of the world.

Although being examples of the most recognizable current *Heimatfilme* that are set in the contemporary era, Steinbichler's and Rosenmüller's films hold on to old-fashioned conceptualizations of place, and thus are part of the *New Heimatfilm's* predecessors, the classical *Heimatfilm* of the 1950s and the *Critical Heimatfilm* of the 1960s and 1970s, instead

of being *New Heimatfilme* of the new millennium that engage with globalization and Europe. This project is the first to define the *New Heimatfilm* as its own genre that in its hybridity is not limited to the rural. It is also the first to exclude successful directors like Steinbichler or Rosenmüller from discussions on new expressions of the *Heimatfilm*.

2.2 SHOWDOWN AT THE BAVARIAN MCVILLAGE — *HEIMAT* AND GLOBALIZATION IN THOMAS KRONTHALER'S *THE HYPOCRITES* (2001)

In contrast to Steinbichler's gloomy vision of *Heimat*, Thomas Kronthaler engages with it through a comical lens. This low-budget production also was Kronthaler's graduation project from the University of Television and Film in Munich. With 180,000 viewers, the box office success was by far not as big as for some examples of the classical era that it satirizes (*The Forester of Silberwald*, 1954, ca. 28 million viewers, and *Green is the Heath*, 1951, approximately 19 million viewers). Nevertheless, it was successful within Bavaria and influenced Marcus H. Rosenmüller, whose modern *Heimatfilme* are famous all over Germany. He called Kronthaler's film a precursor for his breakthrough *Wer früher stirbt, ist länger tot* (*Grave Decisions*, 2006) (Rosenmüller in an interview with *Bayern 2*). However, Rosenmüller picked up on the comic elements rather than on Kronthaler's critical engagement with *Heimat*. On the one hand, this is probably the reason for Rosenmüller's greater reputation, since his characters mostly remain in their beautiful and sheltered Bavarian *Heimat*, which resembles the classical *Heimatfilm* to a great extent. On the other hand, we have seen that it can be

questioned that his “modern” *Heimatfilme* attest to anything other than a nostalgic interest in *Heimat*.

Being anchored in the tradition of the *Heimatfilm*, Kronthaler’s film shows a striking reworking of themes from Hans Deppe’s 1951 classic film, which I will briefly discuss before turning towards *The Hypocrites* to reference part of the *Heimatfilm*’s trajectory. Deppe’s film is considered the embodiment of the *Heimatfilm*. It closes with the line “Bleibe im Land und nähre dich redlich” (“Dwell in the country and earn your living honestly”), a well-known phrase that counts as the motto of most films of this classical genre. In *Green is the Heath*, a quasi-homeless Silesian expellee struggles to adjust to his new home in the Lüneburger Heide and out of *Heimweh* hunts for deer like he used to back in his lost home. However, in this foreign territory, the foresters consider him a poacher. In the end, he promises the authorities that he will adjust to the village’s law and order. The dynamics of this idyllic community becomes obvious in the opening sequence: A new forester is introduced to the village community, which also includes three friendly vagabonds. The retiring forester gives them a free meal every Tuesday, and his successor learns that he will need to take care of them as well. Here we see the traditional setting and village population: a picturesque rural scenery, the *Ordnungshüter*, the protector of law and order as a positive figure, and even the vagabonds are not only harmless and likable, but also promise to be punctual, proclaiming, “Ordnung muss sein” (“Things have to be in order”). The film suggests, what a wonderful place this could be if only the foresters would not have to worry about the mysterious poacher! This poacher is presented to us from the start as a disruptive force to the community and as it turns out we quickly recognize that the poacher is someone who is literally from outside this place. In Deppe’s film, *Heimat* is classically depicted as being

threatened from outside and in need of protection.

If anybody wanted to make a parody of *Green is the Heath*, it would have to look similar to Thomas Kronthaler's 2001 comedy *The Hypocrites*, in which everything is inverted: the police officers are the poachers, the refugee is an African asylum seeker, the village officials are corrupt and a vagabond restores law and order. As a humorous statement on the film's contemporary moment, even the local organic farmers use antibiotics for their cattle. Steve Neale argues that an old genre comes to an end as soon as it becomes parodied (201). However, two *Heimatfilm* concepts currently coexist: the modern *Heimatfilm* that follows the classical tradition (e.g. Rosenmüller's films) and the *New Heimatfilm* with films like *The Hypocrites*. The latter ridicules what we commonly recognize as the typical *Heimatfilm* genre, and therefore it breaks with established viewer expectations.

Paralleling the vagabonds of Deppe's film, Kronthaler's debut film tells the story of three outsiders to a small Bavarian community: The asylum seeker Theophile from Gambia, the local embittered widow Leni, and the homeless wood carver Johannes. The aging Leni owns land close to a highway, which the village officials of Daxenbrunn want for building an exit to a fast food restaurant. However, Leni does not want to give up on her land and in her self-defense against the mischief of the mayor, the head of the district and even the priest, she leads a secluded life and does not hesitate to shoot at uninvited guests. After Johannes' and Theophile's hostile welcome to the village, Leni takes them in and together they establish a force against the city hall. With Johannes' help, Leni gains back her good reputation among the inhabitants and is able to thwart the corrupting plans. The film is based on real events in Kronthaler's *Heimat* Irschenberg in Upper Bavaria, where the building of a McDonald's restaurant made quite a splash. The characters, both lay actors and well-known

Volksschauspieler, dialect actors who play in locally set stories on regional stages, such as Maria Singer, contribute to the film's high level of authenticity. The Upper Bavarian dialect is difficult to understand for many speakers of standard German and requires subtitling. This phenomenon continued to develop in the subgenre and became established practice with the popular Rosenmüller films like *Grave Decisions*.

In *The Hypocrites* we recognize some further basic elements of the classical *Heimatfilm* that get ridiculed and that refer in particular to *Green is the Heath*. Again, there is the eye of the law, a vagabond and the malpractice of poaching. The traditional guitar and zither music, the beautiful slow pan shots of the snow-covered Alps and a rushing mountain torrent stand in a harsh contrast to the overall hostility towards strangers, or “*Zugereisten*” as they call them (the ones that have traveled there, but remain others). When the police officers are the ones who chase the wanderer away and start poaching, it becomes obvious that this *Heimat* still is protective of itself, but the dynamics are switched around. In that regard, *The Hypocrites* also references the German xenophobia in the 1990s that ranges from “*rassistisches Wissen*” (Terkessidis 59) as a distinct consensus within society to the violent attacks on asylum seekers in the 1990s. By the time Kronthaler made his film, these attacks seemed to have come to an end. Nevertheless, racist sentiments have remained. The Free State of Bavaria has historically viewed itself as separate from the rest of Germany, which is why the notion of foreignness gets applied easily (even to North Germans as former Prussians), which sets the more conservative Bavaria up for being parodied. Nevertheless, globalization does not spare Bavaria, which causes a clash between the stereotype of the most famous *Heimat* space and the sobering reality that Kronthaler depicts.

Its filmic depiction shows an unusual relation between the inside and outside of the vil-

lage. Here, *Heimat* views itself critically, ridicules its stereotypes, and has to face challenges of the global age: financial shortages, the dependence on a multi-national company, and immigration. Despite being aware of its position within a globalized world, Kronthaler's film presents itself being anchored between tradition and progress. Accordingly, the mayor does not only dream of Daxenbrunn as the "chicken metropolis," but also wants to make money with a museum for the *Wolpertinger* (the legendary creature that is said to inhabit the alpine forests in Bavaria). These differing economic plans for boosting Daxenbrunn's crashed economy exist side by side. *The Hypocrites* is a *New Heimatfilm* that starts with a clichè depiction of an idyll and then reverses the familiar order throughout the film. The threat to community does not only come from outside (globalization), but from inside as well; the village's functionaries are up to their tricks in a world of capitalism and corruption. The literal outsiders, the wanderer and asylum seeker, are perceived as possible dangers, but in truth they are the only ones who provide protection to threatened Leni.

Similarly to the *Critical Heimatfilm* of the 1960s and 70s, *The Hypocrites* breaks with established patterns of the classical genre. Kronthaler's film on the clash between tradition and globalization shares its critical lens on a local community with directors like Reitz. *The Hypocrites*, however, uses comedy to interweave playfully the *Heimatfilm* with the Western genre and undermine both comically. Kronthaler does not draw clear lines as to who is good and who is bad. Most characters are neither purely good nor bad, which Leni succinctly says in relation to her lost trust in saints: "There are no false saints, and there are no true saints (...) and only few of them are actually willing to help." The village is full of hypocrites. Johannes helps Leni, but he is a professional counterfeiter of saint statues known all over Germany. The priest initially supports the corrupt and corrupting course of the politicians,

keeps the money from the offertory box and commissions Johannes to duplicate the statue of the Virgin Mary, so he can barter away the original. Similarly to the police officers, he eventually switches sides and helps defend Leni's inheritance. At first, however, the officers refuse Johannes the entry to Daxenbrunn exactly at the moment that they are poaching for the mayor.

Thus, we notice that the emphasis of the film's title lies on the Schein, appearance, as a central motif. Ironically, the counterfeiter Johannes will put things straight again. When Leni suspiciously asks him what he's doing for work, he responds: "Making saints." This is not only true in terms of his craft, but he also teaches the local apostates a lesson, considering that he takes care of Leni and cures the villains from their greed. After the visitors can resolve the conflict and the village becomes peaceful again, Johannes decides to move on to Rome to work on a comprehensive order for the Vatican. Thus, *The Hypocrites* closes with a final side swipe to the Catholic Church. In this satire Kronthaler alludes to the strong connection between the Catholic Church and state in Bavaria, which is especially the case in provincial regions. Moreover, Daxenbrunn's mayor and the district's politician's practices stand in for cases of political corruption in Bavaria.

Self-reflexivity in Kronthaler's film is brought to new levels, not only by its characters and motif reversal, but also by genre hybridization. Borrowing motifs from the Western genre, a local pub becomes a wild west saloon during a fight between the locals and the perceived intruders: They throw each other over the tables, smash steins on each other's heads and the pub owner intervenes with a gun shot into the ceiling. In general, the characters tend to resolve conflicts by weapons. Accordingly, the film climaxes in an ultimate showdown between the police and the political sharks. Accompanied by extra-diegetic Western scores,

Kronthaler uses shot/reverse shots of the opponents and American shots, a framing technique used in the Western that goes below the waistline to reveal the rifle. The final showdown between the police officers and the armed bodyguards of the politicians gives the impression of a Wild South rather than an orderly Upper Bavarian community, which matches the film's disruption of the orderly. A central theme of the Western genre is "the conflict between civilized order and the lawless frontier" (Bordwell 118), which gets picked up in *The Hypocrites*, albeit in switched terms. Johannes is the typical Western hero, who can "start out on the side of the lawless," but who "decides to join the forces of order, helping (...) fight hired gunmen, bandits, or whatever the film presents as a threat to stability and progress" (119).

The *Heimatfilm* and the Western share a practice of othering that Kronthaler ridicules. Another twist in Kronthaler's trans-generic parody concerns racist stereotypes. The classical Western was most openly racist in its depictions of Native Americans and Hispanics (Bordwell (Bordwell 119), and likewise in Kronthaler's film so are the village officials towards African Theophile. Furthermore, the film debunks the *Schein* (appearance/illusiveness) of the locals' Catholic charity, when e.g. the priest does not want to host a "black sheep." Ironically, Theophile, an alleged heathen from Africa, is the only true character, who is not a *Scheinheiliger* (literally a hypocrite or one who appears as a saint) like everybody else. His name can be translated as "love of God" or "friend of God." Kronthaler's satire tells us a story about mavericks, corrupt local politicians, xenophobia and the fear of change of any kind.

There is a variety of recent *Heimatfilme* that show local communities either of the past or of the present. Stefan Ruzowitzky's *Die Siebteilbauern* (*The Seventh-Part Farmers*, 1998) in the style of the *Critical Heimatfilm* is set in the 1920s, while the successful modern

Heimatfilme of Marcus Rosenmüller are set in the contemporary. Some of them coincide with a reactionary pattern of the classical *Heimatfilm*, for example in *Best Times* that marks going abroad as a bad choice. Others, however, show communities that are often no longer self-sufficient, that look beyond, both in terms of space and genre. In addition to *The Hypocrites* and other examples discussed in this chapter, this includes Sung-Hyung Cho's documentary *Full Metal Village* (2007), taglined as "Ein *Heimatfilm*" that explores the relation between its 1,800 inhabitants and the approximately 70,000 heavy metal fans from all over the world, who attend the annual local open-air festival. Cho's film alludes to a classical *Heimatfilm* framework, but subverts it. More critical examples like Steinbichler's *Hierankl* resemble the techniques of the New German Cinema as employed by Reitz. The case study of Kronthaler presented here does not only attest to a new interest in *Heimat* on the verge of the 21st century, but also shows how this genre becomes more playful and subversive. In conjunction with shifting motifs, movement, and a critical awareness of locality, hybrid forms express these new configurations. The *Heimat* discourse gets picked up again despite, or rather because of developments on the global scale.

From *Green is the Heath* to *The Hypocrites*, we can trace back a rich trajectory of this genre that keeps changing. Since the New German Cinema and its way out of *Heimat*, a new desire for it has been reformulated in post-unification audiovisual culture. The *New Heimatfilm* offers both a locally grounded and mobile lens that looks at concepts of home under transitional conditions for the individual. Characters like Johannes and Theophile are examples of Appadurai's social imaginary in the globalized "imagined worlds." In their nomadism they are "transitional agents" and function as "landscapes" of people who mark our unsettled world. They leave their imprint on local community of Irschenberg before

moving on instead of simply being assimilated to adjust to the status quo, like the Silesian expellee in *Green is the Heath*.

Within the larger picture of a growing Europe and its film production, we can say that *no home is in place*, and the concept of home seems both challenged and promoted with increasing mobility, moving towards new tensions and sites of conflict. The ostensible village motto is “ois bleibt, wia’s is” (Bavarian dialect: everything stays how it is), according to Leni. However, the village officials welcome certain changes (the promising earnings through the fast food restaurant) while others are opposed (the wanderer and the asylum seeker). Yet, they no longer make the decision by themselves. *Heimat* within contexts of departure and mobility does not simply disappear, but rather it is emphasized again in its co-existence with and counter-action to the trends of what Ulrich Beck refers to as globalization and globality that deal with the economic and psychological implications. In *The Hypocrites* we find an example of “globalism” (Beck, *Was ist Globalisierung?*, 11), a locality that is dominated by economic aspirations. Irschenberg is not depicted as a place that provides protection from global phenomena, because they necessitate local ties: “local cultures can no longer be justified, shaped and renewed in seclusion from the rest of the world” (Beck 48). In other words, both the village and the *Heimatfilm* as locally bound concepts reflect the global, but they are also strongly intertwined with other entities, such as localities or genres. *The Hypocrites* may have specifically focused on Bavarian culture and politics, but it also stands in for a larger number of current German films set in the rural with similar tendencies, which deal with *Heimat* against a larger backdrop and which have become hybrid genres, which the following examples in this chapter will show. Further examples include Detlev Buck’s short film *Erst die Arbeit und Dann?* (*First the Work — And Then?*, 1985), *Liebesluder*

(*Bundle of Joy*, 2000), and Dominik Graf, Christian Petzold, Christoph Hochhäusler's crime trilogy *Dreileben* (2011).

Green is the Heath represents the traditional understanding of *Heimat* and it is easily recognizable what the aspirations of the relatively homogeneous classical *Heimatfilm* of the 1950s were: stability, arrival, and stasis, rather than change, departure, and transition, as displayed in Kronthaler's film. *The Hypocrites* revisits this traditional genre and views it through a comical and subversive, but eventually conciliatory lens and provides a new perspective on *Heimat* in its global entanglement.

I am positioning myself between Beck's and Appadurai's conceptions. According to Appadurai, "the imagination is now central to all forms of agency, is itself a social fact, and is the key component of the new global order" (31). By contrast, Beck focuses more on the challenges and risks of a globalized society. I also focus on its chances considering a possible European unity and concomitant changes that promote the formation of new genres. Within the tensions of spatial reconsiderations, current *Heimat* discourses are situated. Referencing Henri Lefèbvre's influential work *The Production of Space* (1974), Appadurai entitles one of his chapters as "The Production of Locality" (48), indicating that place is not a fixed category, but with more factors playing into it than geography. Accordingly, he poses the following quintessential question from his anthropological perspective: "What is the place of locality in schemes about global cultural flow?" (178). This framework applies to my study of current audiovisual *Heimat* expressions within the rural, urban and on the road as well. Further notions explored within new spatial considerations include Michel de Certeau's "practiced space," particularly as it pertains to the urban context.

2.3 THE RURAL HOME IN THE BERLIN SCHOOL — VALESKA GRISEBACH'S *LONGING* (2006)

The term Berlin School was first used by film critic Rainer Gansera (Baute, Michael et al.) On the occasion of Thomas Arslan's film *Der Schöne Tag* (*A Fine Day*, 2001), he tried to provide a set of rules in order to reveal the shared aesthetics of films by directors Thomas Arslan, Angela Schanelec, and Christian Petzold: "All three wish neither (sic) to expose nor to ironize reality. They generate self-evidence by endowing their characters with beauty and dignity" (Gansera qtd. in Baute, Michael et al.). According to Marco Abel, the Berlin School is "the first significant (collective) attempt at advancing the aesthetics of cinema within German narrative filmmaking since the New German Cinema" (Abel)(Abel). The transition from classical South German *Heimat* spaces to North- and East German settings and the engagement of directors from the Berlin School with *New Heimat* attests to the progression of this new genre into different directions. The *New Heimatfilm* becomes deterritorialized. Classical *Heimat* depictions are less and less considered appropriate and thus became initially contested in the *Heimatfilm*'s home region, both by Kronthaler and Steinbichler, albeit in very different ways.

Newer considerations of *Heimat* are sometimes hard to pin down to a specific genre, but can be read in the tradition of the *Critical Heimatfilm*, although they are not explicitly dealing with a search for or criticism of *Heimat*. One example is Grisebach's rurally set *Sehnsucht* (*Longing*, 2006), a love tragedy that is strongly intertwined with motifs of *Romeo and Juliet*. In this way the *Heimat* is turned into a platform of the poetic and dramatic qualities of the material world. An example by the so-called Berlin School, it is set in a

village in the Ruppiner Heide (Brandenburg). Markus overshadows the documentary-style like depiction of the village's everyday life, performed by the village's real inhabitants, after he witnesses a fatal accident that drives him into a depression.

Longing opens with the volunteer firefighter Markus providing first aid at the site of a car accident while being off-duty. Then the film cuts to his seemingly happy life with his wife Ella in Zühlendorf, a village in the former East German state of Brandenburg. Yet, Markus agonizes with thoughts about the accident that turned out to be a couple's only partially successful attempt to commit suicide. Grisebach does not provide a lot of insight into the introvert Markus, and while Ella finds the suicide "somehow romantic, like in *Romeo and Juliet*," Markus expresses his doubts about the appropriateness of his first aid. He thinks he should not have interfered with the couple's fate. During an excursion with his fire department he begins an affair with the waitress Rose. When he wants to end their affair, she falls from the balcony, and the film does not make it clear if it was an accident. After his village learns about this and Ella leaves him, he tries to commit suicide, but survives. The film ends with a group of children on a playground. A girl tells the story of Markus and Ella like a fairy tale, but leaving it open if they lived happily ever after.

The final scene on the playground gives an example of local stories that are passed on from generation to generation and become inextricably linked with a timeless phenomenon within *New Heimatfilm*. The overall focus on the present of *Longing* (and of Berlin School films in general) only allows for a look back into the past through "the ghost of the love story that are part of Western Europeans' cultural memory" (Herrmann 165). *Longing* is framed by two tragedies that establish a link to the suicidal motif in *Romeo and Juliet*: The car accident in the beginning of the film and Markus shooting himself in the end. William

Shakespeare's tragedy is the most obvious intertextual reference in *Longing*, because it is part of the local cultural memory, as Ella's comment attests to.

However, instead of showing the effects of globalization on a rural community as in Kronthaler's setting Irschenberg, the depicted Zühlen seems quite secluded from these developments. We see various gatherings of the family and neighbors that suggest a supportive community. Yet, life seems to be happy only on the surface, and thus no longer corresponds with the aesthetics of the classical *Heimatfilm*. There is an overall sense of uneasiness and spatial confinement expressed through the *mis-en-scène* and editing: Grisebach alternates between far, static shots of a dismal landscape and long close-ups, in which the protagonists appear confined and separated from their surroundings. Something is hidden under the surface, a mysterious longing for a *Fremde* (an elsewhere). *Heimat* is not explicitly portrayed as a site of problems like in the *Critical Heimatfilm*. This stands in contrast to Michael Haneke's *Das weiße Band* (*The White Ribbon*, 2009). Like *Longing*, it is also set in a North-German village, but more than 90 years earlier, before World War I. There is a subliminal and mysterious violence in both films. Although Grisebach sets her story in post-millennium Zühlen, there is still a tendency towards a slow representation of country life and a tendency towards a conjunction of Realism with self-reflexive affect. This affect is not expressed via excess and left to conscious viewing techniques.

Longing appears like a documentary. Grisebach, who was trained as a documentary filmmaker, observes the village life in a detached manner, and the inhabitants of Zühlen play themselves. Instead of the scenic and melodramatic depiction that is underscored by extra-diegetic music within the classical *Heimatfilm*, *Longing* sticks to a realistic and silent presentation of the bourgeois rural life. This sober visualization that is the signature of

the Berlin School, explores new forms of Realism that rely on the observation by both the director and the viewer. By focusing on the habits of a specific place and its inhabitants, *Heimat*'s uncanny components become obvious.

While Grisebach's film presents a longing to leave the rural *Heimat* that can be found anywhere else, the choice to set this story in East Germany alludes to a larger paradigm change after reunification. Many East Germans left their *Heimat* in hope for better chances in the West. It is the longing for a departure that is presented as a threat and which hurts Markus and Ella's marriage. However, to "dwell in the country and earn your living honestly," to evoke the motto of *Green is the Heath* again, no longer guarantees happiness at a time when one is free to leave. Mareike Herrmann describes Zühlen as "a traditional provincial space that seems archaic and strangely disconnected from the modern, globalized world" and that "focuses on the limitations of such a community" (165). Thus, although not explicitly mentioned, life in Zühlen is informed by the aftermath of reunification, and thus participates in the reconfigurations of *Heimat* in the global age.

Longing represents well the need for us to consider problems in genre theory and offer new understandings of hybridization in genre. The classical understanding of genre is derived largely from discussions of classical Hollywood production at a point in time when it had reached its industrial peak. Contemporary production, especially in Europe where the output of film understood in national parameters is much lower than that in Hollywood, requires us to consider subgenres and hybridization. The classical *Heimatfilm* has been largely successful in the 1950s, and yet it no longer resonates well with a younger audience. It no longer bespeaks the yearnings that are manifold and situated between the desire to stay in one place and to move on since processes of globalization and Europeanization began.

Thus, current filmmakers deal with *Heimat* in very different ways that exceed the scope of classical understandings of genre: By somewhat updating the beautiful *Heimatfilm* narrative (Rosenmüller's *Grave Decisions*, *Best Times* and *Best Place*), by abandoning both *Heimat* and the *Heimatfilm* genre (Steinbichlers *Hierankl*), by parodying them (Kronthaler's *The Hypocrites*), or by dissecting *Heimat* through intense observations (Grisebach's *Longing*).

Longing is hard to classify as a genre, because of the paradox of showing most affiliations with different genres and sub-genres on the one hand, and seemingly not belonging to any kind of genre. Grisebach calls *Longing* a *Liebesfilm* (romance film), although it keeps the viewer at a distance and denies the viewers' involvement, which distinguishes it from the usual melodrama and romance comedies. She presents a sober, distancing depiction of a tragedy with a strong tendency towards Dogma 95-like Realism. These techniques are common among the filmmakers of the Berlin School (such as Maren Ade, Thomas Arslan, Sylke Enders, Christoph Hochhäusler, Angela Schanelec, and Henner Winckler). Despite being an arguable term that these filmmakers were reluctant to accept, the term Berlin School has become a widely accepted label for this excess-free representation of mostly everyday-life drama. There seems to be a silent agreement on particular aesthetics, such as the slow plot development and camera movements, the absence of visual excess and a specific local focus. Since these filmmakers began their careers in the 1990s, we can also understand the Berlin School as a possible counter-reaction to the times of increased geographical and technological mobility. At the same time, however, they do not promote the rural as the place to be, but rather critically investigate it as a place that bears no less threat than the *Fremde* (places away from home).

A similar tendency can be found in East German films that were made directly after

reunification. The fall of the Berlin Wall and the end of the GDR state did not only lead to the freedom of speech and the right to travel, but also marked a loss of the East German home. Films like Helke Misselwitz' *Herzsprung* (1992) portray the misery of the locals, who are torn between fascination and abhorrence considering foreign Western influences. While *Longing* is also set in the post-1990 Brandenburg area, displaying its dialect, it seemingly distances itself from a specific Eastern focus. One could think that it rather works towards what Nick Hodgkin refers to as "normalization" (189), encouraged by recent realist filmmaking approaches (such as those by Andreas Dresen or Christian Petzold) that display life in the East without referring to unification and its aftermath, screening narratives that would work likewise in the West. Hodgkin considers this a chance that such practices could break through the perception of the East as "geography and not of socio-political context" (196). However, we have to view films like *Longing* or *Herzsprung* within the context of reunification, in order to fully understand them. In these films, the geo-political contexts are the core of *New Heimat* presentations.

To that effect, Nick Hodgkin maps out an Eastern territory that, facing the ruins of its past, is signified by voids that actively express the loss of a previous confining, yet protective *Heimat*. He includes discussions of comic encounters between East and West, Eastern province films that deal with notions of a ruined *Heimat*, and nostalgia in the so-called (but often mislabeled) *Ostalgie* films that express a longing for the pre-wall past (Hodgkin 154-79). Hodgkin argues that East German post-unification films serve as strong and often only-remaining visual records that provide important insights into the East German sense of self within a new geo-political context. Among them were "first encounter films" (37) including the comedies *Go Trabi Go* and *No More Mr. Nice Guy*, both presenting crossings

of the former German-German border and the exploration of unknown territory. These post-unification films “evoke the cinematic *Heimat* tradition” (59) from the classical post-war era. Critical East-German films that mourn the decaying *Heimat* within the economic hardships of a reunified Germany, such as *Herzprung*, are not typically part of the audiovisual reunification discourse.

Thus, the *New Heimatfilm* also turns towards explorations of East Germany that has not been part of the classical *Heimatfilm* focus. Grisebach maps a locality that needs to participate in broader realms exceeding the village’s spatial confinement. Here, Michel de Certeau’s differentiation between “place” and “space” provides useful insights. Zühlen is a place that is determined “through its objects that are ultimately reducible to the *being-there* of something dead, the law of a place.” It lacks the “operations” of a space that is defined by movement, “passages back and fourth” (“Spatial Stories” 118). Yet one does not have to move away from a place in order to experience this shift, because de Certeau further points out to “the awakening of inert objects (a table, a forest, a person that plays a certain role in the environment) which, emerging from their stability, transform the place where they lay motionless into the foreignness of their own space” (118). Markus’ displacement initiates this shift. Despite the attachment to place and its interpersonal connections within the community, this place has been lost to a reunified context that the individuals merely inhabit, but can no longer dwell in it. In order to dwell, they have reconsider the changing complex relations of their place again. From Heidegger’s perspective, this resembles a plight, but in de Certeau’s terms, this introduces a necessary dynamic to overcome the law of place.

Reading *Longing* in the context of a post-GDR environment adds another dimension to the spatial confinement it depicts. It is not merely the confinement within any German

village; it is one that bears even more tension between dwelling and longing for departure. The film's title marks its subliminal tenor, which is longing: What for? Where to? This *New Heimatfilm* is driven by these questions. They may not be answered, but they describe a "passage."

2.4 *HEIMAT BETWEEN THE ALPS AND PLATTENBAU* — TAMARA STAUDT'S *WHERE THE GRASS IS GREENER* (2008)

Tamara Staudt was born in Göppingen, Swabia, but her film style differs from her South-German colleagues Hans Steinbichler and Thomas Kronthaler, probably because she studied at the DFFB (German Film and Television Academy) in Berlin. Her experience as a dairy-maid for two summer seasons inspired her to make *Where the Grass is Greener*, which premiered in 2008 in the Arthouse Cinema Le Paris in Zurich. Staudt supposedly makes "DEFA films of the present" (Dockhorn). However, this claim proves problematic given that DEFA (*Deutsche Film-Aktiengesellschaft*), which was the state-owned film studio in the German Democratic Republic, was officially dissolved in 1992 after reunification. Also, a high number of West-German directors who make films about the East complicates this notion further. One may think of examples like Wolfgang Becker's *Good Bye Lenin!* (2003), Florian Henckel von Donnersmarck's Oscar-winning *Das Leben der Anderen* (*The Lives of Others*, 2006) or Christian Petzold's *Barbara* (2012) that claim East-German perspectives.

DEFA thus means here an aesthetic strategy. To this end Staudt's work is influenced by DEFA. It won the audience award of the Festival of the German Film and the DEFA

Sponsorship Award. Her observations of social conditions and her focus on the working class with frequent documentary-like insertions call DEFA strategies to mind, not just Socialist Realism. In the film production of the German Democratic Republic it was binding to reflect reality as “the new, growing, positive,” performed by a “positive hero,” who represented Socialist ideology (Gersch 332). Staudt’s films belong to the tradition of Socialist Realism because they focus on the individual and accurate depiction of everyday life. Along similar lines, Staudt was trained as a carpenter first, because she wanted to do “something with her hands” (Staudt qtd. in Dockhorn). Not surprisingly then all characters in *Where the Grass is Greener* are workers: mostly farmers, milkers and manufacturers.

Reviews of *Where the Grass is Greener* have been limited to declaring it a “gorgeous love film” (*Berliner Zeitung*) and a “[r]omantic dropout comedy” (*Die Welt*). However, *Where the Grass is Greener* has more to offer, both in terms of socio-political observations and genre, which makes it a striking example of the *New Heimatfilm*. One striking aspect of Staudt’s film in terms of undermining genre expectations is the fact that it leaves open if the main character chooses to stay in her *Heimat* or if she will move to Switzerland for good. The film ends with a return home for the time being. Being set in between a small town near Brandenburg and the solitude of a Swiss mountain, it also raises questions about working migration, tradition and modernity, gender roles and genre expectations.

In *Where the Grass is Greener* place matters with all its socio-political implications, such as the increased rate of unemployment in the Brandenburg area. However, Staudt does not determine which place, the Swiss Alps or Eberswalde, is preferable. *Where the Grass is Greener* begins with a far shot of a dismal grayish landscape, showing the detonation of a *Plattenbau*, a building constructed of huge prefabricated concrete slabs as was common in

the GDR. This shot can be read as a reference to DEFA films such as Heiner Carow's *Die Legende von Paul und Paula* (*The Legend of Paul and Paula*, 1973) that also begins with the emblematic detonation of a building and keeps the construction site as a fundamental component of the *mis-en-scène*. Or to Konrad Wolf and Wolfgang Kohlhaase's *Solo Sunny* (1980), in which a building is detonated along the way. In both films, these are certainly not exploded *Plattenbaus*, but an older building from 19th century working-class Berlin. Staudt carries her fascination with DEFA films over into new geographical spaces and connects this *Socialist Realist* working class film with ongoing notions of working migration.

In contrast to *Hierankl* in which the journey from a different place is only implied, *Where the Grass is Greener* (Tamara Staudt, 2008) is set in two contrasting places. It starts out as an expression of love for the decaying *Heimat* in Eberswalde, Brandenburg. Unemployed Eva hesitates about going to the Swiss Alps for temporary employment as a milker, but eventually her desire to work again is stronger. The job center assigns its local clients all over Europe, so an increased demand of flexibility and the willingness to move come along with the tough job market situation. An alternative title *Wen der Berg ruft* (*The Mountain Calls*) is reminiscent of Luis Trenker's famous mountain film, but it becomes clear that this genre has gone a long way since the 1930s. Other than the Alpine setting and the similar title, *Where the Grass is Greener* has little in common with Trenker's oeuvre, particularly *The Prodigal Son*, in which the Tyrolean son succumbs to the American metropolis and eventually finds comfort back home. In Staudt's film the experience abroad is not disillusioning and the homecoming is based upon a true decision instead of being born out of necessity.

Right from the start we see how *Where the Grass is Greener* draws direct references to contemporary economic and political conditions as opposed to the absent or alluded

references of the idyllic 1950's generation of the genre. In the frame following the detonation we see the main character Eva. She looks off-screen, by which the impression is created that she witnesses the demolition. Through a voice-over, accompanied by a playful non-diegetic piano theme, she introduces herself directly and gives basic information about her job training and unemployment, as if she were talking to a job center. We learn that she once was trained in a "real" profession and that she likes to work. Interestingly, she uses the contemporary German job market jargon that not only every job seeker is familiar with, but which is also part of mass media language. So far, this *New Heimatfilm* has been destructive both in terms of the exploding building and the conditions of her *Heimat*. The geopolitical implications of the setting become clear within the first few minutes of the film. Although most of the film is set in Switzerland, the opening and closing scenes are set in Eberswalde. This is important, because the film portrays the East-German *Heimat* critically considering its high rate of unemployment, and yet it does not condemn it like a *Critical Heimatfilm* would. The English title *Where the Grass is Greener* (the literal translation of the German title *Nur ein Sommer* is "only one Summer") may suggest a preference of one locality over the other. However, the film's open, its focus on beauty in both places, and its optimism withhold a definite judgement. These features set the *New Heimatfilm* apart from the destructive mechanisms of the *Critical Heimatfilm* as its predecessor.

As in the other examples of this chapter, local color plays an important role that emphasizes the settings' specific characteristics and atmosphere. In Staudt's film, conversations of the Swiss characters are entirely in Swiss German, a dialect that is unintelligible to most speakers of standard German, so these conversations require subtitling. The dialect matters not only for *Where the Grass is Greener's* plot advancement, but also for Eva's

origin. She is finally successful at the job center, because her first job training as a milker at the LPG (*Landwirtschaftliche Produktionsgenossenschaft*, the official designation for large, collectivized farms in the former GDR) qualifies her for temporary employment in the Swiss Alps. Hence, this *New Heimatfilm* draws a connection between the GDR past and possible continuities for a culture that has been almost completely annulled after reunification.

Accordingly, *Where the Grass is Greener* also establishes an unusual aesthetics of the East. Disappearing *Plattenbauten*, similarly looking modern apartment buildings and work sites mark this *Heimat*. When Eva and her son Jens celebrate his acceptance as an apprentice, they are sitting at a construction site and watch cranes at the horizon. A point of view shot shows the sun setting right above tree tops, beautiful scenery within Eva's grayish and decaying neighborhood that consists of modernized apartment buildings. However, a point-of-view-shot during the night shows construction vehicles loading the rubble of her former apartment building onto a truck. The film constructs *Heimat* then in its beginning as a loss. It is a loss of living space, a loss of possibilities in the locality, a loss of affective and familial ties. This loss has a certain melancholy at first. It reminds us of the conditions that obtain for the Silesian refugees in *Green is the Heath*, but here the melancholy is tempered by a sense that there is an expanded horizon in comparison to the conditions of the former GDR. The melancholy is not a longing for the past of dictatorship but it is a longing for a place in the world.

Eva's younger boyfriend Marco is the only character who is depicted as holding on to this melancholy. He functions as her foil, because Eva is mourning instead, which marks a process that leads to her recognition of new chances as she decides to move. He insists, "one has to stand up, make pressure, so things will change in your own place," making it hard for

Eva to leave. Marco remains unclear about how to achieve this change and it rather sounds like an outdated clichè well known from the classical *Heimatfilm* era home is best. However, after having lost Eva, a name that also signifies the biblical mother figure, he eventually overcomes his melancholy to live up to his name and travel to far-away places, when he accepts a job offer in Norway.

The *New Heimatfilm* creates references and relations between different places. After having depicted Eva's life in Eberswalde and her departure, a shot shows a mountain in the Swiss Alps, also early in the morning. Temporal editing links two related sets, creating a sense of simultaneity. The opening credits are accompanied by folksy sounds and an echoing yodel that carries over to a shot of a mountain pasture with cows with their ringing bells. So far the change of scenery implies a dichotomy between the gray East Germany and the picturesque Swiss Alps, displaying images that can be easily associated with the traditional *Heimatfilm* genre. However, throughout the film it becomes clear that none of the places is favored over the other and each of them has its beauty.

Moreover, *Where the Grass is Greener* gives an example of working migration. Not only is Eva a working migrant, but also she meets a mirror of herself in Mehmed, a Turkish migrant laborer who works on Daniel's competitor's farm. Mehmed represents a current phenomenon of capitalist labor migration; he is without papers, working illegally in Switzerland as an itinerant. For the story, however, as a Turk he also represents a historic West German foil to her new condition. This also works against common conceptions of the (Turkish) *Gastarbeiter* (guestworker), because she has become one as well. She also learns about a Pole, who has already left. In Eva's and probably the Pole's case, work was legally arranged via the job center. Both are from the East, where the economic situation and unemployment are worse.

The film gives us information about current labor conditions by staging a sequence in which Mehmed tells Eva about the facilitators who demanded a lot of money to smuggle him into Switzerland. Hence, all three of them had to leave their homes for economic reasons and go to the Swiss Alps, which sheds a critical light on this allegedly idyllic *Heimat* space. Eva and Mehmed are “transitional agents” between different places, traveling not as tourists, but as workers who bring the world to the secluded mountain pastures.

Staudt’s *New Heimatfilm* provides opportunities for the beginning of a new relationship, when Eva and Daniel become lovers. However, she refuses any commitment. At the end of the summer she returns home and looks like she enjoys being back. A shot of a sunset is accompanied by a cheerful accordion theme. On a large farm, Eva is riding a bike along the long row of cows in their feedlots. Already from afar it is obvious that she is advanced in pregnancy. A shot of her operating a dairy machine, shows how much she enjoys her new job. The film does not make any kind of judgment on industrial production versus the traditional production of cheese in the mountains. Staudt’s film establishes a contrast between the rural and the suburban, but both homes and both modes of production are juxtaposed as serving equally their respective needs. The cut places us into a setting that clearly represents a return to Germany for Eva, but unlike the previous sections of the film where we know a great deal about the characters, here the frame is more like that of the Berlin School. There is an exclusion of direct description for a frame that offers suggestive information.

The film ends, wrapping up some narrative threads, but not resolving them in closure. When Eva is back in Eberswalde, she receives a letter from Daniel that contains some pictures of him in front of his parents’ newly renovated house. They look like postcards or real-estate advertisements, trying to sell her a new life. While she finds a dried edelweiss flower enclosed,

Daniel walks by. He stands in front of a graffiti covered wall, typical for this semi-urban scenery, and smiles at her. They are kept distant from each other in separate shots. Still not having noticed him, she smells the edelweiss and her image fades out. It remains open if she and Daniel will become a family, if she will stay in Brandenburg or move. There is no eyeline match, so we do not get her reaction and have no hint at how Eva will decide. For the credits, the lively accordion theme is picked up again that has been used for dramatic relief throughout the film. Hence, this *New Heimatfilm* ends on an uplifting note, suggesting optimism for Eva and maybe even her *Heimat* Brandenburg.

Traditionally, the *Heimatfilm* endings were set up as happy endings: The role models achieve harmony with their community, filled with love, and nature, and the villain was sent back to where s/he came from. Since *New Heimatfilm* demonstrates itself as permeated by different genres, their endings are similarly varied. From the examples given here, *Where the Grass is Greener* comes from the DEFA tradition. Their *Socialist Realist* focus calls the 1970s Berlin School and its *Arbeiterfilme* (films for and about the workers or the low-class) into attention that were produced for German television. In spite of being a descendent of the German Film and Television Academy Berlin and being of the same age group, the work of Tamara Staudt does not belong to the cohort of the Berlin School since the 1990s. Their aesthetics are too different:

(...) most of the “Berlin School” films might be summed up as a Realism intent on avoiding the pitfalls of Naturalism. It is a Realism that avoids all kinds of manipulative effects, ranging from plot point oriented storytelling to sound tracks heavy on music. (*Vertigo*)

Yet, the documentary insertions in *Where the Grass is Greener* follow similar principles of the Berlin School techniques: the focus on the everyday, the detailed observations, and

the anti-climactic structure. Similar to not resolving the family catastrophe in *Hierankl*, we find a real crossroad in Staudt's film, not only in terms of a narrative, but also a genre. It can easily be imagined as a continuation of the travel migration by following Marco to Norway, or Eva returning to Switzerland, or it will just end with the status quo: Eva finally finding her *Heimat* as the site of her work and family, the summer in the mountains as a mere station towards her homecoming, sealed in memory by her final gesture of smelling the edelweiss. From here the film could start over, but it remains unclear which genre it would be. This indeterminacy belongs to the process constructing a new genre. We can note that *New Heimatfilme* with East-German settings (we have to take into consideration that some are made by West-German filmmakers, like Valeska Grisebach and Tamara Staudt in contrast to Helke Misselwitz) particularly revisit notions of melancholy and mourning for a lost *Heimat*. Unification happened more than two decades ago, but renegotiations with the *New Heimat* have begun only few years ago.

In her focus on a post-wall East German *Heimat*, Staudt calls Andreas Dresen to mind, who was trained in the GDR and successfully launched his career after reunification with films like *Halbe Treppe* (*Grill Point*, 2002) that is set in Frankfurt/Oder, *Summer in Berlin* (2005), and *Willenbrock* (2005), which is set in Magdeburg. Admittedly, Eberswalde is a Kleinstadt (small town), but still different from the rural. In contrast to Dresen, Staudt creates relations and contrasts between different places. Accordingly, the film is mostly set in the Swiss Alps, but its frame is constituted by Eberswalde. Still, both directors emphasize an urbanization of the usually rural *Heimat* concept, Dresen even more so than Staudt. I discuss Dresen's oeuvre and the urban *Heimat* in the following chapter.

2.5 OVERCOMING THE EXCLUSIVENESS OF PLACE

In the examples of the rural *New Heimatfilm* I discussed, place is presented as an open and more inclusive concept. This is often achieved through the inclusion of characters with a foreign status or migrant background that challenge homogeneous concepts in the rural. Theophile's presence in *The Hypocrites* exposes the village's racist tendencies that the film ridicules. Most members of the community eventually accept him. The stereotypical image of the migrant worker is subverted in *Where the Grass is Greener* through the mirroring of Eva and Mehmed, who are both from the East, albeit from different geo-political backgrounds. In addition, the *New Heimatfilm* presents a criticism of the local that is particularly emphasized in *The Hypocrites* and more subdued in *Longing*.

As we have seen, traveling, as a sign of relationship to the world outside the narrowly circumscribed *Heimat*, plays an important role, and so it is no wonder that there is a strong connection to be found between the road film and the *New Heimatfilm*. It is also possible to view the *New Heimatfilm* as an extension of the urban, road and travel film, and vice versa. Still, individuals in the urban and the rural space seek identification with their regional surroundings, but they are increasingly in touch with distanced places by traveling or personally affected by global developments. The experience of displacement is no longer viewed negatively within the *New Heimatfilm*. According to Ulrich Beck, "places become new opportunities for discovering and testing out particular aspects of oneself" and lead to questions like "[t]o what extent is the place my place', and my place' my own life?" (*Was ist Globalisierung?*, 76). However, Beck generalized statement is not always valid. Staudt's film shows that this often combined with difficulties, since the new place for Eva and Mehmed

also mean exploitive working conditions.

The *New Heimatfilm* establishes contrasts between differing lifestyles in different places. The classical *Heimatfilm* used the same technique, but with a clear judgment on which place enables the “better” life. A good example for that is Alfons Stummer’s Austrian *Heimatfilm* *Der Förster vom Silberwald* (*The Forester of Silberwald*, 1954), one of the most popular *Heimatfilme* and a rare box office success in German cinema. The main character Liesl lives and works with the modern artist Max in Vienna, who turns out to be bad influence. Liesl visits her grandfather in her home village, and she unexpectedly extends her stay, where she finds comfort and inspiration from nature and eventually decides to leave the egoistic artist and return home.

In *The Hypocrites*, on his way to Rome Johannes comes across Irschenberg and finds this place of mischief to be improved before he continues his wanderings. Hierankl, by contrast, cannot be saved. Back home again after many years, Lene searches through the attic for childhood memories, but the place is burdened with the past that falls apart under the weight of guilt and family entanglements. Again, memories and melancholia about past losses are depicted with their destructive potential. Places in *Where the Grass is Greener* bear positive potential. Staudt does not make a claim about which locality is better, but considers them to be equal despite their differences. She creates dichotomies between tradition and modernity, the highlands and the lowlands, the remote Swiss microcosm and the modern German small city, the East and the West. These dichotomies are the typical framework of most *Heimatfilme*, but *Where the Grass is Greener* deals with them in a more self-reflexive way without assigning judgmental statements to them. The main characters in these films, primarily Lene in *Hierankl*, Johannes and Theophile in *The Hypocrites*, Marcus in

Longing, and Eva, Marco, Mehmed and Daniel in *Where the Grass is Greener* move through a complex set of landscapes and become transitional agents, dealing with their surroundings and themselves in different, more or less challenging ways.

While the traditional *Heimatfilm* constructs an awareness of its own place, the *New Heimatfilm* focuses on all places occurring in the diegesis, the here and there, past, present and future, but not necessarily in terms of a hierarchy; a local and chronological competition that will seek its winner. *The Hypocrites* presents a position within a globalized world, being anchored between tradition and progress, and in the Upper Bavarian province economic hopes rely on the *Wolpertinger* and a fast food restaurant. In all of these films there is a competition, a comparison, of differing and contradictory lifestyles, but its resolution (if there actually is one) is most of the time not presented.

Place and genre are inseparably connected to each other, as Altman has already pointed out when he describes the ways in which genre formation equals the constant reconstitution nations (2056). Staying within one place promotes a generic stasis in the context of the classical *Heimatfilm* that confirm historical, yet outdated approaches in genre studies that claim genres either have a socially conservative or subversive potential in the way their narratives are set up and how they find resolution. However, they do not take the spectator into consideration. Some think “[g]enre films produce satisfaction rather than action” and “[t]hey serve the interests of the ruling class by assisting in the maintenance of the status quo” (Hess Wright 60), others as innovative because of their ability to become subversive statements, using “an interplay of implicit meanings” to criticize society and mainstream representations (Bourget 76). These approaches, nevertheless, do not bring forth new categories. The *New Heimatfilm* criticizes place by going beyond generic limitations and leads to the formation of

a new genre via the spatial adjectives rural/urban/mobile that constitute the “new” in the *New Heimatfilm*. We can extend Altman’s theory for how a genre is formed by recognizing that the *New Heimatfilm* offers multiple directions of characteristics to eventually formulate a substantified genre.

Heimat or *Heimat* related topics play an important role in general for recent films that focus on traveling and road tripping. *The Hypocrites* consciously ridicules established patterns of the classical *Heimatfilm*. Comical elements were also part of this 1950s genre (e.g. the adorable vagabonds in *Green is the Heath*), but Kronthaler elevates the comedy to a new level as part of the film’s self-reflexivity. The final showdown between the outsiders of the city and the village’s officials gives the impression of a Wild South rather than an orderly Upper Bavarian community.

Hierankl starts out as a travel film (or a road film on railroad tracks) and then moves in between psychoanalytic and political drama and art cinema. This precursor of the *New Heimatfilm* brings baggage from the past considering its diegetic, because it picks up on the *Critical Heimatfilm* tradition and works *Heimat* as a site of trauma towards its negation. With these elements Steinbichler does not create a new *Heimat* expression, but rather destroys it. Even some characters smirk at the idea of participating in a *Heimatfilm*.

Grisebach’s introverted tragedy *Longing* is the only example of the Berlin School in this chapter. Despite its challenging generic categorization, it ties in with a recent representation of *Heimat* and adds to the diverse techniques of the *New Heimatfilm*. It soberly depicts the *Heimat* of Zühlen without being judgmental. While it can be understood as an example of rural communities anywhere, the East-German contextualization enables another way of reading.

For the classical *Heimatfilm* traditional models of sexuality are taken for granted, and woman is displayed in her innocence and shyness. She becomes “bambified” (Majer O’Sickey 209) through the emphasis on her soft and tender characteristics. This changes with the *New Heimatfilm*. In *Where the Grass is Greener* gender roles are shown as depending on modern lifestyles that show a newer family order in contrast to what is usually shown in a *Heimatfilm* or in German *Familienserien* (TV series for families): the nuclear family. The new family order emphasizes the independence of individual family members and the flexibility of role models. Eva refuses to be a wife and avoids discussions about a new family. Hence, *Where the Grass is Greener* depicts neither a family idyll nor a mere destruction of the nuclear family, but a contemporary reality of many families struggling with working migration, separation, and possible social reconfigurations.

2.6 CONCLUSION

Although the case studies in this chapter are set in the rural, the *New Heimatfilm* differs from its precursor, the classical *Heimatfilm*, profoundly. It may borrow specific motifs, such as love and family, and visualize them in rural settings as generic signposts, but it provides a hybrid structure, introduces new family orders and gender roles, and often works against viewer expectations, e.g. the lack of closure. Despite the fact that the concept of the nuclear family was already questioned in the 1960s and historical materialism has also shown it to be an ideology that cannot be sustained, the most popular *Heimatfilm* productions for television today still hold on to these outdated principles like a nostalgic longing for the past. Even the

New Heimatfilm's platform for expressions of mobile lifestyles, such as working migration, the destruction of the nuclear family, and psychological disorders hark back to the *Critical Heimatfilm* of the 1960s and 1970s. The true advancement of this new genre is the display of the changed (and normalized) materialities without employing them as oppositions to a conservative conceptualization of *Heimat*.

The *Heimatfilm* genealogy shows a development from oppositions between *Heimat* and *Fremde*, belonging and displacement to their negation in the *Critical Heimatfilm* and, for the time being, to their recontextualization in a globalized world. If Hans Deppe's *Green is the Heath*, the embodiment of the classical *Heimatfilm*, had been made twenty years later as a *Critical Heimatfilm*, it would have looked very different. It would have focused on the *Vertriebene* (expellees) after World War II and their deflated sense of *Heimat* (homeland). Instead, it portrays a Silesian who breaks the law by poaching, but finally submits to the law and order of the new place. The three adorable village-owned vagabonds who sing cheerful songs and easily get by would be excluded or even openly confronted. This depiction would criticize the exclusion of these useless, subversive elements.

If *Green is the Heath* had been made 50 years later, it would have been permeated by qualities that describe the *New Heimatfilm*; the parallel montage between the steady village life and the visiting circus would equally signify a dichotomy between home and homelessness or stability and mobility. However, it would not necessarily have ended with the line "dwell in the land and earn your living honestly," but it would have rather stayed vague about local preferences and lifestyles and therefore it would lack closure. Hence, we see not only that *Green is the Heath* is neither a *Critical Heimatfilm* nor a *New Heimatfilm*. We also realize that the motifs of this classical 1950s *Heimatfilm* (e.g. belonging, loss, family, love, nature)

would work in different eras of German film history. The latest modification of this rural film is the *New Heimatfilm* that I introduce here.

We have traced the *New Heimatfilm* back to its precursors, the classical *Heimatfilm* of the 1950s and 1960s, the New German Cinema, in particular the *Critical Heimatfilm* of the 1960s and 1970s. The case studies presented show that the *New Heimatfilm* has more different shapes and forms than the classical *Heimatfilm* ever had. German film genres and places are currently in flux, and considering some examples from the New German Cinema, these transformations already started in the late 1960s. The case studies presented here do not only share an interest in *Heimat*, but they also expand it, both in terms of geography by traveling and considering generic changes. In conjunction with shifting motifs, movement, and a critical awareness of locality, hybrid forms best express these new configurations. Thus, *Heimat* gets picked up again in post-1990 Germany and renegotiates its timeless elements against the backdrop of a changing geo-political sphere. The *New Heimatfilm* takes these considerations towards the development of a growing European consciousness. Both the formation of the *New Heimatfilm* genre and sentiments of a European community are ongoing processes. Instead of causing merely modernized, escapist forms of the *Heimatfilm*, the *New Heimatfilm* views itself critically, no longer holds on to local exclusiveness, and often displays a search for home somewhere else. This becomes even more noticeable within road films that become exceedingly more self-conscious with these matters. The historically established binary opposition between *Heimat* and travel moves towards a more complex web that allows for a simultaneity of these terms. However, the successor of the *Critical Heimatfilm* and the entertaining Bavarian comedies can be mistaken as a *New Heimatfilm*, as the examples of Steinbichler and Rosenmüller have shown. Unlike these productions, the *New*

Heimatfilme of Kronthaler, Grisebach and Staudte unveil a new dimension of *Heimat* that, despite being critical and inclusive of larger socio-political developments, do not abandon *Heimat* altogether.

3.0 HOME IN THE CITIES — *HEIMAT* AND THE URBAN FILM

Four different examples of visualizing the urban space evidence the need to rework theoretical critical concepts of the city as *Heimat*, but also of the mobile figure of the *flâneur* as a classical urban motif that I situate within a European and global context. The *flâneur* as figure especially in contemporary films set in a post-Wall re-modernized Berlin acts as a motif to represent larger shifts on the European scale: shifts in economics and mobility. This chapter reveals a critical-theoretical need to reconsider Walter Benjamin's *flâneur* conception as well as Michel de Certeau's theory of lived and practiced space. Anne Friedberg has begun to update the notion of the *flâneur* with her discussion of the experience of virtual mobility in *Window Shopping* (1994). She has highlighted how gender functions in consumer society. In this chapter, however, the question of the *flâneuse* is less tied to consumerism than to precarity and flexibility within the new economy and an enlarging realm of experience within Europe. These tendencies enter into high contrast especially by the discussion of my final and most recent example.

The following questions will guide me through this chapter: What does the urban space mean for us in our understanding of *Heimat* now? How can we imagine ourselves in an urban *Heimat*, especially when the urban space itself becomes hostile and even inhospitable? If *Heimat* is about community in some form, a sense of belonging, how does that belonging

change? And what happens in the new millennium to the vision of woman, once central to the romantic conservative family agenda of conceptions of *Heimat*?

The case studies come from three different directors and cinematic traditions: two films by Andreas Dresen's *Nachtgestalten* (*Night Shapes*, 1999) and *Sommer vorm Balkon* (*Summer in Berlin*, 2005), Angela Schanelec's *Marseille* (2004) and Tatjana Turanskyj's *Eine flexible Frau* (*The Drifter*, 2010). Each of these films undoes the dynamics of the city of Berlin, its "readable surfaces," of the familiar and yet changing and estranging surroundings in a unique way. Considering these films through a socio-economic and a film historical lens demonstrates the connection between urban dwelling and the struggle for a home at different moments during post- *Wende* Berlin. This period for the films, the first decade of the new millennium, was one dominated by discourses on the expansion of the European Union and a new turn in globalized capital to what sociologists commonly refer to as "second" or "reflexive modernity" (Beck, Lash, and Rang).

Cinema from its early beginning in the period of First Modernity onwards visualizes the city and anchors it as site of modernity and technological innovation. A quick review of the history of German cinema alone reveals how not infrequently, these depictions were put into a relation with home, bringing forth its various meanings within an urban setting: home as a shelter from the turbulent metropolis as in Karl Grune's *Die Straße* (*The Street*, 1923) and Joe May's *Asphalt* (1929), or the interior as mirror of urban poverty like in G.W. Pabst's *Die freudlose Gasse* (*The Joyless Street*, 1925). There are multiple expressions and usages of the city and home in conjunction with each other in the film of the Third Reich. The city is used as a negative foil for rural life in Luis Trenker's *Der verlorene Sohn* (*The Prodigal Son*, 1934) and in particular presenting its nationalist ideology in Veit Harlan's *Die goldene*

Stadt (*The Golden City*, 1942), in which the Sudeten German farmers are contrasted with the corrupted Slavic townsmen to name only two.

After World War II the skylines of the bombed city in *rubble films* like Wolfgang Staudte's *Die Mörder sind unter uns* (*The Murderers Are Among Us*, 1946) offer strong visual metaphors for the loss of home. The 1950s as the era of the classical *Heimatfilm* genre continue conservative assumptions and generally make a case for the rural home versus the treacherous city, as it is the case in Alfons Stummer's *Der Förster vom Silberwald* (*The Forester of Silberwald*, 1954). On the East German side, DEFA productions like Gerard Klein's *Berlin. Ecke Schönhauser* (*Berlin. Schoenhauser Corner*, 1957) mark the *Kiez* (a term for neighborhood particularly used in Berlin) of the adolescents as home and develops into a commitment to living in the East rather than the West of Berlin. While the GDR was modifying the idea of *Heimat* for socialist culture (see Hodgins 458), the directors of the New German Cinema in West Germany were presenting the concept of *Heimat* as unlivable, no matter if rural or urban (a point discussed at length in the preceding chapter 2). Towards the end of the German-German divide, Wim Wenders visualized divided Berlin and notions of belonging in *Der Himmel über Berlin* (*Wings of Desire*, 1987).

Since the fall of the Berlin Wall film has been displaying changing urban structures: Hannes Stöhr's *Berlin is in Germany* (2001) demonstrates the loss of the GDR as home and seeks a reorientation on the changed urban landscape. Andreas Dresen's films *Night Shapes* (1999) and *Summer in Berlin* (2005) strongly intertwine life in the city with the ordinary and exceptional everyday. Tatjana Turanskyj's *The Drifter* (2010) shows the challenged individual navigating through neo-liberal living space and working conditions. The directors of the Berlin School observe the city and the individual's belonging very differently, or rather

they have the city offer settings to the ordinary and quotidian: Angela Schanelec's *Marseille* (2004) takes the protagonist back and forth between two European cities and turns the exterior into her home and the interior into the street. And Christoph Hochhäusler's *Unter dir die Stadt* (*The City Below*, 2010) sets a love affair in Frankfurt's banking district that visually puts the glass and steel skyscrapers in opposition with the human body and empty homes, emphasizing the individual's homelessness.

In the previous chapter, we looked at new cinematic engagements with the rural as classical *Heimat* space. This chapter reveals differing and contrasting ways of locating and presenting a *Heimat* in the city, whose filmic representation changed in accordance with current processes of European expansion and globalization. We focus on these directors because although they follow different cinematic styles and traditions in Germany, what they have in common is a distance from classical genre cinema, although they borrow here and there from certain generic concepts. I say classical here, because their reputation of not belonging to a particular genre, nevertheless, brings forth other forms of categorization in at least two cases: The Berlin School, with its cool and distanced style, as it is represented here by Angela Schanelec, and Dresen's style that often observes a harsh reality through documentary-style techniques. Together with Turanskyj's experimental feature film, three contrasting styles visualize Berlin as home, urbanity and *Heimat*. Although Dresen does not only stick to Berlin in his overall oeuvre (*Grill Point* is set in Frankfurt/Oder and *Willenbrock* in Magdeburg), I will focus on Dresen's Berlin films as local foils to Schanelec's and Turanskyj's works. This contrast enables a formulation of generic specificities via difference.

3.1 THE *KIEZ* AS HEIMAT — ANDREAS DRESEN’S *NIGHT SHAPES* AND *SUMMER IN BERLIN*

The *Heimatfilm* as a rural concept was prevalent in the 1930s and 1950s. Already Georg Simmel differentiates between typical urban and rural character traits in his essay “The Metropolis and Mental Life” (1903). According to Simmel, the small town person “rests more on feelings and emotional relationships” while the metropolitan resident is considered an “intellectualistic character” (325). Yet, he does not merely criticize the anonymous city with its masses, but explains the urban phenomenon of reserve and indifference, the “incapacity to react to new stimulations with the required amount of energy,” which he calls “blasé attitude” as a necessary mechanism of self-protection against the “rapidly shifting stimulations of the nerves” (329) within the modern urban space. Further, he notes that the urban spatial constriction evokes intellectual distancing, which is a precondition for the personal freedom of the urban individual “in contrast with the trivialities and prejudices which bind the small town person” (334). Nevertheless, this freedom comes at the cost of the sheltered rural community that the metropolitan type has to do without.

Still, there have been many arguments for and against the city as *Heimat*. The blood-and-soil ideology of the Nazis did not correspond with the notion of city as *Heimat* either. Its strategic importance for the Third Reich remained unquestioned, but its peasant and folkloristic ideology remained the flagship of the German *Heimat* understanding. After World War II, the focus shifted from the bucolic to the urban space, not only for logistic reasons, but also because of the tainted *Heimat* concept of the Nazi past. For the first time since the Weimar Republic, the city became site and setting for filmic engagements with

its contemporary socio-political sphere with decades of specific themes and styles to come, such as the post-war *rubble films*, the rebellious *Halbstarkenfilme* (juvenile delinquent films) of the 1950s, the socially critical *Arbeiterfilme* (workers films) of the late 1960s and 1970s, films about the isolating “Neue *Heimat*” of guestworkers in the Federal Republic.

However, these films have been denied a classification as urban *Heimatfilme*, since they are dominated by other genres like the crime story (Grammatikopoulos et al. 190). Accordingly, it seems that the urban *Heimatfilm* has not come into existence in the 1980s. Since the late 1990s, Andreas Dresen’s films offer a new approach to *Heimat* in the city, one that comprises the cosmopolitanism of what Simmel ascribes to the metropolis and the sense of a “rural” belonging and community against the backdrop of Second Modernity within the Berlin Republic. While being identified as an East German filmmaker who successfully made his transition into the post-unification era, Dresen does not emphasize the differences between the East and the West. He applies what Nick Hodgkin calls a “normalizing approach” (195) instead, for which his typically eastern German settings are not necessarily the crucial factor for his narratives. Accordingly, Dresen’s characters and he himself share an East German history that, indeed, made them who they are, but in his films they become East Germans, citizens in a region of the Berlin Republic. This normalized aspect shines through at times, but not as an accented feature that is quintessential for the narrative. He thereby presents the concerns and desires of average reunified German citizens of the Berlin Republic, who sometimes have a GDR past. Dresen’s work imagines a type of *New Heimat* in contemporary Berlin and in Germany’s East. While on the one hand being rooted in the local, his films express the ordinary and peculiar universality of life that could always be staged elsewhere. By contrast to Tamara Staudt who considers her films as the continuation

of DEFA's *Socialist Realist* tradition (chapter 2), Dresen's career started with DEFA, but he has developed his own cinematic signature more independently from it.

Many critics have referred to his style as "magischer Realismus" (magic realism, see e.g. Daniel Lode 120, Hendrike Bake, and Werner Busch), by which Dresen's occasional interruptions of the depicted harsh reality is meant. However, this term can be misleading, since it is not magic that occurs in his films (as in Christian Petzold's *Yella*, 2007), but rather *unerhörte Begebenheiten* (unheard-of events) like in the novella that often initiate Dresen's narratives: In *Night Shapes* (1999), homeless Eva finds a 100-marks bill in her hat after not having paid attention for only a second; In *Halbe Treppe* (*Grill Point*, 2002), the number of musicians in front of Uwe's snack bar mysteriously increases and a lost parakeet returns to its cage; And in *Sommer vorm Balkon* (*Summer in Berlin*, 2003) Katrin is almost run over by a truck. These events, despite being unusual, are rather coincidental than magical. Dresen's oppositional film style depicts grim reality and silver linings side by side. His notion of realism is down-to-earth and allows for unexpected glimpses of hope within the urban community, which informs his urban *Heimat* depictions, as we shall see.

With his episodic film *Night Shapes* he made the transition from television to cinema. In his reflections he recalls a sense that with its premier at the 1999 *Berlinale* competition his career was at stake, "an dieser Vorführung wird sich meine berufliche Existenz entscheiden" (Dresen qtd. in "Debütfilme. Stilles Land").⁹ *Night Shapes*, with its unusual mixture of professional actors and lay actors acting side-by-side, with its reduced technological means and improvised dialogues, was celebrated at the *Berlinale* and won the German Film Award in silver as best feature film. In *Night Shapes* Berlin serves many functions in the film's

⁹"(...) with this showing, my professional career will be decided."

various narrative threads. It is displayed as a space of transition, confrontation and solidarity. Three seemingly conflicted pairs are forced to wander through the streets during an exceptional night in Berlin. The pope is visiting the city, which functions as the unheard-of event: Miraculously, homeless Hanna finds a 100 mark bill dropped in front of her and together with her boyfriend Victor their subsequent search for a room results in various encounters, both hostile and gentle. The farmer Jochen comes to the city to seek love and an adventure and his bag is robbed right after he gets off the train. Still having his wallet, he runs into the underage drug-addicted prostitute Patty. In spite of Jochen's reservations about her youth and the overall pathetic situations into which she brings him, she eventually turns into his tour guide and he develops sympathetic and romantic feelings for her. Feliz, a boy from Angola, arrives at the airport, but instead of being picked up by his "uncle," who is supposed to help Feliz find asylum, the businessman Peschke is put in charge of him by chance. Instead of meeting his Japanese business partners, he drives Feliz through the city. As with the other characters, the night is filled with misadventures for Peschke: his car gets stolen. But as with the other characters a human experience comes to transcend the quest for material comfort: despite the fact that Feliz does not understand his German outbursts of fury, this involuntary interruption of usual procedures warms Peschke's heart for a short while. The film's title *Nachtgestalten* can mean both night figures, but also to shape the night. The different characters literally try to "gestalten" (shape) the night in Berlin according to their possibilities.

Dresen's style of how to visualize the city offers points of comparison with other Berlin films. There are no establishing shots or high-angle placements of the camera. The viewer takes on the street level perspective in de Certeau's sense. The interwoven structure of the

episodic narrative establishes the film's multi-faceted appearance. Dresen's film reminds us how Walter Ruttmann's visualizations in *Berlin. Die Sinfonie der Großstadt* (*Berlin. Symphony of a Great City*, 1927) also point to the dichotomy between the different social classes. Both Ruttmann and Dresen's Berlin films, although more than 70 years apart, produce various and differing forms of Realism by drawing on social questions like poverty and work life. Ruttmann's avantgarde practices aim to convey a comprehensive impression of modernity from dusk till dawn. By contrast, Dresen's optimistic realism punctuates his stories here and there and the film visually grasps what cannot be shown in a conventional documentary. Thus, he has gone beyond his original training as documentary filmer at the HFF (*Hochschule für Film und Fernsehen/University of Film and Television*) "Konrad Wolf" in Potsdam-Babelsberg: "Für mich beinhaltet Realismus durchaus die Möglichkeit zur Verfremdung, wenn man damit bei einer Form von Wahrheit ankommt, die ins Herz der Gesellschaft zielt und ins Herz der Menschen" (Dresen in an interview with Lode 97).¹⁰ One decisive difference is, however, that most of Ruttmann's depictions are not staged and there is no focus on particular characters through whose eyes we experience the city.

Via the characters in *Night Shapes*, we get a glimpse of Berlin. We particularly see the city through the eyes of strangers: the farmer Jochen and the African boy Feliz. Being muted, because he does not seem to know German, Feliz is restricted to his sense of vision, the most important sense of a *flâneur*. It is the perception of a *Fremder* (stranger, but also foreigner) that Dresen develops: "Die Stadt erzählt sich über sie [die Charaktere]" (Dresen, *Night Shapes*).¹¹ By contrast, the Berliners in *Night Shapes* (such as Hanna, Victor, Peschke,

¹⁰"To my mind, realism, by all means, contains the opportunity of alienation, if it makes you achieve a kind of truth that aims at the heart of society and at the hearts of people."

¹¹"The city narrates itself through them [the characters]."

Patty, and Feliz' "uncle") do not particularly reflect on their familiar surroundings. The camera stays on eye level with these figures that are at the bottom of the city's hierarchy. Dresen's "*Rattenperspektive*" (rat's eye view, a term coined by Ralf Schenk) contrasts with another filmmaker's classic depictions of Berlin. Wim Wenders' angelic perspectives in *Wings of Desire* (1987) transgress the Berlin Wall and the no-man's-land between the East and the West. Its successor, *In weiter Ferne, so nah!* (*Far Away, So Close!*, 1993), by contrast, mainly employs a street level perspective, because both Damiel and Cassiel, previous angels, are both human beings now. Cassiel turns into an underworld view that at times equals Dresen's *Rattenperspektive*, but alternates between top-down and bottom-up perspectives. The angelic perspective is nevertheless contrasted with the poet Homer's wandering along the graffiti-covered Wall on the pre-*Wende* Potsdamer Platz (before it became rebuilt with the hyper modern Sony Center), puzzled by its disappearance:

I cannot find the Potsdamer Platz. Here? It cannot be here. Potsdamer Platz. That's where there was the Café Josti. In the afternoons I went there to chat, then to drink a coffee and to watch the crowd, having smoked my cigar at Löhse and Wolff, a renowned tobacconist. Just about here. This can't be the Potsdamer Platz. And no one, whom you can ask. It was a lively place. Tramways, horse- drawn omnibuses and two cars: mine and that of the chocolate shop. The Wertheim store was here, too. And then suddenly the flags appeared. There The whole Platz was covered with them. And the people weren't friendly anymore. And the police wasn't either. I will not give up as long as I have not found the Potsdamer Platz. (...)

This inner monologue, partially accompanied by original footage of post-World War II destructions, shows the restrictions of the street-level *flâneur* by time and space that does not allow him to move around freely and go back in time. Homer is "lacking a place" in the truest sense of de Certeau's words. Wenders does not provide a restricted view of the confined space in divided Berlin. Angelic views from the Victory Column, from the damaged spire of the Kaiser Wilhelm Memorial Church or helicopter shots scan over Berlin's history,

overcome boundaries and provide an overview of space. What we can note from these different employments of the *flâneur* motif is that his wanderings (later on we will follow *flâneuses* as well) are strongly intertwined with changes of the urban space. Accordingly, Anne Friedberg notes that “[t]he city itself redefined the gaze” (38) due to its modernizing infrastructure. However, as it becomes obvious through Wenders’ film set in divided Berlin, it is not the shop windows that “invited passersby to engage in imaginative new sites of looking” (Friedberg 38), but landmarks.

The different narratives in *Night Shapes* are set during a fictional visit of the Pope. The film might present Berlin as expecting a visitor from high above, but it tells its story as seen from the bottom. The episodic wanderings of the characters visualize Berlin from various points of view. It is a bottom-up perspective, both in optical and social regards, of the “eccentric and despised representatives” (Gilloch 9) that already fascinated Walter Benjamin in his *Arcades Project*. Accordingly, the first shot of the film is a low-angle shot of the wet asphalt, taken from Hanna’s point of view; she is sitting on the street, begging for money. This resembles Rainer Werner Fassbinder’s opening credits of *Angst essen Seele auf* (*Ali: Fear Eats the Soul*, 1974), which equally suggests a lower social class point of view from the guestworker Ali and the widowed Emmi. Similarly, in Dresen’s film one does not have to belong to the group of those who are officially considered as socially disadvantaged: the down-home farmer Jochen and the businessman Peschke are as much part of it as the homeless couple, the teenage prostitute, the African boy and the punks. Thus, *Night Shapes* gives us a cross-section through Berlin, not only of its inhabitants, but also of its visitors.

Dresen shows a unified Berlin as it has not been visualized before, not even in Wenders’ post-*Wende* film *Far Away, So Close*. Films like *Ali: Fear Eats the Soul* and *Night Shapes*

prove that there is “a fondness for the marginal and the forgotten,” which “are the traits of *flâneur* and filmmaker alike” (Vidler 116). Dresen creates a tension of how we get to experience Berlin, which is through the locals and the tourist’s gaze. As observers of an unruly nightlife, we take sides with Feliz, who catches his first glimpse of Berlin (and probably Germany) out of Peschke’s car, or we are similarly confronted with a harsh underworld like Jochen, when Patty drags him into the drug milieu. Hence, *Night Shapes* indeed puts us into the position of the *Fremder* (stranger), the visitor, who has not experienced such thing before.

However, through the encounters with visitors, locals also gain new experience in their *Kiez* (their hood), which is their *Heimat*. Through the interruption of their routine, they learn to observe their home consciously: Peschke falsely accuses the African boy of having stolen his wallet. This initial mistake seems to confront Peschke with his own latent racism and makes him feel responsible for the abandoned boy at the airport. While helping Feliz to find his alleged uncle, who actually helps asylum seeker kids arriving with a one-way ticket from Africa, as Dresen explains in an interview with *Der Tagesspiegel* (Lauterbach), Peschke puts his tight work schedule at risk. His precarious situation results in excessive venting despite his growing fondness of the boy. Peschke’s monologues give insight into the life of an aging businessman, whose car is more his home than his apartment. His BMW attests to his status in the business world, both of which he loses. With his suit and car he could easily be (mis)recognized as being part of the affluent society (which makes him a target for local punks). During their wanderings we learn that he is at the bottom of the pecking order as well. The encounter with Feliz lets him be the human being Peschke for a brief time and overcome his “blasé attitude” that, according to Simmel, appears as the

city dwellers' dulling towards the differentiation between objects due to an "intensification of emotional life" (325) in a fast moving urban surrounding. Already at the beginning of the 20th century Simmel's essay "The Metropolis and Mental Life" describes a *Zeitgeist* with all its drifts, opaqueness, and fragmented perceptions that do not enable a dwelling as being in Heidegger's sense. Thus, Dresen depicts the city in *Night Shapes* as being strongly related to homelessness. This equally involves the visiting farmer Jochen, the boy far away from home, the allegedly settled character Peschke, the prostitute Patty, and the homeless couple.

The clash between the urban characters' "blasé attitude" and the visitors' more sociable behavior, as associated with the rural community (Simmel 325), becomes obvious through the interaction between Jochen and Patty. She attempts to steal Jochen's money and can barely put up with his nave talking all night, but she also smiles at his clumsy charm and at least puts a 100-mark bill back into his wallet before they part. Moments of the locals' altered viewpoints through their encounters are fleeting, but they permeate the episodic structure. The differences between the oppositional characters abide when they part, and yet, they find moments of hope and tenderness, which punctuate the overall roughly depicted Berlin that marks Dresen's Realism.

Night Shapes shows the *Kiez* as the unknown adventure for some and the alienated familiar for others. The opposite is the case for Dresen's *Sommer vorm Balkon* (*Summer in Berlin*, 2005). The film tells the story of two neighbors in Prenzlauer Berg, who are also friends. Katrin is originally from Freiburg and now she lives alone with her son Max in Berlin. Her daily routine consists of job coaching, unsuccessful interviews, occasional day labor and rewarding summer nights on Nike's balcony. Nike is from East Berlin and grew up in an orphanage. She works as an outpatient care nurse and home help for the elderly. Both

are singles and enjoy the summer nights together until the truck driver Ronald interferes. Nike starts a relationship with him that is, however, reduced to the physical. Meanwhile, the women's friendship suffers and Katrin gets increasingly desperate spending her nights by herself instead with Nike. Her alcohol addiction becomes obvious, which escalates after a club night with Nike. Katrin drinks herself into unconsciousness and undergoes withdrawal treatment. Nike dismisses Ronald and the film closes with the two women reunified on the balcony again. A light-hearted comedy turns into an existential drama and vice versa, and Dresen switches back and forth between comic and tragic elements.

As in *Night Shapes*, Dresen's characters are situated within the actual social-political landscape of Germany. In *Summer in Berlin* it is the world of *Hartz IV*. This colloquially used expression for long-term unemployment benefits has become a synonym for the class of non-working poor and strictly regulated outpatient care. In an interview with the *Berliner Zeitung*, Dresen refers to the transition "vom Sozialstaat zum Individualstaat. Von einer Fürsorgegesellschaft in eine Gesellschaft, in der jeder auf sich gestellt ist" (Sylvester).¹² His stories are placed within realistic settings and seek the humane within the rough challenges of our time. Dresen remembers his reaction to the screenplay by dramatic advisor Cooky Ziesche: "Das war ein bisschen so, als ob man eine Straße lang geht. Man guckt kurz durch ein Fenster rein und sieht den Menschen da drinnen für einen Moment bei ihrem Leben zu, und dann geht man weiter" (Dresen in an interview with Mattern).¹³

The film shows different kinds of homes as a cross-section through different parts of Berlin citizens: Nike's light and airy top floor apartment with the balcony, Katrin's dark place on

¹²"(...)from the social state to the individual state. From a society of welfare to a society, in which everybody is on their own."

¹³"It was a little as if you go down a street. You take a brief look through a window and watch these people leading their lives for a moment, and then you move on"

the ground floor, the elderly people's old-fashioned homes that attest to their memories of a lost past, Max' secret attic that leads to the roof and provides a view over the city, and also the Berlin houses that Katrin painted after reunification, because they are "irgendwie so ostmäßig" ("somehow so East-like"). While *Night Shapes* mostly gives us insight into the lives of Berliners through encounters with regional outsiders, in *Summer in Berlin* we accompany the locals in their private sphere at home and in their *Kiez* throughout the story. Although both Katrin and Nike are Berlin locals and thus are depicted within their *Heimat*, Katrin is marked as an outsider in two regards: socially as an unemployed, and regionally as a Swabian. Nike struggles with the hardships of her job and her longing for a serious relationship, but she makes a living, while the West German depends on social welfare. With his two main characters, Dresen reverses the post-unification stereotype of the superior West German and the unsuccessful East German. He uses this device to work towards a normalization of East-West representations. The difference between the two women does not depend on their origin, but is constituted by their current places and conveyed visually: The former orphan Nike had to struggle to belong to society, but now has a petit-bourgeois life, to which her daily structure and tidy and bright apartment attest. Katrin, on the contrary, lives on the ground floor in a dark and untidy place that corresponds with her loneliness and pessimism. Nike's telling name of the Greek goddess of victory not only refers to her superiority, but also its Latin equivalent Victoria calls the Berlin Victory Column into attention. Like the goddess, who is represented with wings, Nike is a dynamic character, riding her bike through Berlin fast from client to client, an angel for the elderly of whom she takes care physically and emotionally. Dresen thereby subliminally evokes a different stereotype, one of the more caring East German, who grew up in a society, in which commercialization was still at bay.

The clash between East and West occurs when her superior Nike repeatedly exceeds her home care visitations and both her superior and a client's daughter reprimand her about the financial consequences. Dresen's normalization process still allows room for a staging of East German characteristics at a time when they have already begun to disappear.

Berlin is home to both women, more specifically they live in Prenzlauer Berg a neighborhood that has already been used as a setting and statement for urban belonging in films like Gerhard Klein's *Berlin. Schoenhauser Corner* (1957). Different from *Night Shapes, Summer in Berlin* provides a sense of orientation through various establishing shots. When the camera follows Nike on her bike and Katrin's son Max jogging, the *Kiez* is laid out. The film shows the Helmholtzplatz, the Schönhauser Allee and the subway station Eberswalder Straße. However, it does not visualize Prenzlauer Berg as known today, but rather its remains that are about to vanish. "Früher war der Prenzlauer Berg eine sozial viel rauhere Gegend mit Treppenhäusern, die nach Pisse rochen und nach Kachelöfen. Das hatte eher etwas Räumiges" (Dresen qtd. in Lode 177).¹⁴ *Summer in Berlin* does not have much to do with the Prenzlauer Berg of 2004 that changed drastically since reunification and got into the gentrification process. Dresen includes subtle hints towards these occurring changes, such as a scaffold building and Katrin's paintings of houses before they got painted over. These construction sites are even more present in Wolfgang Becker's *Das Leben ist eine Baustelle* (*Life is All You Get*, 1997).

The old Prenzlauer Berg is shown as a disappearing *Heimat* that will soon turn into memory. Nike's patients, aging retirees, stay in their apartments and already live in the

¹⁴"Back then, Prenzlauer Berg was a socially much rougher area with staircases that smelled like piss and tile stoves. There was something mangy about it."

past. For the younger generation of Katrin and Nike the old and the new still exist side by side. The adolescents like Max can hardly relate to the old *Kiez* by personal experience. Hence, he helplessly tries to explain his mother's dull paintings of gray houses: "These are three houses. (...) You can see what they used to look like. Now they are painting them." On the canvas, as well as on the screen, they have already turned into memory. The *Kiez* as Dresen almost nostalgically visualizes it, speaks more through his film style and structure instead of through the images of a particular location. According to David Lode, the real Prenzlauer Berg makes itself seen by its atmospheric tensions between "silent melancholia and sudden irruption of reality's hardship, between airy mild nights up on the balcony and the coldness of life down on the ground floor" (177). The balcony, in particular, turns into a place of harmony, but also of longing. None of the characters goes on vacation in the summer, but rather than longing for a place away from home, an impression that the Mediterranean music during the balcony scenes creates, the balcony is depicted as their exotic resort. Here they can unwind from their worries about unemployment and loneliness.

When Katrin returns home, Max welcomes her back through the open window, which signifies a new openness towards life and its hardships. The apartment turned into a bright and tidy place, and Katrin and Nike are back on the balcony. The summer comes to an end, and so does the old Prenzlauer Berg, indicated by two shots of a building covered in scaffolding, accompanied by construction noise. It resembles Nike and Katrin's corner building with a single balcony on the highest level. The first shot is an extreme long shot that gives an idea of the building's surroundings. The next shot cuts in to a medium close-up with a slight violation of the 30-degree rule within this film that otherwise sticks to continuity editing. This very subtle change signals that something is off here. The changes in Katrin

and Nike's *Heimat* do not even spare their most special place, which is their balcony.

Dresen visualizes Berlin as a *Heimat* in most of his films by means of different styles and generic references. Tragedy, comedy and documentary meander through his entire work. He shows an unadorned reality as when Katrin is rebuffed from job interviews and later intoxicated in the hospital. The authenticity of the latter results from the fact that the real staff of the *St. Josefs-Krankenhaus* takes care of Katrin and that the whole scene is shot with a hand-held camera in one single take (Lode 187). Dresen also accompanies Nike's daily duties of changing adult diapers and justifying herself to her superior why she spends too much time at the patients' households, which exceeds the budget plan. Many of these situations nevertheless allow for humor, such as when Nike is washing a patient's back:

Helene: If only my face was still as smooth as my ass.

Nike: You probably haven't seen your ass in a while, Helene.

Dresen's montage often alters between tragic and comic elements via cross-cutting. The episodic structure of *Night Shapes* gets introduced this way in the opening. Jochen arrives at the station and the punks steal his bag. At the police station he is asked what he lost and the film cuts to the thieves, who only find flip flops and condoms instead of cash. The film also ends with the punks, but surprisingly away from the city in broad daylight, and seemingly with a different genre: the road film and action film. With Peschke's car they drive to the sea and experience moments of peace and quiet before they light the car on fire and the film closes with a stylistic return to the mode of the social drama: the close-ups of the teenagers and one of them directly gazing at the camera. Dresen's camerawork is set up to observe, not judge.

Dresen has acknowledged that his work is not influenced by only one particular film

or style (Lode 10). His films stand in various traditions such as the aesthetics of Weimar Cinema, *film noir*, the New German Cinema, and the Soviet Cinema (Hodgin 133). Dresen is certainly aware of these traditions and genres and he admits to have enjoyed watching Neo-Realist films and Fassbinder's *Die Ehe der Maria Braun* (*The Marriage of Maria Braun*, 1979) in the GDR (Lode 11). However, Dresen's approach to reach his audience differs significantly from the New German Cinema. In an interview on the dvd *Night Shapes* he states the following:

Die Realität darf nicht politisch-didaktisch serviert werden. Die Geschichten müssen leinwandtauglich sein, den Zuschauer zu einer emotionalen Achterbahnfahrt einladen. Wir dürfen nicht den Fehler des Neuen Deutschen Films wiederholen und in eine belehrende Schiene abrutschen.¹⁵

Dresen observes and shows rather than to comment and judge, another reason why his work is hard to describe in generic terms. His training in the documentary craft and DEFA's emphasis on Socialist Realism left their fingerprints on him, but he developed his own language to set himself apart. He screened his first films publicly under the acronym "DREFA" ("Dresen-Film-Arbeitsgemeinschaft"), obviously a DEFA pun (Lode 14) that attests to his irony and originality. The fact that scholars feel challenged to classify Dresen's oeuvre, expresses as much a fascination with his films as it does a desire to categorize them.

I am discussing his films as examples of the *New Heimatfilm* that do not derive from the substantiated genre *Heimatfilm*. By being recognized as belonging to different genres (such as the urban film, comedy, or tragicomedy) his films are hybrid constructions, in which notions of *Heimat* are of importance, but not represented as a superior framework. *Heimat*

¹⁵"Reality should not be served in a political-didactical way. The stories have to be suitable for the screen and invite the viewer to a ride on the emotional roller coaster. We should not make the same mistake as the New German Cinema and stoop to an indoctrinating approach."

motifs can be derived out of this composition rather than approaching the film from the very beginning as a *Heimatfilm*. Thus, in contrast to films like *Hierankl*, *The Hypocrites*, and *Where the Grass is Greener*, which at least resemble the *Heimatfilm* aesthetics visually (with their picturesque bucolic settings), films like *Summer in Berlin* engage with *Heimat* outside of the established *Heimat* concept. To that effect, Steven Cohan points out that it can be questioned to what extent genres function “solely as a formal narrative structure that gets codified and so internalized in an individual text through convention,” and hence a singular object offers different ways of looking at it. Further, a genre-focused analysis entails a consideration of “wider social contexts of production and reception” (Cohan 225), and thus the audiovisual text (with its context) always remains in flux.

An example for a wider context is one of Dresen’s early films during his first year at the HFF, the documentary *Jenseits von Klein Wanzleben* (*Beyond Klein Wanzleben*, 1989) that he was commissioned by FDJ (Free German Youth). Originally intended as a glorious piece about the FDJ brigades in Zimbabwe, it turned into a *Critical Heimatfilm* about the GDR, for which Dresen would have gotten into trouble, if the Fall of the Wall would not have intervened (Lode 25).

In this discussion we looked at two contrasting films that both deal with *Heimat* in a subliminal way, which means that they are not clearly marked as what we have come to understand as the typical (classical) *Heimatfilm* conception. *Night Shapes* shows us the harsh life of a city with its characters being out on the street for various reasons. The wanderings, particularly by strangers to the city, who are not yet blunted to its sensations, employ the *flâneur* motif. Their depicted physical homelessness corresponds with the metaphysical homelessness of Benjamin’s *flâneur*, to whom the street becomes his housing, his “Interieur”

(Gesammelte Schriften 531), and yet neither *Night Shapes* nor *Summer in Berlin* end on a completely sad note. *Summer in Berlin* is particularly constructed as a narrative around the imminent change of a *Heimat* due to gentrification processes in the new millennium, and there is still hope for finding a new home within these changing surroundings. The indicated constructions herald the advent of something new, which stands in contrast to *Hierankl*, where any form of *Heimat* is irretrievably lost. Dresen's urban *Heimat* concepts cannot be categorized according to a hierarchical principle, as in *Hierankl*. In Steinbichler's film *Heimat* is a destructive principle that does not allow any new evolvments. On the contrary, Dresen does not work against *Heimat*, but rather shows its various shapes within the city and its capability of transformation — two important aspects of the *New Heimatfilm* genre.

3.2 ANGELA SCHANELEC'S *MARSEILLE* — HOME IN BERLIN OR EUROPE

We can consider Angela Schanelec's urban film *Marseille* (2004) a European film (both in relation to the EU and Europe) for the following reasons: 1) It is a Franco-German co-production; 2) It is produced by the European culture channel *Arte*, whose mission is to “bring French and German citizens closer on a cultural level and promote cultural integration throughout Europe” (The *Arte Group*); 3) It depicts seamless traveling within the EU and visually constructs Berlin and *Marseille* as contrasting, but complementary city structures. Thus, it is one of the “forward-thinking broadcast experiments that contribute to the development of the transnational aesthetic” (Halle, *German Film After Germany*

172). Further, *Marseille* extends perspectives on the urban *New Heimat* in other ways than the relation between the rural and urban that the case studies so far discussed in this chapter have shown: the rural and urban as an opposition in the classical *Heimat* text (e.g. The Forester of Silberwlad, 1954), a clash between the sociable visitors and blunted city dwellers in Dresen's *Night Shapes*, and the *Kiez* as an equivalent to the small town neighborhood. Instead of focusing on the rural-urban distinctions, Schanelec takes two different European cities into consideration and their different impacts on the individual. There is tension between the home city and the foreign city. Strolling in the latter enables a *flâneuse* to regain her self autonomy both physically and mentally. Schanelec dissolves traditional *Heimat* concepts of gender against the backdrop of a larger European terrain by employing the mobile figure of *flânerie*.

With the advent of modernity, the *flâneur* became an indispensable figure in the discussion of urban phenomena by aesthetically reflecting on the nature and dynamics of (at that time only) his surroundings. For Walter Benjamin in *The Arcades Project* (1927-1940), the *flâneur* was an uninvolved, highly perceptive bourgeois male, an integral part of modernity itself, but at the same time its harshest critic. The motif of the *flâneur* has been influenced by several technological and socio-political implications that shaped the way we understand this reflective wanderer of the urban space. Its introduction to photography was a logical consequence due to the *flâneur*'s visual orientation and provided additional modes of expression. Furthermore, the rich variety of theoretical considerations shed light on the multiple facets of the motif of the *flâneur* that has proven its topicality until today.

Until the mid 19th century, the female was strikingly absent from the streets and any unaccompanied appearance in public aroused reactions of anxiety and distrust (see Elizabeth

Wilson, "The Invisible *Flâneuse*," 1992). To that effect, the encounter between man and woman on the street has often been described in literature as "the impersonal yet intimate relation between the prostitute and client" (Harvey 746). With the emergence of the consumer culture, female observers the *flâneuses* made their way into department stores. In this new setting that displaces the arcades, Anne Friedberg finds "the origins of the new social character" that provided "a protected site for the empowered gaze of the *flâneuse*" while "desires were created for her" (*Window Shopping* 37). Her revision of the notion of the *flâneur* in its relation to "virtual mobility" adds critical insights into the understanding of postmodern phenomena and the role of gender in consumer society. Anke Gleber focuses on the "panoramic and photographic mode of seeing (...), a quasi filmic-way of seeing" within the "diverse forms of modern life" (41). Patrice Petro provides a look at Weimar film culture that differs from previous male-centered focuses. She suggests there is a difference between women's and men's responses to modernity expressed through gender-specific fears, desires and hopes. Through her "postfeminist approach" (*Joyless Streets* 225) she questions notions of an exclusive male subjectivity within Weimar Cinema.

Considerations of gender are revisited in the Second Modernity as well. *Marseille* has to be understood against the backdrop of an enlarging European Union. However, we have to note that the main character in Schanelec's film, Sophie, marks a break from the paradigm in two ways: As a walker and *flâneuse*. The walker performs "pedestrian speech acts" as a "spatial acting-out of the place (just as the speech act is an acoustic acting-out of language)" (de Certeau 98). De Certeau makes the point that we inhabit predefined built environments, but we traverse them according to logics that are not those of the architects and urban planners. The walker seems to pass through space in this way. Accordingly, we see Sophie

in spaces where pedestrians are not supposed to walk, such as on the middle of the street and in an undefined space close to escalator, where two security guards repeatedly ask her to leave. However, Sophie is also a *flâneuse*. What turns the average walker into a *flâneur* is a “form of looking, observing (of people, social types, social contexts and constellations), a form of reading the city and its population (its spatial images, its architecture, its human configurations)” (Frisby 823). Although we do not get any insight into her thoughts, Schanelec’s *flâneuse* completely relies on the observation of places and people, whose meaning is only made accessible through the contradistinction with the Berlin part of the film. Yet, she does not show all the typical characteristics of a *flâneuse*: She is neither marked in a sexual way, nor is she marked particularly as a consumer herself she is not out window-shopping. She develops her own logic of walking and artistic production through photography. The criticism of her surroundings is expressed through mobility rather than verbally, when she leaves her affiliated *Heimat* Berlin behind. She is a new type of *flâneuse* that moves about an extended European space.

Schanelec’s film consists of three continuous, spatially structured units: Marseille, Berlin and the return to Marseille. In these units the film relates a minimum of narrative and that is driven by visual storytelling and not back-story. Scant information from dialogues only hints at motivations and interior emotional states. The German photographer Sophie seeks a break from her relationship problems in Berlin and exchanges her apartment with Zelda, a French woman, in Marseille. Already the names indicate a larger European connection, given that Sophie is a French name and Zelda is a form of Griselda, a figure in Giovanni Boccaccio’s *Decameron* (1348-1353) and composed of Old French and Old High German. Sophie spends her stay mostly walking around and taking pictures of streets. She meets

up with the mechanic Pierre and then returns to Berlin. Back home, she confronts again the complicated relationship with her friend Hanna and Hanna's husband, which might be a love triangle, and Sophie eventually decides to return to Marseille. The space shifts again to a police station in Marseille and there through Sophie's giving a report do we learn that a stranger mugged her upon her arrival, and he forced her to exchange clothes with him. Having lost all her personal belongings, the film ends with Sophie going to the German embassy and then taking a walk at the beach.

Berlin is home, but Sophie seeks to leave it, at first for a vacation, then she decides to return to Marseille for good. Only in the second unit does it become clear that Marseille lets her break free from her confining life in Berlin. Accordingly, the display of inside versus outside ratio differs from each other in these two places, and also the "homes" in Marseille and Berlin reflect the respective cities. Sophie's visit to the *Fremde*, the unfamiliar city Marseille, is a return to conscious seeing after having been blunted in her familiar home city. Through her camerawork and editing strategy Schanelec strongly intertwines conscious seeing with a borderless Europe as an enlarged realm of experience. The film involves the spectators actively in such seeing and offers them as well as Sophie flexible definitions of home and belonging.

Although famously associated with Paris, Walter Benjamin developed his understanding of the *flâneur* while wandering in Berlin, Marseille, Naples, and Moscow as well. Schanelec's film thus turns to two of the significant places for his urban wanderings. The film, however, is not just a depiction of Benjamin's reflections; rather it is a critical extension. In Marseille Sophie turns not just into a Benjaminian *flâneur* but into a *flâneuse*. This transformation is visualized in the following ways: most scenes in *Marseille* are set outside and show Sophie

moving and observing. Sophie becomes a *flâneuse* away from home, in the other, this still unknown city. The street, normally the antithesis of the private sphere, becomes her housing, her “interior” (Benjamin 531). Her temporary home is spartanly furnished, and rather than a typical domestic space, Sophie turns it into an outside space by hanging a city map and her photographs of streets on the walls. The *Marseille* streets, by contrast, seem to become more and more her home. She does not convey her reflections, in contrast to Benjamin’s *flâneur*, who in one of his *Denkbilder* (sketches, literally thinking in pictures/images) entitled “Marseille,” drafts his impressions of the city regarding noises, walls and “the monotonous quarters of the inhabitants, who understand the sadness of Marseille” (Benjamin, *The Arcades Project* 361—2). Schanelec’s film does not provide such narrative appraisals, even affords us no point of view shots, and the camera does not follow Sophie’s gaze. Rather it keeps focusing on her, which might mark her as a passive *passante*, the mere object of the gaze. However, we see Sophie seeing and watching, although we do not know what exactly caught her eye. Her active and conscious seeing, most vividly represented by her taking photographs, mark her as a viewing subject.

Sophie is marked as a *flâneuse*. Her pragmatic and physical actions set her apart from her male predecessors described in Benjamin’s oeuvre. His *flâneurs* see and communicate intellectually and verbally and cut out all the physical circumstances that go or do not go without saying. Sophie, on the contrary, is a down-to-earth figure. She equips herself for the city and buys comfortable shoes, which indicate her physical presence and her experience of the city as being dependent on walking. She takes her camera and buys films, which shows that her walking is about seeing, putting things into perspective, saving her impressions and revisiting them later. Although she spends most of her time alone, we see her in everyday

situations: eat, sleep, ride the bus, flirt, and dance. Her intellectual seeing is transposed visually. Sophie is a hands-on *flâneuse*, who conveys her thoughts through things we can see and cannot see. The *flâneur's* female counterpart initially was “strikingly absent from accounts of the metropolis” (Harvey 750), but *flânerie* as a gendered concept transforms along with women’s history in public spaces.

The *flâneuse's* travel marks a departure from her home, which contradicts the gender-specific expectations of the *Heimatfilm* genre from earlier decades. In her introduction to her volume *Women in the Metropolis*, Katharina von Ankum points out that the experience women made with the city during the interwar period also came along with the disillusionment of modernity and fantasies of returning “to the countryside to escape the pressures and frustrations of urban reality” (Ankum 5). By contrast, Sophie exchanges one urban space for another and leaves her affiliated circle of friends. She is independent from pre-modern views on women in public, female walkers, who were viewed as “objects for consumption, objects for the gaze of the *flâneur*” (Friedberg 35).

This sense of liberation is increased by her travels that reconfigure the opposition between home and foreign space against the backdrop of the EU’s expansion. Sophie’s journeys between France and Germany are either limited to one shot (Sophie sitting in a train compartment looking out of the window) or even completely omitted. In both cases, a hard cut suggests the differences between Marseille and Berlin for her life. The editing cuts from a social gathering at a French-Arabic nightclub to a traffic light in Berlin, where Sophie is standing. This change of scenery occurs unexpectedly and cuts out the journey completely. While this editing technique conveys that getting around in Europe does not require an emphasis on travel, this hard cut also introduces her everyday life at home as a harsh opposite.

The distanced *flâneuse* turns back into a local, who is absorbed by her social entanglements.

The Berlin episode demonstrates her “real” life in her “*Heimat*” Berlin, which informs the viewer about her complicated precondition for her trip to Marseille. The visual support by means of claustrophobic settings and dramatic dialogues signify her lonesome and unsettled stay in Marseille as a soothing break from her social entanglements. We see her in roles that are more typically associated with women: as a babysitter, a girlfriend, and a lover. However, these roles confine her. Her decision to return to Marseille, maybe also to Pierre, might continue her social entanglements, but she is ready to begin a new life.

However, this new life begins with an involuntary identity exchange that is also related to gender attributes. Back in Marseille, we see her walking down the stairs to the city. After the film’s most striking ellipsis, Sophie changes into a yellow dress and is being questioned in a French police station. We learn that a stranger forced her to exchange clothes with him and give him all her belongings. She wanted to set herself free, but this is achieved through the forced act of the robbery, which literally takes her baggage she brings from Berlin. She is without belongings as much as she is without a belonging in a big city that she might begin to dwell in. Her return to Marseille already marked a different kind of traveling: instead of going into the unknown space, Sophie returned, which is demonstrated as a homecoming.

Schanelec’s film suggests that to be home prevents you from perceiving home consciously. In that regard, it corresponds with Dresen’s characters in *Night Shapes*, who are blunted and rediscover their city through encounters with strangers. One must leave in order to consciously see again. Dresen overcomes this obstacle of no longer seeing your home by pairing up his *Kiez* inhabitants with visitors. *Night Shapes* even suggests that you no longer need to leave the *Heimat* in order to see again, because the stranger comes to the city

and makes those who live there look at their home city through their eyes. The Berlin characters in *Marseille* no longer see their city, because they are too busy with their work and relationships. The dvd itself advertises this understanding of the film by including on the case a brief interview in which Schanelec states “sie schauen nach innen, statt nach außen” (“they look inside themselves rather than outside”).

Comparing *Marseille* with her other films *Mein Langsames Leben* (*Passing Summer*, 2001) and *Nachmittag* (*Afternoon*, 2007), Schanelec’s play with tensions between stillness and movement becomes obvious. In *Passing Summer*, the characters who stay in Berlin remain stuck in their personal problems. The only one who leaves the city for a temporary employment in Italy returns with a fresh perspective and new understandings. *Afternoon* is entirely set within a house at a lake and observes the decay of a family during one afternoon. It was drafted as a foil to the both temporally and spatially more generous *Marseille*, which ends optimistically with the openness of a beach and the chance of a new beginning away from home. Consequently, *Marseille* is Schanelec’s only film that employs the motif of the *flânerie* given the extended space that allows the main character to break out of confining gendered relations.

Nevertheless, one should not understand Schanelec’s films necessarily as Berlin films, in the narrow sense, but rather as the epitome of the city, whose inhabitants try not to be alone and look for the kind of change suggested by the famed final line of the Rilke poem “Archaischer Torso Apollos” (“Archaic Torso of Apollo”): “Du musst dein Leben ändern” (“You have to change your life”) (*Neue Gedichte/ New Poems* 58). This tag line marks both the beginning and end of *Marseille*. In an interview with *Peripher Film*, Schanelec acknowledges the influence of Rilke’s modernist poetry on her work, however another great

impact seems to have made Rilke's *Die Aufzeichnungen des Malte Laurids Brigge* (*The Notebooks of Malte Laurids Brigge*, 1910), his only novel, or rather "prose book," as he referred to it. This is one of the paradigmatic literary examples of exploring the city. The novel begins in Paris at the *Fin de Siècle* during industrialization processes, which bring forth both glamour and misery that Malte observes. In Schanelec's film, we do not know what Sophie is observing, but we can recognize a continuation of the play with the objectification, now within Second Modernity. The "Archaic Torso of Apollo" is a *Dinggedicht* (thing poem), in which a thing becomes objectified and described as if it would talk about itself in order to express its essential being. The torso has "keine Stelle, / die dich nicht sieht" ("no spot / which does not see you"), and Schanelec's character as both the subject of the gaze (observing the city) and simultaneously its object (of the viewer's gaze) enters this dynamic relation that Rilke has already described for the First Modernity. While Malte's narration resembles the observations and critical reflections of a *flâneur* at the turn of the century, Sophie's wanderings through Marseille in the new millennium remain silent and are restricted to the visual, to what we see and what we do not. Thus, Schanelec interweaves these different texts with each other. Her heroine's attempt to change her life is poetically motivated by First Modernity, but put into praxis in the Second.

In order to change her life, Sophie has to leave. She finds her destination by chance; in the newspaper a French woman advertises looking for an apartment swap. This casual encounter, typical of modernist narratives, unleashes Sophie's impulse to leave. In Marseille, she does not slip into someone else's life, as she might have expected. Zelda's apartment is almost empty and appears more like a vacation home. It allows Sophie the chance to inscribe herself there with her own production. Through her journey, Sophie is able to look outside.

She sees the city. She is not (yet) home in Marseille, but her new beginning from scratch because of the robbery leaves the possibility open that she could find a new home.

The film is about leaving the familiar, the urban *Heimat*, and about learning to see again by means of the *Fremde*. According to the fact that her *Heimat* with all its complications of her social life is drawn in rather negative terms, one could think of it as an *anti-Heimatfilm*. However, *Marseille* is not about criticizing a specific place and its inhabitants (like in the *Critical Heimatfilme* of the New German Cinema), it works rather with the experience of confined versus open space, and gender roles as confining principles. While she experiences these limitations in her *Heimat* Berlin, she liberates herself by going away from home.

Schanelec made a film about neither Marseille nor Berlin, which is the major difference from Turanskyj's and Dresen's films. What nevertheless connects them is their different engagements with urban *Heimat* spaces that are impacted by Second Modernity. While Sophie seeks to abandon any form of socially confining obligations, she seeks more complex forms of local attachment, a conscious way of being. Schanelec points out that she chose Marseille, because it is "big, out of hand and mazy, very bright and with an almost irrational power" (Schanelec in an interview printed on the dvd case *Marseille*). Her character can easily get absorbed by it, enter its anonymity, and focus on things we cannot see, but which nevertheless draw her to this place. Sophie eventually "gives thought" to her Berlin housing plight, in Heideggerian terms, and reconnects to place in more complex ways in Marseille, as demonstrated by the *flâneuse*. The *flâneur's* most developed sense is vision, an illustrative seeing. However, we rarely see what Sophie is looking at or what she is taking pictures from. Schanelec's film does not provide any narrative appraisals and does not include point of view shots. The camera does not follow Sophie's gaze, but rather it keeps its focus on

her in medium shots and close-ups. By unwarily focusing on the hardly accessible character, Schanelec pushes the scopical drive of the viewer and leaves a lot to the imagination. That is why the viewer has to piece together Sophie's story into something that could be a story about belonging. Her initial anonymity in Marseille is visualized by her often being cut off from her surroundings. Sophie's close-ups fill the frame and Schanelec does not use a deep focus, which frequently blurs the setting or her. Thus, the *mise-en-scène* stigmatizes her as a loner. Only when meeting Pierre and his friends, Sophie slowly enters the frame and becomes part of the image. It remains open if Sophie will fully belong to Marseille or if she will remain its distanced observer. While the *flâneuse* is quite engaged with her surroundings, she also needs her distance for her critical reflections, as will also see in Turanskyj's film.

We learn more about Sophie through the depiction of her former life in Berlin in the second part. The depiction of a bar night in Marseille ends with a cross-cut, eliding time and space, showing Sophie back in Berlin standing at a traffic light after her return from Marseille. A woman in the attire of the McDonald's restaurant approaches her and returns a cap that she had left before her trip. She is no longer anonymous like she was as a foreigner in Marseille and it seems as if Sophie would have never left Berlin. The same impression is implied when she finds out that Zelda has never been to Sophie's place. When she meets her neighbor in the corridor, he tells her straight to follow him inside, because he has to show something to her. We do not learn what, but several visual cues suggest that Sophie is also isolated back "home." The next-door neighbors are filmed through a doorframe, which sets Sophie apart from her neighbor. She is literally boxed in a small square window. The only shot from inside of his apartment is a close-up of Sophie, who tells him that she has been to Marseille. Through these incidences at the traffic light and in the corridor, Schanelec

signals that Sophie's everyday life takes over again and her trip to Marseille did not leave any visible traces. She notably remains as distant and isolated in the *mise-en-scène* as she was in Marseille.

In the Berlin episode, we find many other things Sophie left behind in Berlin: The obscure role she plays in her relationship to her friend, the depressed actress Hanna, and her partner Ivan that could be a love triangle or all made up by Hanna's dramatization. In Berlin, Sophie is a friend, a nanny of Hanna's son Anton and the fifth wheel in the little family. Not only does she appear as an outsider, but even as not belonging anywhere. The filmic strategy is one that disrupts space, eschewing easy continuity editing and establishing shots. The viewer is left unable to easily develop a cognitive map of Sophie's space. Her apartment rather looks like an artist's studio with almost no personal items, which resembles Zelda's apartment in Marseille. It remains unclear if the kitchen and workspace we see belong to her apartment or workplace. Schanelec suggests that home and work are interchangeable, but in a rather artistic sense, which differs from Turanskyj's *The Drifter* as the next case study, in which work is transformed by neo-liberalism. *Marseille* investigates the question about home and belonging around housing and relationships that are only displayed in fragments. Who belongs to whom and where is unclear.

Sophie is a stranger to the city without being a foreigner. The depiction of Marseille as the *other*, the contrasting space for the main character, or in which one supposes Sophie to be specified as the other, goes beyond nation-specific issues such as culture shock, language or the clash between different nationalities. From Marseille to Berlin it only seems a stone's throw. One of Sophie's trips between Berlin and Marseille is even omitted as a result of the hard cut. Distance, border crossings, language and national mentalities are

not problematized. The German main character is fluent in French and shortly after her arrival she is pursuing her profession as a photographer. There is no drama of getting her bearings with these new surroundings and Sophie is not recognizable as a tourist. However, there are differences concerning her behavior in both cities. If we compare the depiction of Marseille as a place of liberation, with the depiction of Berlin as a confining space, Schanelec suggests that one has to go beyond the familiar, one's *Heimat*, and expand one's own view, visualized by the motif of a European *flâneur*. The film's episodic structure presents her "return home" to Berlin only as an intermission, which makes her second visit of the foreign city the true homecoming. On another level, *Marseille* seems to suggest that Europeanness in a Europe without borders is not defined by foreignness or exchanging identities, but by some other strategy, visually expressed in the motif of the *flâneuse* a strategy of discovering new territories within the tension of detachment and attachment through travel, observation and active engagement with urban space.

The following case study includes another *flâneuse*, who struggles for attachment in the neo-liberal society. Instead of traveling new territories, in which she gradually might turn from a tourist into a dweller, she stays in her *Heimat* Berlin and remains an outsider due to her economic status. Thus, we are shifting our attention now from a multi-city *Heimat* Europe back to Berlin. The gentrification process, in its early processes indicated in Dresen's *Summer in Berlin*, has now become a dominant principle for the *New Heimat* within the new economy.

3.3 POACHING HER OWN TERRITORY — TATJANA TURANSKYJ'S

THE DRIFTER

Greta 40 years old, an unemployed architect, separated parent of an aggressively antagonistic teenage son, alcoholic, critical intellectual, utopian thinker, and cynic is the anti-heroine of Turanskyj's *Eine flexible Frau* (*The Drifter*, literally "a flexible woman," 2010). She is situated within the "strangeness" of her "anemic surroundings" (Gaida) in that everybody merely converses in new economy jargon. Turanskyj's 21st century gentrified Berlin is *unheimlich* (un-homely) or even *unheimlich* (uncanny). The personal and political affect Greta, who is indeed challenged by the 21st century's society and who does give us a quite different heroic performance. Turanskyj identifies neo-liberalism as this Second Modernity by intertwining her heroine's private and professional disturbances and disorientations.

To a certain degree, she is comparable to Sophie in Schanelec's *Marseille*, inasmuch as there is no sharp differentiation between home and street that constitute the *flâneuse's* urban territory. Also, both *flâneuses* have to be considered within their gender-specific contexts. The difference is that Turanskyj's film is driven by socio-economic imbalances, similar to *Night Shapes*. However, reconciliatory moments in *The Drifter* are scarce, and the film closes as relentlessly as it begins with Greta being drunk and alone. At least, she steps outside of the city and remains standing.

Turanskyj shows us an urban *Heimat* that is in decay since the 1990s. Where Dresen's *Summer in Berlin* ends, *The Drifter* begins. Katrin and Nike's old building is already scaffolded, and if they could have an appearance in Turanskyj's film, they might have had to move out, because they do not belong to the new community of Prenzlauer Berg which

is gradually replacing the former working class and counter-cultural residents. Dresen consciously did not show the emerging Prenzlauer Berg, which is why it is suitable as a *Heimat* for characters like unemployed Katrin and geriatric nurse Nike. In contrast, Turanskyj's 2010 Prenzlauer Berg has been gentrified and no longer looks the same. Within this setting, Greta appears like a stranger, a remnant of former times. The clashes between Greta and society also make the city appear strange. Turanskyj's depictions resemble collisions that "draw direct inspiration from the filmic strategies developed at the height of New German Cinema and especially the feminist New German filmmakers" (Randall Halle, "*Großstadtfilm* and Gentrification Debates," 185), and thus play with various forms of alienation. *The Drifter* is a very recent *Critical Heimatfilm* that we only get to experience as such through Greta's eyes as a *flâneuse*. Her conflictive appearances as a non-conformist and critical observer let us experience a rift between differing value systems that turn the urban community into a society of individualists, as Dresen has put it.

Richard Sennett argues that in this new economy, character and corporation become infused with each other. His sociological study *The Corrosion of Character* (1998) scrutinizes the impacts of "flexible capitalism." Turanskyj names him as a major influence to her film. Considering Sennett's narrative and vivid style in his discussion of capitalist economy, his impact on a visual artist is certainly not surprising. Understanding his notions helps us identify the socio-economic factors of this urban anti-Heimat. Not only in Berlin's case, cities have been treated more like a business rather than a local community. In his forthcoming article, Halle establishes a larger frame of reference to discuss Fatih Akın's *Soul Kitchen* (2009) and Turanskyj's film against the larger backdrop of gentrification. Accordingly, the civil resistance movement "Marke Hamburg" protesting these developments closes its man-

ifesto as following: “a city is not a brand. A city is also not a business. A city is a local community” (qtd. in Halle, “*Großstadtfilm* and Gentrification Debates,” 190). *The Drifter* is about the changes within such a local community.

Greta is a *flâneuse* who walks the city, similarly to Schanelec’s character, but in *The Drifter* it is not the other city in the sense of an unknown place that evokes the contemplative and alert perception. Greta becomes the *flâneuse* in her *Heimat* Berlin that no longer is familiar to her and vice versa. Not only the city is the other as was the case with *Marseille* for Sophie, but so is Greta, too. The city around her keeps changing, but as an unemployed architect she can no longer contribute to these changes. She no longer has a say and is thus unable to shape her city. There is a new sense of homelessness that reappears in the 21st century, one that Heidegger has already discussed during First Modernity. The fact that Greta is an architect plays a vital role within this revival, since her take on her profession, what architecture is supposed to achieve, equals Heidegger’s discussion of “housing shortage” and decisively contradicts her contemporary colleague’s notions of desirable projects. In this neo-liberal society, a true sense of dwelling, and thus being, has been lost. Greta has lost her ability to “gestalten” (shape) her surroundings, as Dresen’s title *Nachtgestalten* (*Night Shapes*) refers to urban agency. And while Sophie blends in with her environment, giving way to an extended notion of a European urban *Heimat*, Greta is staged as a disruptive appearance that causes outrage and rejection. Although she keeps opposing the neo-liberal ideas, she fails because she inevitable has to remain within a society that is entirely driven by the new market structures. Turanskyj creates her as a visionary figure, who was a successful architect in the 1990s. Therefore, Greta represents an anachronistic remnant of her profession. However, it is also her outsider status, through which she affords us a view

of this new society, which makes a new economy *flâneuse*. She is a drifter, because she is adrift from Second Modernity principles.

The Drifter shows characteristics of the 1960s' *Critical Heimatfilm*, in which *Heimat* and protagonist are staged as incompatible with each other. In Turanskyj's film the city's landscape is changing due to gentrification processes and turns into an other for everyone who does not play along. As a more idealist architect, Greta turns a critical eye on these developments and leads the viewer through this New Berlin. Consequently, there are multiple levels of alienation in terms of form and content that complicate this depiction of an urban *Heimat*: the depiction of Berlin as an exclusive space, an at times unlikeable *flâneuse* as "victim" and Turanskyj's experimental filming techniques. Greta establishes a visual alterity between herself and her surroundings. First, the film visualizes a subjective experience of the urban of an unemployed architect, whose view of the city is altered in a two-fold way: as an outsider and increasingly through her intoxication. Second, this film offers us an exploration of Berlin on the larger scale of the new economy and its effects on places that its inhabitants call their *Heimat*. In doing so, it depicts a *flâneuse*, who leads us through a Berlin that is marked by these new socio-economic and architectural parameters. By observing various locations, she creates a "Psychogramm" ("psychograph") of Berlin, as Greta calls it. She tries to intermingle and play according to Berlin's new strategies, and yet she inevitably goes against the grain with her inability to conduct herself personally and professionally. The female character in this film has to play along with newer developments in neo-liberalism and urban planning, filling in differing and contradicting roles in her life. Despite moving within the city's strategic outline, she develops her own tactics and theory of walking. Her critical examinations, along with her walkings as "pedestrian speech acts"

(de Certeau 97), undermine the city's strategic outline and surfaces that "the everyday has a certain strangeness" (93). It is not only Greta, who is the other, but also the city with its deviation from local community to the "Planwerk Innenstadt," which is a strategy for the urban development of the city of Berlin aiming at "reurbanisation and revitalization of the historical center of Berlin as well as of the planning area City-West" (Senate Department for Urban Development and the Environment). Greta through her unemployment and her critical insights "disentangle[s] [her]self from the murky intertwining daily behaviors and make[s herself] alien to them" (de Certeau 93).

Part of the city's outline that Turanskyj visualizes and that become readable through Greta's wanderings, are also reactionary gender structures. If there is one major difference between the *flâneuse* of the new economy and her 1970s feminist predecessor(s), it is the fact that she no longer has allies. Greta's encounters with females all make clear there is nothing they have in common. They have made their career, as the following dialogue shows:

Greta: "Maria! How are you?"

Maria: "Very good. I made it from Oberhausen to Schmachtdorf, a house, a horse. What about you? You look awful!"

Consider how in films like Helma Sanders-Brahms' *Shirins Hochzeit* (*Shirin's Wedding*, 1976), female solidarity trumps ethnic and linguistic community. In that film the Turkish immigrant Shirin says, "Ich Frau, du auch Frau" ("I woman, you woman too"). This statement signals an immediate understanding that goes without elaborate wording and creates a sense of belonging. In her article on 1970s feminist filmmaking, Annette Brauerhoch picks up this iconic phrase in her title and argues that there is a female *Heimatlosigkeit* that forms a "transnational and transgeographical community", a "Heimat des Geschlechts" (a

homeland of gender) (159). However, in *The Drifter* there is no more such solidarity among women. Greta's alleged friend Marlene refuses her request for work, and Francesca deprives her of a payoff from a past job. The loss of her friends, particularly her female friends, becomes strikingly clear. To that effect, Turanskyj's acute socio-political analysis of work and life for a woman in contemporary Berlin borrows motifs from 1970s German feminist filmmaking in general and from Helke Sander's *Die allseitig reduzierte Persönlichkeit* (*The All-Around Reduced Personality*, 1978) and Ulrike Ottinger's *Bildnis einer Trinkerin* (*Ticket of No Return*, 1979), in particular.

Sander's film, often abbreviated as *Redupers*, is set in the divided Berlin of the 1970s. Edda works as a freelance photographer with financial constraints. As a woman and single mother, she struggles hard to support herself and her daughter. Edda is part of a group of female photographers who have been assigned to take pictures of the Berlin Wall. The women visualize the divided city critically, distressing the men who intended to advertise West Berlin to business investors. The feminist group merely serves as a profitable flagship, and their critical contribution is not appreciated. Despite differing views among the group members, the women, identified as *others* within the male dominated Federal Republic, support each other. This status in the new economy presented in Turanskyj's film is lost, and women are no longer united in a special status.

Ottinger's *Ticket of No Return*, the first part of her Berlin trilogy, also shows a union between two female outsiders. The English title translates from the French title *Aller Jamais Retour*. The German title translates into "Portrait of a Female Drinker." However, these women are established as foils and together they drink in order to deal with their surroundings. A rich and beautiful woman (throughout the film referred to as "She") arrives at the

Berlin-Tegel airport, in order to purposely conclude her life with excessive drinking. The voice-over makes that perfectly clear during her arrival at Berlin-Tegel airport: “Her passion was to drink live to drink a drunken life life of a drunkard. (...) She decided to do a sort of boozier’s sightseeing. Briefly, sightseeing for her personal needs.” Tatjana Turanskyj adapted the motif of drinking for contemporary Berlin *flâneuse*. One among many differences between *Ticket of No Return* and *The Drifter* is that the former’s narrative follows a more linear pattern, while the latter is a *collage film* that creates a series of miniatures of a Berlin view, as Ottinger explains:

I believe that real events are better understood when they have been taken out of their whole context and placed together in a somewhat displaced manner. I think that one can contemplate such images, which certainly also exist in reality as fragments, simply more rigorously than if I filmed a story from A to Z and represented it in a way that is also available to us in real life. (Rickels 43)

Norbert Jochum reads *Ticket of No Return* as an attempt at establishing an image of the city in a very literal sense, not only *Stadtbild* (cityscape), but *Bild einer Stadt* (portrait/image of a city): “In this film Berlin is a city of isolation: not, in a mundane way, the isolation from outside; not, in a less mundane way, the inner isolation; but Berlin is isolation as a city, loneliness turned into a city. (...) The film does not tell a story, but creates a collage of the portrait of a drinker (...)” (Jochum qtd. in Ottinger).

In contrast to Turanskyj’s film, the construction of geographical relations or any realistic site-specificity and itinerary in Ottinger’s work are impossible to locate. Ottinger’s heroine comes from a Renaissance villa close to Vicenza, Italy that might as well be referenced as a merely fictitious place. She books her flight “aller jamais retour,” but speaking Spanish (the only time she actually speaks, but her voice comes from off-screen). She lands with an

American airline in Berlin. *Ticket of No Return* gives an account of its reality by codifying its constitutive components visually and verbally. Berlin could be understood as an arbitrary setting, although it is still identified as the perfect place for her “sightseeing tour.” Being completely foreign to her, it serves as her ideal place where nobody can interrupt her plans of self-destruction. Again, like in *Marseille*, it is the other city that motivates the wanderings, because one is blunted towards the familiar or can pursue walking (or drinking) habits in an undisturbed fashion. For other arrivals at the airport, the three ladies with their gray houndstooth capes and hats, it is called out as a venue for a scientific congress. Being named “Common Sense,” “The Social Problem,” and “Exact Statistics,” they provide a top-down macro-perspective on the city. Hence, Ottinger sets up a totalizing, institutional view of social phenomena against an individual and aestheticized consideration.

The *flâneur* shares one decisive characteristic with the street-level walker in de Certeau’s theory of practiced space, which is subversion. What distinguishes them is how they express their criticism and their ability to see. While de Certeau’s walker is all about performing the undermining of authoritative structures, which might or might not happen consciously, the *flâneur* and *flâneuse* operate on the conscious level and thus will certainly recognize and contemplate these structures. Further, the street-level walker does not see the whole picture, while the *flâneur* does due to his conscious engagement with his surroundings. However, he or she might nevertheless choose to go with the flow and follow the outlined urban design, albeit with a critical eye. One striking aspect within Ottinger’s film is how she interweaves the criticism of society’s totalizing perspective, which is also opposed by de Certeau’s street-level walker, with her *flâneuse*. Ottinger creates an antagonism between her mute *flâneuse* and the ladies “Common Sense,” “Social Problem” and “Exact Statistics,” who represent

society and its top-down view. One object of public discourse carried out by them is the increasing alcoholism among women. They repeatedly make generalized statements and judgments. According to Elsaesser, “they take her alcoholism literally, and are the ironic stand-in for those presumed and intended audiences who expect films to show them how to change their lives” (Elsaesser 225). Certainly, Ottinger does not attempt to create an awareness of alcoholism among females and their public behavior, but I would argue that she exemplifies a social system in which females are at the center of public interest, and yet marginalized by being reduced to decontextualized facts. In these depictions, females have no voice, and neither does the *flâneuse* in Ottinger’s film in a literal sense. Alcoholism stands in for various matters through which women gained more attention during the second wave of feminism.

Unlike *Ticket of No Return*, *The Drifter* is partially similarly theatrical, but more legible with its socio-political and economic contexts provided by the narrative. It is not a didactic film but it is pedagogical. Turanskyj presents her heroine (or rather anti-heroine) in Berlin in its current socio-political context. In Greta’s depiction as incompatible and even anachronistic, Turanskyj speaks to those who have to face anxieties about the job market and see themselves as isolated and disoriented as Greta, who has a variety of disheartening encounters: She visits her old “friends” and former colleagues who do not believe in her skills and therefore put her off with their dandy-like affectation, well-intended advice and humiliating job offers. Her son Lukas is ashamed of her. Her job interview coach eventually gives up feeding her phrases of survival. Her anonymous drinking buddy from the street turns out to be her job center agent, who tells Greta the truth about the hopeless job market situation and cries on her shoulder.

The Drifter may borrow from its feminist predecessors, but there is no longer a community that fights against a patriarchal regime, as it was the case in Sander's *Redupers*. Hence, in a sequence that appears like a quasi documentary insertion of a guided tour through a museum, the guide talks about a wall painting of demonstrating female workers of the first wave of feminism, and his provocative claims remain unchallenged in Turanskyj's film:

Work is worthless if women do it. Work is worthless, because women do it. Poorly paid service jobs are plentiful while productive, highly paid jobs are becoming scarcer. The male so-called elite distributes those jobs among each other. Clearly, not much has changed. Female workers are now female service employees.

The same voice then whispers that women, who believe they have equal rights, are clearly blind to reality. Greta's resistance is in vain, since she has a low hierarchical order, which the editing and camera perspective suggest. The guide and visitors look down on Greta, like an exhibit of the past or a dead body. This top-down view also resembles what de Certeau links with the city's strategic outline provided and controlled by urban authorities. In Ottinger's case, the ladies "Common Sense," "The Social Problem," and "Exact Statistics" similarly look down on the city's data and make generalized statements. Being examined in a museum, Greta is visually associated with an outdated remnant of early feminism, since she does not accept that she is disadvantaged by her gender in society. The guide concludes, "The entire feminist revolution of the 20th century did not change that." She is wearing sunglasses in this shot, in which the visitors and the tour guide of the museum are reflected. Thus, she is visually turned into an object, an inferior, whose views are literally overshadowed by society as represented by the museum group. While Greta as a *flâneuse* turns her critical focus on the city, the city's look back subordinates her.

This moment recalls Lucy Fischer's article "City of Women" that analyses the relation

between Busby Berkeley's films, the city, women, and architecture. Her analysis of the opening scene in the musical *Gold Diggers* (1935) points out to a visualization of woman and the city that we can find in the museum of *The Drifter* as well: The New York City skyline is superimposed over Wini Shaw's face at the end of her song performance "Lullaby of Broadway." According to Fischer, "the urban environment (...) recedes into the female visage (...). [T]he city is a woman" (Fischer 123). In Turanskyj's film, the city is represented through the agents within the new economy, who literally look down to her. Hence, society is superimposed over her face. An even closer resemblance of Fischer's observation is a close-up of Greta's face during her wanderings through a gentrified neighborhood. Her sunglasses reflect the newly-built townhouses, while she points her chin upwards. In this scene, the buildings seem to be looking down to her, which can be understood as her inferior role in this economy that is expressed through its architecture.

In contrast to Greta, her female friends seem to have made peace with that: the ones who are part of a "supplemental wage society" and who form a "team" with their successful husbands while they raise the kids. This is not too far from the classical *Heimatfilm* narrative or from considerations about the interwar period, in which women were geared towards traditional gender roles:

[P]rominent intellectuals of all political hues expressed their hopes that women, after having conquered traditionally male domains, would not become imitators of male ways but rather develop viable alternative lifestyles. Rather than indulge in promiscuity and careerism, women were asked to maintain their internal balance and use their maternal instinct in the interest of the future humankind. (von Ankum 5)

Although the film shows these roles as structural and not ideational, these mechanisms are similar and present conservatism in Second Modernity disguise.

Greta does not fit into a team that would make her betray her professional convictions. She stays committed to her self-understanding as a visionary architect, who does not want to give in to the “Planwerk Innenstadt.” However, in *The Drifter*, not only woman faces problems in the new economy. The museum tour guide appears in another scene and states Turanskyj’s attitude towards feminism: “Feminism, as it is preached today, is in reality nothing but a conservative emancipation. The conservative emancipation is appreciated by all religions, for it supports the existing system, a system, in which men and women are losers to an equal degree.” This scene is presented as a *YouTube* clip and thus presents his statements as being strongly intertwined with social media platforms, retrievable for everyone, and thus a fast-spreading and catchy message.

The Drifter suggests that the line between men and women in terms of power structure is no longer clear, but still existent. On the one hand, her female “friends” are successful, and on the other, they have to choose between career and family and form a “team,” which Greta disparagingly calls a world of “secondary wage earners.” A woman may be her superior in the call center, but the agents who earn seven Euros per hour are exclusively women, too. Nevertheless, Greta tries to function in the city’s new market and lifestyle, and even seeks help for acting appropriately, but always fails. At the same time, she verbally and actively opposes the voice that seeks to prove her ambitions futile. Yet, *The Drifter* is positioned within a multi-medial context in which the authenticity of any voice is contested, and often is depraved or debunked as a copy or echo. Greta and her (rather unsuccessful) repetitions of job market formulas that contradict her authentic critical insights (but that do not serve her well in this new economy), exemplify this multi-layering of mediated voice.

In an interview with the German film Production Company and distributor *Filmga-*

lerie451, Turanskyj names Richard Sennett's sociological study *Corrosion of Character* (1998) as the major influence for her film. This bestseller hit a nerve in Germany at a time of the what Beck calls the "globalization shock" and the reemergence of the *Heimat* discourse, and thus it presented a narrative that many Germans could easily relate to. In its German translation, the film's reference to Sennett's work becomes clear, which is *Der flexible Mensch* (the flexible man, but in the sense of "human being" which does not express sex or gender in German). The first chapter "Drift" is echoed in the English translation of Turanskyj's film. Sennett's sociological studies of the urban environment describe the severe changes with the advent of postmodern capitalism. In his study Sennett depicts "flexible capitalism" and how it influences character. He claims that flexibilization of professional life causes moral values to decline, such as work ethic, loyalty and responsibility, caused by the increasing work speed, corporations' growing demands, relocations, growing competition and job insecurity. These are some of the factors Sennett lists that contribute to an overall atmosphere of anxiety, helplessness and instability in large parts of society. Turanskyj considers these ongoing socio-economic developments a "basic fact" and provides a female point of view, raising the question how far the propagated image of the "modern, emancipated woman" is nothing but a commitment to the current situation, a "conservative emancipation" (*Zeit Online*). Thinking about *The Drifter* as a *Critical Heimatfilm* that denounces local confinements and misery, Turanskyj narrates a case study as *Critical Heimatfilm* according to Sennett's list of socio-economic parameters.

The film opens in a disorienting fashion through a disruption of continuity editing. We get introduced to drunken Greta from the end of the film before we know what happened to her. In a far shot towards the horizon, she stands on a harvested field motionless and gazes

off-screen, with the sound of traffic audible from afar. When the camera cuts in to a close-up, her uncoordinated moves and lurching towards the camera make it obvious that she is drunk. A hard cut leads to close-ups of her in a nightclub with flickering lights, where she sways with the electronic music until she gets kicked out. After she wakes up at her kitchen table and receives a happy birthday voice message, she is still intoxicated and desperately tries to get hold of the caller. In what follows, Greta takes us through the city to the time before she got drunk, and we learn about incidents preceding the opening of the film. In contrast to *Ticket of No Return*, we get to know the heroine well. She worked as a freelance architect for a company that went bankrupt and got dismissed. Since then, she keeps walking in the city, more or less with destinations in mind.

The meetings with her personal job coach are supposed to give Greta a chance of familiarizing herself with the demands of the job market and equip her with a convincing performance. Part of this training is that she is recorded for self-evaluation while talking about herself. Ultimately, this moment turns into a platform for her emotional suffering and displays a nervous breakdown. The film shows Greta watching it together with her coach. The recording shows her weeping and sobbing. The coach speeds up the recording offering an “essence” of Greta’s affect. This forces Greta (and the viewer) to come to the conclusion about herself, “That’s disgusting!” Not only do we get implacable frontal close-ups of this vulnerable moment (a technique that Schanelec would refrain from as being too “brutal”), but also Greta turns into a viewer of herself by being turned into a kind of super-object that is no longer entitled to any form of subjectivity. In abjecting her recorded image, she turns into what de Certeau calls society’s “waste product” (de Certeau 94), and all efforts of rehabilitation by constituents of the same economy that abandoned her, turn out to be a

mere expenditure.

Yet, Greta is a visionary architect with great potentials outside of this economy. In a mock interview with her coach, she explains her architectural philosophy and we see her from a more beneficial side perspective, but above her Greta's sobbing frontal close-up is still projected while she gives a lively and enthusiastic speech:

I'm interested in the fleeting, in the relationship to non-places, to vacant lots. How can I utilize those places without functionalizing them, in an amusement park, for example? It's about grasping cities' periphery as urban space, as chance, and not always as a void which I drive through to get to the supermarket. It's about finding images for the uniqueness of these places.

This performance conveys a completely different impression about her, since we usually see her failing in her communication attempts that are defensive, dull and sometimes cynical. Moreover, for a short moment she makes the city her object instead of being its object. However symptomatically, her interview trainer slurs over her visions and returns to job interview jargon: "Very interesting. But why should we hire you, of all people?" She cannot manage the desired set phrase and only stutters, "I could imagine that I'm a real challenge asset to your team." Suddenly, Greta is objectified again. She is off-screen, and her frontal projection is still on. While talking about her capacity for teamwork, she remains isolated in the frame, so Turanskyj visualizes her outsider status in terms of this most-wanted job market skill. After all, one has to be flexible. Her job coach steps in front of the canvas and blocks Greta's projection partially while she criticizes her performance. Repeatedly, people and objects of her surroundings (architecture, the group in the museum, and her coach) "recede[] into the female visage" to borrow Fischer's expression from a different filmic context from the 1930s again. Also Turanskyj's *flâneuse* does not only reflect on the city, but also the city imposes

its images on her.

Happy is she who still has a home, freely adapted from Nietzsche's poem. Yet, Greta's twelve-year old son Lukas is the only person near her who openly shows his disgust without hiding behind pretentious phrases. Being quite frank with his mother and calling her a "loser" with a "trashy job" as a call agent, he has nothing to do yet with the adult world of composure and euphemistic jargon, but nevertheless has absorbed its new standards. Despite being able to see through the mechanisms of professional slickness, Greta is neither able to adjust to it nor withdraw from it. When Lukas cancels his visit for her birthday and tells her how much he despises her, she starts her drinking excess. Styled salaciously, she finds her friend Max during a business meeting with a British partner in a café and she harasses them with her story of her unemployment while she exposes her body intrusively. In this scene the *flâneuse* appears as the "public woman . . . unattended—unowned," possibly a "prostitute" (Wilson 93) as it was considered in the 19th century.

However, this *flâneuse* does not give up on her *Heimat* and looks for every possible confrontation. In the *Critical Heimatfilm* of the 1960s and 1970s she would have been hunted down for not fitting in. Turanskyj, however, stages her behavior as unheard of, but it does not remain unseen. Considering films like *Ticket of No Return* and *The Drifter*, it is possible to understand de Certeau's essay "Walking in the City" as an interactive manual for *flâneurs*. According to de Certeau, cities consist of strategic designs that are institutionalized power constructions. The pedestrian makes use of the urban space by "tactics" that undermine the strategically defined roster. In order to create an individual use of space "within the planned metaphorical or mobile city," the walkers have the ability to subvert the given structures by taking shortcuts or "meandering aimlessly in spite of the utilitarian layout of the grid of

streets” (de Certeau 110). The walking individual encounters gaps in the coherence of the city and creates his or her personal narrative that connects with the public space, its history and socio-political context. Greta is a user of the city in de Certeau’s terms, who takes “advantage of opportunities” and causes “lapses in visibility” that “reproduce the opacities of history everywhere” (94). While her fellow citizens no longer really see the city (similarly to Dresen’s and Schanelec’s Berlin characters), Greta is an *other* in her home city by means of her outsider status and her alienating encounters and observations. Walking in the concept city, on the territory that is the result of complex power structures, leaves room for tactics, revives place, and the *flâneur* conveys this tension to us.

The growing material world increases the value of place, especially considering globalization (Sennett 14). Against the backdrop of a global market and growing competition, the experience and fear of failure give rise to the need of belonging to a particular place. Since work can no longer be a guaranteed space of belonging due to relocations and outsourcing, the individual has to commit to geographic places (15). “A city might ideally provide what the modern corporation denies: a site for forming loyalties and responsibilities, a site for shaping life purposes, a site that offers relief from the burdens of subjective life” (23). However, Sennett calls this an “ideal city” and refers to its reality: “modern place-making involves a search for the comforts of sameness in terms of shared identity, uniform building context and reduction of density.” He refers to these urban planners as “artists of claustrophobia, whose communities, however, promise stability, mutual trust and durability” (23).

Accordingly, we see shots of architectural sameness and presumed shelter in Turanskyj’s film. Greta poaches secluded and uniform neighborhoods and refers to the picturesque

townhouses as “urban ghettoization or modern residential culture.” She describes the “psychograph of space” that comprises a “security psychosis, cleanliness and uniformity” as “symptomatic for the new German mainstream.” This Second Modernity way of dwelling is the result of a standardizing trend on the real estate market. Architects are paid well, but they commit to a uniform style as dictated by economic needs that interferes with the concept of dwelling, and thus being, according to Heidegger. The renunciation of constant rethinking, the succumbing of architecture to gentrification mechanisms results into a way of living emptied of meaning and attachments.

Greta observes her colleagues, who no longer care about her, which turns them into an uncommented *tableau vivant* of their profession in the new economy. They illustrate what Ronneberger, Lanz and Jahn’s analysis of the contemporary city’s restructuring exemplifies as the appropriate inhabitants of the houses they are commissioned to build. Part of the “Planwerk Innenstadt” is the focus away from renting to owning: “the upgrading of central areas of the city through a section of the population that is estate-capable” as a “recapture of declining city centers through the so-called normal population” (Ronneberger, Lanz, and Jahn 79). Further, Ronneberger notices a drastic change concerning who is considered an ideal urban citizen: “The image of the consuming yuppie that for the majority of local affairs in the 1980s functioned as a synonym for egotism and separation mutates in these changes to a figure of the responsible citizen and celebrated savior of urban culture” (79). Thus, the “so-called normal population” is no longer desired. The new established and liquid citizens mark the center of this changing concept of urban *Heimat*.

Sennett suggests that people who do not do well in this emerging political economy can emerge from failure with the help of “ego strength.” He takes this term from the

psychoanalyst Heinz Hartmann that characterizes the “capacity for standing apart from the tests to which one is subject” (Sennett, “Growth and Failure” 24). If only the density of the city would enable “an open structure”, distance for those who seek “an alternative forum for experience would be easy to find” (25). How this can be achieved, Sennett does not reveal. Greta certainly does not find a way out of the economic vicious circle and remains a stranger in her alleged home city. Her unemployment impacts her entire life and constantly haunts her through a newfound identity crisis. In a cynic statement, she refers to herself as “an expert in crisis.” It remains unclear whether she will ever be able to put her remarkable “ego strength” to good use. After all, the film’s conclusion shows Greta still standing, although not stably in her intoxicated condition.

However, we cannot automatically assume Greta to be in the position of the victim. This resembles the overall problem of the Second Modernity that holds everybody liable and expects flexibility at anytime. Visually, we are kept at a distance to her most of the time and only get close in moments of failure and breakdown that cause instantiation. On the one hand, Greta is an anti-heroine in terms of her negative development, but on the other hand, there is no positive counter-balance. *The Drifter* could be understood as an *Anti-Heimatfilm* in every respect: an un-homely city as the main character’s antagonist. As a *flâneuse*, Greta discovers the principles of the city that make it inhabitable to her and many others. Greta physically and mentally reveals this changing *Heimat* and what it means especially for woman participating within a “conservative emancipation” literally and visually step by step.

3.4 CONCLUSION

All these films rely on various depictions of mobility. In Dresen's *Night Shapes*, the characters are all homeless in different ways despite coming from various social classes; they all struggle to find a place of belonging in the city. This *New Heimatfilm* visualizes the city in its opposition to the rural in productive ways. Typical urban characters (punks, a prostitute, the businessman, homeless people) face characters that seem out of place: a farmer from the rural, who fits better into a classical *Heimatfilm*, and an unaccompanied migrant boy from Africa. For both characters the city still demonstrates a spectacle, a contrast to their *Heimat*. The locals with their blunted perception of their urban *Heimat* (the businessman Peschke and the prostitute Patty in particular) are temporally sensitized again through their encounters with these nave figures. It is particularly the perspective of the migrant child *flâneur* Feliz, who communicates the urban experience through his mute observations. The fact that he is from Africa, establishes another dimension towards the display of the urban space, which is beyond the scope of this dissertation. Peschke, who inflicts his prejudice onto the silent boy, performs the popular imagination of the Northern hemisphere of the geographical space of Africa. Dresen reveals the perceived opposition of progressive vs. backward and reverses the roles between objectified Africa and objectifying European: Now Feliz is the observer and thus turns Berlin, Peschke, and everything it stands for (Germany or Europe, if you will) into a spectacle. Thereby Dresen turns the familiar into the unfamiliar as seen through foreign eyes.

In *Summer of Berlin* the locals observe how their neighborhood is slowly disappearing in the wake of reunification and beginning gentrification processes. Dresen examines these

effects across different age groups and takes a closer look at their differing domestic spaces. The depicted *Kiez* is a space of familiarity, in which people know each other. Given that it took Dresen some time to find a place like that in 2004, indicates that his urban *New Heimatfilm* operates on the nostalgic level and is critical of the imminent changes.

Like in *Summer in Berlin*, Angela Schanelec does not depict the home city as an anonymous place. However, in *Marseille* this is viewed negatively, because the main character seeks to break out of her social network and seeks new visual stimuli for her wanderings. To that effect, Berlin is brought into a relation with another European city, where she tries to regain a sense of anonymity again. The developments on the European scale are viewed positively, because they facilitate her relocation to *Marseille*, where she practices the *Fremde* (the unknown space) in a liberating sense. During her *flânerie* she turns the outside space into her interior, which enables her to experience a conscious way of being through seeing.

The motif of the *flâneuse* appears in *The Drifter* as well. Turanskyj's (anti-)heroine drifts through the city, however even while being intoxicated, she views it critically, and thus acts more like a *flâneuse* than a thoughtless drifter. Nevertheless, this *flâneuse* is adrift from society and employs an outside view on neo-liberal pitfalls that bring the "blasé attitude" to a new level. In contrast to Schanelec's *flâneuse*, there is no sense of familiarity any longer. Instead, Greta has become an outsider within her own city through her lacking career and provocative actions. We can also view the depicted Berlin in Turanskyj's 2009 film as a continuation of Dresen's 2004 film *Summer in Berlin* that hints at the imminent changes concerning Second Modernity dwelling.

Dresen, Schanelec and Turanskyj's strategies of representation differ, yet they all represent the *New Heimatfilm* in different shapes. The urban *New Heimat* is marked by change

due to historical and socio-political circumstances since reunification that impact notions of dwelling and belonging: The harsh reality in Dresen's episodic film *Night Shapes*, the depiction of the imminent change from a Social Welfare State to a society of individuals in *Summer in Berlin*, dwelling as a mobile European experience in *Marseille*, and the hostile home city in the new economy.

Through their observations we get an idea of the matters that complicate the relation between the city and the individual, of calling something a home within a global framework. These are thematic principles employed to negotiate the binary of rural versus urban: 1) An equal focus on the community and attachment, either through its existence or absence; 2) Similar to the rural *New Heimatfilm*, disturbances within the urban *Heimat* are viewed against the backdrop of larger socio-political events; 3) Upon facing a hostile and even inhospitable rural or urban space, films differ in their depiction of acceptance, resistance or withdrawal from *Heimat*. However, the *New Heimatfilm*, in its demarcation from the *Critical Heimatfilm*, does not condemn *Heimat* completely; 4) Since *Heimat* is about community and a sense of belonging in some form, both the rural and urban *Heimatfilm* are depicted as being equally affected considering their emphasis on individual approaches rather than communal approaches, which can entail that the characters leave their *Heimat* for better chances without being punished; 5) Once central to the romantic conservative family agenda of rural *Heimat* conceptions, women in rural and urban *New Heimatfilme* oppose their classical and stereotypical depiction.

This corresponds with the usage of the *flâneuse* motif that grants female characters agency within the *New Heimatfilm*. The case studies engage with the *flâneuse* motif in different ways, and yet we can recognize common characteristics that are specific to a Second

Modernity context regarding a larger European backdrop and the economy: In contradistinction from the classical “window shopper,” as employed by Anne Friedberg, the contemporary European woman is not a consuming *flâneuse*. On the contrary, she appears as alienated and abstains from mainstream culture. Women still struggle to find their place in society, as depicted in Dresen’s films, in which particularly the females (Hanna and the punk girl in *Night Shapes*, and Katrin in *Summer in Berlin*) view the city from the *Rattenperspektive* (rat perspective). And while Sophie in *Marseille* breaks out of her confining surroundings, Greta in *The Drifter* exemplifies the “conservative emancipation,” in which women only seemingly left dominating structures behind and no longer stand united. Thus, the new *flâneuse* is an outsider of the society, which her First Modernity precursor has indulged in.

4.0 FROM THE HEATHLAND TO THE HIGHWAY — *HEIMAT*, THE ROAD, AND TRAVEL FILM

The development towards the *New Heimatfilm* in combination with traveling in the road film is the focus of this chapter. It creates a full circle in the analysis discussing the link between the urban and the rural space as a matter of deterritorialized movement. Although this concept was fostered by Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari (*Anti-Oedipus*, 1972) considering their criticism of capitalist society, the term deterritorialization became used in other contexts as well. I follow the anthropological understanding that refers to the decreasing ties between place and culture, which means that particular cultural facets transgress defined territorial boundaries. To that effect, *Heimat* is no longer limited to German territory either. Accordingly, now the focus shifts from *das Fremde in der Heimat finden* (finding strangeness/the unfamiliar at home) to *Heimat in der Fremde finden* (finding home away from home).

While the importance of the *Heimatfilm* has been ebbing away from the 1980s onwards, road films, especially as comedies, prevailed among German film productions. The fall of the Berlin Wall gave way to the advancement of the European Community to the European Union. Thus, the focus was no longer primarily on economic interests, but also took political and cultural dimensions on an enlarged geo-political space into consideration. Among the

questions to arise after German reunification, outlasting the enthusiasm, were where and how to imagine *Heimat* for all the residents of Germany in a newly expanded territory. Elizabeth Mittmann suggests that 1990s comedies like Peter Timm's *Go Trabi Go* (1991) or Detlev Buck's *Wir können auch anders* (*No More Mr. Nice Guy*, 1993) do not lead to any resolution of their German-German conflicts, "at least as long as they remain on German soil" (Mittmann 344). These 1990s' films, despite being produced within a united Germany, rather emphasize the differences between East and West Germans. These narratives are often part of hybrid films, e.g. other than invoking *Heimat* topoi like the loss of home and community life, they play with elements of the Western to depict the Wild East as an expression of both disorientation and adventure (as in Buck's *No More Mr. Nice Guy*).

The preceding chapter explored what happens when the city, once antithesis to *Heimat*, became a central aspect of imagining a space of dwelling. We saw that the urban was not necessarily a space of contrast to the place of home in the rural idyll, rather the urban becomes the place of home albeit one that can be threatened by Second Modernity's transformations to the urban space. With Schanelec though we also saw an interchangeability of the urban space and a hint at a notion of mobility in *Heimat*. Sophie takes to the road to find her place in an expanded urban spatial terrain: Berlin and/or *Marseille*.

Although *Heimat* has been mainly considered a static concept, Johannes von Moltke convincingly argues that already the 1950s *Heimatfilm* resembles a dialectical framework, in which home and travel intersect. On the one hand, there was an attempt to renew domesticity, particularly due to the shortage of living space in the wake of WWII destructions and expellee waves. On the other hand, the modernization processes during the *economic miracle* launched a new mobility that comprised the Volkswagen success and traveling by

car (von Moltke 1178): “Associated at first with the enclosed security of place and with the valorization of domesticity in the early years of the Federal Republic, *Heimat* also becomes a terrain on which to map patterns of mobility and displacement that define the decade” (118). Von Moltke draws on Paul May’s *Die Landärztin vom Tegernsee* (*Lady Country Doctor*, 1958) to point to its modern elements. It is particularly the urban main character (although the urban space is not visually present) and her VW convertible, through which “the distinction between *Heimat* and *Fremde* is literally set in motion” (128). However, the film closes with the main character stating, “this is where I belong,” which is in tune with the classical *Heimatfilm* narrative and its commitment to only one place. Despite the depicted mobility in this example, travel is nevertheless a form of displacement that has to end in order to find belonging in one (rural idyllic) space. What happens however when this too is inverted, when travel becomes the prerequisite of home or if travel itself turns into home?

This chapter explores the perceived oppositional motifs home and travel in German road films that negotiate the theme of belonging in the light of contemporary global contexts, and how its dissolution spurs the development of the *New Heimatfilm* genre. Similarly to the trajectory of the classical *Heimatfilm* towards the current rural *New Heimatfilm* (as discussed in chapter 2), there are striking parallels between motifs of the classical *Heimatfilm* and the road film. In other words, while the rural contributions to the genre of the *New Heimatfilm* in chapter 2 are marked by a development from settlement to departure, the examples of the *New Heimatfilm* as road film discussed in this chapter feature struggles for an attainment of home through departure and movement. I now work from the other end and suggest that movement as such turns into a tool for discovering *Heimat* or accompanies expressions of a

mobile *Heimat*. Thus, mobility becomes a driving force for the exploration of an increasing European interconnectedness.

After a brief overview of the road film genre, this chapter focuses on the discussion of four road films, two from the period of the inner German divide and two post-Wall examples of the *New Heimatfilm*: The first one is Roland Oehme's DEFA film *Wie füttert man einen Esel?* (*How Do You Feed a Donkey?*, 1974), followed by Andrea Maria Dusl's *Blue Moon* (2002) as a somewhat immediate response to the fall of the Berlin Wall. The narrative is set around the notion of unrestricted traveling and as an exploration of the East as an adventure. I will continue with a discussion of Fatih Akin's *Auf der anderen Seite* (*The Edge of Heaven*, 2008) that I will eventually compare with Wim Wenders' *Im Lauf der Zeit* (*Kings of the Road*, 1976). Obviously, this structure across time and place differs from my previous contemporary focus. Here, I discuss how specific engagements with home and travel have been employed over the course of time in German film history, which allows me to combine two sets of case studies according to their socio-historical and aesthetic common grounds. Among those are two films from the 1970s. The inclusion of films from the past demonstrates the historical trajectory of *Heimat* and the road film genre during the German-German divide as a predecessor of the *New Heimatfilm* within a transnational context.

The shifts in discussions of *Heimat* in a Turkish German context that I will attend to with a side step to Christian Zübert's film *Dreiviertelmond* (*Three Quarter Moon*, 2011), and more specifically with the analysis of Akin's film, present one of the latest turns within both German film and the *Heimat* discourse. Already in the 1990s, in the wake of reunification, there were films that focused on *Heimat* within the new Berlin Republic from a migrant perspective. Yet, it was not before Akin's *Gegen die Wand* (*Head-On*, 2004) that the interest in

Turkish German film spread to a broader audience. Thus, we can view German unification as only the beginning of an ongoing process that accelerated in the new millennium. *Heimat* is no longer a matter for non-hyphenated Germans. In her article on marketing strategies for Akin's films, Karolin Machtans points out to a shifting focus concerning debates on German identity. This was a part of the "normalization" process that was particularly spurred through Chancellor Gerhard Schröder's redefinition of "Germany's identity in the global arena." However, the new attention to Germany's others is a double-edged sword: On the one hand, "migrants symbolize Germany's postunification openness and tolerance," and on the other, "the threat of global terrorism after 11 September 2001 has added authority to the debates about the dangers of Islamic radicalism and questions of European and German identity" (Machtans 151). After Germany's history as a homogeneous culture (primarily during the Third Reich and in the immediate post-World War II period, but in populist thinking for a longer time), a new trend to go global and diverse emerged. However, certain tendencies came along with the change of government in 2005. As Machtans notes, under Chancellor Angela Merkel another shift considering the debates about normalization occurred: The emphasis of the Christian Democrats on a "German *Leitkultur*" ("leading culture" as a monocultural view) and the belief that "Germany is not a country of immigration, but of integration with assimilation and adaptability (*Anpassungsbereitschaft*) being key goals" (151). Being Germany's largest immigrant community, it was particularly the role of German Turks that has received a lot of attention, especially during the past decade. In 2005, the negotiations about a possible Turkish membership in the EU began, which made it obvious that "the Turk" was not only an "internal other," but also an "external other" (Halle, *German Film After Germany* 142). Thus, this chapter will close with an outlook on

this matter through visual culture as a European *Heimat*.

4.1 GENRE HISTORY — *HEIMAT* AND THE ROAD FILM

Whereas the most suitable venue for representing notions of settlement and belonging seems to be the *Heimatfilm* genre, explorations of space and mobility are associated with the road film. Although films about and on the road have already existed throughout the 20th century (e.g. Helmut Käutner's *In jenen Tagen/Seven Days*, 1947 and George Hurdalek's *Der eiserne Gustav/ The Iron Gustav*, 1958), Wim Wenders has imported this genre from the US with his trilogy *Alice in den Städten (Alice in the Cities*, 1974), *Falsche Bewegung (Wrong Move*, 1975), and *Im Lauf der Zeit (Kings of the Road*, 1976). When using the American road movie as a frame of reference for German road films, clearly, we cannot consider these valid examples. They differ from the Americans significantly. In his book *Driving Visions* (2002) David Laderman points out how rich the American road movie is in its film styles and how suitable this genre is in offering reflections on physical and cultural conditions. Ewa Mazierska and Laura Rascaroli apply his definition to European road movies and travel films in their study *Crossing New Europe* (2006), and observe the following similarity:

[D]irectors on both continents use the motif of the journey as a vehicle for investigating metaphysical questions on the meaning and purpose of life. Travel, thus, commonly becomes an opportunity for exploration, discovery and transformation (of landscapes, of situation and of identity). (4)

However, in contrast to the American road movie, which emphasizes departure, spatial extensions and the experience of unlimited freedom, the German road films are also about returns and homecomings (Hickethier 129). Thus, it does not come with surprise that the

vacation film was part of the *Heimatfilm* that “took to the roads in the *Motorisierungswelle* (motorization wave) and the *Reisewelle* (travel wave)” during the *economic miracle* (von Moltke 117). Films like Hans Wolff’s *Die Drei von der Tankstelle* (*Three Good Friends*, 1955) and Hans Deppe’s *Immer die Radfahrer* (1958) may resemble traveling on the road (albeit by bike), but the protagonists are not really in search of a deeper truth and their bike tour is more like a satire of an attempt to break free from bourgeois life (Hickethier 132).

Another reason why German road films have been different from the American road movies is Germany’s geography and its political history. Bordered by nine countries in all directions, traveling until 1993 was not accompanied by the same sense of unlimited freedom as it has always been on US territory. Border crossings, with the exception eastwards during the German-German divide, were usually not a problem, but one had to interrupt the flow of traveling. Accordingly, director Detlev Buck has often been quoted saying that in Central Europe, road films tend to end at the next traffic sign (qtd. in Hickethier 141). Yet, the geopolitical parameters changed dramatically with the fall of the Berlin Wall, the founding of European Union, and the eastern extension. Andrea Maria Dusl’s *Blue Moon* with its travel eastwards, for instance, a film that Buck even stars in, shows this changed conception of traveling within Europe. As a road film set in the aftermath of reunification it even takes him all the way from East Germany to the Black Sea. This film may start out as an American-style gangster road movie, but halfway through it turns more and more inward and deals with the loss of home.

The road film has experienced a boom since the 1990s, beginning immediately with the fall of the Berlin Wall. Films like Timm’s *Go Trabi Go* (1991) and Buck’s *No More Mr. Nice Guy* (1993) show road trips within the newly reunified Germany and comically explore

the “Wild East.” With the imminent extension of the EU eastwards and negotiations about further developments, in the first decade of the new millennium films like Fatih Akin’s *Im Juli* (*In July*, 2000) and *The Edge of Heaven* (2007) not only continued the German road film production, they also changed course considering the negotiation with *Heimat* and space. German road films, it seems, are in the process of finding their own voice apart from the American “master narrative” (Hickethier 128).

This voice inevitably includes motifs that are commonly associated with *Heimat* as well and thus appears in the shape of hybridity. First and foremost, my usage of the term refers to genre mixing in film. According to Rick Altman, genres are created through adjective-noun relations, which describes a basic hybrid process. However, particularly in the discussion of Fatih Akin’s film, the larger meaning of hybridity becomes important concerning the post-colonial turn with its criticism of cultural imperialism and globalization. To that effect, Homi Bhabha shows how the alleged past concept of colonialism still affects our present multi-cultural society and problematizes cross-cultural relations (*The Location of Culture*, 1994). Jan Nederveen Pieterse claims that globalization is marked by hybridity, which results in multiplicity instead of homogeneity (*Globalization and Culture*, 2009). Hyphenated (hybrid) identities have become a primary focus in Germany’s political discourses and cultural productions in the past decade, which frames the discussion of *The Edge of Heaven*.

We can notice that *Heimat* motifs have been imported into the road film genre in Wenders and Akin’s oeuvres, although none of them is particularly associated with *Heimat*. While Wenders is famous for the road film of the New German Cinema, Akin stands for the successful Turkish German cinema comprising a variety of genres. Nevertheless, both directors are connected across time and space by overtly dealing with *Heimat*. *Heimat-*

Fremde, local-global and home-travel are usually put into binary opposition where each former component traditionally belongs to the *Heimatfilm* genre, and each latter one counts as a classical element of the road film. Akin's *The Edge of Heaven* and Wenders' *Kings of the Road* as an important predecessor combine elements from both sides of the oppositional pairs respectively. Thus the *Heimatfilm* and the road film tradition inform both films, which mark them as hybrid. This mixture of different genres neither fully turns into one nor the other. According to Norbert Grob, "Heimat ist eine Utopie, die unentwegt gesucht werden muss; im Wenders-Kino stets irgendwo draußen, in weiter Ferne" (210).¹⁷ The same is true for Akin, as my analysis will show. Reading *The Edge of Heaven* through the New German Cinema, especially Wenders' *Kings of the Road*, opens up the perspective to the past that informs Akin's oeuvre, and the present, in which *Heimat* engages with a larger European cross-cultural space and in which the New German Cinema is revived to pursue another quest for *Heimat*.

In contrast to the *Heimatfilm*'s emphasis on local identities, visual expressions of mobility have always been inherent to the road film genre. Wim Wenders imported this genre from the US with his trilogy *Alice in den Städten* (*Alice in the Cities*, 1974), *Falsche Bewegung* (*Wrong Move*, 1975), and *Kings of the Road* (*Kings of the Road*, 1976). However, films about and on the road (including vehicles like boats, trucks and horse buggies) did exist before in Germany. To that effect, Rudolf Jugert's *Nachts auf den Straßen* (*The Mistress*, 1952) realistically documents the approaching *economic miracle* with its infrastructure. However, the road serves additional functions and is inseparably linked with the consciousness of a truck driver,

¹⁷ "Heimat is a utopia, which always has to be searched for; in Wenders' films somewhere out there far away."

played by Hans Albers, who promoted his star persona with this role. Helmut Käutner's *Unter den Brücken* (*Under the Bridges*, 1944) escapes the reality of war with a love story set on a riverboat as a floating home around Berlin and Potsdam. George Hurdalek's *Der eiserne Gustav* (*The Iron Gustav*, 1958) features the true story of a droshky driver, who protested the decay of his business due to the increasing number of automobiles with his famous ride from Berlin to Paris in 1928. These films show their characters hitting different kinds of roads well before Wenders launched his career with the genre. Wenders' appropriation of this genre, nevertheless, linked German with Anglo-American popular culture at a time, when a critical self-perception could only be expressed through strategies explicitly foreign to the German film industry.

My discussion of the connection between home and travel also includes an East German film that is set in various Soviet countries. The *New Heimatfilm* is deeply rooted within German film history, both West and East, as the discussion of Roland Oehme's road film *Wie füttert man einen Esel?* (*How Do You Feed a Donkey?*, 1974) will demonstrate. My historical perspective recognizes the New German Cinema and East German film DEFA films as important predecessors of the current *New Heimatfilm*. As different the states of the FRG and GDR were politically and ideologically, the examples by Wenders and Oehme resemble similar ways of dealing with geographical limitations due to the German-German divide, albeit in different directions: westwards in Wenders' case, eastwards in Oehme's case. Admittedly, while Akin's film definitely references the New German Cinema tradition, he does not make any connections with film in the GDR (in contrast to Staudt's film *Where the Grass is Greener*, as discussed in chapter 2). Yet, Oehme's work serves as an insightful cinematic foil to Wenders' depictions of West German road tripping. This DEFA road film

gives an example of an imagined community of the formerly socialist states and thus a possible precursor of the *New Heimatfilm*.

4.2 HOW DO YOU IMAGINE BOUNDLESS SOCIALISM?

The geographical restriction visually approached from the East of the German-German border brings forth an interesting example of East-German film production. Roland Oehme's *Wie füttert man einen Esel?* (*How Do You Feed a Donkey?*, 1974) is set in Dresden, Prague, Debrecen and Bucharest and mostly shot on-site. Admittedly, contemporary Western criticism referred to it as a superficial "love story in the long-haul truck driver milieu" (*Zweitausendeins Filmlexikon*). In terms of its narrative, this is certainly true: While the East Germans Fred (Manfred Krug) and Orje drive an "intertrans" truck through Prague with a delivery for a chemistry company in Bucharest, an accident happens and Orje is hospitalized. Jana, a Czechoslovak, who as a female truck driver finds herself discriminated against and hence, uses tricks to get herself into the position of his replacement. On Fred and Jana's way to Bucharest, Fred visits his lovers in every city, which makes Jana more and more jealous. However, at the same time they become peers and finally fall in love with each other. In contrast to this clichè narrative of love and gender stands the dynamic mobility across borders. Although the film does not miss its chance to show Jana struggling for her equality within the GDR's context of progressive self-understanding, her superior, male colleague and new lover with his promise to be faithful to her, tames her fighting spirit.

The film depicts plenty of situations of inter-national and inter-class solidarity and com-

radeship during the trip. The name of the truck “intertrans” evokes the impression of an international appeal that one would not expect from a geographically restricted GDR film. Yet, it also indicates the East-West divide and the interzonal traffic, which rather corresponds with how confined the presented mobility to and from the Eastern Bloc was. This gets further displayed through Jana and Fred’s encounter with the young philosophy student Zoltn who hitchhikes and wears a fake Marx beard. He explains that most travelers in that area (which is probably Hungary) are from the GDR, but they would not pick up a bearded hitchhiker in their own country with the exception of Marx. However, Zoltn explains further, GDR citizens abroad act the opposite way and would pick up a bearded hitchhiker, which is why he is wearing a beard to increase his chances for a ride. After an initial sideswipe at the popularity of Marxism in the GDR, the film seems to suggest that international journeys in between socialist states creates a sense of brotherhood and belonging. Considering the travel restriction to satellite states of the Soviet Union, it could also be argued that the term “transnational” would be more appropriate, however the film emphasizes a multiplicity within unity, which from a Western or today’s perspective can be overseen. As indicated by the truck’s lettering “intertrans,” there is a tension between inter- and transnationalism. Accordingly, we should keep in mind that “[b]efore transnationalism there was internationalism” (Halle, *German Film After Germany* 20), which Oehme is employing in his construction of imagined Socialist travel space. Furthermore, upon their arrival in Bucharest, the chemistry professor refuses Fred’s formal address and gives him a hug instead. The truck driver and the professor meet at eye-level without hierarchical differences. Furthermore, the drivers help a Transylvanian Saxon with his broken down truck, who says, humorously referring to his ancestors, he has been home in Romania for

800 years. Fred is intrigued by the fact that he is a Saxon without speaking the (German) Saxon dialect. With this incident the film emphasizes how little is known about the GDR's cultural and historical relations to Eastern Europe beyond Socialism. In this brotherly travel environment, not even the different languages (German, Eastern European accented German, Czech, Bulgarian and Hungarian) prove as problematic. Friendly gestures make up for a lack of language proficiency.

How Do You Feed a Donkey? also mirrors the theme of border-crossing harmony in its musical scores. The narrative is interrupted by on-site pop and rock music performances of German and Eastern-European bands. To a certain degree, the performances of Turkish folksongs at the Bosphorus in Akin's *Head-On* (2004), rhyme with these sequences. They complement the dramatic events with *melos*. According to the *Zweitausendeins Filmlexikon*, the musical pieces in the DEFA film were "built helplessly into the plot." However, since these interludes are shot against the skyline or terrace front of Eastern-European cities, they establish a sense of the (alleged) geographical openness and establish the rhythm of this road film that is despite its restriction to socialist territories about an international road trip. Oehme's DEFA film with its "intertrans" drivers works against a notion of spatial confinement.

In contrast to the solidarity depicted in between the Socialist brother countries, the West is displayed negatively with its materialism and arrogance. Fred saves Zoltn from two middle-aged West-German female tourists (over-dressed and dislikable) who offer Zoltn room and board at a hotel in exchange for sex. When they realize that their deal is ruined, they conclude, "Wär'n wir doch in Düsseldorf geblieben" ("We should have stayed in Düsseldorf"), which alludes to a popular 1970s *Schlager* song about the failures of a "schöner Playboy" in

the American wild west. The West Germans are marked as the “other” Germans that are certainly less desirable peers than the Czechoslovaks, Bulgarians, Romanians and Hungarians along the way. While overall this study attends to current shifts in German film genres since the collapse of the Eastern Bloc, we can find similar cinematic aspirations already during the German-German divide. This travel across (some) national boundaries seeks to create an “Us,” a sense of Socialist unity that emphasizes the similarities between different cultures. Fred’s lovers in all his destinations, who eventually pester him about marriage, literally love the East German back, while the West German tourists fail to accomplish their desires with money.

This pre-*Wende* digression shows that the post-*Wende* idea of an extended *Heimat* and its audiovisual imagination through the road film genre already occurred during Socialism. To be sure, we have to differentiate internationalism, as depicted in Oehme’s film, from transnationalism that draws various European film industries together and where everybody may travel and move as they choose. *How Do you Feed a Donkey?* is a road movie that gives the impression of boundless traveling (along with boundless Socialism), but it is nevertheless a limited space. You may travel from Berlin to Budapest and beyond, but it is an international solidarity with the idea that one has a place to which one belongs.

Other examples of the GDR road movie are often coming-of-age films: Dieter Schumann’s documentary *Flüstern und Schreien* (*Whisper and Outcry — A Rock Report*, 1988) gives an account of adolescents and their rebellion in the GDR. Herrmann Zschoche’s *Und nächstes Jahr am Balaton* (*And Next Year by the Balaton Lake*, 1980) describes the limitations to traveling. Frank Beyer’s *Bockshorn* (*Taken for a Ride*, 1983) was shot and set in the US after a period in which he was not granted permission to make movies in the GDR. His earlier

road film *Karbid und Sauerampfer* (*Carbide and Sorrel*, 1963) is set in the postwar era, and similarly to *How Do You Feed a Donkey?* it evolves around a delivery of a necessary supply for the building of Socialism, displaying an adventurous exploration of the home landscape along the way.

It has been widely assumed that *Heimat*, as rooted within the Western tradition and understood as a reactionary genre, would be incompatible with ideas of a Socialist modernity. However, the East German regime made an effort to modify this popular genre and use it to promote “a specific GDR love of home *Heimatliebe* (Hodgin 47) as an “antifascist *Heimat*” in contradistinction to the West German “post-fascist *Heimat*” (46). Yet, Hodgin points out that these endeavors like Kurt Tetzlaff’s documentary *Erinnerung an eine Landschaft — Für Manuela* (*Memories of a Landscape — To Manuela*, 1983) remained mostly unsuccessful, as most East German viewers “preferred to tune into West German television” (47). Typically, the intended attachment occurred only in the shape of nostalgia concerning a lost *Heimat* after the disappearance of the GDR (48). This equals the imagining of space in classical *Heimatfilme*. Although they are informed by modernization processes of the 1950s, they are also constructed as ideal worlds far away from the social reality of that time (Koch et al. 69). Hence, they are a projection onto something already lost. The *New Heimatfilm*, on the contrary, might use nostalgia as well, but approach it more critically, as we will see in the analysis of *Blue Moon*.

Hodgin maps out an Eastern territory that, facing the ruins of its past, is signified by voids that actively express the loss of a previous confining, yet protective *Heimat*. He includes discussions of comic encounters between East and West, Eastern province films that deal with notions of a ruined *Heimat*, and nostalgia in the so-called (but often mislabeled)

Ostalgie films that express a longing for the pre-wall past. Hodgin argues that East German post-unification films serve as strong and often only-remaining visual records that provide important insights into the East German sense of self within a new geo-political context. In 1973 the GDR and FRG accepted each other as sovereign states for the first time and began diplomatic relations. Films like *How Do You Feed a Donkey?* were meant to demonstrate the GDR's independence from the West and its orientation towards the East, where it looked for new models of identification: the truckers as working class and socialist solidarity across borders. With the fall of the Berlin Wall and the collapse of the Soviet bloc, however, these imaginations came to an end.

Filmmaking in reunified Germany explores similar themes and strategies like in this DEFA example. They unearth some of the key elements of the *Heimat* and road film genres regardless of their socio-political contexts. They possibly also meet similar challenges and restrictions: How far does the inclusion reach? Who is “us” and who is shown as a foil? Despite the fact that the GDR and FRG were diametrically opposed projects, what the East and the West had in common was a desire to express a socio-spatial attachment. While West Germany manifested its identity through regional *Heimat* concepts and the *Heimatfilm* genre, East Germany sought to emancipate itself from the West and establish a more comprehensive Socialist identity, a *Heimat* if you will, that exceeded national borders eastwards. *How Do You Feed a Donkey?* illustrates how moving beyond national parameters was part of the GDR's self-understanding. Dreaming big within a geographically and ideologically confined context, however, was not sufficient for the GDR. The actual European expansion in current audiovisual narratives trumps the former's international and restricted mobility.

From this cinematic side-step we can derive that the East German film imagined a

cohesive international community as *Heimat* well before the post-unification film imagined a European transnational community in audiovisual culture. The COMECON (Council for Mutual Economic Assistance), the Soviet installed counterpart to the EEC (European Economic Community), was an economic organization, and so was the EEC. None of these structures stimulated to an overall national or transnational identity. Nevertheless, the idea of international connectedness during the German-German divide occurred first in the Eastern Bloc.

In the next step, we will see how the *New Heimatfilm*, particularly with its extending Eastern territories, looks back to the history of East German cinema, although current *Heimat* revivals so far do not take this legacy into consideration. My discussion seeks to work towards closing this gap. The following *New Heimatfilm* film picks up on these ongoing issues of a lost Eastern *Heimat* within a European context.

4.3 DETERRITORIALIZING *HEIMAT* — FROM *WENDEFILM* TO EUROPEAN FILM

Notions of increased space and deterritorialization hark back to the 1970s New German Cinema, as I will show. John E. Davidson was the first to discuss the 1960s *Auteur* films beyond the German context in the light of Postcolonialism, and thus appropriates the term in its relation to the international constellations of the Cold War period (*Deterritorializing the New German Cinema*, 1998). I will use the term to describe the detachment of *Heimat* from German territory within the *New Heimatfilm* genre.

The road film as *New Heimatfilm* presents a deterritorialized experience en route, leaving behind what de Certeau calls the “incarceration-vacation surrounded by glass and iron” (114) the vehicle as “*primum mobile*” that both separates and connects the traveler from his surroundings (113). The protagonists of the *New Heimatfilm* do not only get fleeting impressions from their journeys, but also grapple with their new surroundings they just reached, often staying for an indefinite time at their preliminary destinations. While, for the most part, they need vehicles to move in that keep them at a distance in contrast to the urban walker at street level they rarely stick to the (same) car as the ultimate vehicle like in the American road film. In German road films, the characters frequently leave their shelter to continue their journey by foot or other means of transportation. One example is Wenders’ *Paris, Texas* (1984), a European-American co-production that is set in the US, which begins with the main character walking through the desert before he goes on a road trip. These various forms of movement in combination with dwelling demonstrate the conception of being as an ongoing process of thinking in its relation to mobility. Although Heidegger describes the constant search “for the nature of dwelling” as a “plight” (159), the *New Heimatfilm* does not always resemble a negative take on the relation between home and traveling, but it does emphasize traveling as a necessity due to changing geopolitical circumstances. Grisebach’s *Longing* demonstrates the urgent need for such a search and the misery of staying within a place that has already been lost within the context of a reunified East Germany.

Wim Wenders’ *Kings of the Road* (1976) and Fatih Akin’s *The Edge of Heaven* (2007) demonstrate a new engagement with *Heimat* in its relation to place and genre by approaching it through traveling. Despite being situated in different moments of German and European

history, these moments have in common a transitional quality within the *Heimat* discourse. Fatih Akin's early road film *Im Juli* (*In July*, 2000) was produced before the 2004 enlargement of the EU eastwards. Thus, the terrain they travel is still marked by official border-crossings and the characters have to play tricks to cross various Eastern European borders due to a missing passport. At the Bulgarian-Turkish border, it is even Akin himself in a cameo, who refuses to open the tollgate and allow the couple to-be reunited, so the travelers have to pretend an engagement right in front of the border guard. Three years later in *The Edge of Heaven*, again the journey goes beyond the EU and explores notions of belonging and identity on more complex levels.

In his anthology solely devoted to *The Edge of Heaven*, Özkan Ezli claims that Akin's film "[bemüht] weder de[n] Mythos von der Rückkehr zu Geburtsort, *Heimat* und Identität [], und ebenso nicht das Ankommen in der Zielgesellschaft, noch handelt es sich bei diesem Film um einen Kulturdialog oder um einen Kulturkonflikt" (9).¹⁸ The main character's trip to Istanbul and Trabzon, which is his father's birthplace, does certainly not account for a homecoming narrative, given that his home is clearly Bremen. However, Ezli argues from the assumption of a traditional and more limiting definition of *Heimat* situated between binary oppositions and as an either-or, but that no longer suffices in our global age.

Travel experience on the Western side of the Iron Curtain is demonstrated in films like Wenders' *Kings of the Road* and Peter Bringmann's *Theo gegen den Rest der Welt* (*Theo Against the Rest of the World*, 1980), two contemporary examples of Oehme's film. The latter can be seen as a West German opposite to *How Do You Feed A Donkey?* since it also

¹⁸ "neither strives for the myth of the return to the birthplace, *Heimat* and identity, and it is also not about the arrival in the target society, nor is this film about a cultural dialogue or a cultural conflict."

shows a truck driver's cross-national journey. After Theo's truck gets stolen, he uses various vehicles to chase the thief from the Ruhr through France and Switzerland, and from Milan, to Naples and Marseille. While Oehme's film suggests a unity among the Socialist states along the trip, Bringmann's film features a journey full of obstacles and national peculiarities. In contrast to the DEFA road film that aspired to international and cultural unity, this example from the Bonn Republic is based on difference, struggle and competition. The following discussion focuses on the aftermath of this imagined community and its mourning for a lost *Heimat*.

4.4 TRAVELING EAST IN THE POST-*WENDE* FILM — ANDREA MARIA DUSL'S *BLUE MOON* (2002)

Multilateralism and co-productions mark the transition into 21st century European filmmaking. This development is represented very clearly in visual culture. Many films increasingly bear characteristics that transgress the old national boundaries that defined subjectivity in geopolitical ways. Both in terms of aesthetics and regarding their production and distribution in alliance with the development of the European Union, they open up new possibilities of communal affiliations. According to Halle, while Walter Benjamin still spoke of how mechanical reproduction was made possible by industrialization and technological innovations, the large shift we are currently experiencing is no longer caused by new technology. Rather, he suggests that radical transformations come from the drawing together of the European national markets. This serves as the political and economic backdrop to the evolving

transnational aesthetic (Halle, *German Film After Germany* 1-4) that “all film production” is affected. Halle emphasizes that “globalization is not simply a matter of mega-budgets for blockbuster films; rather, global financial flows can also bring into being small-scale, local, independent productions” (4).

This material context is often expressed through the visualization of border crossings and expanded geographical settings. Travel narratives are set into all directions: Peter Lichtefeld’s “Zugvögel . . . Einmal nach Inari” (*Trains’n’Roses*, 1998) leads us North from Dortmund to Lapland; Angelina Maccarone’s characters in *Vivere* (2007) go West from Cologne to Rotterdam; Cyril Tuschki’s *SommerHundeSöhne* (*SummerDogsSons*, 2004) travel South to Morocco; and Andrea Maria Dusl’s *Blue Moon* (2002) starts out in Austria and explores Slovakia and the Ukraine. It is the direction eastwards, the unexplored space for the Western Europeans, that particularly seems to spur post-unification border-crossing narratives. This approach is echoed in *Blue Moon* that not only crosses genres, but also borders. Released in 2002, it is set in the 1990s and based on Dusl’s immediate impressions after the fall of the Wall. To be sure, the historical context of Austria and Eastern Europe differs from the East-West German relations with Eastern Europe, however I am looking at a pan-European phenomenon. This phenomenon is established through the appearance of a multinational cast and through the references to the GDR and German film history.

The story begins in Austria close to the Slovak border. Johnny Pichler, a petty crook, is supposed to meet a Slovak businessman for an illegal transfer of money. However, something goes wrong and Johnny is forced into the car. His company, a Ukrainian prostitute, gets annoyed by her insufferable customer. In an opportune moment, she steals his car with Johnny in the backseat, which starts their road trip. They decide to sell the car in Slovakia,

but cannot find anyone who is willing to pay the requested amount. Johnny begins to fall in love with the hostess, so he stays by her side. All of a sudden, she disappears and leaves him behind with the car and her notebook. Although Johnny does not even know her name and only finds her passport pictures taken at a Lviv photo studio, he is determined to travel to Ukraine to find her. The East German Ignaz Springer, who forces himself on Johnny and accompanies him partially, causes a lot of troubles during their trip. Johnny thus takes to his heels and hitchhikes to Lviv by himself. There he meets the taxi driver Jana, the alleged twin sister of his earlier female companion. She claims to be missing her twin sister Dana and claims to recognize her in the pictures Johnny carries with him (looking like the hostess, but also like Jana, just wearing a wig). According to Jana, her sister left Eastern Europe during perestroika to go to the US. Johnny moves in with Jana. She leads what appears to be a more settled down life in Lviv with a house, a garden and sheep. Johnny and Jana fall in love with each other. While being alone in the house, he finds documents proving that her whole family, including her sister Dana, had died during a shipwreck in the Black Sea many years ago. Hence, the woman with whom he drove into Slovakia was not the missing twin sister, but Jana herself in disguise. He learns further that she secretly works as prostitute under the name Shirley. Upon Johnny's confronting her and a customer, they get separated again, initiating another odyssey towards Odessa with Ignaz, where Johnny and Jana meet at the harbor again.

The characters in *Blue Moon* resemble different geo-political systems in flux after the decline of the Soviet Union. As in *How Do You Feed a Donkey?*, an *other* from a German-speaking country functions as a foil of the more likeable main character. However, in Dusl's film the East German is not the hero, who promotes progressiveness, but a comical figure

instead, naive and clumsy with outdated worldviews. The Ignaz Springer character, played by Detlef Buck, is a reference to his 1990s comedy. In contrast to *How Do You Feed a Donkey?* the negative foil is not played by the stereotypical *Besser-Wessi*, a pun consisting of the term *Besserwisser* (know-it-all) and *Wessi* (the half-joking, half-insulting name for a West German). This term (along with *Ossi* for *Ostdeutscher*/East German) indicates the stereotype of the superior West German. The annoying character in Dusl's film is played by an East German, who is torn between saying farewell to Socialism and indulging in the new possibilities of capitalism. Accordingly, he refers to Johnny half-jokingly as "comrade Pichler from capitalist abroad," but exchanges Johnny's car (or rather the car that Johnny stole) for a bust of Lenin and money. Ignaz still proclaims Socialist ideology ("Socialism is dead. Long live Socialism") and happily invokes Socialist fraternity and brotherly equality as a means to appropriate Johnny's money. This goody two-shoes represents the East German, who is already subconsciously westernized, but still cannot handle the new system. The loss of his former GDR *Heimat* is presented in a comical way.

Obviously, the GDR is not what Dusl wants to explore in her filmic travel eastwards, but rather the countries which the Iron Curtain made inaccessible for decades: "It was very positive and enthusiastic for me to explore a world that is so close but so very different. A world that we still know very little about" (Cineuropa), referring to the direct aftermath of 9 November 1989. The fall of the Berlin Wall inspired Dusl to make her film debut:

Im Spätherbst 1989 fiel der Eiserne Vorhang. An dem Abend, an dem die Grenzbalken hochgingen, sprangen wir in den alten Mercedes meines Vaters und fuhren in den Osten. Wir fanden eine andere Welt. Anders als alles, was wir bis dahin gesehen hatten. Und ich wusste sofort: Darüber musste ich einen Film machen. Über diese seltsame andere Welt. (Josef Hader Online)¹⁹

¹⁹"In late fall 1989 the Iron Curtain fell. In the night in which the tollgates were lifted, we jumped into my father's old Mercedes and drove into the East. We found a different world. It was different from everything

To be sure, a decade after the production of *Blue Moon* and more than two decades after reunification, the East is no longer such an adventure. However, the West German populace still knows little about life in this other Germany and the Eastern Bloc, as represented by the Austrian character Johnny Pichler, and even to a certain degree by the East German character Ignaz Springer, who naively seeks to conquer Eastern Europe with his shoe business. In keeping with the current flourishing of auto-biographical novels and films, Nick Hodgkin reads the concentration on diverse East German accounts expressed in post-unification films as counter-histories to the established “master narratives” that focus on the failings of the desolate and past GDR. In fact, *Screening the East* functions like a retrospective imaginary map. Through these visualized accounts of the East, which are less concerned about historical accuracy and hence, preferred over history, memory is made somewhat accessible to the viewer without a GDR past (Hodgin 878). Although *Blue Moon* is not an autobiographical account, it operates in a similar fashion and recreates a lost *Heimat*.

Over years, Dusl traveled through Eastern Europe to discover this “new world” and to find sites for her shoot. Her personal experience is conveyed through Johnny’s eyes, who occasionally echoes her response to the fall of the Berlin Wall in voice-overs like the following one: “Wie der Eiserne Vorhang aufgegangen ist, sind wir alle vorm Fernseher gesessen und waren sehr gerührt.”²⁰ In addition, the subjective point of view is visualized by the frequent usage of a camcorder through which Johnny records his trip and investigates his new surroundings. Originally, Dusl intended to use the recordings of her many visits to Eastern Europe for a short film series rather than making a feature film. Instead, her

we had seen until then. And I knew immediately: I have to make a film about that, about this strange, different world” (Hader Online).

²⁰ “When the Iron Curtain was lifted, we were all sitting in front of the TV and we were very affected.”

singular observations and encounters were incorporated into the film's narrative with its *leitmotif* of love between the East and the West that she devotes more sensitivity to than in her illustration of the (East) German comical figure. *Blue Moon* is among a variety of films that explore the enlarged realm of experience and its new opportunities of traveling and redefinitions of identity and belonging. While Dusl focuses on the East as a new world and discovers attractions between the East and the West despite or because of their differences, the EU's Eastern expansion two years after the film was released brings Dusl's imagination closer to a political reality.

The protagonists in *Blue Moon* stand in for tensions within this changing European setting. Similarly to the director's various trips eastwards after the fall of the Berlin Wall, her protagonist Johnny falls in love with the East, which is represented by a Ukrainian woman. Dusl considers this "a metaphor for the profound relations between East and West" (Dusl in interview with Chiari). Although Jana cannot understand why Johnny came here, because "hier ist nichts," this city is clearly defined as her *Heimat* to which she introduces Johnny: she takes him to the market and teaches him some Ukrainian words for food items. She accommodates him in her house, and some scenes resemble a settled lifestyle of the new couple: they watch TV, enjoy the garden, eat and bathe together. On the one hand, she embraces her local culture and dances until exhausted to a Ukrainian folksong in a nightclub, while on the other, she uses her sheep as an excuse for why she has not left. It is particularly the multi-faceted female protagonist with her contradictory, if not even schizophrenic, performances, who serves as the narrative's linchpin. Due to her childhood trauma, Jana acts as three different characters: The road-tripping prostitute Shirley, the homebound taxi driver Jana, and her alleged runaway-sister Dana.

This constellation seeks to grapple with trauma-induced schizophrenia after having lost her family in the ferry disaster. Further, it translates into broader questions concerning identity and belonging after the old binary oppositions East-West and communism-capitalism no longer serve as reliable coordinates for a *Heimat*. Dusl may reflect her own experience within the newly explored Eastern Europe through Johnny's Western point of view, but the narrative proceeds with a response from the East. On a more complex level, this voice belongs to a schizophrenic character, which demonstrates the ruptures going through a previously Soviet Union that is now falling apart.

Blue Moon also combines these different responses within one persona to demonstrate how closely related these opposite choices of how to handle the new post-Soviet "freedom" are. Jana as the only real existing female character bears these three possibilities: The first one comprises the decision to leave home for the West, most clearly shown by focusing on the US and its symbols of freedom. She tells Johnny that her twin-sister Dana chose to leave the Soviet Union in the 1980s during a phase of political mitigation. Jana quotes her sister, who apparently left home head over heels, "I want to go to America." In the beginning of the film, Jana appears disguised as Dana wearing a blond wig and appearing like a Americanized stereotype: she starts the road trip with Johnny by stealing a gangster's Cadillac, a brand that in itself is still associated with America, and in the film's iconic representation stands for Americanization. She wants to sell it for dollars, not for "fucking shillings," and she speaks accented English claiming to be "from America or something like that." The second option is the opposite of Dana's escapism to the West and expresses a desperate clinging to a decaying home. Upon her (re)encounter with Johnny in Lviv, "the real" Jana initially only speaks Ukrainian and is able to switch to German, as soon as she begins to trust

Johnny. Jana is the exact foil of her lost twin sister: Instead of driving a Cadillac, a rarity in Europe especially at that time, she drives a shabby taxi that ensures her existence. She does not go on border-crossing road trips, but stays in her spacious family house in Lviv. The third choice is presented through Shirley, who connects these two disparate concepts of being homebound and homeless. We do not learn if financial reasons make Jana work as a prostitute or if this profession offers her the adventurous life of engaging with the world that she secretly ascribes to Dana. Dusl seems to interweave this third way of dealing with her post-Soviet *Heimat* to have Jana act like how she claims her sister behaves without having to change anything in her settled life. The story does not limit itself to the implications for the West, portrayed by Johnny, who does “international business,” but also provides a look from the East that is focused on either staying in a decaying *Heimat* or going away.

Dusl formulates a *Heimatlosigkeit* (homelessness) within a vanished political context. This is visualized in the *mis-en-scène* that depicts Jana’s house in Lviv, in which time has stood still. It is filled with objects from the communist era: Johnny wakes up in a room that looks like that of a kid in the 1970s with a large map that marks the borders of the former Soviet Union. A collection of medals hangs right next to it. While he is walking through the house, we see old-fashioned and worn-out furniture that do not match a young woman’s style. There are different photographs of the family, one of them from 1979. In a study, a red flag with Lenin’s image, various diplomas and a rocket model decorate the walls. We learn later that Jana’s father was an accomplished cyberneticist, so this must have been his room, which looks like it is still in use. The house is full of family history, but it appears empty and uninhabited. Jana even admits that the whole property is a burden for her, and she cannot understand why her sheep are not taking advantage of their chances to escape. However,

Jana appears to be tied, or rather torn between staying and leaving, which is expressed through her multiple personalities. When Johnny discovers that her whole family has died in 1979, it becomes clear that she left everything in the house like it was and pretended the ferry disaster did not happen.

Thus, this conventional, place-specific *Heimat* appears to be a shell that prevents Jana from getting over the past and moving on. Through the encounter with the West, personified by Johnny (especially by his American first name), she is confronted with her trauma and eventually reunited with him, but Dosl leaves it open where she will be going with her newly gained freedom. The overall stance she takes, however, is that stagnation and being homebound are signs of psychological disturbance. Departure and mobility afford the accomplishment of a whole integrated personality. Jana's schizophrenia is a symptom of her desperate and futile adherence to a past *Heimat* that no longer exists. Further, the film's title *Blue Moon* references the famous ballade of Richard Rodgers and Lorenz Hart (written in 1934) of the same name and made successful through performers, such as Jeff Funk in *Grease* (1978). "Blue Moon" is played twice during the film, once towards the end, when Jana and Johnny meet again at the Odessa harbor. It seems that in the light of the film's title and reoccurring theme song, *Blue Moon* ditches the notion of *Heimat* as a territorial place and instead endorses the ballade's idea of love as the only true form of belonging. Not the territorial bonds of *Heimat* are capable of healing Jana's trauma, but the human bonds.

Blue Moon with its exploration of an increased geographical space does not only reference Buck's post-unification road film *No More Mr. Nice Guy*, but also an earlier cinematic predecessor of the *New Heimatfilm*. The scene, in which Ignaz exchanges the stolen Cadillac for a bust of Lenin references a New German Cinema road movie. The comical inclusions

of the former state leaders of Nazi Germany and the Soviet Union both symbolize societies in cultural and ideological transformation, although of very different kinds. Wenders' *Kings of the Road* (1976), as part of the critical *Autorenkino* that engaged with Germany's recent history and its continuities, alludes to the Third Reich using a similar gesture: At a fair, one of the main characters meets a woman, who seems to mirror his state of mind and concerns. To begin a conversation, she presents a bust of Hitler to him that turns out to be a cigarette lighter, which she won at a carnival booth. After having used Hitler's head to light a cigarette and having shaken their heads about this strange prize, she eventually hides the macabre object under her jacket before taking off.

The New German Cinema belongs to an era, in which Germany had not yet begun to deal with its recent history of the Holocaust. The young directors confronted the generation of their fathers and started the necessary discourse. I am not suggesting that the bust scenes in *Kings of the Road* and *Blue Moon* indicate a direct parallel between post-National Socialist and post-Soviet periods, between Hitler and Lenin, but both Wenders and Döhl portray their respective moments of history with icons. These appear diverted from their intended use (Hitler's bust is comically designed as a cigarette lighter) or discarded (Ignaz feels lucky to have made a good bargain after he exchanges the Cadillac for Lenin's bust and money). In both cases, an era heavily loaded with quite differing ideologies and iconic representations has come to an end. One may mark these bust scenes as moments of comical relief in both films that deal with the remnants of the past in their present respective *Heimat* settings.

This moment of comparison between Wenders and Döhl's films lets us derive the following principles for the discussion of the *New Heimatfilm*: 1) The cinematic past (here the post-unification films and the New German Cinema) informs the *New Heimatfilm*; 2)

Both films, in spite of the decades that lie between them, show a critical self-awareness of their transitional moment in history (a generation beginning to deal with the Third Reich in Wenders' film, a post-Soviet exploration of Socialism's legacies and Capitalism's promises in Dusl's film. These differing transitional settings with their specific socio-political contexts mirror the contemporary *Heimat* space respectively; 3) Unlike the classical *Heimatfilm* of the 1950s, the *New Heimatfilm* looks back to the present and negotiates historical and generic impacts within the present moment. Accordingly, *Blue Moon* starts out as an American-style road movie (the escape, the Cadillac) and opens up to other generic elements, such as the documentary and the urban film. In contrast to the beginning of the film, when the genre, mission and direction were clear (a road film heading East to sell the car and further East to find Dana/Shirley alias Jana), the film becomes increasingly unsettled. The road film ends with Jana jumping from a departing ferry into the Black Sea and swimming back to the waterside to be with Johnny, blurring the boundaries between departure and arrival, between the road film and the *Heimatfilm*.

While references to the DEFA tradition within the *New Heimatfilm* are usually tied with contemporary investigations of German-German relations, tributes to the New German Cinema seem to be more conscious of Germany's multicultural developments and so-called hyphenated identities. The following sections will explore the changing German film culture at points of time, when the understanding of a homogeneous *Heimat* concept was no longer functioning and brought forth hybrid genres.

4.5 LEGACIES OF THE NEW GERMAN CINEMA — HAYAT IN THE CITIES

To a certain degree, current filmmakers continue the imaginations of the West German *Auteurs* of the 1970s. A prototype of such a cinematic exploration is Wenders' *Alice in den Städten* (*Alice in the Cities*, 1974) that is also about the quest for belonging and home across borders, and even continents. The film begins in New York City, where Philip Winter has been commissioned to write about the American landscape. When he finds himself unable to express verbally and cannot please his editor, he has to return to Germany. At the airport, he teams up with two other Germans, Lisa with her nine-year old daughter Alice. They share a hotel room, but the next morning, Lisa has left. In a message, she tells him to take Alice and wait for her in Amsterdam. After Philip and Alice leave without her and Lisa does not follow them as promised, they go on a road trip and try to find Alice's grandmother. However, Alice neither remembers her grandmother's name nor does she know where she lives. Only relying on a picture of the grandmother's house and Alice's gut feelings, they meander through half of Germany, both rediscovering their alleged *Heimat* through the eyes of strangers, accompanied by their experience with American pop culture. Philip overcomes his initial aversion against his demanding company, who in fact seems to ease his lethargy. They are separated twice, but each time, Alice manages to return to Philip. Finally, Philip and Alice as a new unit go to Munich together, where her grandmother lives. The film closes with the two of them back on the road, or rather train tracks, where they are home with each other.

The father-child surrogate and traveling demonstrate a combination of motifs from both

the *Heimatfilm* and the road film genre. This character and narrative constellation is revived and appropriated in various ways by current filmmakers: In her *Auslandstournee* (*Tour Abroad Europe*, 2000), Ayşe Polat has an eleven-year old girl search for her mother on a journey from Germany via France to Turkey and back. This post-1990 road film not only presents a geographical and cultural update, because it transpires over a larger European territory and its margins, but it also investigates stereotyping by depicting the figure of the adult outsider as a homosexual night club singer; The child character in *Alice in the Cities*, played by Yella Rottländer, inspired Christian Petzold for his film *Yella* (2007), in which the adult protagonist leaves her home Brandenburg to start over in the West; and in Christian Zübert's *Dreiviertelmond* (*Three Quarter Moon*, 2011) as the most recent example negotiates an old-fashioned homogeneous with a current multicultural understanding of *Heimat*. A bullheaded taxi driver is left by his wife after 30 years of marriage and his adult daughter leads an independent life. He cannot accept this sudden change and his empty house, particularly because of his established ideas and habits concerning what his *Heimat* has to look like. While driving a Turkish German mother and her daughter Hayat through the city, his subliminal racism becomes obvious, upon which the mother calls him a "Nazi." The little girl, not knowing any German, thinks this is his real name and keeps referring to him as "Nazi." Hartmut cannot wait until the ride is over, but it turns out that he is not yet done with this encounter: the next day, he finds Hayat sitting in the backseat of his taxi and from now she will not let go of him. Hartmut learns that her grandmother passed away and her mother is out of reach, so Hayat is all by herself. Similar to Philip Winter in *Alice in the Cities*, a male adult initially struggles to take over responsibility for a child. In *Three Quarter Moon*, Hartmut eventually gains new perspectives on his surroundings and realizes

there is a new form of belonging apart from ethnic origin and the nuclear family. Not having a language in common, they slowly begin to communicate intuitively and he overcomes his prejudice against German Turks. Their names Hayat means life and Hartmut hard spirit, but also determined courage determine the dynamics of this duo and what they bring to each other.

While *Alice in the Cities* shows the reluctant journey from the US to a Germany that Philip no longer considers home, *Three Quarter Moon* captures a Nuremberg in which a local has to learn to accept changing surroundings to an equal degree: the migrant cultures and the decay of the nuclear family. Unlike Philip in Wenders' film, Hartmut is not a spiritually minded artist, an aloof global citizen, but a down-to-earth pragmatic, who owns a house and wants things to stay the way they are. Hayat is a foreigner. She lives with her mother Gülen in Turkey, visits Germany for the first time, and does not know any German. Her mother probably grew up in Germany as a second-generation Turkish German, but moved to Turkey as an adult. Her mother, Nezahat, Hayat's grandmother, who lives Nuremberg, is supposed to look after her while Gülen works temporarily on a boat. Hartmut might not be a foreigner like Hayat, but still he is depicted as a stranger in his city and even in his own house. On this level as social outsiders, he and the girl temporarily form a new unit that can be considered a new home, similarly to what eventually connects Philip and Alice. Hartmut experiences a whole new world in his city: he now has regular lunches at a Turkish deli, where he seeks help for communicating with Hayat, and he begins to recognize the Germans and Turkish Germans around him as part of his *Heimat*.

Zübert chose a city with a dark past for his film about prejudice and racism. Given that Nuremberg was venue of the annual NSDAP rally between 1923 and 1938 with its inhuman

proclamations including the racist Nuremberg laws, it features a remarkable transformation of the so-called “Nazi” Hartmut. Today, Nuremberg is home to the largest Turkish German film festival in Germany. Viewing *Three Quarter Moon* against this backdrop, we can consider this film a response to contemporary racism as “rassistisches Wissen” (racist knowledge) in everyday life (Terkessidis 20) and to the Nazi’s blood and soil ideology, which recalls the *Heimatfilm* of the Third Reich.

Questions of belonging, identity and finding a place of home are also the focus of a number of films by Fatih Akin, a Turkish German director, screenwriter and producer who was born and raised in Hamburg. Over the last fifteen years, Akin has produced and directed award-winning films such as *Gegen die Wand* (*Head-On*, 2004), *Auf der anderen Seite* (*The Edge of Heaven*, 2007), *Soul Kitchen* (2009) and his most recent documentary *Der Müll im Garten Eden* (*Garbage in the Garden of Eden*, 2012). Although he has already moved well beyond the Turkish German migration film towards becoming a “representative of a globalized cinema” (Buß, *Spiegel Online*), the stereotype of the Turkish German filmmaker remains (Machtans 156). In his oeuvre, Akin highlights the crossing of borders and cultures, and his narratives explore various pilgrimages toward home: “Heimat in *The Edge of Heaven* is constructed by each individual somewhere on his/her journey between different places” (Machtans referring to Buß 157).

Heimat, as Akin’s films seems to imply, is never easily realized and cannot be taken as a given. One has to search for it in faraway places or even abandon it altogether. This becomes obvious in *Head-On*, in which the female protagonist, Sibel, needs to break away from her confining Turkish family in Germany. Surprisingly, she eventually settles down in Turkey, in a place that is intricately linked to her family and thus to a tradition Sibel

strongly used to object to. This ambiguity is also a decisive feature of *The Edge of Heaven*, a multi-layered narrative about losses and mourning in which all characters abstain from a clear commitment to a home. Again, the film is set in the two countries of Turkey and Germany and addresses topics such as migration and cultural diversity. Hence, *The Edge of Heaven* challenges established conceptions of home and travel, which are traditionally understood as antitheses: to travel is to be away from home whereas feelings of home defy the act of movement.

In the following section, I intend to investigate what happens when home becomes travel, and the difference between home and travel is obscured. By primarily focusing on Akin's film *The Edge of Heaven* I will explore how Akin constructs a *Heimat* for his protagonists contrary to classical assumptions about origin, and how his concept serves as a useful paradigm to discuss *Heimat* as comprising a larger European space. I argue that Akin's work not only speaks to shared experiences of existential restlessness but also to the specific historical moment within which he and his fellow Europeans find themselves a moment characterized by the phenomena of globalization and the coming together of the European Union that compress space and fundamentally redefine our traditional sense of mobility and stasis.

Yet, in order to do so, I will first turn to Wim Wenders' film *Kings of the Road* which will serve as a foil for my subsequent analysis of *The Edge of Heaven*. Both the *Heimatfilm* and the road film tradition inform both films, which mark them as hybrid. This mixture of different genres neither fully turns into one nor the other. According to Norbert Grob, "Heimat ist eine Utopie, die unentwegt gesucht werden muss; im Wenders-Kino stets irgendwo draußen, in weiter Ferne"²¹ The same is true for Akin, as my analysis will

²¹ "Heimat is a utopia that constantly has to be searched; in Wenders's cinema always somewhere out

show. Reading *The Edge of Heaven* through the New German Cinema, especially Wenders' *Kings of the Road*, opens up the perspective to the past that informs Akin's oeuvre, and the present, in which *Heimat* engages with a larger European cross-cultural space and in which the New German Cinema still inspires contemporary filmmakers.

I present *The Edge of Heaven* as a *Heimatfilm* in the context of the transnational aesthetic. Not only does it question established territorial and cultural notions of *Heimat*, but it also shows new opportunities of *Heimat* constructions in the 21st century. Akin's film combines diverse elements from both the *Heimatfilm* and road film genre. By doing so, it harks back to German film history and revisits the 1970s New German Cinema. While being informed by the techniques of the New German Cinema, Akin literally takes a different route in his cross-cultural film, one that both progresses towards a consolation with *Heimat* instead of abandoning it, and that travels an enlarged European space rather than being confined by the Iron Curtain.

4.6 WIM WENDERS' *KINGS OF THE ROAD* — “PAPAS KINO IST TOT”

A quintessential predecessor of Akin's film, Wim Wender's *Im Lauf der Zeit* (*Kings of the Road*, 1976) critically engages with the past, present and future of Germany, particularly of German cinema, and deals with *Heimat* subliminally. The main characters Bruno Winter and Robert Lander are primarily interested in leaving home, in untying the bonds of their fathers' generation and in journeying without a final destination in mind. Whereas Bruno is

there, far away.”

constantly on the road to repair projectors in rural movie theaters, Robert, a linguist, just left his wife and suffers from depression, which makes him try to take his own life by speeding over the edge into a lake. Bruno, who happens to observe Robert's attempted suicide, decides to take Robert along in his moving truck, which serves as his home and workshop. Completely silent, while listening to an English song from Bruno's portable record player which substitutes for conversation, they travel along the Inner German Border without any other destination in mind besides the next movie theater in need of help. On their way, they revisit their old "homes," which involves a liberating confrontation for Robert with his father and the discovery of Bruno's home left empty and in decay. Significantly, Bruno and Robert's shared journey ends at the German-German border at a former U.S. military barracks. They part in opposite but undetermined directions.

It remains unclear as to where this road film is heading and where home might be in this *Heimatfilm*. According to Timothy Corrigan, the film "begins not with the desire to be somewhere or the vision of a new direction, but with the desire not to be somewhere and the choice of no direction" (Corrigan 27). The characters in *Kings of the Road* try to overcome the *Heimatfilm* by abandoning its salient motifs of home, belonging and family; yet they still continue to silently yearn for them. As Inga Scharf notes, "the notion of homelessness' at home pervades NGC [New German Cinema] films in the form of a *leitmotif*" (Scharf 202), thereby linking "at home" to West Germany as a larger cultural framework that does not offer a specific personal and local belonging. Hence, Wenders' characters have to be regarded as representations of their own contemporaries, who, despite a lack of itinerary and feelings of being lost, seek to move on in an attempt to alter their circumstances. Consequently, Robert eventually leaves a note to Bruno at the military barracks: "Es muss alles anders

werden" ("Everything has to change"). Although Wenders does not offer a decisive formula for change, he clearly indicates that things can no longer stay the same. Thus, *Kings of the Road* opposes established structures, thereby echoing the student movement, yet without offering anything but a void.

Another common *Heimatfilm* motif that is turned upside down is the father-son relationship which Wenders dismantles in a twofold way: Instead of placing its emphasis on the harmonious bond between father and son, the narrative discusses the various problems the characters face when dealing with their fathers. By openly confronting his father, Robert breaks the conventions of the patriarchal family system on a personal level whereas Bruno, by way of repairing old film projectors, stands in for Wenders and his fellow *Autorenfilmer*, who, through their new film culture and the Oberhausen Manifesto defy their father's generation publicly. The Oberhausen Manifesto was the declaration by the group of young German filmmakers on the occasion of the International Short Film Festival Oberhausen in 1962. The filmmakers declared the new film to be "free from outside influence of commercial partners" and "from the control of special interest groups." With their "concrete intellectual, formal, and economic conceptions about the production of the new German film" they were "as a collective prepared to take economic risks." The successful short films of these filmmakers became an "experimental basis for the feature film" (qtd. in Rentschler 2).

Thus, the motif of father and son is not only reversed by the return of the son to his former home and his subsequent departure, but it is also more comprising: The generation of the children (the 68ers and *Autoren*) confront the generation of their fathers, whose dominance (as patriarch of the family and cultural landscape of German film production) is no longer accepted.

To that effect, *Kings of the Road* is also a story about the condition of 1970s German film itself. Wenders defines Germany's cinematic status quo as being situated between Hollywood productions and outdated expressions of *Heimat*, also known as "Papap Kino." While Bruno repairs a projector, Robert waits for him outside, looking at film posters of the comedy *Zwei Bayern im Urwald* (*Two Bavarians in the Jungle*, 1957) and the Bavarian sex comedy *Auf der Alm, da gibt's koa Sünd* (*Bottoms Up*, 1974) typical examples of popular films operating with *Heimat* motifs in an exploitive manner. *Kings of the Road* defines German culture as reactionary, because it is operated by these outdated cultural productions, in contrast to things American, in particular music, that function as substitutes for the young German generation. Consequently, the appearance of American pop songs and citations in the film does not merely constitute the rhythm of the film, but also provides placeholders for a modern culture Robert and Bruno cannot find in 1970s Germany.

Yet, American culture is not embraced wholeheartedly. As Robert points out: "Die Amerikaner haben unser Unterbewusstsein kolonialisiert" ("The Americans colonized our sub-consciousness"), thus demonstrating his awareness of the American "master narrative" with its colonizing tendencies. However, the film's self-reflexivity through the format of the American road film genre, the characters' ambiguous constructedness as anti-heroes and the narrative tensions between a reactionary German culture versus a progressive Anglo-American one mark this statement as problematic. According to Gerd Gemünden, *Kings of the Road* depicts two young Germans "whose identities are shaped in decisive yet contradictory terms by the American way of life" (158). Yet, he points out that the Americanization of German postwar culture, the alleged "colonialization of the subconsciousness," "was much more voluntarily accepted, and any critique of this colonialization' is therefore often accom-

panied by elements of self-hatred and guilt” (Gemünden 32). Hence, the characters willingly allow for the aforementioned “manipulative” American ways to help them overcome their confining *Heimat*, which informs their dilemma. By doing so, it could be argued that Robert and Bruno are embracing America as a new *Heimat*, instead of creating their own German version of home that, as Wenders demonstrates, puts his characters in the midst of an existential strife.

Due to the influences of the road film genre, this struggle is literally driven by mobility. The characters are constantly on the move without a home or a destination. While moving along the German-German border, they are mapping out Germany’s geographical restriction as a decisive backdrop to their increasing reflections on their own identity conflicts. As a consequence, Bruno and Robert are literally traveling through an alleged *Heimat*, without being able to relate to it while displaying a genuine longing for a *Heimat* whose impact can still be felt in a number of contemporary films more than three decades later.

4.7 FATIH AKIN’S *THE EDGE OF HEAVEN* — *PAPAS KINO LEBT!*

Like Wender’s *Kings of the Road*, Fatih Akin’s film *Auf der anderen Seite* (*The Edge of Heaven*, 2007) follows a complementary structure of contrasting spaces and characters, whose lives are related and whose actions affect one another, partially without the characters’ awareness. The first two of three film parts “Yeter’s Death,” “Lotte’s Death” and “*The Edge of Heaven*” mostly take place simultaneously. The first half of the film is set primarily in Bremen, Germany, whereas the second half takes place in Istanbul and eventually Tra-

bzon, Turkey. While the plot advances, the entanglement of the depicted personal stories becomes obvious and the incidents prophesied in the titles of the respective parts (two deaths and a journey to “the other side”) become multi-layered through the inclusion of different perspectives.

Nejat, a Turkish German professor of German literature, is estranged from his father Ali, who is expelled from Germany, after having accidentally killed the Turkish prostitute Yeter. Unhappy with his life in Germany, Nejat decides to travel to Istanbul, in search of Yeter’s bereaved daughter Ayten who does not know about her mother’s death. Yet, instead of finding Ayten, Nejat’s journey turns into an experience of cross-cultural interactions. He decides to give up his university position in Germany and takes over a German bookstore in Istanbul. In the end, he tries to reconcile with his father who has taken up his former profession as fisherman in his birthplace Trabzon.

While Nejat is busy searching for Ayten and eventually with starting a new life in Turkey, Ayten who is part of an illegal activist group is on her way to her mother Yeter in Germany in an attempt to avoid being arrested by the Turkish police. Unable to find her mother, who does not work in any of Bremen’s shoe stores (as Yeter made her daughter believe in order to hide her true profession as prostitute), she chances upon the German student Lotte who provides her with a temporary home and with whom she falls in love. Yet, their romance is short-lived since. Ayten is deported back to Turkey as an illegal immigrant where she is imprisoned for her political activism. Lotte follows Ayten to Istanbul but instead of freeing Ayten she accidentally gets shot in the street. Upon learning of her daughter’s death, Lotte’s mother Susanne, too, decides to journey to Istanbul to mourn Lotte and to reconnect with Lotte’s girlfriend Ayten. There she meets Nejat, who was Lotte’s landlord and thus a vital

link between the present and the past. Their budding friendship not only helps Susanne to find hope in her new environment but it also provides Nejat with the emotional willingness to finally attempt reconciliation with his father. The film ends with Nejat sitting at the shore of Trabzon, awaiting his father's return from fishing while a storm looms on the horizon.

From this brief and rather simplified synopsis of the film's manifold layers and themes, several motifs of the classical *Heimatfilm* can be derived that were also prevalent in Wenders's *Kings of the Road*, be it a possible family reunion, the search for belonging, the (re)settlement in a new *Heimat* or father-son relations. These motifs will be the focus of my subsequent analysis of *The Edge of Heaven* with an occasional comparison with *Kings of the Road* in order to point out similarities of as well as differences from both narratives.

As stated previously, the father figure is problematized in both Wenders and Akin's films, which differs from the classical *Heimatfilm* narrative that invokes the parable of the prodigal son. In *Kings of the Road*, it is the father figure *per se* that is the problem, as Gemünden points out: "If one looks at Wenders's own statements about America, the United States seem to be portrayed as a kind of ersatz father; that is, as an alternative to a German fatherland tainted by a fascist past and unacceptable to the rebellious son" (160). Wenders' protagonists are the prodigal sons, who revisit their childhood homes. A decisive difference between these two films is the allusion to the biblical parable. While Bruno only finds an abandoned house on a Rhine island with an absent mother (the father died during the war), Robert encounters his father the way he has left him: sitting at his typewriter in his print shop of the Ostheimer newspaper that he publishes. Robert's return inverts the parable of the prodigal son that has been turned into a *Heimat* motif, such as in Luis Trenker's mountain film, in which all genre expectations are fulfilled, including the final realization

that there is no place like home. In Trenker's film, Tonio leaves his Tyrolean Mountains for New York City and experiences luxuries and poverty before he decides to return home after his downfall. In *Kings of the Road*, however, it is the son who denounces the father. Robert confronts him with the paternal repression that mother and son suffered from. He repeatedly commands him to remain silent before leaving for good.

Akin converts the parable of the prodigal son as well, but in different ways. *The Edge of Heaven* is the story of the prodigal father, because it is the father who leaves, albeit by force. The son abandons his father at first due to his killing of Yeter, but tries to find him eventually. The Islamic Festival of Sacrifice, whose Christian equivalent is the binding of Isaac, serves as a "touching tale" (Adelson) that brings the two cultures together and changes Nejat's mind about his father. He remembers that Ali once eased his fear of this story by reassuring him that he would not sacrifice Nejat and would even alienate God in order to protect him. Nejat decides to leave his bookstore with Susanne to visit him in Trabzon. However, whether they will meet again and restore their relation remains unclear. Thus, conflicts between father and son occur in both films, but while Robert and Bruno break with their fathers' generation, Nejat does attempt to reconnect with his father. Although it remains open if Nejat will go back home to Germany or stay with his father in Turkey (and find a new home there), his consoling gesture indicates his desire to connect the incompatible components of his *Heimat* that may or may not be spatially defined.

Both *Kings of the Road* and *The Edge of Heaven* visualize homes that do not correspond with classical territorial understandings of *Heimat*. The respective domestic spaces make clear visual statements. Robert and Bruno's "home" is a truck, and during Bruno's visit of his abandoned childhood home it becomes clear that the characters are homeless. In Akin's

film, by contrast, the characters have a house or apartment to inhabit. Ali's German home is small but cozy. Despite not having mastered the German language (and thus predestined to provoke German integration debates), he has settled in Bremen quite well, and enjoys growing tomatoes on his patio. Nevertheless, to the German legal system, Ali's home is not Germany, so he is expelled due to the right of residence after having killed Yeter. Back in Turkey, we only find him sitting outside, so it remains unclear what his "home" looks like. Susanne's house is depicted as a closed-off space in cool blue colors and she makes a clear distinction that this is "my [Susanne's] house" and not "your [Ayten's] house." This emphasizes both her initial reservation towards her daughter's lover and her conventional understanding of belonging. In contrast, when she mourns her daughter in a Turkish hotel room, she is framed in full red and green colors that emphasize her emotional state and affectedness, which contrasts her previous distanced depiction in cool colors.

Beyond invoking the same color codes as used by many *Autorenfilmer*, Akin's casting of the character of Susanne is significant. His choice of actor for this part reveals his goals in reframing German historical understandings of *Heimat*. Hanna Schygulla, the female icon of Rainer Werner Fassbinder's New German Cinema, plays the role of Susanne. Schygulla is best known from *Die Ehe der Maria Braun* (*The Marriage of Maria Braun*, 1979), in which she plays a character who chronicled the history of Germany through the end of the Third Reich into the *economic miracle* of the young Federal Republic. In *The Edge of Heaven* the character of Susanne updates Maria Braun in some ways, as she marks yet another decisive step of the FRG, an extension of Fassbinder's *BRD-Trilogie* that transgresses borders, charting out a new moment in the history of the Berlin Republic, in which she makes us aware of common grounds for a cross-cultural *New Heimat*. As already in *The*

Marriage of Maria Braun, Schygulla performs this transition within a melodramatic setting by communicating “touching tales.”

Yet, employing the concept of *Heimat* when referring to Akin’s road film without further explanation is not entirely accurate. Akin certainly does not depict Turkey as a home for his characters. In fact, whatever capacity Turkey has to serve as “home” is potentially enjoyed by all the characters including the “non-hyphenated Germans” Lotte, Susanne and even to a certain extent Nejat’s former bookstore owner Markus Obermüller. Nejat’s trip to Istanbul and Trabzon does not account for a homecoming narrative, given that his home is clearly Bremen. Yet, Özkan Ezli argues against the appropriateness of a *Heimat* discourse for *The Edge of Heaven* due to his assumption of a traditional and more limiting definition of *Heimat*. However, binary oppositions like either-or, of familiar and foreign, *Heimat* and *Fremde* do not apply to Akin. The *New Heimatfilm* framework operates on the global scale, uses genre-mixing and a multitude of *Heimat* expressions. Thus, *The Edge of Heaven* can be read as a “Möglichkeitsraum . . . , der die Phänomene Nation, Kultur, Lokalität und Globalität aus Lebensgeschichten speisend in neue Verhältnisse jenseits einer Entweder-oder-Logik von Integration und Desintegration setzt” (Ezli 10)²². As Machtans puts it, “Akin is a master at finding the balance between nostalgic longing and a reconciliatory, down-to-earth celebration of *Heimat* and belonging” (160). Therefore, *The Edge of Heaven* is a *New Heimatfilm* that depicts the new relation between nation, culture, locality and globality and, in its wake, reconfigures the concepts of *Heimat* and genre in their entirety. Moreover, Akin’s film suggests that other genres and narratives of identity-formation need to inform and alter

²² “scope of possibilities () supplying the phenomena nation, culture, locality and globality with life stories and putting them into new relations apart from an either-or-logic of integration and disintegration.”

the understanding of *Heimat* as well, which has to be found somewhere else literally on the other side. In more concrete terms, discussions on German, Turkish and German Turkish identity find their expression in the *New Heimatfilm* in combination of *Heimat* with the road film genre. This noun-noun relation is possibly a hyphenated identity itself: the two substantified nouns *Heimat* and road film.

Akın uses cinematographic as well as thematic elements of the road film in order to expand upon traditional perceptions of home and travel. The film, for example, accompanies scenes of Nejat with his car inside a gas station with a moving frame set in the Turkish countryside. The accompanying folk song, Kâzım Koyuncu's "Ben seni sevdiğumi," sung in the dialect of his father's place of birth, plays inside the gas station and is used repeatedly for Nejat's road trip. The repetition of this road scene and the theme song attest to the fact that Nejat constantly remains in transition and so do his identity, his relation to his father and his father's original *Heimat*.

In addition, Akın dissolves explicit territorial *Heimat* understandings by correlating German and Turkish culture. References to German 18th century literature, 20th century German and Turkish socialist movements, Turkish folk music and shared religious stories illustrate that numerous components travel with Akın's road film, thereby creating a visual dialogue between Germany and Turkey: Akın situates his characters in a contrasting and yet complementary web of cultural references. These narrative fragments are either specifically German (e.g. Goethe) or Turkish (e.g. Koyuncu's song) or shared by both (e.g. the story of Abraham and Ishmael) and thus function as "touching tales" that invoke familiarity on both sides of the Bosphorus as Susanne recognizes: "Diese Geschichte gibt es bei uns auch" ("We have the same story"). However, not even the allegedly specifically German or Turkish

fragments are without a cross-cultural connection: Goethe's *Die Leiden des jungen Werther* (*The Sorrows of Young Werther*, 1774) was one of the first texts translated into modern Turkish.²³ And concerning Koyuncu's song, there is a global connection that Deniz Göktürk proposes (210): When Nejat stops at a gas station during his road trip to Trabzon, he listens to it for the first time. The gas station owner does not miss out on his chance to pass on the popular myth that Koyuncu's death from cancer at a young age is related to the Chernobyl disaster – a shared threat in our “risk society” (Beck, *Risk Society*).

Moreover, the phrase “on the other side” in the film's title implies another presumed unity between Germany and Turkey, where Turkish, German and Turkish German identities and spaces – though as fragments – all come together in the film's references across nations and cultures, cinematic eras and genres. There are two sides, but they complement each other and offer different perspectives on Europe. Göktürk interprets the closing image of *The Edge of Heaven*, in which Nejat awaits his father at the seashore and looks at the horizon, as “an image that is echoed in the film's Turkish title *Yaşamın Kıyısında* (literally, On the Shore of Life’)” that “can be read on the background of the geopolitics around the Black Sea as an ironically distanced gaze at Europe from the other shore” (2078). The different sides are visually transposed also through a mirroring editing technique and movements into opposite directions. One example is Ayten's search for her mother Yeter in Bremen. While she and Lotte are going by car, Nejat and Yeter are traveling just above them in an elevated streetcar. The two pairings are not aware of each other and after a moment of traveling at the same speed in the same direction, the tracks change course and the streetcars go in a different direction. Another example of mirroring is the transport of coffins by plane from Germany

²³I thank Randall Halle for pointing this out to me.

to Turkey and vice versa. A Turkish character (Yeter) dies in Germany and her body is sent back to Turkey. A German character (Lotte) dies in Turkey and her body is sent back to Germany. The conveyor belt transports the coffins in these separate scenes into opposite directions, which makes it appear like a repeated shot. Along those lines, Barbara Menzel considers *The Edge of Heaven* a “Hoffnungsträger für soziale Beziehungen und kulturelle Verknüpfungen im globalen Zeitalter” (115)²⁴.

German film today is informed by notions of *Heimat* and mobility, as was already the case during the New German Cinema. Accordingly, considering the wave of films since the mid-1990s by Turkish German directors, Tunçay Kulaoğlu’s article “Der neue deutsche Film ist türkisch’?” picks up the Oberhausen slogan “Papas Kino ist tot” and suggests that directors with migrant backgrounds now represent the new Germany in cinema instead of the merely Germanic ones. While Kulaoğlu refers to the revival of the innovative and creative potential of the New German Cinema, we can say that with *The Edge of Heaven* in particular, Akin clearly references the New German Cinema as a filmic predecessor. Together, both Wenders and Akin offer constructive perspectives on *Heimat* and thus work towards the *New Heimatfilm*.

While *Heimat* was indicated as a space of confinement in *Im Lauf der Zeit* and traveling as its opposed concept, we find a connection between local belonging and travel in Akin’s border-crossing film that defines *Heimat* in new ways. Although the characters remain unsettled, there is a desire for a home in Akin’s film. In contrast to the classical *Heimatfilm* (which implies home is heaven) and also in opposition to the *Critical Heimatfilm* (home is hell), we do not know for sure if Nejat will choose one particular locality over another.

²⁴“hope for social relations and cultural connections in the global age.”

According to Machtans, this is also true for Akin. It remains unclear, “which part of his identity is emphasized in the press Turkish, German, or the hyphen itself depends to a large extent on newspapers’ stances on issues of migration and is deeply connected to the shifting self-image the Berlin Republic” (152). To these listed factors we can also add the further development of Akin’s hybrid cinema, and on a broader level, the progression of the negotiations about Turkey’s EU accession.

This open-endedness is a characteristic of the *New Heimatfilm*. Most importantly, *The Edge of Heaven* is formally expressed through genre hybridity. As Sabine Hake and Barbara Mennel note in their introduction to their recent volume *Turkish German Cinema in the New Millennium* (2012): “From its inception German cinema has been multicultural, accented, hybrid, and hyphenated; Turkish German cinema is only the latest manifestation of a model of cultural production and representation” (11). The New German Cinema that current filmmakers reference, particularly with migrant backgrounds, already emphasized this hybridity. When in the 1960s and 1970s *Autorenfilmer* felt foreign in their own country, they launched their anti-Heimat projects. Now German filmmakers engage with *Heimat* in more optimistic ways. As Arjun Appadurai points out in his discussion of globalization, thinking local is always a relational concept constituted by flows and disjunctures due to the mobility of “transitional agents” and electronic media (33). Thus, if the global and local are inevitably linked with each other, the combination of the *Heimat* and road film genres provide useful lenses for exploring the meaning of increased mobility within and beyond specific local contexts. This mixture enables current German film to break free from the American “master narrative” of the road film, the patriarchal *Heimatfilm* of the 1950s, and the pessimist counter-movements of the 1970s. Within the larger picture of a growing

Europe, no home is in place, and its transitional agents often seek for a *Heimat on the other side*. Thus, *The Edge of Heaven* gives an example of how classical *Heimat* spaces begin to dissolve in current German film, and yet engage with *Heimat* constructively.

4.8 CONCLUSION

All films discussed in this chapter share a tension between home and travel that developed into a stronger force in the past two decades with drastically changing geopolitical parameters. These effects are rooted deep in German film history on both sides of the former German-German border. To that effect, I included discussions of two films from the past that are not examples of the *New Heimatfilm* in order to demonstrate the historical moments of *Heimat* and the road film that the recent case studies relate back to.

Roland Oehme's DEFA film *How Do You Feed a Donkey?* (1973) has pursued its own (Eastern) European project already in the 1970s, albeit in international instead of transnational terms. Socialist brotherhood unifies different nations and serves as an image of the extended East German *Heimat* that is in tune with the progressive self-understanding of the German Democratic Republic. By traveling, this new *Heimat* (new in contrast to the post-fascist West German *Heimatfilme*) gets explored and seems boundless.

Around the same time in West Germany, Wim Wenders introduced his version of the road film genre that engaged with *Heimat* in critical ways. Compared to Oehme's film, *Kings of the Road* (1976) appears as a geographically and culturally confined space, although citizens of the Federal Republic were able to travel without any problems. Watching this film as a

predecessor of the *New Heimatfilm*, it becomes clear that the classical *Heimatfilm* era with its promotion of modern lifestyles and domesticity had to be abandoned due to a critical consciousness of place.

The actual *New Heimatfilme*, the results out of these differing predecessors, are Andrea Maria Dusl's *Blue Moon* (2002) and Fatih Akin's *The Edge of Heaven* (2007). Although both case studies are very different from each other in terms of their styles, they share a specific imagining of the community that we as spectators participate in most clearly. In Tamara Staudt's *Where the Grass is Greener*, the main character Eva comes from East Germany as well, but she has her home before traveling to Switzerland for pragmatic reasons. In *Blue Moon* it is the adventure and fascination of the unexplored East that sets Johnny in motion. And Jana suffers from a personal trauma after she lost her family, which the film strongly intertwines with the mourning for a lost Socialist *Heimat*. To ease her suffering, she embodies three different personalities, which allow her to fill the void without having to leave. This prevents her from true dwelling until she meets Johnny, who becomes a new *Heimat* for her. Stasis is marked as a psychological disorder. Similarly to Valeska Grisebach's *Longing*, in which the functional life within a rural East German community is interrupted as soon as the imagination of an elsewhere sets in. It might be anonymity, as in *Marseille*, that Grisebach's main character Markus might want to try, but it would remain open if he would be the prodigal husband, who comes back home again. The most complex form of imagination is *The Edge of Heaven* that finds its fullest expression at the intersection of various genres and is inspired by the rich history of the New German Cinema.

To travel means to search for something in these films. There is a combination between fleeting impressions and deeper engagement with new spaces as preliminary destinations that

form the *New Heimatfilm* as road film: 1) The *New Heimatfilm* is not only concerned with the present, but references the past, and thus provides a concrete socio-historical context; 2) *Heimat* is deterritorialized. Thus, the *New Heimatfilm* engages with *Heimat* on a larger European level; 3) The *New Heimatfilm* differentiates between dwelling and stasis. Stasis is the precondition for the collapse of a *Heimat* (which can then turn into a *Critical Heimatfilm*), whereas dwelling can only be experienced in its relation to mobility and change; 4) The hybrid *New Heimatfilm* genre develops alongside cultural identities. While non-hyphenated Germans were comprised in the *Heimatfilm*, the *New Heimatfilm* corresponds with shifts towards genre hybridity that provide less determined structures.

5.0 CONCLUSION — EUROPE/*HEIMAT*/FILM

In my dissertation I have given an overview of how *Heimat* conceptions have changed since the golden era of the classical *Heimatfilm* in the 1950s a time and style that is still commonly associated with *Heimat* discourses. The different filmic case studies show an engagement with *Heimat* that exceeds the traditional frameworks operating with the clearly connoted binary opposition *Heimat-Fremde*. Further, the films that I define as *New Heimatfilme* take larger global socio-political developments into consideration and do not exist in a timeless, idealized space withdrawn from reality. The fact that my selection of films comprises both smaller and larger productions shows what Randall Halle noted about the “[w]ork of film in the age of transnational production” (*German Film After Germany* 1): All films without exception “emerge[] as a product of global economies” (4). This shift in the overall mode of production also affects the status of a hybrid genre such as the *New Heimatfilm*. Once viewed as a popular genre that adhered to specific structures in order to meet viewer expectations, the *Heimatfilm* now has transgressed its former limitations. These changes comprise modes of production (e.g. the Franco-German production *Marseille* and the global cinema of Fatih Akin), political contexts (e.g. political corruption and globalization in *The Hypocrites*, labor migration in *Where the Grass is Greener*, and Turkey’s possible accession to the European Union in *The Edge of Heaven*), and no less the entanglement of genre and place that turn into

a new genre and space. Thus, the *New Heimatfilm* genre actively participates in discourses about questions of belonging against a larger European and globalized backdrop by drawing on its manifold forms. While the classical *Heimatfilm* certainly does serve as a contemporary witness of the 1950s and is inseparably linked with German identity formation, this function has been overlooked for several decades, and instead it was reduced to its entertainment purposes (von Moltke 16; Koch et al. 69). The popular films of the *New Heimatfilm* that deal with larger political issues as listed above indicate their critical gestures without necessarily signaling an art house appeal. To that effect, the *New Heimatfilm* does not differentiate between the art film and popular film *per se*, but uses bits and pieces from both, which contributes to its hybrid design.

In its three variations presented here (the rural, urban and road film), two cinematic traditions from the past and a current aesthetic have served as recurring points of reference: The New German Cinema (in *The Edge of Heaven*) and DEFA productions (in Staudt and Dresen's films). Both functioned in the past as place-specific systems of production, each developing a particular aesthetic. Although the New German Cinema and DEFA no longer exist, their aesthetics are still revived, as we have seen in *The Edge of Heaven* and *Blue Moon*. It seems that their core concerns are still of interest, which for the New German Cinema was the rupture with dominant modes of production and the socio-political sphere with its reactionary sentiments related to it. Hence, it does not come with surprise that directors with migrant backgrounds, who declare themselves as others within the young Federal Republic, use the legacy of the New German Cinema to take up a stance in current debates on multiculturalism and their share of German identity. These discourses are inevitably about *Heimat*.

DEFA marks a different case considering it was owned by the GDR state that had its artists work under the constant pressure of censorship. The specific production modes of DEFA deserve further attention. The *New Heimatfilm* within the Berlin Republic that reference DEFA productions (e.g. the reference to *The Legend of Paul and Paula* and *Solo Sunny* in *Where the Grass is Greener*) focus on their aesthetics and the burgeoning attention that current cultural production devotes to the GDR past. How this is currently performed differs from the immediate historical approach that mainly focused on injustice in the Socialist state. Further, newer investigations of the GDR are often falsely labeled as belonging to *Ostalgie* (literally Eastalgia, a combination of East and nostalgia) that merely glorifies the GDR past. Among those were films like Leander Haußmann's *Sonnenallee* (*Sun Alley*, 1999) or Wolfgang Becker's *Good Bye Lenin!* (2003). However, Nick Hodgkin makes a case for a more critical reading of Haußmann's and Becker's films that makes them unfit for the classification as *Ostalgiefilme* (192). Instead, in the past decade East German authors and directors gave personal accounts in films like Christian Schwochow's *Novemberkind* (*November Child*, 2008) and Jana Hensel's autobiographical novel *Zonenkinder* (*After the Wall*, 2002).

The Berlin School films (*Longing* and *Marseille*) demonstrate another branch of the *New Heimatfilm* that is grounded within German film history, but that seeks for innovative expressions apart from references to the cinematic past. Hence, it is less based on generic principles. *Heimat* has returned in cultural production and in political discourse, and for the first time, *Heimat* is not subsumed within only one framework. The different ways of exploring *Heimat*, drawing on the traditions of the New German Cinema, DEFA, Berlin School, the urban film, the road film genre etc. attest to that. The *New Heimatfilm* participates with its critical investigation of place, a legacy from the *Critical Heimatfilm* of the 1960s and 1970s, in this

endeavor. However, in contrast to the *Critical Heimatfilm*, which deconstructed *Heimat* and condemned its very principles, the *New Heimatfilm* has to be understood as a progressive continuation at a point in time, during which global interconnectedness both threatens, but during which it can also be understood as an enlarged realm of experience, and in which *Heimat* is deterritorialized from both place and genre.

To that effect, the *New Heimatfilm*, beyond being the descendant of the classical *Heimatfilm*, shares certain characteristics with the *Critical Heimatfilm* of the 1960s and 1970s that are not shared with the classical *Heimatfilm* genre: 1) Socially critical and leftist values as they were opposing the contemporary political conservatism; 2) A variety of generic forms such as the urban and road movie; 3) A projection of different spaces and their lifestyles; 4) A causality between the past and the present. In chapter two and three, we saw the socially critical and leftist values in *The Hypocrites*, *Where the Grass is Greener*, *Night Shapes*, and *Summer in Berlin*. In chapter three, films like *Summer in Berlin* and *The Drifter* showed the move of the *Heimatfilm* genre from the rural countryside to the urban and metropolitan as the significant, if not central, setting. Films like *Where the Grass is Greener*, *Marseille*, and *Blue Moon* revealed the projection for different spaces and their lifestyles. And finally, the causality between the past and the present appeared in *Longing*, *Where the Grass is Greener*, *Blue Moon*, and *The Edge of Heaven*. For the development of a European identity as a European *Heimat* these points are crucial, because they allow for a critical engagement with current discourses that involve all Europeans (e.g. the accession of new European member states). In order to reach a transnational “Us” (a European community) instead of a national “They” (and certainly of a Socialist, international “Us” as in *How Do You Feed a Donkey?*), the *New Heimatfilm* provides a platform that has not been there before.

Still, it must be underscored that the *New Heimatfilm* involves some significant shifts away from the critical films of the 70s. For instance this project has discussed extensively the new *Heimat* spaces (the urban, the road) and the emergence of atypical *Heimat* spaces (that are dissociated from national or cultural origin, such as *The Edge of Heaven*). The urban space is closely related to developments on the global scale, such as gentrification processes and the new economy. While I was discussing how even rural spaces are not safe from these challenges (see e.g. the corrupted village in *The Hypocrites*, working migration in the suburb in *Where the Grass is Greener*), it is usually the global city that displays these changes (such as in *Night Shapes* and *The Drifter*, which also depicts an anti-Heimat). Accordingly, the urban *Heimat* is threatened by change (*Summer in Berlin* and *The Drifter*). In the Berlin School film, the city is not the dynamic and liberating place that it is often associated with, but it is no less confining than the rural place in Grisebach's depiction of Zühlen. *Marseille* shows Sophie's sense of entrapment in Berlin and experience of freedom by traveling to another European city. These changing parameters within the urban space are often communicated through the eyes of a *flâneur* or *flâneuse*, who must have a minimum attachment to place for their reflections to be possible. The fact that they are able to see the common quotidian with "new eyes," (i.e. the camera's observational mode is dynamized here) prevents the film and its characters from developing what Simmel described as the blasé attitude. Thus, *flâneurs* are transients, who participate in the reading of space through movement and with them, the film positions the spectators in this role as well: everything is made local and wondrous by and for the camera. Through their movement and reflections they turn place into space. As operators within Second Modernity, they are often displayed as society's outsiders, which become most apparent in female *flânerie*. No

longer defined through consumerism, the contemporary new *flâneuse* critically investigates changing spatial, social and economic parameters. Within the *New Heimatfilm* context, this presents a newly-gained agency in contradistinction from the classical *Heimatfilm*. As demonstrated in *The Drifter*, the city's outline has changed in Second Modernity, which complicates dwelling for the incompatible *flâneuse*, who must learn dwelling anew. This *New Heimatfilm* turned into a hostile environment for women, who do not want to adapt to the city's alleged progression. Films like *Summer in Berlin* or *Marseille*, by contrast, depict possibilities of attachment within the city despite challenging conditions in the post-1990 era.

What I boldly kept referring to as the genre of the *New Heimatfilm*, certainly is still in the process of its formation. Yet, it might be the “liquid lava of a new genre still in the creation process” (Altman 143). We are moving towards the *New Heimatfilm*. At this point, the “new” is the necessary “adjective-to-noun progression” (51) that can become a full status. Beyond the formal aspect of genre formation, what the imagining of the community and processes of genrification have in common, is a dialectical process within an already existing community or genre (206). Thus, the films I discussed imagine their local homes within Europe (*The Hypocrites*, *Where the Grass is Greener*) or Europe as a home (*Marseille*, *Blue Moon*, *The Edge of Heaven*). In their hybrid forms, these geographical and generic border-crossings bring forth a plurality of *Heimat* as a transnational aesthetic.

Starting from the categorization of most of the analyzed films as *Heimatfilme* (with the exception of *Longing*), we could add adjectives like critical (*Hierankl*), globalized (*The Hypocrites*), *Socialist Realist* (*Where the Grass is Greener*) or optimistic Realist (Dresen's oeuvre). This procedure follows Rick Altman's suggested principle of genrification. However,

in the case of *Longing*, we already noticed that a clearly substantiated genre is neither given nor can it be easily determined. Nevertheless, we can relate its discussion to the development of the *New Heimatfilm* genre, which means that the linguistic approach that is based on the hierarchy between noun and adjective is not sufficient, also because it excludes the dynamic process. The discussions of case studies in the urban and road film chapters demonstrated this problem even further.

All of these contrasting sub-categories of the *New Heimatfilm* inform this genre simultaneously. Its focus on mobility that brings forth new forms evokes Michel de Certeau's essay "Spatial Stories" again: "Every story is a travel story a spatial practice" and "every day, they traverse and organize places; they select and link them together; they make sentences and itineraries out of them. They are spatial trajectories" (115). If this describes the production of a text that is capable of creating new spaces, it prepares the soil for the emergence of something unprecedented. We can derive a principle for the formation of the *New Heimatfilm* genre: starting from *Heimat* as place, it operates with a variety of connections to different modes and genres. Through the "passages back and forth" it overcomes "the law of place," in de Certeau's terms. The overcoming of place corresponds with the overcoming of genre and creates a new hybrid that connects with various entities.

Generic representation becomes permeable, so that the *New Heimatfilm* has to be defined as a mixture of different genres while being able to move along with the exploration of the European space. The distinctive hybrid qualities of the *New Heimatfilm* include 1) the motif of increased movement with a less competitive site specificity as a result of deterritorialization: identifiable German and European landscapes and lifestyles are no longer treated as positive or negative foils of each other; 2) a critical self-awareness as shown through film historical

precursors. References to the New German Cinema or DEFA sustain the “passage” between genres, because these differing past traditions distanced themselves largely from genre cinema as low cultural film to the greatest possible extent; 3) a tendency towards the lack of closure that further works against generic categorization.

We can include further examples from the documentary genre, such as Sung-Hyung Cho’s *Full Metal Village* (2006), a film that focuses on the idyllic town of Wacken, where nevertheless once a year the biggest heavy metal festival of the world takes place. This film consciously identifies itself in its opening as “a *New Heimatfilm*.” Or we can turn towards the TV crime series, such as the German classic *Tatort* (Crime Scene, since 1970), Michael Haneke’s *Das weiße Band* (*The White Ribbon*, 2009) or Christian Petzold, Dominik Hochhäusler and Thomas Arslan’s *Dreileben* experiment (2011) that all further dissect the notion of a coherent *Heimat* understanding. More films that engage with *Heimat* in new ways will be made, and more films from various other genres need to be examined. We can expect these films to become even more inclusive in their projection and imagination of other countries as deterritorialized *Heimat*. Possibly more *New Heimatfilme* will appeal to a European audience. Some *New Heimatfilme*, in that regard, can teach us about the opportunities that come along with an extended European space (such as *Where the Grass is Greener*, in which the viewer is led to see the options on the European job market). What the *New Heimatfilm* does not do, is focus entirely on Europe’s limitations. Thus, its progression is marked by its liberation from the past *Critical Heimatfilm* that was decidedly didactic.

In that regard, the question remains open if the *New Heimatfilm* is merely a German genre within Europe or a European one that is here viewed from within a German-centered

perspective and needs further exploration. Most of my case studies are oriented towards a German-speaking audience with the German-French film *Marseille* and the German-Turkish-English film *The Edge of Heaven* as the only exceptions. My dissertation is limited to Germany and its specific *Heimat* discourse that evolved alongside the controversial theories of Germany's *Sonderweg* (literally, "special path") through history and its more recent attempts towards "normalization." Nevertheless, other European countries participate in the same geopolitical transformations. Although they are specific to each nation, home, identity, and belonging matter to everybody. Despite Germany's specific relation to *Heimat*, which was always an important but never a lighthearted concept, it is possible that *Heimat* is a German term that reveals something universal about the condition of belonging, community and locality. And thus, in my next project, I will focus specifically on the visual cultures of urban and rural spaces in other national cinemas since the 1990s. I am most interested in films that redefine or challenge the images of "home" in the context of Europe as an enlarging realm of experience and increasing mobility across borders.

As European parameters and the formation of a European identity change, so do national cinemas of Europe. In 2002, before the fall of Europe's internal borders, Mike Wayne notes that "a pan-European cinema will need to construct itself out of elements of national cinemas in much the same way as national cultures constructed themselves out of the local and regional cultural materials" (74). According to Wayne, a pan-European cinema can emerge out of co-productions that evolve around border-crossing travel narratives. In this regard, I suggest that changing notions of home against a larger European backdrop serve as an important shared European theme, which plays a role in several national cinemas. To name only a few, in Sue Clayton's Irish-Swedish film *The Disappearance of Finbar* from 1996, the

protagonists struggle to expand the narrow horizons that their Dublin home imposes on them, and resemble the contradictory forces of rootedness and restlessness evident in the contemporary world. François Ozon's *Gouttes d'eau sur pierres brûlantes* (*Water Drops on Burning Rocks*, 2000) is an adaptation of a German play by Rainer Werner Fassbinder and includes visual cues of the classical *Heimatfilm* genre. And as I indicated with the discussion of an Austrian road film that is mostly set in Eastern Europe and that deals with a case of post-Soviet homelessness, the struggle for a home in post-communist films may play a vital role as well.

If and how other national cinemas have begun to move towards a deterritorialized understanding of home and belonging that parallels the German *Heimat* needs further consideration. Extending this research to both national cinemas and European cinema as a whole is the natural next step. To that effect, we can view the main character in Wim Wenders' *Lisbon Story* as an example for all Europeans. He drives across Europe, translates the word *Heimatland* (home country) into different European languages and states: "Yes, here I am at home. This is my home country."

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abel, Marco. "Intensifying Life. The Cinema of the Berlin School." *Cineaste* 33.(4 Mar. 13, 2008). Web. 14 July 2013.
- Adelson, Leslie A. "Touching Tales of Turks, Germans and Jews: Cultural Alterity, Historical Narrative, and Literary Riddles for the 1990s." *New German Critique* 80.(2000): 93. Print.
- Altman, Rick. *Film/Genre*. British Film Institute, May 1, 1999. Print.
- Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. Verso, 1991. Print.
- Ankum, Katharina von. *Women in the Metropolis: Gender and Modernity in Weimar Culture*. University of California Press, 1997. Print.
- Appadurai, Arjun. *Modernity At Large: Cultural Dimensions of Globalization*. 1st ed. U of Minnesota P, Nov. 15, 1996. Print.
- Applegate, Celia. *A Nation of Provincials: The German Idea of Heimat*. University of California Press, 1990. Print.
- Augé, Marc. *Non-Places: Introduction to an Anthropology of Supermodernity*. Verso, 1995. Print.
- Bachmann-Medick, Doris. *Cultural Turns*. 3., neu bearbeitete Auflage, Nachdruck. Rowohlt Taschenbuch Verla, 2006. Print.

- Bake, Hendrike. "Filmkritik." Programm kino.de. Arthouse-, Filmkunst- Und Programmkinos in Deutschland. (July 2013). Web. 10 July 2013.
- Bakhtin, M. Mikhail Mikhailovich. *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays*. University of Texas Press, 1981. Print.
- Baute, Michael, et al. "Berliner Schule. Eine Collage." *Kolik Film* (Sonderheft 6, October 2006 Apr. 2008). Web.
- Beck, Ulrich. *Risk Society: Towards a New Modernity*. SAGE Publications, Sept. 3, 1992. Print.
- . *Risk Society: Towards a New Modernity*. SAGE, Sept. 3, 1992. Print.
- . *Was Ist Globalisierung?* Wiley, Feb. 3, 2000. Print.
- Beck, Ulrich, Scott Lash, and Philipp Rang. *Reflexive Modernisierung: eine Kontroverse*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1996. Print.
- Benjamin, Walter. "The Flâneur." *Gesammelte Schriften*. Frankfurt a.M.: Suhrkamp, 1972. 524–569. Print.
- Berlinale.de. "Internationale Filmfestspiele Berlin." Berlinale. (Mar. 2011). Web.
- Betz, Mark. *Beyond the Subtitle: Remapping European Art Cinema*. Univ Of Minnesota Press, May 21, 2009. Print.
- Bhabha, Homi K. *The Location of Culture*. Routledge, Oct. 12, 2012. Print.
- Blickle, Peter. *Heimat: A Critical Theory Of The German Idea Of Homeland*. Camden House, 2004. Print.
- Boa, Elizabeth and Rachel Palfreyman. *Heimat - A German Dream : Regional Loyalties and National Identity in German Culture 1890-1990: Regional Loyalties and National Identity in German Culture 1890-1990*. Oxford University Press, Sept. 21, 2000. Print.

- Boccaccio, Giovanni. *The Decameron*. The Decameron / Giovanni Boccaccio. Penguin Books, 2004. Print.
- Bordwell, David and Kristin Thompson. *Film Art: An Introduction*. 7th. Mcgraw-Hill College, June 2003. Print.
- Bota, Alice, Khuê Pham, and Özlem Topçu. *Wir neuen Deutschen: Wer wir sind, was wir wollen*. 2nd ed. Rowohlt, Sept. 7, 2012. Print.
- Bourget, Jean-Loup. "Social Implications in the Hollywood Genres." *Film Genre Reader IV*. Austin: U of Texas P, 2012. 69–77. Print.
- Braudy, Leo. "From the World in a Frame. Genre - The Conventions of Connection." *Film Theory and Criticism: Introductory Readings*. Ed. Braudy, Leo and Cohen, Marshall. 2004. 663–679. Print.
- Braudy, Leo and Marshall Cohen, eds. *Film Theory and Criticism*. Seventh Edition. Oxford University Press, USA, Jan. 14, 2009. Print.
- , eds. *Film Theory and Criticism: Introductory Readings*. 6th. Oxford University Press, USA, Mar. 11, 2004. Print.
- Brauerhoch, Annette. "‘Ich Frau, du auch Frau.’ Die Heimat des Geschlechts in Helma Sanders-Brahms’ Film ‘Shirins Hochzeit (BRD 1976).’" *Kein Land in Sicht. Heimat - weiblich?* München: Wilhelm Fink Verlag, 1997. 159–168. Print.
- Busch, Werner. "Eichbaum im Schnee." Schnitt Online. *Schnitt Online* (2012). Web. 10 July 2013.
- Certeau, Michel de. *The Practice of Everyday Life*. Reprint. University of California Press, Dec. 1, 2011. Print.
- Chiari, Valeria. "Andrea Maria Dusl: Director." *Cineuropa* (2013). Web. 23 Mar. 2013.
- Cohan, Steven. "Teaching Film Genre(s)." *Teaching Film*. Options for Teaching 35. New York: MLA, 2012. 224–232. Print. Options for Teaching 35.

- Corrigan, Timothy. *New German Film: The Displaced Image*. Revised. Indiana Univ Pr, May 1994. Print.
- Cowles, Maria Green, Thomas Risse, and James A. Caporaso. *Transforming Europe: Europeanization and Domestic Change*. Cornell Univ Pr, Feb. 2001. Print.
- Cox, Ayça Tunç. “Hyphenated Identities. The Reception of Turkish German Cinema in the Turkish Daily Press.” *Turkish German Cinema in the New Millennium. Sites, Sounds, and Screens*. New York: Berghahn Books, 2012. 161–173. Print.
- Davidson, John E. *Deterritorializing the New German Cinema*. U of Minnesota Press, 1999. Print.
- DEFA Stiftung. “Tamara Staudt.” (Mar. 2013). Web. 23 Mar. 2013.
- Deleuze, Gilles and Félix Guattari. *Anti-Oedipus*. Continuum International Publishing Group, Sept. 1, 2004. Print.
- Deleuze, Gilles and Eugene W. Holland. *Deleuze and Guattari’s Anti-Oedipus: Introduction to Schizoanalysis*. Routledge, 1999. Print.
- Der Deutsche Heimatfilm: Bildwelten und Weltbilder: Bilder, Texte, Analysen zu 70 Jahren deutscher Filmgeschichte*. Tübinger Vereinigung für Volkskunde, 1989. Print.
- Der Spiegel. “Geh über die Dörfer!” *Der Spiegel* 40.(Jan. 10, 1984). Web. 15 July 2013.
- Der Spiegel*. “Hausmitteilung.” *Der Spiegel* 15.(Apr. 7, 2012): 5. Print.
- . “Herzlich willkommen in Hollyroth.” *Der Spiegel* 40.(July 1984). Web. 14 July 2013.
- Der Spiegel. “Herzlich willkommen in Hollyroth. Augenschein in den ‘Heimat’-Dörfern des Hunsrück.” (Oct. 1984). Web. 14 July 2013.
- Dimendberg, Edward. *Film Noir and the Spaces of Modernity*. Harvard University Press, June 15, 2004. Print.

- Eigler, Friederike. "Critical Approaches to Heimat and the "Spatial Turn"." *New German Critique* 39.(1 115 Feb. 2, 2012): 27–48. Web. 22 Mar. 2013.
- Eigler, Friederike and Jens Kugele. *'Heimat': At the Intersection of Memory and Space*. Walter de Gruyter, Oct. 1, 2012. Print.
- Elsaesser, Thomas. *European Cinema: Face to Face With Hollywood*. Amsterdam University Press, 2005. Print.
- Enzensberger, Hans Magnus. *Ach Europa!* Non Basic Stock Line, Nov. 1, 1989. Print.
- Erlich, Victor. *Russian Formalism: History - Doctrine*. Walter de Gruyter, Jan. 1, 1980. Print.
- Everett, Wendy Ellen. *European Identity in Cinema*. Intellect Books, 2005. Print.
- Ezli, Özkan. *Kultur als Ereignis: Fatih Akıns Film Auf der anderen Seite als transkulturelle Narration*. 1., Aufl. Transcript, Nov. 2010. Print.
- Featherstone, Mike and Scott Lash. *Spaces of Culture: City, Nation, World*. London [etc.]: SAGE, 1999. Print.
- Fischer, Lucy. "City of Women: Busby Berkeley, Architecture, and Urban Space." *Cinema Journal* 49.(4 June 2010). 111: 111+. Print.
- Fischer, Lucy and Patrice Petro, eds. *Teaching Film*. Modern Language Association of America, June 15, 2012. Print.
- Freud, Sigmund. *The Uncanny*. Penguin, 2003. Print.
- Freud, Sigmund; James Strachey; Anna Freud. *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud Volume XVII: (1917-1919) An Infantile Neurosis and Other Works*. 1ST edition. London:HogarthPress,InstituteofPsycho-Analysis, print.

- Friedberg, Anne. *The Virtual Window: From Alberti to Microsoft*. MIT Press, Apr. 30, 2009. Print.
- . *Window Shopping: Cinema & the Postmodern*. University of California Press, 1994. Print.
- Friedman, Susan Stanford. *Mappings*. Princeton University Press, Oct. 19, 1998. Print.
- Frisby, David. "The Flâneur in Social Theory." *The Flâneur*. London: Routledge, 1994. 81–110. Print.
- Gaida, Evelyn. "Eine flexible Frau - Ein Film von Tatjana Turanskyj." *Aviva Online Magazin für Frauen* (June 2011). Web. 17 Mar. 2013.
- Galt, Rosalind. *The New European Cinema: Redrawing the Map*. Columbia University Press, 2006. Print.
- Gansera, Rainer. "Glücks-Pickpocket. Thomas Arslans traumhafter Film "Der schöne Tag"." *Süddeutsche Zeitung* (Nov. 3, 2001). Print.
- Gemünden, Gerd. *Framed Visions: Popular Culture, Americanization, and the Contemporary German and Austrian Imagination*. U of Michigan P, 1998. Print.
- Gersch, Wolfgang. "Film in der DDR. Die verlorene Alternative." *Geschichte des deutschen Films*. Weimar: Metzler, 1993. 323–364. Print.
- Gersdorff, Dagmar von. *Die Erde ist mir Heimat nicht geworden: Das Leben der Karoline von Günderrode*. 1st ed. Insel Verlag, Feb. 20, 2006. Print.
- Giering, Frank. "Johanna Wokalek in 'Hierankl.' Ganz oder gar nicht." *Der Spiegel* (11 February 2003). Web.
- Gilloch, Graeme. *Myth and Metropolis: Walter Benjamin and the City*. First Paperback Edition. Polity, Dec. 12, 1997. Print.

- Gleber, Anke. *The Art of Taking a Walk: Flanerie, Literature, and Film in Weimar Culture*. Princeton University Press, 1999. Print.
- Gledhill, Christine. "Rethinking Genre." *Reinventing Film Studies*. New York: Oxford UP, 2000. 221–243. Print.
- Gledhill, Christine and Linda Williams. *Reinventing Film Studies*. Bloomsbury USA, Mar. 27, 2000. Print.
- Göktürk, Deniz. "World Cinema Goes Digital. Looking at Europe from the Other Shore." *Turkish German Cinema in the New Millennium. Sites, Sounds, and Screens*. New York: Berghahn Books, 2012. 198–211. Print.
- Grammatikopoulos, Herbert et al. "Stadt(heimat)film." *Der deutsche Heimatfilm. Bildwelten und Weltbilder. Bilder, Texte, Analysen zu 70 Jahren deutscher Filmgeschichte*. Tübingen: Tübinger Chronik e.G., 1989. 173–191. Print.
- Grant, Barry Keith, ed. *Film Genre Reader IV*. 4th ed. University of Texas Press, Dec. 15, 2012. Print.
- . "Social Implications in the Hollywood Genres." *Film Genre Reader II*. Ed. Barry Keith Grant. Austin: University of Texas Press, Jan. 1995. 50–58. Print.
- Grob, Norbert. *Wenders*. Spiess Volker GmbH, 1991. Print.
- Grob, Norbert; Thomas Klein. *Road Movies 1*. Bender Theo Verlag, July 1, 2006. Print.
- Haase, Christine. *When Heimat Meets Hollywood: German Filmmakers in America, 1985-2005*. Camden House, 2007. Print.
- Habermas, Jürgen. *The Crisis of the European Union: A Response*. 1st ed. Polity, June 19, 2012. Print.
- Hader, Josef. "Hader online." (Mar. 2013). Web. 23 Mar. 2013.

- Hake, Sabine and Barbara Mennel. *Turkish German Cinema in the New Millennium: Sites, Sounds, and Screens*. Berghahn Books, Oct. 15, 2012. Print.
- Halle, Randall. *German Film After Germany: Toward a Transnational Aesthetic*. Urbana: U of Illinois P, 2008. Print.
- . “German Film, Aufgehoben: Ensembles of Transnational Cinema.” *New German Critique* (87 Oct. 1, 2002): 7–46. Web. 17 Mar. 2013.
- . “Großstadtfilm and Gentrification Debates.” *New German Critique* (120): 171–191. Print.
- Halle, Randall and Margaret McCarthy. *Light Motives: German Popular Cinema in Perspective*. Wayne State U P, May 2003. Print.
- Halle, Randall and Reinhild Steingröver. *After the Avant-Garde: Contemporary German and Austrian Experimental Film*. Camden House, 2008. Print.
- Harvey, Melinda. “From Passante to Flâneuse: Encountering the Prostitute in Dorothy Richardson’s Pilgrimage.” *Journal of Urban History* 27.(6 Sept. 1, 2001): 746–764. Web. 23 Mar. 2013.
- Hefty, Georg Paul. “Angst vor der Transferunion? Heimat Europa.” *FAZ* (July 21, 2011). Web. 23 Mar. 2013.
- Heidegger, Martin. “Building Dwelling Thinking.” *Basic Writings. From 'Being and Time' (1927) to 'The Task of Thinking' (1964)*. London: HarperCollins, 1977. 344–363. Print.
- . *Poetry, Language, Thought. Translations and Introduction by Albert Hofstadter*. New York, Harper & Row, 1971. Print.
- Herminghouse, Patricia and Magda Mueller, eds. *Gender and Germanness: Cultural Productions of Nation*. Berghahn Books, Feb. 3, 2003. Print.

- Herrmann, Mareike. "Geisterlandschaften: The Memory of Heimat in Recent Berlin School Films." *Heimat' At the Intersection of Space and Memory MCM 14*. Ed. Friederike Eigler and Jens Kugele. de Gruyter, Sept. 15, 2012. 158–175. Print.
- Hess Wright, Judith. "Genre Films and the Status Quo." *Film Genre Reader IV*. Austin: U of Texas P, 2012. 60–68. Print.
- Hickethier, Knut. "Auf dass einem etwas wiederfährt. Road Movies im deutschen Film." *Road Movies. Genres/Stile 2*. Mainz: Bender Verlag, 2006. 128–164. Print. Genres/Stile 2.
- Hodgin, Nick. *Screening the East: Heimat, Memory and Nostalgia in German Film Since 1989*. Berghahn Books, May 1, 2011. Print.
- Höfig, Willi. *Der deutsche Heimatfilm 1947-1960*. F. Enke, 1973. Print.
- "Interview mit Andreas Dresen." (July 2013). Web. 26 July 2013.
- Jacobsen, Wolfgang, Anton Kaes, and Hans Helmut Prinzler. *Geschichte des deutschen Films*. 2., aktualis. und erw. A. Metzler, 2004. Print.
- Kara, Yade. *Selam Berlin*. 8., Aufl. Diogenes, Oct. 2004. Print.
- Kara, Yadé. *Cafe Cyprus*. 1. Diogenes, 2010. Print.
- King, Alasdair. "Placing "Green is the Heath" (1951). Spatial Politics and Emergent West German Identity." *Light Motives. German Popular Film in Perspective*. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 2003. 130–147. Print.
- Knörer, Ekkehard. "Luminous Days: Notes on the New German Cinema." *Vertigo Magazine* 3.(Spring 2007). Web. 23 Mar. 2013.
- Koepnick, Lutz and Stephan K. Schindler, eds. *The Cosmopolitan Screen*. U of Michigan P, Apr. 30, 2007. Print.

- Kracauer, Siegfried. *From Caligari to Hitler: A Psychological History of the German Film (Princeton Classic Editions)*. Rev Exp edition. Princeton University Press, Mar. 22, 2004. Print.
- Kulaoglu, Tuncay. "Der neue 'deutsche' Film ist 'türkisch'? Eine neue Generation bringt Leben in die Filmlandschaft." *Filmforum* 16 (Feb. 1999): 8–11. Print.
- Laderman, David. *Driving Visions: Exploring the Road Movie*. U of Texas P, July 15, 2002. Print.
- Lash, Scott and Mike Featherstone. *Spaces of Culture: City, Nation, World*. SAGE, Mar. 28, 1999. Print.
- Lauterbach, Alexandra. "Ist Berlin für Sie eine gefährliche Stadt, Herr Dresden?" *Der Tagesspiegel* (Aug. 11, 1999). Print.
- . "Ist Berlin für Sie eine gefährliche Stadt, Herr Dresden?" *Der Tagesspiegel* (1999). Print.
- Lode, David. *Abenteuer Wirklichkeit - Die Filme von Andreas Dresen*. Schüren Verlag, Sept. 1, 2009. Print.
- Lyon, John B. *Out of Place: German Realism, Displacement, and Modernity*. Bloomsbury Academic, 2013. Print.
- Machtans, Karolin. "The Perception and Marketing of Fatih Akin in the German Press." *Turkish German Cinema in the New Millennium. Sites, Sounds, and Screens*. New York: Berghahn Books, 2012. 149–160. Print.
- Majer-O'Sickey, Ingeborg. "Framing the Unheimlich. Heimatfilm and Bambi." *Gender and Germanness. Cultural Productions of Nation*. Providence: Berghahn Books, 1997. 202–126. Print.
- Mazierska, Ewa and Laura Rascaroli. *Crossing New Europe: Postmodern Travel and the European Road Movie*. Wallflower Press, Sept. 18, 2006. Print.

- Mennel, Barbara. "Überkreuzungen in globaler Zeit und globalem Raum in Fatih Akin's "Auf der anderen Seite"." (2010): 95–118. Print.
- Mittmann, Elizabeth. "Fantasizing Integration and Escape in the Post-Unification Road Movie." *Light Motives. German Popular Film in Perspective*. Detroit: Wayne State UP, 2003. 326–348. Print.
- Moltke, Johannes von. *No Place Like Home: Locations of Heimat in German Cinema*. U of California P, 2005. Print.
- Neale, Steve. *Genre and Hollywood*. Routledge, Jan. 30, 2000. Print.
- Nederveen Pieterse, Jan. *Globalization and Culture: Global Mélange*. Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Mar. 16, 2009. Print.
- Newmark, Catherine. "Mit der Kuh auf du und du." *Berliner Zeitung Online* (Mar. 2009). Web. 23 Mar. 2013.
- Pelz, Annegret. "Europa in die Karten geschaut. Bilder und Figuren europäischer Herkunft." *Kein Land in Sicht. Heimat - weiblich?* München: Wilhelm Fink Verlag, 1997. 169–186. Print.
- Petro, Patrice. *Joyless Streets: Women and Melodramatic Representation in Weimar, Germany*. Princeton University Press, 1989. Print.
- Rentschler, Eric. *West German filmmakers on Film: Visions and Voices*. Holmes & Meier, 1988. Print.
- Rickels, Laurence A. *Ulrike Ottinger: The Autobiography of Art Cinema*. U of Minnesota P, July 29, 2008. Print.
- Rilke, Rainer Maria. "Archaischer Torso Apollos." *Der neuen Gedichte anderer Teil*. Berlin: Zenodot Verlagsgesellschaft, 2010. Print.
- . *Der neuen Gedichte anderer Teil*: Zenodot Verlagsgesellschaft, Dec. 7, 2010. Print.

- . *Neue Gedichte / Der neuen Gedichte anderer Teil (German Edition)*. CreateSpace Independent Publishing Platform, Mar. 7, 2013. Print.
- . *The notebooks of Malte Laurids Brigge*. London: Penguin, 2009. Print.
- Ronneberger, Klaus, Stephan Lanz, and Walther Jahn. "Die Stadt als Beute." Dietz, Bonn, 1999. Print.
- Rosenmüller, Marcus H. "'Eins zu Eins'." *Bayern 2. Bayern 2* (Apr. 13, 2011). Print.
- Sandmayer, Peter. "Grundbedürfnis: Was ist Heimat?" *stern.de. Stern Online* (Dec. 15, 2004). Web. 15 July 2013.
- Scharf, Inga. *Nation and Identity in the New German Cinema: Homeless at Home*. 1st ed. Routledge, June 26, 2008. Print.
- Schenk, Ralf Schenk. "Berlin aus der 'Ratten'-Perspektive." *Film und Fernsehen* 3+4.(1999). Print.
- Sennett, Richard. *Der flexible Mensch: Die Kultur des neuen Kapitalismus*. München: Siedler, 2000. Print.
- . "Growth and Failure. The New Political Economy and its Culture." *Spaces of Culture. City, Nation, World*. London: SAGE Publications, 1999. 14–26. Print.
- . *The Corrosion of Character: The Personal Consequences of Work in the New Capitalism*. 1st ed. W. W. Norton & Company, Jan. 17, 2000. Print.
- Shakespeare, William. *Romeo and Juliet*. First Edition. Dover Publications, May 4, 1993. Print.
- Sieg, Katrin. *Choreographing the Global in European Cinema and Theater*. First Edition. Palgrave Macmillan, Sept. 15, 2008. Print.

- Simmel, Georg. "The Metropolis and Mental Life." *On Individuality and Social Forms*. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1971. 324–339. Print.
- Stadtentwicklung, Berlin. "Senate Department for Urban Development and the Environment." *Berlin.de* (2013): 03. Web. 23 Mar. 2013.
- Ströbele, Carolin. "Regisseurin Tatjana Turanskyj: "Wer sich aufregt, ist unprofessionell".
Zeit Online (Feb. 2010). Web. 23 Mar. 2013.
- Sylvester, Regine. "Wir drehen hier nur einen Film." (Nov. 12, 2005). Print.
- Terkessidis, Mark. *Die Banalität des Rassismus: Migranten zweiter Generation entwickeln eine neue Perspektive*. transcript Verlag, 2004. Print.
- The ARTE GROUP. "Alles über ARTE." *ARTE TV Website* (Sept. 2008). Web. 23 Mar. 2013.
- Trimborn, Jürgen. *Der deutsche Heimatfilm der fünfziger Jahre: Motive, Symbole und Handlungsmuster*. Teiresias-Verlag, 1998. Print.
- Tuan, Yi-Fu. *Space and Place: The Perspective of Experience*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1977. Print.
- "Ulrike OTTINGER." (Mar. 2013). Web. 23 Mar. 2013.
- Vidler, Anthony. *Warped Space: Art, Architecture, and Anxiety in Modern Culture*. Reprint. The MIT Press, Mar. 7, 2002. Print.
- Wayne, Mike. *The Politics of Contemporary European Cinema: Histories, Borders, Diasporas*. Intellect Books, Jan. 1, 2002. Print.
- Wilson, Elizabeth. "The Invisible Flâneur." *New Left Review* I.(191 Jan. 1992): 90–100. Print.

Wilzcek, Barbara. "Die Fünfziger Jahre. Heide und Silberwald." *Der deutsche Heimatfilm. Bildwelten und Weltbilder. Bilder, Texte, Analysen zu 70 Jahren deutscher Filmgeschichte*. Tübingen: Tübinger Chronik e.G., 1989. 69–95. Print.

Wolf, Christa. *Kein Ort. Nirgends*. 3rd ed. Suhrkamp Verlag, Oct. 1, 2007. Print.

Zweitausendeins Filmlexikon. "FILME von A-Z - Wie füttert man einen Esel." (Mar. 2013).
Web. 20 Mar. 2013.