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INTRODUCTION

1. See, for example, work such as Günter Holzweissig, *Die schärfste Waffe der Partei* (Cologne: Böhlau, 2002).


4. This is also noted by Corey Ross, *The East German Dictatorship: Problems and Perspectives in the Interpretation of the GDR* (London: Arnold, 2002); Mary Fulbrook, “Approaches to German Contemporary History since 1945,” *Zeitgeschichtliche Forschungen* 1 (2004); and Geoff Eley, “The Unease of History: Settling Accounts with the East German Past,” *History Workshop Journal* 57 (2004): 175–201, here page 188. The early work of the Enquete commission also exemplified this tendency.


13. Arguing against what he calls the “Fulbrook School,” Eli Rubin argues that “there was a distinctly East German society; it was not just the state or the party, but it was constituted and shaped by the economic processes put in motion by the state.” Eli Rubin, *Synthetic Socialism* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2008), 7.


15. Mary Fulbrook summarizes recent historiographical trends, including the emergence of a “new paradigm” normalizing GDR history, in Fulbrook, “Approaches to German Contemporary History,” 31–50. See also Mary Fulbrook, *The People’s State: East German Society from Hitler to Honecker* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2005), 11.


17. Pence and Betts, eds., *Socialist Modern*, 7–8.

18. For Buck-Morss, “the construction of mass utopia was . . . the driving force behind industrial modernization in both its capitalist and socialist forms . . .” and “the mass democratic myth of industrial modernity—the belief that the industrial reshaping of the world is capable of bringing about the good society by providing material happiness for the masses—has been profoundly challenged by the disintegration of European socialism, the demands of capitalist restructuring, and the most fundamental ecological constraints.” Buck-Morss, *Dreamworld*, ix–x. Pence and Betts “hope to shift the way modernity is assessed from the achievement of particular standards of industrialization or political structures to the examination of a commitment to the full reshaping of society.” Pence and Betts, *Socialist Modern*, 8. The definition of modernity is contested, but whether you define it as Buck-Morss and Pence and Betts do, as a program of reshaping society for the better, or as Detlev Peukert did (see note 22), most scholars can agree that its central characteristic is not sheer adherence to political liberalism.


21. In Habermas’s view, the public sphere is space between state and private life where “people came together to form a public, readied themselves to compel public
authority to legitimize itself before public opinion” (26). Cultivated in the social institutions of the salon, the coffeehouse, and secret societies, these private people formed a “public opinion” that held the ruler accountable to the people and influenced his decision-making power. But this public sphere, which had once facilitated participation in the political process, decayed in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, monopolized by corporate media. In the twentieth century, the public sphere was increasingly dismantled while maintaining the illusion of integrity, depriving the public of participation in public life, and denying true “public opinion” in favor of “public relations.” Jürgen Habermas, *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1989).

22. Detlev Peukert (and others) challenged the view that National Socialism resulted from Germany’s lack of modernization—its social and political “misdevelopment”—in the nineteenth century, arguing instead that it emerged out of the “crisis of classical modernity” that could not be overcome in the Weimar period. Nazism was “an exaggerated development of Nazi Germany’s dark side.” Detlev Peukert, *The Weimar Republic: The Crisis of Classical Modernity* (New York: Hill and Wang, 1992). In his analysis, Peukert “reclaimed” Max Weber to present “an ambiguous and contradictory ‘modernity’” characterized by the “progressive rationalization of everyday life through the processes of secularization and bureaucratization that threaten(ed) to produce the complete ‘disenchantment of the world’ and the growth of a misplaced faith in the capacity of rational science to solve all human problems.” David Crew, *Germans on Welfare* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998), 4.


24. Similarly, in a historiographical survey of scholarship entitled “Media and the Making of British Society,” James Curran identifies a strong liberal narrative that casts the history of British media since the eighteenth century as the story of how “a succession of media became independent over two centuries, and contributed to the cumulative empowerment of the people. The media exposed government to public scrutiny. They enlarged the political community, and facilitated public debate. They spoke up for the people, and increased public influence over government.” He contrasts this with other narratives, including “feminist,” “populist,” “radical,” and “libertarian” interpretations. James Curran, “Media and the Making of British Society,” *Media History* 8 (2002): 137. In the context of the GDR, scholars have long seemed convinced that any real challenge to the state was made through literature or, to a lesser extent, film. Television, still understood as a less legitimate object of study and a conduit of SED propaganda, plays no part in this vision. Goodbody et al. claim, for example, “If television emerged from the Eleventh Plenum relatively unscathed, this was because it was practically insignificant as a channel for social criticism. . . .” Yet “(t)he Eleventh Plenum for Christa Wolf was a traumatic experience, which resulted in months of depression. The bitterness of her disillusionment . . . is reflected in her next novel. . . .” Alex Goodbody, Dennis Tate, and Ian Wallace, “The Failed Socialist Experiment: Culture in the GDR,” in *German Cultural Studies*, ed. Rob Burns (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995).

25. Gramsci argued that, although coercion was an important component of rule by a dominant social group, particularly in authoritarian societies, the power to rule could
not be reduced to force. Instead, the ability to rule resulted from a complex combination of factors that allowed the ruling classes to take a hegemonic position in society. The battle for hegemony—or the ideological dominance of a particular social system—was waged in particular on the field of civil society. The dominant social group ruled “political society” by coercion, establishing its authority by means of force and “repressive bodies” such as the police, government, or judiciary. But they derived as much or more of their power by generating consent to legitimate their rule among those they subordinated. They accomplished this by organizing consent through the institutions of “civil society,” or “the ensemble of organisms commonly called private,” including educational or religious institutions, trade unions, or the media. David Forgacs, ed., An Antonio Gramsci Reader: Selected Writings, 1916–1935 (London: Lawrence and Wishart, 1988), 227, 304.

26. In post-socialist works, Cold War triumphalism has corrupted “civil society” to the point where it stands so amorphously for concepts of liberal institutions and political forms that it has come to mean nothing. John Downing, Internationalizing Media Theory (London: Sage, 1996).

27. Where Adorno and Horkheimer tended to focus on the authoritarian tendencies of modern mass culture, Walter Benjamin and Siegfried Kracauer were more ambivalent. Bourdieu’s concepts of “cultural capital” and “habitus” have been influential in cultural history and cultural studies (as well as television studies). Scott Denham, Irene Kacandes, and Jonathan Petropoulos, eds., A User’s Guide to German Cultural Studies (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1997). One of the purposes of the volume is to collect some good, recent work and bring greater profile to this emerging field.

28. Denham et al., User’s Guide, 15–16. I describe this interdisciplinarity as collaborative to reflect Kacandes’s differentiation between “interdisciplinarity” and “multidisciplinarity.”


32. Thankfully I worked on a national television service that was centrally organized, administered, and, most important, archived, unlike the West German system of federated television broadcasters, for example.

33. Jason Jacobs described the difficulty of dealing with the scraps of information in thin files containing the “residue of artistic endeavor” he found in his first trip to the archive. In fact, it seems there was much more in (some of) his files than mine: he was able to consult “studio plans indicating various camera positions,” for example, that allowed him to ask questions about “how creative practitioners practically and intellectually deal with a new medium.” As in other historical work, these documents needed to be read against the grain. Jacobs noted, “there was a debate about the aesthetics of this new medium but it was couched within the pressure of production. Complaints about the lack of camera practice time, for example, were part of legitimate bids to explore the mobility of televisions mise en scène rather than simply a ruffled producers gripe.” Jason Jacobs, “The Television Archive: Past, Present, and Future,” Critical Studies in Television 1 (2006): 13–20.

34. Williams compares television to cinema, which existed “on the margins” (in variety shows, for example) until the construction of film theaters allowed it to be capitalized (10–11). He argued, in 1974, that television served the purpose of “mobile privatization,” which “resolved the contradictory pressures of . . . industrial capitalist society,” which he identified as mobility on the one hand, and the “apparently self-sufficient family home” on the other. Television, which provided “news from the ‘outside,’” was one of the important elements that maintained the illusion of self-sufficiency of the postwar (suburban) Anglo-American home. Raymond Williams, Television: Technology and Cultural Form (New York: Schocken Books, 1975), 20–21.

35. One of television’s most defining characteristics, Williams argued, was the introduction of almost endless sequence and flow. That is, one could not consider television programs as discrete units, as was commonly the case in contemporary television criticism and in the average TV guide; instead, the “constant interruptions” of commercials, for example, were central to the operation of the medium and its programming.

36. Williams identified as particularly (potentially) innovative those programs that blurred the line between drama and reality, provided “education by seeing,” opened up space for sustained “discussion,” embraced the intrinsic sequential nature of television, and “features” that “combine(d) and extend(ed) elements of the essay, the journal and the film documentary.” Williams, Television, 71. To be sure, Williams saw innovation in what we have come to call “reality TV,” which, in 2013, is often derided for its distortion of reality. But Williams argued, perceptively, that “(s)ome of the complaints about ‘confusion between reality and fiction’ is naïve or disingenuous. This attempt hold a hard line between absolutely separated categories seems to depend on a fiction about reality itself. It depends also on the convention that ‘factual’ television simply shows, neu-
trally, what is happening. The real engagement of every observer in the events he or she is observing is doubtless a matter of degree. But it is so crucial and general a fact that its possibilities for creative television drama, of a new kind, ought to be directly examined rather than ruled out by an ultimately untenable classification.”


38. Mass communications scholarship initially posited the “direct effects” understanding of television—that, like a “hypodermic needle” or “transmission pipe,” television could transmit stable messages to unsuspecting viewers. Mass communications researchers were set on identifying and quantifying who watched television, when, and to what effect. Due, in part, to the difficulty of proving such a hypothesis, “direct effects” eventually gave way to more nuanced work speculating that audiences played a more active role in making meaning, exemplified by the “uses and gratifications” approach. Robert Allen, *Channels of Discourse Reassembled* (London: Routledge, 1992), 13–14.

39. Research on television took some time to emerge from the shadow of the better-established fields of film and media studies. By the 1980s, television had arrived on American college campuses, though courses on the subject still fought for legitimacy among scholars and even practitioners. In 1986, one professor of mass culture claimed of television that “everybody watches it, but no one really likes it. . . . Its only champions are some executives, the advertisers who exploit it, and a compromised network of academic boosters. Otherwise, TV has no spontaneous defenders, because there is almost nothing in it to defend.” As late as 1990, the former head of the American network NBC, Brandon Tartikoff, dismissed television courses as without academic rigor: “When I hear about college professors writing books about people who do prime-time shows, my natural cynicism says there’s got to be courses for all these athletes to make them academically eligible to play football.” Mark Crispin Miller and Brandon Tartikoff, respectively, cited in David Bianculli, *Teleliteracy* (New York: Continuum, 1992), x, 284.


44. For example, the British government financed a research working group on Television Drama in the late 1990s; the French government—unlike most—has taken steps to make the French audio-visual heritage widely available through a digital archive and website (http://www.ina.fr/); and the German Research Society (DFG) financed the research project “Program History of GDR Television—comparative” (2001–2007) (which followed on the DFG project “Aesthetics, Pragmatics, and History of the Screen Media” of the Federal Republic, begun in the mid-1980s).


47. When I began this project, there was not much historical scholarship (in English, certainly) on television in Eastern Europe and, in general, media research on the area was still mired in the mass communications approach of an earlier era. This work was hampered by a lack of access to and, often, a deep skepticism about sources from the countries of the Soviet bloc. According to Karol Jakubowicz, for example, “by the early ‘fifties media no longer represented reality, but rather replaced it.” Jakubowicz, “From Party Propaganda to Corporate Speech? Polish Journalism in Search of a New Identity,” *Journal of Communication* 42 (1992): 65. There were a number of studies from mass communications researchers concerned with the general problem of press freedom, but few works that dealt primarily with television broadcasting. Tomas Goban-Klas, *The Orchestration of the Media* (Boulder: Westview Press, 1994). Goban-Klas was a former Polish journalist writing about the pressures that constrained and, at times, allowed some liberalization of the Polish media. Burton Paulu produced an informative reference work on broadcasting in the Eastern bloc. Burton Paulu, *Radio and Television Broadcasting in Eastern Europe* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1974). Political scientist Jane Leftwick Curry wrote a timely book that began to revise the Western view of a thoroughly controlled media and even break down the binary model of the state against society in Eastern Europe, opening up space to shed some of the assumptions of liberal scholarship that had defined Western research on communist media in the postwar period. Jane Leftwich Curry, *Poland’s Journalists: Professionalism and Politics* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990). As the Cold War ended, media scholars tended to leave historical work behind and move directly on to post-socialist developments, such as how the media transformed during the fall of communism. See, for example, Ellen Mickiewicz, *Split Signals: Television, Power and


49. Hans Müncheberg and Peter Hoff, eds., Experiment Fernsehen. Vom Laborversuch zur sozialistischen Massenkunst (Berlin: Verband der Film- und Fernsehenschaften der DDR, 1984).

50. See, for example, Peter Hoff’s chapters in Knut Hickethier, Geschichte des deutschen Fernsehens (Stuttgart: Verlag J. B. Metzler, 1998).


52. See, for example, Nina Schindler, Flimmerkiste: ein nostalgischer Rückblick (Hildesheim: Gerstenberg, 1999).

53. The group published early results of their work in a special issue of the Historical Journal of Film, Radio and Television 24 (2004). An overview of their results is found in Rüdiger Steinmetz and Reinhold Viehoff, eds., Deutsches Fernsehen Ost: Eine Programmgeschichte des DDR Fernsehens (Potsdam: Verlag für Berlin-Brandenburg, 2008). The Leipziger Universitätsverlag is home to a series resulting from the project.

54. The preponderance of available sources on the DFF date from the period after 1965, which is reflected in the publications of the project.

55. This dilemma was discussed at “Aufgewickelt: Deutsches Fernsehen Ost,” held at the Stiftung Deutsche Kinemathek—Museum für Film und Fernsehen, in cooperation with the Deutsches Rundfunkarchiv (DRA), Potsdam-Babelsberg, 2 June 2007.


57. And television in the FRG may not even be the best context for comparison to the DFF. Historian of technology Raymond Stokes argued, for example, that the best way to draw conclusions about the (technological) development of the GDR was not to compare it directly to the FRG but to compare and contrast the trajectories of technological development to similar patterns and differences between the United States and the United Kingdom (that is, to compare each country not with its German “other,” but rather compare its relationship with its “other” to the corresponding partner in a similar geopolitical or economic relationship. Raymond Stokes, Constructing Socialism [Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2000], 8). I have often thought that the best comparison to make to the GDR–FRG might involve the Canada–United States relationship: both have the problem of cross-border programming, and Canada developed a small, but effective, public broadcasting service with a clear political mandate, whereas the United States built a sprawling system with (in its early days) significant regional
differences. The comparison is not perfect, but it suggests other ways of measuring developments in the two German states.


62. Authorities referred to Adlershof first as the “Central Television Laboratory” and later, the “Television Center.” By 1952 the television service was called Deutscher Fernsehfunk (“German television-radio communication,” reflecting the conceptual dependence of television on radio in those early years). After 1972, authorities renamed it “Television of the GDR” (Fernsehen der DDR), reflecting both the recognition of television as a medium independent of and different from radio, and the cultural demise of the SED’s “one Germany” policy. In the interest of clarity, though, I will refer to Adlershof as the Television Center, and the television service as the DFF throughout the book.

CHAPTER 1


3. Mechanical television used cameras with scanning discs mounted in front of a photoconductive “eye,” while electronic television used a beam of electrons to scan the image. The major advantages of electronic over mechanical television were light insensitivity (mechanical systems required lots of artificial light) and the ability to produce much higher definition images. One could say that mechanical television produced an image that was more of a shadow of the object, while electronic television could reproduce the interplay of light and shadow, and thus a better picture of the object.


13. Uricchio, “High-Definition Television,” 311–315; Manfred Hempel, “German Television Pioneers and the Conflict between Public Programming and Wonder Weapons,” *Historical Journal of Film, Radio and Television* 10 (1990): 123–162. William Uricchio argues that there was a considerable power struggle between industry and the Postal Service, which wanted to introduce home reception, and the Propaganda Ministry, which favored the ostensibly politically more valuable reception conditions of public viewing; William Uricchio, “Envisioning the Audience.” Laura Heins argues that Nazi-sympathizing television theorists envisioned television not as a mass medium to be consumed in public exhibition spaces, but rather as a “literate high art” that could achieve greater intimacy, realism, and spirituality than other media, making it “the most
modern expression of a literate national culture with roots in the eighteenth century.”
Heins, “Experiential Community,” 46–47.


16. Although he made great use of film appearances for propaganda purposes, television was not nearly well enough developed to be used in the same way. Hickethier, Geschichte, 37.


19. As in Germany, it was American radio manufacturers that first took interest in developing television, intent on capitalizing on the potentially lucrative new market in television receivers and maintaining (or expanding) their market share. Williams, Television. See the discussion over postwar television standards in Edgerton, American Television, 74–76.


22. Wired (as opposed to wireless) radio broadcasts signals through electrical or telephone lines. It is a popular choice in Europe: in 1992 estimates suggested there were 800,000 wired sets in Western Europe and perhaps 100 million in Eastern Europe. Wired radio was cheaper and, since it is hardwired, could not be jammed. Claude-Jean Bertrand, “Radio Beyond the Anglo-American World,” in Radio: The Forgotten Medium, eds., Edward Pease and Dennis Everette (New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers, 1995), 113–114.

23. See, for example, Heide Fehrenbach, Cinema in Democratizing Germany (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1995).


29. The decentralized nature of the broadcasting system persisted as television developed, resulting in stations with very different personalities.” American media scholar James Schwoch questions contemporary American authorities’ characterization of NWDR as a “British” station, because so few scholarly studies refer to it that way, arguing instead that this was simply the rhetoric of policymakers in the Cold War. But scholarly studies tend to focus on the unifying and leveling impulse of the ARD; (German) studies of early West German television (and sometimes Germans today) very clearly identify NWDR this way, but less so after it split to become NDR and WDR.
30. “Muscovites” were (German) communists who emigrated to the Soviet Union during the Nazi period, most of whom returned with the end of the war. Eric Weitz reminds us that, during the early occupation period, the Soviets worked toward denazification and the spread of anti-fascism, while conservative “Muscovites” of the so-called Ulbricht Group instead worked toward realizing their goal of establishing communism in Germany. Moreover, documents that surfaced after the collapse of the GDR have “more fully demonstrated [that] . . . KPD/SED leaders sought the establishment of a separate socialist state in Germany far earlier, far more completely than their Soviet mentors.” Not until 1948 did Soviet and SED interests become much more consistent. Weitz, Creating German Communism, 341.
34. Schwoch, Global TV, 28.
36. Riedel argues that the major offenders were the Americans and Soviets, but that illicit use had been instigated by smaller states unsatisfied with their own frequency allotment. Riedel, Hörfunk, 117.
38. Heil, Fernsehen der SBZ, 35.
42. Peter Hoff in Hickethier, Geschichte, 98.
43. BArch (DH), DM3 BRF II/633, Untitled, December 1955, 2.
44. BArch (DH), DM3 BRF II/74, “Bericht über die Schwierigkeiten der Fernsehsenderbau im Planjahr 1954,” 29 September 1953, 3.
45. On the difficulties, both technical and political, facing industrial manufacturing in the GDR, see Stokes, Constructing, and Dolores Augustine, Red Prometheus (Cambridge: MIT Press, 2007).
47. Ibid.
49. BArch (DH), DM 3 BRF II/6341, “Republikflucht im Funkwesen,” 1 December 1956.
55. This according to Günter Puppe, cited in Müncheberg, Experiment, 26.
56. BArch (DH), DM 3 BRF II/604, Letter from Sachsenwerk Radeberg to Ministe-
57. 55. For clarity, I use the international currency designation for East German Marks in the postwar period, DDM, to denote the GDR’s currency and DM when referring to the West German currency.
59. The average monthly salary was about DDM 256 in 1950, rising gradually to about 354 DDM by 1955. Dietrich Staritz, Geschichte der DDR (Frankfurt: Suhrkamp, 1996), 55.
60. Authorities considered 800 DDM to be “affordable” due to an analysis of receiver prices internationally that showed that it should be possible to manufacture sets cheaply enough to offer them at this price. BArch (DH), DM 3 BRF II/929, “Beschluss über Massnahmen zur Verbesserung des Fernsehens in der Deutschen Demokratischen Republik,” [January 1956], 3. BArch (DH), DM 3 BRF II/604, “Bericht über die Tagung der Kommission ‘Fernsehempfänger’ am 13.5.1953,” 14 April 1953.
63. Herbert Köfer recalled that watching the Leningrad, “often . . . one could tell only with great difficulty, whether [the person onscreen was] Quermann or Köfer.” Köfer, cited in Jost-Arend Bösenberg, Die aktuelle Kamera (1952–1990) (Potsdam: Verlag für Berlin-Brandenburg, 2004), 91n37.


72. BArch, DM 3 BRF II/2431, “Jahresbericht für den deutschen Post für das Jahr 1959.”

73. Hoff in Hickethier, *Geschichte*, 186. Media scholars have historically, and rather arbitrarily, understood the one million mark as the point at which reception becomes a mass phenomenon.

74. With four times the population, West German ownership reached the million mark in 1959. Of course, viewership always exceeds ownership, and we can estimate that at least two and perhaps as many as four people watched any registered television set.

75. For American historians, these roots are often found in the Russian Revolution of 1917; European historians, on the other hand, point to the emergence of a Western habit of mind that defined “asiatique Russia” in opposition to their own, more developed “civilization.” Bernd Stöver, *Der Kalte Krieg* (Munich: C. H. Beck, 2003), 8.


81. Media scholars such as Peter Hoff have long recognized the importance of the emerging Cold War in driving the development of television in the GDR. Certainly, the potential loss of the VHF frequencies allocated at the Stockholm Conference was a decisive moment, which convinced Kurt Heiss of the SRK that the DFF needed to go on the air. And as I will demonstrate in chapter 3, it was the Hungarian uprising of 1956 that convinced the Central Committee that television was a medium worth their attention.

82. All quotes in Schwoch, *Global TV*, 35.

83. Hickethier, *Geschichte*, 76.
84. Hickethier, *Geschichte*, 78–79.
87. Under the Nazis, audiences had watched television in a number of public viewing facilities in Berlin for not more than one (Reichs-) mark per visit, and it is possible they considered public viewing a more politically reliable environment for reception. But that was not to be the case in postwar East Germany.
91. BArch (DH), DM 3 BRF II/74, “Feststellung über die Fernsehversorgung im Grossberliner Bereich,” [1954], 2.
92. Ibid.
93. Ibid.
94. Ibid., 2–3.
95. “It appears that the small antennas everywhere in the GDR serves the reception of transmitters in Band 3. Those kind of transmitters are not yet up and running in the GDR. Despite this, there are a whole bunch of this type of antenna...” Ibid., 1.
96. Ibid., 3.
98. BArch (DH), DM 3 BRF II/465, “Technische Entwicklung,” [1955]. Already in 1955 NWDR officials had begun to discuss the possibility of lining the border with small transmitters to protect their signal, a situation that would have saturated the border regions with ARD programming. BArch (DH), DM 3 BRF II/633, [Beobachtungen in Westdeutschland], 8 November 1955.
100. Significantly, when GDR authorities were faced with a similar decision a decade later, this time about what standard to use for color programming, they came to a different decision. West German viewers, who by the 1970s were largely ignorant of DFF programming anyway, would have to watch DFF programming in black and white.
More important, East Germans would have to do the same with the more colorful West German television program.

101. On SED policymakers’ desire to compete with Western broadcasting, see Joseph Naftzinger, “Policy-making in the German Democratic Republic: The Response to West German Trans-border Broadcasting” (Ph.D. diss., University of Maryland at College Park, 1994).


CHAPTER 2


2. Williams, Television, 28.


6. This was also the case in early postwar radio. Adelheid von Saldern, “Radio in the GDR.”

7. She played the title character in “Bianca Maria and the Dripping Dagger,” for example. Müncheberg, Experiment, 46.


9. Whereas DEFA films could be denied exhibition rights, television programming was almost always transmitted. If, later, it was deemed a “negative result,” that could be discussed, rather than ignored (according to accounts from 1961). Thomas Beutelschmidt, Kooperation oder Konkurrenz? Das Verhältnis zwischen Film und Fernsehen in der DDR (Berlin: DEFA Stiftung, 2009), 77.

10. Walter Baumert in Müncheberg, Experiment, 9.

11. The date 21 December 1952 marked the beginning of the “official test program” in the GDR. Some make much of the fact that the program debuted on Stalin’s birthday; others concentrate on the fact that the DFF began broadcasting the “official test pro-
gram” only four days before the West Germans began their own official program. I have found no evidence that Stalin’s birthday drove the DFF to begin on 21 December; more likely, it was a matter of fortunate coincidence, since beating the West Germans to the punch was far more important.

12. BArch, DR 8/1, “Protokoll über die Abteilungsleiter-Besprechung am 26.1.53,” 26 January 1953. Although paper rationing can be politically motivated when regimes attempt to curb the media, in this case the DFF was simply not important enough to adequately provision, especially given the conditions of scarcity in other parts of the economy.


15. Film could be shown on television through the use of the “telecine,” which shone light through the film, turning the light into the electrical charges that could be read by the television transmitter.

16. Müncheberg, Experiment, 16.

17. Contemporary cameraman Herbert Kutschbach, noted that “one wanted to make the viewer of the television image believe he saw the picture from the point of view of a theater spectator sitting in the parquet.” Kutschbach, cited in Knut Hickethier, “The Television Play in the Third Reich,” Historical Journal of Film, Radio and Television 10, no. 2 (1990): 172.


19. Similarly, BBC producers complained of a shortage of studio space in the early 1950s, anticipating the opening of a new “purpose-built television studio” slated for the late 1950s. Turnock, Television, 29.


22. Müncheberg, Experiment, esp. 94–103.


24. Müncheberg, Experiment, 16.

25. Müncheberg, Experiment, 15.

26. According to this report from 1955, the DFF produced no original programming before December 1952, but they discounted the slide series. BArch, DR 8/3, “Über die Programmätigkeit des Fernsehens in der Deutschen Demokratischen Republik,” [October 1955].

27. Müncheberg, Blaues Wunder, 17.


29. Ibid.

ferson, NC: McFarland, 2003), 71. The use of videotape may have saved CBS $8,400 a week in film and film processing costs. Ibid., 78. Video recording technology arrived in Britain in 1958 but took some time to win over television producers. It was expensive and, though videotape could be reused, unlike film, it could not (at this early date) be edited. Turnock, Television, 93–97. The GDR did not acquire recording technology until the early 1960s.

31. On the use of DEFA films in television, see Beutelschmidt, Kooperation, 326–355.
33. Müncheberg, Blaues Wunder, 14.
34. Stemmler, “Bemerkungen,” 78.
40. Müncheberg, Experiment, 97.
41. Müncheberg, Experiment, 66.
43. Müncheberg, Experiment, 40.
45. On the 180-degree rule, see Holland, Television Handbook, 63.
47. A group of television workers, including Ernst Augustin, attended the filming of a soccer match in 1951 while on a trip to view the television center in Moscow. But Augustin and his colleagues were technicians interested in technology, not programming. Nor did they involve themselves in programming after their return. By the same token, camerawoman Christian had had plenty of opportunity to work with television technology in the studio. Yet the few cameras were housed in small studio spaces. Before August 1954, no studio existed that was large enough to get a 180-degree view through the camera. Hanna Christian in Müncheberg, Experiment, 72.
48. Extant film clips suggest that, in their broadcasts of Olympic soccer matches in 1936, the Nazis filmed most, but not all, of the action from positions behind the goal line at one end of the field. Michael Kloft, Television under the Swastika: Unseen Footage from the Third Reich (Chicago: International Historic Films, 2001). Cutting between those perspectives produced an astonishingly chaotic spectacle. But those transmissions likely were intended less to provide an intelligible representation of the game than to exploit the shock value of visual simultaneity by providing moving images for those who were watching from public viewing rooms in Berlin. Such conventions were not “natural” but had to be learned.
50. The DFF broadcast four hours daily in 1957, five hours in 1958, and seven hours
in 1959. By 1962 the daily broadcast had grown to nine hours. Hoff in Hickethier, Ge-
schichte, 191.

52. Fehlig distinguished this experience from that of theater, which he characterized as establishing a strong personal relationship with the audience over the course of a specific play. BArch, DR 8/3, “Gedanken zu einer Dramaturgie des Fernsehens,” [1955], 8–9.

53. BArch, DR 8/3, “Gedanken zu einer Dramaturgie des Fernsehens,” [1955], 6, 7, 10.


60. “Drama,” “topical” (or “political”), or “entertainment” programming were categories used by the television service. I am using them here because they reflect the ways in which television workers understood the programming they were creating. More important, these categories are not irrelevant, because a program defined as explicitly political often commanded more resources and greater attention from state representatives than other types of programming. So, these categories serve here not as interpretive categories but as a reflection of the administrative taxonomy mobilized by historical actors.
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