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ABSTRACT

In 1950, Walter Ulbricht declared socialist realism as the official artistic method in the German Democratic Republic (GDR). Using the implementation of this method in the East German art world as a starting point, this dissertation examines the careers of several influential photographers, notably Arno Fischer, Brigitte Voigt, Helga Paris, Gundula Schulze Eldowy, and Maria Sewcz, whose artistic practices did not cater to the ideological imperatives of socialist realism. These photographers, who neither saw nor positioned themselves as political dissidents, not only sustained their independent practices, but also had successful careers in the GDR. Some were hired to teach photography at the Academy of Arts (Berlin-Weißensee) and the Academy of Fine Arts (Leipzig) and to work as editors and photographers at popular illustrated magazines, including Das Magazin and Sibylle, both of which contained little to no overt news and permitted photographers to practice under the radar of official censorship. Others were able to disseminate their work in small exhibitions organized by the East German Cultural Association.

By the late 1970s, when photography was recognized as an autonomous art form in both Germanys, these photographers were granted further opportunities to circulate their work. Their photographs began to appear in specialized photography journals and state-sponsored art exhibitions, often alongside regime-affirming propaganda. By investigating the increasing support offered to Fischer, Voigt, Paris, Schulze Eldowy, and
Sewcz by the East German state and its cultural apparatuses, this dissertation challenges the labels “official” and “unofficial” photography: it argues that the classification “official” can also be applied to their work and has little value in identifying the different kinds of photography and photographic practices that flourished in the GDR. Based on the disparate types of photographic images that circulated in East Germany’s visual culture in the 1980s, this dissertation also claims that cultural authorities no longer knew how to treat photography, at least not to the same degree as they did in the 1950s and 1960s, and failed to reach a consensus on how to photographically depict the GDR during the country’s last decade of existence.
INTRODUCTION

On 23 April 1932, the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (CPSU) ordered an end to pluralism in the arts by disbanding and restructuring all independent literary and artistic organizations in the Soviet Union. Immediately following its draconian decision, the CPSU selected and tasked a small group of prominent politicians and writers, many of whom belonged to the former Russian Association of Proletarian Writers (RAPP), with founding the Union of Soviet Writers.1 Gathering several times over the course of the next two months to discuss the future of Soviet literature, its members wasted little time in determining the aesthetic position of the new coalition.2 With input from the Central Committee, including General Secretary Joseph Stalin, they decided to forego the “dialectical materialist method” of the RAPP, despite displeasure expressed by those previously affiliated with the association, in favor of what they characterized as the “method of socialist realism.”3

2 Ibid.
3 Ibid., 38; On the emergence of socialist realism, see Herman Ermolaev, Soviet Literary Theories, 1917-1934: the Genesis of Socialist Realism (Berkeley, University of California Press, 1963); C. Vaughan James, Soviet Socialist Realism: Origins and Theory (New York: St. Martin’s Press, 1973); Margaret M. Bullitt, “Toward a Marxist Theory of Aesthetics: The Development of Socialist Realism in the Soviet Union,” Russian Review, vol. 34, no. 1 (January 1976): 55-76; and Boris Röhrl, World History of Realism in Visual Arts (Hildesheim; Zürich; New York: Georg Olms Verlag, 2013), 249-289; For a greater understanding of the events that were initiated from both below and above, particularly in Moscow and Leningrad, before the Central Committee took drastic measures to control cultural production in the Soviet Union, see Sheila Fitzpatrick, ed., Cultural Revolution in Russia, 1928-1931 (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1978); On what followed the CPSU’s decision in the early 1930s, see Thomas Lahusen and Evgeny
A response to nineteenth- and early twentieth-century modernism as well as to the diverse artistic practices and groups that flourished after the October Revolution, socialist realism was introduced to Moscow’s literary circles on 19 May 1932 and to a larger audience six days later in Literaturaia Gazeta (Literary Gazette), what would quickly become the organ of the Writers’ Union.4 The concept was discussed in the media and was the topic of countless writers’ meetings for the next two years.5 In August 1934, after Andrei Zhdanov, an influential Soviet politician, delivered a speech on the objectives of Soviet literature at the First All-Union Congress of Soviet Writers, it was declared the official artistic method in the Soviet Union.

Implemented first in literature and then in the visual arts as well as music, theatre, and architecture in the latter half of the 1930s, socialist realism found its origins in the realist tendencies that emerged in the nineteenth century in response to what historian C. Vaughan James aptly describes as “the sharpening contradictions within capitalist society, the crisis in bourgeois culture and the rise of the socially conscious proletariat.”6 Elements of socialist realism can be traced to the work of the Peredvizhniki (The Wanderers) in painting; of Aleksandr Pushkin and Leo Tolstoy in literature; of Mikhail

---

4 The years following the October Revolution saw, for instance, the rise of Constructivism and Productivism and the establishment of the Front (LEF), the Association of Artists of Revolutionary Russia (AKhRR), the New Society of Painters (NOZh), the Society of Moscow Artists (OMKh), and the Society of Easel Painters (OSt). On these movements and groups, see Evgeny Kovtun, Russian Avant-garde (New York: Parkstone International, 2012); Julia Vaingurt, Wonderlands of the Avant-Garde: Technology and the Arts in Russia in the 1920s (Evanston, Ill: Northwestern University Press, 2013); and Röhr, World History of Realism in Visual Arts, op. cit., 270-275.

5 On these discussions in the media and private meetings, see Régine, Socialist Realism, op. cit., 37-76.

6 James, Soviet Socialist Realism, op. cit., 85.
Glinka and Modest Petrovich Mussorgsky in music; of Mikhail Shchepkin in theatre; Matvey Kazakov in architecture; and Alexander Herzen, Vissarion Belinsky, Nikolay Chernyshevsky, and Nikolay Dobrolyubov in criticism and aesthetics. In the twentieth century, it was directly preceded by the work of the Association of Artists of Revolutionary Russia (AKhRR, 1922-1932) and the Society of Easel Painters (OST, 1924-1931), which, in many ways, helped pave the way for a new socialist conception of the arts. Inspired by the paintings of Gustave Courbet and The Wanderers, the AKhRR believed that art should be rooted in society and legible to all its members. It demonstrated this through its realist paintings of the Red Army, political figures, and everyday life of the working class. Influenced by Expressionism, Surrealism, and German Verism, the OST was interested in contemporary themes and depicted modern life under socialism in a variety of styles and media, notably painting and sculpture. Despite being quite distinct, work produced by AKhRR and OST artists shared several salient qualities with socialist realism: their art not only dealt with current issues and made itself accessible to the proletariat, which it frequently took as its subject, but it also, in the case of the OST, captured reality, as Zhdanov described in the aforementioned speech, in its “revolutionary development.”

7 Ibid.
“truthfully,” but rather from a socialist standpoint, producing optimistic images of a forthcoming society.\textsuperscript{11}

The definition of socialist realism was never fixed -- it differed among countries, based on their histories, and shifted according to the needs of political and cultural authorities at various times between the early 1930s and the fall of socialism. Despite this, its philosophy remained unchanged: to educate the proletariat in the spirit of socialism and to inspire its members to build socialism. This required artists to depict an idealized view of their society, one that did not exist in the present moment, but that would come into existence in the future through the collective efforts and ideological commitment of its members. It also compelled artists to adhere to four central, yet somewhat equivocal principles derived from Marxist-Leninist theory: to express the interests of the proletariat (\textit{narodnost}); bring awareness to the ongoing class struggle (\textit{klassovost}); depict relevant and contemporary issues (\textit{ideinost}); and, most importantly, follow the Party line (\textit{partiinost}).\textsuperscript{12} Broadly articulated by Vladimir Lenin, first in his 1905 article “Party Organization and Party Literature” and then in his 1920 article “On Proletarian Culture” (published in \textit{Krasnaya Nov} in 1926), these tenets, in particular the latter, encouraged art’s subordination to the demands of the CPSU and were officially adopted in Soviet aesthetics in the 1930s.\textsuperscript{13}

\textsuperscript{11} It must be noted here that this form of realism neither signifies the imitation of nature in art nor does it simply equate to figurative art. Informed by Marxist-Leninist philosophy, it depicts both reality in the context of the class struggle and the socialist state under construction. For more, see Röhr, \textit{World History of Realism in Visual Arts}, op. cit., 257-258 and 261.
\textsuperscript{12} For a description of these four principles, see James, “Art and the People” and “Socialist Realism,” in \textit{Soviet Socialist Realism}, op. cit., 1-14 and 84-102.
In the visual arts, particularly in painting -- what some viewed, according to historian Susan E. Reid, as “the cornerstone of Socialist Realism” -- and photography, the requisites of socialist realism resulted in a limited number of themes and motifs explored by Soviet painters and photographers during the 1930s and 1940s. They included, among others, workers operating machines; peasants laboring on collective farms; major building projects, such as the Dnieprostroi dam and the Moscow Metro; athletes practicing; young couples and families spending time together; celebrations and demonstrations on the streets; and Stalin in the company of other CPSU members, addressing the Soviet people, and conversing with foreign leaders and dignitaries.

Paintings depicting these topics in a variety of styles, more often than not nineteenth-century academic Realism, were commissioned by state agencies, such as the VseKoKhudozghnik, and shown in cultural institutions and the *All-Union Art Exhibition* of 1939, 1946, and 1947, while their photographic counterparts circulated in the press, the photographic journal *Sovetskoe foto* (*Soviet Photo*), and photo shows, including the *Exhibition of Works by the Masters of Soviet Photo Art* in 1935 and the *First All-Union Exhibition of Soviet Photographic Art* in 1937.

---

15 While nineteenth-century academic Realism was certainly privileged, there was no one unifying style associated with socialist realism. This is made evident, for instance, by the diverse paintings by celebrated artists Aleksandr Deineka and Isaak Brodsky and by the following claim made by Anatoli Lunacharski, the first people’s commissar for enlightenment (a position equivalent to the minister of culture and education): “Although the world ‘style’ does not have a fully exact, established definition, one must object strongly against any identification of the term ‘socialist realist’ with any specific style, since Socialist Realism presumes a diversity of styles – indeed it requires a diversity of styles.” Lunacharski, *Lektsii po istorii estetiki*, ed. M. S. Kagan (Leningrad: Izdatel'stvo Leningradskogo universiteta, 1973), 96 [quoted in Catherine Cooke, “Socialist Realist Architecture: theory and practice,” in *Art of the Soviets*, op. cit., 86]; On the VseKoKhudozghnik, see Christina Kiaer, “Was Socialist Realism Forced Labour? The Case of Aleksandr Deineka in the 1930s,” *Oxford Art Journal*, vol. 28, no. 3 (2005), 332-333; On these exhibitions, see Reid, “Socialist Realism in the Stalinist Terror,” op. cit., 156-176; Margarita
After the Second World War, socialist realism quickly began to spread beyond the Soviet Union to Eastern Europe and Asia. In what would become East Germany in 1949, the country under study in this dissertation, it was discussed as a possible aesthetic within the Kulturbund zur demokratischen Erneuerung Deutschlands (Cultural Association for the Democratic Renewal of Germany) shortly following its founding under the direction of writer and politician Johannes R. Becher on 3 July 1945. Less than two years later, the Soviets made socialist realist literature and art -- drawings, paintings, sculptures, films, and photographs -- readily accessible to Germans at the House of Soviet Culture. Located in East Berlin, the cultural institution held, for instance, four art exhibitions alone to commemorate its opening on 28 February 1947: *Moskau – Hauptstadt der UdSSR* (Moscow – Capital of the USSR), *Die Freundschaft der Völker der UdSSR* (The Friendship of the People of the USSR), *Die sowjetische Familie* (The Soviet Family), and *Mutter und Kleinkindschutz* (Mother and Infant Protection). Concurrent with these shows, Alexander Dymschitz, a cultural officer who attended the Leningrad Institute of Art in the late 1920s and who was the Director of the All-Union Society for Cultural Relations with Foreign Countries (WOKS), delivered a speech at Humboldt University

---


16 On these discussions and an introduction to the Kulturbund, see Rainer Knapp, *Chronik der Gesellschaft für Fotografie (GfF): Eine Zeitgeschichte zur Fotografie im Kulturbund der DDR 1945 bis 1990* (Berlin: Kulturbund e.V., 2008), 3-9; and Anne Hartmann and Wolfram Eggeling, “Selbstverständnis und Funktion des Kulturbundes zur demokratischen Erneuerung Deutschlands,” in *Sowjetische Präsenz im kulturellen Leben der SBZ und frühen DDR 1945-1953* (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1998), 188-196.

17 Hartmann and Eggeling, *Sowjetische Präsenz im kulturellen Leben der SBZ und frühen DDR 1945-1953*, op. cit., 181-185; The former two exhibitions included paintings and graphic works by Ivan Pavlov, Ilya Sokolov, Michail Matorin, Aleksandr Deineka and Isaak Brodsky, while the latter two featured photographs only. Unfortunately, I have found no further information on these photography exhibitions and the photographers included. Nevertheless, the fact the House of Soviet Culture organized two photography shows to celebrate its opening highlights the importance of photography and its role in Soviet cultural imperialism.
entitled “The Relationship of Soviet Art to Bourgeois Art.”18 In front of a crowd of prominent Germans, Soviet administrators and Allied personnel, Dymschitz purported what would soon become a commonly held view among East German cultural authorities: the “superiority of Soviet socialist realism over and against the ‘bourgeois’ modernism prized by the United States and other Western capitalist countries.”19 This same message would be delivered repeatedly and to a broader audience in Bildende Kunst: Zeitschrift für Malerei, Graphik, Plastik, und Architektur (Visual Arts: Magazine for Painting, Graphics, Sculpture, and Architecture), commencing with Anatol Schnittke’s article “Thirty Years of Soviet Painting” in its October 1947 issue.20 By 1950, under intense pressure from the Soviet Union, Walter Ulbricht, First General Secretary of the Socialist Unity Party (SED), declared socialist realism the official artistic method in the German Democratic Republic (GDR, 1949-1990).21

While socialist realism became something of the past in most socialist countries after the death of Stalin in 1953, it remained the official artistic method in the GDR until the fall of the Berlin Wall in 1989 (albeit its definition, as I have suggested above, was constantly shifting, becoming less and less about social politics and revolutionary progression than about honoring the everyday from the late 1970s onwards).22 As I will

19 Ibid.
20 This art journal was established by German artists Karl Hofer and Oskar Nerlinger in 1947.
21 This decision was made at the Third Party Congress of the SED in July 1950.
22 The mutability of socialist realism’s definition is made manifest not only by Erich Honecker’s broadening of the concept in 1971, which I will discuss in Chapter Two, but also by the actions of East German photography theorist Berthold Beiler. After spending the 1950s denouncing modern photography, Beiler, who criticized August Sander’s photographic practice for being too bourgeois and for failing to depict the new working class, saw his anonymizing drive as a model for socialist photography. He communicated as much in his article “August Sander und sein
argue in this dissertation, its implementation and persistence in the East German art world created two distinct groups of artists -- those who appropriated the method and those, often referred to as individualists, who pursued their own artistic interests -- and had a significant impact on cultural production in the GDR. In the case of photography, the subject of my doctoral research, the decree to employ socialist realism resulted in the emergence of two worlds of photographic representation, worlds that would exist in parallel for thirty years.

One photographic world was comprised of the work of press photographers, photojournalists, and, to a much lesser degree, amateur documentary photographers. Its images, often commissioned, taken over a short period of time, and contextualized by the media in which they circulated, served to communicate the benefits of living under socialism as well as to idealize the East German state. They included, but were not limited to, men and women working in factories or on collective farms; students sitting in lecture halls; athletes performing; major building initiatives, such as Stalinallee (now Karl-Marx-Allee) and Alexanderplatz in East Berlin; mass gatherings on the streets, notably the annual May Day parades; and politicians welcoming foreign dignitaries, visiting factories, or enjoying a meal among the working class. Towards the late 1960s


In terms of contextualization, photographers working within this world rarely had control over the theme, selection, and sequencing of their photographs. This fell into the hands of editors, publishers and prominent members of the Kulturbund.
and early 1970s, when relations between the two Germanys began to normalize and the GDR was accepted into the United Nations, its repertoire of images expanded to include white-collared professionals -- doctors, scientists, engineers and so on -- and leisure time in the GDR. These documentary photographs and others, which toed the Party line and translated socialist ideology in an easy, legible manner, were ubiquitous in the mass media. They were printed, first and foremost, in Neues Deutschland (New Germany) and other daily newspapers controlled by the SED, illustrated magazines, visual arts publications, and specialized photography journals, most notably Fotografie: Monatsschrift für gestaltende und dokumentarische Fotografie (Photography: Monthly for Formative and Documentary Photography, 1947-1991). They were also featured in major recurring exhibitions organized by the Kulturbund, renamed the Kulturbund der DDR (East German Cultural Association) in 1949, and the Zentrale Kommission Fotografie der DDR (East German Central Commission for Photography or ZKF), a section founded within the Cultural Association in 1959, and their catalogues.25 These included the Berliner Internationale Fotoausstellung (Berlin’s International Photo Exhibition or bifota), Fotoschau der DDR (East German Photo Show), Pressfotoschau der DDR (East German Press Photo Show), and INTERPRESS-FOTO (International Press Exhibition), among others.26

The other world, the focus of my dissertation, featured the work of Berlin-based photographers Arno Fischer, Brigitte Voigt, Helga Paris, Gundula Schulze Eldowy and Maria Sewcz. With the exception of Fischer, who trained as a sculptor at the

25 The ZKF plays an important role in my dissertation and its members, aims, and initiatives are discussed at length in each of my chapters.
26 On these and others exhibitions organized by the ZKF, see Rainer Knapp, Chronik der Gesellschaft für Fotografie (GfF), op. cit. 11-79.
Kunsthochschule Berlin-Weißensee (Academy of Arts or KHB), and Paris, who received a degree in fashion design from the Ingenieurschule für Bekleidungsindustrie Berlin (Technical School for Clothing Industry or IBB), these artists studied photography at the KHB and the Hochschule für Grafik und Buchkunst (Academy of Graphic and Book Art or HGB), the only academic institution in the GDR to offer a degree in art photography. They worked in the “documentary mode” and were neither interested in glorifying the socialist state nor in bringing about social reform, a common feature of liberal documentary photography in the early twentieth century, which, as artist and writer Martha Rosler argues in her seminal essay “In, around, and afterthoughts (on documentary photography),” “now belongs to the past.” Instead, they concerned themselves with aestheticizing the world around them. They used their cameras not to capture their subject matter “truthfully” -- an impossible feat regardless of intentionality --, but to express how they saw and experienced their surroundings. For this reason, I describe them throughout the dissertation as Fotokünstler or “art photographers.” My characterization of these photographers is chiefly informed by my reading of Allan Sekula’s seminal essay “Dismantling Modernism, Reinventing Documentary (Notes on the Politics of Representation).” In his appeal for a political critique of the documentary

genre, Sekula claims that documentary is deemed art photography when the referent becomes subordinate to the expression of the artist. He writes:

Documentary is thought to be art when it transcends its reference to the world, when the work can be regarded, first and foremost, as an act of self-expression on the part of the artists. To use Roman Jakobson’s categories, the referential function collapses into the expressive function. A cult of authorship, an auteurism, takes hold of the image, separating it from the social conditions of its making and elevating it above the multitude of lowly and mundane uses to which photography is commonly put.28

I also label Fischer, Voigt, Paris, Schulze Eldowy, and Sewcz as art photographers because their work circulated in galleries and museums before the Wende, and, as such, was institutionalized by the art world long before East Germany ceased to exist.29

Working serially and spending anywhere from several weeks to years on a single project, the abovementioned East German art photographers took their handheld cameras to the streets of major East German cities, Berlin, Leipzig, and Halle/Saale, and indoors, in sundry places ranging from living rooms, state hospitals, slaughterhouses, to working class bars. Their documentation of both their experiences in and impressions of the metropolis often called attention to the omissions and misrepresentations in East German visual culture. At times, it also challenged the optimistic view that the East German state had, or at the very least, tried to maintain of itself during its first thirty years. Despite this, these art photographers were able to not only disseminate their photographs in the GDR, including small Kulturbund galleries, but to also maintain a high degree of control over their context and meaning. Between the 1950s and late 1970s, they circulated their series

29 Here I am acknowledging that documentary also becomes art photography at the level of reception, when photography is repositioned and/or institutionalized by the art world. Atget’s work, as David Campany argues, is a case in point. On this, see David Campany, *Art and Photography* (London; New York: Phaidon, 2003), 20.
in venues that chiefly catered to an art-world audience: small solo exhibitions and group shows sponsored by the Kulturbund or organized by the artists themselves through the support of the Cultural Association; in photobooks (at the time an exception to my claim); and, during the first half of the Honecker era, in underground and pop-up galleries.\footnote{Between the early 1950s and mid-1970s, the photobook was a common vehicle for documentary photographers to disseminate their work to a broad audience. This shifted in the late 1970s, however, when the costs of producing, storing, and shipping dramatically rose and made these objects less accessible to the masses and, subsequently, sought out by collectors. On the photobook, see A.D. Coleman, \textit{Depth of Field}, op. cit. 42-44; and Martin Parr and Gerry Badger, \textit{The Photobook: A History} (London; New York: Phaidon, 2004), 6-11; On underground and pop-up galleries, see Paul Kaiser and Claudia Petzold, “Lizenz zum Widerspruch – Facettenreicher Mythos: Der Prenzlauer Berg als Zentrum und Transitraum einer von den Rändern nach Berlin drängenden Subkultur,” and “Fette Ecken im dunklen Raum – Assoziation der Aktionisten: Inoffizielle Privatgalerien und Atelierausstellungen am Prenzlauer Berg,” in \textit{Boheme und Diktatur in der DDR: Gruppen, Konflikte, Quartiere 1970-1989} (Berlin: Fannei und Walz, 1997), 339-341 and 342-348; and Bernd Lindner, “Eingeschränkte Öffentlichkeit? Die alternative Galerieszene in der DDR und ihr Publikum,” in \textit{Blick zurück – im Zorn? Die Gegenwart der Vergangenheit}, ed. Jürgen Schweinebraden (Niedenstein: EP Edition, 1998), 225-33.} After the founding of the ZKF, they also sought out and accepted employment at illustrated magazines, such as \textit{Das Magazin (The Magazine)} and \textit{Sibylle: die Zeitschrift für Mode und Kultur (Sibylle: The Magazine for Fashion and Culture)}, which contained little to no overt politics and news and whose editorial staff either ran in the same artists’ circles or, in the case of Fischer who taught photography at the KHB and the HGB, were former students.\footnote{Fischer taught at both institutions at various times between the 1950s and 1980s.}

As I will contend in this dissertation, the boundaries separating these two worlds of photographic representation began to dissolve in the late 1970s. This was by and large due to the shift in photography’s status. The medium, which had been acknowledged for its artistic merit in the late nineteenth century and began to secure its place in the American art world in the late 1950s and 1960s, first through the work of pop artists and then conceptual and land artists, was finally recognized as a legitimate art form in both
Photography was given its own section at *documenta* 6, which took place at the Museum Fridericianum in Kassel between 24 June and 2 October 1977, and was the subject of a major art exhibition entitled *Medium Fotografie*, held at the state-run Galerie Roter Turm in Halle/Saale. Opening on 4 December 1977, this historical survey of twentieth-century photographers featured the work of August Sander, John Heartfield, Laszlo Moholy-Nagy, and Oskar Nerlinger next to that of Fischer, Evelyn Richter, Günter Rössler, and Christian Borchert, among other prominent East German art photographers. The retrospective not only brought serious attention to these photographers for the first time, but it also suggested -- incorrectly, I might add, given that these art photographers had more in common with Eugène Atget, Henri Cartier-Bresson, Brassai, and Robert Frank than the photographers associated with the Neue

---

32 I am borrowing here from Martha Rosler’s definition of the art world, which she describes in “Lookers, Buyers, Dealers, and Makers: Thoughts on Audience” as follows: “The ‘art world’ (revealing term!) includes the producers of high art, a segment of its regular consumers and supporters, the institutions that brings the consumers and work together, including specialized publications and physical spaces, and the people who run them. Since the art world is fundamentally a set of relations, it also encompasses all the transactions, personal and social, between the sets of participants. The gallery system remains basic to the art world.” In doing so, I am neither denying the artistic merit granted to photography from the late 19th century onwards, as addressed by Aaron Schank and others, nor am I claiming that the medium was suddenly institutionalized in the late 1960s—the Museum of Modern Art, after all, began to collect photography in the early 1930s, founded its Department of Photography under the direction of Beaumont Newhall in 1940, and Aperture was established in 1952. What I am suggesting is that photography began to be seen as a high art in the late 1950s and 1960s—marking the trend was brought about by the work of pop artists, notably Robert Rauschenberg and Andy Warhol, who incorporated photographic imagery respectively into their combines and paintings, and was further propelled by conceptual and land artists, for instance, Joseph Kosuth, Mel Bochner, Robert Smithson, and James Turrell, who either integrated photographs in their work or documented their projects with camera. On the definition of the art world, see Martha Rosler, “Lookers, Buyers, Dealers, and Makers: Thoughts on Audience,” in *Decoys and Disruptions*, op. cit., 28 and 33-45; and Aaron Scharf, *Art and Photography* (Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1974), 235-242; On the use of photography in artistic practices from the 1960s onwards, see Campany, *Art and Photography*, op. cit. 13-45.

33 The work of many of these modern artists was labeled as “bourgeois” and was prohibited from appearing in East German art journals and exhibitions by cultural authorities between the early 1950s and mid-1970s. For more, see Karl Gernot Kuehn, *Caught: The Art of Photography in the German Democratic Republic* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997), 125-126.
Sachlichkeit, Dada, and Neues Sehen movements -- that East German art photographers were the inheritors of a tradition established by the historical avant-garde. As my research demonstrates, shortly following *Medium Fotografie*, which closed on 28 March 1978, cultural authorities began to offer photographers more opportunities to sustain their artistic practices and disseminate their work. They started to provide East German art photographers with generous stipends; to collect photography with funds made available by the Cultural Fund of the GDR; and to open photography galleries throughout the GDR (over five hundred photography galleries opened between the late 1970s and mid-1980s in major cities across East Germany). They also began to include their photographs in the same print media that featured the work of photojournalists, press photographers, and amateur documentary photographers, such as *Bildende Kunst* and *Fotografie*, and in major exhibitions ranging from *bifota* to the quadrennial *Kunstausstellung der Deutschen Demokratischen Republik* (*East German National Art Exhibition*). The latter included photography alongside painting and sculpture for the first time only in 1982.

As a result of the state’s increasing support of photography after *Medium Fotografie*, the work of East German art photographers began to circulate alongside regime-affirming propaganda. As I will claim in this dissertation, the conflation of art

---


photography and idealized images of the GDR calls into question what defines “official”
photography. Furthermore, it also suggests that the East German regime became more
and more confused about whether it should continue to promote the motifs of socialist
visual culture or endorse art photography in the 1980s. This was due in part to socialist
realism, as it was conceived and understood in the Stalinist years, losing its validity as an
artistic method in the Honecker era -- this is evident by the broadening of its definition to
include images of everyday life, including workers in the privacy of their homes and
during their leisure time in the late 1970s --, and in part to cultural authorities no longer
knowing how to treat photography after it was recognized as an autonomous art form in
both Germanys.

Since German Reunification in 1990, East German photography has become a
topic of increasing interest among curators, art historians, historians, and cultural
sociologists largely based in Germany and the UK.36 It has been, first and foremost, the
subject of numerous retrospectives in Germany, notably Nichts ist so einfach wie es
scheint: ostdeutsche Photographie 1945-1989 (Nothing is as simple as it seems: East
German Photography, 1945-1989, curated by Ulrich Domröse and held at the Berlinische
Galerie from June until July 1992); Utopie und Wirklichkeit: ostdeutsche Fotografie

36 With the exception of Recollecting a Culture: Photography and the Evolution of a Socialist
Aesthetic in East Germany, an exhibition curated by John P. Jacob in collaboration with the
Staatliche Galerie Moritzburg (now the Kunstmuseum Moritzburg Halle (Saale)) and held at the
Photographic Resource Center at Boston University in 1998, and Art of Two Germanys: Cold
War Cultures, an exhibition curated by Stephanie Barron and Sabine Eckmann at the Los Angeles
Country Museum (LACMA) in 2009, very little attention has been paid to East German
photography on this side of the Atlantic. This is, however, slowly beginning to change: in 2008
LACMA acquired 12 photographs from Maria Sewcz’s series inter esse, 8 photographs by
Gundula Schulze Eldowy; and 12 photographs by Helga Paris; the MoMA has also purchased 5
photographs by Gundula Schulze Eldowy; and, more recently, OSMOS, a gallery in the Bowery,
held, to my knowledge, the first solo exhibition of work by an East German photographer --
Sibylle Bergemann -- in North America in April 2015.
1956-1989 (Utopia and Reality: East German Photography, 1956-1989, curated by Norbert Moos and held at Forum für Fotografie from November 2004 until February 2005); and, more recently, Geschlossene Gesellschaft: künstlerische Fotografie in der DDR 1949-1989 (The Shuttered Society: Art Photography in the GDR 1949-1989, curated by Ulrich Domröse and held at the Berlinische Galerie from October 2012 until January 2013). It has also been the theme of smaller exhibitions, particularly solo and group shows, at the C|O Berlin, the Museum der bildenden Künste Leipzig, the Akademie der Künste Berlin, the Staatliche Galerie Moritzburg (Halle/Saale), and the Berlinische Galerie (the latter two institutions, for reasons I will discuss in Chapter Three, now boast the largest collections of East German photography in the world).37

Alongside these exhibitions, which have not only provided chronological accounts of photographic production in the GDR, but have also drawn attention to particular photographers and periods, particularly the 1980s, a growing body of scholarship on East German photography has emerged thanks to the research of Karl Gernot Kuehn, Sarah E. James, and Bernd Lindner, among others.38 Complementing the


38 Documentary practices began to diversify in the GDR in the 1980s. Artists began to take photography as their subject and to use their cameras to document installations, performances,
rising number of articles, catalogue essays, and monographs on individual East German photographers, their work provides insightful overviews of East German photography.39


Kuehn, the only historian to date to have written a monograph on the subject, traces, for instance, major developments and trends in East German art photography between the 1950s and 1980s in *Caught: The Art of Photography in the German Democratic Republic* (1997), paying considerable heed to the changing political, cultural, and social contexts in which artists worked. Art historian James, on the other hand, claims in *Common Ground: German Photographic Cultures Across the Iron Curtain* (2013) that the “objective, archival, and anonymizing drive of [August] Sander’s photography,” made manifest in the photographer’s project *Antlitz der Zeit (Face of Our Time)*, provided a model for East German photography from the 1960s onwards.40 Despite their vast differences -- Kuehn’s is a survey of East German photography that is informed by archival sources, cultural and historical studies, and, to a lesser degree, interviews with artists, while James’ is primarily a theoretical endeavor that draws on the writings of photography theorist and founding member of the ZKF Berthold Beiler to establish, among other things, a relationship between German photography in the Weimar and Cold War eras --, both studies use the same oppositional adjectives “official” and “unofficial” to describe East German photography. Endorsing this dichotomous characterization, Lindner, a historian and cultural sociologist who has written extensively on the underground gallery scene in the GDR, argues in his 2004 article “Ein Land – zwei Bildwelten: Fotografie und Öffentlichkeit in der DDR” that two kinds of photography existed in the GDR: “official,” “state-supporting pictures in the mass media loyal to the regime,” and “unofficial,” or

40 See James, *Common Ground*, op. cit., 190-210, esp 196. James also makes this argument in an earlier article, “A Socialist Realist Sander?,” op. cit., 42.
“Gegenbilder” (counter images), “artistic photography, which struggled with varying success to achieve autonomy and to circulate in the general public.”

Both indebted and in response to these studies, in particular Lindner’s, which maintains that there were two “photo worlds” in the GDR, this dissertation challenges the rigid definitions used by these and other scholars to describe East German photography. It examines the support offered to East German photographers, both before and after photography was acknowledged as an autonomous art form in both Germanys, and seeks to reconsider the term “official” by highlighting the opportunities afforded to Fischer, Voigt, Paris, Schulze Eldowy, and Sewcz by the East German state and its cultural apparatuses. In addition to circulating their work in solo and group exhibitions and popular magazines, as abovementioned, these art photographers were given editorial jobs and prominent teaching positions at the KHB and the HGB and visas that allowed them to photograph and participate in exhibitions held outside the GDR. Gundula Schulze Eldowy, for instance, travelled to Vienna to partake in the exhibition Fotografie aus der DDR at the Museum of Modern Art in Vienna in 1985 and to Amsterdam, where she had a solo show entitled Der große und der kleine Schritt (The Big and the Little Step) at the Nieuwe Kerk, in 1989. Arno Fischer travelled throughout Western Europe, Africa, and

42 As I maintain throughout this dissertation, these two “photo worlds” were certainly more complex than press and art photography, and the latter did reach the general public as early as the 1960s, when art photographers began to work for illustrated magazines.
43 On the interest among Western photographers, curators, and publishers in photographic production in the GDR during the latter half of the Cold War, see Jana Duda, “From the Family of Man to Waffenruhe: International Influences on Photography in the GDR,” in Geschlossene Gesellschaft, op. cit., 317-318; Karin Thomas, “Neue Fotogrammatik,” in Kunst in Deutschland seit 1945 (Cologne: DuMont, 2002), 330-356; and Rolf Sachsse, “Kodak reitet nach Osten: zur Rezeption der DDR-Fotografie im Westen um 1980,” in Fotogeschichte, no. 102 (2006): 41-46; Gundula Schulze Elwody et al., Gundula Schulze el Dowy: das weiche Fleisch kennt die Zeit
the United States in the 1970s and 1980s. He spent considerable time, for example, meeting with Magnum photographers and photographing the streets of New York City, an endeavor that resulted in his photobook *New York: Ansichten (New York: Faces)*, printed by the former East German publishing house Verlag Volk und Welt in 1988. These photographers were also awarded sought-after commissions from the state; for instance, Fischer was commissioned together with documentary filmmaker Peter Voigt to collect worker photographs for the reliefs on the steles at the Marx-Engels Forum in East Berlin in the 1970s and 1980s. Given their successful careers and the diverse state vehicles and institutions in which these photographers disseminated their photographs and exerted their influence, the label “official,” as I argue, can also be applied to their work. As such, the adjective, which has been unreservedly assigned to photography that reaffirmed the SED and the socialist project, has little value in identifying the different kinds of photography and photographic practices that flourished in the GDR.

In addition to contesting the labels “official” and “unofficial” East German photography, this dissertation claims that authorities, members of the SED, the State Security Service (Stasi), and the Kulturbund, struggled to reach a general agreement on how to represent the GDR during the latter half of the Honecker era. This is evident not noch nicht (Berlin: Galerie Pankow, 1993), 61-62; Matthew Shaul, “The Impossibility of Socialist Realism: Photographer Gundula Schulze Eldowy and the East German Stasi,” in *Conspiracy Dwellings: Surveillance in Contemporary Art*, eds. Outi Remes and Pam Skelton (Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars, 2010), 20.

44 Interestingly, Fischer’s wife Sibylle Bergemann was commissioned by the state to photograph the various stages of the production and installation of the Marx-Engels monument between 1975 and 1986. One of her images was chosen for the cover of the *Art of Two Germanys* catalog -- the only major exhibition in North America to include East German photography to date. She also famously documented its destruction after the Wende. On this series, see Wulf Herzogenrath et al., “Sibylle Bergemann,” in “Zustandsberichte” deutsche Fotografie der 50er bis 80er Jahre in Ost und West (Stuttgart: Institut für Auslandsbeziehungen, 2002), 72-81.
only in the kinds of photographs that circulated in major exhibitions and publications overseen by the Kulturbund in the 1980s, but also in authorities’ inconsistent treatment of art photographers. To cite two germane examples here, the Verband Bildender Künstler der DDR (Association of Visual Artists of the GDR or VBK-DDR) decided to sponsor an exhibition of Paris’ photographs of Halle/Saale at the Galerie Marktschloesschen Halle in 1986.\textsuperscript{45} Several weeks prior to the opening, after the organization had already printed the exhibition catalogue, invitation cards, and posters, local cultural officials and Party members decided that the photographer’s images gave a “false impression” of Halle/Saale.\textsuperscript{46} Following several months of discussions and disagreements between the various players involved, Paris’ show was postponed twice and finally cancelled by the VBK-DDR in 1987.\textsuperscript{47} Around the same time, the ZKF, which had been including Schulze Eldowy’s photographs in major exhibitions since 1982, offered the photographer a solo show and praised her photographic series in \textit{Fotografie}, while the SED actively sought to censor her work. The photographer best describes this situation herself when discussing her experiences in the GDR with curator Matthew Shaul in 2007:

\begin{quote}
The Party’s efforts to control me were never clear and always contradictory. When I first showed at Galerie Sophien Strasse 8 three Party functionaries showed up while we were installing. However, instead of taking the show down they said, “Your pictures are very powerful, especially the \textit{Tamerlan} series. We hope that we don’t end up in a similar situation at the end of our lives. We’ve received an order from the Party leadership to ‘take the edge off’ the show, but now we’ve seen it, we don’t
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{45} The VBK-DDR was another section founded within the Kulturbund in the 1950s. To openly work as an artist in the GDR and to receive magazine commissions one had to be a member of this organization.
\textsuperscript{47} For a thorough analysis of the exchange between Paris and cultural authorities regarding her exhibition in Halle/Saale, see Lindner, “Ein Land—zwei Bildwelten: Fotografie und Öffentlichkeit in der DDR,” and Albrecht Wiesener, “Halle an der Saale – Chemiemetropole oder ‘Diva in Grau’?,” both in \textit{Die DDR im Bild}, op. cit., 197-202 and 51-68.
know what to do.” So we went through the exhibition together and took down one nude, one dead person and one fat person.48

In outlining these and other examples, this dissertation simultaneously underscores the incongruous behavior of East German officials and provides a new perspective in which to view the East German regime.

Unlike the scholarship on East German photography, studies on the GDR have developed on both sides of the Atlantic in what historian Andrew I. Port describes as three “waves.”49 The first wave, the political, emerged after the peaceful revolution in 1989, when East German archives -- the East German state and the SED -- were opened to the public. Scholars contributing to this stream of investigation focused on the repressive nature of the East German regime; the activities of the State Security Service (Stasi); and major political events, such as the Workers’ Uprising in 1953 and the fall of the Berlin Wall in 1989. Their studies maintained that the GDR, often characterized as the “second dictatorship” and compared to Nazi Germany, was totalitarian in nature.50

The second wave, the social, was initiated in the mid-1990s by historians interested in moving away from a top-down approach in favor of examining the history of everyday life. This group of historians, which included those affiliated with the Zentrum für Zeithistorische Forschung in Potsdam, investigated how the state and East German citizens exercised power over the course of forty years. Their subject matter ranged from the experiences of specific social groups, for example, women and artists, to the role of the Protestant church. They refuted the GDR’s totalitarian label and claimed that East Germany was an “education dictatorship,” “modern dictatorship,” and “welfare dictatorship.” The third and current wave, the cultural, overlaps with the work of social historians. These scholars examine how East Germans fashioned, as historians Paul


52 Given the rise in studies on transnationalism, one could argue that scholars are now also studying the GDR in a global context and are moving beyond the cultural wave. Ina Merkel foresaw this shift when she argued “that we should stop looking at the GDR in isolation as a self-contained society, but look at it rather in the context of post-war European modernization. That requires analyzing the GDR in relations to the macro-structures of broader social orders (Europe, industrial societies, etc.).” See Merkel “The GDR—A Normal Country in the Centre of Europe,”
Betts and Katherine Pence argue, “spaces for agency and autonomy within a largely paternalistic, coercive and didactic regime” through, for instance, their personal relationships, travels outside the GDR, and consumer choices.53 Providing a more complex understanding of the relationship between the state and its citizenry, these scholars, interested not only in cultural objects, but also in culture as lived experience, have turned their attention to topics that have been largely understudied in the past: consumer culture, fashion, film, punk culture, music, television, sex and desire, the domestic sphere, and photography in the GDR, among others.54

This dissertation belongs to the third wave of scholarship. It does so not only through its subject matter, photography, but also through one of its central aims: to impart

---


a more nuanced reading of the East German regime. It neither supports the totalitarian 
view of the GDR, one that has been long contested and is currently being modified by its 
main protagonists, nor does it attempt to characterize the East German dictatorship with a 
single adjective (although one could certainly argue that the GDR exhibited some 
elements of each of the abovementioned dictatorships at various times over the course of 
fifty years). Instead this dissertation highlights the inconsistent actions of East German 
officials and the lack of consensus among the different divisions of the East German 
government from the late 1970s onwards, when socialist realism, as above mentioned, 
began to be treated more and more as a malleable, one might even argue futile, category 
by the East German regime. In doing so, my research bears a strong affinity to recent 
scholarship on East German visual culture, in particular to historian Heather L. 
Gumbert’s careful analysis of television in the GDR. Her study Envisioning Socialism: 
Television and the Cold War in the German Democratic Republic (2014) explores 
television service in East Germany and makes evident “the difficulties GDR authorities 
had in defining and executing a clear vision of the society they hoped to establish.”

This project also falls under the category of the third wave of scholarship because 
like the work of Betts, Pence, Josie McLellan, Jennifer Evans, Eli Rubin, and Alf Lüdtke, 
among others, which demonstrates how ordinary East German citizens constructed what 
historian Geoff Eley describes in “The Unease of History: Settling Accounts with the 
East German Past” as “workable lives inside the constricting boundaries of what an 
established but beleaguered and poorly-resourced state could realistically make

55 Given the increasing support offered to East German art photographers, Jarausch’s concept of a 
“welfare” dictatorship is certainly the most applicable of all four where my study is concerned. 
On Jarausch, see footnote 48.
56 Gumbert, Envisioning Socialism, op. cit., 1.
available,” it argues that East German art photographers worked around the dictates of the regime, finding ways to circulate their images both before and after the exhibition *Medium Fotografie.*\(^{57}\) For instance, they organized their own exhibitions, disseminated their series in underground and pop-up galleries, and took on freelance and staff positions at *Sibylle* and *Das Magazin*, popular illustrated magazines that not only granted their editors and photographers a high degree of autonomy, but that also flew under the radar of official censorship in the GDR. In doing so, these art photographers created and utilized spaces that allowed them to work without abiding to the cultural directives of the regime.

The primary sources for my research have been *Fotografie* and *Bildende Kunst*, photography publications that include articles and images that promoted the agenda of the SED; the ZKF’s monthly newsletters, pamphlets printed in *Fotografie* that not only offer guidance to professional and amateur photographers alike, but that also include calls for participation in shows organized by the Kulturbund and exhibitions reviews; Reports of the Party Congress of the SED, official documents that summarize the responsibilities and expectations of East German artists, among other issues; and exhibition catalogues, which illustrate the kinds of photographs approved of by the Kulturbund and ZKF. Other printed materials that my research has drawn on are the illustrated magazines *Sibylle* and *Das Magazin*. In addition to these sources, my project incorporates interviews and exchanges with East German photographers, notably Arno Fischer and his former students Gundula Schulze Eldowy and Maria Sewcz. Finally, and above all, my investigation of East German photography relies on its object of study: photographs.

Photographs printed in photobooks and illustrated magazines as well as existing in photographic series are the foundation for this research. The images analyzed in this dissertation bear testimony to the diverse photographic practices in the GDR and to the concerns of East German art photographers and the East German state alike between the founding and the collapse of East Germany.

Chapter Contents

This dissertation consists of three chapters, each of which examines a specific period in the history of East German photography: 1949-1961, 1962-1976, and 1977-1989. Chapter One, “Diverging Trajectories: Two Worlds of Photographic Representation,” analyzes the emergence of two worlds of photographic representation in the GDR. It focuses on two projects that took Berlin as their theme shortly after Ulbricht declared socialist realism as the official artistic method in the GDR in 1951: Verliebt in Berlin: ein Tagebuch in Bildern und Worten (In Love With/In Berlin: A Diary in Pictures and Words) by Horst Beseler and his wife Edith Rimkus and Situation Berlin by Arno Fischer. Taken as these photographers traversed the streets of Berlin in the 1950s, their images provide alternative narratives of a metropolis marked by economic, ideological, and geopolitical divisions. Those by Rimkus and Beseler depict East Berlin as an urban center filled with grand buildings and boulevards, children playing, and blissful citizens rebuilding their city, fighting for peace, attending classes, and falling in love. Their images of West Berlin, on the contrary, present a city littered with ruins and filled with citizens mainly interested in entertaining themselves. To strengthen their visual dichotomy of the city, these photographers paired their images with a fictional text, a
story to guide the contemporary viewer on how to see Berlin. Those by Fischer also
document everyday life in Berlin. They do so, however, without emphasizing the
differences between East and West Berlin (or, for that matter, between capitalism and
socialism). More often than not, they capture scenes that took place on the sidelines of
major political and public spectacles and picture apathetic-looking East and West
Berliners alike watching and waiting for events to unfold before them. Pointing to the
tension between “reality” and propaganda on both sides of the political divide, Fischer’s
photographs expose an altogether different urban experience behind the façade of
postwar reconstruction than the one depicted by Rimkus and Beseler. As this chapter
demonstrates, Situation Berlin was exhibited at a small Kulturbund in Weißensee, Berlin,
in 1959 and remained relatively unknown until after the Wende, while Verliebt in Berlin
was featured in Fotografie and published as a photobook by Verlag Neues Berlin in
1958.

The first chapter concludes by discussing the founding of the ZKF. This
organization sought to restrict the activities of East German photographers and urged
them to “depict [socialist] reality in its revolutionary development, as a battle of
opposites, as an overcoming of dissent, as a victorious struggle between the new and the
old, as an aspiring society striving for progress.”\textsuperscript{58} While the ZKF was tasked with
organizing all photography exhibitions in the GDR, artists, as Chapter Two, “Alternative
Sites: East Germany’s Illustrated Magazines,” demonstrates, found other means to

\textsuperscript{58} Friedrich Herneck, “Hinweise zu den ideologischen und ästhetischen Fragen der
Lichtbildkunst,” Mitteilungsblatt der Zentralen Kommission Fotografie in Fotografie, no. 3
(March 1959): unpaginated.
circulate their work. They began to work in groups and coordinate their own exhibitions, something that was permitted by the Kulturbund if done by a collective of artists. They also began to accept and seek out employment at illustrated magazines. This chapter examines the endeavors of Gruppe DIREKT (Group DIRECT), a group of art photographers that formed around Fischer in the mid-1960s. It considers how its leading members, Fischer, Brigitte Voigt, and Sibylle Bergemann worked as editors and photographers at Sibylle and Das Magazin. Their contributions to these publications, which Domröse claims changed the landscape of East German illustrated magazines, influenced a younger generation of artists, notably Helga Paris, who, as this chapter also demonstrates, relied on Das Magazin as a primary vehicle to circulate her photographs in the 1970s.

While illustrated magazines permitted art photographers to make a living and to, at times, pursue their own interests in the 1960s and 1970s, the state and its cultural apparatuses, as Chapter Three, “Der Übergang: (East German) Photography as Art,” shows, began to actively support the work of art photographers by the late 1970s. To illustrate this shift, which resulted in the merging of the two worlds of photographic representation in the GDR, this chapter explores the photographic practice of Gundula Schulze Eldowy.

Known as the enfant terrible of East German photography, Schulze Eldowy photographed citizens who differed from the socialist “types” propagated by the media and ZKF exhibitions prior to the 1980s and exposed an alternative mode of existence.

60 Domröse, Geschlossene Gesellschaft, op. cit. 333.
under “real existing socialism.” Despite doing so, Schulze Eldowy circulated her photographs in major state, solo, and group exhibitions, many of which were organized by the ZKF and the Kulturbund. Her series, like that of Rimkus and Beseler thirty years earlier, were also promoted in *Fotografie*.

In spite of the support that she received from the ZKF and the Kulturbund, Schulze Eldowy was prohibited from leaving the GDR after her show in the Netherlands and her exhibitions were increasingly monitored and censored by the SED in the late 1980s. Explored at length in this chapter, officials’ conflicting treatment of Schulze Eldowy and other East German photographers, notably Maria Sewcz and Helga Paris, not only suggests discord within the East German government, but also its inability to reach a consensus on how to the represent the GDR in the decade leading up to the fall of the Berlin Wall.
CHAPTER ONE
Diverging Trajectories: Two Worlds of Photographic Representation

On 7 May 1945, General Alfred Jodl, on the order of Adolf Hitler’s successor, Karl Dönhitz, signed Germany’s unconditional surrender to the Western Allies and the Soviet Union in Reims, France, effectively putting an end to the Second World War in Europe. In the months that followed, the Americans, British, French, and Soviets, acting on plans first discussed in Tehran in 1943 and then in Yalta in 1945, divided Germany into four zones and took responsibility for implementing policies and overseeing reparations in their respective areas of military occupation. While the Allies unanimously agreed that Germany should be denazified, demilitarized, and democratized at the Potsdam Conference, which took place outside of Berlin between July and August of 1945, each

---

61 The Tehran Conference took place between 28 November and 1 December 1943 and included US President Franklin Roosevelt, British Prime Minister Winston Churchill, and Soviet Premier Joseph Stalin. During the conference, these leaders discussed their plans to invade northern France in May 1944, a venture known as Operation Overlord; the war against Japan; the Polish border; elections in select Eastern European countries; and the division of Germany into Allied zones of occupation after the Second World War. On this conference, see Philip Michael Hett, “The Teheran Conference, 28 November – 1 December 1943: Turning Point for the Grand Alliance,” in Twelve Turning Points of the Second World War (New Haven, Conn.; London: Yale University Press, 2011), 147-165; The Yalta conference took place between 4 and 11 February 1945 and included the same political figures as mentioned above. Discussions revolved around the Soviet Union’s role in the war against Japan; the division of Germany; France’s role in governing one of the four sectors; and reparations, among other issues. On this conference, see Serhii Plokhy, Yalta: the Price of Peace (New York: Viking, 2010).
occupying Power had its own agenda and the governing of the country’s four zones quickly took different paths in the immediate postwar years.\textsuperscript{62}

In the French Zone, France began to ruthlessly collect wartime remittances in 1945. The British and Americans, however, realized that it was in their best interest to aid the reconstruction of western Germany and strengthen rather than to dismantle its economy.\textsuperscript{63} The British began to import basic consumer goods, namely foodstuffs to avoid starvation in their zone, starting in the spring of 1946, while the Americans offered economic assistance to western Germany through the Marshall Plan in June 1947 and subsequently pushed for the conversion of the Reichsmark to the Deutschmark (DM) in 1948.\textsuperscript{64}

\begin{itemize}

\item 63 Without a strong economy in the western zones, the British and Americans knew that they would bear the financial burden of supporting western Germany. They also realized that further suffering among the German population could lead to the spread of communism.

\item 64 Economic support from the US was also offered to the Soviet Union in 1947. The Soviets, however, rejected the aid because it was dependent on a market economy rather than a state-controlled economy and would benefit American exports. For more, see Mary Fulbrook, \textit{A History of Germany 1918-2014: The Divided Nation (4th Edition)}, (Somerset, NJ: Wiley, 2014), 134; idem, \textit{A Concise History of Germany} (Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press,
The currency reform, which came into effect on 20 June 1948, enabled the US to administer aid to Germany, and shifted the direction of the Cold War. Given the rising tensions between the West and the East and the realization that the quadripartite control of Germany was becoming less and less feasible by both sides, the Soviets retaliated against what they fittingly saw as a means to divide Germany. Between 24 June 1948 and 12 May 1949, the Russians blocked all modes of entry, with the exception of air routes, into West Berlin. As a failed attempt to restrict the movement of essential goods into West Berlin and to take full control of the city, which lay in the heart of Soviet-controlled territory, the Berlin Blockade acted as a catalyst for the Western Allies to sever their governing responsibilities with the Soviet Union. That is, it pushed the Western Allies, who had preemptively met twice with the leaders of the Netherlands, Belgium, and Luxembourg in London in 1948 to discuss the founding of a democratic German state, to create the Federal Republic of Germany (FRG) on 23 May 1949.

In addition to playing a vital role in the establishment of the FRG, the currency reform encouraged trade between West Germany and the rest of Western Europe and helped to strengthen its economy. Following the introduction of the Deutschemark, the FRG saw a slow but continual increase in industrial production, exports and gross
national product; a decrease in unemployment levels; and the elimination of the black market, rations, and price controls.67 Contributing to West Germany’s so-called *Wirtschaftswunder* or “economic miracle” in the 1950s, these changes brought affluence to West Germans. They also widened the gap between the FRG and what would become, in large response to the actions of the Western Allies in the spring of 1949, the German Democratic Republic (GDR) on 7 October 1949.68

In the Soviet Zone of Occupation (SBZ), the Soviets began to make far-reaching socioeconomic changes of their own, well in advance of the economic reforms implemented by the Western Allies in the late 1940s. In the months following the end of the war, the Russians started to expropriate all agrarian estates that were larger than 250 acres or owned by former Nazis and redistribute them among landless laborers, refugees from the East, and the state.69 They also began to reduce the number of privately owned businesses and to nationalize large industries, mining, and banking.70 In addition to these reforms, the Soviets dismantled and, in some instances, transferred entire factories to the USSR (the Soviets stripped 1,900 factories in their zone between 1945 and 1948);

70 Ibid.
confiscated over 32 percent of the goods produced in its zone; and extracted large amounts of uranium deposits to be used either for nuclear weapons or in nuclear power plants on Soviet soil.\textsuperscript{71} In total, these latter actions cost the SBZ and its successor state, the GDR, approximately US\$30 billion -- three times the amount agreed upon at the Potsdam Conference -- between 1945 and 1955.\textsuperscript{72} More importantly, they left East Germany, which had also suffered significant losses due to Germany’s division, unable to compete with the FRG’s thriving social market economy in the 1950s.\textsuperscript{73}

Owing to social restructuring and the exacting of reparations in the SBZ, East Germans, like their western neighbors, who also experienced food shortages, a housing crisis, and high unemployment rates, among other issues, faced severe privation in the immediate postwar years.\textsuperscript{74} Unlike West Germans, however, they would continue to do so well into the 1950s, particularly after the Second Party Conference in July 1952, when the Socialist Unity Party (SED) announced its accelerated plan to build socialism and began to invest in heavy industry at the expense of consumer goods and to raise

\textsuperscript{72} There is some discrepancy regarding the total amount of reparations collected by the Soviets. Corey Ross claims that the number is US\$14 billion, while Mary Fulbrook maintains that it is US\$30 billion. For more, see Fulbrook, A History of Germany 1918-2014, op. cit., 132; and Corey Ross, “The East German economy: ‘Planned miracle’, victim of circumstance or fundamentally flawed?” in The East German Dictatorship: Problems and Perspectives in the Interpretation of the GDR (London: Arnold; New York: Oxford University Press, 2002), 84.
\textsuperscript{73} In addition to having its economy stripped while the FRG’s was subsidized by Marshall Aid, East Germany was cut off from raw materials, such as coal and steel, in the Ruhr region and isolated from its previous markets in the Western economic bloc. On this, see Ross, The East German Dictatorship, op. cit., 71.
\textsuperscript{74} German suffering both during and after the Second World War was the theme of “Theorizing German Suffering,” a conference held at the University of Toronto’s Munk Centre for International Studies on 11-13 October 2007. Participants included Aleida Assmann, Micha Brumlik, Ben Frommer, Anne Fuchs, Atina Grossmann, Jennifer Jenkins, Rainer Ohliger, Derek Penslar, Peter Pulzer, Rainer Schulze, and Rebecca Wittmann, among others. It is also the subject of Screening War: Perspectives on German Suffering, eds. Paul Cooke and Marc Silberman (Rochester, N.Y.: Camden House, 2010).
production quotas in the GDR.\textsuperscript{75} In response, many East Germans retaliated against the regime -- the Workers’ Uprising on 17 June 1953 was a direct response to the working conditions and lack of consumer goods in the GDR -- and/or defected to the FRG, where the rates of growth and productivity offered citizens a significantly higher standard of living.\textsuperscript{76} The loss of East Germans to the West, what has been often been characterized as the “hemorrhaging” of the GDR, proved to be a grave problem for the East German regime in the 1950s, both challenging its legitimacy and weakening its workforce.

Between 1949 and 1961, the GDR lost approximately 2.7 million citizens, by and large members of the intelligentsia, skilled laborers, and white-collared professionals, to the West via East Berlin, where streets and public transportation leading to West Berlin remained open and accessible until the building of the Berlin Wall.\textsuperscript{77} In this climate, the visual realm became an important venue for garnering support for competing ideologies

\textsuperscript{75} The decision to accelerate the building of socialism was made after several failed attempts between the Western Powers and the Soviet Union to reach an agreement on the terms of German reunification. On 7 April 1952, Walter Ulbricht (First General Secretary of the SED), Otto Grotewohl (Prime Minister of the GDR), and Wilhelm Pieck (President of the GDR) met with Stalin in Moscow where the latter alleged told them to focus on their own state rather than the FRG, since “any proposals that [the Soviet and East German leaders] can make on the German question the Western Powers will not agree with them. … It would be a mistake to think that a compromise might emerge or that the Americans will agree with the draft of a peace treaty … the Americans need their army in West Germany to hold Western Europe in their hands.” Stalin quoted in Peter Grieder, \textit{The East German Leadership, 1946-73: Conflict and Crisis} (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1999), 64.

\textsuperscript{76} The Workers’ Uprising is discussed in Chapter Two of this dissertation. It is also important to note here that to counter unrest in the GDR, the regime slowly began to channel monies into the production of consumer goods. The monthly life and culture magazine \textit{Das Magazin (The Magazine)}, the subject of Chapter Two of this dissertation, is a case in point. On this magazine, see the following chapter; Josie McLellan, “Visual Dangers and Delights: Nude Photography in East Germany,” \textit{Past and Present}, no. 205 (November 2009): 143-174; and idem, “‘Even Under Socialism, We Don’t Want to Do Without Love’: East German Erotica,” in \textit{Pleasures in Socialism: Leisure and Luxury in the Eastern Bloc}, eds. David Crowley and Susan E. Reid (Evanston, Ill: Northwestern University Press, 2010), 218-237.

and regimes, and Berlin, which stood at the center of the East-West conflict, became the subject of several photobooks. The city was, for instance, the theme of Fritz Eschen’s *The Face of Berlin* (Wolfgang Stapp Verlag, East Berlin, 1956), Lynn Millar and Will McBride’s *Berlin und die Berliner: von Amerikanern gesehen* (*Berlin and the Berliners: from an American Perspective*) (Rembrandt Verlag, West Berlin, 1958), Edith Rinkus and Horst Beseler’s *Verliebt in Berlin: ein Tagebuch in Bildern und Worten* (*In Love in/with Berlin: A Diary in Pictures and Words*) (Neues Leben Verlag, East Berlin, 1958), Hans Scholz and Chargesheimer’s *Berlin: Bilder aus einer großen Stadt* (*Berlin: Pictures from a Big City*) (Kiepenheuer & Witsch Verlag, Cologne, 1959), and Arno Fischer’s *Situation Berlin* (Edition Leipzig Verlag, Leipzig, 1961 and Nicolai & Berlinische Galerie, Berlin, 2001). Produced by photojournalists, documentary photographers, both amateur and professional, and art photographers from both sides of the political divide, these photobooks encouraged their “readers” to see Berlin and the political systems that governed its two halves in very distinct ways in the 1950s and early 1960s.

Berlin also began to play a significant role in films at this time. The city was the stage for Kurt Mätzig’s *Roman einer jungen Ehe* (*The Story of a Young Couple*) (1952) and Gerhard Klein and Wolfgang Kohlhaase’s *Eine Berliner Romanze* (*A Berlin Romance*) (1956) and *Berlin – Ecke Schönhauser* (*Berlin – Schönhauser Corner*) (1957). In these productions, each of which were commissioned by DEFA, Berlin’s sectors emerged, as historian Jennifer Evans argues, “as important tropes with which to explore contemporary barriers to intimacy, love, and personal fulfillment at work and in the home,” and helped to position socialism “as the salve for postwar malaise, generational strife, and the quest for the good life.” The divided city also served as the stage for Billy Wilder’s popular film *Eins, twei, drei* (*One, Two, Three*) (1961), a comedy that gives articulation to Cold War stereotypes and resolves with one of its central characters, a young communist living in East Berlin, becomes a capitalist through hypnosis and moves to West Berlin to presumably live the good life with his American wife and unborn child. For an insightful description of these films, see Jennifer Evans, *Life Among the Ruins: Cityscape and Sexuality in Cold War Berlin* (Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire; New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011), 84-87; and Sebastian Heiduschke, “The Gegenwartsfilm, West Berlin as Hostile Other, and East Germany as Homeland: The Rebel Film *Berlin—Ecke Schönhauser* (*Berlin Schönhauser Corner, Gerhard Klein, 1957),” in *East German Cinema: DEFA and Film History* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013), 61-68.
In this chapter, I will examine how East German photographers Edith Rimkus, Horst Beseler, and Arno Fischer represented Berlin in their respective photobooks. I will not only analyze and compare *Verliebt in Berlin* and *Situation Berlin*, highlighting the differences between their narratives, aesthetic approaches, and objectives, but I will also trace the support these documentary projects received from official channels in the GDR. In doing so, I argue that two worlds of photographic representation emerged in the 1950s, both of which were sustained, albeit to varying degrees, by the East German state and its cultural apparatuses.

*Verliebt in Berlin: ein Tagebuch in Bildern und Worten*

Edith Rimkus was born in East Prussia in 1926 and studied graphic design under Josef Hegenbarth at the Hochschule für Bildende Künste (Academy of Fine Arts) in Dresden after WWII.79 While completing her studies, she attended a free photography workshop offered by Pan Walter, a portrait photographer known for having also trained Evelyn Richter between 1948 and 1951, and became interested in photography.80 To purchase her first camera, a Primarflex (a SLR manufactured in Görlitz), Rimkus worked at Wismut as a mine surveyor assistant in the late 1940s.81 In 1952 she moved to East Berlin, where she was hired to teach photography classes at the Fachschule für Grafik und Buchkunst Berlin-Schöneweide (Technical College of Graphic and Book Arts), and became a member of the Verband Bildender Künstler der DDR (Association of Visual

80 Ibid.
81 Ibid.: Wismut was a large mining company that had a presence in Saxony and Thuringia during the Cold War.
Artists of the GDR or VBK-DDR). Her membership in the VBK-DDR allowed her to work as a freelance photographer and to accept her first major assignment, *Erntesommer* (*Summer Harvest*) (Sachsenverlag, Dresden, 1954), a photobook comprised of seventy-six documentary photographs of the mechanization of agriculture and a text written by Erwin Strittmatter. While *Erntesommer* was and remains little known, it caught the attention of Horst Beleser, a strong advocate of socialism. Beseler would not only write a short review of the publication for *Neues Deutschland* in July of 1954, but he would also invite Rimkus, whom he would later marry in 1957, to collaborate with him on several projects in the 1950s and 1960s.

Born in Berlin in 1925, Beseler was the son of a German railroad employee. He received his Notabitur (emergency diploma given during the war) in 1944 and was immediately drafted into the Wehrmacht; he was captured by American troops the following year, inciting a strong aversion toward the Western Allies that would last for much of the Cold War. Following Germany’s surrender, Beseler worked as a technician and switchboard operator in a Soviet factory in East Berlin (1945-47) and then as a journalist for *Junge Welt* and *Neues Deutschland* (1947-54). In the early 1950s, he began to write fiction novels for children and young adults. His first book *Die

---

82 Muschter, *DDR Frauen fotografieren*, op. cit., 179.
83 Erwin Strittmatter, who ran in the same circle as Bertolt Brecht and Stefan Heym, also wrote about the collectivization of agriculture in the GDR, which was achieved in two stages in 1952-3 and 1959-60, in his novels *Tinko* (1954) and *Ole Bienkopp* (1963). On his collaboration with Edith Rimkus, see Annette Leo, *Erwin Strittmatter: Die Biographie* (Berlin: Aufbau, 2012), 283 and 344.
84 Horst Beseler, “Zwei junge Fotografen: Edith Rimkus · Horst Beseler,” *Fotografie*, no. 10 (October 1959), 378; Horst Beseler and Edith Rimkus would collaborate, for instance, on *Bullermax: ein Fotobilderbuch* and *Matti im Wald: ein Fotobilderbuch*, which were respectively published by Kinderbuchverlag, East Berlin, in 1964 and 1966.
86 Ibid., 505.
Moorbande (The Moor Gang) (1952) was published by Kinderbuchverlag, while his subsequent books, including Im Garten der Königin (In the Queen’s Garden) (1957), which was printed eight times and sold over 90,000 copies in the GDR, were published by Verlag Neues Leben.\(^87\) Within five years of beginning his career as a novelist, Beseler published four books and was awarded the Theodor Fontane Prize for Art and Literature in 1957, becoming one of Verlag Neues Leben’s most successful writers in the 1950s.\(^88\) It was with relative ease therefore that the East German writer, who wanted to write a love story set in Cold War Berlin -- a popular theme at the time -- and to have Rimkus illustrate his book, acquired a publishing contract for Verliebt in Berlin in 1956.\(^89\)

The outcome of Beseler’s first collaboration with Rimkus was a photobook, as mentioned above. Characterized by British photographer Martin Parr as something “between a novel and film,” this genre of photographic book not only permits its makers to create a narrative through the sequencing, framing, and juxtaposition of their images, but it also invites viewers to read photographs collectively, in dialogue with one another, rather than as single images.\(^90\) Photobooks were first produced in the mid-nineteenth century and largely used by documentary photographers as a vehicle to deliver information on subjects as diverse as astronomy, nature, foreign countries and cultures, architecture, war, and life, for instance, on the streets of London and in the slums of New York.

\(^88\) Kühlmann, Killy-Literaturlexikon, op. cit., 504.
\(^89\) See Evans, Life Among the Ruins, op. cit., 84-100 and ft. 16.
\(^90\) Martin Parr and Gerry Badger, The Photobook: A History (London; New York: Phaidon, 2004), 6; For an excellent source on the narratives constructed through the sequencing, editing, and framing of photographs in twentieth-century photobooks, see Andrea Jeannette, “Reading photobooks: Narrative Montage and the Construction of Modern Visual Literary.” Diss. (University of Minnesota, 2007).
York. In the first few decades of the twentieth century, those belonging to the European avant-garde used photobooks as a means to denounce bourgeois culture; explore the camera’s vision; experiment with the medium of photography; and convey how they saw and experienced their surroundings. They were also used to circulate propaganda and address, in the case of several American documentary photobooks made in the 1930s and 1940s, the socio-economic climate in the United States. As an alternative to the gallery wall, the photobook circulated, as photography critic A.D. Coleman argues, “at low prices through existing distribution systems” and was a democratic means to reach a

91 That is not to suggest that all nineteenth-century photobooks were documentary in nature. Those made by members of the Pictorialist movement, such as Julia Margaret Cameron’s Alfred Tennyson’s ‘Idylls of the King’ and Other Poems Illustrated by Julia Margaret Cameron (Henry S. King, London, 1874) and Peter Henry Emerson and Thomas Frederick Goodall’s ‘Life and Landscape on the Norfolk Broads’ (Sampson Low, Marston, Searle and Rivington, London, 1886), treated photography as art. On this subject, see Parr and Badger, “Photography as Art: The Pictorial Photobook,” in The Photobook, op. cit., 60-81; See, for instance, James Nasmyth and James Carpenter’s The Moon: Considered as a Planet, a World, and a Satellite (John Murray, London, 1874), Anna Atkins’ Photographs of British Algae: Cyanotype Impressions (Halstead Place, Sevenoaks, 1843-53), Francis Frith’s Egypt and Palestine (James S Virtue, London and New York, 1858-9), John Forbes Watson and John William Kaye’s The People of India (W H Allen and Co., London, 1868-75), Roger Fenton’s Photographs Taken Under the Patronage of Her Majesty the Queen in the Crimea (Thomas Agnew & Sons, Manchester, 1856), John Thomson, FRGS, and Adolphe Smith’s Street Life in London (Sampson Low, Marston, Searle and Rivington, London, 1877-8), and Jacob Riis’ How the Other Half Lives: Studies among the Tenements of New York (Charles Scribner’s Sons, New York, 1890).

92 Here I am referring to photobooks made by the Constructivists in the 1910s and 1920s, such as Vladimir Mayakovsky and Alexander Rodchenko’s Pro Eto. Ei i Mne (About This: To Her and Me) (Gos.Izd-vo, Moscow, 1923); by members of the Neues Sehen movement in the 1920s, such as Laszlo Moholy Nagy’s Malerei Fotografie Film (Painting Photography Film) (Bauhaus Bücher 8, Albert Langen Verlag, Munich, 1927, 2nd edition, original 1925) and Franz Roh and Jan Tschichold, eds. Foto-Auge ... Oeil et photo ... Photo-Eye (Akademischer Verlag, Dr Fritz Wedeking & Co., Stuttgart, 1929); by the Surrealists in the 1920s and 1930s, such as Léon-Paul and Roger Parry’s Banalitè (Banalità) (Editions de la Nouvelle Revue Française, Gallimard, Paris, 1930); and by photographers working in the ‘documentary mode’ in the 1930s and 1940s, including Brassai’s Paris de nuit (Paris by Night) (Editions Arts et Métiers Graphiques, Paris, 1933), Bill Brandt’s A Night in London (Country Life, London, Editions Arts et Métiers Graphiques, Paris, and Charles Scribners Sons, New York, 1938), and Weegee’s Naked City (Essential Books, New York, 1945).

93 On documentary photobooks in the 1930s and 1940s, see Parr and Badger, The Photobook: A History, op. cit., 116-145; on photobooks used as a means to disseminate propaganda, see idem, The Photobook: A History, op. cit., 152-185.
broad audience up until the 1980s. It was, therefore, the ideal vehicle for Rimkus and Beseler to disseminate what the reader quickly comes to realize is more than a story about young lovers in Berlin in the 1950s.

Created between 1956 and 1958, *Verliebt in Berlin* consists of one hundred and sixty-six black and white socialist realist photographs, the majority of which occupy their own page, and a forty-page socialist realist text. Taken by Rimkus and Beseler using a variety of hand-held cameras, including a Flexaret IV, Certo-Six, Primaflex, Zorki III, Exakta-Varex, Praktica, and a Zeiss-Ikon Plattenkamera, the photographs are grouped into eight sections separated by text. Often captured while the photographers were walking alongside or in close contact with their subjects, the images present a highly constructed view of everyday life in Berlin. At times sharp and others blurred and difficult to discern, indicating the speed at which Beseler and Rimkus often worked and, more generally, the pace of life in Berlin, the photographs document the typical motifs of socialist visual culture as outlined in the introduction: major building projects; students sitting in lecture halls; young lovers strolling through the city; children playing; workers aiding the reconstruction process; athletes training; and citizens attending demonstrations, peace rallies, and, particular to this book, performances by the Aeros circus [Figs. 1.1-1.8]. The photographs also depict ruins, traces of the destruction caused by Allied

---

94 According to Coleman, the cultural significance of the photobook shifted in the 1980s, when the costs of paper, printing, storage, and shipping increased and the book, as a cultural object, began to be seen as archaic, as “a repository of knowledge and/or a vehicle for investigative social criticism.” See A.D. Coleman, “Documentary, Photojournalism, and Press Photography Now: Notes and Questions,” in *Depth of Field: Essays on Photography, Mass Media, and Lens Culture* (Albuquerque: University of Mexico Press, 1998), 43.

bombings and the Red Army during the Second World War, alongside café and bar culture [Figs. 1.9-1.10].

At first glance and in conjunction with the book’s title, the photographs lead the viewer to believe that the text will describe a love story that uses Berlin as its setting. While this is certainly the case, the narrative also purports the benefits of living under socialism and attempts, through its sophisticated subtext and critique of the West, to persuade readers to be loyal socialist subjects. To support this claim, I will first examine Verliebt in Berlin’s text and then its photographs, paying particular attention to how the latter both substantiate and reflect the aims of the narrative.

A Diary in Words: In Love in/with Berlin’s Text

As the title of the photobook insinuates, Beseler’s text is comprised of diary entries written from the perspective of its lead characters. It begins with a description of a chance encounter between the photobook’s protagonists, Wolfgang, a physics student from Berlin, and Sabine, a young woman from Thüringen who has moved to East Berlin to complete a one-year apprenticeship as a seamstress. Presented from the view of Wolfgang, the opening paragraphs convey how he catches Sabine, who accidentally stumbles into his arms after the heel of her shoe breaks, in the midst of rush hour traffic along Friedrichstraße. Acting as her guide, he assists Sabine to the nearby S-Bahn station where he quickly learns that she does not share his fondness for Berlin: unlike Wolfgang, she is far from enamored by its piles of rubble, empty lots, and clouds of dust that hover above its residual architecture and population like a harbinger of its divisive past.96

Angered by her position, Wolfgang resolves to change her view of the city, marking the beginning of a relationship that not only develops between the young protagonists, but also Sabine and Berlin.

Rather than embarking on what quickly becomes a tour of divided Berlin, Wolfgang finds it necessary to first outline why he is troubled by Sabine’s impression of Berlin. Reflecting on their initial exchange, he writes:

Sabine apparently believes that I won’t stand for opinions against Berlin just because I was born here. I have yet to convey to her the real reasons. She already knows that I have always lived here, but she knows very little of what I have experienced and seen in Berlin.

I would have to describe to her how the Americans bombed our house and how entire blocks burned and everything seemed to be falling down. I would also have to narrate how I starved and stole firewood from the rubble—that I grew up as Berlin also began to grow again. I would have to describe how the city was cut into two by the hatred and imperviousness of those who were partly responsible for the catastrophe. I experienced that too. I was there through it all. That is why I love Berlin—regardless that there is now an “over there.” It is my city.97

Operating on multiple levels, his thoughts communicate that Sabine, who is both a literary substitution and a model for the reader, is unaware of the hardships and growth he experienced during WWII and its immediate aftermath in and together with Berlin.

Residing in Thüringen, a less populated state south of Berlin, Sabine did not experience the burning of her home at the hands of enemy bombers; the lack of warmth and provisions that overwhelmed the majority of Berlin’s population; and the division of the city by the Western Allies and the Soviet Union.98 Instead, she moved to Berlin in the 1950s, once the immediate corollaries of the war had subsided and the two German states

97 Ibid., 18.
98 Given the aim of the photobook, it is not surprising that Wolfgang’s thoughts fail to acknowledge the role that the Red Army played in the destruction of Berlin in 1945. For a further analysis, see Evans, Life Among the Ruins, op. cit., 57-59.
were already established, and she therefore lacks the knowledge to fully understand her current surroundings. To remedy what he sees as her flawed sight, Wolfgang acknowledges in the conditional tense that he “would have to describe” the city to Sabine, foreshadowing both his actions and the pedagogical nature of the photobook.

Initially committed to writing a letter to Sabine outlining his reasons for loving Berlin, Wolfgang reconsiders his approach after determining that language alone cannot capture the city from his perspective; a position reinforced by the presence of photographs in the book.\(^9\) Aware of the importance of sight, he resolves to also teach Sabine to feel affection for Berlin by showing her the city. His decision to guide her through its streets, however, is not underlined by his investment in what she sees, but how she sees Berlin. He writes:

One often says that our ordinary way of viewing is quick, fleeting and, in our contemporary society, fails to posses the power to calmly dwell on something. Perhaps I feel different [about Berlin] because mathematics requires of me constant focus and close observation. But I still would find it unfortunate; even the most detailed Baedeker travel guide cannot list what is interesting, beautiful, or worth seeing despite its unsightliness in Berlin.

In general, I do not believe that one loves only what is glorious from the beginning. Such love has no foundation and doesn’t last long. One can buy such love with money or with a tourist ticket to Venice. Even so, what remains of that love is usually only a pair of worn postcards.

And I think in the end what is really beautiful is only that which became beautiful through the devotion of the heart. Even the most inconspicuous of things acquires radiance through this type of devotion. One must understand and experience what surrounds us. One must see for himself. Perhaps, I will still be able to teach Sabine to love Berlin.\(^\)\(^{10}\)

This passage, which sets Wolfgang apart from his contemporaries, suggests that his training as a physicist has led him to see things with mathematical precision; an attribute

\(^{9}\) Beseler and Rimkus, *Verliebt in Berlin*, op. cit., 18 and 19.
\(^{10}\) Ibid., 19.
that not only conveys that to find beauty in the unremarkable and to fall in love with Berlin, Sabine, too, must see her surroundings objectively, but that appeals to the viewer to read the photobook’s images, which correspond to the sight of the protagonists, as impartial views of everyday life in Berlin.

What follows Wolfgang’s disclosure to reeducate Sabine (and, for that matter, the reader), is a yearlong journey through the city.101 Rather than showcasing Berlin’s offerings as Wolfgang’s diary entries have insinuated thus far though, the text sets out to establish the differences between the city’s eastern and western sectors, respectively referred to as “Berlin” and “drüben” or “over there,” its residents, and the politics governing each side.

Concerned with building a strong profile against West Berlin and its citizens, the text initially takes the reader to Charlottenburg, where Sabine, out of an “obligation to be seen,” visits her aunt and uncle with Wolfgang.102 In Charlottenburg, the central characters have afternoon coffee and cake and engage in polite conversation with Sabine’s West German relatives, that is, up until the moment of their departure. Presenting them with some cake to take home, Sabine’s uncle jokes that “they could


102 Beseler and Rimkus, Verliebt in Berlin, op. cit., 42.
surely use it.”

This patronizing remark, which speaks to the scarcity of basic consumer goods in East Berlin, offends Wolfgang and leads to a heated discussion between the two men:

When I [Wolfgang] pointed out what he said, we clashed. The man went so far as to say that one is only allowed to study in the “East” out of propagandistic reasons and that we would lose our ideals once we realized this. He could not admit the fact that he would gladly allow his son to go to university, but was not able to send him. We both closed up and neither of us wanted to be persuaded otherwise. Finally, I had to tell him that he should not let his newspapers make him more stupid and that he should be content to not lose his job at the next crisis and have to sell thread on the street. That didn’t help. Finally, we left formally and politely. I am not mad at him: I feel sorry for him.

Rather than acknowledging his offensive remark once reprimanded by Wolfgang, Sabine’s uncle further affronts the young man by insinuating a direct relationship between education and propaganda in the East. In response, Wolfgang, who understands that Sabine’s uncle is unable to provide a university education for his son, for reasons that are developed later in the text and below, argues that the West German press propagates inaccurate information and contributes to the ignorance of those averse to questioning the authority of the printed word. Together challenging the West’s representations of the East and placing Sabine’s uncle in the latter category of readers, Wolfgang charges the West Berliner of being unacquainted with the aims of socialism and the instability of the very structure that sustains him, the Federal Republic’s social market economy.

103 Ibid., 43.
104 Ibid.
Consequently, he expresses pity for Sabine’s uncle; a gesture that not only conveys the superiority of those living under socialism, but also their awareness, their ability to see through the ideological agenda of the press.

To strengthen its case against the West, the narrative turns to Sabine’s cousin, Achim, who was at work when Sabine and Wolfgang visited his parents in West Berlin. Wanting to celebrate Sabine’s birthday with her, he drives to her apartment where the cousins spend the evening discussing their lives. In this intimate setting, Achim talks about his desires and his father’s priorities, disclosing what Sabine sees as both a lack felt by and inherent in those living under capitalism. She writes:

Achim also told me that he would like to attend university like Wolfgang, but that it was probably no longer possible. He owns hardly any books, only a few technical papers. His father reinforced in him that one should read only what is necessary for one’s profession. Uncle says that novels only prevent one from working. This I cannot understand. Wait until Wolfgang hears this! At our place everybody who is interested in books gets praised. At the factory they often advertise the library. There one does not need to pay. Achim told me that they don’t have money for books anyway because uncle is getting a new car. He can no longer afford to show up by foot at his administrative office. He did not get a promotion or a higher wage though, so he has to pay for it in installments. I would also like to drive a car, but this I cannot understand. He actually seems to behave like Wolfgang said after their fight -- they rate life by the amount of floors in luxury skyscrapers they cannot live in; in the price of butter they cannot afford. They eat margarine instead and turn every penny twice so they can put something new on their bodies; otherwise, the neighbors would look down on them. Good heavens, if one should only live for that. I really felt pity for Achim that evening. If nothing changes, he could become like his parents. Only money. It is true that he wears nice suits, but he does not own books.106

While this passage underscores the disparate concerns of those living on both sides of the political divide from the standpoint of the author -- education in the East and money and material possessions in the West --, it also ingeniously highlights the hardships faced by

West Germans. It makes known that despite the FRG’s growing economy, many of its working-class families, as historian Michael Wildt and others have shown, could not afford sought-after consumer goods, such as refrigerators, washing machines, television sets, radios, and automobiles, without having to work long hours or, as in the case of Achim’s father, pay in installments until the end of the 1950s.\(^{107}\) By drawing on real-life circumstances, something that Beseler does throughout the photobook, the author gives credence to the text as well as validates the beginning of Sabine’s transition: after hearing about Achim’s life in the West, Sabine starts to see things from Wolfgang’s perspective. More importantly, she begins to feel sympathy for those residing “over there”; a clear indication that she, too, is now seeing the differences between those living in the West and those living in the East.

Interlaced between these and other passages on West Berlin and its citizens are journal entries that showcase the venerable qualities and desires of those living in East Berlin. In stark contrast to their Western neighbors, who, as the text purports, obsess over money and keeping up appearances, East Berliners are characterized as caring and helpful. While their regard for others is suggested throughout the text, it is made explicit in an entry written by Sabine after peering out her bedroom window one afternoon. She writes:

The children dressed up in our courtyard and pretended to have a wedding. The activities didn’t last long, yet I could see all the neighbors looking from their windows, naturally also Frau Zeschke [a maternal figure, who, unable to have children, gladly welcomes Sabine into her home when she first moves to East Berlin]; an entire little theatre audience. It is also like this when one asks for directions. Immediately, there is a crowd of people who all want to give information.108

Rather straightforward, Sabine’s diary entry suggests that members of the socialist society look out for one another: not only do the residents of her building, regardless of their familial situations, monitor the children playing below in the courtyard, but they also readily help those in need, including unknown passersby. While Sabine does not expand on why this might be, the text highlights their motives when the leading characters meet unexpectedly once again in East Berlin.

The second surprise encounter between Sabine and Wolfgang takes place on the grounds of the Walter Ulbricht Stadium (renamed the Stadium of World Youth in 1963), where thousands of East Berliners have gathered to take part in a peace demonstration.

This scene is used to convey the population’s mutual longing to live in harmony:

We are still quite breathless - with surprise. Sabine and I have just met each other for the second time by chance in Berlin. Shortly in front of the stadium where everyone went to the demonstration, surrounded by hundreds and thousands of people. We had both forgotten about the other’s plans and under no circumstances thought that we would find each other here. [...] This time Sabine has fallen into my arms without having to apologize for a broken heel. Our hands still lie in one another. And now we sit up here, at the very edge of the stadium. Among us in the encircled area, a gigantic oval filled with laughter, is excitement and shouts of applause. A circle of people that appears to be assembled from faces, shoulders and waving hands. Temporarily it becomes quiet. At the same time the doves are turned loose. They rush upwardly, countless, whirling, and self-important. For a long moment, one believes that they darken the sky. But then we realize that they make it brighter. I feel not the first time, how beautiful common ground is.109

108 Beseler and Rinkus, op. cit., 18 and 19.
109 Ibid., 84.
Written in the present tense from the viewpoint of Wolfgang, as the text mimics the diary form, the passage demonstrates a collective desire for amity not only through the attendance of thousands of East Berliners at a demonstration for peace, but also through what can be read as the merging of human bodies.\textsuperscript{110} This occurs twice in the passage: first when Sabine and Wolfgang embrace outside the venue and remain entwined, even after they have found their seats, through their interlaced fingers, and then again when Wolfgang narrates the scene inside the Walter Ulbricht Stadium. From his elevated perspective, situated between the flying doves -- a metaphor for the participants’ desires -- and the masses below, he describes those around him as one large body comprised of thousands of faces, shoulders, and hands that fills the air with laughter and applause. The synthesis of human bodies, which the protagonists both see and experience firsthand, compels Wolfgang to proclaim that East Berliners share the same desires. It also encourages the reader, on the other hand, to see all those living under socialism as peace-loving citizens, united in the fight for concord.

Aside from caring for others and desiring peace, East Berliners are also characterized as patient. While the reader sees traces of this between Wolfgang’s opening declaration to reeducate Sabine and the closing lines of the text, one is not candidly exposed to this attribute until Wolfgang reflects on Sabine’s imminent departure from Berlin. He writes:

\textsuperscript{110} East Germany was founded on the notion that it would be a peace-loving and, for that matter, democratic nation. This rhetoric served to distance the country from its fascist past, to position itself against imperialists and militarists in the West, and, more importantly, to legitimize the East German regime. On the official rhetoric of peace in East Germany, see Hope M. Harrison, “1956-1958 Soviet and East German Policy Debates in the Wake of the Twentieth Party Congress,” \textit{Driving the Soviets up the Wall: Soviet-East German Relations, 1953-1961} (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2003) 49-95; and Alice Holmes Cooper, “The 1950s: Burning Issues but Stunted Protest,” \textit{Paradoxes of Peace: German Peace Movements Since 1945} (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1996), 25-82.
We have also agreed to consider the physical separation as a necessary task. Sometimes one must control himself and deliberately act differently from what the heart wants. In doing so, the equation is really quite simple – everything that we are planning for later depends on the success of our training. To be able to fulfill wishes, one must first establish the preconditions. However, the wait will nevertheless be difficult. Particularly, when we see others who are already allowed to be together.111

Expressed by Wolfgang as Sabine prepares to return to Thüringen to live with her family and work after her one-year apprenticeship in East Berlin has ended, these thoughts operate on multiple levels. They inform the reader of the young lovers’ inability to reside together in East Berlin and their need to take measures in the present to guarantee their future together. In a less candid manner, they also address the status of the planned economy and its impact on those living in the GDR. As mentioned above, the East German economy suffered under the weight of reparations and East Germans went without basic foodstuffs and consumer goods until the late 1950s, when the East German regime put an end to rationing and focused its energies on overcoming production in the West and raising living standards in the GDR.112 In this climate of want, East Germans

111 Beseler and Rimkus, op. cit., 184.
were encouraged to work hard and trust that their efforts would be rewarded at some indeterminate point in the future.\textsuperscript{113} In short, they were asked by the regime, as one popular dictum of the day makes clear, to “first produce now, then live better.” Rather than criticize the regime or, as millions of East Germans did in the 1950s, defect to the West via East Berlin, Wolfgang communicates their willingness to accept the hardships they must endure in the present for the sake of their long-term objective: building a home together/building socialism. Like all ideologically committed East Germans, the young protagonists are prepared to wait for prosperity.

The passage cited above is also Wolfgang’s final diary entry and it points to an important shift in the text. It marks the climactic moment when Wolfgang stops using the singular form of the first person “I” in favor of the plural form “we,” at once revealing Sabine’s full transition into a loyal socialist subject and heralding the photobook’s closing lines: “He has made me fall in love with Berlin. Today I will tell him that I love Berlin as much as he does.”\textsuperscript{114} Written from the perspective of Sabine, the book’s final sentences divulge the successful outcome of Wolfgang’s endeavor to teach Sabine \textit{how to see} Berlin.

\textbf{A Diary in Pictures: In Love in/with Berlin’s Photographs}

York: Berg, 2001); and Katherine Pence, “Rations to Fashions: The Gendered Politics of East and West German Consumption, 1945-1961,” Diss. (University of Michigan, 1999); Also worth noting here is that while 1958 was the year that rationing officially ended in the GDR, many goods that were rationed at the beginning of the decade in the East were available as of 1953. See Ina Merkel, “Der aufhaltsame Aufbruch in der Konsumgesellschaft,” in \textit{Wunderwirtschaft: DDR Konsumkultur in den 60er Jahren}, ed. Neue Gesellschaft für Bildende Kunst (Cologne: Böhlau Verlag, 1996), 8.

\textsuperscript{113} On the prosperous future promised to the citizens of the GDR in return for their ideological commitment and labor in the 1950s, see Pence, “The Myth of a Suspended Present,” in \textit{Pain and Prosperity}, op. cit., 137-159.

\textsuperscript{114} Beseler and Rimkus, op. cit., 188.
While the text in *Verliebt in Berlin* serves to establish the ostensible differences between East and West Berlin, their citizens, and their political systems from the standpoint of its socialist author, the photographs, ranging from photojournalistic snapshots to reportage shots, are less forthright in their intention. Both borrowing from the repertoire of socialist realist motifs and representing the sight of the protagonists, the photographs taken by Beseler and Rimkus present the viewer with scenes of everyday life in Berlin’s eastern and western sectors. Distinct from the narrative, which develops in chronological order over the course of one year, the photographs are neither arranged in sequence nor do they have, with the exception of a few images that capture major events, advertisements, and recognizable buildings, markers or captions to indicate their location [Figs. 1.11-1.13].115 Without descriptions and visual signifiers to situate them, the photographs are intended to be read by way of Beseler’s fictional narrative (that is not to say, however, that they cannot be read on their own).116 For instance (and in rather simplistic terms), photographs of ruins, teenagers in jazz clubs dancing, smoking or drinking coca-cola products, and shoppers, all of which appear in the text when the protagonists reflect on their time spent in the western sector, are meant to connote West Berlin, while vibrant streets filled with young lovers, children playing, and men and women working to rebuild their city, as

115 There are a handful of images that capture the Alte Nationalgalerie, the Rotes Rathaus, the Gedächtniskirche, the Altes Museum, Frankfurter Tor, and Stalinallee in their backgrounds, placing the images without a doubt in either East or West Berlin.

116 This corresponds with Parr’s claim that “a particular effective context was the picture/text format of the documentary photographic essay, where – in conjunction with judicious sequencing of the images – forewords, afterwords or captions could be used to ensure that the reader’s understanding, his or her ‘reading’ of the photographs, was the right one.” See Parr and Badger, *The Photobook*, op. cit., 119.
described in Sabine’s and Wolfgang’s diary entries when recollecting their experiences in the Soviet sector, are meant to suggest East Berlin.

Although framed by the text, embedded in its complex structure, the photographs do operate outside the diary entries to lend credibility to Beseler’s narrative. They do so by depicting real-life events, such as peace demonstrations, protests against militarism, and May Day parades that took place on the streets of Berlin, and by illustrating scenes as described in the text [Figs. 1.14-1.15]. The latter is visible in several of the photobook’s images. One pertinent example can be found, for instance, in the photograph that corresponds to Sabine and Wolfgang’s second chance encounter [Fig. 1.16]. Taken from inside the Walter Ulbricht Stadium, it captures the scene depicted by Wolfgang from the same vantage point, the “very edge of the stadium,” as the cropped tower in its foreground and skyline intimate. It also documents the same subject matter: thousands of Berliners sitting in tiered seats in the upper level of the stadium and a flock of birds flying above. The resemblance here between the photograph and the text gives authority to Beseler’s biased account and underscores Wolfgang’s mathematical or, better put, mechanical vision. The photograph “seems to declare,” as art historian John Tagg asserts in *The Burden of Representation*, “This really happened. The camera was there. See for
In other words, photography’s privileged status as “evidence” of the events it depicts, a position that Tagg argues is “produced and reproduced by certain privileged ideological apparatuses, such as scientific establishments, government departments, the police and the law courts,” and the likeness between the two descriptive systems permits the text to appropriate the photograph’s “objectivity.”

In addition to authenticating the text, that is, making it appear “real,” the photographs strengthen the narrative’s division of Berlin through their arrangement. At times related and other times not, neighboring images often allude to the divergent qualities of life under capitalism and socialism through their juxtaposition. For instance, in the book’s third section of images, photographs depicting devastation and


118 Tagg, “Currency of the Photograph,” in The Burden of Representation, op. cit., 160; Barthes argues for the same thing, although without drawing a comparison between the content of the text and the photograph, when stating that “the effect of connotation probably differs according to the way in which the text is presented. The closer the text to the image, the less is seems to connote it; caught as it were in the iconographic message, the verbal message seems to share in its objectivity, the connotation of language is ‘innocented’ through the photograph’s denotation.” See Barthes, “The Photographic Message,” op. cit., 26; I place quotations around the noun objectivity here to draw attention to what Martha Rosler describes as the “monolithic cultural myth of objectivity”: photographic truth. Reiterating the same sentiment, Allan Sekula argues that the “only ‘objective’ truth that photographs offer is the assertion that somebody or something -- in this case, an automated camera -- was somewhere and took a picture. Everything else, everything beyond the imprinting of trace, is up for grabs.” On their interpretation of documentary practices and photographic truth, see Martha Rosler, “In, around, and afterthoughts (on documentary photography),” in Decoys and Disruptions: Selected Writings, 1975-2001 (Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press in association with International Center of Photography, New York, 2004), 188; and Allan Sekula, “Dismantling Modernism, Reinventing Documentary (Notes on the Politics of Representation),” The Massachusetts Review, vol. 19, no. 4, Photography (Winter 1978), 863.
reconstruction are placed side-by-side [Fig. 1.17]. Taken in an unidentifiable location, the image printed on the left-hand page captures the traces of World War Two. Beside an unknown man, who is seen both walking toward the photographer and away from a barely legible woman in the background, stands a large building with its windows, several walls, and roof missing. Its supporting elements, metal rods that are both contorted and exposed, extend into a space that was once occupied by an adjacent structure that has, unlike the ruins in the middle ground, been removed, leaving a void in the cityscape. Taken from the southeast corner of Warschauer Straße, the image printed on the right-hand page, on the other hand, documents the reconstruction efforts taking place at Frankfurter Tor, the meeting point of Frankfurter Allee and Stalinallee; the latter being an ambitious initiative of the SED’s Nationales Aufbauprogramm (National Reconstruction Program or NAP), which launched in East Berlin in November 1951 and was used to demonstrate to those on both sides of the political divide what socialism was capable of achieving. Framing a particular view of Frankfurter Tor -- as we shall see later from Fischer’s images, many areas near this intersection in Friedrichshain were empty in the late 1950s --, the image pictures growth. It focuses on a crane that occupies the foreground and one of the last buildings, carefully outlined by the machine’s latticed boom, to be built along the Stalinallee in the background. While there is some debris in the foreground as well as behind the three individuals walking toward the camera in the

middle ground, the streets are largely cleared and the area is in the final stages of completion, as indicated by the scaffolding used to add the finishing touches to the backside of architect Hermann Henselmann’s building in the background.

While the combination of the abovementioned photographs is one of the most obvious examples of visual contrasting in the photobook, there are more subtle instances seen throughout *Verliebt in Berlin*. In its fourth section, for example, two images, each capturing groups of three sitting in different establishments, are placed together [Fig. 1.18]. Taken inside a dimly lit bar, the grainy photograph on the left documents what appear to be friends sitting at a table directly in front of a window that has one of its two curtains drawn. Despite the dark setting, which, along with the use of a large aperture, contributes to the image’s overall lack of depth, it is clear that these three casually-dressed friends are enjoying each other’s company: the woman sitting in the center smiles as she looks at her companion on the left, while the man on the right peers over his glass of beer toward his male companion, who seems, from the attention he is garnering, to be conversing with his friends. The photograph printed on the right-hand page, at once the latter’s opposite and complement, also pictures three individuals sitting at a table, but from an altogether different perspective: the street. Captured through a pane of glass that both reflects the vibrant neon lights of the storefronts located behind the photographer -- presumably along the Kurfürstendamm -- and effaces much of the restaurant’s interior, the photograph shows an older couple and a young woman having dessert, as the teapot and coffee carafe placed in the center of the table and the small dessert forks held by both women suggest. Unlike those sitting inside the bar, these three well-dressed individuals not only sit tight-lipped with their coats and scarves on, implying a certain level of
discomfort, but they also turn their attention to unrelated sights: the young woman turns her head to observe the comings and goings on the street, while the man looks at the older woman seen staring down at her plate.

In arranging these and other photographs in such a manner and by framing them by a propagandistic text that draws attention to the benefits of living under socialism, often at the expense of life under capitalism in the West, Rimkus and Beseler endeavored to not only show the reader how to see Berlin, but also how to feel about the Cold War city. Like many photographers working in Berlin at the time, as historian Jennifer Evans maintains in *Life Among the Ruins: Cityscape and Sexuality in Cold War Berlin*, a small section of which deals with photographic representations of Berlin at the height of the Berlin Crisis (1958-1961), Rimkus and Beseler attempted to sway the reader’s impression of the city’s two halves. She writes:

As ethnographers of everyday life, these image-makers [Lynn Millar, Will McBride, Edith Rimkus, Horst Beseler, Hans Scholz and Chargesheimer] did not simply circulate their photos as supplemental documents of the Berlin Crisis; they played an active, constitutive role in formalizing the visual representation of the city divided. That these photographers seized on street scenes and images of youth is especially telling since it was in leisure spots, like Wannsee Beach in the furthest reaches of West Berlin, or amidst the hustle and bustle of a curbside market, the bus stop, and traffic circulation that the landscape of war and destruction was reconfigured to suit a new master, that of competing ideological systems desperate to win over the hearts of its citizenry. [...] In essence, photojournalism, and photos of divided Berlin especially, created an emotional geography of the Cold War city that was a supremely important means of communicating the supposed naturalness of a way of life safeguarded and protected on this side of the boundary. Well before the building of a brick-and-mortar wall between two opposing ideological systems, the simple association of happiness with one side of the city linked memory, self-actualization, comfort, and desire to a particular political system.¹²⁰

¹²⁰ Evans, *Life Among the Ruins*, op. cit., 92-93.
Unlike Rimkus and Beseler, who used Verliebt in Berlin to communicate the alleged disparities between East and West Berlin and to garner support for socialism, their contemporary, Arno Fischer, photographed Berlin without advocating for either of the city’s competing ideologies and regimes. In the following section, I will examine Fischer’s photobook Situation Berlin and argue that the East German photographer documented Berlin as he saw it rather than how one should see it in the 1950s.

**Situation Berlin**

Arno Fischer was born in Berlin in 1927 and raised by his aunt and uncle, Erna and Franz Zabel, after the untimely death of his parents; his mother died in 1938 and his father in 1941. His uncle, a fervent amateur photographer, encouraged Fischer to purchase a 6x9 Voigtländer camera with his earnings from his apprenticeship as a carpenter at Borsigwerke (1941-44) to document Berlin.\(^{121}\) Shortly afterwards and before volunteering to serve in the navy in 1944, Fischer exchanged this model for a 35mm Leica, an easier-to-handle camera that allowed him to capture his surroundings with greater ease and speed. After the war, Fischer enrolled in drawing classes at the Käthe-Kollwitz-Kunstschule (Käthe Kollwitz Art School) in Tiergarten (1947-48) and then studied sculpture at the Kunsthochschule Berlin (Academy of Arts or KHB) in Weißensee (1949-1951) and the Hochschule für Bildende Kunst (Academy of Visual Arts) in Charlottenburg (1952-53).\(^{122}\) While completing his education in the plastic arts,


\(^{122}\) Ibid; During the Cold War, Tiergarten, which is now part of Mitte, was its own district in West Berlin.
he returned once again to photographing his environment and decided to forego, with the support of his professors, his studies in sculpture to pursue a career in photography.

Along with his decision to explore the medium of photography, Fischer moved from Wedding to the Schiffbauerdamm in Mitte, where he would live until well after German reunification. Between 1953 and 1960, he took to the streets with his small-format camera and photographed everyday life in Berlin. He sustained this documentary project through employment as a photographic laboratory assistant in a private institute for radiology (1954-56); as an instructor of photography at the KHB (1956-1971); as a freelance photographer for the monthly life and culture publication Das Magazin (The Magazine); and through the financial support of Günther Rücker, an East German playwright and documentary filmmaker who took an ardent interest in his photographs and gave him a monthly stipend of three hundred DM between 1955 and 1960.123

The outcome of Fischer’s time photographing on the streets of Berlin in the 1950s and early 1960s is Situation Berlin, a photographic series comprised of seventy-two black and white images that fall under the category of straight photography, photography that depicts scenes as the photographer encountered them in real life, accompanied by captions indicating their precise location.124 While the series was to be published by

---

124 In other words, straight photography is a kind of photography that is neither staged nor doctored in the darkroom. The term first emerged in the 1880s in response to pictorialist photography, which often combined two or more photographs and attempted to mimic the effects of painting through the use of special lenses, printing processes as well as manipulating images in the darkroom. After the 1910s, owing to the work of Paul Strand, the term was increasingly used to reference an aesthetic associated with high contrasts, sharp focus, and an emphasis on geometric structures. On the subject of straight photography, see Hilde Van Gelder and Helen Westgeest, “Straight and Composed Photography: The Impact of the Digital,” in Photography Theory in Historical Perspective (Chichester, West Sussex; Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell, 2011), 23-33; Naomi Rosenblum, “Photography since 1950: The Straight Image,” in A World History of Photography (New York: Abbeville Press Publishers, 2007, 4th ed.), 516-569; and the
Edition Leipzig in 1961, the photobook, for reasons that I will outline below, did not circulate until 2001, when Fischer and Ulrich Domröse, curator of photography at the Berlinische Galerie, revived the project and published it under the same name. The original photobook is now in the possession of Domröse and has not been made accessible to the public. What follows, therefore, is an analysis of the 2001 version, which, according to Fischer, includes the same photographs without the original texts, none of which were written by the photographer.

Distinct from Rimkus and Beseler’s photobook, which reproduces the motifs of socialist visual culture to help construct a rich narrative on the differences between East and West Berlin, *Situation Berlin* presents a more idiosyncratic view of Berlin in the 1950s. Arranged intermittently in terms of their dates and locations, both of which are listed in the book’s appendix, its images also capture everyday life in Berlin. However, at times critical of life in divided Berlin and others favorable, picturing tender moments between lovers, children and their school teachers, and families in both its eastern and western sectors, its photographs, almost always taken at a short distance from their

---

125 When I asked Fischer about the mock-up of the book two months before his death, he directed me to Domröse. Unfortunately, the latter has neither responded to my request to see the original nor has he included it in any of the major solo and group exhibitions at the Berlinische Galerie featuring Fischer’s work, most notably *Arno Fischer Fotografien 1953-2006* (2010) and *Geschlossene Gesellschaft: Künstlerische Fotografie in der DDR 1945-1989* (2013). He has, however, printed two double-pages from the mock-up in his essay “A Crack in Wall.” See Domröse, “A Crack in the Wall,” in *Situation Berlin*, op. cit., 28 and 29.

126 In interview with Candice Hamelin on 12 July 2011 in Gransee, Germany.

127 Not only was Fischer aware of Cartier-Bresson’s work, in particular his photobooks *Images à la Sauvette* (also known as *The Decisive Moment*) and *Les Européens (Europeans)*, respectively published by Editions Verve in 1952 and 1955, the two photographers would become friends and the French photographer stayed with Fischer and his wife, Sibylle Bergemann, in East Berlin in the 1980s. In interview with Candice Hamelin on 12 July, 2011 in Gransee, Germany; Fischer was also aware of other international photographers through Swiss publications such as *Du* and *Camera*, which were all readily available in West Berlin. See Domröse, “A Crack in the Wall,” op. cit., 18 and Chapter Three of this dissertation.
subjects, impart an altogether different view of Cold War Berlin than those printed in *Verliebt in Berlin*.

Having spent considerable time in both halves of Berlin, living and attending different artistic institutions between 1945 and 1953 and then traversing its streets with a camera for nearly a decade, Fischer was well acquainted with it various districts. Rather than set its two sides against each other, like Rimkus and Beseler, Fischer photographed what he saw as characteristic of everyday life in Berlin, underscoring the social, political, and economic polarization in the GDR’s capital without supporting one political and economic system over the other.

Interested in situations on the periphery of political demonstrations and spectacles, Fischer opens his photobook with three images taken in East Berlin. Characteristic of many of those to follow in *Situation Berlin*, they capture East Berliners waiting for events to take place outside the photographic frame. In the first photograph, *East Berlin, May Day, Unter den Linden, 1956*, Fischer documents six individuals, aligned in three groups of two, and a young boy, cropped from the bust down, waiting for the May Day parade to pass along Berlin’s central boulevard [Fig. 1.19]. A far cry from the enthusiastic, flag-bearing East Berliners pictured at these kinds of events in the press and, for that matter, in Rimkus and Beseler’s photobook, they appear both tired and bored: they either sit or lean their bodies against the Kronprinzenpalais and look in opposite directions, not only to the left or the right, but also straight ahead, in search of a diversion. Underlining both their extended wait period and fatigue, the photographer,

who stands on the left with a camera hanging around his neck, closes his eyes altogether, while the dog, seen behind the young boy, lays on a checkered blanket to get some respite.

The tedium seen among those waiting along Unter den Linden is reiterated in Fischer’s following photographs *East Berlin, Day of the Republic (this is where the City Castle once stood; today the Palace of the Republic stands on these grounds)* 1958 and *East Berlin, on the occasion of N. S. Kruchev’s first visit, Friedrichshain 1957* [Figs. 1.20-1.21]. In the former image, a crowd comprised of both children and adults sits in a provisional stadium on the grounds of the former Stadtschloss (City Palace). Waiting for the prams pictured in the foreground to be removed and for the next performance to commence, they pass the time by talking amongst themselves, looking around the grounds, and, in the case of the lone man sitting in the front row between the carriages, reading the newspaper. Also seen waiting for something to transpire, in this instance, the procession of Nikita Khrushchev and his delegation in Friedrichshain, are the four individuals captured at Bersarin Platz, a square located a few hundred meters from Frankfurter Tor, in the latter photograph. Distinct from the attentive masses seen cheering at the arrival of East Germany’s alleged “beste Freunde” or “best friend” outside Berlin Ostbahnhof on August 7th, 1957, in *Neues Deutschland* the next day, they wait at a distance for the political spectacle to unfold and direct their attention, with the exception of the elderly man who patiently sits on the crossing of two wooden beams, everywhere

129 The Stadtschloss was severely damaged by Allied bombings in 1945 and demolished by the Socialist Unity Party in 1950.
except the street: the two men sitting on opposite fence poles are seen talking and looking at each other and the young woman beside the elderly man looks toward the ground [Fig. 1.22].

While the individuals captured in Situation Berlin’s opening images provide an alternative view of the East German collective -- one that categorically calls into question the population’s unrelenting enthusiasm for socialism as propagated by the organs of the state, notably Neues Deutschland, and by socialist works such as Verliebt in Berlin --, what is striking in these and other photographs of East Berliners seen waiting are the ruins and voids that surround them. The bystanders in East Berlin, May Day, Unter den Linden, 1956, for instance, are photographed in front of the remains of the Kronprinzenpalais [Fig. 1.19]. This impressive 17th-century building, which occupies the entire background of the photograph, unequivocally puts Berlin’s recent past on display. Unable to delineate between the internal and external environment, as the numerous windowless openings and destroyed northwest corner attests, its residual walls bear witness to the effects of the Second World War. The same can also be said of the vacant space in East Berlin, on the occasion of N. S. Kruchev’s first visit, Friedrichshain 1957 [Fig. 1.21]. Bordered by tenement buildings and a wooden fence, the large void seen in the photograph’s foreground and middle ground, covered in arid earth and scattered with unkempt bushes and mislaid objects, highlights the physical destruction caused by the Second World War: here absence transmits, to the same degree as the dilapidated palace,

132 These are the products of hundreds of bombings by the Royal Air Force Bomber Command and its US Allies between 1940 and 1945 and of severe shelling by the Soviets in the spring of 1945. On Berlin’s streets during the immediate postwar period, see Evans, Life Among the Ruins, op. cit., 46-100.
the damage done to Berlin in the final months of WWII and in the days leading up to its capitulation.

Despite its authority in conveying the physical state of East Berlin in the 1950s (not to mention in undermining images of socialist reconstruction in the East, commonly referred to as *Aufbau* photography), the destruction seen throughout Berlin’s eastern sector is not the focus of Fischer’s photographs. Instead, it operates both as and within the background to situate East Berliners and, more generally, all East Germans between the past and the prosperous future guaranteed to them by the very political bodies omitted from the photographer’s images. This forthcoming period is repeatedly called into question by the lingering presence of ruins and voids seen throughout Fischer’s photobook. Since 1952, when the Socialist Unity Party (SED) decided to accelerate the building of socialism, the Party continuously boasted of the benefits socialism would bestow upon the GDR’s hard-working and ideologically-committed citizens. In exchange for their support, East Germans were promised a better life in the future (as discussed in the context of the 1953 Workers’ Uprising and Wolfgang’s last diary entry in *Verliebt in Berlin*). Caught in the interim, both photographically and literally, Fischer’s subjects are seen not only waiting for parades and demonstrations to pass by on the streets before them, but also for change to take place in the GDR.

Unlike the GDR, the FRG began its postwar recovery as early as 1948, as mentioned above. Owing to the economic reforms that took place in the late 1940s, West German citizens began to not only experience higher living standards than those living in the East. They also began to seek out the new forms of diversion and recreation available in the FRG. Highlighting this, Fischer’s photographs of West Berlin frequently show

133 Grieder, *The East German Leadership*, op. cit. 64.
West Berliners -- in what has become somewhat of a cliché -- spending an evening out on the town and window-shopping in Charlottenburg, an area filled with restaurants, cinemas, cafés, and jazz clubs.\footnote{See, for instance, how West Berlin is represented in the aforementioned DEFA films as well as in Lynn Millar and Will McBride’s photobook Berlin und die Berliner: von Amerikanern gesehen.} Taken as the photographer stood amidst a bustling crowd, \textit{West Berlin, Zoo Station 1958}, for instance, captures fashionable West Berliners outside Zoologischer Garten station at dusk [Fig. 1.23]. Surrounded by an outdoor café, movie theater, and French perfume shop, they are seen strolling in different directions; waiting for others to join them, perhaps to go either to the cinema or restaurant pictured in the background of the image; and, in the case of the women walking by the display windows in the image’s foreground, glancing at consumer goods. The latter is also seen in \textit{West Berlin, Kurfürstendamm 1958} [Fig. 1.24]. With the exception of the elderly woman standing in the middle ground with her eyes closed, those in the foreground and background of the image, turned away from both the viewer and the camera, are seen admiring the lights exhibited in the shop windows. They not only stop to have a closer look, but they also direct the viewer’s attention to the merchandise for sale, as the elegantly-dressed woman in the foreground, who uses her left hand to point to something outside the photographic frame, demonstrates.

In addition to photographing West Berliners looking at goods for sale, Fischer also pictures them as the owners of sought after consumer goods, communicating their purchasing power in images such as \textit{Berlin, Bismarkstraße 1959} [Fig. 1.25].\footnote{The date of this photograph in \textit{Situation Berlin} is incorrect: the Opel Rekord PII and the film \textit{La Dolce Vita} were respectively produced and released in 1960.} Taken as Fischer was crossing the street, this image captures cars idling at a crosswalk in front of a Borgward showroom both filled with new car models and flanked by what appears to be
a quickly assembled building that advertises Schultheiss, a German pilsner, and a vacant space. Seen together with the cars on Bismarkstraße, the showroom models do not appear as objects to be observed behind panes of glass by the solitary man seen on the sidewalk and others like him, but as objects to be possessed by the likes of those driving the Opel Rekord PII, Mercedes, and Volkswagens in the foreground. These automobiles, together with the billboard ad for Federico Fellini’s 1960 film La Dolce Vita (The Sweet Life) captured above the exhibition space, insinuate that the city’s western sector is a place where one can live the good life.

Given the austere surroundings of the Borgward showroom, it is no surprise, however, that the association made between West Berlin and the good life in Berlin, Bismarkstraße 1959 is a derisive one. Despite its offerings, West Berlin often fails, as Fischer’s images West Berlin, Kurfürstendamm 1959 and West Berlin, Tauentzienstraße 1959 attest, to provide a life of pleasure and comfort for all its residents [Figs. 1.26-1.27]. Taken from the sidewalk, the former photograph captures two men sitting in a parked car along the Kurfürstendamm. Set against a backdrop of expensive cars and advertisements, including one for Vademecum, a Swedish brand of toothpaste distributed in Europe in the 1950s, and another for Hinter blinden Scheiben (Young Girls Beware), a 1957 French drama directed by Yves Allégret, the men are seen with their backs turned to the distractions on the other side of the street. Equally disinterested in his surroundings as in his passenger, the man behind the steering wheel stares aimlessly at the dashboard, while his companion, who rests his head in his right hand, confronts Fischer’s camera with a look of utter boredom. Surrounded by entertainment options like those in West Berlin, Zoo Station 1958, they appear disinterested in the sights and sounds of West Berlin. That
is, sitting motionless, they express no desire to leave Charlottenburg or their vehicle to partake in the bustle outside its confines.

Unlike the men seen in *West Berlin, Kurfürstendamm 1959*, who can choose whether or not to indulge in West Berlin’s offerings, the disabled man in Fischer’s *West Berlin, Tauentzienstraße 1959* -- one of the only images in *Situation Berlin* to be taken at a slight angle, reminiscent of the work of those associated with the Neues Sehen movement -- is not granted the luxury of choice. Sitting alone on the sidewalk between a storefront filled with shoes and a note and change box to collect donations from passersby, the man, perhaps an injured war veteran, is photographed playing the harmonica. Unable to provide for himself through other means of employment, he depends equally on the generosity of others as on the crutches placed before him for his subsistence. Distinct from the individuals seen walking away from the Gedächtniskirche (Memorial Church) along Tauentzienstraße in this and other photographs in *Situation Berlin*, he is neither able to leisurely stroll along its sidewalks nor to purchase the merchandise in its stores. In short, he does not belong to those allegedly living ‘the sweet life’ in West Berlin.

While Fischer’s characterization of West Berlin is, at times, piercing, his critical eye is not only reserved for the city’s western sector. The segregation seen in *West Berlin, Tauentzienstraße 1959*, for instance, can also be read in several of his images of

---

East Berlin, where, despite the rhetoric of togetherness propagated by the SED and underlining the very theory of socialism, Berliners are captured alone or wholly ignored by those around them. This can certainly be seen in his images of the Lustgarten (Pleasure Garden). Located in Mitte and bordered by the Berliner Dom and the Altes Museum, the park, which hosted fairs filled with rides, games, and booths selling a variety of wares in the 1950s, provided the grounds for Fischer to photograph scenes of isolation. In the first of two images with the same caption, *East Berlin, Lustgarten, 1953*, Fischer photographs a young blind woman [Fig. 1.28]. Standing alone behind a chain partition amidst fallen litter, traces of the day’s activities, she is seen clutching a piece of paper in one of her clenched fists. Whether she is in need of assistance or is anxiously waiting for someone located outside the photographic frame is unclear; what is evident, however, is that she stands away from the general crowd and, as indicated by the man busily working in the background with his back turned to her and the camera, unnoticed. In the second photograph, Fischer captures East Berliners driving bumper cars, a subject that was similarly captured by Robert Frank in a Parisian fairground two years earlier [Figs. 1.29-1.30]. While the background of Fischer’s image is blurred due to the movement of the bumper cars, the foreground isolates a rather somber-looking pair that sit, unlike the couple in Frank’s photograph, who are not only pictured with their mouths open in excitement, but with the man’s arm placed behind his companion’s back, expressionless and without touching each other. The young woman in Fischer’s photograph places her hands on the steering wheel, while the man raises one arm to his

137 On the history of the Lustgarten, see Heinz Knobloch, *Im Lustgarten: Geschichte zum Begehen* (Halle: Mitteldeutscher Verlag, 1989); It is not known whether European existentialism had an influence or not on Fischer’s practice in the early 1950s, but it seems, given the content of the images taken in the Lustgarten and on Tauentzienstraße, that he was certainly concerned with the theme of alienation in modern society.
chest and avoids coming into contact with her body. A far cry from the couple photographed by the Swiss photographer, not to mention the affection lovers seen throughout Rimkus and Beseler’s Verliebt in Berlin, these individuals sit with their eyes closed and appear to shut out their surroundings, subtly suggesting that one can also feel alone in the company of others.

In addition to highlighting the harsh realities of everyday life in Cold War Berlin, Fischer also used his camera to capture tender moments that unfold in the city. In East Berlin, Friedrichshain 1958, for instance, Fischer photographs children playing; friends catching up; individuals either relaxing or reading the newspaper; and young lovers, as the pair looking at each other adoringly in the center of the photograph make plain, spending time together in a park in East Berlin [Fig. 1.31]. Another warmhearted scene documented by Fischer, this time in West Berlin, can be seen in West Berlin, Kurfürstendamm 1958 [Fig. 1.32]. Taken at night, the photograph shows a young boy and a man standing in front of a case displaying military awards and decorations. While the image could certainly be read as a forewarning of Germany’s future, given that it is a young boy who stands before objects reminding the viewer of the country’s recent past, its focus is less on what resides in the background than on the boy’s excitement as he looks up at the man, presumably his father, and smiles. Although rare, scenes like these intimate that families and friends as well as love and joy can be found throughout Berlin.

The Emergence of Two Worlds of Photographic Representation
Despite their disparate aims and formats, *Verliebt in Berlin* and *Situation Berlin* both rely on documentary photography to construct a particular view of Cold War Berlin. Like all other types of photography, documentary is a highly mediated form of representation. Its meaning is created through context, framing, cropping, editing, and sequencing, as well as by the “textual, epistemological, and ideological systems that inscribe and contain it,” as Solomon-Godeau and others, including Tagg, Martha Rosler, and Allan Sekula, have pointed out in their respective writings on the genre in the 1980s and 1990s.

Relying on a fictional narrative to contextualize their documentary photographs, Rimkus and Beseler aimed to not only guide their readers on *how to see* Berlin, but also *how to feel* about the divided city. That is, they endeavored to garner support for the socialist cause and to show their readers that life was better on *their* side of the political divide. Fischer, on the other hand, was less interested in promoting one competing ideology and regime over the other than in capturing an alternative view of the city, one behind the façade of postwar reconstruction. Having more in common with Cartier-Bresson and Frank than with his East German colleagues -- the former through his carefully composed

---

138 John Grierson first used the term “documentary” when reviewing Robert Flaherty’s film *Moana* in 1926. It is worth noting here that the term was ascribed to what the nineteenth-century viewer would have considered, as Abigail Solomon Godeau argues, tautological after pictorialism and symbolism had long challenged photography’s status as an objective transcription of reality. On the conception of documentary photography, see Solomon-Godeau, “Who Is Speaking Thus? Some Questions about Documentary Photography,” in *Photography at the Dock*, op. cit., 169-170.

photographs and the latter through his ability to capture a view of Berlin that was at odds with the status quo --, Fischer, despite the handful of images in his photographic series that suggest love and happiness in divided Berlin, drew attention to the different standards of living in Berlin and the flaws underlining both socialism and capitalism.\textsuperscript{140} For this reason, his photographs were met with a very different reception than those taken by Rimkus and Beseler during the Cold War.

Described as the “architects of socialism” by Marina Bugajew, editor-in-chief of \textit{Sovetskoe foto} (\textit{Soviet Photo}), East German photographers were expected to help build socialism in the 1950s.\textsuperscript{141} Distinct from their Western colleagues, who were experimenting with abstraction and formalism and accused of engaging in bourgeois decadent trends by East German officials at the time, they were compelled, that is, if they wanted to openly disseminate their work in the GDR, to employ the method of socialist realism.\textsuperscript{142} Thought to “contribute to the ideological transformation and education of the

\textsuperscript{140} On Henri Cartier-Bresson’s photographic practice, see Peter Galassi, \textit{Henri Cartier-Bresson: The Modern Century} (New York: Museum of Modern Art, 2010); and Clément Chéroux, \textit{Henri Cartier-Bresson} (London: Thames & Hudson, 2008); Awarded a Guggenheim Fellowship in 1955, Robert Frank travelled throughout the United States in his car and photographed scenes of everyday life for almost two years. The result was \textit{The Americans}, a photobook containing eighty-three black and white photographs published first in France (1958) and then in the United States (1959). At odds with the optimistic images that circulated in the US media at the time, its photographs captured American society as Frank saw it, often highlighting racial segregation, poverty, and loneliness. Frank photographed Americans in a manner that they did not want to, or perhaps could not, see, and his photobook was met with hostility when it was first published in the US. The same could be said of Fischer’s photographs of Berliners taken during the same period and, as I will shortly demonstrate, of the reaction to his work. On Robert Frank and \textit{The Americans}, see Jonathan Day, \textit{Robert Frank’s The Americans: The Art of Documentary Photography} (Bristol; Chicago: Intellect, 2011); and Sarah Greenough et al., \textit{Looking in: Robert Frank’s The Americans} (Washington, D.C.: National Gallery of Art, 2009).


\textsuperscript{142} Strong positions against Western art practices are easily found in art magazines and exhibition catalogues of the time. In a short article entitled “Von der 1. zur 2. Bifota,” published in the 2. \textit{bifota} exhibition catalogue, for instance, Heinz Bronowski and Gerhard Henniger write that the
people in the spirit of socialism,” the approach was viewed as an effective means to build socialism and, as such, the SED strove to place photography in its service as early as July 1952.143

To highlight the significance of socialist realism, historians of photography and critics, notably Bertolt Beiler, Friedrich Herneck, and Gerhard Henniger, published countless articles on the subject throughout the 1950s in Fotografie: Monatsschrift für gestaltende und dokumentarische Fotografie (Photography: Monthly Magazine for Creative and Documentary Photography), the only state-authorized publication featuring both professional and amateur photography from the Eastern Bloc in the GDR.144 Advocating photography’s role in the socialist cause, these contributors, many of whom were on the magazine’s editorial board, argued that “photographers, like writers, must contribute their specific artistic means to help solve the great task of socialist development in the GDR” by employing socialist realism and presenting optimistic views

---

143 Friedrich Herneck, “Zur Frage des Sozialistischen Realismus in der Fotografie,” Fotografie, no. 3 (March 1960), 298; While socialist realism was announced as the official aesthetic in the GDR in 1951, it was not until after the Second Party Conference of the SED, held between 9-12 July 1952, when Walter Ulbricht announced the accelerated plan to build socialism, that photography was solicited to help build socialism. For a further analysis, see John C. Torpey, Intellectuals, Socialism, and Dissent: the East German opposition and its Legacy (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1995), 22.

144 A collection of their essays can be found in Friedrich Herneck et al., Fotografie und Gesellschaft: Beiträge zur Entwicklung einer sozialistisch-realistischen deutschen Lichtbildkunst (Halle/Saale: Fotokinoverlag Halle, 1961). In addition to writing short pieces on photography, Berthold Beiler wrote the following books: Parteilichkeit im Foto (1959), Die Gewalt des Augenblicks: Gedanken zur Ästhetik der Fotografie (1967), Weltanschauung der Fotografie: Beiträge zu einer marxistischen Ästhetik der Fotografie (1977), and Denken über Fotografie (1977).
of East Germany and its citizens.\textsuperscript{145} Given the stance of these prominent photography theorists and critics and the political climate in the late 1950s, when tensions between the East and West were again on the rise and Berliners feared another blockade was imminent, it is no surprise that Rimkus and Beseler’s photobook was met with enthusiasm in the GDR.\textsuperscript{146}

In 1958, Neues Leben published and circulated over five hundred copies of \textit{Verliebt in Berlin} in the GDR, a considerable number given that each copy cost 14,80 DM.\textsuperscript{147} One year later, the photobook was praised in \textit{Fotografie}. In a four-page article entitled “Verliebt in Berlin: Eine gespaltene Stadt, zwei junge Leute und ein Buch,” printed in its October 1959 issue, the journal claimed that Rimkus and Beseler’s photobook rendered Berlin not only as “the most exciting city in Europe, but as the capital of a uniform, peaceful and democratic Germany.”\textsuperscript{148} The publication also applauded \textit{Verliebt in Berlin} for its distinct components: the text was deemed “so objectively and informatively constructed that it not only created a real picture of modern Berlin, but also the emotional movements of young people, the wealth of their inner

\textsuperscript{145} Friedrich Herneck, “Über die Grundsätzlichen Aufgaben der Fotogruppen der Deutschen Demokratischen Republik,” \textit{Fotografie}, no. 6 (June 1959), 237; The comparison of photographers to other artists, in particular writers, filmmakers, painters, and musicians, reoccurs in the literature of the time and can be readily found in the following essays written by the editors of \textit{Fotografie}: “Hinweise zu den ideologischen und ästhetischen Fragen,” \textit{Fotografie}, no. 3 (March 1959): 2-3; “Fotografie als Kunst,” \textit{Fotografie}, no. 4 (April 1960): 133-36; and “Der Fotograf und die Wirklichkeit,” \textit{Fotografie}, no. 7 (July 1960): 262-263 and 277.


\textsuperscript{147} Verlag Neues Leben, \textit{20 Jahre Verlag Neues Leben}, op. cit., 129-130; To put this price into context, Beseler’s novels were on average 5,00 DM at the time.

\textsuperscript{148} The editors of \textit{Fotografie}, “Verliebt in Berlin: Eine gespaltene Stadt, zwei junge Leute und ein Buch,” \textit{Fotografie}, no. 10 (October 1959), 379.
experiences, were properly portrayed,” while its images were described as “unadorned, real life. They range from factual documentation to the exciting reportage photo, balanced by the static image to the photo full of real dynamics. The entire span of modern photographic technique and design finds application here.”\textsuperscript{149} Thought to represent Berlin objectively, despite their overt political agenda, Rimkus and Beseler were hailed by the editors of Fotografie as the “talented offspring [Nachwuchs] of our young Republic,” a label never associated with Fischer, who would go on to become one the GDR’s most esteemed photographers.\textsuperscript{150}

Unlike Rimkus and Beseler who were given a publishing contract in 1956, Fischer began photographing Berlin as a private endeavor in 1953. It was not until Günther Rücker took an interest in his work after seeing Fischer’s photographs in 1955 that the artist considered showing his photographs to the public. In 1958, he exhibited his series for the first time in Warsaw together with the work of Evelyn Richter, whom he befriended after seeing her photographs at the Hause der Filmbühne “Capitol” in Leipzig in 1956.\textsuperscript{151} He also submitted eight images from his series Situation Berlin to U.S.

\textsuperscript{149} Ibid., 383.

\textsuperscript{150} The editors of Fotografie, “Verliebt in Berlin,” op. cit., 378; Despite the book’s approval by Fotografie, the editors candidly maintained -- revealing their sole criticism of the publication -- that Rimkus and Beseler needed to a stronger profile against West Berlin. In their opinion, the photographs documenting the western sector of the city lacked an accompanying narrative to guide the viewer, thereby permitting the images to speak for themselves. Including this concern in their review of Verliebt in Berlin, the editors acknowledged the need for photography to function in the service of the text; a requisite that, despite the assertion made by the magazine, was effectively met by the photographers.

\textsuperscript{151} This exhibition, titled action fotografie 56, was the first of two shows featuring the work of action fotografie, a group of young amateur and professional photographers that included Evelyn Richter, Gunter Rössler, Helga Wallmüller, Wolfgang G. Schröter and Roger Rössing. While action fotografie 56 and its second show, action fotografie 57, which took place at the Handelshof in Leipzig in 1957, were organized by its members, both exhibitions were sponsored by the Kulturbund. On action fotografie and its exhibitions, see Jeannette Stoschek, “‘action fotografie’. Ein kurzer Aufbruch,” in Kunst in Leipzig seit 1949 (Leipzig: E.A. Seemann, 2009), 88-94.
Camera 1958, one of which -- *A Crack in the Wall* -- was selected by Tom Maloney and printed alongside the work of Walker Evans, Brassaï, and Robert Frank, to name only a few modern photographers whose photographs were included in the same issue. One year after being characterized in the publication as a photographer not only “concerned with filming humanity in terms of reality,” but also with showing “life as it exists with all its problems,” Fischer was offered a solo-exhibition at a small Kulturbund gallery in Weißensee, East Berlin. While no documents on the 1959 exhibition exist, Fischer claims that his work was negatively received: during a public gallery talk he was allegedly criticized by the audience for not abiding by the cultural policy of the day, that is, for not presenting life under socialism in a positive light, and for not including an explanatory text alongside his photographs (his series was accompanied, however, by the same captions found in *Situation Berlin*). The reaction to his work in Berlin prompted the photographer to turn his attention to his teaching career and to other means of disseminating his photographs. Put differently, the response to his series, as Domröse claims, caused the photographer to lose interest in exhibiting:

In those days, spiteful discussions in the context of art exhibitions were not uncommon in the GDR. Politicians and ideologists had demanded in more or less sharp tones that art be close to the people and realistic. At the same time, they discriminated any other kind of artistic expression, accusing it of being bourgeois, decadent, and cosmopolitan; worst of all was art that was obviously in the tradition of the Modern Movement.

---

152 The same issue devoted twenty-four pages to *The Americans* by Robert Frank, who became a close friend of Fischer’s and, as I discuss in Chapter Three, spent time with him and his students in East Berlin in the 1980s. When I interviewed Fischer, he claimed that he first became aware of Frank’s work through this issue and felt a sense of validation because someone else was photographing like him.


154 In interview with Candice Hamelin on July 12th, 2011 in Gransee, Germany; According to Domröse, members of the audience took issue with Fischer’s photographs of the Freedom Rally. See Domröse, “A Crack in the Wall,” in *Situation Berlin*, op. cit., 26.
Fischer was just as scared by the disapproval of his work as by the tone of the discussion. His desire for exhibitions was satiated.155

In January 1960, at the request of Rüber, Hans Egloff, the head of Verlag Edition Leipzig, met with the East German photographer to discuss publishing *Situation Berlin* as a photobook. Taking a great interest in the series, Egloff offered Fischer a book contract that same year. However, given its critical view of East Berlin, Fischer’s series was not to be published alone: it was to be paired with texts and excerpts from newspapers and magazines written by Theodor Fontane, Thomas Mann, Kurt Tucholsky, Bertolt Brecht, Johannes R. Becher, Albert Einstein, Max Born, Walter Ulbricht, Otto Grotewohl, Nikita Khrushchev, Joseph Stalin, and William S. Schlamm, all of which were chosen by a team comprised of Rüber, Kurt Bortfeldt, Heinrich Goeres, and Werner Klemke to contextualize Fischer’s photographs and foster support for the socialist cause [Figs. 1.33 and 1.34].156 In the fall of 1961, only a few weeks after Ulbricht’s government began to erect the Berlin Wall, a mock-up of the photobook was finished and displayed at the annual book fair in Leipzig. It was there that a member of the state inspection commission under the Ministry of the Exterior glanced at Fischer’s photobook and claimed “Comrades, comrades! Berlin is no longer a situation!”157 With this statement, the photobook was removed from the display booth and Fischer’s project remained dormant until 2001.

The disparate venues in which *Verliebt in Berlin* and *Situation Berlin* circulated highlight the two worlds of photographic representation that began to emerge in the GDR in the 1950s. East German photographers like Rimkus and Beseler, who employed the

155 Ibid., 22.
156 Ibid., 32.
157 Ibid., 55.
method of socialist realism and advocated for the socialist cause, saw their work praised on the pages of Fotografie, printed in major newspapers such as Neues Deutschland, and, in their particular case, published in photobooks, whereas photographers like Fischer, such as Evelyn Richter and Ursula Arnold, who pursued their own artistic interests, at times disregarding the SED’s cultural policy and calling attention to the omissions in socialist visual culture, saw their work relegated to small exhibitions sponsored by the Kulturbund.158

While these two worlds were slow to develop, they would be firmly established shortly after May 26th, 1959, when the Zentrale Kommission Fotografie der DDR (East German Central Commission for Photography or ZKF) was founded within the Kulturbund under the direction of Beiler. From its initiation the organization set out to not only impede the activities of East German photographers, but also to manage the venues in which they could circulate their work. The ZKF quickly began, for instance, to promote East German photography at home and abroad; to closely monitor the contents of Fotografie; and, more importantly, to coordinate all state-sponsored photography shows in the GDR.159 Over the course of the next thirty years, it would organize the Fotoschau der DDR (East German Photo Show), the Berliner Internationale Fotoausstellung (Berlin’s International Photo Exhibition or bifota), the Internationale Fotoausstellung der Ostseeanliegerstaaten und Norwegens (International Photo Exhibition of the Baltic Sea Bordering States and Norway or ifo scanbaltic), the

Porträtfotoschau der DDR (Portrait Photo Show of the GDR), the Pressefotoschau der DDR (East German Press Photo Show), and the INTERPRESS-FOTO (International Press Exhibition), major exhibitions that featured the work of amateur and professional photographers alike. Believing that the role of the cultural field was “to lead us [East Germans] to victory in the struggle against imperialist and fascist ideology and bourgeois decadence that invades us from the West through artistic means,” as stated in its first newsletter, published one month after its founding in Fotografie, the ZKF endeavored to turn East German photography into regime-affirming propaganda.\textsuperscript{160} For its leading members, the abovementioned individuals who contributed to Fotografie throughout the 1950s, photography could “no longer be permitted to be left to its own devices”; it had to be commandeered to fight against the various manifestations of capitalist culture on the other side of the Iron Curtain, in particular in the FRG.\textsuperscript{161}

To circumvent the control exerted by the ZKF between its early years and the late 1970s, when photographers were granted more opportunities to disseminate their work in the GDR, East German photographers, as I will demonstrate in the following chapter, turned to illustrated magazines to earn a living and circulate their work.

\textsuperscript{160} Herneck, “Über die grundsätzlichen Aufgaben der Fotogruppen der Deutschen Demokratischen Republik” Mitteilungsblatt der Zentralen Kommission Fotografie in Fotografie, no. 6 (June 1959), unpaginated.

\textsuperscript{161} Ibid.
CHAPTER TWO
Alternative Sites: East Germany’s Illustrated Magazines

Since German reunification in 1990, when East German archives opened and permitted scholars from around the globe to access their sources, there has been an increasing interest among historians, art historians, and cultural sociologists in the GDR, in particular its visual culture. Historian Paul Betts argues that this growing scholarly concern is, in part, “because the arts were apparently among the most vibrant and least effectively controlled cultural fields in the GDR.” While this was, as he also maintains, “certainly the case for painting and film, and even arguably more so for photography,” especially after photography found its place in the East German art world in the late 1970s and early 1980s, Betts’ claim overlooks the attempt made by the state and its cultural apparatuses to encumber the activities of East German photographers and the various ways in which they responded in the 1960s and 1970s.

Following the founding of the ZKF on 26 May 1959, East German photographers were required to reproduce the motifs of socialist realism, as previously discussed in the Introduction and Chapter One of this dissertation, and to present the GDR not as it was,

162 For more on East German visual culture, see Elaine Kelly and Amy Wlodarski, eds., Art Outside the Lines: New Perspectives on GDR Art Culture (Amsterdam; New York: Rodopi, 2011); Stephanie Barron et al., Art of Two Germanys: Cold War Cultures (New York; Los Angeles: Abrams; In Association with Los Angeles County Museum of Art, 2009); and Eugen Blume and Roland März, eds., Kunst in der DDR (Berlin: G+H, 2003).
164 Photography’s place in the East German art world is discussed in Chapter Three of this dissertation.
but as it could be. Those interested in circulating their work in ZKF-sponsored exhibitions submitted photographs that aligned with the organization’s needs; those wanting to document something other than the orthodox scenes and figures promoted by the ZKF found other venues to show their work. Some photographers did both. While attention has been paid to the private and underground gallery scene that began to flourish in East Berlin, Leipzig, and Chemnitz in the mid-1970s, notably by scholars Bernd Lindner, Paul Kaiser and Claudia Petzold, there has been little concern over the role that illustrated magazines played as alternative sites for East German photographers to disseminate their work after 1959. Appealing not only in terms of the income they provided, and certainly many photographers sought out commissions for this very reason, illustrated magazines offered East German photographers exposure and, depending on the type of publication and its intended audience, the opportunity to pursue their own artistic interests.


167 Income for freelance photographers was set by the East German state: photographers were paid between 30-40 DM per image and 400 DM for cover images. On these figures, see Carola
Distinct from the ZKF, which set out clear parameters for professional and amateur photographers in its monthly newsletters in Fotografie, a journal that the organization effectively took control over in 1960 and used as its mouthpiece thereafter until 1989, illustrated magazines were generally less rigid in their expectations of photographers. While their editorial staffs hired permanent and freelance photographers, they also, as I will demonstrate, accepted proposals and allowed photographers the chance to explore new subject matter. In a tightly controlled society where artists’ activities were restricted by the ZKF and increasingly monitored by the Ministerium für Staatssicherheit (Ministry for State Security or Stasi), the latitude offered by illustrated magazines led many East German photographers, such as Arno Fischer, Sibylle Bergemann, Elisabeth Meinke, Brigitte Voigt, Roger Melis, Michael Weidt, Helga Paris, and Ute and Werner Mahler, among others, to seek out or accept their employment.

The aim of this chapter is not to provide a full account of East Germany’s illustrated magazines, but rather to examine two popular publications whose editorial and creative teams were comprised of open-minded individuals and young artists, often graduates of the KHB: Sibylle: die Zeitschrift für Mode und Kultur (Sibylle: The Magazine for Fashion and Culture) (1956-1994), an eighty-page bimonthly fashion and culture magazine, and Das Magazin (The Magazine) (1954-present), a monthly lifestyle and culture magazine, also eighty pages in length, that still appears on German


168 After the ZKF took over Fotografie in 1960, the organization changed the magazine’s name to Fotografie: Monatsschrift für kulturpolitische, ästhetische und technische Probleme der Fotografie (Photography: Monthly for Cultural Policy, Aesthetics, and Technical Problems of Photography).
newsstands today. In what follows, I will first outline the early histories of these magazines and then examine a selection of fashion series by Arno Fischer, who accepted a position at Sibylle after his book contract with Edition Leipzig was annulled in 1961, and photo-essays by Helga Paris, who began to submit her work to Das Magazin in the 1970s. In doing so, I argue that these magazines functioned as desirable alternatives to ZKF exhibitions and publications for East German photographers in the 1960s and 1970s.

*Sibylle: The Early Years, 1956-1961*

In 1934 the Dom modelei (House of Prototypes) was founded in the Soviet Union. Placed under the direction of the Ministry of Light Industry and staffed with prominent Russian artists, fashion and costume designers, and politicians, including Nadezhda Makarova, Nadezhda Lamanova, Nathan Al’tman, Yevgeny Yevgenyevich Lansere, Vera Mukhina, Aleksandr Grigor’evich Tyshler, and Vladimir Favorskii, the Dom modelei was responsible for organizing the textile and clothing industries and for designing prototypes for mass production.169 Its designs, for the most part impressive adaptations or copies of Western fashions, were intended to clothe the entire Soviet population.170 Unfortunately, owing to the scarcity of everyday goods, the problems of the nationalized textile and clothing industries, and the Soviet Union’s steadfast drive toward industrialization at the time, they rarely reached the store shelves.171 Nevertheless, samples from the Dom modelei were exhibited with the hope that tasteful and elegant clothing would soon be

170 Ibid.
made available for wide purchase in the Soviet Union in its boutique, a luxurious showroom that was opened with the help of Elsa Schiaparelli on Moscow’s Sretenka Street in December 1935; in national and international fashion shows; and on the pages of its in-house magazines, Dom modelei and Modeli sezona (Prototypes of the Seasons). 172 While the Dom modelei’s boutique and fashion shows permitted a limited audience to view its samples, its monthly and biannual fashion magazines reached a greater audience and became a standard feature of the central dress institutes that formed in the Eastern Bloc after the Second World War.

Following the example set in the Soviet Union, the East German Ministry of Light Industry founded the Institut für Bekleidungskultur (Institute for Clothing Culture or IBK) in 1952. Elli Schmidt, who was the head of the Democratic Women’s League of Germany and of the State Commission for Trade and Supply, was appointed as its first director. 173 Under her leadership the role of the IBK was the same as the Dom modelei and its counterparts, Moda Polska (Polish Fashion), the Ruhaipari Tervező Vállalat (Central Design Company for the Clothing Industry), and the ÚBOK (Institute of Material and Dress Culture): “to design and transfer new dress proposals to industry and to coordinate the mass production of clothing and fashion accessories.” 174 It was also to

172 Elsa Schiaparelli, Shocking Life (New York: Dutton, 1954), 92; and Bartlett, Fashion East, op. cit., 72 and 278.
educate women on the latest designs through fashion congresses and shows and its in-
house magazines *Bekleidung* (*Clothing*) and *Sibylle*.

*Bekleidung*, as its title suggests, was a rather unimaginative publication conceived
by Schmidt and her creative team to advertise work clothes and everyday apparel
designed by the IBK in 1954. While it would remain in print until 1961, the publication
was more or less abandoned one year after its inaugural issue, when Schmidt wrote to the
Ministry of Light Industry requesting permission to publish a contemporary East German
fashion magazine, one that had a sartorial edge and that would compete with publications
such as West Germany’s *Burda-Moden* (*Burda Fashion*) and *Film und Frau* (*Film and
Woman*).175 Given permission to launch a new magazine in 1955, Schmidt hired Sibylle
Boden Gerstner, an affluent German Jew who studied textile and fashion design at the
Berliner Kunstakademie (Berlin’s Art Academy) (1936-1939) before moving to Paris to
report on the collections of the few French houses that remained opened during the
Second World War, to assist in the undertaking.176 Gerstner’s appointment at the
Institute, which coincided with the beginning of the Khrushchev Thaw (1954-64), a
period that saw significant changes in policies, artistic practices, and material life in the
Eastern Bloc, demonstrated a shift in its interests.177 While the IBK was initially

176 According to the biographical databank provided by the Bundesstiftung zur Aufarbeitung der
SED-Diktatur, Gerstner (b. 1920) fled to Paris in the fall of 1940. There she studied at the École
Nationale Supérieure des Beaux-Arts and reported on the French collections between 1940 and
1944. It is not only unclear how Gerstner was able to study in Paris during this period, but also
which newspapers and magazines employed her.
177 For more on the Khrushchev Thaw, see Denis Kozlov and Eleonory Gilburd, “The Thaw as an
Event in Russian History,” in *The Thaw: Soviet society and Culture during the 1950s and 1960s*,
eds. Denis Kozlov and Eleonory Gilburd (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2013), 18-84;
and Gerchuk, Iurii, “The Aesthetics of Everyday Life in the Khrushchev Thaw in the USSR
(1954-64),” in *Style and Socialism*, eds. Susan E. Reid and David Crowley (Oxford; New York:
Berg, 2000), 81-99.
concerned with designing basic prototypes for mass production, it began to take notice of French haute couture (high dressmaking), believing, as did some East German officials who began to embrace foreign influences at the time, that “to dress oneself beautifully, tastefully, and usefully is one of the most elementary life-needs of humans, that satisfaction of which is the goal of socialist society.”\(^\text{178}\) It was this newfound interest, encouraged by Gerstner and equally shared by the abovementioned central dress institutes, that the IBK decided to communicate on the pages of its second magazine, Sibylle.

Published for the first time in August 1956 and thereafter bimonthly until 1994 by Verlag für die Frau, Sibylle wasted no time in informing its young female readership both within and outside the GDR, notably in West Berlin, Hamburg, Milan, Vienna, London, Amsterdam, Moscow, Beijing, Budapest, Prague and Bucharest, where its 200,000 copies were either circulated or made available upon request, of its enthusiasm for French haute couture.\(^\text{179}\) Its inaugural issue included what would become a standard editorial in the 1950s, „Wir sahen in Paris“ (“What we saw in Paris”), and „Ich über mich“ (“About Myself”), a short article that introduced the magazine and stated its intentions through the voice of Gernster’s alter ego, a prophetess named Sibylle:

You have already read my name on the title page. Do you like it? I am starting to get used to it. Sibylle. Why of all names Sibylle? Parents sometimes have such strange ideas. Sibyls were known in Ancient Rome

\(^\text{178}\) An unidentified East German official quoted in Judd Stitziel, *Fashioning Socialism: Clothing, Politics, and Consumer Culture in East Germany* (Oxford; New York: Berg, 2007), 15. It is important to note that luxurious Western dresses were no longer associated with the class degeneration of the capitalist system in the 1950s. Not only did designers and officials in East Germany embrace Western fashion at the time, those in other socialist countries did as well. \(^\text{179}\) The first issue of *Sibylle* was also made available in Antwerp, Athens, Copenhagen, Sofia, Tirana, Warsaw, and Zürich. The magazine was later made available in Basel, Brussels, Helsinki, New York City, Oslo, Paris, Tokyo, Turin, Salzburg, Stockholm and Vancouver, among other cities. On this, see the table of contents page in *Sibylle* between 1956 and 1994.
as fortunetellers. Yes, if one works in fashion, one has to have intuitions. They say that a prophet is not accepted in his own land, but it is especially in my own country that I would like to be heard.

For you, my dear friend, this girl Sibylle will look around a little in the world of fashion, especially at our Institute for Clothing Culture and in the fashion studios of our Republic. *My gaze is directed at the fashion of the world, whose center is today, as it has been for centuries, the City of Lights on the Seine.* I promise you that my eyes will be everywhere: in Prague and Florence, in Warsaw and Vienna, in Moscow and New York, in Beijing and London—and *again and again in Paris.*

Making good on its word, the magazine, with the financial support of the state, sent Gerstner, who first served as its editor-in-chief between 1956 and 1958 and then as its creative director until 1959, along with a team of illustrators, designers and photographers to fashion congresses and shows in various cities throughout Europe, in particular Paris. In the French capital they spent their time viewing collections by Hubert de Givenchy, Christian Dior, Pierre Cardin, Coco Chanel, Jacques Heim, Guy Laroche, Jacques Fath, Jeanne Lanvin and her predecessor Antonio Canovas Castillo. Upon returning to East Berlin, the designers would copy the French prototypes in small quantities and send them either to East German factories for mass production or to the Sibylle Boutique, a large showroom located on the corner of Unter den Linden and Friedrichstraße, where they would be sold for exorbitant prices, while Gerstner and the

---


181 Wanting to promote luxury goods to not only siphon off the buying power of highly qualified specialists such as engineers, doctors, and artists, but to also secure their loyalty, the East German state funded the travels of Gerstner and her team. It also opened a chain called Exquisit stores that were each given a second name, such as Yvonne, Jeannette, Madeleine, Kavalier, and Charmant, and that exclusively sold designer goods and accepted Western currency. For more on this, see Stitziel, *Fashioning Socialism*, op. cit., 126-132.
remaining members of her team would work on articles and fashion spreads for forthcoming issues of *Sibylle*.

Despite the magazine’s attempt to “contribute to a true cultivation of taste,” as stated by Alexander Abusch, State Secretary and Deputy of the Ministry of Culture, in its first issue, neither its articles nor its fashion spreads were received with great enthusiasm. Some East German women found its articles to be both dated and trivial, focusing too often, for example, on mundane things such as “skirt lengths and collar types.” Others considered the entire magazine and its interest in French *haute couture* to be out of touch with the realities of everyday life in the GDR. The magazine’s poor reception during its early years resulted in Gerstner being replaced by Margot Pfannstiel in April 1958. Unlike Gerstner, who made no attempt to hide her predilection for French *haute couture*, Pfannstiel aimed to turn *Sibylle* into a contemporary magazine that not only reflected the times, but that also featured, with the exception of the occasional article on or reference to Coco Chanel, ready-to-wear fashion made in the GDR.

---

182 The Sibylle Boutique also sold *haute couture* created by Heinz Bormann’s firm in Magdeburg, the VEB Elegant, the VEB Fortschritt, the Kunsthochschule Berlin-Weißensee, and the Ingenuerschule für Bekleidung. According to Ina Merkel, items sold in the Sibylle Boutique cost the following: dresses from 250,00 to 900,00 DM; ladies jackets and coats from 45,00 to 1200,00 DM; shoes from 110,00 to 185,00 DM; and knitwear from 120,00 to 290,00 DM. See Ina Merkel, “Luxury in Socialism: An Absurd Proposition?,” in *Pleasures in Socialism: Leisure and Luxury in the Eastern Bloc*, eds. David Crowley and Susan Reid (Evanston, Ill: Northwestern University Press, 2010), 70.


185 Ibid.


187 Claudia Zimmermann, *Die Zeitschrift ‘Sibylle’ und ihre Frauenbilder 1960-1969* (Munich: GRIN Verlag, 2010), 15; In general there was a move away from *haute couture* to ready-made clothing in fashion magazines in the 1960s, when fashion photography began to reflect, as Nancy Hall-Duncan aptly describes, the “new liberties sanctioned by the sexual revolution, the women’s
However, having little experience in running a magazine and a background in economic journalism, *Sibylle*’s new editor-in-chief would have to wait until 1961, when a thesis by Dorothea Bertram came across her desk, to implement considerable change at the magazine.\(^{188}\)

**Sibylle’s Transformation: 1961 and Beyond**

As part of her final project at the KHB, where she studied fashion design between 1956 and 1961, Bertram was asked by her professors to write about *Sibylle*. Neither fond of the publication nor one to mince her words, she candidly described the IBK’s fashion and culture magazine as “an irrelevant, quite old-fashioned magazine with conventional indigenous fashion alongside articles on Parisian *haute couture*—an absurd thing during a time in which ration cards were given, serious housing shortages prevailed, and many women worked in the three-shift system.”\(^{189}\) She also claimed that it failed to be “a highbrow magazine for fashion and culture as its title reads.”\(^{190}\) After reading these statements along with the rest of Bertram’s thesis in the fall of 1961, Pfannstiel invited Bertram to the magazine’s headquarters in East Berlin to discuss the future of *Sibylle*. The meeting resulted in Pfannstiel appointing Bertram as the magazine’s new fashion editor and assigning her the task of hiring “like-minded people, who together with [Bertram] wanted to change *Sibylle*, to make it into a contemporary magazine.”\(^{191}\)


\(^{190}\) Ibid.

\(^{191}\) Ibid.
Having received her education at the KHB, a school founded by the metal sculptor Otto Sticht in 1946 and staffed by numerous artists and professors formerly associated with the Bauhaus, Bertram did not have to look any further than her classmates and teachers to put together Sibylle’s new creative team. Her classmates were trained by the likes of Arno Fischer, ceramic artist Jan Bontjes van Beek, and architect, urban planner, and furniture designer Mart Stam, among others, in the subjects of photography, ceramics, sculpture, painting, fashion and textile design, stage and costume design, and visual communications.192 They also acquired, alongside their professors, an informal education in the arts from the city’s offerings prior to the building of the Berlin Wall: they “regularly visited exhibitions and the theater in West Berlin, had made contacts at the Hochschule der Künste Berlin Charlottenburg, and had seen French and Italian avant-garde films along the Ku’damm.”193 That is, Bertram’s former classmates and teachers were not only in dialogue with their colleagues at what is now the Universität der Künste Berlin (University of the Arts or UdK), the largest art school in Europe, but they were also exposed to the same exhibitions, theater productions, and foreign films as those in the West before 13 August 1961.194 It was from this group of artists, conversant with contemporary culture on both sides of the political divide, that Bertram decided to cull her team of photographers, graphic designers, and stylists.


Bertram would spend several years recruiting artists affiliated with the KHB. She would, for instance, hire fashion designer-turned-photographer Elisabeth Meinke in 1962 and Gruppe 4, a small collective of students who trained under Klaus Wittkugel, a graphic designer and poster artist, and Werner Klemke, a graphic designer and illustrator, as her design and layout team in 1964. She would also approach Arno Fischer regarding a position as staff photographer. Bertram and Fischer met several years after the East German photographer, who originally accepted a position to work as Wittkugel’s assistant in 1956, was asked to develop the KHB’s photography department. Within months of its establishment, the photography department saw high enrollment numbers and Fischer’s courses became compulsory for all students by the end of 1957. According to the photographer, the fashion design students were particularly interested in his classes and would frequently ask him to photograph their collections. One such student was Bertram. In her final year at the KHB the two cultivated a relationship: Fischer photographed her thesis collection (her final project included her analysis of Sibylle along with this collection) and she saw him not only as a teacher and mentor, but also as a talented photographer. It seemed only natural, therefore, for Bertram to ask Fischer to join her at the magazine.

196 In interview with Candice Hamelin on 12 July 2011 in Gransee, Germany; and Jens Semrau, Was ist dann Kunst?, op. cit., 223.
Having very few options to circulate his gritty images of everyday life in Cold War Berlin after the ZKF began to organize all major photography exhibitions in the GDR, and interested in supplementing his income from the KHB, where he earned 700,00 DM per month, Fischer readily accepted Bertram’s offer to work at Sibylle.\(^{199}\) His decision to work at a fashion and culture magazine, a genre that endeavored to sell commodities and illusions to its female readership for a small price, in this particular case 2,50 DM per issue, was not altogether uncommon among art photographers in the twentieth century; for instance, Henri Cartier-Bresson, Brassaï, Robert Frank, Charles Sheeler, Bernice Abbott, Diane Arbus, and Nan Goldin, among countless others, worked as fashion photographers or published their images in fashion magazines at various times during their careers. Like those working in Western Europe and the United States at the same time, such as Helmut Newton and Guy Bourdin, both of whom worked for French Vogue, and Richard Avedon, who had been under contract with Harper’s Bazaar since the 1940s, Fischer experienced a high degree of latitude at Sibylle.\(^{200}\) He was permitted to choose his own models, young, attractive women he approached on the streets of East Berlin as well as in its cafés, bars, and university libraries, and to decide on the concepts and locations of his fashion shoots.\(^{201}\) Fischer was also in charge of arranging his photographs, even after Gruppe 4 became responsible for the magazine’s layout in

\(^{199}\) Fischer, “Wir haben erst einmal die Puppenposen abgeschafft,” Sibylle: Modefotografie aus drei Jahrzehnten DDR, op. cit, 78; According to Domröse, Fischer was more interested in making money than making establishing himself in the art world. On this, see Domröse, “A Crack in the Wall,” in Situation Berlin, op. cit., 18.

\(^{200}\) On the latitude given to these photographers, see Nancy Hall-Duncan, “Fashion Photography,” in The Berg Companion to Fashion (Oxford; New York: Berg, 2010), 302.

\(^{201}\) In interview with Candice Hamelin on 12 July 2011 in Gransee, Germany.
1964. Owing to the high degree of control that Fischer exercised over his work, the East German photographer, as I will discuss in the following section, produced conventional fashion series for the magazine, spreads that pictured young women on the move, as well as innovative series that called attention to the nature of fashion photography and the photograph itself.

Like most fashion photographers working in the 1960s, whose work Fischer regularly saw in Vogue, Harper’s Bazaar, and Film und Frau, among other Western magazines to which Sibylle received complimentary subscriptions, Fischer spent the decade photographing on the streets rather than in the studio. In his first series, Herbstmode in Berlin (Fall Fashion in Berlin), a fifteen-page spread printed in the August 1962 issue of Sibylle, Fischer photographed four models in the East German capital using black and white and color film and, at times, a telephoto lens. Dressed by Bertram in coats and two-piece suits made, according to the series’ captions, what Roland Barthes calls “written clothing,” from blends of wool, tweed, and mohair by the IBK/Deutsches Modeinstitut (DMI), Fischer’s models are seen posing near the Rotes Rathaus and on the Weidendammer Brücke [Figs. 2.1-2.2]. The IBK/Deutsches Modeinstitut (DMI), Fischer’s models are seen posing near the Rotes Rathaus and on the Weidendammer Brücke [Figs. 2.1-2.2].

---

202 Ibid.; While Fischer experienced great autonomy at Sibylle, the photographer did inform me during our interview that Pfannstiel had to meet weekly with a member of the Central Committee to discuss the contents of the magazine and often had to defend the work of her photographers.

203 On Sibylle’s (as well as Das Magazin’s) complimentary access to Western magazines, see Jana Duda, “From the Family of Man to Waffenruhe: International Influences on Photography in the GDR,” in Jana Duda et al., Geschlossene Gesellschaft, op. cit., 315-319, esp. 315.

204 Color photograph was seen as an expression of modernity and the promise offered by socialism, and was increasingly used in East German print media in the 1960s. For more on the use of color photography in East German illustrated magazines, see Jüllig, Farbe für die Republik, op. cit., 11-15.

205 The IBK changed its name to the Deutsches Modeinstitut (German Fashion Institute or DMI) in 1957; Barthes claims that fashion magazines contain two structures: image-clothing and written clothing. The difference between the two is as follows: “In principle these two garments referred to the same reality (the dress worn on this day by this woman), and yet they do not have the same structures, because they are not made of the same substances and because, consequently,
walking on sidewalks together with causal strollers and children; riding public transportation; standing next to or leaning against cars; and running toward the camera [Figs. 2.3-2.7]. By photographing his models against the backdrop of East Berlin, often moving along its streets in this and countless other series published in Sibylle during his twelve-year tenure at the magazine, Fischer characterized the ideal young woman as a stylish urbanite making her way through the city.206

While Fischer would reproduce the image of the modern woman traversing the city streets throughout the 1960s, a common trope in fashion photography at the time that reflected, according to art historian Hilary Radner, “a culture in transition,” he would also suggest that the modern woman was a world traveler.207 For example, in his series Abflug/Ankunft Berlin-Schönefeld (Departure/Arrival Berlin-Schönefeld), an eleven-page spread published in the February 1968 issues of Sibylle, Fischer photographed three models at Berlin’s Schönefeld airport. Dressed in outerwear and two-piece suits designed by the VEB Damenbekleidungswerk Gera and DMI and accessorized with knee-high boots, hats, gloves, handbags, scarves and even cameras, communicating the desire to document their travel experiences, the models are seen sitting inside the airport surrounded by luggage and walking on the tarmac [Figs. 2.8-2.9]. They are also captured

---


207 Ibid., 128; One only needs to be reminded here that the 1960s saw, for instance, the building of the Berlin Wall; the election and assassination of John F. Kennedy; the beginning of the Vietnam War; and the Civil Rights, student and women’s movements.
standing next to and in front of planes belonging to the company Interflug, East Germany’s national airline, at times with crewmembers and passengers rushing past in the background or looking on with great interest as they board their plane; the latter mise en scène calls to mind the moment when Anita Ekberg’s character in Federico Fellini’s *La Dolce Vita* lands in Rome and is greeted by a throng of paparazzi waiting outside her plane [Figs. 2.10-2.13].

In another image, a model is seen taking one last look at the setting behind her as she rests her left foot on the bottom step of an Ilyushin II-14, a contrived stance that, together with the pilot seen waiting behind her, suggests her imminent departure from East Berlin [Fig. 2.14].

To reinforce the theme of *Abflug/Ankunft Berlin-Schönefeld* -- the modern woman as a globetrotter --, the editors of *Sibylle* accompanied Fischer’s series with a short advertisement for Interflug. Appeared on the first double-page spread, it reads:

> We live in a world where we are separated from Moscow by a two-and-a-half-hour plane ride; where one can reach Prague in 50 minutes, which corresponds to the time it takes to get from Pankow to Schönefeld on the S-Bahn; and where Conakry on the Atlantic Ocean is almost near enough to touch: the journey takes forty hours with stopovers in Budapest, Algiers, and Bamako. The world is within reach.

> It was not only the initial desire to fly, to rise-up-in-the-air, which inspired the first aircraft designers to make such adventurous things with which they risked their lives. Otto Lilienthal wrote: ‘The progress of culture is to a high degree dependant on whether people will ever succeed in transforming the realm of the sky into a public, much used open road.’

> In 1955, the Society for International Air Traffic of the GDR, INTERFLUG, was founded. In its first two years flight routes from Berlin

---

208 The difference here being that Fischer’s model is not seen exiting the plane like Ekberg but standing on the tarmac; While the image of the woman standing next to the plane calls to mind the abovementioned scene in Fellini’s film, it is important to note here that the Italian director often appropriated imagery from popular culture and I am not insinuating that Fischer borrowed directly from him. The image of the film star exiting a plane was part of Western visual culture in the 1950s and 1960s. On Fellini’s use of images from the media, see Sam Stourdזé, *Fellini* (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2013).
to Warsaw, Budapest, Bucharest, Sofia, Prague, and Moscow were opened, which mutually operated with air-freighters of the People Democratic Countries and of the USSR. Since then, INTERFLUG participates in world air travel with over three million kilometers of air mileage. It connects the eastern part of Europe to Africa and the Middle East and offers connections to Asia and all parts of Africa.

But also destinations that are less far away are worth a trip on the INTERFLUG airline. Turbine propeller aircraft of model AN24, which seat 48 persons, already flies between Berlin, Erfurt, Leipzig, Dresden, and Barth.

In the competition of the airlines the tastiest snacks and stewardesses are often served. Despite all the advantages of such offers, security and speed remain the decisive criteria. It is characteristic of the work of our airline that INTERFLUG stands at the forefront of world safety statistics. With 73 percent seat booking in 1965, INTERFLUG belongs among the top-ranking airlines.

The French fashion designer Chanel once said that one must maintain in clothing, just as demonstrated in airplanes, the unity of function and form. From the offerings of ready-to-wear clothing and from the latest proposals of the German Fashion Institute, we have selected classic, elegant and functional fashion, which is not only suitable for boarding a plane.209

While the announcement for Interflug is not needed for the reader to follow the storyline of the fashion spread, it works alongside Fischer’s photographs to communicate that we, the reader/consumer, can have the same glamorous lifestyles as the women pictured in the fashion magazine. That is, we, too, can travel to foreign cities in Eastern Europe, Asia, and Africa with Interflug or have comparable experiences if we purchase and wear the latest designs and accessories made by the DMI and its affiliated factories, since, as the editors remind us, the “classic, elegant and functional fashion” pictured is “not only suitable for boarding a plane.”

According to Susan Sontag, as well as countless other scholars who have written on twentieth-century fashion photography, “the greatest fashion photography is more

than the photography of fashion.” What is implied in this claim is that fashion photography, particularly after the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, when the genre served as a means of record-keeping for designers and was chiefly concerned with capturing the details of garments, is not merely about the clothing. It is about creating illusions, fostering consumer desires, and, as Fischer himself claimed after *Sibylle* went out of print in 1994, “selling dreams.” Fashion photography is also, as art historian and curator Nancy Hall-Duncan claims in *The History of Fashion Photography*, “an index in miniature to culture and society, to people’s aspirations, limitations and tastes” that reflects “the self-images of people as well as their dreams and desires.”
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and Papier-mâché) (August 1965). To create this series, Fischer travelled in the company of two models to the Deutsche Film Aktiengesellschaft (German Film Company or DEFA) studios in Babelsberg. There he photographed his models inside the movie studios and against elaborate backdrops, again presenting them as performers [Figs. 2.17-2.18]. He also captured them standing next to and against set designs that had long been in disuse, often on the verge of collapse. In one photograph, for example, a model is seen standing in the foreground both against and on a rock wall that has begun to detached from its supportive structure [Fig. 2.19]. While half of the rock wall remains upright, the other half has fallen to the ground, together acting as a cover for the model to stand on and exposing not only the wooden planks used to support the wall, but also its own construction: the layers and fibers seen along the tears of the rock wall reveal that it is made, as the title of the series intimates, of papier-mâché. In another image in this same series a model is seen wearing a red evening dress and high heels posing on a deserted dirt path [Fig. 2.20]. Both to her left and behind her is a mock store selling, as the word “Mode” or “fashion” painted across its façade suggests, clothing. Like the wall that has started to peel away from its support in the previously discussed image, the storefront is also in a state of decline. The windows in its upper storey have been haphazardly replaced by what appears to be both wood and plastic, while those on its lower level remain uncovered or missing their glass altogether, not only revealing the wooden beams used to buttress the set from behind and a vacant area overrun by tall weeds in the middle ground, but also another abandoned movie set to complement the one seen behind the model in the distant background.
By photographing glamorous models posing against and alongside movie sets that have fallen into disrepair, at times, revealing their own fabrication, Fischer disrupts the viewer’s reading of *Mode, Film und Pappmaché*. In the same way that German playwright and theater director Bertolt Brecht liberated theatergoers “from the state of being captured by illusions of art which encourage passive identification with fictional worlds” through a technique known as the *Verfremdungseffekt* or “alienation effect,” Fischer makes known the construction of DEFA’s movie sets and produces a sense of estrangement -- a distancing from the visual narrative -- that frees the viewer from the illusion of the fashion series.213 Put differently, the East German photographer borrows from Brecht’s aesthetic strategy, one that prompted the latter’s audience to recognize what was unfolding on the stage through the actions of the actors, to make us conscious that what we are viewing is fiction.214

In addition to underscoring the nature of fashion photography in his series *Premiere* and *Mode, Film und Pappmaché*, Fischer would, at times, remind his viewers of the essence of the photograph and highlight the photographic process in his work. For instance, in 1964, Fischer worked alongside Günter Rössler, a former press photographer who trained at the HGB between 1947 and 1950, to create the series *Regentage (Rainy*

214 While Elizabeth Wright is correct to argue that “in postmodernist art everything is subject to a V-effect and so the concept becomes redundant,” as is Andreas Huyssen when stating that “in an age saturated with information, including critical information, the *Verfremdungseffekt* has lost its demystifying power,” the technique would have been effective for the viewer in the early 1960s. For more on these positions, see Elizabeth Wright, *Postmodern Brecht: A Re-Presentation* (London; New York: Routledge, 1989), esp. 96; and Andreas Huyssen, “The Hidden Dialectic: Avantgarde-Technology-Mass Culture,” in *After the Great Divide: Modernism, Mass Culture, Postmodernism (Theories of Representation and Difference)* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1986), 3-16, esp. 15.
Days) (October 1964).\textsuperscript{215} What can only be labeled as a hybrid fashion spread owing to its two authors and their disparate photographic styles -- Rössler took rather prosaic photographs of models posing next to medieval castles in the countryside and lighthouses on the Baltic Sea, while Fischer photographed models in the heart of East Berlin --, Regentage opens with a color photograph of a model standing in a field of dirt and debris behind the northeast corner of the Berliner Dom (Berlin Cathedral) in Mitte [Fig. 2.21].\textsuperscript{216} Dressed in a long green coat, matching hat, and black leather gloves, the model is seen leaning against a cream-colored Wartburg with one arm behind her back and the other holding a plastic raincoat casually draped over her right shoulder. The car, which is placed at an angle almost perpendicular to the picture plane, at once appears to extend into the space of the viewer and recedes toward the middle ground of the photograph. Its strategic position in relation to Fischer’s camera permits the photographer to capture the reflection of the model and the Berliner Dom in its windows, in effect duplicating their image within the image. This visual repetition, a theme explored by numerous photographers ranging from Hungarian artists Brassaï and Dóra Maurer, Canadian video artist Michael Snow, to East German photographer Tina Bara, each of whom relied on mirrors and reflective surfaces to include their subjects twice, sometimes more, in a single frame, emphasizes the fundamental characteristic of the photograph. That is, the


\textsuperscript{216} Unlike Fischer’s work, Rössler’s fashion photographs were featured in Fotografie. See Helga Herzog, “Günter Rössler: Immer wieder und vor allem: Modefotografie,” Fotografie, no. 1 (January 1969): 18-27.
doubling seen in this photograph, and, for that matter, in the series’ following images by Fischer, exposes photography’s fundamental quality: it, too, doubles its subject.217

Returning to the same theme in Regentage’s third photograph, Fischer photographs a model standing behind a car located in front of the northwest corner of the Berliner Dom, a position made evident by the portico of the Altes Museum seen in the image’s upper left-hand corner [Figs. 2.22]. As in the previously discussed photograph, both the fashion model and the Berliner Dom are reflected in the window of the car. Though the black and white image subtly reminds the viewer once again what a photograph is in the mechanical sense, it also refers to the medium of photography through the inclusion of the umbrella that rests open on the model’s right shoulder. While the umbrella works together with the series’ title to suggest that the designs featured in the fashion spread are intended to be worn on rainy days, it also refers to the photograph’s own making. A tool used by photographers when shooting in a studio as well as on the streets to soften, diffuse, and control the direction of the harsh light emitted from the camera’s flash, the umbrella implies one of several processes involved in the production of professional photographs.218

In the series’ following image, the last in a sequence of photographs picturing women standing near automobiles, Fischer photographs a model holding an umbrella


218 Fischer taught photography courses at the KHB and was well versed in the effects of using, for instance, different lenses and umbrellas.
once again. Taken in front of the Sophienkirche in Mitte, the black and white photograph captures a model posing in front of a car parked along Große Hamburger Straße [Fig. 2.23]. Wearing a loose-fitting coat and leather gloves made by the DMI, the model assumes a familiar stance for the camera: her left hand casually rests in her coat pocket, while her right hand holds an open umbrella that rests on her shoulder. Unlike the images discussed above, in which Fischer stood outside the car to take the photograph, Fischer takes the image from inside the vehicle. By photographing the model from this position, Fischer at once documents her and the church seen in the background as well as the inverse side of the photographic plane, the space where the photographer and camera reside, through the mirror located between the camera and its subject. In doing so, Fischer not only implicates himself in the production of the image, but he also, as artist, writer, and curator David Campany argues in the context of Lee Friedlander’s self-portraits, which often rely on reflections, shadows, glass and mirrors, “invites [the viewer] to identify with the camera position, or more abstractly with the making of the photograph.”

Despite the assertion made by art historian Gabriele Muschter that East German photographers began to search for new forms of expression and claim the medium of photography as their subject only in the 1980s, Fischer’s work for *Sibylle* in the 1960s suggests otherwise. While the photographer often produced conventional fashion series for the magazine, series that were comparable to the work of Western fashion

photographers at the time, he also explored the medium of photography in his work.221 His interest in photography -- as subject matter -- was both unorthodox and unprecedented in the GDR in the 1960s, a decade when East German photographers experienced little freedom. Not only were East German photographers expected to employ the method of socialist realism after the founding of the ZKF in 1959, as the organization’s monthly newsletters and articles in Fotografie and major photography exhibitions, including the Berliner Internationale Fotoausstellung (Berlin’s International Photo Exhibition or bifota) and the Fotoaschau der DDR (East German Photo Show) attest. They also had to deal with the repercussions of the Eleventh Plenum of the Central Committee of the SED in 1965.222 Originally intended to address the country’s economy, the Eleventh Plenum became without warning a forum for leading members of the Central Committee to attack East German artists, in particular DEFA filmmakers.223 It

223 An interesting theory as to why members of the Central Committee attacked artists at the Eleventh Plenum has been put forth by Joshua Feinstein. Arguing that it was because East German artists found an “independent voice,” he writes: “In addition, overemphasizing the external determinants of the regime’s cultural policy runs the risks of ignoring what the historical actors themselves understood to be at stake. In retrospect, the aspirations of East German artists were hopelessly utopian, but to those who believed in socialism the issues being contested were hardly academic. Implicit in much of the art criticized at the Plenum was an alternative vision of East German society, one that was far from harmonious and where the Party did not always represent the best interests of the new society. These works did not so much attack the GDR from
not only resulted in the banning of twelve DEFA films, productions by directors Kurt Maetzig, Gerhard Klein, Jürgen Böttcher, and Frank Beyer, among others, that became known as the *die Kaninchenfilme* or “Rabbit films,” but it also lead to the hardening of East Germany’s cultural policy. After the Eleventh Plenum, writers, playwrights, filmmakers, and visual artists experienced severe restrictions, and cultural products that did not align with the ideological needs of the East German regime were prohibited until the early 1970s, when Erich Honecker replaced Walter Ulbricht as the leader of the SED.²²⁴

without as criticize it from within. Drawing on the same system of representation that the Party used to define its objectives, they appealed to Communism’s allies, not its enemies. Still other artworks tried to explore fundamental questions adhering in socialist discourse through satire and macabre parody. These reasons help explain the unexpected vehemence of the official reaction at the Eleventh Plenum. During the formalism debates of the early fifties the regime had gone on the offensive against modernist art it deemed useless for the revolutionary tasks at hand. Now artists were finally creating works relevant to socialism, but they were claiming an independent voice.” See Joshua Feinstein, *The Triumph of the Ordinary: Depictions of Daily Life in The East German Cinema, 1949-1989* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2002), 168.

²²⁴ On the Eleventh Plenum, including the speeches made by Christa Wolf and Walter Ulbricht, see Günter Agde, *Kahlschlag: das 11. Plenum der ZK der SED 1965: Studien und Dokumente* (Berlin: Aufbau Taschenbuch Verlag, 1991); On the DEFA films banned by the SED, see Feinstein, “The Eleventh Plenum and das Kaninchen bin ich,” in *The Triumph of the Ordinary*, op. cit., 151-175; and Katie Trumpener, “La guerre est finie: New Waves, Historical Contingency, and the GDR ‘Rabbit’ Films,” in *The Power of Intellectuals in Contemporary Germany* ed. Michael Geyer (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2001), 113-137; To understand how the SED sought full control over cultural production in the GDR, see Walter Ulbricht’s closing speech at the Eleventh Plenum, in which he stated the following: “And now I return to the question of democracy here and of democracy at DEFA [Deutsche film Aktiengesellschaft, the GDR state film studio.] Since we knew that there were some people (for the moment I won’t name any names) who have declared – in the spirit of this “opposition party” [the parliamentary opposition proposed by regime critic Robert Havemann] that they would use every means to ensure a [cinematic] run for the Rabbit [Kurt Maetzig’s DEFA film *Das Kaninchen bin ich* (*I am the Rabbit*), condemned at the Eleventh Plenum], because they wanted it to set political goals— (Erich Honecker: They planned to present the Party with a fait accompli.) (Kurt Hager: They even said directly that they wanted to force us into it.) we said: of course the Politburo could simply have withdrawn the film, from the point of view of the Party statutes, we would have the right to do so. But it was clear to us that the stake was not simply this “Rabbit” but a few dozen other rabbits. We therefore decided to present all the material to the Central Committee. The Central Committee is to decide.
In spite of the restrictions placed on artists in the 1960s, Fischer’s work was at once permitted and encouraged at *Sibylle*. This was due in part to the vehicle in which his images circulated: distinct from other print media, including books and plays, illustrated magazines were vetted by the Ministry of Culture after they were printed, allowing their editors to defend, if necessary, the contents of their magazines once they had already been distributed.225 It was also the result of the changes taking place at *Sibylle* in the late 1950s and early 1960s and the progressive attitudes of Pflannstiel and Bertram, both of whom, as stated above, wanted to turn *Sibylle* into a contemporary fashion and culture magazine. And, finally, it was because Fischer’s fashion photographs did not challenge the view that the East German state had of itself; on the contrary, his fashion series, with their emphasis on beautiful East German women either navigating the busy streets of Berlin, spending their time at the theater or in Babelsberg, or being whisked away to an exotic location by Interflug, highlighted the progress of socialist culture (one might even argue that they also pointed to the similarities between socialist and capitalist modernity).226

---

Yes, the Central Committee is to decide. How it will go, who will force whom, and who will determine whom in the German Democratic Republic, this is what we want to test.” [Ulbricht quoted in idem, “La guerre est finie,” in *The Power of Intellectuals in Contemporary Germany*, op. cit., 113]. For more, see Walter Ulbricht, “Schlußwort auf der 11. Tagung des ZK der SED 1965,” in *Kahlschlag*, op. cit., 344-358.


Met with great enthusiasm by the magazine’s editors, Fischer’s fashion photography resulted in his membership in the VBK-DDR in 1962, allowing him to apply for a tax number to legally work as a freelance photographer in the GDR.\textsuperscript{227} It also attracted the attention of numerous East German photographers who were eager to work outside of the parameters set by the ZKF in the 1960s and 1970s. Both overlapping and following Fischer’s tenure at \textit{Sibylle}, which would conclude in 1973, the fashion and culture magazine would employ some of the most influential East German photographers, notably Roger Melis, Sibylle Bergemann, Karol Kallay, Ute and Werner Mahler, Peter Meißner and Sven Marquardt.\textsuperscript{228}

In addition to appealing to other photographers, \textit{Sibylle} was extremely popular among young women in the GDR. It was, according to Fischer when asked whether fashion photography had an effect on everyday culture in the GDR, in which he replied that “[I]t certainly did,” “always sold out precisely because we [the fashion photographers] did not deal with Party politics. We often sold dreams probably because we ourselves were dreamers. That was what made the influence and effect of this

\textsuperscript{227} According to Fischer, someone at Verlag für die Frau was against publishing his first series, \textit{Herbstmode in Berlin}. Pfannstiel, however, insisted that his work be included in the August 1962 issue of \textit{Sibylle}. In my interview with him, Fischer stated the following: “I had a full year to finish my first assignment, the Berlin series. That's a lot of time. They [fashion editors] had picked the dresses, but I didn't like the typical models. I wanted regular women. So we went [Fischer and Bertram] and searched for them on the streets. We asked girls if they wanted to be in our photos, and that gave us a type of woman. I strolled through Berlin with one of my students [from the KHB] scouting locations for the backgrounds. And then I started to photograph and it took me the whole year. When it was finished, the producer said: ‘we are not printing this!’ But the editor-in-chief said: ‘Yes, we are printing this!’ It was amazing. Suddenly I started liking the whole thing, these photos. For the magazine, it was a turning point, a breakthrough.”; As a general rule, East German artists could only work freelance if they were members of the VBK-DDR. See Günther Feist, “Künstlergilde VBK. Eine Organisation in der Wende,” in \textit{Kunst in der DDR}, eds. Eckhart Gillen and Rainer Haarmann (Cologne: Kiepenheuer & Witsch, 1990), 53.

\textsuperscript{228} On the work of these photographers, see Dorothea Melis, \textit{Sibylle: Modefotografie aus drei Jahrzehnten DDR}, op. cit.
Bertram claims that *Sibylle* offered its readership a chance to escape everyday life in the GDR. She writes:

> At first glance the fashion photography in *Sibylle* looked realistic. It pretended to depict the everyday environment. But it was deceptive. The grey reality was only too gladly edited out. We would rather show a harmonious world, clean and friendly, and fashion, which was hardly acceptable or feasible under the harsh conditions of everyday life in the GDR. Many contributions in *Sibylle* served to uplift rather than to be practical. As in Western magazines, the fashion photography of the GDR also transmitted the illusion that dreams could be fulfilled. Women on this side of the [Berlin] Wall, too, wanted the possibility to escape their day-to-day life and dive into beautiful imagery.\(^{230}\)

Another magazine that offered readers some respite from everyday life in the GDR was *Das Magazin*. While the magazine catered to a broader audience than *Sibylle*, to men and women from all different backgrounds, it provided East German photographers, like the fashion and culture publication, the opportunity to work and to address themes that were unprecedented in the GDR at the time. To demonstrate this, the second half of this chapter will examine two photo-essays by Helga Paris, both of which were published in *Das Magazin* in the 1970s.

**The Origins of Das Magazin**

In July 1952, two months after West Germany’s Chancellor Konrad Adenauer signed the European Defense Community Treaty in Paris, Walter Ulbricht, First General Secretary of the SED, decided to accelerate the plan to build socialism in the GDR. Backed by the


Soviet Union, his decision initiated the first of three waves of forced collectivization of agriculture; economic policies that favored heavy industry over the production of food and consumer goods; and a significant rise in production quotas in the GDR, as discussed in Chapter One. The latter, which was approved by the Council of Ministers on 28 May 1953 and meant that workers would lose more than 10 percent of their monthly income, fueled discontent among the population and resulted in over one million workers, first in East Berlin and then in other cities and towns, either taking to the streets to protest, storming public buildings, or striking on 17 June 1953. Rather than attempting to convince East German workers that their efforts would be rewarded at a future date, the regime responded by force, relying on thousands of Soviet soldiers and members of the Kasernierte Volkspolizei (Barracked People’s Police) to quash social unrest. Shocked by the unorganized uprising and the rapid pace at which it unfolded, the SED understood, as did the Kremlin, that if it was to appease the population and garner its support it would have to increase the standards of living in the GDR, starting with the production of more consumer goods. Das Magazin was (re)born out of this understanding.

231 While workers saw a 10 percent decrease in their wages owing to the increase in production quotas, the rise in prices for consumer goods resulted in workers losing over 30 percent of their total income. For more on this and the economic crisis that initiated the increase in production quotas in the GDR, see Gareth Dale, *Popular Protest in East Germany, 1945-1989* (London; New York: Routledge, 2005), 9-36.

232 While protests lasted for over one week, most events took place between the morning shift and the imposition of martial law in the afternoon on the 17 June 1953.

233 Approximately 100 civilians were killed either by security forces and tanks; 20 citizens were executed; and 15,000 protesters were arrested. For more on the regime’s response to the Workers’ Uprising, see Dale, *Popular Protest in East Germany, 1945-1989*, op. cit., 10.

234 On the shift from heavy to light industry in the GDR and the regime’s decision to produce more consumer products after the Workers’ Uprising, see Katherine Pence, “‘You as a Woman Will Understand’: Consumption, Gender, and the Relationship Between State and Citizenry in the GDR’s Crisis on 17 June 1953,” *German History*, vol. 19, no. 2 (2001): 218-52.
Das Magazin was co-founded by filmmaker and producer Robert Siodmak and journalist Franz Wolfgang Koebner in the fall of 1924. Published by Giesecke & Devrient until 1927 and thereafter by Dr. Eysler & Co., the same publishing house that circulated the satirical weekly Lustige Blätter, the monthly lifestyle and culture magazine initially devoted its pages to the themes of fashion, literature, film, theater, dance, and photography. It featured articles by Alfred Polgar, Maxim Gorky, and Walter Hasenclever, among other prominent writers and artists, and frequently circulated the work of avant-garde photographers, including photomontages by Man Ray and Heinz Hajek-Halke. However, after the rise of the National Socialists in 1933, the magazine, which had reached a monthly circulation of 220,000, shifted directions. Koebner, who had been its editor-in-chief since its third printing in December 1924, when Siodmak decided to leave the magazine to pursue a full-time career in film, was removed from his position for his Jewish ancestry, and the magazine, which no longer featured the work of avant-garde artists and communist contributors, was used to increasingly espouse Nazi ideology until it went out of print in 1941. While Das Magazin was resurrected under the direction of Koebner in 1949, it failed to achieve the following it had during the Weimar years and it went out of print for a second time after thirteen issues were printed in Stuttgart the following year.

After the Workers’ Uprising, when the regime felt pressured to find ways to conciliate the working class, the Ministry of Culture decided to revive Das Magazin once

235 The work of these writers and artists can be viewed online thanks to a project called Illustrierte Magazine der Klassischen Moderne. For more, visit http://magazine.illustrierte-presse.de.
again. However, unlike its earlier versions printed in the Weimar Republic and the FRG, the East German illustrated magazine aimed to cater to the intelligentsia and cultural elite as well as the proletariat.\footnote{For more on the history of \textit{Das Magazin}, see Josie McLellan, “‘Even Under Socialism, We Don’t Want to Do Without Love’: East German Erotic,” in \textit{Pleasures in Socialism}, op. cit., 219-237; Manfred Gebhardt, \textit{Die Nackte unterm Ladentisch: Das Magazin in der DDR} (Berlin: Nora, 2002); Evemarie Badstübner, “Auf 80 Seiten um die Welt. \textit{Das Magazin} zwischen 1954 und 1970,” in \textit{Zwischen ’Mosaik’ und ’Einheit’ Zeitschriften in der DDR}, eds. Simon Barck, Martina Langermann, and Siegfried Lokatis (Berlin: Ch. Links, 1999), 189-201.} Heavily subsidized by the East German state and never costing readers more than 1,00 DM per issue, despite the GDR’s economic instability, \textit{Das Magazin} did indeed include something for everyone.\footnote{On East Germany’s economic history, see André Steiner, \textit{The Plans that Failed: An Economic History of the GDR} (New York: Berghahn Books, 2010).} A typical issue contained articles on marriage and infidelity; erotic short stories; fashion spreads; reviews of films, theater productions and literature; international food recipes; surveys on topics such as the secrets to a good relationship; images of everyday life; and one customary nude, a genre that had been, according to Betts, “dismissed,” along with landscapes and portraits in the 1940s and 1950s, “as bourgeois, decadent, or formalist.”\footnote{McLellan, “‘Even Under Socialism, We Don’t Want to Do Without Love,’” in \textit{Pleasures in Socialism}, op. cit., 222-223; Betts, “Picturing Privacy,” in \textit{Private Life in the German Democratic Republic}, op. cit., 196.} Containing little news or politics, the magazine reflected, as historian Josie McLellan aptly argues, “how the majority of people chose to spend their leisure time—not working extra shifts or attending party meetings but spending time with the family, reading, cooking, traveling, talking about relationships, and dressing up.”\footnote{McLellan, “‘Even Under Socialism,’” in \textit{Pleasures in Socialism}, op. cit., 222.} Like \textit{Sibylle}, \textit{Das Magazin} provided a welcomed alternative in a landscape of print media all too often laden with socialist ideology.
Described by one anonymous reader as “our aperitif, our canapé, our compote” and another as “a glass of champagne at the end of a harsh work week,” Das Magazin was a coveted item in the GDR.\textsuperscript{242} The eighty-page magazine sold out in Berlin within 24 hours and its circulation rose from 167,100 to 565,000 between 1954 and 1981.\textsuperscript{243} Among those responsible for its popularity were some of East Germany’s most prominent writers, illustrators, and photographers, who were sought after by Hilde Vogel-Rothstein, a well-connected German Jew who was not only married to Gerhart Eisler, the Head of East German Radio, but who served as the editor-in-chief of Das Magazin between 1956 and 1979.\textsuperscript{244} Endeavoring to publish something comparable to the international


\textsuperscript{243} While the magazine’s circulation more than tripled during this period, the number of copies printed each month is not an accurate reflection of its number of readers. According to McLellan, 50 copies of the magazine were shared between 18,000 workers in the Zeiss works in Jena in 1954, suggesting that the number of readers was significantly higher. For more, see McLellan, “Even Under Socialism, We Don’t Want to Do Without Love,” in Pleasures in Socialism, op. cit., 221.

\textsuperscript{244} McLellan, “Even Under Socialism, We Don’t Want to Do Without Love,” in Pleasures in Socialism, op. cit., 222; Hilde Vogel-Rothstein moved to Paris in 1933 and then to New York once the Second World War broke out in 1939. In 1942, she married Gerhart Eisler, the brother of composer Hans Eisler and a devoted German communist accused of both running the American Communist Party in the 1930s and being involved in atom-bomb espionage for the Soviets in the 1940s. For several years, the couple lived under FBI surveillance and Eisler was interned on Ellis Island in 1947. While out on bail set at $20,000, he posed as a blind man and boarded a Polish ship en route to London, effectively escaping American authorities. The British refused to extradite him to the United States and he returned to Germany via Czechoslovakia in 1949 with his wife, who was promptly arrested and deported from the United States after his escape. Warmly received by East German authorities, Gerhart was first given the prominent position of Head of the Office of Information in 1949 and then Deputy Chair of the East German State Radio Committee in 1956, while his wife went on to run Das Magazin in 1956 (she replaced Heinz H. Schmidt in 1956, when the latter was offered the position of editor-in-chief at Eulenspiegel). For more on Hilde and Gerhart Eisler, see Catherine Epstein, The Last Revolutionaries: German Communists and their Century (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2003), 91-99; George A. Finch, “The Eisler Extradition Case,” in The American Journal of International Law, vol. 43, no. 3 (July 1949): 487-491; and Nicholas J. Schlosser, “The Berlin Radio War:
magazines she saw while living abroad, first in Paris and then in New York in the 1930s and 1940s, Vogel-Rothstein featured and commissioned articles by the likes of Johannes R. Becher, Stefan Heym, Anna Seghers, and Christa Wolf; printed hundreds of covers by graphic artist Werner Klemke, which more often than not contained witty references to sex and relationships; and hired rising East German photographers to illustrate articles and complete other assignments for the magazine. For example, Arno Fischer began receiving regular commissions from the magazine in 1956, while Sibylle Bergemann worked in its photography department between 1965 and 1967 and then started to freelance for the magazine in the 1970s. In addition to seeking out contributors, Vogel-Rothstein and her editorial team also accepted submissions from East German photographers, many of whom saw the magazine as a platform to circulate ambitious work. One such photographer was Helga Paris.

Prior to the Second World War, Paris’ family moved from Zossen, a residential town approximately 30 kilometers outside of Berlin, to Gollnow, Pomerania (now Goleniów, Poland), where she was born on 21 May 1938. While Paris’ father, Wilhelm Steffens, a former typesetter, and her two brothers would leave Gollnow after joining the Wehrmacht, Paris would remain with her sister and mother, Gertrud Greulich, until the Russians started to approach and the town was evacuated in March 1945. In the spring of that same year, Paris moved to Brandenburg, where she and her sister grew up in the care of their mother and their mother’s working-class family; her father died after being

Broadcasting in Cold War Berlin and the Shaping of Political Culture in Divided Germany, 1945-1961.” Diss. (University of Maryland, 2008), 88.

interned by the Russians in May 1945 and her brothers allegedly “set off for the West” after the war.246

After passing her university entrance exam in 1956, Paris moved to East Berlin to study fashion design at the Ingenieruschule für Bekleidungsindustrie Berlin (School of Engineering for the Clothing Industry). There she met her future husband Ronald Paris, a painter who trained, like so many other East German artists, at the KHB between 1953 and 1958, and was hired to teach drawing and art history at the Ingenieruschule für Bekleidungsindustrie Berlin in the late 1950s. It was through Ronald Paris, whose friends included Wolf Biermann, Jean and Brigitte Soubeyran, Robert Havemann, Christa Wolf, and Peter Voigt, among others, that she began to move in East Berlin’s most prominent intellectual and artistic circles.247

Similar in some respects to Fischer, whose uncle, an amateur photographer, encouraged him to purchase his first camera in the late 1930s, Paris was introduced to photography by an aunt who worked in a photography lab after the war. Always wanting to pursue the medium but unable to find the opportunity, Paris purchased her first camera, a twin-lens 6 x 6 Felxarett, a Czech camera similar to the Rolleiflex 6 x 6, after she completed her studies in 1960.248 While her picture taking was initially a private endeavor, Paris decided, with the encouragement of Peter Voigt, a documentary

247 Ibid.
filmmaker who saw her photographs for the first time in 1967 and thereafter took a great interest in her work, to pursue a career in photography.  

With this decision, Paris purchased a 35 mm Praktica (an East German camera made in Dresden), and began photographing rehearsals for productions at the Volksbühne (The People’s Theater) in East Berlin and the Sofia National Opera and Ballet in Bulgaria, where her husband was responsible for the set designs in the early 1970s. She documented, for instance, Benno Besson’s production of Carlo Gozzi’s König Hirsch (The Stag King) and Brigitte Soubeyran’s version of Tirso de Molina’s Don Gil mit den grünen Hosen (Don Gil of the Green Breeches) at the Volksbühne and Carl Orff’s Carmina Burana (Songs from Benediktbeuern) at the Sofia National Opera and Ballet. Paris used these photographs along with those of her family and friends to apply to the VBK-DDR in 1972. Her membership in the artists’ association provided her with an individual tax number needed by all freelance East German photographers at the time, as mentioned above, and allowed her to not only accept assignments from illustrated magazines such as neues leben (new life), a youth magazine that occasionally hired her to take fashion photographs, but to also pursue commissions at Das Magazin.  

In 1966, eight years before she would start to circulate her work in Das Magazin, Paris and her family moved to Prenzlauher Berg, a working-class district in East Berlin. Distinct from other East German photographers, both before and after her, who walked the streets of East Berlin looking for subjects to photograph, notably Arno Fischer and his

---

249 Ibid; Paris spent most of the 1960s photographing her children, Robert and Jenny, born in 1962 and 1965, and close friends.  
251 It is unclear whether the tax number provided to artists upon entry into the VBK-DDR was needed to work freelance prior to the early 1960s, when Fischer, as abovementioned, began taking commissions from illustrated magazines.
student Gundula Schulze Eldowy, Paris spent years getting acquainted with her neighbors, often forging lasting friendships with them. It wasn’t until one evening after speaking with her neighbor Helmut Arnold, a trash collector, about the disparaging treatment he often received because of his profession that she decided to broaden her photographic interests, to photograph East Berliners, starting with Prenzlauer Berg’s trash collectors.

In the fall of 1973, Paris approached the editor of photography at *Das Magazin*, Brigitte Voigt, with the idea of publishing a photo-essay on Arnold and his crew members. Paris’ aim was to not only address unexplored subject matter -- garbage collectors had no place hitherto in East Germany’s visual culture --, but to also dignify trash collectors and communicate their role in keeping the streets and homes of East Berlin clean. Luckily the East German photographer reached out to the right person. In addition to her position at the magazine, Voigt was also a founding member of Gruppe DIREKT (Group DIRECT), a small group of East German photographers that formed around Arno Fischer in East Berlin in 1966 and whose photographs, according to Ulrich Domröse, “set new standards in the landscape of illustrated magazines in the GDR.”

Influenced by the work of Eugène Atget, Henri Cartier-Bresson, William Klein, and Robert Frank, members of Gruppe DIREKT, which, in addition to Fischer and Voigt, who trained under Fischer at the KHB between 1958 and 1963, included Sibylle Bergemann, Elisabeth Meinke, Roger Melis, and Michael Weidt, circulated their work in

---

252 The full quote, which includes a reference to *Sibylle*, is as follows: “A group of young photographers [Gruppe DIREKT] formed in East Berlin in 1966. Its members included Sibylle Bergemann, Arno Fischer, Elisabeth Meinke, Roger Melis, Brigitte Voigt and Michael Weidt. Their photos, some of which appeared in *Sibylle*, set new standards in the landscape of illustrated magazines in the GDR.” See Domröse, “Glossary,” in *Geschlossene Gesellschaft*, op. cit., 344.
Für Dich, Sibylle, Sonntag, Neue Berliner Illustrierte and Das Magazin. Voigt, for instance, published photographs of her family and friends and everyday life on the streets of her hometown Magdeburg in Sonntag and Neue Berliner Illustrierte in the 1960s and 1970s, and afforded this same opportunity to like-minded photographers who wanted to publish in Das Magazin, including Paris.

Helga Paris’ Photo-essays: Wer räumt unseren Dreck weg? and In den Kneipen von Berlin

Paris’ first photo-essay, Wer räumt unseren Dreck weg? (Who Takes Away our Trash?), was published in Das Magazin in February 1974. Belonging to a genre that began to increasingly appear in illustrated newspapers and magazines in Weimar Germany, such as the Berliner Illustrierte Zeitung (Berlin’s Illustrated Newspaper) and Münchner Illustrierte Presse (Munich’s Illustrated Press) and that relies on both text and images to construct a narrative, Wer räumt unseren Dreck weg? is a three-page photo-essay comprised of twelve of black and white photographs, arranged side-by-side and one on top of the other, and a didactic text written by Paris [Figs. 2.24-2.26].

Surviving into the early 1980s, Gruppe DIREKT, which was known simply as die Gruppe um Fischer or “the group around Fischer” between its founding in 1966 and its third exhibition at INTERCLUB in 1969, when Peter Voigt suggested that they call themselves Direkt owing to the “straightforwardness” of their photographs, served as a precursor to the Arbeitsgruppe Fotografie (Photography Working Group). The latter was founded by Fischer and Melis within the Verband Bildender Künstler der DDR (Association of Visual Artists of the GDR) in June 1981 and allowed photographers to work with greater autonomy in the GDR. For more on Gruppe DIREKT and their activities and influences, see Ulrich Burchert, Wolfgang Kil, and Matthias Flügge, “Redaktionsgespräche mit Fotografen: Gruppe DIREKT,” Bildende Kunst, no. 4 (1984): 157-161.


On Weimar photo-essays, see Sarah E. James, “Between Images: Photography’s Social Form,” in Common Ground: German Photographic Cultures Across the Iron Curtain (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2013), 32-33 and 38-40; and Daniel Magilow, The Photography of Crisis: the Photo Essays of Weimar Germany (University Park, Pa.: Pennsylvania State University Press,
her photo-essay’s title/question, the text begins by Paris recounting a story of a teacher scolding a young schoolgirl for misbehaving and warning her that she “will end up a garbage collector” if she doesn’t behave. In response, the young girl, whose father happens to be a trash collector, perhaps Arnold, jumps up and angrily asks her teacher (and, for that matter, the reader): “what do you think, sitting there in your white shirt, you would look like if nobody were to collect your trash?” Rather than providing the reader with the teacher’s response, Paris interrupts the narrative here to pose a different question. She asks the reader to consider how East Berlin’s trash collectors, men who spend their days removing “the waste and dirt of other people,” can be defended against such prejudice. Without explicitly answering the question, Paris makes it known that it is through knowledge, and uses the rest of her text to inform the reader about Arnold and his colleagues. She begins by stating that these public servants work in groups of four to deliver six hundred tons of waste to one of three landfill sites in East Berlin each day. Changing routes every six months, these men, as she also notifies the reader, walk an
average of twenty to twenty-five kilometers per day and are responsible for not only removing what resides in designated trash bins, but all garbage, old sofas, comforters, baby strollers, and toilets, discarded on the streets.\textsuperscript{259} In addition to outlining these and other duties, Paris maintains that these men are no different from other workers in East Berlin. Their problems are the same as those experienced by contractors, electricians, carpenters, butchers, window cleaners, and bank clerks: they all think about money, their standing in their brigade, the most efficient and fastest work plan, Berlin’s terrible weather, and when they will get their Trabant.\textsuperscript{260}

Whereas Paris’ text, in particular its conclusion, exemplifies the similarities between all workers in the GDR, her photographs operate in a different manner, that is, they narrate a different story. Of the twelve black and white photographs included in Wer räumt unseren Dreck weg? only three depict Arnold and his crewmembers performing the tasks described by the photographer, such as emptying trash bins and returning them to their respective courtyards. With the exception of one image depicting a quiet street in the district of Pankow, the other photographs, group and individual portraits, show these men on break, sitting in their truck, frequenting a local pub, and drinking coffee in what appears to be a courtyard. The fact that these men are, at times, seen during their break is not what distinguishes Paris’ photographs from the essay’s textual frame; it is the different relationships these men have with Paris and her camera that sets them apart from her written account.

Taken frontally and in profile, at various distances and times of day with the use of natural light, Paris’ images do not reinforce similitude but rather the singular

\textsuperscript{259} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{260} Ibid., 8.
temperaments of East Berlin’s garbage collectors. Her photographs show these men smiling in response to something presumably said or done by one of their colleagues located outside the photographic frame; approaching the camera with a sense of unease or looking directly into its lens, fully aware of its invariable presence; or paying no notice at all to the photographer and her mechanical device. In one image, for instance, Paris, who positions herself directly in front of her subject in the cab of the garbage truck, photographs a middle-aged worker, whose face is partially lit from the light streaming in from the vehicle’s right window, broodingly looking at the camera [Fig. 2.27]. In another, she photographs a younger worker inside a Berlin pub, who, visibly uncomfortable by the presence of the camera, makes an awkward face and diverts his attention away from her Praktica [Fig. 2.28]. And, in a group portrait, Paris documents one of the men, who appears to be more interested in her than in the conversation unfolding at his table, extending his right arm to catch the photographer’s attention [Fig. 2.29].

By capturing their distinct moods, facial expressions, and rapports with the camera, Paris presents these men not as a socialist “type” but as individuals. That is, she uses her camera to underscore their heterogeneity and confront the anonymizing drive of mainstream socialist photography. Between the founding of the GDR and the late 1970s, East German workers were represented in a limited number of contexts, expressing even fewer emotions: they were repeatedly photographed working in factories, shoveling in opencast coal mines, posing alongside their brigade members, and, despite the introduction of Western television and the production of DEFA’s Alltagsfilm (everyday films) in the 1960s, when “rigidly optimistic official iconography,” as art historian Sarah E. James correctly points out, “was seen as archaic,” with smiles on their faces [Fig. 2.30-
Like other groups in the GDR, as Peter Pachnicke, art historian and Head of the Photography Department at the HGB in the 1980s, argues in “The Search for Individuality – Portraiture of the Eighties,” workers were not characterized as individuals in East Germany’s visual culture. He writes:

“In predominately staged images the ideals of the working class were presented to the people [of the GDR]: the sweat-covered steel worker looking energetically into the future, his balled fist embodying a resolute understanding of the responsibilities of the future, the smiling joie de vivre etched into the dust-covered face of the miner, the wizened, contemplative face of the Party workers, the comforting hand of the master on the shoulder of the apprentice. Concern for the younger generation and embracing all the peoples of the world regardless of color -- less the concrete individual and more the social type, this is what imparted the idealistic and pedagogic in these staged photographs.”

Rather than contribute to these stock images, which served at once to eradicate the traditional bourgeois conceptions of originality and individuality and to assert the

---


collectivity of socialist society, Paris went against the established way of photographing workers and drew attention to their distinct “personalities.” In other words, she used her camera to highlight diversity rather than uniformity within East German society.

Met with great enthusiasm by Voigt and her colleagues, *Wer räumt unseren Dreck weg?* was followed by Paris’ second photo-essay, *In den Kneipen von Berlin (In the Bars of Berlin)*, in the September 1975 issue of *Das Magazin*. *In den Kneipen von Berlin* consists of sixteen black and white photographs arranged, again, side-by-side and one on top of the other, and a short text written by the photographer [Figs. 2.32-2.33]. Like her first photo-essay, which sought to change readers’ pedestrian view of East Berlin’s garbage collectors, *In den Kneipen von Berlin* attempts to alter the general attitude towards Berlin’s working-class bars. Having spent a considerable amount of time

263 On portrait photography’s ability (or lack thereof) to capture the so-called individual subject, see Benjamin Buchloh, “Residual Resemblance: Three Notes on the Ends of Portraiture,” in *Face-off: The Portrait in Recent Art*, ed. Melissa E. Feldman (Philadelphia: Institute of Contemporary Art, University of Pennsylvania, 1994): 53-69, esp. 58 and 59; Stock images were advocated by members of the ZKF, in particular Beiler, who saw August Sander’s typologizing portraiture as a model for postwar socialist photography. His interest in Sander’s photographic practice raises larger issues such as the ZKF’s precarious relationship to modern photography and the inconsistent definition of socialist photography. After the founding of the ZFK, the organization, which realized early on that there “were no investigations and representations of the history of photography from the Marxist-Leninist point of view,” began to take an interest in early Soviet photography, German worker photography, and the practices of Lewis Hine, Eugene Smith, and August Sander. While Beiler criticized Sander’s photographic practice for being too bourgeois and for failing to depict the new proletariat class, he saw his anonymizing drive as a model for East German photographers, communicating this first in “August Sander und sein deutsches Pan-Optikum,” an article that appeared in *Fotografie* in September 1963, and, according to Katharina Röhl, twenty-nine other times between 1963 and his death in 1974. Sander’s work was also featured in the exhibition *Medium Fotografie* and shown at the HGB’s gallery, respectively in 1977 and 1981, as discussed in Chapter Three, and influenced many East German photographers, notably Christian Borchert. For more on this topic, see Sarah E. James, “A Socialist Realist Sander?”, op. cit., 38-59; John P. Jacob, *Recollecting a Culture: Photography and the Evolution of a Socialist Aesthetic in East Germany* (Boston: Photographic Resource Center at Boston University, 1998), 6; Gerhard Henniger, “Zur Bedeutung der Traditionen der deutschen Arbeiterfotografie,” *Fotografie*, no. 1 (January 1966), 8; Beiler Bertold, “August Sander und sein deutsches Pan-Optikum,” *Fotografie*, no. 9 (September 1963), 332–336 and 355; and Katharina Röhl, “Gesicht—Geschichte—Gegenwart: Das Porträtwerk August Sanders als Impuls für die ost-deutsch Fotografie,” *Fotogeschichte: Beiträge zur Geschichte und Ästhetik der Fotografie*, no. 102 (2006), 15–24.
in these establishments since moving to Prenzlauer Berg in the 1960s, the photographer saw Berlin’s bars as social spaces where couples, friends, and regulars often gathered to have a conversation or to simply enjoy a beer on their own in an affable and lively environment that she describes as a *Wohnzimmer* or “living room.” Paris writes:

> Auntie Olga has stood behind the bar for thirty years. The pub is about the size of a living room, the clientele are mostly regulars, a lot of women, some married couples, some men. Conversation fills the room, and there’s a lot of laughter. It is Friday. Someone has bought a bottle of bubbly. New shoes are examined, and dogs spoiled. A woman in a wheelchair outside the open door asks for a glass of beer, shouts a few jokes to the people inside, finishes her beer and moves on – accompanied by the respectful, low-voiced remarks of the women enjoying themselves inside.

Berlin pubs. Who knows them and who doesn’t? Supposedly there are some people in the capital who have never been into a Berlin pub. And they’re proud of it. They say decent people don’t go into places like that! But most people regard the local pubs quite highly. Not merely for their historical value, but more so for their social importance. Pubs are the most human of all meeting places. They are to restaurants, as provincial towns are to big cities. No other venues can fulfill the specific function they do. Of course people could drink their beer somewhere else, but they can’t get the same atmosphere everywhere. Pubs attract a specific kind of guest, regulars, people who know each other vaguely or sometimes quite well. Sometimes for decades. But it’s not the fifty-year-old bar or the brass fittings that are so strangely touching as they conjure up the past, it’s more the charisma of the people who spend time there – and a perception of what they have experienced in the last fifty years.

The openness is striking, but it’s combined with a sort of detachment as well. You sit on your own or not, talk to people or not, go or stay… In such pubs you can find out a lot about old Berlin; what happened when and where, or perhaps you might know where Pühlmann’s Garten used to be? And people discuss problems as well, social and private problems, and there’s no reason to keep your voice down.264

To convey her impression of Berlin’s bars, Paris entered “Tante Olga,” “M. Fick,” “Mutter Grün,” and “Elfriede Wyrwis” in the districts of Prenzlauer Berg, Mitte, and Weißensee, and photographed their working-class patrons. Taken over the course of

---

several months, her photographs, which have a rich range of tones and shadows due to her reliance on natural light, document their boisterous clientele, young, middle-aged, and elderly individuals, talking, laughing, smoking, and drinking together. At times taken with great care and others quite spontaneously, evident by the blurred and cropped bodies seen throughout the photo-essay, the images show customers looking directly at the photographer, reacting to the presence of her camera, as well as diverting their gazes sideways, downwards, and beyond the photographic frame, paying no heed at all to her actions. Regardless of where they are found looking, the patrons, through their body language and rapport with the camera, appear at ease, enjoying both themselves and the company of those around them. Depicted in such a manner, they present Berlin bars as spirited spaces, an outlook shared not only by Paris, but also by her friend, the poet Elke Erb, who after seeing Paris’ series in Das Magazin, stated the following:

There were many pubs in our working-class neighborhood. If I went into them it was to buy cigarettes, and I always left with a feeling of horror. They had a whiff of the grave about them, people without hope drinking themselves to death. But the photos [in Paris’ series Berlin Bars] showed that these people were not only still alive, but also lively and in communication with one another. With the help of the pictures, I realized this instantly. Whereas without them I would have stuck with my trite impression, which was part of the general impression I had of the everyday life around me, an impression of compact and stifling stagnation. At least in this one instance I was proven wrong.\textsuperscript{265}

Described by Domröse as one of Paris’ “major photographic series,” In den Kneipen von Berlin not only presents East Berlin’s bars in a favorable light, but it also captures workers wholly outside the world of work.\textsuperscript{266} Anticipating the interest among German photographers on both sides of the political divide, such as Ute Mahler, Christian

\textsuperscript{266} Domröse, Geschlossene Gesellschaft, op. cit., 335.
Borchert, Margrit Emmrich, Bernd Lasdin and Herlinde Koelbl, in taking their cameras indoors and documenting Germans in the comfort of their homes in the late 1970s and early 1980s, Paris’ photo-essay addresses a theme that was without parallel in the mid-1970s: workers relaxing in a familiar environment where there are little to no expectations for them to perform as workers or, for that matter, citizens contributing to the success of socialism.

While Paris’ work was undoubtedly unprecedented, it was not considered polemical at the time. Her photo-essays were published during a short-lived period in the first half of the 1970s (the era of détente and Ostpolitik), when East German artists began to experience new liberties, as they did when Khrushchev’s reforms in the Soviet Union had an impact on artistic production throughout the Eastern Bloc in the late 1950s and early 1960s.267 This period began after Honecker both succeeded Ulbricht as General Secretary of the SED in 1971 and encouraged artists to explore new subject matter. At the SED’s Fourth Central Committee Plenum in December of 1971, Honecker announced: “If one proceeds from the social premise of socialism, there can be in my view no taboos in the realm of art and literature. This applies both to questions of content and style -- in short, to the concept of artistic mastery.”268 The SED leader was also the one to end this period when he agreed together with members of the Politburo to strip guitarist and singer Wolf Biermann of his East German citizenship on 16 November 1976. Biermann’s expulsion from the GDR, which sparked outrage not only among the cultural elite, such

267 This period of liberalization extended beyond the arts. During the early 1970s, Honecker allowed East Germans to tune into Western radio and television programs, which most East Germans were already doing, and took a relaxed stance on Western clothing. For more, see Peter Grieder, The German Democratic Republic (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012), 74.
as writer and former member of the Central Committee of the SED Christa Wolf, but also ordinary people in the GDR who felt that the SED had damaged the country’s international reputation, marked an end to yet another phase of liberalization in the GDR.269

Despite the fact that there were “no taboos” in art and literature and artists were encouraged to investigate socialist realism in new ways in the GDR during the first half of the 1970s, it was not until November 1978, when Willi Sitte, painter and President of the VBK-DDR, announced that “the private sphere of workers, their relations to their families, to their environment, nature, sports and leisure” was equally as important to the Kulturbund as the world of work that photographers were officially permitted to document and circulate images of workers outside the setting of the factory, mine, or brigade gathering.270 By documenting workers in the bars of East Berlin in the mid-1970s, Paris was one of the first East German photographers to broach the subject of leisure time and to show the proletariat in an entirely new context in the GDR.

**Conclusion**

According to art historian Matthias Flügge, *Sibylle* and *Das Magazin* “represented a cultural voice that stood out from the ideologically conforming printed matter” in the GDR. They were not “bastions of resistance,” but rather publications that “gave

---

individuals the right to express themselves.” Put differently, they offered East German artists autonomy. In spite of their different audiences, these ephemeral cultural products, part of the state’s initiative to build a socialist consumer economy in the 1950s and 1960s, acted as vehicles to disseminate the work of East German photographers who, like Fischer and Paris, explored what would have been considered unconventional subject matter at the time. Moreover, owing to the open-minded individuals and young artists who ran these illustrated magazines during the 1960s and 1970s, they acted as alternatives to ZKF publications and exhibitions, both of which required East German photographers to produce regime-affirming propaganda. In this way, these illustrated magazines allowed East German art photographers to build successful careers in the GDR.

273 It is important to draw out the connection here between art photographers and ordinary citizens in the GDR. I have situated this project in the third wave of scholarship on the GDR, the cultural wave, because like ordinary East German citizens, who as historians Betts, Pence, McLellan, Rubin, Stitziel, Lüdtke, and Lindenberger, among others, have shown, built “workable lives” under the East German regime through their personal relationships, foreign travel experiences, and consumer choices (ranging from what kinds of plastic goods, clothing and foodstuffs from the HO and specialty stores, to illustrated magazines to purchase), art photographers found ways around the dictates of the East German state and its cultural apparatuses. That is, they found means to evade the control of the ZKF and were able to effectively sustain their photographic practices, make an income, and gain notoriety in the GDR. For more on this last wave of scholarship on the GDR, see Betts and Pence, eds., Socialist Modern: East German Everyday Culture and Politics (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, 2008); Betts, Within Walls: Private Life in the German Democratic Republic (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010); Lindenberger, “Alltagsgeschichte und ihr Beitrag zur Erforschung der Sozialgeschichte der DDR,” in Die Grenzen der Diktatur: Staat und Gesellschaft in der DDR, ed. Richard Bessel and Ralf Jesse (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1996), 298-325; Lüdtke, “Geschichte und Eigensinn,” in Alltagskultur, Subjektivität und Geschichte. Zur Theorie und Praxis von Alltagsgeschichte (Münster: Westfälisches Dampfboot, 2004), 139-153; McLellan,
While Sibylle and Das Magazin would continue to provide East German photographers with the opportunity to work and circulate their images until well after the Wende, photographers were given more opportunities to disseminate their work starting in the late 1970s, when the status of photography shifted in both Germanys. No longer relegated to small Kulturbund exhibitions and illustrated magazines, the work of East German art photographers, as the following chapter will demonstrate, began to be included in major Kulturbund exhibitions, such as Kunstausstellung der Deutschen Demokratischen Republik (East German National Art Exhibition), exhibited in solo and group shows sponsored by the ZKF, and featured in Fotografie.

CHAPTER THREE
Der Übergang: (East German) Photography as Art

Berlin hatte mich zur Fotografin gemacht.
[ Berlin had made a photographer of me.]
-Gundula Schulze Eldowy

*l’enfant terrible* of East German Photography

In 1972, at the age of eighteen, Gundula Schulze Eldowy left her hometown of Erfurt, a small city in Thuringia, to study at the Fachschule für Werbung und Gestaltung (College of Advertising and Design or FWG) in East Berlin. Taken with the unfamiliar sights and sounds of the East German capital, a city that she recollects as “an extinct metropolis” that not only had the “feel of an archaeological site,” but that had “an unexpected magic” due to its “unique blend of art, subculture, workers, refugees, and dreamers,” Schulze Eldowy spent her days and nights as a young student frequently wandering its streets. The scenes she saw and the individuals she encountered during these meanderings piqued her interest in those around her. Eager to learn more about their lives she approached the locals whom she came across every day in the districts of Prenzlauer Berg and Mitte and listened to their stories. These initial interactions with her broadly defined neighbors -- the baker, the cobbler, the newspaper seller, the vegetable man, the bar patron -- helped

275 Ibid., 17.
her acclimatize to her new surroundings and shaped her artistic interests. Shortly after she
completed her studies in 1975, she took to the streets with a Nikon FE camera and began
to photograph East Berlin and its residents. While Schulze Eldowy selected her subject
matter rather indiscriminately at first, as the early images of her series Berlin in einer
Hundenacht (Berlin on a Dog’s Night, 1977-1990) attest, from 1979 until German
reunification in 1990 she used her camera to capture the disenfranchised, among them the
elderly, the poor, the sick, the obese, the transgender, the disabled, and the exhausted
worker. Describing her motivations and artistic practice in “Im Herbstlaub des
Vergessens” (“In the Autumn Leaves of Oblivion”), a lyrical account of her experiences
in East Berlin during the latter half of the Cold War, she asserted the following:

What spurred me on was curiosity. It was a sense of beauty, too, which
taught me dismay. How could so many people live in the most degrading
circumstances? With this question in mind I approached these people and
listened to them. I experienced their stories, for I was living side-by-side
with them, became one of them. Berlin overpowered me entirely. I
penetrated into the guts of the city and photographed them.276

Put differently, Schulze Eldowy travelled to the innards of East Berlin to photograph
those rarely documented by East German photographers.

The individuals whom Schulze Eldowy photographed in the late 1970s and 1980s
were those largely absent from the media and ZKF-sponsored exhibitions and
publications when she first arrived in East Berlin. Committed to building socialism in the
1950s and subsequently with propagating its success in the 1960s, East German officials
encouraged artists not to show life as it was, but to create inspiring images of what the
future could be. Their interests did not entirely shift in the 1970s. Despite the significant
developments that marked the beginning of this decade -- for instance, Honecker’s call

276 Ibid.
for “breadth and diversity” in the arts at the Eighth Party Congress of the SED and assertion that there were “no taboos in the fields of art and literature” at the Fourth Plenum of the Central Committee of the SED --, the East German state and its cultural apparatuses continued to call upon its photographers to present an idealistic view of socialist society and its members.277

The state’s actions were no more evident than in the request made by the ZKF for submissions to the 1. Porträtfotoschau der DDR (1st Portrait Photo Show of the GDR). Appearing in the ZKF’s monthly newsletter in Fotografie in December 1970, the advertisement for the 1. Porträtfotoschau der DDR invited “all amateur, press and professional photographers […] to submit their best work” in its opening line.278 Rather than leaving this appeal open for interpretation, the ZKF promptly delineated in the following paragraph what it classified as a photographer’s “best work,” announcing that “special attention will be given to portraits of our pacesetters and innovators, socialist brigades, scientists and research collectives, artists and their interactions with the working class, and to portraits that speak to the political and cultural life of personalities in the family, in sports and in leisure activities.”279 This statement made clear that while all submissions were welcomed, the only photographs that would be considered for exhibition were those that captured individuals contributing to, participating in, and

277 Erich Honecker, Bericht des ZK an den VIII. Parteitag der SED (Berlin: Dietz Verlag, 1971), 76; Honecker quoted in “Schlußwort auf der 4. Tagung des ZK der SED Dezember 1971,” in Gisela Rüß, Dokumente zur Kunst-, Literatur- und Kulturpolitik der SED 1971-1974 (Stuttgart: H. Seewald, 1976), 287; While Honecker encouraged artists to explore new subject matter in the early 1970s, his “no taboos” rule did not mean that negative views of the GDR were tolerated. Wolf Biermann, an East German poet and folk singer, who often used his music to critique the state, is a case in point. On 16 November 1976, while on tour in West Germany, Biermann was stripped of his citizenship and prohibited from re-entering the GDR.
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enjoying life in socialist society. \textsuperscript{280} Leaving no reader to question its motives the ZKF also explained the reasoning behind its selection process: following the State Council’s resolution on the task of culture on 30 November 1967, which “focused on the undertaking of the century: to design the image of the people of our community,” the ZKF aimed to construct a positive image of East German citizens. \textsuperscript{281} To no one’s surprise the exhibition did just that.

The 1. \textit{Porträtfotoschau der DDR} opened on 16 October 1971 in Dresden and travelled to Berlin one month later where it was displayed in the exhibition space at the Berliner Fernsehturm (TV tower) for the remainder of that year. The exhibition consisted of four hundred and eight photographs selected by eight members of the ZKF from over four thousand submissions sent by amateur, press, and art photographers, including Sibylle Bergemann, Christian Borchert, and Evelyn Richter. \textsuperscript{282} The photographs, all black and white with the exception of twenty-five color images, showed the customary motifs of socialist realism: smiling politicians; men and women socializing and diligently working; professors either teaching or sitting in their offices surrounded by books; doctors performing surgeries; farmers toiling the land; students studying; children playing and learning; and young families and lovers sharing intimate moments. Seen together the photographs pictured East Germans as healthy, educated, carefree citizens who were

\textsuperscript{280} For more on the exhibition’s emphasis on individuality, see Paul Betts, “Picturing Privacy: Photography and Domesticity,” in \textit{Private Life in the German Democratic Republic} (Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 2010), 206.
\textsuperscript{282} The jury for the 1. \textit{Porträtfotoschau der DDR} consisted of Gerhard Kiesling, Berthold Beiler, Dietrich Dorfstecher, Heinz Hoffmann, Gerhard Ihrke, Barbara Meffert, Wolfgang G. Schröter, and Werner Wurst. For more, see Walter Heilig et al., \textit{1. Porträtfotoschau der DDR} (Berlin: Deutscher Kulturbund; Zentrale Kommission Fotografie der DDR, 1971), unpaginated.
equally invested in each other, evident in the familial, platonic, and romantic relationships seen throughout the exhibition, as in their socialist society.

According to the introduction in its exhibition catalogue “Mensch wie du und ich” (“People Like You and Me”), written by Walter Heilig, Chairman of the ZKF and former worker photographer, and Dr. Gerhard Mertink, Federal Secretary of the Kulturbund, the photographs showed “human sentiments and the high moral and ethical character that coin the development of the citizens in our Republic, our socialist personalities, and their diverse relations in the community and with the environment” and were viewed collectively as “a portrait of our time.”

Their subjects, as indicated by the title of the introduction and the assertion made by its authors that viewers would be “seized by the blissful feeling that the people photographed are just ‘like you and me,’” were considered to be average citizens of the GDR.

The typical East Germans described by Heilig and Mertink in “Mensch wie du und ich” were not limited to the walls and exhibition catalogue of the 1. Porträtfotoschau der DDR. They appeared throughout the 1970s and 1980s in Neues Deutschland, Fotografie, and other photography exhibitions organized by the ZKF, such as the Berliner Internationale Fotoausstellung (Berlin’s International Photo Exhibition) and the Fotoschau der DDR (Photo Show of the GDR). Where they did not materialize, however, was in the work of Schulze Eldowy. Known among her colleagues as the enfant terrible of East German photography, she photographed citizens who differed considerably from those represented in the media and the abovementioned exhibitions and publications. That is, she used her camera to capture marginalized individuals who were on the whole

---
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omitted from East German visual culture.285 By examining both Schulze Eldowy’s photographic practice by way of her early images and Tamerlan (1979-1987), a series that documents the physical and emotional decline of one woman over the course of eight years, I will explore the ways in which her photographs challenged the view that the East German state tried, in some ways, to maintain of itself during the latter half of the Cold War. Outlining the trajectory of her career and the exhibition history of her work, I will also address the support she received from official channels in the 1980s, making evident the inconsistencies in the logic and actions of the East German state and its cultural apparatuses as well as suggesting their struggle to reach a consensus on how to represent the GDR photographically during the last decade of its existence.

*Berlin in einer Hundenacht (Berlin on a Dog’s Night, 1977-1990)*

Schulze Eldowy began her first series *Berlin in einer Hundenacht* in 1977. The cycle, which she worked on at the same time as *Der Wind füllt sich mit Wasser* (*The Wind fills itself with Water*, 1979-1980), *Aktporträts* (*Nude Portraits*, 1982-1985), *Arbeit* (*Work*, 1985-1987), *Strassenbild* (*Street Pictures*, 1979-1990), and *Tamerlan*, includes approximately seventy black and white photographs taken in Mitte and Prenzlauer Berg over the course of thirteen years.286 Arranged neither thematically nor chronologically the images belong to one of three overarching categories: East Berliners walking on the streets; East Berliners sitting in neighborhood pubs and in the privacy of their apartments; and the buildings in Berlin’s Soviet sector. Whether in the presence or absence of

Berliners, the latter group of images, the architecture of East Berlin, is pictured in a state of neglect, bearing marks of decrepitude on its façades or existing in piles of rubble [Figs. 3.1-3.2]. On several occasions this group of photographs shifts its focus from the damage and ruins of Berlin to the city’s unexpected, anomalous structures; for instance, to a wooden shed on Dragonerstraße (now Almstadtstraße) that operates as a makeshift mobile hair salon or an unadorned storefront window showcasing a prosthetic leg alongside a plastic first aid dog [Figs. 3.3-3.4]. The peculiarities captured by Schulze Eldowy’s camera in this group of images almost always extend to those of East Berliners on the streets. They are visible in photographs of newlyweds Ulla and Horst, who, unable to afford a wedding photographer, asked Schulze Eldowy to photograph them after the fact standing in what appears to be an alleyway in their wedding clothes or of ominous-looking sisters whose central difference, not masked by their identical outfits, hairstyles and gloomy expressions, is the stick held by the girl standing on the left [Figs. 3.5-3.6]. The long line of idiosyncrasies encapsulated in Schulze Eldowy’s series as well as the similarities between the latter photograph and the one of twin sisters Cathleen and Colleen Wade taken thirteen years earlier by Diane Arbus, whose photographs of individuals on the fringes of society influenced Schulze Eldowy’s practice, leaves one to question whether Susan Sontag’s assertion that the American photographer “chooses oddity, chases it, frames it, develops it, titles it” could also be said of the East German photographer at the beginning of her career [Fig. 3.7].

Schulze Eldowy’s early proclivity toward the unusual quickly developed into her penchant for the unrepresented.288 An exhausted worker covered in soot, a legally blind woman delivering the post, and an obese woman, Olympia’s physical antithesis, lying naked on a couch with her legs splayed, each make an appearance in Berlin in einer Hundenacht. These individuals were not, however, photographed nor were their images exhibited, as I discuss later in this chapter, until after she enrolled at the Hochschule für Grafik und Buchkunst (Academy of Visual Arts, Leipzig or HGB). Founded as the Zeichnungs-, Mahlerey- und Architectur-Academie (Academy of Drawing, Painting and Architecture) in 1764 and remodeled as a Kunstgewerbeschule or “school of applied arts” over a century later, the HGB built its reputation on the developments taking place in Leipzig’s printing and publishing industries at the end of the 19th century.289 While its focus during this period had been on book design, the Academy added photography to its curriculum in 1893, when it established the Fachschule für Photographie und photomechanisches Vervielfältigungswesen (Technical College of Photography and Photo Mechanic Reproduction), teaching students “not only reproduction techniques, but also


offering courses to expand their education [in photography] (chemistry, optical lenses, and photography’s application in technology and science, art history, etc.)." \(^{290}\) After Walter Tiemann, a typeface designer, typographer, illustrator and author, was appointed professor and director of the Academy in 1920, the Fachschule für Photographie und photomechanisches Vervielfältigungswesen also began to offer classes in art photography taught by Frank Eugene Smith, who had held a permanent position at the school since 1913, and visiting professors László Moholy-Nagy and Hugo Erfurth (the latter artists were invited by Tiemann to respectively teach classes on photomontage in 1928 and representational photography in 1929).\(^{291}\) Forced to change its curriculum after the rise of the National Socialists in 1933 and then to close in 1938, the Academy reopened under socialist leadership and began teaching art photography again in 1946.\(^{292}\) It is here, the only academic institution to offer an artistic degree in photography in the GDR, where Schulze Eldowy received formal training in photography between 1979 and 1984.

While attending the HGB, Schulze Eldowy took classes with Horst Thorau, Arno Fischer, and Evelyn Richter, and was exposed to the work of other photographers through its library’s impressive collection and the exhibitions held in its gallery.\(^{293}\) The library not only acquired art books from Thames and Hudson, which had a booth at the annual Leipzig book fair, but it also collected foreign journals *Camera* (Swiss), *Art* (West German), *Profifoto* (West German), *Fotomagazin* (West German) and monographs on


\(^{291}\) Ibid., 50.

\(^{292}\) Ibid.

\(^{293}\) Photography students at the HGB were also made aware of the work of countless other photographers through books obtained from contacts in the West and the Deutsche Bücherei, a copyright library in Leipzig that obtained all German publications. For more, see Jana Du da, “From the Family of Man to Waffenruhe: International Influences on Photography in the GDR,” in *Geschlossene Gesellschaft*, op. cit., 316-317.
Richard Avedon, Irving Penn, Diane Arbus, Helmut Newton, Annie Leibovitz, Larry Clark, Stephen Shore, Josef Koudelka and Paul Strand, among others. The gallery, on the other hand, which was founded with the support of the Minister of Culture Dr. Hans-Joachim Hoffmann in 1979, organized exhibitions on August Sander, El Lissitzky, Hans Hartung, Karl-Heinz Mai, Man Ray, and Henri Cartier-Bresson. In addition to seeing the work of these prominent photographers through publications and exhibits, Schulze Eldowy also had the opportunity to show her photographs to some of these artists at the HGB and at Fischer’s apartment on the Schiffbauerdamm, where Fischer and his wife, fashion photographer Sibylle Bergemann, held informal artist gatherings that included their circle of friends and foreign colleagues, Robert Frank, Henri Cartier-Bresson, Helmut Newton, Karol Kállay, René Burri and Josef Koudelka, who had been invited to East Berlin by Dominique Paillarse, the director of East Berlin’s Centre Culturel Français (CCF). As a result, East German and international photographers alike constructively critiqued her work and Schulze Eldowy’s knowledge of modern and contemporary photography grew considerably over this five-year period. What remained unchanged


during her years at the HGB, however, was her interest in photographing those who failed to have a presence in East German visual culture.

**Tamerlan (1979-1987)**

In the spring of 1979, on one of her usual outings in Prenzlauer Berg, Schulze Eldowy came across Elsbeth Kördel sitting alone in Kollwitzplatz. Compelled by what she describes as “her femininity, her beauty, her honesty,” she began to photograph her from a distance using a telephoto lens. On that particular afternoon the square was empty and her actions did not go unnoticed. Within minutes Kördel signaled for the photographer to join her, a gesture that marked the start of a relationship that would last until the elderly woman’s death in 1993. As Schulze Eldowy approached, she took several close-ups of Kördel in advance of introducing herself and putting her camera aside. Before she could do the latter, Kördel began to tell the photographer her life story. According to the account outlined in Schulze Eldowy’s book *Berlin in einer Hundenacht*, Kördel informed her that she was born into a family of wealthy Prussian landowners on 26 March 1913 and that her mother died during childbirth. She was raised by a nanny and had a traumatic upbringing: she saw the murder of her grandfather during the First World War; experienced the loss of her family’s estates once Poland’s boundaries were recognized by the Conference of Ambassadors on 15 March 1923; and was sent to Berlin to become a Catholic nun in the late 1920s. Dissatisfied by the “dour and strict atmosphere in the convent,” she changed vocations and found a position at the post office. She married her husband, a former photographer whom she sometimes

---

297 The following account of Kördel’s life can be found in Schulze Eldowy, “Tamerlan,” in *Berlin in einer Hundenacht*, op. cit., 195-197.
assisted in the darkroom, in 1939, the same year that he was called to service. During the war she lost track of her entire family, never hearing from them again, and had two abortions. In 1948, she had her first and only child with her husband, who returned from the war believing that “he was Jesus” and died eight years later. Once her son was grown, he began to mistreat her, living off her income and pension and physically abusing her. In addition to learning all of this information about the elderly woman within the span of one afternoon, Schulze Eldowy realized that Kördel, lonely and distraught, needed someone to confide in. Taking down her address, the photographer arrived at Kördel’s apartment three days later with her camera in hand -- the mechanical device that contributed to their introduction -- and photographed her once again.

Following a general interest in private life and the domestic sphere in both Germanys from the late 1960s onwards, Schulze Eldowy would carry on the practice of documenting Kördel in her various living quarters until 1987, resulting in the series Tamerlan. Comprised of twenty-seven black and white photographs, the cycle, which bears the same name as the fourteenth-century dictator Timur the Lame as well as the nickname given to Kördel by her late husband, commences with a grainy three-quarter profile of Kördel taken several decades earlier by an unknown photographer [Fig. 3.8].

Given to Schulze Eldowy during one of her visits, the photograph draws attention to the

298 Schulze Eldowy was not alone when she shifted her practice, in part, from the streets to the interiors of Berlin. German photographers on both side of the political divide, including Christian Borchert, Herlinde Koelbl, Margit Emmrich, Ute Mahler and Bernd Lasdin, entered the homes of Germans to photograph private subject matter. For more, see Betts, “Picturing Privacy,” in Private Life in the German Democratic Republic, op. cit., 208-226; and Kuehn, Caught, op. cit., 108-112.

299 According to the photographer, the title of her series takes after the nickname given to Kördel by her late husband, one that derived from a popular song in the 1920s and not the Asian dictator. Nevertheless, its seems appropriate given the slow decline of Kördel’s body that Schulze Eldowy chose the name of an injured ruler for her series. For more, see Schulze Eldowy, “Tamerlan,” op. cit., 195.
striking features of Kördel’s youthful face and neck through its interplay of light and shadows. At the same time as it blends her hair and shoulders into its darkened background, it underscores her arched brows, strong cheekbones, defined jaw line, painted lips, articulated collarbones and neck muscles. Poised as she looks beyond the photographic frame, the woman preserved here is set apart both temporally and ontologically from the one presented in the series’ following images. Untouched by the hands of time and the unforeseen hardships of the future, she marks the existence of a woman who once was. To borrow from French film theorist and critic Christian Metz, this woman, “the person who has been photographed—not the total person, who is an effect of time—is dead: ‘dead for having been seen.’”

Leaving this self-assured woman in the past, the series continues with Tamerlan, Berlin, 1979, a close-up of Kördel sitting in Kollwitzplatz [Fig. 3.9]. The photograph shows the elderly woman, who fills most of the frame, leaning forward with her arms resting on her thighs and a cigarette between the fingers of her right hand. Dressed in a heavy coat with her legs exposed, a contrast that is mirrored by the smoothness of her legs against the roughness of her hand, Kördel appears haggard and old. Her face, which is framed by her disheveled hair, is a testimony to the passage of time: wrinkles line her forehead as well as surround her eyes and mouth, and her once elastic skin has now begun to sag. Distinct from the series’ opening image in which she looks away from the photographer, Kördel stares directly at Schulze Eldowy, undaunted by the presence of her camera, and with her mouth open in mid-sentence invites -- one could even argue, given her angry expression, challenges -- her to document her story.

From here Schulze Eldowý moves her practice from the streets to Berlin’s interiors, where she exposes Kördel’s financial, physical and emotional poverty. The former is first seen in the photograph *Tamerlan in her flat, Berlin, 1980* [Fig. 3.10].

Taken from a slightly elevated perspective, the image documents a space that functions as both a bedroom and a living room. Guiding the viewer’s eye along the diagonal from right to left, it draws attention to a bed comprised of two different mattresses: a small one covered in stains that rests on what appears to be either a blanket or a pillow protruding toward the foreground and a larger one narrowly contained within the bed’s wooden frame. The sheets and duvet intended to cover the mattresses are seen crumpled in a ball at the foot of the bed. Complemented by damaged walls and peeling wallpaper, the unkempt and soiled state of Kördel’s bed extends beyond its borders, seemingly contaminating the rest of the room. Both along and below the side of the bed are scattered shoes, slippers, paper, a scarf, and an ashtray along with several misplaced cigarette butts carelessly tossed on the carpet. On its far end are two chairs separated by an end table covered in dishes, and sitting on the one closest to the photographer is Kördel. Owing to her dark attire and to Schulze Eldowý’s reliance on natural light, the elderly woman blends into the objects housed in her neglected apartment. Moreover, her hunched body mirrors the items placed over the back of her chair and subtly intimates that she, too, along with her home and possessions, is in a state of decline.

In many ways foreshadowing events to come, *Tamerlan in her flat, Berlin 1980* is followed by photographs that trace Kördel’s physical and emotional descent as she oscillates between different state institutions. Diagnosed in 1981 with arteriosclerosis, a peripheral artery disease that limits the amount of oxygen and nutrients delivered to the
cells, Kördel lost the ability to walk and was hospitalized later that same year. It is here where the series continues with *Arteriosclerosis, Berlin, 1981* [Fig. 3.11]. Taken as Schulze Eldowy stood above the foot of Kördel’s hospital bed, it shows the elderly woman sitting partially upright with a blanket covering her midsection. While her face appears calm and her attention is drawn to something or someone inaccessible to the viewer, she gathers the bedding into the balls of her fists, communicating a sense of discomfort, the cause of which becomes readily apparent when the viewer observes her lower extremities. Her exposed feet, which extend from beneath the blanket, are filled with liquid. Swollen to the point of being unrecognizable, they consume her ankles and digits, those crude unaligned shapes seen along the surface of her skin, and confine her to her hospital bed where she would remain for several months convalescing.

After recovering from her first bout of arteriosclerosis and learning how to walk again, Kördel moved into a nursing home and stayed there until 1985. During this period Schulze Eldowy photographed her alone and in the company of other residents, individuals who, like Kördel, were rarely documented by East German photographers. She also photographed the intimate handwritten letters she received from Kördel. Coinciding with the growing interest in private life in the GDR, as abovementioned, which historian Paul Betts proposes was the “logical result of the regime’s own policies of building GDR society around the nuclear family,” this act provides a different lens -- a textual one -- in which to view the elderly woman.301 Moreover, it lends a first person voice to the series. The photographed letters read as follows:

Berlin, 22.7.81
My dear! Do you know that I have landed in a home? At my own request. This will probably be the end. Whether I am happy is another matter. I

301 Betts, “Picturing Privacy,” in *Private Life in the German Democratic Republic*, op. cit., 208.
was not pleased with my first impression, but I must bear my fate. Lunch, oh, do not even ask! I have a wish. If you, my little one, have not forgotten me could please come, please. As always, with warm regards, Tamerlan.

Today is 12.2.82.
Yes, I imagined that my living situation would be different. I wake up, or rather we are woken up, around 5:00 AM to wash and to get dressed. Then it is 6:30 AM. I lie back down again until 7:30 AM. Around 8:00 AM we are called for coffee. There we get two slices of bread with butter and marmalade. The most important thing is my pot of coffee. I sit there together with two others for two hours. We exchange words or one of us tells about the misdeeds he committed as a young brat. By that time it is noon. I have no good friends. The food here is loveless, fatless, mostly without taste. The outcome is that it is returned to the kitchen. Nobody cares here. [...] Afterwards we rest until 1:30 PM. At 2:00 PM we get coffee and cake. At 5:30 PM we have supper: two pieces of bread, some butter, sausages and occasionally a bowl of herring salad that is sometimes good and other times it must be returned. Afterwards we sit in the hall, the only saving grace is to look at other people on the television. This takes us to 9:30 PM. Only four or five people sit there. That is the end of the day. Then comes blissful sleep. My wish is that it would last forever. Everyday is the same.

[Undated]
My little girl! It has been a long time since I have heard from you. Are you sick? Or have you forgotten me?? Come see me soon! I am so alone and lonely. I am learning to walk; I find it very difficult. I am always lying in bed. Everything is moderately beautiful. If only I could walk again and go home—my first stop would be to the local restaurant to eat a nice fat piece of duck. I have been craving duck for a long time. I can wait a little longer. Best wishes, Tamerlan. See you soon, I hope.

Unlike the series’ former images, these photographs communicate her state of mind, something that escapes the camera. Operating as a marker for the photographer’s absence at the nursing home, the letters, like her sentences, are short and informative. Their content oscillates between factual information and her feelings of unhappiness, insecurity, loneliness, and boredom. From them the viewer learns that Kördel longs for Schulze Eldowy’s company and is concerned that the photographer has forgotten her;

303 Ibid., 208-210.
finds pleasure neither in her living situation nor in the food she consumes; and desires to
escape her monotonous life, evident not only through her choice of words, but through
her repetitive writing style. At the same time as her words uncover her distressing
psychological condition they also reveal her transition from accepting her providence to
wanting to fall into an everlasting slumber. That is, her photographed letters convey her
desire to die, and present the viewer with an alternative to the optimism that tended to
underlie photographs in the media and state-sponsored exhibitions.  

Despite being in many ways as revealing as their written counterparts, the
vulnerability expressed in the images of Kördel’s letters does not surface to the same
degree in Tamerlan’s proceeding photographs. Taken one year apart between 1985 and
1987, the final images of the series document Kördel after she had been readmitted to the
hospital. Similar to the series’ opening image, the first of these three photographs,
*Tamerlan, Berlin, 1985*, presents Kördel once more as a strong, confident woman [Fig.
3.12]. Positioned between the photographer and an indistinct background, she stands
naked with her arms by her sides and stares unreservedly at the camera. Her appearance
is no longer in disarray: her hair is neatly combed to one side and her eyes and eyebrows
are accentuated with dark makeup. Bearing a resemblance to the graceful woman who
once was, she encourages the viewer through her open stance and affable look to return
her gaze. Moreover, with the help of the photographer, she puts herself on display and
invites the viewer to observe her unclothed body.

The confidence expressed by Kördel in *Tamerlan, Berlin, 1985* is not seen,
however, in the series’ closing photographs. Standing to the left of her subject in both,

304 For more, see Stefan Wolle, “The Smiling Face of Dictatorship: On the Political Iconography
of the GDR,” in *German Photography 1870-1970*, eds. Klaus Honnef, Rolf Sachsse and Karin
Thomas (Cologne: Dumont, 1997), 127-138.
Schulze Eldowy photographs Kördel amidst the accoutrements of a sterile hospital room and rather than focusing on her upper body, she includes her entire body or, at the very least, what remains of it in the frame. Distinct from her appearance in *Arteriosclerosis, Berlin, 1981*, in which she is wearing a nightgown, Kördel is now seen lying completely naked on her hospital bed with one exception: a bandage that wraps around and binds the wound left by the amputation of her right leg in *Tamerlan, Berlin, 1986* [Fig. 3.13].

Looking directly at Schulze Eldowy’s camera, a device with which she has now established a candid rapport, she beckons the viewer to witness her body, to comprehend its deterioration; an act that she assists by placing one arm behind her head as she lays on her back. In the series’ final image, *Tamerlan, Berlin, 1987*, Kördel is seen sitting upright in the center of the bed. She now has a bandage wrapped around what remains of her right leg and sits with her arms extended out in front of her, both steadying herself and granting the spectator a better view of her emaciated and dismembered form. Compelled to return her gaze in each of these images, the viewer encounters a body that, despite making visible the inevitable aging process that we all experience, is quite foreign. That is, the viewer gazes upon a naked figure, both elderly and disabled, that had little to no photographic exposure hitherto in the GDR and, for that matter, the West. Although it was acceptable for East German photographers to document the disadvantaged in the context of eliminating social injustice from the late 1950s onwards, they did not circulate images of aged and damaged bodies until the 1980s, when the likes of Schulze Eldowy and her colleagues Karin Wieckhorst and Renate Zeun, who photographed people suffering from disabilities and cancer, as I will discuss below, were permitted to openly exhibit their work.305 The same could be said of photography in the West, where sickly

305 Karin Wieckhorst photographed the debilitated in her series *Regina Reichert* (1981-1985) and
bodies did not have a presence in visual culture until the likes of British photographer Jo Spence and American photographer Robert Mapplethorpe began to produce and circulate images that traced the changes their bodies underwent due their respective illnesses. The former photographer documented her experiences of breast cancer between 1982 and 1986, while the latter artist took a self-portrait in 1988, two years after being diagnosed with AIDS, that not only pictured his frailty, but also foreshadowed his imminent death [Figs. 3.15-3.16].

By photographing Kördel over the course of eight years, Schulze Eldowy unveiled not only a woman who was financially, emotionally, and physically impoverished, but also a kind of body that had been largely omitted from East German visual culture. Starting in the early 1950s semi-clad women appeared in advertisements and were quickly followed by nudes in Das Magazin. The typical nude in this illustrated monthly “was female, young, slim, and physically unblemished, lightly tanned, wore little makeup or jewelry, and was photographed out of doors” and “was associated with health and strength” rather than blatant sexuality like its Western counterpart at the time. In spite
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*Disabled* (1985), while Renate Zeun captured cancer patients, herself included, in *Afflicted* (1984), *Station Five* (1986), and *Mrs Anneliese St. – Clinic for Oncology* (1987). For more on these East German photographers, see Gabriele Muschter, *DDR Frauen fotografieren: Lexikon und Anthologie* (Berlin: Ex Pose Verlag, 1989), 166-167 and 170-173.


307 Josie McLellan, “‘Even Under Socialism, We Don’t Want to Do Without Love’: East German Erotica,” in *Pleasures in Socialism: Leisure and Luxury in the Eastern Bloc* (Evanston, Ill.: Northwestern University Press, 2010), 225. In addition to being related to sex and gender, nude photographs, as McLellan points out, highlighted concerns about race, health, nature, and work in
of its association with vitality and health, the nude became an object of desire for men and women alike and eventually found its place in Fotografie, Neues Leben (New Life), Junge Welt (Young World), Deine Gesundheit (Your Health), the Porträtfotoschau der DDR, the Berliner Internationale Fotoausstellung, and the Fotoschau der DDR by the mid-1970s. Like its predecessors in Das Magazin, nudes in these periodicals and exhibitions were, for the most part, healthy young women with voluptuous attributes placed in natural settings and as time progressed, in more provocative spaces such as the bedroom. While nude photography in the GDR began to diversify in other ways besides locales to include children as well as male and black bodies around the same time as Schulze Eldowy began her series Tamerlan, there was little room for photographs of marginalized and disabled bodies in the genre. The same could be said of East German photography in general. Nevertheless, owing to numerous factors, namely photography’s new status in the GDR; the ever-increasing opportunities for East German photographers to exhibit their work; and the lack of consensus among cultural authorities on how to photographically represent the GDR during the 1980s, when the imagery of socialist realist ideology was no longer viewed as convincing (and certainly not as progressive), as its absence from the discussions that took place at the SED’s Central
Committee Plenums and Party Congresses and from the pages of *Fotografie* attest.\textsuperscript{309} Schulze Eldowy was able to exhibit *Tamerlan* along with her other critical cycles.

**The Merging of Two Worlds of Photographic Representation: New Opportunities for East German Art Photographers**

In 1977, the same year that Schulze Eldowy began *Berlin in einer Hundenacht*, the medium of photography, which had only secured its place in the American art world in the late 1960s, largely owing to the work of pop and conceptual artists such as Robert Rauschenberg, Andy Warhol, and Joseph Kosuth in the late 1950s and 1960s, began to gain attention in both Germanys. For the first time photography had its own section in *documenta 6*, which took place between 24 June and 20 October 1977 in Kassel, and was the subject of *Medium Fotografie* (*Medium Photography*). The latter, a state-sponsored exhibition that opened on 4 December 1977 at the Galerie Roter Turm in Halle/Saale, marked a pivotal moment in the history of East German photography. It featured, as stated in the Introduction, the work of August Sander, Lyonel Feininger, John Heartfield, Albert Renger-Patzsch, Heinrich Zille, and Laszlo Moholy-Nagy next to that of Arno Fischer, Evelyn Richter, Christian Borchert, Ulrich Burchert, and Günter Rössler, among others, and suggested a lineage between the avant-garde of the 1920s and East German photographers.\textsuperscript{310} Moreover, the historical survey of twentieth-century photographers,

\textsuperscript{309} Prior to the late 1970s, the topic of socialist realism appeared in almost every issue of *Fotografie*. However, after the death of one of its main advocates, Bertold Beiler, in 1974, the artistic method lost most of its appeal for members of the ZKF and it was neither a prevailing theme in the publication nor was it mentioned in the calls for submissions for prominent photography exhibitions. On this see the ZKF’s monthly newsletters in *Fotografie* in the 1970s and 1980s.

\textsuperscript{310} For a list of photographers and works featured in this exhibition, see Andreas Hüneke et al., *Medium Fotografie* (Leipzig: Fotokinoverlag, 1979), 110.
which was described in its exhibition catalogue by art historian and vice-president of the Verband Bildender Künstler der DDR (Association of Visual Artists of the GDR or VBK-DDR) Hermann Raum as ending “the old argument about whether photography is a visual art form,” drew attention to East German artists for the first time. It also placated those who longed to emigrate to the West where they could freely exhibit and become part of a flourishing international artistic community.

Following Medium Fotografie, photographers saw the establishment of the Arbeitsgruppe Fotografie (Photography Working Group) within the VBK-DDR in June 1981, thanks to the efforts of Arno Fischer and Roger Melis, and the inclusion of photography in the 1982-83 IX. Kunstausstellung der Deutschen Demokratischen Republik (Ninth National Art Exhibition of the GDR). Established in 1950 and held approximately every four years in Dresden, the Kunstausstellung der Deutschen Demokratischen Republik initially showcased the work of painters, architects, sculptors, and graphic and ceramic artists. In 1982 the exhibition broadened its scope to include the work of the aforementioned East German photographers together with that of Helga Paris, Ute and Werner Mahler, Barbara Berthold, Roger Melis, Uwe Steinberg, and Ulrich Lindner, among others. In addition to this national exhibition, hundreds of Kulturbund kleinen Galerien or “small galleries,” underground, and private galleries, such as the Kreiskulturhaus Treptow, Gosenschänke, Sophienstraße 8, Galerie P, Galerie

313 For a list of photographers and works featured in this exhibition, see Erhard Frommhold et al., IX. Kunstausstellung der Deutschen Demokratischen Republik (Berlin: Verband Bildender Künstler der DDR; Ministerium für Kultur der DDR, 1982), 440-448.
Mitte, and Galerie Weißer Elefant, either opened or began to exhibit photography for the first time in the cities of East Berlin, Leipzig, Halle/Saale and Karl-Marx-Stadt (now Chemnitz).\textsuperscript{314} Alongside these new exhibition opportunities for East German photographers, international photographers were also increasingly acknowledged and permitted to show their work in the GDR.\textsuperscript{315} For instance, under the direction of Paillarse, the CCF not only organized exhibitions on prominent international photographers, but it also invited celebrated photographers to East Berlin to speak about their photographic practices in the 1980s.\textsuperscript{316} While visiting the capital, many of these photographers attended artists’ gatherings at Fischer and Bergemann’s apartment, as discussed above, and traveled to the Leipzig, where they conducted studio visits and offered criticism to the last generation of East German photographers at the HGB.


\textsuperscript{315} While international photographers had little presence on the pages of \textit{Fotografie} during the 1950s and 1960s, illustrated articles on photographers working outside the GDR, such as Leslie Krons, Duane Michals, Diane Arbus and Richard Avedon, were printed with increasing frequency from the late 1970s onwards. See, for instance, Lou Stettner, “Panorama,” \textit{Fotografie}, no. 3 (March 1978), 2-3; and Willfried Baatz, “Goldene Letter für Avedon,” \textit{Fotografie}, no. 2 (February 1988), 42-50. The latter article was printed ahead of an awards ceremony held at the Leipzig Book Fair in March 1988, where Richard Avedon and the publishing house Harry N. Abrams were awarded a Golden Letter for the photobook \textit{In the American West}.

Coinciding with photography’s new status and the growing number of exhibition spaces made available to photographers in East Germany, the Ministry for Culture, acting on behalf of the Central Committee of the SED, requested that the ZKF promote photographic activity in the GDR by offering amateur and professional photographers stipends ranging from 1,500 to 6,000 DM; those who had been awarded a degree in photography from the HGB were generally given upwards of 4,000 DM.\textsuperscript{317} Provided by the Culture Fund of the GDR and totaling 100,000 DM per year between 1982 and 1985 and thereafter 80,000 DM per year, state grants allotted by the ZKF, which renamed itself the Gesellschaft für Fotografie (Society for Photography or GfF) in 1982, benefited numerous East German photographers.\textsuperscript{318} Christian Borchert, for example, received financial support in 1983 and 1984 to advance his series \textit{Family Portraits} (1978-1994) and photographed over fifty East German families, for the most part, in the comfort of their homes during this two-year period.\textsuperscript{319} Often allocated to amateur photographers and/or used to sponsor photographic projects that aligned with the needs of the East German state, as Borchert’s documentary project on nuclear families certainly did, this governmental funding highlights a shift in how photography was officially perceived during the last decade of the GDR.\textsuperscript{320}

\textsuperscript{318} Funds were allocated by a working committee that consisted of Gerhard Mertink, Federal Secretary of the GfF, Peter Pachnicke, Head of the Department of Photography at the HGB, and Roger Melis, photographer and Head of the VBK’s Arbeitsgruppe Fotografie. On this working committee, see Schube, “Im Auftrag des Staates,” \textit{Fotogeschichte}, op. cit., 26.  
\textsuperscript{320} For more on the kinds of projects that were funded by the GfF, see Schube, “Im Auftrag des Staates,” \textit{Fotogeschichte}, op. cit., 26-27; Borchert’s series was met with enthusiasm in the GDR: it was featured in \textit{Fotografie} and included in \textit{Konzept-Auftrag-Fotografie}, an exhibition that took place at the Fernsehturm at Alexanderplatz between 12 December 1988 and 15 January 1989.
The importance bestowed upon the medium of photography after it found its place alongside the traditional visual arts of painting and sculpture in the GDR, which occurred shortly after cultural authorities began to realize that the image world of socialist realist ideology was futile, is not only evident in the state’s endorsement of photographers, but also in its concern for collecting photography. In 1983 the VBK requested that Ulrich Domröse, the current curator of photography at the Berlinische Galerie, research photographers and build a ‘collection on the photographic history of the GDR’. This endeavor, which was also funded by the Culture Fund of the GDR, resulted in the acquisition of nine hundred photographs by Fischer, Richter, Steinberg, Bergemann, Schulze Eldowy, Ursula Arnold, Thomas Florschuetz, Klaus Elle, and Michael Scheffer, among others, between 1987 and 1989. While this body of work was transferred from the Kulturbund to the Berlinische Galerie in 1990, the latter was not the first German institution to house an impressive collection of East German photography. Under the direction of curators of photography Ulrich Wallenburg and T.O. Immisch, the Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Cottbus and the Stiftung Moritzburg in Halle/Saale respectively began to acquire photographs from 1979 and 1987 onwards.

Had Schulze Eldowy belonged to an earlier generation of East German photographers she would have had very little opportunity to exhibit her work in the GDR. Her negatives would have been, as Domröse describes the countless photographs by East German artists neither able to exhibit nor to publish their work, “proverbial pictures for

322 Ibid. 7; Thomas Köhler, “Preface,” in *Geschlossene Gesellschaft*, op. cit., 342.
the bottom drawer.” However, owing to the change in photography’s status and to the varied and increasing support offered to photographers following the Medium Fotografie exhibition, when socialist realism, as it was understood in the 1950s and 1960s, was no longer seen by authorities and members of the ZKF as an effective artistic method, her work had a high degree of visibility. Five photographs from her series Berlin in einer Hundenacht were selected by the jury for the IX. Kunstausstellung der Deutschen Demokratischen Republik and shown in the 1982 exhibition. In 1983, the same year that the national art exhibition in Dresden closed, she was given solo exhibitions at Galerie Sophienstraße 8 and the Akademie der Künste in East Berlin, where photographs of Kördel were presented alongside portraits of her neighbors in the Scheunenviertel. She subsequently showed Aktporträts, a controversial cycle that documented obese, tattooed, transgender, pregnant, and prepubescent bodies, at the Kreiskulturhaus Treptow (KKH) in 1985. She exhibited Tamerlan in the entrance hall of the Eduard-von-Winterstein Theater in Annaberg-Buchholz in 1986 and followed this show with three solo exhibitions: the first was held in 1987 at the Galerie Junge Kunst in Gera and featured her series Strassenbild, Arbeit, and Aktporträts; the second took place at the Hans Georg Otto clubhouse in Görlitz in 1987 and included Tamerlan, Berlin in einer Hundenacht, and Aktporträts; and the third, which attracted thousands of visitors from all over the GDR, presented the majority of her work to date in East Berlin’s Galerie Weißer

325 This jury was comprised of East German painters, graphic artists, art scholars, and one photographer, Arno Fischer. For a full list of jury members, see Erhard Frommhold et al., IX. Kunstausstellung der Deutschen Demokratischen Republik, op. cit., 9.
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Finally, nine of her photographs from her series *Aktporträts* were included in the *X. Kunstausstellung der Deutschen Demokratischen Republik*, which took place in Dresden in 1987 and 1988.\(^{329}\)

In addition to gaining exposure through group and solo exhibitions in the GDR, many of which were sponsored by the Kulturbund, her work was both featured and discussed in *Fotografie*, a publication formerly reserved for socialist realist photography. While independent curator John P. Jacob claims that “[East German] artists who produced images too distant from the socialist definition of photography were prohibited from its pages, and thus forced to find refuge for their work in underground galleries and foreign journals,” this was not the case for Schulze Eldowy.\(^{330}\) Rather than excluding the photographer from the magazine, which described itself on its opening page as “the voice of the Kulturbund and the ZKF/GfF,” the GfF promoted her photographic endeavors on numerous occasions. For instance, after organizing one of her last solo exhibitions in the GDR, it printed the following announcement:

The Berlin-based photographer Gundula Schulze presented her slide-sound-show “Tamerlan”-“Scheunenviertel”-“Aktfotografie.”
After the show, a lively exchange of ideas took place, questions were asked and participants discussed the pros and cons of her series.

---

\(^{328}\) Ibid.

\(^{329}\) See Peter Pachnicke et al., *X. Kunstausstellung der Deutschen Demokratischen Republik* (Berlin: Verband Bildender Künstler der DDR; Ministerium für Kultur der DDR, 1982), 536; Schulze Eldowy also participated in solo and group exhibitions in France, Switzerland, and the United States in the 1980s. For more, see Friedegund Weidemann and Gundula Schulze, *Gundula Schulze*, op. cit., 20; and Irina Liebmann et al., *Gundula Schulze el Dowy: das weiche Fleisch kennt die Zeit noch nicht* (Berlin: Galerie Pankow, 1993), 60.

Gundula Schulze confronted this discussion candidly and left no questions unanswered. All in all a very successful event!  

Appearing in the February 1988 edition of *Fotografie*, the review alerted readers to three of her series, including *Tamerlan*, and to the unconventional mode in which she presented her work. Like American photographer Nan Goldin, who began to show *The Ballad of Sexual Dependency* as a choreographed slideshow accompanied by music in various Manhattan bars and clubs in the late 1970s, Schulze Eldowy used music to set the tone of her exhibition and projected her images onto the walls of the clubhouse. The notice also boasted of the show’s overall success: not only were viewers described as being receptive to her work, prompting them to engage in a spirited discussion with the photographer, but Schulze Eldowy was also portrayed as effectively fielding all their questions. The latter was reinforced by a photograph placed beneath the announcement depicting Schulze Eldowy leaning forward while talking to a man who, sitting across from her and mimicking her pose, is seen intensely listening to the photographer [Fig. 3.17].

Despite promotions of this nature in *Fotografie* and the numerous exhibition opportunities afforded to Schulze Eldowy, both of which underscore the support she received from official channels and the merging of the two worlds of photographic representation in the GDR, the Ministerium für Staatssicherheit (Ministry for State Security or Stasi) attempted to impede her photographic practice. According to the photographer’s Stasi files, which have been carefully examined by curator Matthew Shaul, agents were tasked with disseminating the opinion that her work, considered both  

---

“theatrical and narcissistic,” was only concerned with “negative, superficial impressions of socialist society” and “presented the contradictions of socialism without providing any proper socioeconomic context.” Resulting in a small number of hecklers criticizing her work during gallery talks, the Stasi’s effort to tarnish the photographer’s public image was supplemented by its plan to question her and to thoroughly search her apartment. Both alarmed that Schulze Eldowy’s photographs challenged the idealized view that the East German state tried to maintain of itself in the 1980s and allegedly convinced that she was working alongside the CIA, the Stasi intended to inquire about her intimate and platonic relationships, the guests she entertained, and the empty flats in her building. Furthermore, it aimed to incarcerate the photographer. An operational report dated 9 January 1989 stated that the investigation of Schulze Eldowy was to result in “severe sanctions such as arrest and imprisonment as a result of ‘the negative attitudes towards the political circumstances in East Germany which she brings to expression in her work.’” However, due to the political climate in the GDR and the events leading up to the fall of the Berlin Wall on 9 November 1989, the Stasi was deterred from carrying out its plans and Schulze Eldowy avoided internment.

The Stasi’s objective to imprison Schulze Eldowy at the same time as the state’s cultural apparatuses supported her photographic practice points not only to the inconsistencies in the actions of security agents and cultural officials, but also the latter’s inability to determine how to photographically represent the GDR in the 1980s. On the
one hand, the ZKF/GfF expected photographers to reiterate the happiness and success of those living under socialism by photographing the abovementioned themes of socialist realism, as the final bifota and Porträtfotoschau der DDR exhibitions attest [Figs. 3.18-3.20]. On the other, the organization encouraged photographers to explore new subject matter. While the latter is best exemplified by the support received by Schulze Eldowy, it is also made evident by the photographs printed in Fotografie in the late 1980s and shown in the X. Kunstausstellung der Deutschen Demokratischen Republik. For instance, in the same issue that included the review of Schulze Eldowy’s show in Görlitz, Fotografie published six photographs from Maria Sewcz’s thesis project inter esse (to be between) (1985-1987) [Figs. 3.21-3.26]. Including over thirty black and white photographs taken in her final years at the HGB, where she completed her degree under the supervision of Arno Fischer between 1982 and 1987, this series marked a shift from documenting “reality” to using photography as a medium of subjective expression in the GDR. Rather than capturing instantly recognizable views of city life, inter esse presents details of street signs, sculptures, famous monuments, and unknown interiors. It also documents individuals who are frequently blurred by the proximity or movement of the camera, turned away from the photographer, cropped by the photographic frame, and

336 For more on these exhibitions, see the Gesellschaft für Fotografie, 8. Berliner Internationale Fotoschau (Berlin: Kulturbund der DDR, 1985); Gesellschaft für Fotografie, 9. Berliner Internationale Fotoschau (Berlin: Kulturbund der DDR, 1989); and Gesellschaft für Fotografie, 3. Porträtfotoschau der DDR (Berlin: Kulturbund der DDR, 1986).

337 Derived from Latin, the verb inter esse (“between” and “to be”) means to be between. Inka Schube translates the title of Sewcz’s series as follows: “To be present, in between, moving between things, places, times. Sensing friction, tension. Using the senses as seismographic instruments. Not looking for image, beauty or consistency but for points of disruption and gaps.” See Inka Schube, Maria Sewcz: inter esse, Berlin 1985-87 (Göttingen: Steidl, 2010), unpaginated; In addition to gaining exposure through Fotografie, Sewcz’s series was included in Fotografinnen at the Fotogalerie Berlin in 1985; Junge Fotografen der 80er Jahre at the Dresden Galerie Mitt, the Galerie Oben (Karl-Marx-Stadt), and the Kulturhistorisches Museum (Stralsund) in 1985 and 1986; and Junge Berliner Fotografen at the Haus der jungen Talente in Berlin in 1987.
obstructed by objects and animals. One of the photographs published in Fotografie, for example, pictures a man standing in the center of the foreground holding a German Sheppard that has just leapt into his arms, visible by the metal chain trailing in the air behind the dog, and perched itself on his left shoulder [Fig. 3.24]. Taken at night with the use of a flash, the photograph shows the folds and details of the man’s trench coat and the wrinkles and subtle gradations of the dog’s fur. Beyond these particulars, however, little else is familiar in the photograph. With the exception of two triangular shapes in the image’s upper left-hand corner that appear to reflect the camera’s flash, the background is effaced by darkness and the identities of the dog and its owner are unknown: the dog’s face is cropped at its snout and the man’s profile is obscured by the animal and his own long hair that falls loosely around his neck and face. In addition to leaving the viewer to question the location of the photograph and the identities of its subjects, Sewcz essentially blinds both the man and dog, suggesting that like the spectator, they, too, are unable to see.

Another photograph from Sewcz’s series inter esse printed in Fotografie presents a bird’s-eye view of Alexanderplatz. Taken from the observation deck of the Berliner Fernsehturm, a symbol of modernity and progress that was built between 1965 and 1969, and evocative of László Moholy-Nagy’s series of nine photographs taken from the Berlin Radio Tower in the late 1920s, it captures the shadow cast by the 365-metre-high structure over the buildings and crowds gathered below [Figs. 3.26-3.27].338 As in the previously described image, Sewcz’s photograph highlights the obstruction of vision: the silhouette of the tower overlays those gathered outside of the Galerie Kaufhof, making it

338 Between the 1927 and 1928, Moholy-Nagy took a series of nine photographs from the top of the Berlin Radio Tower, capturing modern society from an entirely new perspective. For more, see Moholy-Nagy: Photographs and Photograms (New York: Pantheon Books, 1980).
difficult to discern their activities, while its own iconic form, still recognizable, is
impeded by the photographic frame. That is, the photographic frame crops both the base
and the antenna of the Berliner Fernsehturm. This photograph, as with all images in *inter
esse*, communicates Sewcz’s experiences in and of East Berlin as she experiments with
the formal possibilities and ambiguities of her chosen artistic medium. Sewcz makes this
explicit in the text used to introduce her work to the readers of *Fotografie*:

In the final year of my studies I have dedicated myself to the city of Berlin. My aim was not to create a representative image, but to capture my own perspective, my own experience and my own quest. This body of work shows how I move around in the city, how I feel over here and what I see, sense, and how I react. It is a constant questioning and asking of questions. The taking of pictures allows for insights, which the mere looking at reality (without the camera) would not have rendered possible. I have given this body of work, which is comprised as a folder of images, the title *inter esse* – in the sense of being with, being in between – of the in between spaces, the in between times, the in between good and evil. I compose the images in a way similar to poetry. I do not show situations, nor certain content, but offer the spectator possibilities of association. He/she is not confined to a certain interpretation: he/she can accept or decline the offer and may develop new emotions and thoughts. Therefore I have tried to liberate myself from a kind of representation that merely captures reality or tells stories. Out of glimpses, which at first appear as arbitrary, out of things that are banal, boring, and in themselves not worth being contemplated, I have tried, through the act of removal of the superimposing surroundings, through austere composition, to conjure pictorial parameters, which disclose seemingly secondary, unconscious layers from the background of our minds. I present this diploma work in the form of a folder. In this way, the pictures can be viewed singularly, so that the previous one may impact the one that follows or may simply be forgotten.

Rather than presenting “reality” or a view that one could label familiar and objective,

Sewcz’s partial and, at times, distorted views of the people, places and things she

339 Maria Sewcz, “*inter esse*,” *Fotografie*, no. 2 (February 1988), 68; Sewcz describes this series quite differently after the *Wende*. During an interview with Matthew Shaul on 3 April 2006, Maria Sewcz said the following of her series *inter esse*: “I wanted to capture the aggression in Berlin at this time, at being constrained, at having only a limited range of available themes and motifs and the fact that we [East Berliners] only knew half of the city.” Maria Sewcz quoted in Shaul, *Do Not Refreeze*, op. cit., 91.
encountered in the capital of East Germany between 1985 and 1987 signify her subjective vision of East Berlin, a city separated from its other half by the presence of the Berlin Wall. Comparable in some respects to Ein Tag in Ostberlin, 28/10/86 (One Day in East Berlin, 28/10/86), a series by East German conceptual artist Kurt Buchwald that documents the same man, who, standing in the center of sixty-three photographs of East Berlin, obstructs the view of the city, inter esse communicates Sewcz’s inability to see her city in its entirety [Fig. 3.28]. Moreover, the series articulates Sewcz’s position as an East Berliner, a gesture that was once prohibited and viewed as both “individualistic” and “bourgeois” by leading members of the ZKF/GfF, and highlights the diverse photographic practices that began to flourish in the GDR at the time. Numerous East German photographers, notably Thomas Florschuetz, Florian Merkel, and Helga Paris, began to focus on themselves, their bodies, and their perceptions in the 1980s. East German photographers also began to claim the medium of photography as their subject. Tina Bara, for example, also supervised by Fischer at the HGB, repeatedly created and referenced a mise-en-abyme through the incorporation of negative filmstrips, empty picture frames, mirrors, and photographic paraphernalia in her thesis series Untitled (1984-1986) [Figs. 3.29-3.30]. Through this series, which incorporated elements of both

340 On Buchwald’s photographic practice, see Gunhild Brandler and Kurt Buchwald, Kurt Buchwald: Fotografie in Aktion (Berlin: ex pose Verlag, 1992), 82.
341 Throughout the 1950s and 1960s, Friedrich Herneck and Berthold Beiler, leading members of the ZKF, dismissed subjective photography and its practitioners in the West, in particular Otto Steinert. For more, see Friedrich Herneck, “Zur Frage des Sozialistischen Realismus in der Fotografie,” in Fotografie und Gesellschaft: Beiträge zur Entwicklung einer sozialistisch-realistischen deutschen Lichtbildkunst (Halle: VEB Fotokinoverlag Halle, 1961), 33-36; Berthold Beiler. Probleme über Fotografie: Parteilichkeit im Foto (Halle: VEB Fotokinoverlag, 1959), 34; and idem, “Die westliche Fotografie in der Sackgasse der spätbürgerlichen Philosophie,” Fotografie, no. 7 (July 1962), 242-244 and 265, Fotografie, no. 8 (August 1962), 282-284 and Fotografie, no. 9 (September 1962), 322 and 324.
342 For more on these artists, see Gabriele Muschter, “Medium, Subject, Reflection,” in Geschlossene Gesellschaft, op. cit., 308-312.
staged and documentary photography, Bara not only addresses the constructed nature of photography, but also the limitations of objective representation.

The same year that the ZKF/GfF published a selection of photographs from Sewcz’s *inter esse* in *Fotografie*, the *X. Kunstausstellung der Deutschen Demokratischen Republik* drew attention to individuals previously excluded from the ZKF’s vision of “people like you and me” for the first time. In addition to showing nine photographs from Schulze Eldowy’s series *Aktporträts*, the photography jury of the National Art Exhibition, which included members of the Arbeitsgruppe Fotografie and was overseen by Roger Melis and Peter Pachnicke, a member of the ZKF/GfF and Head of the Photography Department at the HGB, chose to include six photographs from Karin Wieckhorst’s series *Regina Reichert* (1981-1985) and eighteen photographs from Renate Zeun’s cycle *Betroffen* (*Afflicted*, 1983-1984). The former explores the everyday life of Regina Reichert, a paraplegic living on her own in East Berlin. It shows her getting dressed and bathing herself in the mornings, cleaning her apartment, and enjoying time with family and friends in her living quarters and various locations throughout the city during the first half of the 1980s [Figs. 3.31-3.32]. While the later, *Betroffen*, traces the artist’s own battle with breast cancer over the course of one year. Like other photographers at the time, for instance Helga Paris, whose conceptual series *Selbstporträts* (*Self-portraits*), taken between 1981 and 1988, was also featured in the *X. Kunstausstellung der Deutschen Demokratischen Republik*, and Jo Spence, Zeun turned

---

343 For more on the East German photographers included in this exhibition, see Pachnicke, *X. Kunstausstellung der Deutschen Demokratischen Republik*, op. cit., 402-424 and 534-537; Wieckhorst’s series *Regina Reichert* was first shown in the *3. Porträt fotoschau der DDR*, which took place between 11-27 April 1986 at Fucikplatz in Dresden and 11 July and 2 August 1986 at the Fernsehturm in Berlin; Zeun’s series *Betroffen* was first published as a photobook by VEB Verlag Volk und Gesundheit in 1986.
the camera on herself to chronicle the passage of time and changes her body underwent from the moment she detected a lump in her right breast on 11 March 1983 to her last chemotherapy treatment on 10 February 1984, after the photographer underwent a mastectomy [Figs. 3.33-3.34]. While these series neither criticized the East German state nor expressed the alienation from the West experienced by Sewcz, they both complicated and disrupted the idealized view that the state promoted of itself. By photographing individuals who, in different ways, were challenged by serious health issues, Wieckhorst and Zeun, like Schulze Eldowy, provided contemporary viewers with an alternative to than the happy citizens and idyllic scenes that often inundated East Germany’s visual culture.

Conflicting Images of the GDR

Although the East German state and its cultural apparatuses promoted series by Schulze Eldowy, Sewcz, Wieckhorst, and Zeun in major exhibitions and publications, they also continued to promote an idealized view of the GDR and its citizens and, at times, prohibited work that did not align with their needs. For instance, in 1983, the year that Helga Paris’ daughter left East Berlin to attend the Burg Giebichenstein Hochschule für angewandte Kunst (School of Applied Art) in Halle/Saale, the East German photographer began to photograph the medieval city, which before the Cold War, when it became known for its environmental pollution, had built its reputation on its saline springs and

salt production.\textsuperscript{345} Part of what was formerly called Germany’s Chemical Triangle, the city and its surrounding regions inherited chemical and synthetic factories built during the first half of the twentieth century, including the IG Farben Leuna Works (renamed VEB Leuna-Werke „Walter Ulbricht“) and Buna-Werke GmbH Schkopau (renamed VEB Chemische Werke Buna), and provided jobs and new apartments for thousands of workers and their families between the 1960s and late 1980s.\textsuperscript{346} While the chemical industry led Halle/Saale to thrive, Paris did not use her camera to capture the city’s modern concrete housing towers, many of which were located in Halle-Neustadt, a satellite city for the chemical workers seven kilometers from the old city centre that began to be constructed in 1964, nor did she depict that district’s bustling streets.\textsuperscript{347} Instead, over the course of three years, she photographed its residents, frequently walking along quiet streets, and its neglected prewar architecture. Appearing in almost every photograph taken by Paris during this period, the latter, much of which was slated for destruction to accommodate the city’s modern housing projects, is always seen heavily stained by soot or surrounded by a haze of contaminants [Figs. 3.35-3.37].\textsuperscript{348} When seen

\textsuperscript{345} On environmental pollution in the GDR, see Joan DeBardeleben, “‘The Future Has Already Begun’: Environmental Damage and Protection in the GDR,” in Marilyn Rueschemeyer and Christiane Lemke (eds.) \textit{The Quality of Life in the German Democratic Republic} (Armonk, New York: M.E. Sharpe, 1989), 144-164.


\textsuperscript{347} Known as the \textit{Chemiearbeiterstadt} (chemical workers’ city), Halle-Neustadt was conceived by the SED in the early 1960s and designed by architects Richard Paulick and Karlheinz Schlesier in the mid-1960s. According to Gwyneth Cliver, its housing, which was intended to house workers employed at the Leuna and Buna factories and to be surrounded by schools, daycares, stores and playgrounds, was based on prefabricated settlements being constructed in West Germany at the same time. For more on this and the history of Halle-Neustadt, see Gwyneth Cliver, “Ostalgie Revisted: The Musealization of Halle-Neustadt,” \textit{German Studies Review}, vol. 37, no. 3 (October 2014), 615-636, esp. 619.

\textsuperscript{348} According to Schube, it was not only low rents and the lack of craftsmanship and materials that led to the destruction of Halle’s historic architectural center, but also the attitude of the political elite. She writes: “the State's political elite, most of them coming from proletarian
together, these images do not present Halle as a model of socialist modern architecture and urban planning, as the SED certainly desired, but as a city buried beneath a thick layer of pollution.\(^{349}\)

In 1986, after members of the VBK saw Paris’ photographs of Halle/Saale, which, whether intentionally or otherwise, aestheticized environmental ruin -- it is after all the byproducts of the region’s industrial efforts that lend her images their rich contrasts and tones of grey and that often bathe the city’s architecture in a soft, romantic light --, the association decided to sponsor an exhibition of her work.\(^{350}\) The show, entitled *Häuser und Gesichter in Halle* (*Houses and Faces: Halle 1983-85*), was scheduled to open at the Galerie Marktschlösschen Halle on 24 June and its poster, invitation card, and catalogue, comprised of fifty-six full-page illustrations, a foreword by the photographer, and texts by Elke Erb and Detlef Opitz, were printed under supervision of Ulrich Zeiner, the gallery’s director, several weeks in advance of its opening.\(^{351}\) At the beginning of June, however, local SED officials allegedly decided that the exhibition should not coincide with the 1025th anniversary of the city and the VBK postponed the exhibition without

---

\(^{349}\) The pollution in Halle and its surrounding regions was largely due to the processing of Russian crude oil into oil-based chemicals and plastics at the VEB Leuna-Werke „Walter Ulbricht“ and the production of synthetic rubber at the VEB Chemische Werke Buna.


\(^{351}\) Bernd Lindner, “Ein Land—zwei Bildwelten: Fotografie und Öffentlichkeit in der DDR,” in *Die DDR im Bild: zum Gebrauch der Fotografie im anderen deutschen Staat*, eds. Karin Hartewig and Alf Lüdtke (Göttingen: Wallstein, 2004), 198; Other contributors to the first exhibition catalogue, which has been available since 1991, were Wilhelm Bartsch, Heinz Czechowski, Jörg Kowalski, Christa Moog, and Helmut Brade. For more, see Helga Paris et al., *Diva in Grau*, op. cit., 123-124.
warning to the following spring, only afterwards claiming that Paris had failed to capture “the flourishing city’s achievements” and that her photographs would give those visiting the city for the celebrations a “false impression” of Halle/Saale. In February 1987, after Günter Kuhback, a member of the local cultural committee, deemed the original catalogue too negative, the VBK asked contributors to revise their texts by changing descriptions such as “‘grey’ into ‘occasional grey’ and ‘dark river’ into ‘rather dark river’” and Paris to replace sixteen photographs and to rewrite her foreword. While Paris and those collaborating on the catalogue agreed, a number of unfavorable events soon followed: another postponement of the exhibition, this time to June 1987; the cultural committee’s refusal to print the second exhibition catalogue after it was approved by the VBK-DDR on 20 May 1987; and the SED’s decision to stop the second installation of the exhibition and to confiscate all catalogues and posters advertising the show. As a result, Paris, who demanded the VBK-DDR return all of her photographs, did not exhibit Häuser und Gesichter in Halle at the Galerie Marktschlösschen Halle until 1990.

Conclusion

353 Ibid.
354 A full account of these events and the letters exchanged between Helga Paris Wille Sitte (the President of the VBK), Günter Kuhback (member of the SED), Günter Gnauck (member of the VBK district board in Halle), and Hans-Joachim Böhme (member of the SED), which are in the possession of the photographer, have been analyzed by Lindner. For more, see Lindner, “Ein Land—zwei Bildwelten,” in Die DDR im Bild, op. cit. 198-202.
355 Häuser und Gesichter in Halle took place at the Galerie Marktschlösschen Halle between 16 January and 2 February 1990. Invitations were printed using the plate for the 1986 exhibition and were simply corrected by hand.
When asked by curator Matthew Shaul whether she “thought she had been allowed to photograph the way she did because photography was overlooked as a visual art form,” Paris replied:

I experienced the underestimation in Leipzig when a West Berlin publisher put out a book of my work entitled Women in the GDR. Helga Schubert from the GDR wrote the text, which had to be submitted to the censor. The photographs, however, were completely ignored. This was very strange and I completely agree that in this sense photography was often underestimated. But I am not even sure if I consider myself a critical photographer. Had I really approached everything with a cutting critical lens, then I would have taken different photographs. My interest at heart was always to document the simple way in which people lived in their everyday environment.

I also experienced overestimation of photography: when Halle: Häuser und Gesichter was published, there was a hysterical reaction and it was withdrawn. I think this was the first time the city’s administrators realized how dangerous photography was to them. The exhibition was also withdrawn, but it wasn’t forbidden everywhere. I was able to show it elsewhere in the GDR, but in Halle those who were responsible for the decay of the city felt threatened. They were rather simple characters, but highly sensitive to being criticized. The photographs showed the neglect in black and white. If it had been exhibited, some might have complained about the state of the city, but it wouldn’t have had the incredible amount of attention it achieved because of the ban. It even reached the magazine ZK [Zentralkomitee].

While Paris did not directly engage with Shaul’s question regarding her work and the status of photography in the GDR, her response highlights, as do the actions of the various individuals involved in sponsoring, postponing, cancelling, and exhibiting a selection of her photographs from Häuser und Gesichter in Halle, the lack of consensus among cultural authorities on how to treat photographers and the medium of

---

356 Paris quoted in Shaul, Do Not Refreeze, op. cit., 59. While Häuser und Gesichter in Halle was not exhibited in its entirety until 1990, some of its photographs were included in Helga Paris: Fotografien, an exhibition that took place at the Kunsthalle in Rostock and at the Fotogalerie Helsingforser Platz in Berlin in 1989. On these exhibitions, see Inka Schube, Helga Paris: Fotografie (Ostfildern: Hatje Cantz, 2013), 200.
photography. Moreover, it underscores officials’ inability to determine how to represent
the GDR in the 1980s. Some cultural authorities promoted the work of photographers
who presented an idealized view of the GDR and its citizens; while others advanced the
work of photographers who used their cameras, as this chapter demonstrates, to not only
challenge the former images, which had been circulating in the media and ZKF
exhibitions and publications since the Ulbricht era, but to also express their frustration
over the omissions in East German visual culture and the restrictions placed on those
living under “real existing socialism.” At a time when photography was recognized as an
art form in the GDR and art photography found a place outside small exhibitions
sponsored by the Kulturbund and illustrated magazines, such as Sibylle and Das Magazin,
the indecision of the East German state and its cultural apparatuses resulted in new
opportunities for East German art photographers: it allowed them to exhibit their work
alongside regime-affirming propaganda in major national exhibitions, Kulturbund- and
private galleries, and specialized photography publications, and to receive funding from
the state. In the case of Schulze Eldowy, it permitted her to photograph East Berliners,
including Elsbeth Kördel, who were formerly omitted from the media and state-
sponsored exhibitions and to widely disseminate her work, making visible the GDR’s
unseen.
CONCLUSION

In an interview that took place on 3 April 2006 in Berlin, Maria Sewcz was asked by curator Matthew Shaul to address “the difficulty GDR authorities experienced in reaching precise definitions of what was photographically acceptable” and “the freedoms photographers began to enjoy in the 1980s.” She responded by stating the following:

We [East German photographers] made pictures, but we didn’t attach specific [written] meanings to them. If we had, we would have encountered more trouble. Photos are, as it were, an unspoken witness of the times. I was never really a photojournalist, always an artist or an author, and after the early 1980s it became possible for me to make my photography much more subjective and not to bother with constant portrayals of workers. Ideas were encompassed in our work but they were only suggestions -- this was what was special. At the beginning, the [photographic] engagement [in our work] was documentary in character. But working serially we would build a story and lay down the information in layers very slowly, allowing our audience to read between the lines. The multilayered approach wasn’t necessary in the West, but it’s what makes our work special and is a modus operandi specific to photography. My work has to mature and draw on a very close knowledge of a place, person or situation. My photography is about engagement, not about impressions.357

In addition to describing her photographic practice and outlining the methodology of East German art photographers, Sewcz’s reply suggests the moment when photographers no longer had to employ the method of socialist realism: the 1980s. Between 1950, when Walter Ulbricht declared socialist realism as the official artistic method in the GDR, and the late 1970s, photographers were expected to reproduce the motifs of socialist visual

357 Maria Sewcz quoted in Do Not Refreeze: Photography Behind the Berlin Wall, eds. Matthew Shaul and Nicola Freeman (Manchester: Cornerhouse Publications, 2007), 91.
culture if they wanted their photographs to be included in major exhibitions and publications sponsored by the East German state and its cultural apparatuses. As Sewcz aptly points out, this changed during the Honecker era, when the imagery of socialist realist ideology began to lose its efficacy and the definition of socialist realism, as it was understood in the 1950s and 1960s, was broadened to include workers not only in factories and mines, where they had been photographed for almost thirty years, but also in the privacy of their homes and during their leisure time. By the end of the 1970s, the artistic method was rarely mentioned if at all during the SED’s Central Committee Plenums and Party Congresses, and it more or less disappeared altogether from written requests for submissions for major photography and art exhibitions. This shift from imposing an official artistic method in the GDR to granting artists more autonomy is most evident in the ZKF’s publication Fotografie. Staring in the early 1980s, the specialized photography magazine began to regularly feature the work established East German art photographers Arno Fischer, Sibylle Bergemann, Ute and Werner Mahler, and Helga Paris, as well as up and coming photographers Gundula Schulze Eldowy, Erasmus Schröter, and Maria Sewcz.

358 While socialist realism became something of the past in most socialist countries after Stalin’s death in 1953, as stated in the Introduction of this dissertation, it wasn’t until December 1971, when Honecker declared that there were “no taboos in the realm of art and literature” at the SED’s Fourth Central Committee Plenum, that cultural policies began to change in the GDR. 359 See, for instance, Erich Honecker, Zur Vorbereitung des XI. Parteitages der SED (Berlin: Dietz Verlag, 1981); and calls for submissions for the following photography exhibitions in the ZKF’s monthly newsletters in Fotografie between the 1970s and late 1980s: the Berliner Internationale Fotoausstellung, Fotoschau der DDR, Pressfotoschau der DDR, INTERPRESS-FOTO, and Porträtfotoschau der DDR.

360 Prior to the early 1980s, Fotografie chiefly featured the work of socialist realist photographers (on rare occasions it would include images by Arno Fischer and Evelyn Richter); While the work of Fischer, Bergemann, Ute and Werner Mahler, and Paris regularly appeared in Fotografie in the 1980s, it wasn’t until the late 1980s that the magazine began to devote its pages to the work of rising photographers. See, for instance, Gerhard Ihrke and Lothar Prengel, “Fotografie-Diplome 1987,” Fotografie, no. 2 (February 1988), 50-72.
The aim of this dissertation is not only to draw attention to the variations in cultural policy and the kinds of images that began to circulate in East Germany’s visual culture from the late 1970s onwards, when socialist realism was beginning to be conceived by authorities as unconvincing and photography was recognized as an autonomous art form in both Germanys. It is also to trace the actions of East German art photographers before *Medium Fotografie*, an exhibition that marked a significant change in the way that photography and photographers were treated by cultural authorities in the GDR. Commencing with an analysis of photobooks by Edith Rimkus, Horst Beseler, and Arno Fischer, this dissertation demonstrates that East German art photographers were able to sustain an independent practice that did not follow the dictates of the state’s cultural apparatuses during the Stalinist years. It also reveals that Fischer, unlike Rimkus and Beseler, who received official support from Verlag Neues Leben, found various ways to support his photographic series -- he worked at a photography lab, taught photography classes, and accepted a private stipend --, and even managed to exhibit his work in a small Kulturbund gallery in Weißensee in 1959.

Following Fischer’s career into the 1960s, after the ZKF was established and began to actively control photographic production in the GDR, this dissertation also illustrates that East German art photographers found alternatives to state-sponsored exhibitions and publications to circulate their images: they turned to illustrated magazines. By accepting or seeking out employment at *Sibylle* and *Das Magazin*, magazines that were run by young artists and open-minded individuals and that contained little to no overt news and politics, Fischer and several other East German art photographers, notably Helga Paris and Brigitte Voigt, who began their careers at the
latter publication, not only found a means to evade the restrictions placed upon photographers by the regime, but they also built successful careers for themselves. By outlining their unprecedented series and, more importantly, the freedom they experienced at these magazines, this dissertation contributes to the most recent scholarship on the GDR. It bears a strong affinity to studies by Paul Betts, Katherine Pence, Eli Rubin, Jennifer Evans, Josie McLellan, and Alf Lüdtke, among others, which provide a more nuanced reading of the relationship between the East German state and its citizenry and dispel the commonly held belief that the state had complete control over the “daily activities and habitus of East German citizens.”361 Their analyses of everyday life and culture in the GDR make known that ordinary citizens, like East German art photographers who found ways to work and widely disseminate their photographs in the GDR, not only adapted to the regime, but found ways to experience a degree of autonomy through, for instance, their leisure activities, private lives, and consumer choices.362

As well as characterizing illustrated magazines as important vehicles for East German art photographers in the 1960s and 1970s, this project also investigates the career of Gundula Schulze Eldowy, a photographer who came of age in the late 1970s and trained under Fischer at the HGB in the 1980s. It outlines the support she received from official channels in the GDR and argues that art photography and regime-affirming propaganda began to circulate together in state-sponsored exhibitions and publications as early as 1982. As such, it calls into question the labels “official” and “unofficial” photography used by cultural sociologist Bernd Lindner and art historian Sarah E. James,

362 On a basic introduction to this scholarship, see the Introduction of this dissertation.
among others, when describing East German photography, asserting that the former could also be applied to the work of East German art photographers and has little to no value in distinguishing the kinds of photographic practices that emerged and developed over the course of forty years in the GDR.\(^{363}\) By demonstrating the conflation of art photography and regime-affirming propaganda in East Germany’s visual culture, this dissertation also claims that the state and its cultural apparatuses failed to reach a consensus on how to photographically depict the GDR in the decade leading up to the fall of the Berlin Wall. In doing so, this project aligns itself with the work of Heather L. Gumbert, which declares that East German authorities failed to depict the society they wanted to establish through television programming.\(^{364}\)

Finally, this dissertation also draws attention to authorities’ increasing confusion over how to treat photographers and photography. This is best exemplified by the simultaneous promotion and censorship that Schulze Eldowy and Paris both experienced in the second half of the 1980s. The conflicting treatment faced by these two photographers implies that cultural authorities no longer knew how to handle photography, at least not to the same degree as they did between the 1950s and 1970s. It also alludes to the fact that authorities began to include art photography in major state-sponsored exhibitions and publications merely to demonstrate the progressiveness of the East German regime to a national and international audience alike.
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Fig. 1.20 Arno Fischer, East Berlin, Day of the Republic (this is where the City Castle once stood; today the Palace of the Republic stands on these grounds) 1958, from Situation Berlin, gelatin silver print
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Fig. 1.33 Arno Fischer, double-spread page from original *Situation Berlin* [printed in *Situation Berlin* and in the possession of Ulrich Domröse]
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Fig. 2.13 Arno Fischer, from the series *Abflug/Ankunft Berlin-Schönefeld* (Departure/Arrival Berlin-Schönefeld), in *Sibylle* 1/1968, Saxon State Archives in Leipzig
Fig. 2.14 Arno Fischer, from the series Abflug/Ankunft Berlin-Schönefeld (Departure/Arrival Berlin-Schönefeld), in Sibylle 1/1968, Saxon State Archives in Leipzig
Fig. 2.15 Arno Fischer, from the series *Premiere*, in *Sibylle* 6/1962, Saxon State Archives in Leipzig
Fig. 2.16 Arno Fischer, from the series *Premiere*, in *Sibylle* 6/1962, Saxon State Archives in Leipzig
Fig. 2.17 Arno Fischer, from the series Mode, Film und Pappmaché (Fashion, Film, and Papier-mâché), in Sibylle 6/1965, Saxon State Archives in Leipzig
Fig. 2.18 Arno Fischer, from the series *Mode, Film und Pappmaché (Fashion, Film, and Papier-mâché)*, in *Sibylle* 6/1965, Saxon State Archives in Leipzig
Fig. 2.19 Arno Fischer, from the series Mode, Film und Pappmaché (Fashion, Film, and Papier-mâché), in Sibylle 6/1965, Saxon State Archives in Leipzig
Fig. 2.20 Arno Fischer, from the series *Mode, Film und Pappmaché (Fashion, Film, and Papier-mâché)*, in *Sibylle* 6/1965, Saxon State Archives in Leipzig
Fig. 2.21 Arno Fischer, from the series *Regentage (Rainy Days)*, in *Sibylle* 5/1964, Saxon State Archives in Leipzig
Fig. 2.22 Arno Fischer, from the series *Regentage (Rainy Days)*, in *Sibylle* 5/1964, Saxon State Archives in Leipzig
Fig. 2.23 Arno Fischer, from the series *Regentage (Rainy Days)*, in *Sibylle* 5/1964, Saxon State Archives in Leipzig
Fig. 2.24 Helga Paris, first page of *Wer räumt unseren Dreck weg? (Who Takes Away our Trash?),* in *Das Magazin* 2/1974
Fig. 2.25 Helga Paris, second page of *Wer räumt unseren Dreck weg? (Who Takes Away our Trash?)*, in *Das Magazin* 2/1974
Das den Ordnungssinn unserer Kinder fördert, die fröhlich auf ausgangernten Sofas hoppert, ist anzuweilen.

Die Touren der einzelnen Brigade sind vorgeschrieben. Ein halbes Jahr lang fahren sie denselben Bezirk, dann wird gewechselt.

Es gibt unterschiedliche Touren, leichtere und schwere. Die Zahl der Töpfe ist bei allen gleich, aber mal stehen sie günstig, mal ungünstig. Oft gibt es lange Wege. „Wenn du dir das nicht mit Klopfschlaufen einleist, laufst dir die Blutblässe bei in unter 20 bis 25 Kilometern Fußweg!“

Ein ausgeprägtes Gefühl für Berufserhebung ist bei allen zu finden, und oft genug kommt es noch vor, dass diese Männer mit der schmutzigen Arbeit, die sie verrichten, identifiziert werden. Ich glaube, wir können uns kein Bild von unserer Stadt machen, wenn sie nicht wären, mit ihrem alles erklärenden Satz: „Muß ich schließlich euer machen?“

Häufig übernehmen sie in ihren Wohnhäusern die Hauswartstelle: „Wir haben eben keine Angst vor Dreck!“ Und mit stolzer Gänsefedern sagen sie „Wöche, bei andern heißt es freitags, Mama, mach Badewasser! Unserer geht jeden Tag gebraucht und poliert vom Fuhrhof.“

Die Probleme in diesem Beruf unterscheiden sich kaum von denen anderer Arbeiter.


„Wo wohnnet? Rysewstraße 45? Möllentonken links um die Ecke, gleich hinter der Klopfschlaufe.“

Helga Paris

Fig. 2.26 Helga Paris, third page of Wer räumt unseren Dreck weg? (Who Takes Away our Trash?), in Das Magazin 2/1974
Fig. 2.27 Helga Paris, image from *Wer räumt unseren Dreck weg? (Who Takes Away our Trash?)*, in *Das Magazin* 2/1974

Fig. 2.28 Helga Paris, image from *Wer räumt unseren Dreck weg? (Who Takes Away our Trash?)*, in *Das Magazin* 2/1974
Fig. 2.29 Helga Paris, image from *Wer räumt unseren Dreck weg? (Who Takes Away our Trash?)*, in *Das Magazin* 2/1974

Fig. 2.30 Erich Schutt, *Braunkohlenkumpel, 1 Porträtfotoschau der DDR* [ZKF catalog, 1970], Harvard Fine Arts Library
Fig. 2.31 Erich Schutt, *Braunkohlenkumpel, 1 Porträtfotoschau der DDR* [ZKF catalog, 1970], Harvard Fine Arts Library

Fig. 2.32 Helga Paris, first double-spread page from *In den Kneipen von Berlin (In the Bars of Berlin)*, in *Das Magazin* 9/1975
Fig. 2.33 Helga Paris, second double-spread page from In den Kneipen von Berlin (In the Bars of Berlin), in Das Magazin 9/1975
Fig. 3.1 Gundula Schulze Eldowy, *Untitled* from the series *Berlin in einer Hundenacht* (*Berlin on a Dog’s Night*), 1977-1990 (1986), gelatin silver print, 33 x 49 cm, Private Collection

Fig. 3.2 Gundula Schulze Eldowy, *Untitled* from the series *Berlin in einer Hundenacht* (*Berlin on a Dog’s Night*), 1977-1990 (1980), gelatin silver print, 33 x 49 cm, Private Collection
Fig. 3.3 Gundula Schulze Eldowy, *Untitled* from the series *Berlin in einer Hundenacht* (*Berlin on a Dog’s Night*), 1977-1990 (1980), gelatin silver print, 33 x 49 cm, Private Collection

Fig. 3.4 Gundula Schulze Eldowy, *Untitled* from the series *Berlin in einer Hundenacht* (*Berlin on a Dog’s Night*), 1977-1990 (1980), gelatin silver print, 33 x 49 cm, Private Collection
Fig. 3.5 Gundula Schulze Eldowy, *Untitled* from the series *Berlin in einer Hundenacht* (*Berlin on a Dog’s Night*), 1977-1990 (1982), gelatin silver print, 49 x 33 cm, Private Collection
Fig. 3.6 Gundula Schulze Eldowy, *Untitled* from the series *Berlin in einer Hundenacht* (*Berlin on a Dog’s Night*), 1977-1990 (1980), gelatin silver print, 33 x 49 cm, Private Collection

Fig. 3.7 Diane Arbus, *identical twins, Cathleen (l.) and Colleen, members of a twin club in New Jersey*, 1966, gelatin silver print, 38.4 x 38.4 cm, collection of Harvard Art Museums/Fogg Museum
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Fig. 3.14 Gundula Schulze Eldowy, *Tamerlan, Berlin, 1987* from the series *Tamerlan, 1979-1987*, gelatin silver print, 33 x 49 cm, Private Collection
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Fig. 3.16 Robert Mapplethorpe, *Self Portrait*, 1988, gelatin silver print, 57.7 x 48.1 cm, collection of National Galleries of Scotland
Tag der Fotografie in Görlitz


H.-J. Breitschneider

Gundula Schulze beim Tag der Fotografie in Görlitz; Foto: H.-J. Breitschneider
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Fig. 3.37 Helga Paris, *Untitled from Houses and Faces: Halle 1983-85*, gelatin silver print, 35.8 x 24 cm, collection of the Berlinische Galerie
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