

*AMERICAN UNIVERSITY OF ARMENIA*

*CINEMA AND ITS SOCIO-POLITICAL CONTEXT*

*A MASTER ESSAY SUBMITTED TO  
THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE SCHOOL OF  
POLITICAL SCIENCE AND INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS  
FOR PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE DEGREE OF MASTERS OF ARTS*

*BY*

*MARINE KHACHATRYAN*

*YEREVAN, ARMENIA*

*MAY 2014*

## Acknowledgement

Foremost, I would like to express my sincere thanks to my thesis advisor, Dr. Donald Fuller who supported me throughout the whole process of the study. Without his guidance, assistance, enthusiasm, dedication, patience, insightful comments and knowledge the study would not be possible. He has guided me and helped in all the stages of the research but at the same time he was cautious about not to lead me in a direction I didn't want. He was so enthusiastic about a high quality study that he contacted his friend from the Czech Republic who teaches a course called "American foreign policy in film". I should express my gratitude to my advisor for his willingness to help me and his friend for providing many valuable materials.

Besides, I would like to thank the faculty members and university staff. I appreciate their tremendous contribution in this research and my growth in general. Special thanks to the chair of the program, Dr. Shumavon for his constant guidance, support and encouragement. I would also like to thank Dr. Kalberg who has raised many important questions during our classes several of which I have used in this research.

Many thanks to my family and friends for their love, support and sacrifices. I am grateful to everyone who has a contribution in the accomplishment of my thesis and this wonderful educational experience.

## Signature Page

Faculty Advisor

---

Date

Program Chair

---

Date

# Table of Contents

<i>Abstract</i> .....	5-6
<i>Chapter 1</i> .....	7-25
<i>Introduction</i> .....	7
<i>Literature Review</i> .....	9
<i>Model for Analyzing Cinema and its Socio-political Context</i> .....	19
<i>Theory</i> .....	20
<i>Chapter 2</i> .....	26-31
<i>Movie analysis</i> .....	26
<i>Chapter 3</i> .....	32-46
<i>Discussion</i> .....	32
<i>Conclusion</i> .....	46
<i>Appendix</i> .....	48-57
<i>A</i> .....	48
<i>B</i> .....	49
<i>C</i> .....	50
<i>References</i> .....	58-59

## Abstract

Cinema, as well as other media, literary and factual, can, from time to time illustrate a link to identity (Campbell, 1998). Identity can apply to individuals as well as institutions and societies. Identity can be positive, negative and expressive of ideas, values, norms and even reasons behind foreign policy. Often we accept identity as linked closely to our being. It characterizes those things we treasure as well as habits and customs that can be conscious or unconscious. Identity can attach to good things and bad. It can represent a utopian view of ourselves, and even be contradictory. It is contradictory when we acquire a new identity. This can evolve as people migrate or emigrate to a new society.

Identity can be challenged. We can be segregated in a society; we can be thought to be deviant in society; we can be thought to be different in some way such as racial, ethnic, gender or religious. Most societies have such differences within their own nations. Further, as we encounter other societies, we see what Edward Said would have said is “other” behavior. Practically every society is partially “other” to other societies. The Cold War was an example of two “others” fearful of each other. That is because “otherness” can challenge one’s own identity. The cold war saw a challenge to capitalism on one side; to communism on the other side. To ward off “other” behavior, we construct barriers. We protect borders. We are fearful and therefore, we may project our fear on the other as an enemy. Further, we may assume that any member of an “other” group is the same and therefore, a potential enemy.

Cinema has been used to portray identities either normative or imagined. During the Weimar Republic, and later, German movies portrayed the Alpine settings of Germany as clean, fresh and inspiring. This was the “heimat” (homeland) with which all Germans could identify. It was the symbol of life in Germany. Other societies were not as clean, fresh and pure. Hitler

and the Nazis used the heimat to build an affiliation with the German homeland. Others had tried to humiliate Germany at the Treaty of Versailles. Germans were paying for this literally and figuratively. The Nazis wanted to rebuild German character in order to revivify hope and national pride. Cinemas were also used to counteract others both inside (for example, Jews) and outside (for example, communists). Such movies not only energized Germans ravished by inflation and humiliation but set the foundation for transferring their anger to Jews, Bolsheviks and others who threatened to derail capacities of the German people.

Identity can change. Some Germans left Germany, not only Jews but artists, musicians, actors/actresses and academics. Some went to East Germany, some went to the U.S. and others went elsewhere. They left to get away from potential physical and psychological harm by the Nazis. Some returned later, after World War II and after the Cold War. But they had encountered a new identity having lived elsewhere. German films in the 21st century illustrate the change and contradictory aspect of the new identity now encountering the old heimat.

The thesis explores these themes including some references to Soviet and American films. The stories are the same: identity and the possibility of change and a conflicting identity. One thing is clear. Identity is important. It can change or stay the same. But it cannot be obliterated forever. If denied, it can resurface.

# Chapter 1

## Introduction

“Propaganda has nothing to do with truth. We serve truth by serving a Germany victory”

Joseph Goebbels

Identity formation is a complex issue. In terms of the collective identity the issue of who are the people becomes a central question before defining the identity. According to Ivor Jennings “the people cannot decide until someone decides who are the people” (Huntington 2005, p. 16). The decision as to who are the people may be the consequence of a tradition, war, referendum and other causes but it also may be a result of propaganda. As the primary function of a state is to create and defend the nation the state uses different means to do so. Identities are essential as they shape the behavior of people. States may attempt to change the behavior of people by influencing them through media and other tools.

Movies are used as a powerful means for propaganda. This paper aims to study how films trace the development of identity and shift that identity. It will also show the dangers of propaganda films. For doing so it will use government financed German and Soviet Union movies as examples and evidence. The choice of these two cases can be explained by the fact that two of the important ideologies of the 20th century, Nazism and communism, emerged there. It will be explored how the Nazis and Soviets utilized cinema for reinforcing these ideologies and constructed identity. It will develop conceptual framework to analyze the films and their influence. For analyzing the films the paper will attempt to separate the historical reality from the propaganda, ideological dreams, lies, myths and fiction. Some of the conceptualizations and methods of film analysis are borrowed from George Hayes II and will be

used here with minor changes. The hypothesis of the thesis is the following: *Films reflect identity and subsequently construct that identity.* For exploring this theme the following research questions have been developed:

*RQ1. How the identity and its change are reflected in the movies?*

*RQ2. Did the ideas used in the movies need some political context to influence?*

*RQ3. Did the films have a direct impact on the society in Nazi Germany and Soviet Union?*

*RQ4. How was the influence expressed and achieved?*

*RQ5. What are the possible dangers and problems of film propaganda for the society?*

*RQ6. Can the results of two cases be projected to current world cinema industry and political context?*

The intent of this study is to analyze cinema trends in its socio-political context using Campbell's theory. Some of his conceptualizations and problematizing will serve as a basis for the analysis. The author claims that post cold war foreign policy of the United States was an attempt to fix fragile identities thus securing international order (Campbell, 1988, p. 16).

The research paper has qualitative method. I will analyze secondary data using meta-analysis. Content analysis of movies will be done. I will also analyze an expert interview. But I shall admit the following limitation that there will be only one expert interview. As the topic is a rarely occurring subject it is hard to find many experts in this sphere.

The paper is deductively developed. It goes from general to the case, that is it starts from identity construction issues and goes to cinema industry for finding identity building process in the cinema. But the conclusions can be projected and discussed for different countries and in a broader time period tracing also nowadays trends. The conclusion will



contribute to understanding also current situation of film propaganda, preconditions for its influence and possible dangers.

The structure of the paper follows this logic: the first chapter presents the literature review providing the arguments of different authors. In other words, the thesis will examine what other authors have found out about the topic. Then it will briefly present the history of German and Soviet Union film production and definition of propaganda. Then I provide the framework of the film analysis which is a mix of Hayes's framework and my own. The chapter also traces main arguments of Campbell's book called "Writing Security". In the second chapter through the framework I will analyze two films, one from German cinema and the other from Soviet Union. But these are representative movies that reveal main trends of the German and Soviet Union movie industry of that period. The third chapter is the analysis part. In the conclusion I will come up with findings and future study recommendation.

## Literature Review

The concept of identity referred as distinctiveness is vague and it's very hard to define it in a plausible way. "Identity is an individual's or group's sense of self" (Huntington 2005, p. 21). It is a dimension of being, the result of self-consciousness that a group of people or an individual possesses, certain qualities that make him/her or them different from others. It is projected by an actor and shaped (and altered over time) through interactions with "others". People define themselves in relation to others.

Some clarifications have to be done concerning identity. First of all, both individuals and groups have identities. However, individuals define and redefine their identities in groups.

Social identity theory argues that people seek identity even in an arbitrarily constructed group. Second, identities are constructed. Groups shape their identities under various degrees of pressures and inducements. Identities are imagined selves and nations can be considered “imagined nations” as Benedict Anderson described it. Third, individuals and groups have multiple identities and infinite number of possible sources of identity. These may include ascriptive identity such as age, gender, ancestry, kin, ethnicity defined as extended kin; cultural such as clan, nationality, ethnicity defined as a way of life, language, religion, civilization, history; social such as friends, team, colleagues, status; economic such as job, occupation, profession, class, economic sector; territorial such as geographical area, neighborhood, country; political such as ideology, movement, interest group, leader etc. Fourth, identities are defined by the self but they are constructed as a result of interaction with others. The way a group or individual is perceived by others influences the self definition of the person or group. Finally, the salience and intensity of identity depends on the situation. The breadth of most salient identities alters with the situation. “You” and “I” become “we” when a “they” appears” (ibid, p. 22-24).

Identities may be both narrow and broad. Narrower and broader identities in a single person or community may either coexist peacefully or conflict with each other (ibid, p. 14, 28). However, the broadening of identity may be paralleled by the narrowing of identity. When people start to communicate with others of more diverse cultures they also may identify themselves with geographically distant people but with similar culture or language. The supranational identity emergence has been apparent in Europe where it reinforced the simultaneous narrowing of identity. Migrants of different states have intermingled with other people of different races and cultures and acquired dual but compatible identities. These

migrants have been able to mix with other people and remain a part of their original culture and community.

Studying the role of cinema in identity creation and dangers of film propaganda is a difficult task because it is not a frequent occurring subject in the academic sources. Besides, it requires the understanding of both the German's and Soviet Union's cinema history of that period. Thus, to understand the roots of propaganda and its dangers in Germany, Soviet Union and in the world a background on cinema history of the respective countries will be provided.

### ***History***

In 1920s Germany developed one of the world's most successful film industries (Jason 2013, p. 204). Joseph Goebbels – the Minister of Propaganda shaped the Germany's film production. When Adolf Hitler became Chancellor in 1933 Goebbels took control of the German cinema. Through his reform Goebbels ended up the art-for-art's sake dalliance (Nowel-Smith 1996). He set up Reich Chamber of Film in order to cleanse the film industry from “undesirable” movies and produce “useful” ones. In 1933 he took control of the major producers (like Eric Pommer) and prominent actors and directors. For that reason, many of them left Germany. Starting from 1936 Goebbels banned film criticism. “Film observation” meant that journalists had no right to criticize the movies; they could only describe them. The Nazi master censors that were called “National Film Dramaturgists” reviewed all the aspects of new films before they have released. The Nazis also prohibited foreign films, nationalizing the whole industry. At this point, Goebbels had two goals. The first one was to produce entertainment movies that were harmonious or preferably supportive of Nazi ideology. The emphasis on these kinds of movies aimed to replace foreign films and entertain people distracting their attention from their hardship (Albrecht 2007). These were mainly war romance films or light musicals or the combination of the two. The second goal was to provide propaganda films to gain support for

their agenda. Goebbels also created the Nazi film school forcing every filmmaker to take classes there. They instructed the producers and filmmakers how to make movies that were suitable for the Nazi ideology. In fact, almost 1150 movies were produced during 30 years of the Third Reich which is a huge number taking into consideration the country's size at that time and hard conditions of wartime (Jason 2013). A quote by Goebbels helps us to understand the method they used for their propagandistic goals. In his words the so called "orchestra principle" means that "we do not expect everyone to play the same instrument, we only expect everyone to play the same song" (Rentschler 1996, p. 20).

Cinema had an essential role in the Soviet society as well (Taylor, 1998). According to Trotsky it was an eye-opener for people. In 1922 Lenin's directive outlined the main areas on which Soviet cinema should focus. Only a certain proportion of movies should have been definite propaganda films. The rest should have been entertainment movies that would attract audience and bring revenue for the construction of the Soviet cinema industry. In the same year Goskino was established. It was a centralized monopolistic cinema organization which had the right to lease or rent studios, equipment etc to other organizations. In 1923 a commission of inquiry was set up.

In fact, the film production has been popular in Soviet Union and it's not accidental that Lenin stated that it is "the most important of all the arts" (Avrutin 1999, p. 3). The fact that the Soviet Union had stored its film archives as no other country had done at that period illustrates the importance of the film industry and the possible existence of propaganda films.

### ***Propaganda definition***

Also, the term propaganda is tricky therefore a definition is needed. According to Jason propaganda aims to convey a message (2012). At first, the term had neutral meaning just

dissemination to further an idea especially religious one. But since 20th century, the term gained a connotation of propagating ideas through manipulative and deceitful means. Propagation or dissemination of “a belief” (attitude, desire, goal, value, or whatever) by a film (or any other medium) is propaganda only if it is intentional on the part of its creators to further the promulgation of that belief” (p. 216). Richard Taylor’s definition is somewhat different. “Propaganda is an attempt to influence the public opinion of an audience through the transmission of ideas and values” (Taylor 1998, p. 15). It means that the purpose of that kind of activity not the result is important. Propaganda exerts its influence through conveying hidden ideas and values distinguishing itself from overt pressures, violence, threats etc. Soviet and German sources distinguish between agitation and propaganda. Propaganda is a long term activity, it requires time for persuasion. In that case persuasion is a gradual process while agitation has an immediate effect and is more specifically directed. There is also an approach which states that propaganda delivers many ideas to a few people while agitation conveys only one message but to many persons (Bytwerk 2004). However, in practice the division is difficult to maintain that is why I will not include it here in the thesis.

### ***Movies and identity***

In his article George Hayes II argues that mass released films are believed to reflect identity direction of the society in order to encourage acceptance (2012). The reason is that these kinds of movies aim to gain profits but it requires public acceptance. Therefore, the film makers produce movies that will be accepted anticipating public understanding of their identity. The author has proposed the following guideline for the movie’s analysis: In his article he identifies:

- The conflict
- The participants
- The message that films convey

- The argument delivering the message.

To answer these questions he uses these sub questions:

- What are the real conflict and the setting conflict (the event or war happening or surrounding the story)?
- Are they different?
- What are the differences if any?
- What separates the “good” guy from the “bad” guy?
- Who is a catalyst?

Following this structure he analyzes the film “The Quiet American”. He uses film analysis as a method to analyze Campbell’s book, “Writing Security”, and the concept of “foreign policy”. He concludes that foreign policy, even if it is regarded as national identity, needs not be attached to Foreign Policy. Sub-elite identification is more independent and even potentially more diverse than elite actors are. It may be exercised in ways other than movie.

Avrutin tried to find new methods and theoretical concepts to investigate the cinema (1999). He concentrates on the connection between text and metatextuality in the Soviet Union. The author raises the question of historical responsibility in the context of film history. A film collage by Oleg Kovalov called “Scorpion’s Garden” produced after the collapse of the Soviet Union (1991) served a model for Avrutin’s discussion. As a result of montage, cinematic rhetoric and music a new meaning is achieved. Kovalov created a new text using only fragments of the existing (film) texts. He showed the techniques of manipulation with texts and meanings and brainwashing. It was a response to totalitarianism.

Some authors have analyzed the role of German film industry in shaping politics and concentrated on its bad effects and problems (Jason 2013, Albrecht 2007 etc.).

In his article Gary Jason explains what propaganda is, why it is problematic and why films serve as a suitable tool for that purposes (2013). He uses Erwen Leiser's "Germany Awake" film as an example. It serves as an evidence for broader thoughts. The film explores how the Nazi Party systematically exploits film to create a supportive attitude towards the Nazi ideology and agenda. It reviews all the major Nazi propaganda films covering twenty-six movies. He grouped the movies by their messages the Nazis were trying to convey. Some of the contents were to convince people to shift their support from Communism to Nazi Party, humiliate democracy, portray the war as something good, give good feelings about the combats, justify the wars, acclimatize the citizens "with the idea of state murder of targeted groups", and make Germany "Jewish free" (ibid, p. 212). The power of propaganda will be decreased if counter information exists but the control over education and censorship reduces that possibility.

The author discusses the issue of immorality of propaganda (Jason 2013). To make his point clear he uses the neutral word marketing and provides the criteria of judging ethical status of marketing borrowed from business. They are at least five:

1. Transparency of intention: when the marketer makes the audience aware that he/she is trying to convince one to purchase something.
2. Rationality of audience: when marketers direct their message to an audience that is able to understand and act rationally.
3. Logicity of appearance: the audience expects the marketers to avoid sophistry.
4. Avoidance of emotional manipulation: emotional manipulation is the adherence to some irrelevant emotional feelings to the products.
5. Truthfulness of message: misinterpretation or lies are considered unethical.
6. Legitimacy of product: the audience expects the marketer to be offering or selling an ethical product.

The author applies these criteria to the propaganda analysis to show immorality of propaganda films. For example, he observes Goebbels' preference to propagandize Nazi "worldview" (weltanschauung) through entertainment films (ibid, p. 218). The latter are the most effective ones because the watcher is not conscious and suspicious about the message he/she is receiving. Since it is not transparent it is immoral. Another example is the film "Hitler Youth Quex" (1933). The targeted audience is boys who are not mature enough to think rationally and reason themselves understanding for and against facts.

Another author Albrecht in his interview expressed an opinion that Nazi films were to remove the public from the reality, to tell them "lies", to make them believe it (2007). In the entertainment movies only a fraction was propagandistic. The remaining was to distract citizen's attention from the hardship they were facing. Almost no reference to the viewers every day life was included. Only a fraction of the movies had direct propagandistic intentions which portray Nationalistic ideas as an ideal. These movies underline either "superiority of "the Aryan race", or the superiority of the German Reich over its enemies, or the superiority of the greatest generals of all time."

Mühl-Benninghaus discusses the issue of censorship in Germany and its effects on cinema during World War I (1997). He concludes that the social attitude towards the cinema was altered. He also argues that Nazi administration of film production is the continuation of the Weimer administration.

In another article called "The German Film Credit Bank, Inc. Film Financing during the First Years of National-Socialist Rule in Germany" Mühl-Benninghaus focuses on the problems that film industry was facing which were primarily of a financial nature (1989). During Weimer period banking industry was financing the German film production. But this possibility was eliminated because of the international financial crisis and introduction of sound in movies.



Some works try to identify propaganda themes in the German movies. Among them is Weinberg (1984) as well as a few others discussed (Jason 2013, Welch 2004 etc.). The earliest films had an intention to rally the German citizens and primarily youth to its side. In many films like "Hitlerjunge Quex" young Germans juxtaposed with their parents who are communists. These movies also emphasize "the obedience of citizens and soldiers to the Third Reich even to the point of martyrdom" (ibid, p. 114). In other movies, the theme is the plight of Germans living outside the Third Reich. During Weimar period other movies showed the great political leaders of the past. Nazi leaders also utilized movies as a tool to create animosity towards other nations. These were especially the nations or countries that were considered by the Nazi officials as enemies. The author concludes that the examination of movies' content, the impact of the films and the reaction of movie-makers and public is to be done developing a scientific method.

In terms of propaganda Welch attempts to find out the themes associated with propaganda by the regime (2004). He found four major themes that reflects the roots of volkisch thinking. The themes are: first, appeal to national unity that can be summed in this principle "the community before the individual" (Volksgemeinschaft); second, the necessity for racial purity; third, hostility towards the enemies especially Jews and Bolsheviks; finally, charismatic leadership. The spread of these kinds of values and the nurture of the discriminatory and racist feelings prepared and led the German people to war.

According to Welch the Nazi cinema reflects the National Socialist ideology. He believes that movie characters, themes and scenes can reveal the inner world of people. They are able to discover the consciousness and the way of thought that governs the soul of a nation. Movies as evidence help scholars broaden the discourse of a subject while dealing with the problem. The author tried to reveal what is the primary objective of Nazi officials' propaganda through

movies. He argues that they intended to create a “national community” which was quite ambiguous goal. Besides, the author also discussed the role of propaganda. He suggests that propaganda itself could not sustain and nurture Nazi regime. Other factors also are necessary. But the success of propaganda should not be estimated purely by its ability to dramatically alter public opinion and its value system. He maintains that propaganda is about confirming or reinforcing rather than transmitting ideas and attitudes. Nazis realized it and they utilized it to gain at least “passive” support which also gave them an opportunity to lead the society to their anticipated path and transform it in accordance with their ideology.

Nowel-Smith argues that Nazi Germans’ concern after coming to power in 1933 was to reshape people’s imagination and create and recreate a new kind of man (1996). The German films were good at mobilizing emotions and immobilizing minds. Art is not for its own sake but for the sake of creating a new society.

Larkey discusses the idea of Heimat (home) in the German context (Larkey 2008). The search for and loss of the fluid idea heimat is addressed in three films: *Ein Fremder* (A Stranger), *Familienreise* (Family Trip) and *Adeux and Goodbye*. The spatial aspect of heimat associated to a region or location implies the sense of belonging and the temporal aspect linked to childhood and youth denotes the sense of longing. Later the concept started to include “identity, reflection and self reflection, the loss of heimat and even multiple heimatzen” (ibid, p. 1).

In contrast, Ludewig treats the concept of heimat, the attachment and belonging to a place, as a Fasist sublime or at its best, it may be considered a utopian idyll (Ludewig 2008). In the films the idealization of local neighbourhood had desired outcomes which are related to national identity and a strong society construction. In this sense, these films can be considered the continuation of Nazi propaganda. The positive presentation of local surrounding overall

pertain to a sense of well-being that is why heimat implies less a place than a state of harmony with oneself and his/her neighbourhood.

## Model for Analyzing Cinema and its Socio-political Context

The thesis constructs a model for analyzing the link between conceptualization and evidence or data. The conceptualization has been that cinema (and other media) can be linked to the idea of identity. Identity can be an image either that an individual or nation attaches to itself or that can be experienced through reinforcement. Cinema has been used for reinforcement. Its usage has, at times, been to persuade its viewers that this particular film or genre helps to understand a nation or even an individual. Occasionally, it has been used as a means to propagandizing the image. This can occur during wartime or societal crisis such as the Weimar Republic in Germany.

Cinema, as an object of study, has been large. The thesis will point out the dimensions of this study. One can trace it from silent films to sound films. Films are generally made for entertainment. When the film's purpose is to propagandize, it must still gain acceptance by the audience. Otherwise, propaganda can be counterproductive. It is not possible to review all films produced in view of the immense number of sources. More appropriately, the thesis selects certain films or portions of films to illustrate the link to susceptibility of identity or even double identity, as may occur when one emigrates and then returns to the original homeland.

Two primary conceptualizations are those of David Campbell and George Hayes II. Each addresses identity and a link to "foreign policy." Hayes uses cinema as a means to discuss and analyze the importance of identity while differing with aspects of Campbell's differentiation

between “foreign policy” and “Foreign Policy.” This thesis, however, links cinema not only to identity but explores the implications of its use in propaganda. Despite this difference, Hayes has utilized a set of questions in analyzing “The Quiet American” (see Appendix A) that suggests questions potentially useful in pursuing inquiry. The thesis is nevertheless responsible for any interpretations and errors in familiarizing itself with Hayes’s questions. The thesis is concerned with illustrating identity and its importance, even in encountering changing identities. As such, this is primarily an introductory inquiry in a complex field.

## Theory

The following part that is heavily based on Campbell’s theory points out that Identity comprises multiple dimensions and sources. In other words, identity which comprises eclectic and diverse ingredients cannot be reduced to a single source or point of origin. It is a multilayered condition which has depth and possesses texture. This suggests that identity is more than something that derives its meaning merely from the category of difference (race, ethnicity, gender, class). Difference is dangerous. The role of difference in the logic of identity should not be underestimated.

Identity is related to danger. A perception of what people are is intrinsic to an understanding of what they fear. Danger is a result of calculating a threat which objectifies the events and segregate an ideal of identity of a society that is considered to be at risk. There is not always a grounded need for an interpretation of a threat. For producing an understanding of a threat sometimes a mere existence of an alternative identity, a form of being is enough. Alternative mode of being demonstrates that diverse identities are plausible which denaturalizes the claim of a certain identity to be the only true one (Campbell 1988, p. 1-3, 73).

The determination of a threat is related to interpretation. In a society where there are lots of risks it is difficult to know and prioritize all the dangers that may threaten people. As a consequence of the articulation of threat in the process some risks are believed to be more serious than others. Overcoming fears necessitates the institutionalization of the fear. Interpretation crystallizes some threats as very dangerous. But the interpretation does not always depend on objective facts. For example, in US, terrorism is considered one of the major threats to its national security even though the possibility of its occurrence in US is very low (except the two bombings in New York and Oklahoma City). Understanding of the so called reality includes an attempt to present the unfamiliar in the terms of the familiar. An interpretation of “real causes” does not exist. There is just a decision to adopt one mode of presentation over another.

Social and political life is a set of practices where judgments have a context-bound nature that is why discourse has an important role. Policy choice and practice selection is deeply rooted in the conceptualization of identity and state.

Identity, personal or collective, is not fixed by nature, stable, or given by God. It is constituted in relation to difference. But difference also is not fixed. The constitution of difference, in its turn, is done in relation to identity. Comparing body and state Campbell claims that identity of each is built through introducing boundaries that differentiate between a “self” and “other”, a “domestic” from “foreign” etc. For example, gendered identity of a body is mainly cited as a stable and primary identity. But according to Campbell it is a constructed notion. Fixing gender aims to discipline sexuality. Its construction is done in time through a “stylized repetition of acts, a regulated process of repetition” (ibid, p. 9-10). The same is with a state. Its identity is achieved not through a founding act but repeated acts and practices. This

indicates that states and individuals are never finished. They are always in process of becoming something or somebody.

The identity of a community constitutes the foundation for the state legitimacy and its subsequent practices. Identity can be used for encouraging certain orientations and acts and opposing or delegitimizing others. Thus, the construction of nationalism by a state can be for the purpose of legitimizing itself.

### **Foreign Policy vs. foreign policy**

Foreign policy is a certain kind of “boundary-producing political performance” (Campbell, 1988, p. 62). It is one part of a multifaceted process that orders by framing man in the inside or outside, self and other etc. within the state. It is a range of practices that impose boundaries. Through these practices people domesticate the meaning of man by formulating their fears and problems. Because of the established boundaries some alternative identity forms are marginalized and some interpretations of reality and history are privileged. But at the same time foreign policy bridges the states, connects the sovereign entities in an anarchic world.

Understanding foreign policy as a boundary producing process indicates that it produces and reproduces identities although the relationship between identity and foreign policy is more complex. State becomes the entity that secures identity in the condition of disorder which was formerly the function of the church.

Campbell distinguishes between two types of foreign policies. The first “foreign policy” is referred to “all practices of differentiation or modes of exclusion” – exclusion in the process of dealing with objects as “foreign” or “other”. It determines the categories of identity and difference. It establishes modes of dispositions, interpretations and practices that handle new

instances of ambiguity. This understanding of foreign policy serves as a basis for the second understanding of “Foreign Policy”. The latter is state-based and is understood within the discipline. But it is not involved in the process of identity constitution. Rather, it is to reproduce the constitution of identity and inhibit challenges to the identity. In other words, Foreign Policy is engaged in the reproduction of an unstable identity in whose name it operates. It is a power discourse which is global in scope but can be considered national in its legitimation.

### **Inside vs. outside**

It should be also noted that the understanding of Foreign Policy as a boundary producing performance doesn't mean that the boundaries are clear. Rather, they are blurred, multiple and sometimes violent. Foreign Policy does not demarcate the borders of identity, the duality of the self and other. Instead, the border contours are fluctuating and shifting.

Through a range of practices a social space is created which makes a series of moral valuations privileged. The construction of social space is not solely about geographical partitioning. It results in opposing moral spaces. The social and political space of inside/outside both assists to constitute and is created by a moral space of superior/inferior and can be animated in higher/lower.

### **Metaphoric presentation**

In the moral space of identity the metaphor of “body” is essential since that metaphor helps to understand the concept of otherness which is compared with deadly disease that should be combated. Difference may be a threat for social where the social is the body, the healthy body. The “body politics” can be understood from Goebbels's declaration that the usage of terror as a political device was a “social hygiene” which took some people out of circulation “like a doctor would take out a bacillus” (ibid, p.75). The danger to social body is

sometimes represented associating with physiological body. Metaphorically, the representation of social as a body implicates gendered discourses of power where the body of the body politics is female and head of the body politics is male.

Danger is a part of our relationship with the outer world. It can have both positive and negative consequences. It may foster creativity. The problem is how people orient themselves to danger or accommodate themselves. Because difference is necessary for identity, danger is infeasible to that relationship. But danger is often represented as a disease or dirt. The latter opposes order and eliminating the dirt is not a negative process but a positive moment to organize the environment.

A way to orient ourselves to danger is the defilement. But it requires the condition of purity. In the case of body it demands a healthy condition which makes the defilement a natural characteristic. In this case, health and purity are rendered as the logic of stability and disease and dirt as disorder and instability. This takes us to the idea of “bipolarity of the normal and pathological”. It is a regulative ideal for society the practice of whose ideas comes from medical origins. The nature of this understanding is problematic. Bipolarity supposes that “normal” concerns to natural or desired health defined as an absence of disease. Nevertheless, there is no clear distinction between disease and health. But in politics the distinction is the regulative desire of the bipolarity. The same is about the moral identification of inside and outside where inside is good and outside is threatening and bad.

The pathologies of health/illness and normality/deviance besides medical context are animated by moral concerns. This does not mean denying the seriousness of the illness but reaffirm it by distinguishing the social role of medical discourse from the physiological impact of the illness. Presentation of moral and social concerns in medical terms has a series of effects. Being informed about the deviation from the norm of health which threatens the body integrity



establishes a power relationship where the authority that makes the diagnosis resembles a doctor in front of the patient. This creates a perception that the health of the community depends on an elite with specialized knowledge. It also necessitates an intervention (often violent), an action that assumes to cure.

There are two examinations of social medical discourse. Firstly, the regulative ideal of the pathologies often functions without scientific knowledge or even contradicts with empirical data. Secondly, through various modes of representations some groups of people are treated as social dangers. These representations fuse diverse stigmata of difference. It functions as an indicator of an image with which it possesses a far affinity instead of an image with correspondent relationship. This type of metaphor does not provide us with a description. Instead, it shows us what kind of images to look for to determine how we should feel about the represented item.

Campbell shows that the state has "no ontological status apart from the various acts that constitute its reality" (Hayes 2012, p. 8). Particularly he maintains that the identity of the United States is the result of its foreign policy. This indicates that US's foreign policy and its creation are crucial for the national identity. According to his conceptualization, cold war was an attempt to discipline the ambiguity and contingency of global life and thus secure always fragile identities.

## Chapter 2

### Soviet cinema

The Soviet silent film called "**October**" is about the October Revolution. The movie was created by Sergei Eisenstein in 1928. The Soviet government commissioned the movie for showing the revolutionary events of 1917. The film was to commemorate the 10th anniversary of the Revolution. It had an experimental nature and was full of obscure symbolism. "October" was commissioned after Eisenstein's successful movie, Battleship of Potemkin (Rosenstone 2001). The movie was created in a time when the Soviet Union needed to convince its population that socialism is the best choice and shape a new kind of society.

For understanding the movie below I will identify what are the conflict, participants, audience, conveyed message and argument behind it. Then I will discuss the movie through the lens of Campbell's theory.

### ***When is the conflict set?***

There is a clear time period, year (1917) presented in the movie. Even the title - "Ten days that shook the world" makes the scope of the taken time narrower. As it was mentioned, the film has been produced ten years after revolution so the appropriate adjustments in history have been done to meet that period's interest. Even the term - "Ten day drama" has been emerged later (Rosenstone 2001). By showing somehow altered events occurred ten years ago the film shapes the present, the mood of the period when the film has been produced. The construction of the past was to construct the future.

By the time of the revolution Eisenstein was seventeen and has little interest and knowledge of the events happening (Rosenstone 2001). So after ten years he had little chances

of presenting the events as a witness objectively. He thought that film-makers have to create history on their own way.

***What is the setting conflict?***

The conflict, of course, is not imaginary. It's real. It is about 1917 revolution when Bolsheviks overthrow tsarist regime. But the question is how the real event is detailed. In some cases Eisenstein is very brief; he just jumps from one point to another. In other cases he lingers over events. Playing with time helps him emphasize some points and overlook others. This creates an illusion for the viewer that the film exposes the real history but at the same time it was making some arguments outstanding. This makes us speculate that the movie may be even considered a historical fiction because Eisenstein shows events from a particular point of view and sometimes even uses humor and satire and dramatizes the facts to highlight some points which is not common for history. Often, the events are shown so symbolically that you cannot refer to it as history. The development of the events captivates the viewers by creating a historical emotion and showing human struggle, hope, anger, humor, victory and defeat or just creating beauty on the screen. That is not the case in history. Especially the fact that in the first part of the movie is written that the film is based on the real facts means that the film-maker wants the viewer to regard it as a reality but the emotional impact is not the intent of history (Rosenstone 2001).

The events in the film were more dramatized than it was in the reality. For instance, historians claim that there was no major fire fight across Palace Square on November 7. But Eisenstein gave a heroic charge and firefight. It was for the sake of dramatization showing the unity of thought and action (Rosenstone 2001). And this is one of the many examples.

### ***Who are the participants?***

The conflict is between revolutionaries and counter revolutionaries. In other words, it's between the Bolsheviks who plan to establish socialism and people who want to maintain the imperialist power. The participants are mainly the common people who are presented as heroes. The heroes are the people, the leaders of the revolution and, of course, Lenin. In most of the scenes one does not see individuals. Rather, there are mainly overcrowded scenes with lots of people which possibly aimed to illustrate the idea of "togetherness".

### ***Who is the audience?***

The audience is again common people. The movie does not have one point of view like a participant. It has many points of view which means that one (film-maker) just narrates the story like God. However, the story is voiced from the perspective of common people as if the events are told by these people.

### ***What is the message conveyed?***

The film attempts to legitimize the power of Communist Party and Stalin. By legitimization of Lenin's power the authority of Stalin would also be considered a legitimate one. The fact that people support Lenin enthusiastically (which is present in many scenes) indicates that he is a legitimate leader. With different words, pictures, scenes it has been shown that Lenin is the mind behind the revolution. Since Stalin is his predecessor he is also a legitimate leader. Thus the film puts lots of efforts to accomplish this task. A scene where the leaders of Bolsheviks were discussing the issue of starting an uprising or postponing it ends up with agreement with Lenin's proposal to begin the uprising. Then the statement of "all in favor of Lenin's proposal" follows and it is repeated for some times. The latter statement aimed to convince people that the leader is infallible. There is another scene when people chose

Bolshevism by voting. This is also a way to say that their power is according to public will and is legitimate.

The film attempts to convince people that socialism is the best option. It does so by making the reality and history to look heroic. An image of "togetherness" is exhibited for arguing that the era of people comes to replace the time of elite and a group of selected people.

### ***What is the argument behind the message?***

The movie based the argument on some allegations. The film tells people that before the revolution there were hunger, war and inequality. There were no peace, no bread, and no land. The scenes of hardship illustrate that point "revealing" how people suffered. Lenin (the symbol of socialism in this case) came and everything became wonderful. After the revolution people have the land, bread and peace and therefore they are happy. There are many scenes of dances and songs that show how people enjoy the life after revolution and establishment of socialism but before there were only grief and sorrow.

The arguments are either literal or metaphoric. For example, the fall of tsar is presented through the distraction of tsar's statue on the square etc. But some arguments are clearly stated such as it has been literally stated that Bolsheviks had won because people and army supported them. The idea of danger and threat is presented and then the message comes that the party will lead people to win the enemy. In 1928, for people this meant that also on that time the party will lead people against its enemies.

### ***Movie through Campbell's theory***

Some of the generalizations of Campbell can be observed in the "October". Through the repetition of a set of practices a social space is created where some modes of identity are

privileged in the film. The idea of inside and outside is clearly illustrated in the movie in which the inside is "good" and privileged and the outside is "bad", chaotic and disturbing. According to the film the inside is the socialist world and the outside is the capitalist world, capitalist ministers etc. In fact, an exclusion of the outside is practiced. Through these stylized acts of exclusion a boundary is produced. Another differentiation is projected through the use of the word brothers where those who are not in the brotherhood are others.

The movie reflects people's identity. It displays their life, concerns, perceived threats and actions. By doing so it also tries to get acceptance and then fix fragile identities. By marginalizing Lenin as the only leader the film tries to create an identity which takes the leaders actions as given. This was necessary for Stalin later for fixing identity of people in a way he wanted.

### **German cinema**

Unlike "October" the message in the documentary film "**Triumph of the will**" is more direct and simplistic. But it also touches some points that are close to people's hearts. That is why it has been very popular in Germany (700 000 viewers). The film was indirectly commissioned by the Nazi government. It has been produced on 1935 by Leni Riefenstahl. It was a time when Germany was preparing its society for war (Barsam 1992).

### ***What is the setting event and when is set?***

The film portrays 1934 Nazi party congress held in Nuremberg (Barsam 1992). This means that there is not much time between its production and actual event. The film starts with a scene where people greet Hitler. It details the Congress speeches, rally on the parade ground and Hitler's speeches.

### ***Who are the participants and the audience?***

The participants are common people, soldiers, leaders of party and Hitler. The audience is, again, ordinary people. The movie has many points of view which means that film-maker just tells the story.

***What is the message conveyed?***

The principal objective is to gain support. Through the portrayal of Hitler's heroic image they convince people to support and obey him. The movie persuades people to be loyal and selfless, to be obedient and practice obedience. It tries to create a kind of national unity, show its strength, military and civilian. The songs, symbols that met throughout the film were also for the purpose of conveying the impression that people are united for one idea, the nation.

***What is the argument behind the message?***

The argument is the order, equality and stability. In the movie Nazis promised order not only by words but also by showing very structured scenes (strict lines of the standing troops etc.). They said that before them, Germany lied to the people but with them, Germany thrives.

***Movie through Campbell's theory***

Through disciplining the contingencies and anarchy of the world the film tries to shape identity. Here the emphasis is not the unity against others (although there are some scenes that encourage hatred and violence) but it highlights the difference (superior race etc.). The film through the words of Hitler and ministers formulated community's fears and threats and according to it isolates a model of identity.

## Chapter 3

Ideas for influence need a certain political context. Both in Nazi Germany and Soviet Union some conditions already existed that made the way of ideas and messages expressed and used in movies easier. The most important factor is the lack of the civic in the two cases. Some of the reasons for the lack of the civic will be detailed after some clarification of the concept of the civic.

### **The civic**

The civic is a space in the society where different groups compete, discuss and debate (expert interview, see appendix C). One may be a supporter of Catholic Church, one may be more critical of the government, another may be less critical, one may be oriented to region another may be oriented to nation. The civic is an arena where all these groups come together and talk. Besides the competing groups it also means that everybody is in power not just the elite, everybody can participate.

In Germany one of the causes of the absence of the civic can be considered the practice of Lutheranism. Luther thought that “subjects” cannot hold rulers responsible (Kalberg, class discussion). It points out that people should not protest against unjust rulers or as good Lutheran people do not have to rebel against unjust rulers. It is God that will punish him. The king or ruler will be responsible for his actions (Bendix 1978).

Obedience towards authorities was an important impetus in Germany and was practiced repeatedly (Bendix 1978, p. 396). The sign of that obedience had been observed also in German reaction towards the French and English revolutions. Obedience made it easier to shift the whole direction of the way of thinking. It did not allow individuals to develop the art of citizenship and democracy, self-responsibility and self-confidence that would allow



independent actions without firm guidelines. They were accustomed to receive rules and regulations from the state and when the state became weaker they couldn't take actions independently. Further, this nurtured an unconditional obedience towards Fuhrer (leader) because the intertwining identity of I and we limited the resistance (Kalberg, 1992, p. 121-122).

The other factor is the essential role of the idea of fireplace (home and hearth) (Kalberg 1992). One can meet the idea of fireplace also in heimat (home) movies. The family or community, the so called Gemeinschaft, became the ideal. This made the practice of civic secondary. The individuals' withdrawal from public life followed and it became easier to manipulate inexperienced persons.

The lack of the civic sphere was also a result of military values: subordination, hierarchy etc. The dueling fraternity membership was one of the reasons of the deep-rootedness of military behavior (Kalberg 1992, p. 116). Since 1871, the duel became pivotal for fraternity life. Its members felt bound to one another. They made violence and brutality the symbols of power, status superiority, honor and pride. They praised inequality, hierarchy, contempt of all morality, physical strength, aggression, unconditional subordination to honor, hatred of inferiors etc. Before movies' attempt to strengthen these ideas there were prepared grounds for them.

The civic was not strong in Russia as well. The tsar was oppressing the civic. There was no checks and balances, no competing parties; parliament, the emperor, judges; three competitions of power. If Russia had had a civic the Mensheviks might have won instead of Bolsheviks (expert interview, see appendix C).

Both the Nazi party and the Soviet wanted to eliminate the civic because the civic meant too much openness which could lead to criticism. They would say the civic is not necessary, we

have the party, all these discussions are not necessary; the parties are correct. If the civic in Germany or Russia had been strong and deep it would have been very difficult to throw it away, to make it disappear. In fact, on the one hand, the civic was weak in both cases. On the other hand, Nazis tried to make it even weaker through various means, including cinema. The civic would have meant ambiguity, anarchy, disorder and they needed to fix identity for disciplining and controlling it.

### ***Attractiveness of ideology***

An idea for becoming a full-fledged ideology has to be strong enough to attract and convince the majority of people and broad enough to lead them through a range of situations and experiences (Arendt 1966). Throughout history only a few ideologies have been able to survive the difficult competitive struggle of persuasion. In the first half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century only two were able to survive and defeat all others: the ideology that interprets the history as a natural struggle between races and the one that presents the history as an economic fight of classes. Persuasion is not possible without appealing. The latter two ideologies were appealing for the masses thus gaining support. Every ideology is created as a political weapon and not a theoretical doctrine. Racism has been a powerful tool of imperialistic polices since the turn of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. There was a competition between class-thinking and race thinking. It is believed that race-thinking is the mental preparation of national wars and the other creates ground for civil wars. But the opposite is also relevant that racism is a powerful device to stir up and prepare civil conflicts.

The German Nazis and Soviets attracted public support through emphasizing the importance of the masses (expert interview, see appendix C). Nazis tried to form a new identity. The identity before was an identity of elite, a very highly educated people who dominated public life. The Nazis protested against that. They wanted a popular culture and they changed

the world of film, as well as other forms of art. They wanted the films to be a lever to create a new German identity for everybody, not just for a few. So the Nazi films were much more about daily life of everybody. The theme in the Soviet movies was roughly the same. A group of people had come to power who claimed that they were like everybody else. The new hero was the worker not the people from distinguished families. So the movies are about common people.

### **The masses**

Both Nazis and communists selected their members from the mass of indifferent and neutral people who never before had participated in the political life (Arendt 1988). The consequence was that their members had less experience in the political arena and did not even bring opposing arguments. This gave the rulers an opportunity not only persuade them easily but chose the death or terror as a mean for achieving their political goals.

In a democratic country the politically indifferent masses could easily be the majority. In this case a democracy might function according to the rules of a minority. Through this way totalitarian movements often abuse the democratic freedoms for abolishing them.

The indifference of masses is not the only reason for attraction of these ideologies. Besides people who were indifferent towards public affairs and neutral to political issues there was also a group of intelligentsia and educated people who were involved in the political life. Soon it became obvious that the majority of these people were also attracted to mass movements. The reason for that is the social atomization of people who became socialized only through membership in a class. An atomized society consisting of different fragments resulted in mass movements because the cracks between these fragments were cemented through

nationalism. The helplessness of the new experience even led to violent nationalism in Germany.

The loneliness of an individual in a society and atomized and individualized masses preceded Nazism and followed Bolshevism. But they began in the two countries in different conditions. Unlike Nazi Germany where the atomistic society can be considered the result of historical development Stalin had to create it artificially in Soviet Union and for that he used all the possible means including propaganda.

### ***Identity as a mechanism to gain and legitimize power***

According to Campbell, the identity of people constitutes the basis for the state legitimacy and its subsequent practices. Both the rise of Stalin and Hitler were legal in terms of majority rule because they had the confidence of the masses. Through propaganda they gained popularity. Stalin intended to legitimize his power by presenting himself as the political heir of Lenin. Through propaganda he tried to immortalize his name. In the Soviet movies Stalin in the name of his predecessor presented his ideas which have been observed also in the film "October." Hitler attracted masses by evil, crime and the declining moral standards. He knew that the mob would greet "deeds of violence with great pleasure" because of frustration (unemployment, inflation etc.). From this logic it can be understood that a Nazi or Bolshevik committed a crime against those people who were not members of the movement or were hostile towards it. What was amazing is the selflessness of those people, Hitler's and Stalin's adherents. The Nazi or Bolshevik adherent did not hesitate even when he became a victim by himself. On the contrary, he might be willing to help by his own death or persecution (ibid, pp. 305-307).

For cementing the Nazi ideology German cinema emphasized the idea of blood and soil, superior and master race, the need for Lebensraum\*, strength and health, blind obedience, heroic sacrifice, worship of Fuhrer, glorification of war (Welch, 2004). Goebbels wanted the films to be “people’s culture” that would capture “the heart of people” and express their concerns and sorrows. This would attract them. But at the same time he aimed to “educate” people through skillfully produced movies rather than present public opinion. Through different symbols and messages they taught how to be a “good citizen” of the National Socialist Germany. This intended to create an atmosphere of public conformity that was desirable for Nazis. But with a critical audience the manipulations could fail to succeed. For these reason, people were even deprived of an opportunity to make comparisons because German cinema was isolated.

In Russia the October Revolution’s victory was so easy because a centralized bureaucracy governed an unorganized mass. For this reason, Lenin once stated how it has been an easy task to win power and difficult to keep it. It was for keeping power that Stalin has started to fabricate an atomized society (Arendt 1988).

For the above mentioned purpose he initiated the liquidation of classes. The liquidation of property-owning class, the peasants and the new middle class was carried out through artificial famine and deportation under the name of collectivization. Stalin broke class consciousness among workers by creating a gigantic forced labor force. He got rid of all the administrative and military aristocracy of the Soviet Union - bureaucracy.

For creating an atomized society not only classes have to be liquidated but also all other social and family ties had to be destroyed. In Soviet society it was achieved through repeated

---

\* Living space, natural expansionism

purges. They were conducted in such a method that when someone (a relative, mere acquaintance or a close friend) defends the accuser s/he finds the same fate. The result of this method of “guilt association” was that whenever a person was accused, his former friends became his enemies. The only way to prove their trustworthiness and save their own lives was to provide information and even share the nonexistent evidence against the accuser. Thus they tried to prove that their only interaction with the accused person was for spying on him. Soon it became apparent that everybody is suspicious of everyone else. If possible the caution necessitated the avoidance of all close contacts and communications. This was not for preventing the discovery of one’s secret ideas but to eliminate the possible danger of being accused by someone who intends to save his own skin by bringing about one’s ruin. Due to this device the Soviet rulers were able to produce an individualized society.

### ***Self definition***

The atomized, privatized and unstable individuals of masses needed self-definition. This identification not only reestablished the individuals’ self respect but also produced a sense of spurious stability. For example, the Nazi propaganda transformed anti-Semitism into a source of self-definition for Germans. The Jews were the others against whom they should combat for eliminating the deadly disease and establishing order.

The dissatisfaction of people with the existing political situation was used to attract them for achieving their own goals. War was presented as a hope for change in Germany. War in itself rather than its victories was interpreted as a source of inspiration. The war enthusiasm was a mean for the front generation to destruct the fake security, culture, values and the whole life they knew. War was the “mightiest of all actions” thus even suffering was presented as “an instrument of historical progress” (ibid, p. 329). With praising violence, cruelty and power the Nazis tried to prove the elite and mob that “a struggle of all against all is the law of universe,

that expansion is a physiological necessity and that man has to behave by such universal laws” (p. 330). These proofs were “scientifically” supported. Terrorism and violence was a kind of philosophy to express disappointment, resentment and hatred, a sort of political expressionism that used bombs for self-expression.

### ***Basis for power***

For domination and keeping power a physiological basis was to be prepared. To make a person completely loyal a sense of belonging to a movement was established as if the person has no place in the world except his membership in the party. As it was mentioned, this was plausible only by isolating human beings and destroying all social ties.

Nazis and Bolsheviks demanded unconditional and unalterable loyalty from their member people. The complete loyalty is possible when the concrete content is absent. Both sides attempted to empty the fidelity of content and got rid of party programs which would obstruct totalitarianism. They even eliminated the sources of their ideologies. Hitler obscured the party programs not by abolishing them but simply refusing to talk about them and its content soon became outdated. But Stalin achieved it by giving different interpretation of the programs. Because of constant zigzag of the application of Party’s ideologies it became impossible to predict what action the ideology would inspire. Thus, they made the loyalty of individual members not dependent of their actions. This unconditional loyalty built freedom for exercising power and shifting from moderate to more radical actions.

The loyalty was guaranteed also by replacing the talents and intellectual elites with fools, crackpots or the so called professional criminals. The lack of creativity and intelligence of the typical representatives of the mob ensured their loyalty. After transforming classes into masses the organization of masses and their preparation of mass crime were easy. The reason

was that nothing was easier to destroy than the private morality of a person who was ready to sacrifice everything. Taking advantage of the existing conditions they destructed every existing institution, value and belief.

**Evidence in support of propaganda use by expert information source**

Category	Attraction			
Subcategory	Masses, equality (6) common people (20)	Order (8), stability (4)	Unity	
Score	28	12	27	
Category	Identity			
Subcategory	Unity (7) or togetherness (8) All one (2) Nation (10)	Support (8) Secure power (12)	Loyalty (1) Trust (3) Obedience(1)	Enemy (5), Difference (6)
Score	27	20	5	11
Category	Dangers			
Subcategory	Manipulation	Lack of the civic	Personal freedom, liberty, rights	
Score	3	20	4	

Table 1. Content analysis of expert interview

Note<sup>1</sup>: Evidence was obtained from an expert interview of a current professor who has published articles on Germany (current and past such as Weimar Republic, National Socialism periods) as well as studies pertaining to historical sociology in both Germany and Soviet Union.



Note<sup>2</sup>: The above shown table provides a scope for several categories and subcategories linked to three main perspectives of attraction, identity and dangers. The scores indicate the number of times that factor appears in appendix C.

Note<sup>3</sup>: The table lends support to the thesis concentration on these three perspectives.

### **Link between table and the two movies discussed in the thesis**

In fact, both the two movies and the above shown table demonstrated that the most important way of convincing people was the emphasis of mass culture, the promise of equality (score = 28). Order is the next important way of attracting masses. And the most important change in community's identity is the construction of a nation or the idea of togetherness (score=27) and the legitimization of power (score=20). Cinema was also used to produce unconditional loyalty and the idea of enemy which had their consequences such as war.

### ***Propaganda as psychological warfare***

Propaganda is a part of psychological warfare. It may be a tool for preparing ground for terror. Both before terror and during it propaganda is needed. Due to "power propaganda" the rulers showed the population that they were strong and with them one was safer. The crimes strengthened this impression which means that terror and propaganda may mutually support each other. This power propaganda created an atmosphere of fear to be against crime committers and, eventually, even support them.

Mass propaganda and mass advertisement have some kind of similarities. Both stress an emphasis on the "scientific" nature of their allegations. Through these advertising techniques many producers try to persuade people that their product is the best one. Basically, the messages conveyed are indirect and veiled. The exaggeration has a certain element of violence

and the same is with propaganda. However, business publicity did not use prophets and display the correctness of their predictions which was the case for propaganda.

With the so called research and scientific prophecies Nazis and Communists were doing statements in the form of predictions by saying that only the future can disclose its merits and demonstrate its correctness. In this way they eliminate the unpredictability of human being's actions. They could present their future actions as prophecies that were going to be fulfilled. In other words, their political intentions were announced in the form of predictions. This created the effect of unending infallibility of mass leader because whatever was predicted occurred. This kind of theme may be captured in the movies as well. A death is predicted and then the person was murdered by the prophet in the German fiction movie called "the cabinet of Dr. Caligari" (1919) – a movie that anticipated and set the direction of German cinema development.

Mysteriousness was the basic criterion for the selection of topic. This kind of propaganda was effective in the sense that people tended to believe not in what's visible but only their imaginations since they did not trust their eyes and ears. The masses' resentment against reality was the consequence of their atomization. Because of the desire of masses to escape from reality the genre of fiction thrived. Sometimes the line between reality and fiction was obscured so that the inner consistency of the conveying message became strong and convincing. Constant repetition of the message was more important than the very logic of the content or the real facts. Consistency in time was the most important factor. Confessions are the specialty of Communist propaganda. Through consistent accusations Bolsheviks persuade their victims of their guilt. On the other hand, using consistent repetitions the Nazi propaganda tried to legalize crimes.

As a result of consistency, totalitarian propaganda became different from other messages conveyed in a way that its content was no more an issue about which people might have opinions and express them. It was already a kind of dogma. For instance, in Nazi Germany questioning anti-Semitism and racism was like questioning their existence. These ideologies were no longer debatable themes for Germans. In the same way, Bolsheviks no longer needed “to win an argument about class struggle” (Arendt, p. 362). This was achieved through certain techniques. They used elements of reality that are verifiable through experience in the fiction and generalize in a way that could not be controlled by individual experience.

Nazis and Bolsheviks based their propaganda on community fate. An individual was presented as a part of a community and restricted by the fate of that community. They were taught that they are not able to change something because they have a destiny. Everything was according to God’s will and one cannot alter it. Through fatalism Nazis and Bolsheviks aimed to eliminate the rise of strong individuals who, if are not affiliated towards their ideas, could point out the problems associated with them.

### ***Dangers and problems of propaganda***

Propaganda cinema is more dangerous than other media. The first reason is that it is mostly associated with entertainment and relaxation since the audience – the ordinary people are not conscious or aware of its content and purposes (Welch, 2004, p. 264). The intrinsic enjoyment of the films with their “educational” role has a crucial impact. There were also movies that had escapist intentions. These escapist entertainment films were to divert public’s attention from the war or existing political situation. Besides, cinema is a popular art and films are accessible and understandable for people who are not literate. This means that the vulnerable group – the audience is not ready to act rationally and can be easily influenced which leads to manipulation. On the other hand, it leads to the lack of citizen right, personal

liberties and artistic freedom. The civic, besides being the cause of the easy acceptance of propaganda, is also be the result of propaganda which explains its high score (20) in table 1.

Films had to reflect the ideas of the ruling party. Hence, movie-makers themselves should be sympathetic to the corresponding ideologies. For that reason, the “undesirable” masses were cleansed from the cinema making process. As a consequence, many distinguished and talented artists and film-makers left the country because they did not serve the interests of the party and regime. This speaks about restriction of artistic freedom (Welch, 2004, p. 266).

## Discussion

### *History*

A brief look at history suggests that both Weimar Germany and Bolshevik Soviet Union were on parallel tracks seeking to establish identity. Weimar Germany sought to recover from the financial and historical period of World War I, particularly the crushing indebtedness assigned to the Germans. Post revolutionary Russia sought to recover from Czarist incompetencies and seek construction of a technological state accentuated by a humiliating military loss to Japan in 1905. These analogous histories created a ripe opportunity to emerge from political, economic and social losses while constructing an idealized identity to mobilize civic elements around a modernizing transformation calculated to build cohesion and unity amidst technological process. In both cases, cinema was utilized to embellish the national image while grounding the population in loyalty and dedication.

Using condescending state films, the state built upon motivation to succeed while punishing those who might oppose sacrifice and detour from dialectic progress. For the

Germans, the heimat idealized scenic beauty and cleanliness of the homeland. For the Soviets, with their hammer and sickle, the farmer and laborer became images of national pride and accomplishment.

### ***Cinema and its impact***

Cinema eventually became propagandistic as both countries supported and directed film. Cinema became the perfect instrument to construct and provide meaning for two countries starving for recognition and determined toward technological progress and purifying ideology. The exhilarating reward of national purpose and sacrifice was designed to build internal pride and cohesion while demonstrating to international observers that might makes right and work brings social freedom.

### ***Importance of identity***

While excoriating dissenters, both societies identified futility of independence in the national support for a Hegelian state exceeding in its provision of life's meaning. Such an identity projected confidence to replace gloom. A society anchored in unity would emasculate societal divisions projected in less dedicated societies. Various slogans and idealistic truisms promised to guarantee a fruitful future for all in contradistinction to nations founded on greed and self-serving particularities. Standardization and mutual sharing would replace victimization and vicissitudes of civic distractions. Thus, reality and idealism converged toward a national ideology that provided answers for every question. The state was the antidote to political divisiveness and identity based upon work, sacrifice and accomplishment would succeed where rule by a few had propagated defeat.

## Conclusion

This research was an attempt to link cinema and identity. The study derived its theoretical approach from David Campbell and George Hayes II. Campbell and Hayes discussed not only the film/identity link but proceeded further to create a connection to foreign policy. This study eschews the foreign policy application concentrating only on cinema/identity. Methodologically, the study includes analytical reference to German National Socialist films and Soviet films. Further, the study adds primary data obtained by questionnaire/response analysis of an expert source familiar with both the German and Soviet examples. The findings lend support to a conclusion that cinema is seen as a means to portray identity and even a second or, perhaps, more identities in one person or group grounded in epistemological change. Lack of a civic group or groups, however, may well sustain unanticipated consequences. Identity can be a motivator and/or a consequence. It can also be contradicted by a changing identity. There is seldom, however, an identity vacuum. Consciously or unconsciously, most humans identify with something.

Linking cinema and identity the research demonstrated the relationship between them. On the one hand, Soviet and German cinema reflected identity of people, showed main trends in the society. By anticipating the community's understanding of its identity and mirroring that identity films attracted attention and gained popularity, bringing people to the cinema hall. For that purpose, they showed common people and their problems in the movies emphasizing the importance of the masses. They also promised order and unity which was very important for isolated and atomized society in the condition of anarchy. While on the other hand, films constructed and reinforced their identity through disguised and consistently repeated messages. Sometimes, this led to dual identities, competing and opposing ones. But it should be noted that for persuasion the presence of the lack of the civic is important. The absence of

the civic may become both the contributing factor and result for propaganda. The latter can bring some kind of problems for the society such as manipulation and lack of civil and personal rights. Generalizing the findings it can be noted films are able to influence identity. But the discussion of the findings in the current situation, because the world cinema and political context is more complicated now, may seek opportunity for further research.

## Appendix A

### Guiding Questions according to Hayes

#### Who?

1. Who is the enemy? (and who is just a catalyst)
2. Who is the good guy?
3. Who is the audience?
  - a. Do we have one point of view, like a participant?
  - b. Or, do we have many/all points of view like a god/narrator?
4. Who else is there
  - a. Catalysts
  - b. Neutrals

#### What?

1. What is the setting conflict? (this should also take care of where)
  - a. Is it real?
  - b. Is it imaginary?
  - c. Is it historical fiction?
2. What is the actual conflict? (between the good guy and the bad guy)
3. What is the message?
4. What is the argument?

#### When?

1. When is it set?
  - a. Is there a specific time indicated?
  - b. Or is it just "sometime"?



### Technical Questions

1. Who made it?
2. When was it made?
  - a. How close in time is it to the actual event?
3. What was happening in the world when it was made?
4. Are there multiple versions?
  - a. What are their timeframes?
  - b. What are their differences?

## Appendix B

### *Questionnaire for expert interview*

*Thank you very much for agreeing to participate in this interview and sharing your knowledge. It is very important for this research. The thesis explores the theme of the link between identity and cinema. It attempts to find out whether *films reflect identity and construct that identity*. Here are some questions exploring the theme:*

*Q1. In your opinion, are the identity and its change reflected in the Nazi German and Soviet movies, if yes how?*

*Q2. Did the ideas used in the movies need some political context to influence?*

*Q3. Did the films have a direct impact on the society in Nazi Germany and Soviet Union and how the influence was expressed?*

*Q4. What are the possible dangers of film propaganda for the society?*

*Q5. Can the results of the two cases be projected to current world cinema industry and political context?*

## Appendix C

### Answers of expert interview

**Q1.** The German Nazis tried to form a new identity, a different one. The identity before was an identity of elite, a very highly educated people who dominated public life, newspapers, radio etc. The culture was an elite culture, people who read Goethe, Schiller etc. The Nazis protested against that. They said it was only five percent, a very few people. The other 95 percent, the masses, everybody else, the people were not represented by high culture: theater, opera, and classical music. They wanted a popular culture and they changed the world of film, as well as other forms of art. They wanted the films to be a mechanism, a lever to create a new German identity, a new identity for everybody, not just for a few. So the Nazi films were much more about daily life of everybody. What they did, they got up in the morning, went to work, what happened at the workplace, what kind of work, what kinds of relationships with family members especially spread. The working class now was culturally in power. The old elites have gone. This was a huge change and the attempt was to create a new identity for the masses. To say on the one hand, you are not excluded, you belong; you are here with us with German nation. On the other hand, to take the life of the masses and say "it's ok, it's fine". The elite culture looked down on the masses and said "you are inferior, you are not good, less educated, we have read Kant and Goethe and you are not educated. Now that has been changed. The Nazis wanted to emphasize the importance of masses. That meant making different kind of film. On the one hand, they wanted a different German nation. They wanted a nation that was not just old, old elites. They wanted a nation of people. Secondly, they wanted to secure their

power. They wanted to be sure that the people the whole country supported them. So film was one way of saying "we have a new society and the new society is good, the new leaders are good". They were favorably romanticizing the life of masses, the life of people who hardly went to school. They wanted the masses to say about the new rulers "you are helping us, you are good to us". And the old rulers said they were superior and we were down here. So that was a means to change culture and a means to solidify power.

The theme in the Soviet movies is roughly the same, a new class, group of people has come to power and they claim that they are like everybody else. The old aristocracy around the tsar has gone. They are no longer there. Their property has been taken and they must live like everybody else. They must live in communal apartments. The message of the communist party and Marx was that all are equal. So there is no more the old aristocracy that has privileges and looks at itself as superior and expects everybody else to see it as superior. That's not there after revolution. So it's a new world. You have to create new schools, new culture, and new forms of art and there have to be now art, film, painting, music that connects to everybody, that everybody can say I understand that art, I know what those movies mean. Well, the best example is the hero of the Soviet movie, the worker who works better than anybody else, who works in a factory, who produces more material goods than anybody else. The new hero was the worker not the fancy people with fancy cloths, not the people from distinguished families. We have a new Soviet Union and the movies are about common people. The film is a way to create a new society. Lenin and Stalin had an ideal that would be more equal than the old society. Of course, after a few years, the communist party began to separate itself from everybody else and give itself privileges and more money and better houses. So that didn't work entirely. But at the beginning the ideal was clear; to form a new society that included

everybody and made everybody feel that they belong to new nation. New nation is our nation, not just for aristocrats but for everybody.

**Q2.** If the Nazis and Soviets wanted to create a new society and also maintain their power as the leaders of the new society they had to offer in their movies a new message, a convincing message, a new way to give identity to people, to give to them a meaningful life. What both did was to give them the meaning that they are a member of a nation. Nationalism became very important because the nation was the new form of unity of cohesion. The context for everyone coming together was the nation. The Soviet nation, German nation was in the movies and all forms of culture. You are now included in the nation. We are all one; we are together not as a group or tribe or ethnic group but for something higher which helps us to be educated that's the nation. In one of the Hitler movies, as a scene in which a young man and the army are standing all around maybe two three hundred someone in front is saying we are all one, in response to the general's question of where are you from, someone in back says, he is from Southern Germany and the general says that it's wonderful, someone there says he is from Western Germany and the general says welcome, you are a part of a nation now, someone says he is from Northern Germany etc. So parts of a nation that before were fighting with each other are now brought together with all these films, the fancy soldier way of walking, the patriotic songs, and pictures. Very often in the German and Soviet movies you see groups of workers marching down the streets, singing a song and being happy. And the content of the song is clear: we are together, we are brothers and sisters even, and we are a large family.

The civic is a space in the society where different groups compete, discuss and debate. One may be Catholic Church, one may be more critical of the government, another may be less critical, one may be oriented to region another may be oriented to nation. The civic is arena where all these groups come together and talk. It means not only competing groups it also

means that everybody is in power not just the elite, everybody can participate. But that's very difficult to arrange.

Both the Nazi party and the Soviets wanted to eliminate the civic because the civic meant too much openness which could lead to criticism. They would say the civic is not necessary, we have the party. All these discussions are not necessary, the parties are correct. You can join the party and participate in the party's discussion. We want a new Germany of brothers and sisters and a new Soviet Union of peace and tranquility without war and the party will give us that. Of course, the leaders in the party are the people who are really in control. So even if there is a discussion in the party the leaders of the party have more power. Neither the Nazi party nor the Communist party was democratic internally. They didn't say we will vote by majority or majority wins. They said Hitler was right, Stalin was right. So that was not a democracy there and there was not the civic either. The civic would bring criticism so it should not be there.

If the civic in Germany or Russia had been strong and deep it would have been very difficult to throw it away, to make it disappear. The civic was not strong. Bismarck, the authoritarian leader was strong. He did not allow the civic. There was a parliament but the parliament was very weak. There was no checks and balances, no competing parties; parliament, the emperor, judges. There was no competition of power. Therefore, the civic was weak. Soon after Bismarck left in World War I then Germany did not allow any internal criticism. There was some criticism of the war two years after it began but then in 1920s (this was called Weimar period) there was so much unemployment, so much inflation that everything was unstable. And when everything is unstable, then lots of people want order, order, order and Hitler promised order. He said we will have order and employment. He said people will have jobs. He built autobombs. So the civic was never strong in Germany.

The civic was not strong in Russia as well. The tsar was oppressing the civic. In 1860-90s there were protests against the tsar. They were mainly students and intellectuals but they were put in jails or were killed. They were not strong against the tsar. So there was no civic. It would have been much more difficult for Hitler to come to power if Germany had the civic. If Russia had had a civic the Mensheviks might have won instead of Bolsheviks.

**Q3.** I think that films had a direct impact on the society in Nazi Germany and Soviet Union because cinema is an effective mechanism of art to reach the masses. People like to go to cinema. Not too many people like to go to ballet or the theater or the symphony. The film is visual, there is lots of movement, sometimes they are funny. The film is very attractive. In every country people take film very quickly. It very quickly spreads. I think that the films were much more widespread than painting or dance. And yes, it had an effect. It was a mechanism to provide loyalty, support and enthusiasm for rulers, for what they were doing. The films very often convey messages that says "we are doing well, we are now advancing, we are developing the country". The Soviet films could say "we are making the country more wealthy, there is more industry, more jobs". And Nazi films said this too: "we are doing a good job so support us, we are better for you than those of elites, they didn't help you". The old rulers were ruling for themselves. They were doing privileges for themselves and not for everybody else. They've organized universities. In Germany there were many universities. 1% of people went to universities. But the universities received a lot of tax money, money that people paid to support that one percent, that's the elite. That's not fair. It was a part of Hitler's message too: we will govern you, trust us, just trust us and also like us. They wanted to be loved by the people. So the message was we are doing well, there are reasons for us to stay in power and last, but not the least, we are providing order. There is not anarchy in the streets, there are jobs and order.

**Q4.** The danger is manipulation. If people are given attractive message that looks beautiful they may not be as critical as they should be. In the 20<sup>th</sup> century large parts of the world moved towards democracy and that's people with good vote. And that was not the case in Nazi Germany or Soviet Union. The Soviet Union and Nazi Germany had to be sure that people actually believe that their way of governing was better than a kind of democracy. So the message they sent was this: trust us because there are order in the streets and jobs. The other message, in France, US, was that the people should elect their leaders, the people should be active, there should be a civic sphere of discussion. That was not in the movies, that was pushed away. So the danger from the point of view of France, US, Poland etc. is that there is no citizen right, personal liberties and freedom. And if the movies' message is so clear that we are one nation, follow the party, do what the party says, then the danger is the manipulation. That's very political. What would the Soviets and Nazis would answer me what you have in America is chaos, you have anarchy. You have so much discussion in the civic sphere that people are fighting with each other, debating and not agreeing. And we don't want that. So the question of manipulation is difficult. You can say I am a Western democrat supporter thus I believe in civil rights but the Soviets and Nazis would say then you have anarchy, then you have what the Japanese call selfish individualism. The Soviets and Nazis were not ready for the civic. They have never had it in 19<sup>th</sup> century. How could they develop it over night. They couldn't do that. So the strong Soviet party provided stability that was what most people want. They don't want anarchy, insecurity, danger, violence.

Generally, when a group of people rules and organizes a nation they need to make sure that everybody supports its rulership. One way to make sure that there is support is to identify an enemy, someone who is not like us, an outsider. We are different and those are different. They do not belong here and they are not German. Over a century ago they (Jews) have moved

here from Middle East. We are united against them. This message is clear. If we identify an enemy and say they are awful we can create an internal unity, solidarity and cohesion. That's one way of looking at the roots of anti-semitism.

The other way that's clear from Hitler's and party members' writings of 1920s is that they just didn't like Jews not because of they had power of ruling (they were not ruling at 1920s). The elite believed that the Jews were awful and they caused many problems: economic instability, capitalism, unemployment. So they believed they needed to hate Jews. But once the Nazis came to power this message was useful to maintain power because it identified an enemy against which everyone could come together.

For the Soviet Union the enemy was the West. In the 1930s there was no Cold war. The Americans didn't like the Soviet Union because it was socialist. But it was not a huge problem. The Soviets didn't like America because it was capitalist. The argument is that capitalism is exploitation, class conflict and inequality of wealth. In 1940s the two countries were allies against Germany and the Cold war didn't begin until 1950s. The idea of enemy became sharp only with Cold war.

**Q5.** I think it is difficult to project the results of the two cases to current world cinema industry and political context because the things are more complicated now. Of course, today's cinema also has an ideological element. The Hollywood movies stylize the American life. In 1990s they took an American life and put it in a package and show on the screen. They intensified the American life. They show a standard of living that everybody could have. The message is if you work hard and have good ideas you can grow. Many American movies show small success stories. That's a message that says "I can do it, I am strong, I can make money but I have to work hard". The message convinces: don't protest against capitalism or at least don't protest too much, don't think communism is better. It says the system is okay. And there has



been no major protest against capitalism since 1990s. On the other hand, some movies are critical. So when the society and culture is very dynamic and open and when the government says people have a freedom of speech, artistic freedom and right to make a film the way they want to make it there are films all across the spectrum.

## References

- Albrecht, G., interview by Carlos Albuquerque. *German Expert on Nazi Films and Propaganda* (August 12, 2007).
- Arendt, H. *The Origins of Totalitarianism*. New York: Harcourt Inc., 1968.
- Avrutin, L. "The Soldier, the Girl, and the Dragon: Battles of Meanings in Post-Soviet Cinematic Space." *Cinema Journal*, Vol. 38, No. 2, 1999: pp. 72-97.
- Barsam, R. *Nonfiction Film: A Critical History*. Indiana: Indiana University Press, 1992.
- Bendix, R. *Kings or People, Power and the Mandate to Rule*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1978.
- Bytwerk, R. *Bending Spines: The Propagandas of Nazi Germany and the German Democratic Republic*. East Lansing: Michigan State University Press,, 2004.
- Campbell, D. *Writing Security: United States Foreign Policy and the Politics of Identity, revised edition*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press., 1998.
- Combs, J. *Film Propaganda and American Politics*. Garland Publishing, New York: p. 208, 1994.
- Hayes II, G. "Three Incarnations of The Quiet American: Applying Campbell's "foreign policy" to Sub-Elite Identifiers." *Perspectives: Review of International Affairs*, Vol. 20, No. 1, 2012: 5-32.
- Huntington, S. *Who Are We? America's Great Debate*. London: the Free Press, 2005.
- Jason, G. "Film and Propaganda: The Lessons of the Nazi Film Industry." *California State University, Fullerton* Vol. 35 (July 2013): pp. 203-219.
- Kalberg, S. "The German Sonderweg De-Mystified: A Sociological Biography of a Nation." *Theory, Culture and Society*, Vol. 9, 1992: 111-124.
- Larkey, U. "New Places, New Identities." *German Politics and Society*, Vol. 26, No. 2, 2008: 24.44.
- Ludewig, A. "Heimat in Two Contemporary German Films." *Studies in European Cinema*, Vol. 5, No. 3, 2008: 219-232.
- Mühl-Benninghaus, W. "German Film Censorship during World War I." *Film History*, Vol. 9, No. 1, *Silent Cinema*, 1997: pp. 71-94.

- Mühl-Benninghaus, W. "The German Film Credit Bank, Inc. Film Financing during the First Years of National-Socialist Rule in Germany." *Film History*, Vol. 3, No. 4, 1989: pp. 317-332.
- Nowel-Smith, G. *The Oxford History of World Cinema*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1996.
- October*. Directed by S Eisenstein. 1928.
- Rentschler, E. *The Ministry of Illusion: Nazi Cinema and its Afterlife*. Harvard University Press, 1996.
- Rosenstone, R. "October as History." *Rethinking History: Journal of Theory and Practice*, 5, 2001: 255-274.
- Taylor, R. *Film Propaganda: Soviet Russia and Nazi Germany*. Vol. 1. IB Tauris Publishers, 1998.
- Triumph of the Will*. Directed by L. Riefenstahl. 1935.
- Weinberg, D. "Approaches to the Study of Film in the Third Reich: A Critical Appraisal." *Journal of Contemporary History*, Vol. 19, No. 1, *Historians and Movies: The State of the Art: Part 2*, 1984: pp. 105-126.
- Welch, D. "Nazi Propaganda and the Volksgemeinschaft: Constructing a People's Community." *Journal of Contemporary History*, Vol. 39, No. 2, *Understanding Nazi Germany*, 2004: pp. 213-238.
- Propaganda and the German Cinema, 1933-1945*. London: Calvin College, 2001.