Introduction
A Festival at the Heart of the Cold War

November 1967, German Democratic Republic:
French filmmaker Chris Marker is invited to the international documentary film festival that transforms the East German city of Leipzig for a week every year (Marker 1971, 1997). To his astonishment, he discovers that Soviet film director Alexander Medvedkin (1900–1989), whom he admires so much, is still alive![1] Marker has been profoundly influenced by Medvedkin's experiment with the *Kinopoezd*—the "ciné-train" from which he shot footage and screened it for local people across the length and breadth of the Soviet Union during the 1930s—as well as by his film *Schaste* (1935, *Happiness*).[2] Other festival guests gathered around the table where the two filmmakers drink one vodka after the other, toasting to their chance meeting. German singer-songwriter Wolf Biermann, whose critical and ironic attitude will lead to his being stripped of his East German citizenship in November 1976, can still be heard loud and clear. Beside him, equally outspoken Cuban guests contribute to vehemently animated discussions. Among them is Santiago Álvarez, a member of the festival jury, whose accusatory films against all forms of imperialism are excellent at provoking the East German government and party functionaries who are vigilant in the wings of the festival.

Everyone is talking about a young East German documentary filmmaker, Jürgen Böttcher, whose film *Der Sekretär* (1967, *The Party Secretary*) was banned from the festival but has nonetheless been screened before a packed house at Leipzig's ciné-club. Marker was there. Did this heartwarming portrait of a secretary of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany (SED) who is close to his workers really deserve to be removed from the official program? A few dance steps against the backdrop of Latin American music brings everyone together for the duration of an evening; in the midst of the Cold War, guests from East and West, North and South find themselves united by the rhythm of a Cuban rumba.

November 2004, Federal Republic of Germany:
Claas Danielsen becomes the third director of the Leipzig Festival since 1989, and the first not to come from the former German Democratic Republic (GDR). Born in 1966 in Hamburg, Danielsen studied at the University of Television and Film in Munich. Given his age and life trajectory, he represents a clean break in the festival's history, which seems to turn the page on its East German past. Danielsen (2004), however, lays claim to a legacy and expresses his determination to continue the tradition of a festival of politically engaged documentaries and to underscore its international openness to the East as well as the South. Picasso's dove of peace, which has adorned medals and other prizes conferred at Leipzig since 1962, admittedly vanishes in 2005; but it is replaced by yet another dove. Is this rupture within continuity? Continuity within rupture?

The Leipzig Film Festival is one of the rare East German cultural institutions to have survived the collapse of the regime in 1990 and has continued until today in the Federal Republic of Germany (FRG).[3] Launched in 1955 as the Leipzig Culture and Documentary Film Week (Leipziger Kultur- und Dokumentarfilmwoche),[4] for over thirty years the festival was closely associated with the policies of the East Berlin government, which sought to make it the cultural showcase for the GDR's international openness. Up until the country's final hours, the festival's motto remained: Films of the World—for Peace in the World. Collections of firsthand accounts of the festival that have been published since 1990, however, tellingly speak of a "white dove on a dark background," of "dialogue with a myth" (Gehler and Steinmetz 1998; Mauersberger 1997). Such assessments reflect ambiguities in the festival's history and in its much-vaunted openness to the world.

The continued existence of this Cold War film festival in a united Germany raises questions as to its identity, as well as its relations with the regime during the East German era. The festival also offers us an opportunity to examine East German society and power relationships through the lens of a history that mobilized non–state actors, institutional or otherwise, and constantly wavered between provincialism and international dialogue. From a transnational perspective, the festival offers an ideal opportunity to break with the idea of monolithic blocs during the Cold War. It allows us not only to grasp the cultural politics and international flow of people, ideas, and films taking place—between East and West as well as between North and South—but also to see the ways in which these evolved from the 1950s until the 1990s. The history of the festival reveals the complex domestic and international challenges that East German cultural policies attempted to address over four decades. This is because, for the duration of the festival, Leipzig represented a frontier zone where official discourse was constantly put to the test and confrontations took place—not only with the West but also and especially with other East Bloc countries as well as those from the Global South.

Cultural History of the Cold War

In recent years, the history of the Cold War in Europe is no longer solely explored in terms of diplomatic relations reduced to their political dimension and has increasingly opened up to cultural-historical approaches (Frank 2012; Jarausch et al. 2017). In this respect, it has undergone a development also seen in the history of international relations, echoing the cultural turn of the early 1980s (Frank 2003b; Ory 2010). Aside from studies focusing on cultural diplomacy,[5] researchers have explored new, less institutional approaches to considering culture as a fully integrated aspect of international relations.[6] An example is the development of the concept of American "soft power," which encompasses cultural and ideological dimensions (Dagnaud 2011; Nye 2004). The historiography of the Cold War has also adopted questions posed by a social history that regards representations and their significance in terms of both the balance of power and the definition of international influences.[7]

If we consider the Cold War as a series of confrontations and competitions in the domain of cultural practices and norms—as well as in terms of the sensitivities and values of shared imaginaries—the clash was in fact based on structures and rationales going far beyond the framework of interstate or bilateral relations and the establishment of two power blocks.[8] To operate within a truly multilateral dimension—in some sense, the only pertinent one—we must, without neglecting them, go beyond the issues that faced East and West Germany and the East and West Blocs and examine the cohesion of the two blocs as well as the role played by the Global South.

An examination of the role of mass media during the Cold War reveals both the different analytic scales and the play between them (*jeu d'échelles,* or scale shifts) that are needed to grasp the mechanisms behind a confrontation that was largely determined by transnational forces.[9] As mediators of expectations—as well as of fears and collective memories—mass media, and cinema in particular, played an essential role in ideological warfare, circumventing the borders between nations and blocs (Chapman 1998; Karl 2007; Shaw 2000; Sorlin 1998). This cultural history of East Germany, which focuses on cinematographic production and distribution as a core issue in international cultural relations of the Cold War period, affords us ample evidence of this.

Approaches to East German History

Since the 1990s, cultural history has also imposed itself on the historiography of East Germany.[10] Most research—before and since German unification in 1990—focused primarily on political and institutional history, analyzing the hierarchical political control at the heart of the East German system. These

studies were based upon the theory of totalitarianism, borne of Cold War debates. This body of research considers East Germany to have been a society dominated through and through by an all-encompassing regime (*durchherrschte Gesellschaft*). For the German sociologist Sigrid Meuschel (1992), who adheres to a school of thought different from those early proponents of totalitarianism theory, the East German state was "distorted," rendered "undifferentiated," and subsequently "reduced to nothingness" by the state and party.

Other studies sought, in contrast, to no longer reduce the history of the GDR to that of its regime. East German society and its differentiated relationship to political power thus became the object of a series of studies that applied traditional social-historical approaches to the GDR yet retained the interpretation of a thoroughly subjugated society (Glaessner 1988; Kaelble 1994). Yet other studies strove to go further, postulating the existence and evolution of an autonomous society, independent of the power of the party and state. According to these scholars, opportunities for self-expression and communication existed for East German citizens, despite the undisputedly repressive nature of the regime. Here, the goal has been to gauge the limits of state power, the boundaries of dictatorship (*Grenzen der Diktatur*)—or, in other words, the accommodations, compromises, and acts of resistance that emerged during the forty-one years of GDR history (Bessel and Jessen 1996; Lindenberger 1999a). In this scenario, East German citizens are considered stakeholders in their society, having actively participated in its creation and subsequent downfall.

Building on this perspective, social history "seen from below" assumed a growing importance in the historiography of the GDR (Droit and Kott 2006). Partially disengaged from political determinisms, this approach situates social groups and citizens at the core of its argument, in the West German tradition of oral and everyday history (*Alltagsgeschichte*).[11] Thomas Lindenberger, for example, became interested in defining the formation of an *Eigen-Sinn*—in opposition to authority (*Herrschaft*)—within East German society (Lindenberger 1999b). The term *Eigen-Sinn,* which is difficult to translate, concurrently signifies a separate sphere, a sense of self, and aloof dignity or autonomy on the part of individuals or groups. The existence of social niches is posited to have allowed for the emergence of a certain margin of maneuver and empowerment (Camarade and Goepper 2016).

From this emerges a supplementary notion, namely that of diversity. The ability to distinguish different strategies at the heart of both power structures and the population makes it possible to grasp the ways in which East German society did not remain a static, monolithic entity from 1949 to 1990. On the contrary, depending on the particular period, it followed diverse social, political, and cultural trends and rationales—offering a multitude of "experiences

of dictatorship"—and it evolved in response and reaction to these developments (Jarausch 1999). More radically, this approach posited that an attitude of contestation was much more significant and present in daily life than had hitherto been indicated in histories of the GDR and that it had expressed itself in a wide variety of spheres, for example in practices of consumption and music (Hübner 1995; Merkel 1996; Rauhut 1993). Such findings demonstrate the importance and relevance of cultural history.

GDR Culture and Cinema

East German authorities regarded culture as a sphere of the utmost importance (Jäger 1994). Repeating the process of national unification in the nineteenth century, they utilized the entire spectrum of arts and culture to create foundations for a collective identity (*Selbstbewusstsein*) based upon a set of values that shaped a specific vision of the world (*Weltanschauung*) and of belonging to a specific society (*Gesellschaft*). People's reactions to this attempt, which ranged from re/appropriation to refusal of the identities proposed by the regime, constitute the stakes at the core of East German history.[12]

Until the early 2000s, scholarship on literature and theater dominated cultural studies of the GDR.[13] Some works on painting, notably those on contemporary exhibitions, offered glimpses of considerable artistic output (Blume and März 2003; Damus 1991; Flacke 1995; Kuehn 1997). In these studies, the approach to culture is frequently confined to problems of representation, however. In a few rare cases, it is evoked from the standpoint of a particular social group or individual within the framework of the company or other social venue (Bazin 2015; Kott 1999). The study of cinema allows us to adopt another perspective, however.

The history of cinema in the GDR overlaps to a large extent with that of the Deutsche Film Aktiengesellschaft (DEFA), the state-owned company that exercised a monopoly over East German film production from its establishment in 1946 to the demise of the GDR in 1990.[14] Subordinate to both the central government and the SED, the official state party,[15] DEFA was part of the planned industrial economy, and everyone from film directors to technicians was a salaried employee. From the perspective of documentary film—the focus of the Leipzig Festival—examining East German cinema thus becomes a matter of probing the complex and changing relationships linking aesthetics and ideology, the artistic aspirations of individual filmmakers and the dogma of Socialist Realism (whose definition has always been problematic). To this end, we must pursue two levels of analysis, cross-referencing the institutional level—the evolution of the studios as a whole—and the individual level—which focuses on the biographical trajectories of DEFA personnel.

Several works have already been devoted to the DEFA Studios since 1989. These have been published in part by former stakeholders and observers of DEFA, who have provided a lion's share of basic documentation (Jordan 2009; Mückenberger and Jordan 1994; Schenk 1994, 2006), and predominantly by German researchers from both the East and West (Geiss 2001; Heimann 1994; Moldenhauer and Steinkopff 2001). Anglo-Saxon scholars have also been very active in this field, as well as in GDR history in general, in particular around the DEFA Film Library at the University of Massachusetts Amherst in the United States.[16] In French academic circles, where research on the topic has been scarce, East German cinema is treated within German cinema more globally.[17] The publication of historian Cyril Buffet's work in 2008 finally offered an overview of the history of the DEFA Studios in French (Buffet 2008).

Two principal characteristics emerge from these publications. First, research themes have evolved over time: a predominantly political approach, focused on the relationship between feature filmmakers and the regime, has given way to research on social and cultural history (Heimann 1991, 1994), seeking to more accurately reflect the role of fictional cinema in the evolution of East German society (Feinstein 2002). In this context, documentary film has not been entirely neglected.[18] The vast panorama devoted to this genre in 1996 by Günter Jordan and Ralf Schenk has opened up multiple avenues of research, as have the works published by the Haus des Dokumentar Films in Stuttgart (Jordan and Schenk 1996; Zimmermann 1995). Second, there are monographs in which the sole comparison envisaged is that between the two Germanys, reflecting to some degree the dominance of German scholars in this field of study and associated with work on specific memories (Kötzing 2013; Steinle 2003; Zimmermann and Moldenhauer 2000).

More recent publications, however, attest to a growing interest in the history of the global circulation of East German films (Byg 1999; Lindenberger 2009; Val 2012; Wedel and Elsaesser 2011; Wedel et al. 2013). Taking a cultural-historical approach to cinema, this study participates in this same commitment to openness. It seeks to move beyond questions of representation alone and to focus on the technical, economic, and political conditions of cinematic production in the GDR, in comparison to conditions elsewhere and incorporating, insofar as is possible, research on its reception (Ory 2004).

The choice to focus on documentary film—a valuable and intricate source for historians—also presents challenges (Moine 2010a). It is important to understand East German film, both fictional and documentary, in all its complexity—as a set of practices and productions that are anchored not only in domestic issues facing East German society and government but also in competitive Cold War cultural relationships on an international scale. Considering only the GDR would, in fact, run the risk of confining our analysis to

the stakes involved in relations between dominant and dominated, between artists and authorities,[19] without unshackling it from a reductive interpretation of allegiance, propaganda, and loyalty toward the regime. The history of the Leipzig Festival thus offers the perfect opportunity to delve deeper into a cultural history of documentary cinema within an international context.

Toward a History of Festivals

While sociologists, geographers, and media studies scholars have already identified festivals as an important research topic, the subject has thus far not received much attention from historians.[20] Indicative of a new consideration of these cultural manifestations, however, is a proliferation of research projects. These include work on the history of music festivals in Salzburg and Prague and the influential theater festival in Avignon, founded in 1947 (Baecque and Loyer 2007; Charnay 2003; Fink 2009; Moine 2013; Petersen and Mazza 2011). With regard to film festivals, in particular, it is notably Anglo-Saxon researchers in the fields of media studies or information and communication sciences who have paved the way, primarily focusing on the dramatic increase in the number of festivals over recent decades (Elsaesser 2005; De Valck 2007; De Valck and Loist 2009).[21] Over the course of the 2000s, various groups of non-historians and research networks—in fields such as communications and media and film studies—were formed to gather the few studies that had surfaced in different institutions.[22]

In recent years, a historical approach to the subject that links political and cultural history has clearly evolved. In France, Loredana Latil's book (2005) on the Cannes Film Festival long remained a solitary example of work on the subject. Two recent publications—Stefano Pisu's work (2016), covering the period from the 1930s to the 1970s, and the coedited volume by Andreas Kötzing and Caroline Moine (2017), spanning the Cold War period—testify to the fruitfulness of such an approach to film festival history.

We can identify three principal challenges raised by cultural histories of film festivals.[23] The first is the need to study culture in its broadest sense. Historian Akira Iriye proposes a definition of culture that balances representations, ideologies, and mindsets, with the reproduction and dissemination of symbolic objects that constitute the "creation and communication of memory, ideology, emotions, lifestyles, scholarly and artistic works, and other symbols" (Iriye 1991: 215). One question raised by the study of an international festival is, in fact, to what extent the exchange of symbolic products can induce a change in representational system—on one or both sides of national borders—or whether the opening of the representational system abroad generates the desire to exchange symbolic products.

The history of an international festival also underlines the incontrovertible analytic significance of different spatial and temporal scales. It demonstrates the extent to which cultural policies are intertwined at the national and international level. In the case of Leipzig, considerations of scale allow us to better understand the forms assumed by the search for an East German identity—an identity that was bound not only to the question of the regime's legitimacy vis-à-vis its citizens but also to the issue of international recognition. The festival format—with its mostly annual rhythm—also allows us to integrate the temporal scale. To borrow a geological image, studying the Leipzig Festival consists in taking samples from the soil of East German society, observing its evolution at regular intervals, and analyzing different strata—cultural, social, and political—in a dynamic and progressive manner; these geological cores ensure that we avoid the pitfalls of the univocal or teleological vision that can dominate when the collapse of the GDR is regarded as the observational starting point.

Finally, film festivals raise the question of how political entities instrumentalized images during the Cold War and offer an opportunity to analyze various actors operating within these highly complex relations of power. Several successive circles are apparent here.[24] The first—and most frequently studied—are actors in the field of cultural diplomacy; these were clearly represented at the Leipzig Festival, which was a cultural event financed and organized by the state. The second—which integrates both diplomatic and nondiplomatic, official and unofficial actors—makes it possible to grasp cultural exchanges more comprehensively. Transnational cultural movements, in which cultural transfers and exchanges are developed, form a third and final circle.[25] The Leipzig Festival is located right at the heart of these different dynamics.

Writing the History of the Leipzig Film Festival

The Leipzig Festival's history, from its inception in 1955 to German unification in 1990, offers a number of research perspectives that suggest fresh ways of looking at international cultural and diplomatic geography, as well as at the role of the GDR on the European and international stage.[26] A border and contact zone, a place for screenings as well as exchanges and meetings between guests from all round the globe, Leipzig also had its own dynamics. The festival thus represents an observational vantage point of exceptional value for the historian, thanks to its programming, its staging, and the responses and memories it generated.

Analyzing the films selected in different categories, the prizes awarded, and the official and unofficial debates that took place enables us to follow the major international trends in documentary filmmaking during this period—

defense or denunciation of engaged documentary (*cinéma militant*); shift toward Direct Cinema; evolution of sociological documentary; increased competition with television—and the extent to which GDR productions remained isolated from these trends or not, as the case may be (Aitken 2005; Barnouw 1993; Gauthier 1995). In addition to grasping the numerous interactions involved in the process of making documentary films in the GDR, this study gives us a new way to approach the central issue represented by the Soviet model, which was pervasive across the East Bloc during the Cold War (Jarausch and Siegrist 1997). Throughout the festival's history, the evolution of documentary film in the USSR can effectively be traced right up until the highly fruitful glasnost period, in the latter half of the 1980s. Leipzig's history also reveals the importance of alternative points of reference for documentarists from the GDR and the East, for example, post-1958 Cuban cinema.

The research for this investigation relied on three major types of sources—written, film, and oral archives—available mainly in Berlin and the Brandenburg region of Germany. The almost complete opening of the East German archives following German unification is a well-known fact. Such an "archival revolution," however, did not come about without some technical hitches and methodological misgivings (François 1995; Weber 1992; Wolle 1992). Working in the written archives of the GDR entails being confronted with not just a pile of documents but also a monotonous uniformity in the tone of the sources, because of the political doublespeak of the East German administration.[27] The government and party archives, as well as those of the Leipzig Festival—all conserved in Berlin—nevertheless enabled me to trace the history of the festival, from the preparatory stages all the way to its critical reception, including all that unfolded in between.

The films screened at Leipzig naturally constitute the second set of sources used for this study. Putting together a corpus of nearly 150 films—which are, in part, kept in Berlin film archives or sometimes available through the filmmakers—was no easy feat.[28] The first task was to give an account of the diverse aspects of East German documentaries from 1949 to 1990—from films serving the regime's strategic discourse to censored films and films caught in between: uncensored works that received only very limited distribution.[29] The second task was to develop a list of non-German documentaries screened at the Leipzig Festival that evoked particular attention among foreign guests; these films make it possible to decisively inscribe the East German example into an international context.

Obviously, not all films are of equal importance for the present study. As a result, the method of analysis differs according to the role played by a given documentary in the general argument. Above all, I was concerned with highlighting the complexity of the term "propaganda." We would be mistaken to regard East German documentaries as exclusively a series of commissioned

works, of indiscriminate propaganda in which filmmakers were simply anonymous pawns of an institutional system, mere executors devoid of any personal vision. We must go beyond this simplistic designation for DEFA documentaries, if only because propaganda was sometimes claimed by filmmakers from both blocs, even assuming positive connotations, precisely in the field of documentary filmmaking (Hahn 1997).[30] It is thus necessary to resituate these films in their sociopolitical context of production and distribution in order to establish a "more nuanced view of how [these images] were conceived and perceived" (Véray 2003). It is in this spirit that certain documentaries in the corpus, for which I had access to archives and sources, were analyzed with particular attention.[31]

I collected oral testimonies, the third set of sources, during my research stays, mainly in Berlin and in its environs. I conducted a series of interviews with twenty-one people: former DEFA film directors, technicians, dramaturgs, and erstwhile festival directors as well as French and East and West German journalists. Two groups can be distinguished: those who have overcome the turning point of 1989–1990, who have worked out their past and speak of it with a certain detachment, and those who employ the same language and apply the same interpretative grids as in the past.

Of course, we must remain conscious of the specificity of oral sources. The cognitive value of oral memoirs should not be confused with the immediate transmission of a lived past; rather the value is in the opportunity that the interview affords to scrutinize how the past is constructed, how meanings are attributed a posteriori, and how lived experiences are assimilated (*Verarbeitung*)—in a word: subjectivity (Perks and Thomson 1998; Wierling 2002). Using oral sources is particularly important in the case of the GDR, however; a series of processes essential to comprehending the lived history of the GDR were so clandestine that they were invisible to the surveillance apparatus, as highly developed and inquisitive as it was.[32]

The challenge is to understand when and how the internal disaffection felt by many in the GDR operated, the shift from total or partial adherence to resigned submission and then the mere semblance of loyalty (François 1995). Moreover, in an authoritarian state in which taboos and prohibitions prevented the expression of opinions contrary to official discourse, the written sources that survive especially privilege the voice of the regime and are therefore also skewed. Oral testimonies thus constitute a reservoir of perspectives that give rise to an alternative and multilayered image that overlaps the one furnished by written sources. And, at the end, a festival thrives on encounters, individual and collective experiences, and memories; whether a festival lives or dies is mostly determined by the impressions it leaves behind.

Historical Overview

This volume seeks to weave questions of temporal and spatial scale throughout an in-depth exploration of the Leipzig Film Festival. It follows a generally chronological schema whereby it should be noted that "chronological inflexions, or even breaks" in the festival's history do not entirely coincide with those of GDR politics (Kott 2000: 322–23); for example, the landmark dates in the festival's institutional history were 1964 and 1973, corresponding with the arrival of new festival directors who were charged with the task of modifying future festival policy. This chronological approach is overlaid by thematic focal points that allow us to trace broader developments in documentary cinema and international relations, as well as in the GDR.

The Leipzig Documentary Film Festival gradually took shape from 1949 to 1964 and was affected by the overlapping influences of inter-German relations, East and West Bloc policies, and East German intellectuals who were anxious to resist cultural isolation in the evolving political climate of the Cold War. In 1964, the entry of GDR television as the official organizer led to the professionalization of the Leipzig Festival, which was increasingly called upon to actively contribute to the GDR's cultural and diplomatic offensive in the international arena. Partly in response to the aftermath of de-Stalinization, the prevailing international ambience reflected the political effervescence and globalized culture of the 1960s, which were also apparent in various forms of cinematic new waves.

After the GDR finally achieved widespread diplomatic recognition in 1973, it became necessary to deliberate on fresh challenges confronting the Leipzig Festival; dividing lines between East German society and cinema, on the one hand, and ongoing political and cultural developments, on the other, were becoming increasingly permeable in the East, as in the West. Over the course of the 1980s, the documentary films being produced at DEFA underwent profound changes, in line with the international momentum initiated by the institution of reforms in the USSR as of 1985. Finally, in 1989 East Germany's peaceful revolution played out not only on the streets of Leipzig but across the screens of its festival as well.

Notes

1. As of March 1967, Marker had participated in shooting a film on the workers' occupation of a factory in Besançon, in the French provinces; he worked side by side with worker-filmmakers, who then formed the Medvedkin Group in December 1967.

2. Much later, Marker paid Medvedkin a marvelous cinematic tribute in his 1992 film *Le tombeau d'Alexandre* (*The Last Bolshevik*).
3. See the official film festival website: http://www.dok-leipzig.de/.
4. Over time, the festival has had different names: Leipziger Kultur- und Dokumentarfilmwoche (1955–1956); Internationale Leipziger Dokumentar- und Kurzfilmwoche (International Leipzig Documentary and Short Film Week; 1960–1967); Internationale Leipziger Dokumentar- und Kurzfilmwoche für Kino und Fernsehen (International Leipzig Documentary and Short Film Week for Cinema and Television; 1968–1989); Internationale Leipziger Filmwoche für Dokumentar- und Animationsfilm (International Leipzig Film Week for Documentary and Animated Film; 1990); Internationales Leipziger Festival für Dokumentar- und Animationsfilm (International Leipzig Festival for Documentary and Animated Film; 1991–present). Informally, the festival was often simply referred to as the Dokfilmwoche; it is now referred to as DOK Leipzig.
5. See Dubosclard et al. 2002; Paulmann 2005.
6. See Berghahn 2004; Caute 2003; Gienow-Hecht 2009b; Rolland 2004; Saunders 1999.
7. See Gienow-Hecht 2009a; Major and Mitter 2006; Sirinelli and Soutou 2008; Vowinckel et al. 2012.
8. See Iriye 1991.
9. On this vast topic see "The Cold War and the Movies" 1998; Buffet and Maguire 2014; Niemeyer and Pfeil 2014; Shaw and Youngblood 2010; Lindenberger 2006; Mattelart 1995.
10. See Bispinck et al. 2005; Eppelmann et al. 2003; Lindenberger 2014; Port 2013. For an overview of historiographic issues, see Kott 2002.
11. See Kott 2000, 2011; Lüdtke 1998.
12. See Carter 2001.
13. In France, see Hähnel-Mesnard 2007; Poumet 1990.
14. There were also army studios and a studio that specialized in the production of publicity films, but these remained marginal. One must also note the films that were made clandestinely—amateur films and other forms of an underground cinema—which developed especially as of the 1970s with the emergence of new technologies, such as Super-8 and video (Fritzsche and Löser 1996; Löser 2011; interview by the author with Thomas Heise, Nyon, Switzerland [25 April 2002]).
15. SED stands for Sozialistische Einheitspartei Deutschlands, the Socialist Unity Part of Germany, a pillar of the governing regime created in 1946 by the forced fusion of the Socialist Democrat Party (SPD) and the Communist Party (KPD) of Germany in the Soviet Occupation Zone.
16. See Allan and Sandford 1999; Byg and Moore 2002; Hake 2002.
17. Béatrice Fleury-Villatte (1995) compares East and West German feature films; Bernard Eisenschitz (1999) integrates DEFA into his history of German cinema; Matthias Steinle (2008) devotes a chapter to the GDR.
18. In the West before 1989, Ernst Opgenoorth (1984) published *Volksdemokratie im Kino. Propagandistische Selbstdarstellung der SED im DEFA-Dokumentarfilm, 1946–1957;* we must also note post-1990 publications that started before 1989, such as *Erprobung eines Genres: DEFA-Dokumentarfilme für Kinder, 1975–1990* (Jordan 1991).
19. On the issues surrounding commissioned art, see Flacke 1995.
20. In France, see Ethis 2001 and Wallon 2010.

21. For a panorama of recent studies on film festivals, see Blahova 2014; Iordanova 2013; Vallejo 2014; De Valck et al. 2016.
22. See the resource provided by the Film Festival Research Network (FFRN), created by Skadi Loist and Marijke De Valck, which features a large and regularly updated online bibliography. (http://www.filmfestivalresearch.org/).
23. For an analysis of the stakes involved in the history of art festivals, in general, see the proceedings of an international colloquium held in France in 2011 (Fléchet et al. 2013).
24. See Ory 2003.
25. See the pioneering works of Espagne and Werner 1988; Werner and Zimmermann 2004.
26. This book evolved out of a series of research projects on the Leipzig Festival and other film festivals during the Cold War that the author undertook starting in 2000. They formed the basis for a 2005 thesis at the Université Paris 1 (Moine 2005a), as well as the original French version of this volume (Moine 2014a). Preceding such work, however, it is important to note the work of Christiane Mückenberger, who directed the festival from 1990 to 1993 (Mückenberger 1996). Since 2005, the festival has also been the topic of two other works. The first was conducted in information and communications sciences by Martini (2007); this monograph is problematic in several ways, especially its rather uncritical view of the complex relations between the festival and the dominant regime and the absence of any analysis of the films themselves. The work of historian Andreas Kötzing is of entirely different quality; his 2004 Master's thesis centers on the Leipzig Festival in the 1970s, while his 2013 dissertation compares the Leipzig and Oberhausen festivals from 1954 to 1972.
27. Furthermore, not all document collections are accessible yet. In addition to routine regulations limiting access to archives less than thirty years old, certain judiciary archives have not yet been made entirely accessible. See Mouralis 2008.
28. For a detailed filmography of DEFA documentary films, see Gerull and Grusser 1996. The best work to trace the principal historical stages of East German documentary filmmaking is the reference work edited by Jordan and Schenk 1996.
29. Issues with access to films make the question of an exhaustive overview moot. Please see Appendix I on Archival Sources. Directors gave me copies of some films, allowing me to fill in certain blank spots; in this regard, I would particularly like to thank Gitta Nickel, who enabled me to watch the totality of her films on VHS videocassettes, as well as Günter Jordan.
30. Also see the positions of filmmakers like John Grierson from Britain.
31. See, for example, Lindeperg 2014. This historian was able to find sources and archives that allowed her to retrace all aspects of the process of creating a film, from its early history as a project to its screening and reception. Clearly, this is not always possible.
32. On the complexity of using oral sources that face historians of the GDR, see Niethammer 1985.