

Chapter Title: Television and Obstinacy

Chapter Author(s): Christian Schulte

Book Title: Alexander Kluge

Book Subtitle: Raw Materials for the Imagination

Book Editor(s): Tara Forrest

Published by: Amsterdam University Press

Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctt46n2tx.23>

---

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <https://about.jstor.org/terms>



This content is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International License (CC BY-NC-ND 4.0). To view a copy of this license, visit <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>.



Amsterdam University Press is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Alexander Kluge*

JSTOR

# Television and Obstnacy<sup>1</sup>

Christian Schulte

They are incompatible with the notions about genre that exist in television. The 'culture journals' of Alexander Kluge define themselves deliberately as *counter-productions*, as draft projects aimed against the dumbing-down tendencies of the medium and the attention deficits that go with it. Instead of reporting on grand cultural events in the same old standardised forms, as is usual in other journals, Kluge opts for variety and interconnectivity (*Zusammenhang*). In a programmatic statement, he says that the point is '[to] develop forms that can survive inside this impossible situation which destroys expression. These will probably be short forms, but ones that produce so many sequences among themselves and rely so much on the technique of variation – which is also a technique of difference – that in this way very simple and extensive things can be retold'.<sup>2</sup>

What Kluge is describing here is nothing less than a far-reaching experimental disposition to which, with each programme, a further building block, a further perspective, can be added. To describe, without wanting to pin it down, this spinning out of threads – in principle an unfinished process – this rampant flowering that is rhizoid and undirected, one could speak of an *audiovisual essay*, particularly since the style of the essay has long ceased to be identical with a genre of its own, but is rather articulated ubiquitously in all sorts of other forms and media.<sup>3</sup> Of course, this concept would only apply to Kluge's films (beginning perhaps with *DEUTSCHLAND IM HERBST/GERMANY IN AUTUMN*) and television journals, although the theoretical works written jointly with Oskar Negt (I am thinking, for example, of the monumental montage *Geschichte und Eigensinn*) are also *essays* on the 'political economy of the labour force'.<sup>4</sup> And Kluge's narrative prose works, now collected in *Chronik der Gefühle*,<sup>5</sup> also display numerous essayistic features, above all the repeated overlapping of narration and reflection (and clear references to Montaigne, Musil, Benjamin and Adorno). So we are talking about parts of an overall project that is rooted in the identity of the author. And it is precisely this notion of the author with which Kluge laconically characterises his own praxis: an author is someone who does something autonomous.

There are doubtless authors who use their status as writers or film-makers to mark a separation from their readers and viewers. But for Kluge authorship is a collective quantity, a simple condition of entering into a dialogue. To be an author is for him to behave and to express oneself authentically according to one's relationship to reality and to circulate publicly the testimony of this living

experience. Authorship in this understanding of it is dependent on response and participation, on cooperation. For this reason all aesthetic procedures in his programmes are directed against the medium's conventions, against the illusion of completeness, of the finished, the perfect. Like his films, his television work has the 'character of a construction site',<sup>6</sup> whose fragmentary forms do not permit a passive reception. The viewer is absolutely challenged to behave autonomously and – like the author – to appropriate the coarse-meshed offerings as the raw material of his own experience. It is a basic part of Kluge's authorial strategy to put pressure on the viewer's 'muscles of the imagination',<sup>7</sup> in order to make possible a more complex understanding and an increased self-awareness.

In these programmes vertical and horizontal cuts are made, in overlapping 'mixed forms',<sup>8</sup> through present and past; the most disparate and apparently insignificant details from film, theatre and music history and from current affairs, brain research, sociology, philosophy, anthropology, and from such *exotic* disciplines as physiognomy are brought together in ever-changing connections – open constellations whose individual elements have not congealed into ahistorical information, as they are in other programmes where they are presented as consumable culture. The design of the programmes could not be more varied: alongside the conversations are montages or collages of visual, musical and textual fragments, which not only reference the most disparate cultural traditions but also present parts of his own film and literary oeuvre in ever-changing contexts. The images are electronically treated in manifold ways: diverse split-screen techniques divide the screen into separate fields in which a number of images can be seen simultaneously or the same motif is shown from different perspectives; fade-in windows repeat – changing between positive and negative – the full picture in miniature; interpolated titles and circular fades reactivate the feeling of the silent film; images are reproduced in time-lapse, layered in the manner of a palimpsest, turned like pages, mirrored, coloured and overlaid by grids – Kluge leaves no stone unturned to deprive the images of their immediacy, to direct attention to their media origin and to engrave on them in a sense – against all squaring – their own *Beyond*.

This fundamental scepticism regarding the image becomes most evident when – occasionally throughout a whole programme – only letters are to be seen on the screen, whose graphic arrangement indicates a last ironic flicker of iconicity, in actuality stating that not only texts but also images demand to be *read*. For in this Kluge is at one with the avant-gardists Brecht, Benjamin and Adorno: the reality of the twentieth century can no longer be perceived in the image alone, the reproduction can never be one of relationships, but only ever a view, an external view. He likes to quote Brecht's saying about reality having slid into the functional, and discovers alongside the functional a half dozen other physical states in which one can encounter reality.<sup>9</sup> Two photographs of

skyscrapers that Kluge (in the 1983 essay 'Die Utopie Film'<sup>10</sup>) provided with captions are like a late echo of the emblematics of the *War Primer*. One caption reads: 'A media firm. One cannot see it. The typical thing about it is that there is nothing typical that depicts it'. The other says: 'The Paramount Palace on Broadway. That what happens in this building is not simple, is visible'. For Kluge it is not a question of bringing out the *rational core* of the two giant enterprises: rather, his captions foreground the paradoxical nature of the depictions themselves, which purport to show something which cannot be shown, because the symbolic representations of these institutions are just as abstract as the economic processes that are carried out inside them. Kluge is interested in such 'skyscrapers'<sup>11</sup> of abstraction because they say something about the state of society and about the intensity with which life and the multifariousness of its expression are banished from public view. His aesthetic operations all come from the insight that reality presents an ensemble of variable relationships that must be read in different directions simultaneously, like texts written on top of each other.

## Ellipse and Puzzle

If one screens one of these programs today, what strikes one at first is that every kind of moderating, every direct address to the public, is abandoned. That was not always the case. In the early days of *10 vor 11* Sabina Trooger occasionally appeared as the announcer or moderator, although she acknowledged this as a specific media type with an ironic sideways glance. An example is the programme 'Aus der ersten Hälfte des 20. Jahrhunderts/Das Fliegerlied, Schlager von 1932' ('From the First Half of the Twentieth Century/The Airman's Song, the Hit of 1932'),<sup>12</sup> a fine example of Kluge's 'dramaturgy of brevity'<sup>13</sup> that he tries to put into practice in the form of vaudeville or circus-like performances. After a short film clip and the fading in of the song 'Flieger, grüß mir die Sonne' ('Airman, say hello to the sun for me'), Sabina Trooger is seen up close; drily she announces 'number 3', only to continue – after a dense montage sequence on the theme of '*Reichsrohrbahn*' – with numbers 7 to 10. Number 11 is also missed out, and with number 12 – a montage on Schönberg's opera *Moses and Aaron* with pictures of New Year's Eve 1932, clouds in time-lapse and another clip from a film already quoted in the first sequence – the programme finally comes to an end. As a viewer one is at first confused and has the feeling that one has missed something. One knows from experience that one will be reliably guided through the programme by the TV moderator, but now one must learn that this rule does not apply here, indeed that the incomplete programme announce-

ments are part of the programme's dramaturgy. One must think again, and then one might learn that the normal programme structure with moderator is by no means compulsory. The structure with announcer and moderator, the norm in programme design, turns out, in Kluge's work, to be *faulty*, incomplete. The omissions make it clear that the genres of television are *constructed*, and therefore are *alterable*, and its performances, aimed at effectiveness and a sense of completion, do not have any substance, but are based from the beginning on partitions, on exclusions (e.g. of spontaneity). Just as there is no essentially filmic narrative mode, so there is no form of programme presentation that is genuinely native to the medium of television. That the real world is more complex than a schematised form of representation can depict is a truism, but there is a difference between whether this distinction is itself a component of the media presentation or not.

The site of this self-reflection is for Kluge the staged empty space, the 'in-between'.<sup>14</sup> It directs the attention of the viewer to the diversity that lies beyond the screen and to one's own relation to reality. Kluge uses certain representational forms of television, but he alienates them in such a manner that their supposedly stabilised semiotic is taken away. The direct address to the audience was soon replaced by a technique that has since given the journals a high degree of recognisability: a line of print moving from left to right on the screen with short-hand indications of the programme's topic and a tableau – with various graphic foregroundings – that present the title. These elements provide, in the manner of a film's opening and closing credits, the framework for each programme.

First example: in the *Prime Time* programme "Im Zeichen des Mars"/Charakterpanzer und Bewegungskrieg' ('Under the sign of Mars/Character Armour and Mobile Warfare'),<sup>15</sup> dedicated to Heiner Müller on the occasion of his 65th birthday, we see a black screen into whose centre – in a kind of *vanitas* symbol – a strikingly colourful picture is faded in. At the same time there is a booming, monotonous, hectic music that henceforth – in various degrees of intensity – accompanies almost all of the visual montages. The static puzzle-image – like the *pictura* in Baroque emblematics – is completed by subtitles (*subscription*) that bring movement to the screen. The moving text appears, is briefly legible and disappears again. In white and red letters the following appears:

To armour = 'to make oneself insensitive to something'/Tank = 'battle vehicle with armour-plating and caterpillar tread'/Music Journal with *Heiner Müller* and the death and grind groups ABHORRENCE, ACROSTICHON, TOXAEMIA and DISGRACE.

All expectations created by these keywords come to nothing; as parts of a quasi-emblematic ensemble of images, music and texts, they yield instead a 'hybrid structure'<sup>16</sup> with overlapping and contradictory meanings. A programme on

the topic of war as a music journal? A music journal with Heiner Müller? And last but not least: with *this* music? If the definition of terms that lead in leitmotif fashion into the programme, taken by themselves, at first accommodate the viewer's need for clarity, for decidable meaning, the result of these words is all the more irritating as they confront him with the possibility that the human reaction of armouring oneself has something to do with those steel battle vehicles, that he himself is just such a steel battle vehicle, a tank. The montage that follows, with multi-perspective cut-up images of war, of various types of tank, allegorical pictures in miniature about the ego and the id, and brief dialogue snippets with Heiner Müller, supported by the intensity of the music, raises the bewildering question of whether perhaps war is perpetually raging, within and without, whether our inherited character-armour is not itself a warlike gesture that is only waiting for a chance to express itself.

Second example: The irritating but at the same time stimulating episode of *News & Stories* with the sociologist Niklas Luhmann<sup>17</sup> also begins with such a puzzle, with the sketch of a mirrored historical motif that can be read as an allegorical cipher for the dispositive structure of the dialogues. Beneath a dividing red diagonal bar the following moving text appears:

Niklas Luhmann is, with Jürgen Habermas, one of the great theoreticians of now-time/He is concerned with minima moralia of our ability to make distinctions/For example with 'parallel poetry', 'love', 'society', 'justice', Talcott Parsons, the devil, etc./Encounter with a public thinker in an intimate setting –

Then the title appears:

'Careful about understanding too quickly'/Talk Show with Niklas Luhmann on the *ability to make distinctions*

If one looks more closely at these running captions, one can recognise some other interventions characteristic of Kluge: the pragmatists Luhmann, Habermas and Parsons are mentioned by name; but interspersed are terms that, like bookmarks, evoke another – one could say oppositional – group of writers: the phrase 'now-time' is associated with the name and specifically the philosophy of history put forward by Walter Benjamin,<sup>18</sup> 'minima moralia' is the title of the famous collection of aphorisms by the philosopher Theodor W. Adorno, and by twice using the phrase 'ability to make distinctions', Kluge smuggles into the systems theorist's luggage a category that is central to his *own* thinking<sup>19</sup>, one that means something like *critical competence*,<sup>20</sup> the ability to differentiate. This does not so much define a position – which could be the case, since Kluge numbers Benjamin and Adorno among his 'super-rabbis'<sup>21</sup> – as outline a complex of starting points for ideas. But once again this happens in a gesture that raises

questions in the viewer's mind – insofar as he picks up the associations – questions such as: Are Luhmann and Habermas theoreticians of 'now-time', a term Benjamin uses in the sense of a messianic moment, that 'now of recognisability'<sup>22</sup> in which the present of a corresponding past recognises itself as intended? Is Luhmann concerned here with 'minima moralia' in Adorno's sense? With the 'ability to make distinctions in Kluge's sense? As outlined above, no fronts are being formed here; different directions are merely being indicated in which thought might go, possibilities of thinking, in other words. What use might be made of these is not postulated; that is left to the viewer.

One can read Kluge's putting together of diverse starting points for thought as a tentative disposition, a suggestion to the interested viewer to make his own mind up in the jungle of theory, for example read Luhmann in the light of Adorno, etc. Here, too, it is a matter of the lively manipulation of apparently irreconcilable schools of thought, whose frozen identities can perhaps, at some points, be thawed. One merely needs to work with them in an experimental way. The practical value of such an attitude would be precisely that 'capacity to make distinctions', that 'diacritical attentiveness'<sup>23</sup> that is Kluge's central concern. The constellation described above would be a model for this. Obviously not everyone will be able to work associatively with these hints or pointers, but that is another matter.

## Encounters in Private Mode

What we see and hear between the frame segments such as logo, text ribbon and title tableau is also not directed in an immediate way at the viewer; it is never designed to ingratiate itself. Rather, the viewer is witness to a process that has always already begun and has not come to a close at the end of the programme. It does not matter whether Kluge is conducting *pure* conversations or is arranging disparate fragments from the most diverse film, musical and textual traditions in a *wild* montage, or is producing hybrid crosses of both – what happens on the screen is for the most part independent of the reader's attention and thus enables him to behave autonomously as well, and to phase himself in and out. Kluge leaves it to the viewer to place his trust in a form of production which refrains utterly from the usual promises of practical usefulness and instead makes an offer that is purely product-oriented, an offer that either has a practical use or not.

The last keyword in the running captions in the Luhmann programme, 'Begegnung mit einem öffentlich denkenden Mann in privater Umgangsform' ('Encounter with a Public Thinker in Private Mode'), is programmatic for the kind of

conversation that takes place in Kluge's programmes. 'Private mode' stands for a nuanced, authentic way of speaking in the midst of the sterile sameness of the media – without the discount of a tailor-made unambiguousness aimed at consumability. The warning 'careful of understanding too quickly' (like the puzzling sketch) announces that the viewer should not expect a talk show of the kind that his experience has prepared him for. Kluge is convinced that the senses' need for interconnectivity (*Zusammenhang*), interest and curiosity is itself stimulated as long as there is no longer a guiding thread, no purported organic structure. Kluge himself, in his role as interviewer, is mostly present only through his voice from off-screen. His interlocutors are as a rule experts in a specific area or, as Frieda Grafe once characterised them, 'persons who have a specificity or an image':<sup>24</sup> film-makers like Peter Schamoni, Romuald Karmakar, Tom Tykwer and Christoph Schlingensiefel, actors like Corinna Harfouch, Katharina Thalbach or Sophie Rois, the writer Hans Magnus Enzensberger, the criminologist Joachim Kersten, the literature specialist Joseph Vogl, the composers Pierre Boulez and Wolfgang Rihm, the conductor Michael Gielen, such diverse philosophers as Peter Sloterdijk and Kluge's co-author Oskar Negt, the techno-DJs Paul Johnson and Jeff Mills, the congenial translator and Proust specialist Ulrike Sprenger and Peter Berling who slipped into the most varied roles. Kluge developed with Berling the improvised *fake-talk* programme to the point where it became a genre in itself.<sup>25</sup> There are, in addition, countless conversations with politicians, diplomats and military men, with historians, scientists and managers – they are all introduced as authors who passionately pursue an interest. Some of Kluge's long-time guests are no longer alive: August Everding, Hans-Friedrich von Homeyer (alias Erich Komorowski) and the dramatist Heiner Müller, with whom Kluge conducted perhaps the most enduring conversations, conversations that show what living communication can be.

Unlike Günter Gaus, whose programme *Zur Person* can be seen regularly on *News & Stories*, Kluge lets conversations run on; his associative technique, circling round a topic, makes up in a sense the *micrological* model of an aesthetic that is free from the fetishism of meaning, designed to enter into a dialogue with everything that has an individual face; or, in Kluge's words, 'nothing that has a material substance is to be institutionalised'.<sup>26</sup> In this way an encyclopedia of a special kind has come into being over the years; one will not find in it entries on *top performances*, cultural fetishes that are important to know; instead one gains insights into the processes of cultural production, into their motifs and contexts. Kluge's questions take detours via the apparently incidental and unspectacular, in order to set up atmospheric spaces, and again and again they remove thematic focal points into far horizons, in which his interlocutor's imagination can find room to move. These conversations follow the maxims: 'Each person concentrates on the other'<sup>27</sup> and 'The fact that the running-time is not cut short is



more important than any content'.<sup>28</sup> Under these conditions there quite often emerge spontaneous, self-regulated forms of speaking that bring to consciousness the most distant fragments of experience. The following dialogue with Heiner Müller demonstrates this in an exemplary way:

**Kluge:** Maybe if you describe for me what the moon is. It's of course the satellite of a planet. How would you characterise something like that, just try to enter into the planetary system.

**Müller:** The first thing would be that the moon is something that you shouldn't set foot on. First all the other planets, then the moon. The moon is something that one shouldn't colonise, that one shouldn't touch; you should just leave it the way it is, or let it go the way it goes. I'm speaking now in an associative way [...]

**Kluge:** But how would you begin to talk about the moon, would you begin with the sun, would you begin with the planets, would you begin with the stars? You've just begun by saying one should not set foot on it. I think that's very consistent, but just try to describe, say for a stranger, what it is.

**Müller:** The moon is something you need to go to sleep. It's something you have to have in order to know when it's time to sleep.

By directing Heiner Müller's attention to the topic of the moon, asking him to talk about the planetary system and suggesting various approaches and narrative perspectives, Kluge opens up the aperture of his questioning so wide that the dramatist begins, in a quite 'unconcerned' way,<sup>29</sup> to build associations that in their turn evoke one memory after another: an early poem about the moon that is actually about an execution, a short text by Werner Riegel ('The moon over Poland is lovely/For the duration of a shot to the head'), the fact that his mother 'was moonstruck for a while', and finally the memory of his 'first experience of politics or history' in 1934, when

the bells were ringing because Hindenburg had died. And that was really strange, that was actually my first experience of politics or history. I was aware that there was something that meant a hiatus for the grown-ups. Something had finished, a kind of protection or [...]

**Kluge:** A sense of security [...]

**Müller:** [...] a sense of security had gone, and there was an unease, a fear, and everybody was standing by the fence listening to the bells.

**Kluge:** And what does this have to do with the moon?

**Müller:** For me it has something to do with the moon. I don't know why, I can't give a reason for it. The moon was something upsetting, but also something safe.<sup>30</sup>

This passage strikingly demonstrates Kluge's 'midwife's art',<sup>31</sup> an astonishing ability to stimulate the imagination of his interlocutor through unexpected changes of perspective – in this case through a motif that is semantically loaded. It is the ability to set in motion the work of memory, to retrieve long-forgotten experiences. What Kluge is interested in is the documentation of this 'living work',<sup>32</sup> which is no longer to be seen in the finished product, whether it is a film, a book or an opera performance. He seeks the removal of the separation between the public form of expression and the emotions, motifs and libidinous attachments of a life, which are richer than the historically conditioned compartmentalisations of public life, the workplace and the consciousness industry would have us believe.

## Sense of the Possible

This richness, encapsulated in human life stories, finds its way, according to Kluge, into feelings, desires, the imagination. Towards the normative power of the factual these human capacities behave obstinately, which means for Kluge anti-realistically. There lives within them a 'delight in the improbable',<sup>33</sup> a belief in the 'sense of the possible'<sup>34</sup> that refuses to recognise a predestined course. He would like to help this potential for protest to find expression, and for this reason he confronts so-called reality again and again with imaginary perspectives, he suspends momentarily the persuasiveness of facts, the illusion of inevitability. To do this he consistently brushes history against the grain, by inviting his interlocutors to look for analogies from history, e.g. taking as a starting point the question: 'What is a tank?'

**Kluge:** If you go back to Rome or Shakespeare, where do you find something of that sort?

**Müller:** Coriolanus has armour-plating.<sup>35</sup>

Or from nature:

**Kluge:** How does something like that look, visually, a human tide that disappears into the distance and swallows up the buildings?

**Müller:** It's not a meadow, no, it's an animal, something that sort of has a few undulations and arm movements.

**Kluge:** Is it a male animal?<sup>36</sup>

Or by confronting the status quo of historical processes with their promising origins, e.g. the stereotypical mainstream cinema of special effects with the 'primitive diversity'<sup>37</sup> of early film from pre-Hollywood times.

In this scanning of possibilities Kluge's approach is like that of the singer in the film *DIE MACHT DER GEFÜHLE/THE POWER OF FEELINGS* who, when asked why he always acts with a spark of hope in his expression, even though he knows that things will not turn out well, answers drily: 'They could, though'.<sup>38</sup> This utopian horizon of hope manifests itself in continual trials, experiments that take on a new colour with every dialogue. How something like this can look is shown in a short dialogue extract from a programme with the independent American director Richard Linklater:<sup>39</sup>

**Linklater:** But what I like is the idea that everything one can imaginatively conjure up actually exists, it all could exist. [Cut] I love the early cinema, Griffith is one of my favourite directors, Chaplin, Keaton, the whole silent film really.

**Kluge (off):** Cecil B. DeMille [...]

**Linklater:** I don't like DeMille so much, they don't interest me as much, Sternberg or King Vidor [...]

**Kluge:** You would actually develop cinema again from the beginning if there were a few of you. If you were a hundred people you would invent the art-form film all over again [...] start again from the beginning [...]

**Linklater** (laughing in astonishment): From the beginning, to begin again from the beginning [...]

**Kluge:** Yes, yes [...]

**Linklater:** Can one do that?

**Kluge:** Yes, of course, of course, yes.

Linklater's emphasis on the imaginary is directed doubtless at the narrative possibilities of film, with his declaration for the early American cinema he is expressing a nostalgic preference. A second invention of film never occurs to him. Kluge appropriates both statements, connecting them by means of a very visible slow cut, and translates them into the context of his own film utopia, the renewal of film out of its origins (for Kluge the two germ-cells are Lumière and Mé-

liès). That Kluge presents the renewal of film as a real possibility in such a matter-of-fact way at first disconcerts Linklater. He repeats the idea and then asks sceptically whether Kluge is in earnest. This short sequence demonstrates the contrast between Kluge's matter-of-fact support for the obviously impossible and the realism of probability espoused by the film-maker, who would doubtless use the representational potential of film in an imaginative way but who would hardly hit upon the idea of questioning the history of film itself. Kluge's trumping of the probable, from his insight into the deficient forms of cinema as culture industry and out of the wish for a different, richer film history, creates a free space which enables both his interlocutor and the viewer to imaginatively change perspective and look at the actual history of film in its historical relativity, i.e. as just one of many possible histories. With regard to film Kluge's utopia is: 'What has not been filmed criticises what *has* been filmed'.<sup>40</sup> Applied to history, this means in essence: 'What has not eventuated criticises what *has* eventuated, what has been rounded off as a finished product'; 'living work' criticises finished, dead work, the process criticises the result.

Kluge has often been censured for showing his less successful programmes. But this criticism is without substance, since it sets as the sole measure of quality the production ideals of the medium, these being solely oriented towards ratings. This merely reflects an obsession with numbers. The specific characteristic of these programmes is, under these circumstances, quickly lost sight of, namely the attempt to replace the representative modes of speech used in the public sphere with intimate, authentic registers and a temporal economy that is not worried about getting to the point quickly. This means building up the model (of course utopian, but for that very reason necessary) of a public interaction that is founded on the experiences of people cooperating through their senses: 'I believe that it is not the content, which in my programmes tends to be complicated, but the authenticity of the language used, that is judged by the viewers. That these are real people who are talking there. And that is what stays in the memory'.<sup>41</sup>

## Notes

1. Parts of this essay are taken from the article 'Die Rennstrecke der Hoffnung: Alexander Kluges Kulturmagazine', in *Medienwissenschaft* (no. 1, 1999), pp. 8-21.
2. Florian Rötzer, 'Kino und Grabkammer: Gespräch mit Alexander Kluge', in *Die Schrift an der Wand. Alexander Kluge: Rohstoffe und Materialien*, ed. Christian Schulte (Osnabrück: Rasch, 2000), pp. 31-43, here: p. 42.
3. Cf. Wolfgang Müller-Funk, *Erfahrung und Experiment: Studien zu Theorie und Geschichte des Essayismus* (Berlin: Akademie, 1995), p. 281.

4. Oskar Negt and Alexander Kluge, *Geschichte und Eigensinn* (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1993), p. 83 ff.
5. Alexander Kluge, *Chronik der Gefühle* (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 2000).
6. Alexander Kluge, *In Gefahr und größter Not bringt der Mittelweg den Tod: Texte zu Kino, Film, Politik*, ed. Christian Schulte (Berlin: Vorwerk 8, 1999), p. 132.
7. "'Ich liebe das Lakonische': Alexander Kluge im Gespräch", *Der Spiegel* (no. 45, 6 November 2000), pp. 336-340, here: p. 337.
8. Kluge, *In Gefahr und größter Not bringt der Mittelweg den Tod*, p. 58.
9. Thus 'the horizontal', 'the vertical', 'the imaginary' and 'the revolutionary'. Negt and Kluge, *Geschichte und Eigensinn*, pp. 510-514.
10. In Kluge, *In Gefahr und größter Not bringt der Mittelweg den Tod*, pp. 73-112, here: p. 100 ff.
11. Alexander Kluge, *Die Macht der Gefühle* (Frankfurt am Main: Zweitausendeins, 1984), p. 184.
12. *10 vor 11* (RTL, 17 October 1988).
13. Kluge, *In Gefahr und größter Not bringt der Mittelweg den Tod*, p. 57.
14. Alexander Kluge, *Die Patriotin: Texte/Bilder 1-6* (Frankfurt am Main: Zweitausendeins, 1979), p. 250.
15. *Prime Time* (RTL, 23 January 1994).
16. Christa Blümlinger, 'Zwischen den Bildern/Lesen', in *Schreiben Bilder Sprechen: Texte zum essayistischen Film*, ed. Christa Blümlinger and Constantin Wulff (Vienna: Sonderzahl, 1992), pp. 11-31, here: p. 23.
17. *News & Stories* (Sat1, 4 July 1994).
18. Cf. Walter Benjamin, 'Über den Begriff der Geschichte', in Walter Benjamin, *Gesammelte Schriften*, vol. I (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1974), pp. 701, 703.
19. This had already been indicated by the subtitle of the third book written with Oskar Negt: *Maßverhältnisse des Politischen. 15 Vorschläge zum Unterscheidungsvermögen* (Frankfurt am Main: S. Fischer, 1992).
20. Cf. Rainer Stollmann, *Alexander Kluge zur Einführung* (Hamburg: Junius, 1998), p. 131.
21. Kluge, *Die Macht der Gefühle*, p. 178.
22. Walter Benjamin, *Das Passagen-Werk*, in Walter Benjamin, *Gesammelte Schriften*, vol. V (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1982), p. 578.
23. Rudolf Kersting, *Wie dies Sinne auf Montage gehen: Zur ästhetischen Theorie des Kinos/Films* (Frankfurt am Main: Stroemfeld, 1989), p. 108.
24. Frieda Grafe, 'New Look: 13 filmische Momente', in *Geschichte des deutschen Films*, Wolfgang Jacobsen, Anton Kaes and Hans Helmut Prinzler eds. (Stuttgart/Weimar: Metzler, 1993), pp. 365-390, here: p. 390.
25. Cf. Alexander Kluge, *Facts and Fakes: Fernseh-Nachschriften*, ed. Christian Schulte and Reinald Gußmann (no. 1 'Verbrechen', Berlin, 2000; no. 2/3 'Herzblut trifft Kunstblut/Erster imaginärer Opernführer', Berlin, 2001).
26. Alexander Kluge, *Gelegenheitsarbeit einer Sklavin: Zur realistischen Methode* (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1975), p. 196.
27. Alexander Kluge and Heiner Müller, *Ich bin ein Landvermesser. Gespräche. Neue Folge* (Hamburg: Rotbuch, 1996), p. 7.
28. Kluge, *In Gefahr und größter Not bringt der Mittelweg den Tod*, p. 186.

29. Klaus Theweleit, 'Artisten im Fernsehstudio: unbekümmert', *Die Zeit* (18 August 1995).
30. Alexander Kluge and Heiner Müller, *Ich schulde der Welt einen Toten: Gespräche*, (Hamburg: Rotbuch, 1995), pp. 88-91.
31. Negt and Kluge, *Geschichte und Eigensinn*, p. 1011.
32. *Ibid.*, pp. 94-98.
33. Kluge, *Die Macht der Gefühle*, p. 227.
34. The category of the 'sense of the possible' is developed by Robert Musil in chapter 4 of his novel *Der Mann ohne Eigenschaften* (Reinbek/Hamburg, 1978), pp. 16-18. Kluge explains his affinity with Musil in Alexander Kluge, *Verdeckte Ermittlung. Ein Gespräch mit Christian Schulte und Rainer Stollmann* (Berlin: Merve, 2001), pp. 9-24. On Kluge's reception of Musil cf. also Guntram Vogt, 'Zum Zusammenhang von Ästhetik und Ethik im Essayismus Alexander Kluges', in *Augen-Blick* ('Versuche über den Essay-Film' no. 10 June, 1991), pp. 83-106, here: pp. 97-99.
35. Kluge and Müller, *Ich schulde der Welt einen Toten*, p. 87.
36. *Ibid.*, p. 59.
37. Cf. 'Dynamic Cinema/100 Jahre Kino/Wer ist wer im frühen Film?', *Prime Time* (RTL, 25 September 1994).
38. Kluge, *Die Macht der Gefühle*, pp. 77-79.
39. 'Durchbruch eines Außenseiters/Der Südstaaten-Regisseur Richard Linklater und sein Erfolgsfilm "Before Sunrise"', *Prime Time* (RTL, 11 June 1995).
40. Kluge, *In Gefahr und größter Not bringt der Mittelweg den Tod*, p. 60.
41. Astrid Deuber-Mankowsky and Giaco Schiesser, 'In der Echtzeit der Gefühle: Gespräch mit Alexander Kluge', in *Die Schrift an der Wand. Alexander Kluge: Rohstoffe und Materialien*, ed. Christian Schulte (Osnabrück: Rasch, 2000), pp. 361-369, here: p. 364. [See translation in this book, ed.]

*Translated by Philip Thomson*