PROJECTING HITLER:

REPRESENTATIONS OF ADOLF HITLER IN

ENGLISH-LANGUAGE FILM,

1968-1990.

DANIEL MACFARLANE

2004

PROJECTING HITLER:

REPRESENTATIONS OF ADOLF HITLER IN ENGLISH-LANGUAGE FILM,

1968-1990.

A Thesis Submitted to the College

of Graduate Studies and Research

in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements

for the Degree of Master's of Arts

in the Department of History

University of Saskatchewan

Saskatoon

By

Daniel Macfarlane

December 2004

PERMISSION TO USE

In presenting this thesis in partial fulfillment of the Master's of Arts Degree in the Department of History at the University of Saskatchewan, I agree that the Libraries of this University may make it freely available for inspection. I further agree that permission for copying this thesis in any manner, in whole or in part, for scholarly purposes may be granted by the professor or professors who supervised my thesis work or, in their absence, by the Head of the Department of History. It is understood that any copying or publication or use of this thesis or parts thereof for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission. It is also understood that due recognition shall be given to me and to the University of Saskatchewan in any scholarly use which may be made of any material in my thesis.

Requests for permission to copy or to make other use of material in this thesis in whole or part should be addressed to:

Head of the Department of History
University of Saskatchewan
Saskatoon, Saskatchewan
S7N 5A5

ABSTRACT

In the post-Second World War period, the medium of film has been arguably the leading popular culture protagonist of a demonized Adolf Hitler. Between 1968 and 1990, thirty-five English-language films featuring representations of Hitler were released in cinemas, on television, or on home video. In the 1968 to 1979 period, fifteen films were released, with the remaining twenty coming between 1980 and 1990. This increase reveals not only a growing popular fascination with Hitler, but also a tendency to use the Führer as a sign for demonic evil. These representations are broken into three categories – (1) prominent; (2) satirical; (3) contextualizing – which are then analyzed according to whether a representation is demonizing or humanizing.

Out of these thirty-five films, twenty-three can be labeled as demonizing and nine as humanizing, and there are three films that cannot be appropriately located in either category. In the 1968 to 1979 period, four films employed prominent Hitler representations, five films satirized Hitler, with six contextualizing films. The 1980s played host to five prominent representations, six satires, and nine contextualizing films. In total, there are nine prominent representations, eleven satires and fifteen contextualizing films. Arguing that prominent representations are the most influential, this study argues that the 1968 to 1979 period formed and shaped the sign of a demonic Führer, and its acceptance is demonstrated by films released between1980 and 1990. However, the appearance of two prominent films in the 1980s which humanized Hitler is significant, for these two films hint at the beginnings of a breakdown in the hegemony of the Hitler sign.

The cinematic demonization of Hitler is accomplished in a variety of ways, all of which portray the National Socialist leader as an abstract figure outside of human behaviour and comprehension. Scholarly history is also shown to have contributed to this mythologizing, as the "survival myth" and myth of "the last ten days" have their origins in historiography. However, since the 1970s film has arguably overtaken historiography in shaping popular conceptions of the National Socialist leader. In addition to pointing out the connections between film and historiography, this study also suggests other political, philosophical, and cultural reasons for the demonization of Adolf Hitler.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

DEDICATION

Many people in the Department of History at the University of Saskatchewan deserve my gratitude for being there to bounce ideas off of or to provide support, historically or psychologically. In particular, I would like to mention the other four people with whom I started the M.A. program: Bonnie Wagner, Nathan Elliott, Clay Poupart, and Darren Friesen. On both a professional and personal level, I would like to thank Professor John Courtney who has served as both a mentor and a friend, and provided me with work that not only kept money in my pockets (which turned out to be handy for buying all the films for my research) but allowed me to further develop the skills which have made this thesis possible.

There are many people who have "suffered" as much as I have from this thesis. I am lucky enough to have many people who have always supported me, especially my parents, Bill and Becky Macfarlane, and my brothers, Tim and Eric. I would also like to acknowledge my grandparents, Art and Erna Reimer, and Gladys Macfarlane. The person who has been the most instrumental in keeping me going has been Heidi Dixon, who somehow managed to put up with me over the course of my thesis work. Many other friends have kept my spirits up and took my mind off research, or gave me another point of view, including Clay Dubyk, Ryan Washenfelder, Brad Randall, Franco Soldo, Paul Clemens, Berkeley Buchko, Corey Wiebe, Rob Paul, and Chad Parenteau. In particular, I would like to thank Shaun Geisel and Tyler McKenzie.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter One:
Finding the Filmic Hitler

In the introduction to *Imagining Hitler*, Alvin H. Rosenfeld writes that his book is not about Hitler but, rather, about the "ghost of Hitler."[1] Given the plethora of publications about the former Nazi leader and his regime which seek to explain Hitler the man, one might inquire into the reasons for looking at his "ghost."[2] The amount of scholarly literature on Nazism is perhaps unparalleled by any other area of historical research, and to list the names of the historians, political scientists, sociologists, economists, anthropologists and philosophers who have provided studies of the Third Reich is almost impossible. While the historical picture of Hitler is by no means finalized or homogenized, the reading public has presumably been provided with every available source of information on, and every interpretation of, the former Führer. What need is there for a "ghost" when the actual man can be put at our fingertips?

By "ghost" Rosenfeld was referring to what he saw as a Hitler myth in post-Second World War popular imagination, a myth that stemmed from a fascination with the Nazis that seemed to be in some ways even increasing and intensifying.[3] This myth was not static, but evolving, as the history of Nazism has "become so plastic to the contemporary imagination as to be almost whatever one would like it to be."[4] The task of charting this pliable and changing conception of the Nazis, articulated in the person of

---

[1] Alvin H. Rosenfeld, *Imagining Hitler* (Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1983), xii.
[2] Among the many works directly on Hitler, the most notable include Hugh Trevor-Roper, Alan Bullock, Walter Görlitz and Herbert A. Quint, Hans Bernd Gisevius, Werner Maser, Joachim Fest, Percy E. Schramm, John Toland, Robert Waite, and Ian Kershaw (all fully listed in bibliography). For more comprehensive bibliographic listings: David Nicholls. *Adolf Hitler: A Biographical Companion* (Santa Barbara, California: ABC-CLIO, 2000) or Louis L. Snyder, ed. *The Third Reich, 1933-1945*: *A Bibliographical Guide to German National Socialism* (New York: Garland Publishers, 1987).
[3] Rosenfeld, xii.
[4] Rosenfeld, xiv.

Hitler would, therefore, require delving into the sources of contemporary public imagination. Undoubtedly, popular representations of Hitler – novels, cartoons, television, film, etc. – over the past half-century have gone a long way toward shaping perceptions and memory concerning the Third Reich. At the same time, historical literature has also undoubtedly played a prominent role in shaping conceptions of Adolf Hitler.

The purpose of this study is to analyze film as a "new discourse" and demonstrate how Hitler has been portrayed in this discourse. The cinema has contributed significantly to the increased visibility of Hitler in popular culture and created and sustained many of the various images and myths surrounding the Nazi leader. I will identify and examine films featuring a fictional Adolf Hitler character released in America between 1968 and 1990. I divide these portrayals into two periods – 1968-1979 and 1980-1990 – and three categories – prominent, satirizing, and contextualizing. I then ascertain whether each period, category and film is "demonizing" or "humanizing," paying particular attention to how and why Hitler is demonized, and discuss what is revealed about popular conceptions of Adolf Hitler.

The concentration will be on English-language films released in America since the Second World War that employ an actor to portray Hitler, which essentially means that only fictional films that directly portray Hitler will be used, with fictional referring to films which do not use actual footage of Hitler but instead try to recreate him, and films referring to full-length efforts that were released either in theaters, on television, or for purchase/rental. Furthermore, I will concentrate on film between 1968 and 1990. The logic for choosing this period involves the ease in acquiring films from this time period,

the relative increase in movies which feature Hitler, and the fascinating nature of the representations of Hitler over the time span. The reason for featuring only post-Second World War fictional films is to ascertain how Hitler is remembered; to borrow from the title of a John Lukacs book, to search for the "Hitler of History."[5] Ron Rosenbaum has also provided an exemplary study of those who study Hitler – explaining the Hitler explainers, as he labels it – and it is assumed here that the writing of history, especially about Hitler and Nazism, is often influenced as much by contemporary issues as historical ones.[6] While there will not be an attempt to dissect the individual motives and reasons for Hitler representations to near the same extent or in the same manner as Rosenbaum, the idea of explaining the Hitler explainers is certainly a motivating and orienting force.

The decision to consider only English-language films is based primarily on practical and pragmatic reasons. Firstly, the majority of post-1945 motion pictures which feature Hitler are of American or British origins; in Charles P. Mitchell's eminently useful *The Hitler Filmography: Worldwide Feature Film and Television Miniseries Portrayals, 1940 through 2000,*[7] seventy-one of the one hundred films he has catalogued are American. Secondly, continental European films – especially German – that portray Hitler have already been extensively studied. For example, Hans-Jürgen Syberberg's *Our Hitler* (also screened under the title *Hitler: A Film From Germany*) has been the subject of numerous books and articles. Likewise, pre-1945 films – be they North American or

---

[5] John Lukacs, *The Hitler of History* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1998).
[6] Ron Rosenbaum, *Explaining Hitler: The Search For the Origins of His Evil* (New York: Random House, 1998).
[7] Charles P. Mitchell, *The Hitler Filmography: Worldwide Feature Film and Television Miniseries Portrayals, 1940 through 2000* (London: McFarlane & Company, Inc., 2002).

European – have also received adequate study, such as in the case of Chaplin's *The Great Dictator* or Nazi propaganda films.

Furthermore, a recent German film, *The Downfall* (2003), has generated considerable controversy within Germany and internationally because of the humanizing treatment of Hitler.[8] While the humanization of Hitler is a persistent question within Europe, especially in Germany, no study examines the humanization of Hitler in films released in America, a gap that needs to be filled. Two recent American films, *Max* (2002) and *Hitler: The Rise of Evil* (2003), prompted public questions about Hitler's humanity but have led to little academic study.[9]

Portrayals of Hitler in film can be grouped into three general conceptual categories: (1) prominent representations; (2) satirizing representations; (3) contextualizing representations. The first category, prominent representations, includes films that employ Hitler as a significant (and generally serious) character.[10] Films that satirize Hitler (generally comedies) and make him appear ridiculous, pathetic, or silly can also be identified. The contextualizing category (which will also be referred to as plot/literary device films) is essentially for left-over representations of Hitler – those movies where Hitler is employed primarily as a plot or literary device in order to provide context, and in these types Hitler is not given substantial screen time and there is little character development or introspection.

The purpose of using these three categories of film representations is to identify how film can demonize or humanize Adolf Hitler. Rosenfeld suggests that popular

---

[8] Araminta Wordworth, "Germans Flock to New Hitler Film, " *National Post*, 21 September 2004, A3.
[9] Jamie Portman, "Human Side of Hitler," *Saskatoon Star Phoenix*, 25 January 2003, E10.
[10] Overlap between these three categories is possible. The main example would be *The Producers*, which is a satire but could also be considered a prominent representation.

representations of Hitler in fictional literature tend either to "demonize" or "humanize"; that is, Hitler is either made into a monster unlike any other to be found in the history of humankind, or his wickedness is minimized and his destructive side is diminished or denied.[11] There are also variations within these extremes, for Rosenfeld has identified "the raging Hitler, the contrite Hitler, the artistic Hitler, the tender Hitler."[12] This humanizing/demonizing dichotomy will be applied to the aforementioned filmic categories. It is the various portrayals of Hitler as a human being that are under scrutiny here; while many of the films comment on various historical questions concerning Hitler, such as where his anti-Semitism stems from or when (or if) he ordered the Final Solution, these will only be addressed in regards to their relation to the humanizing/demonizing paradigm.

The term "demonize" is borrowed from Rosenfeld, although the following sub-categories will be employed: primordial evil (incapable of love or human relationships); diabolical evil (need to kill and destroy); insane evil (mentally insane or pathological); the evil of impersonal societal forces (variants of the *Sonderweg* thesis); the evil of supernatural forces (Fate, the Devil, a monster); and the evils of modernity (i.e. technology, capitalism, etc.). Conversely, to "humanize" means to explain and examine Hitler as a human phenomenon, instead of one outside of human behaviour and understanding. To be considered a humanizing portrayal, a Hitler representation must clearly show that the Nazi leader possesses genuine human characteristics that are intrinsic to humanity, such as love or compassion. These characteristics must not be superficial, play-acting, or ironic. Humanization portrays Hitler as someone who, even if

---

[11] Rosenfeld, xx.
[12] Rosenfeld, 4.

5

he is indeed the most evil human being in history, still exhibits normal human characteristics at times. For instance, if Hitler is shown to be capable of genuine love – be it for his dog, Eva, or Albert Speer – then he is humanized.

To further illustrate the meaning of humanizing and demonizing, they can be compared to the historicization and de-historicization of Hitler in scholarly historical literature. Historicization is referred to in this context as examining Nazism and Hitler through historical philosophies and practices instead of relying on metaphysical, ahistorical, and overly tautological explanations. In many ways, humanizing boils down to attempting to provide a rational explanation rather than an irrational, abstract interpretation. The humanization of Hitler is the cinematic equivalent of the historicization of Hitler in scholarly literature, although not identical. Both historicization and humanization seek to put Hitler within the realm of what can be labeled as rational human understanding and avoid viewing him as an abstract evil force without any tangible human or historical qualities.

As Rosenfeld noted, there are many variations within the extremes of humanizing and demonizing, and an inherent difficulty of using such measurements is to capture different nuances and levels while still being able to draw general conclusions. While the humanizing/demonizing dichotomy necessitates creating absolute categories where a film is *either* demonizing *or* humanizing, these two categories both run along a wide spectrum. A Hitler character can be both humanized and demonized within the same film, even within the same scene, and no film treats Hitler's humanity in exactly the same manner; hence there is not always a clear demarcation on this spectrum as to where demonization ends and humanization begins. Throughout this study I will use

qualifications such as *subtle* and *overt* in order to help distinguish between different types of humanization, or different types of demonization. However, these qualitative measurements will also be quantitatively summarized in order to draw conclusions.

The thirty-five films released between 1968 and 1990 featuring a Hitler character tend to directly or indirectly use him as a sign for demonic evil. Of the fifteen films featuring a Hitler representation released between 1968 and 1979, almost all are demonizing, regardless of whether Hitler is a prominent, contextual, or satirical character. In this time frame, four films employed prominent Hitler representations, five films satirized Hitler, joined by six contextualizing (or plot/literary device) films. Moving into the 1980-1990 period, filmic representations of Hitler increase to twenty and the majority continue to be demonizing. The 1980s played host to five prominent representations, six satires, and nine contextualizing films. In total, there are nine prominent representations, eleven satires and fifteen contextualizing films. Out of these thirty-five films, twenty-three can be labeled as demonizing and nine as humanizing. There are also three films that cannot be appropriately located in either category. It is clear that Hitler as a cinematic sign represents evil; however, the 1980s do reveal the beginning of a breakdown in the previously monolithic image of Hitler.

This sign reflects and influences the general public's conception of Hitler, and even historiography itself. Respected historian Saul Freidländer has suggested that:

> during the seventies, film and literature opened the way to some sort of 'new discourse.' Historiography followed and the mid-eighties witnessed heated debates about the new interpretations . . . and, in more general terms, about the proper historicization of National Socialism.[13]

---

[13] Saul Friedländer, ed., *Probing the Limits of Representation: Nazism and the Final Solution* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1992), 2.

Friedländer's statement concerning "new discourse" is ambiguous, although I contend that he was referring to the important and growing role popular culture mediums played in explaining and shaping conceptions of Hitler, and the attendant themes and myths surrounding Hitler that grew out of these new portrayals. Many of these themes and myths had their roots in scholarly literature from previous decades,[14] but in the 1970s film went farther in appropriating Hitler as a symbol and stating unequivocally that he was a monster. Furthermore, while historiography tended to focus on Hitler's rise to power, filmic portrayals cast more attention on the last six years of his life. [15] Additional ways in which film representations could be labeled as providing a "new discourse" include the use of satire to present Hitler and non-academics (such as screen-writers, directors, and producers) engaging in assessments of Hitler.

Historians have put forth a variety of points of view concerning Hitler and Nazism, which have generated a number of lively debates, especially since the 1980s.[16] While the cinematic Hitler provides strong evidence of this "new discourse" there are also many similarities between film and historiography. Although there is not room in

---

[14] The most influential appears to be Hugh Trevor-Roper's *The Last Days of Hitler* (New York: Berkley Publishing Corp., 1947).

[15] Lukacs, 14.

[16] The most prominent historiographical issues include the "intentionalist-functionalist" dispute, the various forms of the Sonderweg theory, the *Historikerstreit*, and the Goldhagen dispute. Several works deal specifically with the *Historikerstreit*, including Alfred D. Low. *The Third Reich and the Holocaust in German Historiography: Towards the 'Historikerstreit' of the mid-1980s* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1994) and Peter Baldwin, ed. *Reworking the Past: Hitler, the Holocaust, and the Historians' Debate* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1990). For further information on issues surrounding the Goldhagen dispute consult: Fred Kautz, *The German Historians: Hitler's Willing Executioners and Daniel Goldhagen* (Montreal: Black Rose Books, 2003); and Geoff Eley, *The "Goldhagen Effect." History, Memory, Nazism: Facing the German Past (*Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2000). The "intentionalist-functionalist" dispute and the Sonderweg thesis, in addition to the Goldhagen dispute and the *Historikerstreit*, are also covered in several books dedicated to the historiography of Nazi Germany: John Hiden and John Farquharson, *Explaining Hitler: Historians and the Third Reich* (New Jersey: Barnes & Noble, 1983); Ian Kershaw, *The Nazi Dictatorship: Problems & Perspectives of Interpretation*, 4th ed. (New York: Oxford University Press, 2000); and Roderick Stackelberg, *Hitler's Germany: Origins, Interpretations, Legacies* (New York: Routledge Press, 1999)

this study to undertake a full account of Hitler in historiography, there are important correlations. Firstly, the image of a demonic Hitler grew out of the seminal works on the Nazi leader from the immediate post-war decades (and, of course, conceptions of Hitler while he was still alive). Intertwined with the demonic Führer are the "last ten days" and "survival" myths, which were originally propagated by scholarly writers and then re-worked or elaborated upon by filmmakers. Secondly, filmic portrayals, consciously or not, provide insight concerning many of the main historiographical disputes, specifically the intentionalist-functionalist dispute;[17] by retaining the focus on Hitler as (generally) the prime author of the historical events, film has lent itself more strongly to the intentionalist camp. By retaining this focus on Hitler, film also differs from historical writing because scholars tended to move away from a Hitler-centric perspective after the 1970s.[18] Finally, while the 1980s show the entrenchment of Hitler as a sign for demonic evil on the one hand, on the other films engaging in less overt demonization and even in some cases subtle humanization are evident.

It is necessary to invoke a methodology for dealing with the medium of film as a historical source. The past several decades have seen cinema gain widespread acceptance among historians as a viable text of study; as such, there is no need to debate the validity of film as a historical source. Instead, it is necessary to employ a theory of studying popular culture, and more specifically, a theory for studying film. Furthermore, the focus will be on the text or artifact that the filmic representation constitutes. I argue that societal forces which shape these representations – such as those uncovered by Marxist

---

[17] Lukacs labels the intentionalists as those who argue that "Hitler's intentions and decisions were the evident applications of his ideological convictions" while functionalists attempted to prove "that Hitler's decisions were hesitating and that, largely because of the increasingly complicated and Byzantine conditions within the Nazi hierarchy, Hitler may have been, at least often, a 'weak dictator.'"
[18] Rosenbaum, xxvii.

and Feminist theory – are important but subordinated to analysis of the actual representations. Likewise, how the public perceives films – audience reception – is indispensable; the past half-century of popular culture theories have shown us that audience reception is dynamic and far from static and homogeneous.

However, a study of both the production and the reception of cinematic artifacts is beyond the means and resources of this undertaking (what is assumed out of necessity is that the audience does in fact receive Hitler just as the authors of the films intended, also known as the "theory of uniform influences"). One therefore needs to discern what the authors presented. While creating a paper audience obviously contradicts the manner in which films are received, it appears that in this case the study of the portrayal itself, and the intentions of those who created it, comes before a study of those who view it. While realizing that Hitler is not perceived in a uniform manner (one need only think of Neo-Nazis), the contention that Hitler has become a personification of evil in popular culture[19] – and perhaps more than any other historical figure has become the personification of an attribute, quality, or characteristic – makes it theoretically easier to focus on the production and authorship of the films.

Focusing on the portrayal of Hitler requires an approach to film that is suited for looking at one specific character or one specific scene, for Hitler appears in many movies in only a cameo role (i.e. *Indiana Jones and the Last Crusade*). In others, he is only a minor or subordinate figure (i.e. *Countdown to War),* while in others he is the prime protagonist (i.e. *The Bunker*, *Hitler: The Last Ten Days*). Interestingly, there a number of movies which portray Hitler indirectly – an actor playing an actor who is, in turn, playing

---

[19] Ron Rosenbaum, *Explaining Hitler: The Search For the Origins of His Evil* (New York: Random House, 1998), xxii.

Hitler (*The Producers*, *Full Frontal*), or clones of Hitler (*Boys From Brazil*). What is required, then, is a film theory that can view the scenes in which Hitler appears as separate from the rest of the film when his appearance is only minor, or can approach the entirety of a film when that is necessary.

The history of approaches to studying popular culture will not be given here, as there are a number of excellent studies which do so.[20] Of the many different methods , structuralism will be adopted. Since structuralism is broadly geared towards finding the signs that make up a structure and finding the meaning of these signs, it is ideal for deconstructing representations and images of Hitler on film. To be even more precise, semiotics – a variant of structuralism – will be employed. This approach allows one to consider the individual representations of Hitler and avoids the more abstract and less tangible methods of many other theories for studying popular culture. However, even semiotics can be too abstract if not removed from its context as a theory of mass culture and situated within its application to film theory.

James Monaco has produced one of the standard texts on film interpretation, *How to Read a Film: Movies, Media, Multimedia,* which not only explains film terminology and theory, but does so by couching the discussion within a semiotic approach. Since semiotics is employed in this study, it would be advisable to provide more detail about the term. Monaco takes his understanding of semiotics as it can be applied to film from Christian Metz and Umberto Eco, two of the most prominent film semioticians. Semiotics is a general term that covers many specific approaches to the study of culture *as* language, not *in* language. Film is viewed as a language, and this language can be

---

[20] For example, see in bibliography: Dominic Strintati; John Story; Shearon Lowery and Melvin L. De Fleur; and Douglas Kellner.

understood by the codes of cinema and society. The codes are what can be read in a film, and codes can be further broken down into subcodes.[21] These codes and subcodes can appear paradigmatically or syntagmatically – paradigmatic connotations are comparing a specific shot or scene to other *potential* ways to portray the same subject matter from the wide range of possible choices, while syntagmatic connotations involve comparison to other *actual* scenes or shots that precede or follow.[22] Essentially, paradigmatic choices are those made by the director on how to compose a specific scene and frame the subject matter from the choices with its "unrealized companions in the paradigm"[23]; for instance, the decision to film a character from a low angle or to shadow this character's face.

Since semiotics can cover many specific approaches, semiotics will be used because it focuses on the production of texts. Monaco explains that films communicate in essentially two different manners: denotatively and connotatively. Denotative meaning refers to something that "is what it is"; something that a viewer does not have to strive to recognize. Connotative meaning refers to meaning that goes beyond the denotative. These two sets of terms, paradigmatic/syntagmatic and connotative/denotative, will be used throughout this study.

In addition to film theory, knowledge of film language is also a necessity. This requires an understanding of the manner in which films are produced – lighting, cinematography, etc. – as well as a comprehension of different film styles and genres – such as *film noir* or spaghetti westerns – although it should be noted that style and genre often intersect. Monaco differentiates between Realist and Expressionist approaches to film – by both the analyst and filmmaker – with the latter referring to a focus on the

---

[21] Monaco, 420.
[22] Monaco, 162-163.
[23] Monaco, 162.

power of film and filmmaker to modify or manipulate reality.[24] An elaborate explanation of film language need not be undertaken although, as this is one of the most indispensable aspects of a study such as this, a thorough knowledge and immersion in the particulars of film is vital.

These methodological and theoretical tools allow an analysis of the differing representations of Hitler in film. The goal is to understand, as Marie Wyke has outlined, "not whether a particular cinematic account of history is true or disinterested, but what the logic of that account may be, asking why it emphasizes this question, that event, rather than others."[25] I will be examining the portrayals of Hitler in film and, indeed, looking for the logic of the various accounts. While the understanding of filmic codes is necessary for evaluating whether a portrayal of Hitler is humanizing or demonizing, knowledge of the historical codes is equally vital. The German leader is so uniquely identified with evil that the standards of what constitutes humanizing and demonizing are different from that of other historical figures; in many ways, Hitler is being compared to *himself*, which requires not only invoking historical knowledge about Hitler, but also comparing filmic renditions of the Führer to other cinematic portrayals. Each portrayal crafted by a director is made in the context created by earlier portrayals by other directors. Thus, each Hitler representation is, it must be presumed, part of a discourse with other filmmakers. Any one filmmaker's humanization or demonization must then be compared and contrasted with others.

In the following chapter, films in which Hitler appeared between 1968 and 1979 will be explored. The 1970s produced fifteen films featuring Hitler; these films will be

---

[24] Monaco. 395.

[25] Maria Wyke, *Projecting the Past: Ancient Rome, Cinema, and History* (New York: Routledge, 1997), 13.

analyzed in order to deduce which of the categories – prominent, satirizing, contextualizing – is the most applicable to each film. Then I will attempt to ascertain whether each filmic representation is humanizing or demonizing and explore the different ways films create representations of Hitler. At the end of the chapter, generalizations will be made about trends and tendencies of Hitler portrayals and establish to what extent the Nazi leader became a sign.

The third chapter proceeds in the same fashion, although the focus shifts to films released between 1980 and 1990. The fourth and concluding chapter provides an overview of Hitler representations between 1968 and 1990, again establishing general trends and articulating the image of Hitler that film has created. This description of *how* Hitler has been portrayed will be joined by thoughts on *why*: what different forces influence the manner in which Hitler is presented. Finally, I will link celluloid images of Hitler to popular conceptions and historiography.

Chapter Two:
Hitler in Film, 1968-1979

The setting is Berlin, April 1945, a couch in the bunker underneath the Reichstag. The camera reveals close-ups of a recently wed Adolf Hitler sitting with his new wife, Eva Hitler. Lit by a lamp with ominous music playing in the background, they look into each other's eyes and contemplate their impending suicides. The camera follows Eva's hands as she picks up cyanide pills, cutting to Hitler holding a pistol and lamenting the death of his dog, Blondi. After exchanging last words, they both ingest the pills while Hitler raises a gun to his temple – the scene cuts to the anteroom outside just before a shot rings out.

One could find elements of this sequence in a number of films featuring Adolf Hitler as a character. However, the various renditions of this event carry significantly different implications for understanding Hitler, despite using roughly the same material described above. In fact, this sequence is a contrived composite which borrows from films portraying Hitler's suicide, such as *The Death of Adolf*, *Hitler: The Last Ten Days*, *The Bunker*, and *War and Remembrance*. Despite concentrating on the same person and, in this case, the same event, these films diverge significantly not only in their interpretation of Adolf Hitler's suicide, but the very humanity of the man.

There are a variety of choices – syntagmatic and paradigmatic, historical, factual, and moral/philosophical – that can drastically alter the conception of the German leader that a viewer could acquire from watching the scene. For example, the method in which Hitler committed suicide is a constant source of controversy: was it cyanide, a pistol shot, or both? Likewise, the scene only states that Hitler and Eva conversed; it does not give

any indication about the mood or manner, or the content of the exchange. Nor does it really imply anything about the nature of the relationship between the two: was Hitler capable of love? The aforementioned films all screen Hitler's suicide, but differ in the way it is presented. Changes and modifications to the Hitler suicide scene reveal not only differing takes on the humanity of Hitler, but what Hitler means to filmmakers and, in turn, to the audiences viewing the scene.

In *The Death of Adolf Hitler*, the title character ends his life by re-stating the order to, as he puts it, "kill the Jews!" This phrase is followed by a bizarre monologue on rats (a theme throughout the film):

> [h]ow can we hope to survive if we don't hate. It doesn't matter who you hate, as long as you hate . . . [Hitler is being filmed with part of his face somewhat shadowed and the background darkened, suggesting paradigmatic evil] we were born to destroy ourselves. That is man's one true wish – to destroy himself and leave the world to rats. Rats. Even now I can feel them in the sewers of me, gnawing at my roots. . .in the deepest depths of my cold, dark soul, I have been comforted by rats.

Hitler continues to talk about his fixation with rats and sewers, stating the rodents will "eat my brain and rest at last in my skull." During this tirade, he attempts to sign a re-issue of the Final Solution document, but his hand is shaking, so Eva tries to steady it. Hitler violently knocks its away, affixes his signature and says, "[c]ause of death: rats." A few moments later, he kills himself.

Similar – albeit in a much different style – is *Hitler: The Last Ten Days*. Talking to Eva, Hitler says that ever since General Paulus betrayed him at Stalingrad, he knew that the German people were too weak, the war was over, and all was lost. Eva asks him why so many had to die, and he replies, "nature is cruel, Eva, so I to must be cruel. The lives of millions of mediocre, ordinary people are of no account. Eva, if I had offered to

negotiate, if I had offered surrender, the price would have been *my* life." She protests, and Hitler shouts: "[s]o in your opinion, I ought to have killed myself a long time ago, for the sake of the German populace!" to which Eva replies, "[m]aybe I never knew you, I've never understood you," followed by Hitler:

> [o]f course not, what did you think, you stupid girl. How could you have understood anything? You're only a woman, without any brains. You lived close to me, isn't that enough for you? (shouting last sentence) You're a mere nothing. If history remembers you at all, it will only be because I was generous and married you.

At this point, Eva takes cyanide, while Hitler keeps rambling: "[y]ou don't feel any gratitude, do you? You've betrayed me too. Silly, presumptuous, insolent bitch . . . ." He turns around to find Eva dead, and in wide-eyed shock and anger yells, "[y]ou have betrayed me!" This sequence is indicative of Hitler in the film – even at the end he has not been capable of true human love or emotion, for he is so paranoid he does not even trust his own wife.

This rendition is contrasted by *The Bunker* where Hitler's final scene is noteworthy mainly by virtue of what is *missing* – there are no tirades or sinister comments. Eva, nicely dressed, comes to Hitler. He says, "[a]re you ready?" They stand facing each other for several seconds: he takes her hand and says, "[l]et us say goodbye." In the living room, Hitler shakes hands with the staff still in the bunker without saying anything: he is trembling, especially his face and mouth. But he does seem to be almost smiling, his lips and tongue twitching. He slightly nods when he approaches Bormann, and clasps his arm, doing virtually the same to Goebbels. Cutting back to his chambers, he gives away his portrait of Frederick the Great. In the next scene, the camera tracks Eva as she comes in and sits on couch, beside Hitler. He cocks a gun, and there is a cut to the

staff waiting outside the room. With both Hitler and Eva in the frame, he gives her a cyanide capsule and they clasp hands, followed by intercutting close-ups of the two staring at each other. Hitler tells her to "[b]ite down hard" as they both take the capsules. Hitler picks up the gun, holding it to his head, and Eva grimaces as he shoots himself off-screen.

What these films all have in common is a portrayal of Hitler's last days in the bunker, which is often a source of fascination for filmic representations of Hitler. This enthrallment with Hitler's death is surely intertwined with a persistent popular culture fascination in the Hitler "survival myth." This "survival myth" can be found in virtually every type and genre of film containing representations of Adolf Hitler, be they prominent, satirical or contextualizing films. This "survival myth" is likewise indicative of a general fascination with Adolf Hitler in post-Second World War America, as the figure of Hitler has become an iconic figure with a language and iconography that borders on religious and sacred. However, Hitler is an inverse sacred, for the most persistent myth surrounding Hitler is that he was demonic.

The myths surrounding Adolf Hitler are borne out of several facets, including an inherent popular fascination with his historical figure, and the uses of Adolf Hitler as a demonized and mythologized figure in popular culture. Firstly, the Führer was cast in a mythologizing light while he was still living – he was "flamboyant, theatrical, overstated, omnipresent"[26] – and the mysterious circumstances of his death, coupled with the tendencies of scholarly writers to describe him in mythologizing and magical language,

---

[26] Rosenfeld, 15.

only exacerbated the tendency to view Hitler as beyond human.[27] Secondly, Hitler became a moral signpost in America, with a myriad of societal and political uses; some of the most obvious include justifying American intervention in the Second World War and the Cold-War political power structure, and as a moral, political, and ideological benchmark.[28] Alvin H. Rosenfeld further attributes this particular American fascination to geography[29] and the inability to explain Hitler and his actions in traditional political terms.[30]

The medium of film demonstrates that Hitler is by default seen as demonic evil. While the use of Hitler as a sign for demonic evil predates the 1968-1990 period, filmic representations of Adolf Hitler have played a dominant role in articulating and dispersing this popular conception. Hitler was well-represented on-screen before his death, although in the immediate post-war decades, popular depictions of Hitler generally waned. Fourteen English-language films featuring a Hitler character between 1945 and 1967, where he was usually employed as a gag in a comedy or as a plot/literary device can be identified (Appendix A). Academic interest in Hitler studies started to become apparent in the 1960s, and was also joined by a steadily increasing popular interest. This public fascination reached new heights during the 1970s in the so-called "Hitler-Welle" (or "Hitler-Wave").[31] A British journalist, noting the number of books, articles, novels,

---

[27] Rosenfeld (Chapter 2) argues that Hugh Trevor-Roper's work on Hitler's last days was a seminal work in ascribing "religious" and "magical" qualities to Hitler.

[28] This statement is gleaned from the author's observations of film and supported by a variety of other works on the Second World War in American popular culture, which are discussed in more detail in the concluding chapter of this study.

[29] On page 15, Rosenfeld contends that because Germany is culturally "closer" to the United States than the "Asiatic" regimes of Stalin and Mao, Hitler "stuns the moral centers of imagination."

[30] Rosenfeld, 15.

[31] It is likely that this fascination with Hitler stemmed from several sources: the coming-of-age of a new generation that was curious about Hitler; the emergence of a German engagement with its historical past; the growth of mediums of popular culture; and a general rise in popular interest in Hitler, which in turn

television shows, films, and stage dramas on display in London in 1972, commented, "it was the best year the Führer ever had in England."[32] Hitler's popularity was even more resounding in America, and in Germany itself. In 1973 fourteen major books about him appeared, and it was estimated that by 1975 there were already 50,000 serious works about Adolf Hitler.[33] A variety of explanations for the "Hitler-Wave" have been forwarded, with John Lukacs identifying the following three as the most salient:

> [t]he first was the emergence of a new generation of people who were too young to have lived through the war, whence their interest in its dramatic figures and events. The second, more evident reason was the publication and the availability of more and more sources and documents. The third was the gradual abatement of the so-called cold war with Russia: it was now obvious that World War II was not only more dramatic than the cold war but that Hitler was more interesting than Stalin (and Nazis than Communists).[34]

This "Hitler-Wave" was definitely apparent in film, for not only were there more films using a Hitler character produced during the 1970s than in all previous post-Second World War decades combined, but also Hitler tended to be given a more prominent role in many of these films. Fifteen films between 1968 and 1979 can be identified (Appendix B) with four prominent representations, five satirizing and six contextualizing. The four prominent film representations – *The Death of Adolf Hitler* (1972); *Hitler: The Last Ten Days* (1973); *The Lucifer Complex* (1975/78); *The Boys From Brazil* (1978) – feature Hitler as a central character. The subject matter of these films displays the adherence to the Hitler mythologies; the first two focus on Hitler's "last ten days" while the latter films invoke the Hitler "survival myth." Among the satires, three of the five films portray a

---

stems from many sources. Many of the historiographical works referenced earlier discuss the "Hitler-Welle"; however, most concentrate on the results rather than the origins of the "Hitler-Welle."
[32] Quoted in Robert Waite, *The Psychopathic God: Adolf Hitler* (Canada: Basic Books, 1977), xi.
[33] Waite, xi.
[34] Lukacs, 4.

Hitler or Hitler character *after* 1945, while most of the contextualizing films place Hitler within his contemporary period.

Those films that feature the Hitler "survival myth" in some form tend to demonize Hitler, although this is done in a variety of ways. Demonizing explanation require representations of Hitler that reduce the German dictator to unhuman status to explain or characterize him. Returning to the sub-categories of evil – primordial evil (incapable of love or human relationships); diabolical evil (need to kill and destroy); insane evil (mentally insane or pathological); the evil of impersonal societal forces (variants of the *Sonderweg* thesis); the evil of supernatural forces (Fate, the Devil, a monster); and the evils of modernity (i.e. technology, capitalism, etc.) – what these variants of evil have in common is that they create an unhuman: a person not capable of human behaviour. In the 1968-79 period, all of the prominent representations are demonizing while the one humanizing film comes from the contextualizing group. The five remaining plot/literary device films skirt the territory between humanizing and demonizing, although the majority are the latter. These are joined by five satirizing films which, as a whole, humanize Hitler in an indirect fashion.

The idea of a surviving Hitler is a powerful metaphor in the post-Second World War period and almost half of the films released in the 1970s contribute to the Hitler "survival myth." *The Boys From Brazil* is an extremely interesting piece that provides a unique twist on the "survival myth": although an adult Hitler is not seen in the entire movie, a major underlying theme is the inherent evil of the Nazi dictator. Starring noted actors such as Gregory Peck and Sir Laurence Olivier, this 1978 feature delves into the premise that Hitler's evil characteristics were genetically defined. Josef Mengele, the

infamous Auschwitz doctor, lives in Paraguay and, along with a group of remaining Nazi adherents, is trying to clone Hitler. Having obtained a skin scraping and blood sample from the Führer in 1943, Mengele cloned ninety-four babies and had them placed with families throughout Western Europe and North America where the father was a civil servant type and approximately twenty years older than the mother.

The movie picks up this plot fourteen years later, as Mengele is sending assassins to kill the fathers of these ninety-four boys. The formative conditions include the occupation, age, and death of the father, just as was the case with the actual Adolf Hitler. The idea is that by replicating Hitler's genes, and simulating the environmental and social conditions in which Hitler grew up, a double will be created. As this scheme unfolds, a young man who has been attempting to trail former Nazis stumbles onto their plans and is killed. However, before his death he has contacted Ezra Lieberman – a character modeled on Simon Wiesenthal – who seeks to uncover Mengele's plan and, when that is accomplished, to thwart it.

The theme of *Boys From Brazil* is obvious; all that is needed to replicate Hitler is the genes and formative conditions. While the plot is intriguing, it is also extremely demonizing and de-historicizing, for it removes virtually all responsibility from the actual Hitler by implying that he was merely the product of his circumstances and genes. *Boys From Brazil* directly suggests that Hitler's brutality and demonic nature stem entirely from his biological make-up – each boy, aside from looking and acting the same, has some type of minor artistic talent.

While both *The Death of Adolf Hitler* and *Hitler: The Last Ten Days* came out in the 1972-73 period and focus on Hitler's remaining days in the bunker beneath Berlin,

the latter is the more well-known and viewed of the two. This stems largely from the fact that *Hitler: The Last Ten Days* was a Paramount Studios release shown in North American theaters while *The Death of Adolf Hitler* was a British telefilm originally broadcast on videotape, but later released on film in the Far East, Australia, South Africa, and North America.[35] *Hitler: The Last Ten Days*, starring Sir Alec Guinness in the titular role, is perhaps the most well-known of any film featuring Hitler, and is one of the few major studio releases to feature Hitler as a character, indeed the central character. Using a fictional Nazi officer, Hauptmann Hoffman, as the foil to view Hitler's last ten days alive, the film begins on April 20, 1945, Hitler's birthday. The reason for employing Hoffman as a character is fairly self evident – dealing with Hitler is problematic enough without viewing the events from his point of view. Hoffman is also used as a symbol, for he arrives enamored with Hitler and National Socialism, but by the end of the film he has lost all faith in the movement and its leader.

Guinness' Hitler displays both humanizing and demonizing behaviour. While conversing with his guests as he accepts their birthday presents, he alternates between compliments to the cake, the presents ("how very thoughtful"), and diatribes on smoking, Churchill, Roosevelt and why it is not important for women to be intelligent. Hitler here looks rather affable and the atmosphere is relaxed. There are other instances that are humanizing, such as the rather direct implication that Hitler and Eva were lovers; this relationship is not accompanied by any sort of suggestion that Hitler was sexually perverse. Hitler also acts agreeable in other scenes, including one where some of the Army Chiefs of Staff are about to leave, and Hitler insists, "[n]o, you must have

---

[35] Mitchell, 36.

something to eat." Here he appears almost in the role of a caring grandfather, although his following comment that they "have a long night ahead" of them somewhat tempers this assessment.

Among the other humanizing scenes, there is his seeming affection for the pilots Hanna Reitsch and Robert Ritter von Greim, a short scene where Eva is massaging his shoulders, and a scene where he begins to cry over the pressures of the war. A handful of other rather mundane events also seem humanizing, such as Hitler – right after he has been married to Eva – telling Bormann to let the soldiers in an adjacent room continue celebrating, so long as they are not smoking. One would perhaps expect that any film that focuses on one individual cannot avoid humanizing the protagonist to at least some extent. While some humanization is unavoidable in films such as *Hitler: The Last Ten Days* and *The Death of Adolf Hitler*, the overall effect of the movie must be ascertained to determine whether it is ultimately humanizing or demonizing. In this case, the demonizing scenes far outnumber those that could possibly be labeled as humanizing. While the film is replete with quotes revealing Hitler's ego, paranoia, and sense of self-aggrandizement and destiny, there are also multiple scenes where Hitler is shown to be a brutal lunatic. He gives orders for the flooding of the subway, despite General Krebs' objection that it will kill many, and summarily orders executions. Upon hearing that the searchlights that were supposed to be arriving from Prague have not and will not arrive, he orders the Luftwaffe leadership liquidated. He also reveals, in passing, that he has ordered the Final Solution:

> until a few years ago, I thought of making a clean sweep of all European
> Jews, and lumping them on Madagascar, or some other island, but today,
> I'm sure it's far better to exterminate them right on the spot, wherever you
> find them.

The previous examples rely on the content of what Hitler says, but there are other scenes where his behaviour is as demonizing as his dialogue. The most illustrative of these types include a war-room tirade and Hitler's last discussion with Eva. In the first, a ruthless Hitler who, in his lunatic and paranoid state, not only wants to kill anyone that he perceives as betraying him, but also wants to see them suffer and "drown in their own blood." Hitler mentions and mimes a "meat hook" and "piano wire," which are references to the executions of those involved in the July 1944 assassination plot. Hitler is reputed to have watched a film of these executions, laughing with great delight, an incident this film supports, even though it has come to light in recent years that this event may not have occurred. In this particular scene, he is so overcome with his own anger that he can barely stand, choking and wincing as if having a heart attack, and slouches against a wall and then onto a bench.

While this tirade is the longest in *Hitler: The Last Ten Days*, he flies into several other rages. Upon hearing that a Gauleiter wants to surrender to the American and British so Germany will not suffer two-fold destruction, and to reinforce the Russian front, Hitler replies: "I do not intend to avoid devastation. German people proved themselves too feeble to stand the test of History! They're only fit to be destroyed. Let them go down in a sea of flames; a Viking funeral of the Reich." In addition, there is the sequence preceding Hitler's suicide, which is quoted at length in the opening of this chapter.

While the aforementioned selections are paradigmatically demonizing, the film employs syntagmatic devices to further heighten this effect. The movie opens with faux-documentary footage of Hitler meeting with Himmler's physician, Dr. Karl Gebhardt, who is seeking the post of head of the German Red Cross. Gebhardt explains past

experiments on Jews, as footage of concentration camp inmates is spliced in, followed by Hitler's approval of these experiments: "you have done excellent work for the Third Reich." This comment is followed by footage of Hitler's rise to power accompanied by a voice-over. This narration notes "the price of liquidating this methodical maniac" who "lives out his pathological daydream of conquering Europe." This prominent positioning sets the tone for the film's interpretation of Hitler. The audience therefore views Hitler through this demonizing lens, investing even seemingly innocent events with negative connotations. For instance, approximately half way through the movie, Hitler sits with Magda Goebbels and her children, one of the daughters on his lap, listening to them sing. Hitler smiles for a few seconds and then stares off into space, deep in thought. The original conception the viewer has is that Hitler actually enjoys spending time with the children.

However, this entire scene is skewed by what takes place at the end of it: the child gets off Hitler's lap, joins the other children, and everyone gives the "Heil Hitler" salute. This may seem somewhat innocuous given the context, but the scene is meant to demonize Hitler, not humanize. The authors of this film often tend to be ironic, and this is an instance of just that: Hitler needs to control and dominate even the children. A more obvious example of irony involves Eva saying to Hitler: "[w]hat a pity for the world you couldn't have devoted your life to art," followed by a cut to documentary footage of destroyed cities. Once this ironic tendency has been ascertained, many of the seemingly humanizing scenes must be viewed in a different light. Another example includes Hitler awarding a medal to a young boy: the Führer appears to look caringly upon him and says

"[g]ood boy." However, Hitler then looks away and half-mumbles the words: "[n]ow go back and fight." His interaction with the boy is now seen through a demonizing frame.

The collective message of *Hitler: The Last Ten Days* is that Hitler was a pathological maniac. This is also the theme found in *The Death of Adolf Hitler*. Starring Frank Finlay as Hitler, this 1972 telefilm does not strive for the historical veracity of *Hitler: The Last Ten Days*. Instead, this unfocused film, almost soap opera-like in its presentation, borders on black comedy. Covering the same temporal period as *Hitler: The Last Ten Days* – from Hitler's birthday until his death – Finlay's Hitler is in many ways the inverse of Guinness' portrayal: an empty, hollow rant compared to the subdued Hitler.[36] *The Death of   Adolf Hitler* also employs irony, but uses it in most cases to satirize. In fact, *The Death of Adolf Hitler* variously satirizes, humanizes and demonizes the German leader.

It is difficult at times to establish whether the humour is intended. In some cases, the comedy stems from the inherent hilarity of the words spoken combined with the context of who is speaking them and where. For instance, simple passing lines like "[d]on't you find it rather warm down here? I find it rather warm down here" would seem innocent in most situations, but since this is the extent of Hitler's dialogue with Eva in this particular scene, it is quite amusing. The same can be said of Hitler's dialogue with Bormann and Goebbels regarding the successors in his will; Hitler almost falls into a comedy routine, answering his own questions with snappy one-liners. The same sort of exchange takes place near the beginning of the movie. When Hitler inquires about the Luftwaffe and Hermann Göring stammers an inaudible reply, Hitler sarcastically queries:

---

[36] Mitchell, 39.

"[s]ome of my airplanes. Those things with wings, and a funny thing at the front that goes round and round, what is it called? A propeller. They're becoming quite handy in the war, remember."

Mundane events, such as Hitler inquiring about the temperature, also lend themselves to the humanizing paradigm in some regards. There are also other examples which appear more overt, such as Hitler's relationships. He uses the word "love" to refer to his relationships with Josef Goebbels, Magda Goebbels, Heinrich Himmler, and Hermann Göring. Hitler dotes on Goebbels' son, Holde. Eva refers to her liking for seeing Hitler laugh, and they exchange passionate kisses and intimate moments throughout the story. Hitler's relationship with Eva appears quite normal. They are shown lying in bed, and there are scenes where they are almost like an aged couple who have been arguing for years. *The Death of Adolf Hitler* also clearly maintains that Adolf and Eva had sexual relations; for instance, he disallows her request to wear a white wedding dress, saying "[w]hite? You aren't entitled to wear white. You haven't been white for years."

Hitler displays other human emotions as well, crying at several points. He appears genuinely affectionate with Blondi in several instances, and becomes hysterical when he hears her suffering as the cyanide pills are tested. At other times, Hitler displays normal human weaknesses. He is incapable of looking at pictures containing concentration camp inmates or experiments to the point of shrinking away in fright. When told that his lamp is made of Jewish skin, he gags, runs in and out of the room throwing things at people before retiring to the bathroom and seemingly vomiting. Strangely, he also makes a

speech where he feels that he has let down the German people, which – although later contradicted – is the inverse of what is usually portrayed.

Taken alone, the humanizing elements exceed virtually any other film in the years presently under consideration. However, these humanizing elements are overshadowed when compared to the demonizing scenes and put into context. Essentially, the Hitler in *The Death of Adolf Hitler* is pathologically insane and a drug addict. Furthermore, no film exists which contains more Hitler ranting, either in frequency or length. For instance, the scene where he gibes Göring about air power quickly turns more sinister, as he threatens to shoot him, a threat he repeats throughout the movie. He flies into histrionics at the slightest provocation, while at other times which would seem more deserving of a tirade – such as hearing about treasonous activities by Göring or Himmler – he makes a calm remark or two before completely losing control and yelling at the top of his voice. He also makes a habit of smashing (coffee cup) and throwing things (papers, lamp) at people. Not only are these tirades frequent, but the pitch and length are also remarkable.

Taken together, these rants hint that Hitler is indeed a madman. His insanity is confirmed by his psychological obsession with blood, rats, sewers, and Jews. During the first quarter of the film, Eva prods Hitler to take off his clothes in bed (this is confusing since the film directly suggests they had a sexual relationship) but he refuses, muttering to himself that Eva does not understand that he slept in his clothes for years in the sewers full of rats. Hitler drifts into a nightmare where a Jewish man tries to sell him bread which Hitler cannot purchase for he has no money. Then he is confronted by female and male prostitutes. They are all Jews, and the rats also represent Jews. Hitler – in his dream

– begins to fume about even rats getting bread, and how he will start a revolution so that even poor Germans (of Aryan race) will be able to get bread.

It must be assumed that Hitler's nightmare was in the context of his Vienna years. The rat allusion can be found elsewhere, referring to the German people and again to the Jews at the end of the film. In addition to rats, Hitler also demonstrates an obsession with blood, which is again linked to the Jews. He refers to blood in several rants (referring to Himmler's treachery: "Kill him. I want his head, his blood. Blood. Blood. Everything.") and there is a particularly disturbing scene where Hitler and Goebbels begin to – after deciding on the execution of Fegelein, Eva's brother-in-law – pound the table and ecstatically chant "Blood! Blood! Blood!"

Moreover, if there was any doubt that Hitler was insane, it is removed by a scene in the last half of *The Death of Adolf Hitler* where he virtually asks his shadow for orders. A light shining from the side projects his profile onto a wall, and Hitler calls it "your master and mine" followed by a request for instructions and then Hitler repeating "Kill and destroy. Kill and destroy." In addition, not only is Hitler mentally ill, but someone reveals to Hitler that the pills and injection he has been receiving from Dr. Morrell have left him addicted to an opiate, and that he is suffering withdrawal problems. Previously humanzing examples are also nullified by these revelations. After Hitler's hysteria over Blondi's suffering, he frantically seeks out his original order for the Final Solution, sure that it did not include dogs but only "inferior races." Hitler's relationship with Eva, which appears humanizing in the first half of the film, becomes significantly skewed by later behaviour. Despite all of Hitler's seemingly affectionate interplay with Eva, when she asks whether he loves her, he replies, "I'm not sure. I don't think so – does it matter?" He

later states at the start of another rant that hate is the fuel for power, and Hitler's final tirade about hate and rats has already been detailed earlier, as well as his suicide. In presenting Hitler as insane (and a drug addict) he loses responsibility for his actions and he is viewed as an abstract evil force beyond the realms of human comprehension and rationality. In this respect, *The Death of Adolf Hitler* has similarities with the psycho-historical studies so prevalent in the 1970s. Indeed, most prominent films parallel historiography in some regards, most notably *Hitler: The Last Ten Days*, which employed actual historians in attempting to correspond to reality, a quality often found in prominent and contextualizing representations and rarely in satirizing films.

The cumulative effect of these prominent films is that Hitler becomes a mythologized figure. The very fact that they are prominent – instructive portrayals of Hitler in greater length and depth than other pictures and generally seen by larger audiences – means that they are the most influential in shaping popular conceptions of Hitler. In other words, prominent films create perceptions of Hitler while satirical and contextualizing films tend to reflect these perceptions. While *Boys From Brazil* turned Hitler into a monster metaphorically and symbolically, *Lisztomania* does so literally and physically. A Hitler reference appears only near the conclusion of the film; a Frankenstein-esque Hitler rises from Wagner's grave on a stage and opens fire on the audience with a guitar-cum-machine gun. The Hitler-monster then proceeds to march down a street with his weapon, shooting Jews who try to defend themselves with the Cross of David. However, after destroying most of the world, the Hitler/Wagner monster is struck down by missiles from Liszt – the hero of the story, killed by the Hitler-monster earlier – who is in heaven. This Hitler-monster is meant to be a resurrected Wagner as a

cross between Frankenstein and Hitler. While this is a borderline Hitler representation, there are several different ways to interpret this monster, but whichever interpretation one chooses, Hitler is nonetheless portrayed as a monster.

The appearance of a posthumous Hitler in *Lisztomania* is joined by another contextualizing film, *Inside Out* [aka *Hitler's Gold*] (1968). The story centers around a group of mercenaries who attempt to find missing gold by tricking Reinhard Holtz (who is meant to be Rudolf Hess, but legal technicalities forced the producers to change the name[37]) into helping them. Along the way, one of the mercenaries impersonates Hitler so that Holtz will reveal the location of the gold. The Hitler representation in *Inside Out* is fairly innocuous, which is true of the remaining contextualizing films: *Battle of Britain* (1969), *The Gathering Storm* (1974), *Rogue Male* (1976), and *Ring of Passion* [aka *Countdown to the Big One*] (1978) feature Hitler cameos in movies set during the Second World War. In the first, Hitler only appears in a recreation of an actual September 1940 speech. As the speech is quoted verbatim, the audience is never given a close-up – Hitler is only seen from a distance or from behind. This inclusion serves to heighten the tension and reveal the developing plot. The same can be said of the Hitler appearance in *Ring of Passion*, which is actually a made-for-television boxing movie about Max Schmeling and Joe Louis. *The Gathering Storm* also necessarily invokes Hitler to emphasize his rivalry with Winston Churchill, the main character. Hitler is seen in two reconstructed scenes at Berchtesgaden during 1938; in the first he threatens to march into Austria and force the Anschluss, while in the second he talks with Neville Chamberlain about Czechoslovakia.

---

[37] Mitchell, 119.

These contextualizing films use the National Socialist leader in only a subordinate role, leaving little room for character development or nuance. While these films do not clearly demonize Hitler, they certainly do not humanize him, which leaves an interesting gap in the Hitler explanation, for the representations are neutral enough for the respective Hitler representations to be skewed according to the viewer's conception of Hitler. However, as this study argues that filmic representations of Hitler are so replete with mythologizing representations that Hitler is by default seen as extreme evil, the result is that any ambiguity in the humanity of Hitler automatically results in a demonized perception. Furthermore, the makers of contextualizing films use Hitler as a moral foil where his extreme evil antagonist is contrasted with the moral superiority of the protagonist, which generally takes the form of the Allied countries and/or their leaders.

In fact, only one contextualizing film could be considered humanizing, although it is arguably accidental. *Rogue Male* (1976) features a Hitler appearance that is a plot/literary device due to the briefness of the portrayal. In the opening sequence of *Rogue Male*, Peter O'Toole's protagonist is hunting when he notices Hitler outside with Eva Braun at Berchtesgaden. Through the scope on his rifle, he observes the two dancing and prancing around the patio with a camera in a recreation of the infamous "home video." Hitler appears doting and affectionate with Eva, and even silly as he plays up for the camera and then looks self-consciously to see if anyone is watching. Since this is the only sequence containing Hitler, and because nothing else throughout the movie suggests otherwise, it appears Hitler has a genuine relationship with Eva. If Hitler *is* capable of love, then he is humanized. The question is to what extent is Hitler's capability to love unambiguous, a question the film does not ultimately resolve.

The effect of a satirized Hitler can also be ambiguous: does it make him seem unreal, or does it make Hitler seem more ordinary and human? Even when he was living, Hitler appeared as an exaggerated or comical figure to many,[38] a perception surely exacerbated by Charlie Chaplin's *The Great Dictator*. It would seem then that many filmmakers satirize Hitler because he is inherently seen as comedic and ridiculous in many ways. However, comedy at the expense of Hitler also derives its effectiveness in part from the fact that Hitler is so sacred as a symbol. Satire therefore paradoxically reinforces the demonic image of Hitler while undermining it to some extent. Although ambiguity appears intrinsic to satire in all mediums, ambiguity is also characteristic of many of the films under discussion. This ambiguity stems from two primary factors: the uniqueness of films as a medium, and the uniqueness of Hitler as a historical character.

In the 1968-1979 period, five films in total can be identified as satirizing: *The Producers* (1968); *Which Way to the Front?* (1970); *Blazing Saddles* (1974); *Undercovers Hero* [aka *Soft Beds, Hard Battles*] (1974); and *How to Seduce a Woman* (1974). Satirizing portrayals, as the name suggests, ridicule Hitler and use him for comedic purposes. Satire presents, and generally relies upon, preconceived stock conceptions of Hitler – without these preconceptions, much of the satire fails. For instance, there are a roomful of actors auditioning to play Hitler in *The Producers*, but they are variously dressed as cowboys, hippies, lesbians, etc. The audience recognizes that despite the missing characteristics associated with Hitler – the haircut, the uniform, the swastika, the speaking and behavioural style – these are Hitler characters because of

---

[38] The comic appearance of Hitler can be attributed to his mannerisms – especially when giving speeches – but also the fact that much of the footage taken of him from the 1930s and 1940s was shot at slower film speeds than was used in the post-war period. As a result, when film from that era is played, the film is "sped up" which makes actions seem more abrupt and jerky, and therefore comical.

the trademark moustache, the most recognizable sign of Hitler. Contextualizing films are just as reliant on these signals for Adolf Hitler, for the brief nature of their portrayals requires that an audience quickly be able to grasp the character. Satire is employed as a separate category because satires of Adolf Hitler have not only the potential to be humanizing or demonizing, but also the potential to only be *satire*. In these cases, the effect of the satire on conceptions of Hitler can be ambiguous, for an argument can be made that satire has the capability to normalize Hitler, to stray from a mythologizing explanation and reduce him to an ordinary human being.

Like many of the films already discussed, in *Blazing Saddles* and *How To Seduce a Woman*, Hitler is thrust into a non-Second World War period. In both motion pictures, Hitler (or in the case of *Blazing Saddles*, an actor playing Hitler) is used as a one-time gag. In both *Which Way to the Front?* and *Undercovers Hero*, Hitler's character is transplanted into a more traditional context, that of the Second World War. Again, he is used for comedic purposes. In the latter film, Peter Sellers, known for playing multiple roles in the same film, portrays Hitler in one of his six characters in *Undercovers Hero*. He appears as Hitler in only three scenes, with the comedy coming largely from the lack of gravity one would expect given the military situation. The same is true of Sidney Miller's rendition in *Which Way to the Front?*; however, his Hitler is much more slapstick than Sellers'. For example, there is a scene where an American imposter (played by Jerry Lewis) pretends to be Field Marshall Kesselring – upon arriving for his meeting with Hitler, he shouts "Führer!" causing Hitler to leap onto the table in a comical pose. They break into a slow-motion dance routine, to the tune of Tchaikovsky's *Romeo and*

Juliet, seemingly courting each other. As this ends, Hitler slaps Kesselring on the shoulder and pinches him on the cheeks.

Hitler is flamboyant and emotional, almost effeminate, in his only scene in *Which Way to the Front?* Engaging in some rather amusing dialogue, Hitler asks Kesselring why he has not yet asked about Eva Braun, and when Kesselring does indeed ask, Hitler shouts: "[n]one of your business!" Hitler then continues this hilarious interrogation: "why haven't you asked me to ask about *your* wife?" Soon after, he mimics Eva: "[w]hy can't I come to the Bunker? Get me Spain, get me Belgium." This farcical exchange continues as Kesselring's briefcase, loaded with a bomb, is mixed up with other similar briefcases. The satire reaches its most extreme as Kesselring says to Hitler: "[y]ou're always thinking of other people. You're a nice person."

While these four films satirize Hitler himself, *The Producers* lampoons the symbols and mythologies surrounding Hitler in popular culture as much as satirizing the dictator himself. Due to the amount of screen-time that "Hitler" receives, this film could be included within the prominent films category; however, it has been included separately because of the satirical tone of the film. Whereas the other satirical filmmakers subordinate the use of Hitler as a sign to that of a comedic device, *The Producers* employs comedy to make a much stronger existential statement regarding Hitler.

Mel Brooks' breakthrough film involves a former Broadway producer, Max Bialystock, who – along with his accountant, Leo Bloom – comes up with the idea that producing the worst play possible will actually increase revenue. They find a play, *Springtime For Hitler: A Gay Romp with Adolf and Eva in Berchtesgaden*, written by a former yet still devoted Nazi. This musical is purposefully outfitted with a sub-par

director as Bialystock raises the money to stage the production by cavorting with elderly women. The casting for the lead showcases a variety of goose-stepping and heiling Hitlers: there are fat Hitlers, short Hitlers, bald Hitlers, cowboy Hitlers, lesbian Hitlers, etc. The only similarity they share with Hitler is the trademark moustache. The one exception is an actor who remarkably approximates Hitler; however, he is quickly removed, undoubtedly because he actually bears a strong resemblance to Hitler.[39] Brooks' is obviously toying with the physical attributes that are iconic of Hitler. The audience knows these actors intend to represent Hitler, not only because of the simple fact that the plot reveals Bialystock casting the part of Hitler, but also because of the invocations of Hitler symbols, such as the characteristic moustache. Out of these ludicrous choices, Bialystock decides on the actor he believes will provide the *worst* possible Hitler performance: a hippie, known by the acronym "L.S.D.," who thought he was showing up to audition for a different play.

The play opens with a fantastically ludicrous musical number bearing the same name as the title of the stage production. Without going into great detail, the viewer is treated to goose-stepping showgirls, columns turning into cannons, a swastika-shaped dance routine, and lines such as "[d]on't be stupid, be a smarty, come and join the Nazi Party." Several further selections from *Springtime for Hitler* are interspersed throughout the film, and a stoned-hippie Hitler is pictured, replete with earring, spouting phrases such as "hey man," "baby," and "that's a groove, daddy."

Brooks, the writer and director, maintains that: "the way to deal with despots like Hitler is not to get on a soapbox and fight dictators – and people like that – with rhetoric,

---

[39] Mitchell, 184.

but to fight them with ridicule, to laugh at them. To laugh them into ridicule . . . laugh

them into eternity."[40] Charles P. Mitchell states:

> [w]ith his approach, Brooks makes a statement as profound as any by the historians, philosophers and theologians whose positions have been examined in Ron Rosenbaum's brilliant *Explaining Hitler*. By turning Hitler from a figure of evil and loathsomeness into a mere buffoon, Brooks demonstrates the life-affirming fortitude and spirit of not only the Jewish people, but humanity as a whole.[41]

Mitchell asserts that Hitler is turned into a buffoon instead of a figure of evil; the question

is in what way does making Hitler ridiculous humanize him? It can be argued that

making Hitler a buffoon trivializes the actions of his regime, and it in no way helps us to

further understand Hitler. This conception can be viewed as de-historicizing, for it

removes Hitler from the realm of rational historical understanding. At the same time,

being ridiculous and silly is symptomatic of humanity. Even though satire of this sort

lends itself to creating the mythology of a buffoon Hitler, and does not inherently dispel

myths of a surviving Hitler, it nonetheless can portray Hitler as a pathetic human being

rather than a monster.

Given that *The Producers* was released in 1968, Brooks attempt to lampoon the

dictator suggests that the icon of Hitler was still in flux during the late 1960s. However,

the 1970s Hitler established Hitler as a sign for demonic evil in popular culture, for films

released between 1968 and 1979 cumulatively create and support the legend of a demonic

Führer. There are many different variations of demonic evil evident in film, as most

Hitler portrayals fit into the various sub-fields of evil. For example, *The Death of Adolf

Hitler* and *Hitler: The Last Ten Days* present a Hitler of diabolic, primordial and insane

evil, while *The Lucifer Complex* employs only diabolic evil. The *Boys From Brazil*

---

[40] Mel Brooks quote in "Special Features" section of the Special Edition DVD of *The Producers*.
[41] Mitchell, 182.

combines impersonal societal forces with the evils of modernity, while *Lisztomania* relies on the evil of supernatural forces. Although the majority of filmmakers used these symbols to make their plot more effective, believable or humorous, several attempted to make serious comments about the nature of Adolf Hitler. In doing so, the majority of films created or reinforced the mythical status of the Führer and, in turn, audiences came to see Hitler as a sign for demonic evil, which is borne out by an examination of the 1980s.

Chapter Three:
Hitler in Film, 1980-1990

The 1970s witnessed an increase in motion pictures featuring Adolf Hitler as a character, and the 1980s saw no abatement. In fact, the period between 1980 and 1990 generated twenty films containing Hitler representations (Appendix B) compared to the fifteen generated between 1968 and 1979. Like the former period, the majority of Hitler roles were small, occurring in satirical or contextualizing films. The 1980s witnessed only one film, *The Bunker*, featuring Hitler as *the* focal character, while a handful of other films accorded Hitler a prominent role, such as *The Winds of War, War and Remembrance, Inside the Third Reich,* and *Countdown to War*. Of these twenty, six films can be labeled satirizing, nine contextualizing, with five prominent portrayals.

The continuing use of a film language to present Adolf Hitler is evident when moving from the 1970s to the 1980s as an increased number of satirizing and contextualizing films reflect the dominant discourses generated in the 1970s. Conversely, a larger number of prominent films attempt to alter these discourses by including more strongly humanizing elements in their portrayals. There is also an increase in the number of films produced in America, indicative of the growing "Americanization" of Hitler. It can be posited that with the mellowing of Cold War hostilities, American films were more apt to focus on Hitler and Nazi Germany as the epitome of moral and political evil. Coupled with a growing Holocaust consciousness in America, Hitler continued to be used as a powerful metaphor. Partly a result of this growing "Americanization" of the Hitler image, and partly in contradiction to it, there is also a trend to treat Hitler more seriously; that is, to situate his character within historical

recreation films. This trend bespeaks increased attempts to come to terms with the historical Hitler, and although the majority of cinematic representations continued to mythically explain Hitler, a relative increase in treating him as a human is also evident.

The number of satires remained virtually unchanged between decades – six satirical films were produced in the 1980s compared to five in the previous period, and all but one of these eleven films were American. Mel Brooks again provides a satirical view of Hitler with *History of the World, Part I* (1981*)* and *To Be or Not to Be* (1983). These two films are joined in the satirizing category by *Under the Rainbow* (1981); *Hard Rock Zombies* (1984); *That's Adequate* (1986/90); and *Highway to Hell* (1990). Hitler is a minor character in all of these films. However, unlike satirical films from the 1970s, the majority in the 1980s demonize Hitler and all employ him as a minor character.

Only the two Mel Brooks films can be branded as well-known.[42] *History of the World, Part I* features only a singular Hitler rendition at the conclusion of the picture. A series of clips preview the sequel to the film and Brooks announces "Hitler on Ice!" as a figure in a Nazi uniform is followed across a darkened ice sheet by a spotlight, and then proceeds to display a variety of figure-skating maneuvers. This presentation is among the most bizarre of the films under discussion and the goal is simply to ridicule Hitler. The same can be said of *To Be or Not to Be,* a remake of a 1942 film of the same name. The original "is now considered to be a comedy classic and frequently appears on popular lists of the hundred best films ever made" [43] and is often grouped with *The Great Dictator* as classic anti-Nazi comedies. While Brooks' rendition has not achieved as much acclaim, it is still an effective satire of Hitler.

---

[42] A perusal of film databases, video stores, etc reveals that these films are not in wide circulation.
[43] Mitchell, 212-213.

Brooks is Frederick Bronski, a Pole who headlines a theatrical troupe in Warsaw along with his wife Anna. The film begins during an on-stage presentation of *The Bronski Follies of 1939* and, after several routines, the cast sets into a skit called *Nasty Nazis*. Several German officers are in Hitler's office discussing the poor opinions of the Reich Chancellor in the foreign press (noticeable on the desk is a name plate that reads "A. Hitler" with the words "The Mark Stops Here" underneath). Hitler (played by Brooks) enters, responding to his subordinates' greetings with a loud "[h]eil myself!" followed by "[h]ave you read the foreign papers? Look what they call me! A monster! A madman!" He slams the paper down as his staff choruses "und a madman." Hitler continues: "[w]hat do they want from me? I'm good-natured, I'm good hearted, I'm good looking (posing against desk and then with his arm on a bust of himself). Everyday, I'm out there trying to make the world safe for Germany. I don't want war, all I want is peace. Peace!"

At this point, Hitler breaks into a song-and-dance number that makes a play on the word "peace," listing all the countries of which he wants a "piece." As the stage performers break into a showgirl kick routine, the curtain is brought down. Bronski adamantly demands to know what has happened and he is informed that the Polish Foreign Office believes the routine could be construed as an insult to Chancellor Hitler. After they threaten to shut the theater down if Bronski continues with the act, he instead turns to *Highlights from Hamlet*. During the performance, a young Polish officer who is enamored with Bronski's wife goes backstage to meet her. She is taken with this young admirer, and he returns the next night – at the same point in the performance while Frederick is busy onstage – only to announce that Germany has invaded Poland and he is off to fight.

As the war progresses, the main characters become involved in a scheme to help protect the identity of the Polish underground movement. It is not until near the end of the film before Hitler again appears, and this time there are two different caricatures. The "real" Hitler (played by Roy Goldman) arrives to watch a show at the theater. Meanwhile, Bronski impersonates Hitler in order to help the group of performers and Jews that have come to reside in the theater escape to England. Goldman's Hitler is fairly inconsequential – there are no frontal shots or close-ups as he arrives to see the play and walks to his private box. Bronski's Hitler says little, aside of repeating the "Heil myself" line from earlier in the film and a few throwaway lines as he spirits his wife away from the amorous intentions of a Gestapo chief. Bronski and his entourage escape to an airplane and after a long flight are forced to crash land. Bronski charges into a British pub, still dressed as Hitler, and shouts: "[e]xcuse me! Is this England?"

To Be or Not to Be is similar in many respects to *The Producers*, not only in plot and characters, the style and tempo of humour, and the penchant for theater and musicals, but also in the manner Hitler is satirized. The *Nasty Nazis* sketch serves completely to ridicule Hitler and make him appear as foolish as possible. While *To Be or Not To Be* allots less time to the Hitler presentation, the opening scenes are certainly adequate in establishing the nature of the portrayal. The Hitler appearances that follow later are brief and generally involve the dictator standing around and saluting. However, the ironical tone of the satire demonizes Hitler to a certain extent. When Hitler states that the foreign newspapers are calling him a madman and a monster, the film appears to be ironically suggesting that he is.

Satirizing films in the period under discussion alternate between variants of the "survival myth" and placing Hitler in his contemporary temporal period. Hitler's brief cameo in *Under the Rainbow* takes place near the beginning of the film; Hitler (played by Teddy Lehman) meets with Kriegling (a midget) to give him a secret plan. Hitler is situated at a desk with a gigantic swastika behind him on the wall. This paradigmatic choice to put Hitler's head in the bottom of the shot while the swastika banner fills most of the frame, and from a low angle, is quite hilarious. With an amusing scowl, a retreating hairline and comical language, Hitler gives instructions. The scene ends with the midget striking Hitler in the groin with a "Sieg Heil" salute. Little needs to be read into this sequence, as the slapstick humour speaks for itself. *That's Adequate*, a comical pseudo-documentary concerning a fictional Hollywood studio that creates lowball rip-offs of famous movies and actors, also situates Hitler within the first half of the 20th century. The studio puts out *Young Adolf*, a filmic version of *Mein Kampf*. Considering Robert Vaughn's impersonation of Hitler the highlight of the film, Charles P. Mitchell writes that:

> [Vaughn's] spirited and crafty impersonation of Hitler is so hilarious that it rates among the most notable in the book. Vaughn's resemblance to Hitler is not particularly strong, but he crafts his satire very well, and is magnificently supported by the superlative editing. The sequence opens with the genuine Hitler's entrance to the podium lifted from *Triumph of the Will*. Scenes of Vaughn at the podium are intercut with reaction shots of Hess, Goebbels, Göring, and Himmler. As presented in this documentary, this was a rare public address by Hitler in English after his completion of a deal with Adequate Studios to bring his life story to screen as drawn from *Mein Kampf*. There is a miscue in Tony Randall's narration when he suggests this deal happened after Pearl Harbor, since Hess had flown to England on May 10, 1941, seven full months before America entered the war. Therefore, the setting of this imaginary speech had to be before May 1941. The Führer enthusiastically praises the films of Adequate Studios as his favorites, and believes that they would be the only film company to portray "a Hitler with a heart, a Hitler with a helping

hand." Vaughn exaggerates Hitler's mannerisms quite deftly. Finally, a scene is viewed from the film, entitled *Young Adolf*, in an idealized backwoods Bavarian setting where the seven-year-old Hitler is seen chopping firewood for his family. With Adequate's usual touch of *kitsch*, the soundtrack plays a soupy rendition of "My Old Kentucky Home" in the background. "Keep working hard," his mother advises, "and you may grow up to be a great man." "Perhaps Führer?" young Adolf chirps. When his father later questions the youngster about chopping down a tree he shouldn't have, the youngster blames the deed on the Jews. The film flops when it is released. "Obviously, the American public was not ready for another side to Adolf Hitler," Tony Randall intones as the sequence concludes.[44]

Hard Rock Zombies is an unknown and obscure film from 1984 which provides a Hitler that cuts across the different categories of representation.[45] Charles P. Mitchell contends that Jack Bleisner provides " a vigorous and wacky spoof with many interesting touches"[46] as Hitler. This horror picture involves a grandfather who is actually a disguised elderly Hitler, with poison gas laboratories and crematoriums in the basement of the mansion he shares with Eva Braun and their family. As the story proceeds, Hitler is killed by zombies, becomes a zombie himself, and leads a pack of zombies with the Nazi salute before being killed. While the film itself is, strictly speaking, not a satire, the Hitler representation is, and a demonizing one at that.

In *Highway to Hell*, a fantasy/horror picture, the protagonist finds himself in a truck stop in Hell and is confronted by a variety of historical figures: Jimmy Hoffa, Cleopatra, Attila the Hun, and Adolf Hitler. The latter's appearance is very brief, claiming in a thick accent that he is *not* Hitler and then complaining that he is always situated at the same table as the Flintstones.[47] While the purpose of this appearance is

---

[44] Mitchell, 206.
[45] *Hard Rock Zombies* could not be located, so the description comes from Charles P. Mitchell's *The Hitler Filmography*.
[46] Mitchell, 85.
[47] Mitchell, 90.

undoubtedly to ridicule Hitler, it is the context of Hell – and Hitler as one of its representative figures – which carries with it obvious demonizing connotations. Both of the horror films within the satire category base their Hitler presentations on the idea of Hitler as a demonic monster, appearing in Hell in *Highway to Hell* and as an actual monster in *Hard Rock Zombies*. *To Be or Not to Be* also strays into supernatural evil and, despite being counterbalanced by satire that ridicules Hitler, is demonizing. The other three films are satirical without any demonizing implications. Hence, these six films are divided within the humanizing/demonizing paradigm.

Shifting to the plot /literary device category, six of the films are historical dramas: *Mussolini: The Untold Story* (1985); *The Dirty Dozen: The Next Mission* (1985); *Hitler's SS: Portrait in Evil* (1985); *Mussolini and I* (1985); *Great Escape II: The Untold Story* (1988); *The Plot to Kill Hitler* (1990), while one is an adventure story, *Indiana Jones and the Last Crusade* (1989), and two are comedies: *Zelig* (1983); *Order of the Black Eagle* (1986). Only two of the nine films are not cameos, and the majority of these films are set during the time of the Third Reich. Also, of the six historical dramas, five were made-for-television films (*The Plot to Kill Hitler* is the sole exception). The majority of these films carry rather straightforward Hitler presentations with the Führer performance based on historically documented occurrences, such as speeches or meetings. All are set during the Nazi era (with the exception of *Order of the Black Eagle*) and employ a Hitler character more or less as a necessary antagonist.

While contextualizing films from the 1980s do not display overt mythologizing or de-humanization, there still is still an implicit acknowledgement and subtle use of Hitler as a moral extreme, which is a natural outgrowth of using Hitler as a minor or stock

character because such portrayals reflect the dominant stereotypes of Hitler. Furthermore, it is assumed that audiences will automatically recognize Hitler as a sign for evil. Even *if* filmmakers wished to present a view of Hitler that diverged from presenting his inhumanity, audiences would not likely permit or accept any rendition that deviated from casting Hitler as a mythological symbol. Filmmakers of contextualizing films do not appear to be attempting to create a mythological Hitler, but it is obvious that they rely on this image for Hitler to be an effective plot device or antagonist.

Several of the contextualizing films are as neutral as is possible given that they are dealing with Adolf Hitler. For instance, in *Zelig,* Woody Allen's title character appears in the background of a Hitler speech. *Indiana Jones and the Last Crusade* is similar in that Indiana bumps into Hitler within a crowd at a Nazi rally, and the Führer proceeds to autograph his diary. Of course these selections cannot be completely neutral in terms of interpreting Hitler; however, aside from the context of the films, little insight into the humanizing dyad is provided. *Zelig*, while a comedy, does not directly satirize Hitler himself, but uses the context of a Nazi rally to intensify the joke that Zelig is akin to a human chameleon who, like Forrest Gump, shows up at a number of important historical events.

Other films in the contextualizing category do contribute to the demonizing of Hitler, although not to the same extent as contextualizing films from 1968-1979. Like films such as *The Gathering Storm*, in *Hitler's SS: A Portrait in Evil* and *The Dirty Dozen: The Untold Story*, Hitler is syntagmatically invested with evil or de-humanized by other scenes within the movie. Of particular note is a passing remark in *Hitler's SS: A Portrait in Evil* that attributes the German's success to his serving as a tool of the

capitalists. Conversely, in several other films Hitler's behaviour itself implies evil. For instance, in *The Great Escape II*, the bulk of the Hitler display involves the German leader ordering executions. *Order of the Black* Eagle, set in the 1980s, features the thwarting of a neo-Nazi organization that is trying to develop a proton beam. The film opens with documentary clips accompanied by a voice-over stressing Hitler's megalomania and desire for war. As the plot develops, it is revealed that Hitler has been cryogenically kept alive, although comatose. There are several shots of Hitler lying in suspended animation in a special chamber. At the climax of the story, Hitler's visage cracks open and melts, accompanied by screaming, when the cryogenic chamber is broken. These films have a mixture of demonizations, ranging from supernatural evil (monster) to diabolical evil (need to kill and destroy) to the evils of modernity (a tool of big business).

The *Plot to Kill Hitler* and *Mussolini and I* both include more Hitler footage than the previously discussed contextualizing films, as the main characters in both films are historical figures who came into contact with the National Socialist leader. *The Plot to Kill Hitler* retells the story of the attempted assassination of Hitler by a group of German High Command Officers in July 1944. Using Colonel Count Claus von Stauffenberg as the main protagonist, the focus of the story is on the *plot* to kill Hitler; hence, Hitler is sparingly employed as a character. Stauffenberg syntagmatically implies near the beginning of the film that Hitler is "mad," but the contextualizing factors and the scenes with Hitler himself do not expand on Hitler's madness.

Hitler is of course seen as the villain, given the title and subject matter, but nothing in *The Plot to Kill Hitler* probes deeper existential questions of his humanity.

For the most part, this Hitler character is based on historical accounts and those involved in the film resist adding any additional interpretation. Hitler is seen holding court at a staff dinner and in conferences, alternating between charm, shouts, and snippets of his infamous monologues. At points he breaks into tirades, although not as extreme as are most other films, and it is implied that he knows about the Final Solution. His behaviour after the bomb attempt is violent – ". . . the spineless weaklings. I'll exterminate them. I'll exterminate them all" – but given the context, is not by itself de-humanizing. At the same time, Hitler cracks a joke with Morrell, and in another scene says to his aide in reference to Mussolini's impending visit: "[h]ow do you like my new trousers? I'm receiving Il Duce this afternoon. Il Duce deserves my new trousers, don't you think?" Taken collectively, not enough about Hitler is revealed to appropriately place this performance in the demonizing sub-categories; however, nor does this filmic Hitler do anything to convince us that he is human.

The same can be said of the two films with Il Duce in the title, *Mussolini and I* and *Mussolini: The Untold Story*.[48] The actor's rendition provided in the latter has been called "superficial, matter-of-fact and empty reading . . . is simply an unimpressive stock figure." [49] With actor Kurt Raab playing Hitler in *Mussolini and I*, Mitchell summarizes the Hitler reading:

> Raab presents a rather different interpretation of Hitler, unctuous and manipulative, bullying Mussolini yet using a velvet touch because has a sincere reservoir of genuine affection for his fellow dictator and one time role model . . . Hitler is highly focused, yet casual, disciplined and in total control, a side of Hitler seldom portrayed on film.[50]

---

[48] *Mussolini: The Untold Story* could not be located. This description comes from Charles P. Mitchell's *The Hitler Filmography*.
[49] Mitchell, 161.
[50] Mitchell, 159.

This is indeed an apt description, for Hitler appears charming at times, while threatening to use "secret weapons" against Milan if Mussolini does not cooperate. The German dictator urges Mussolini to eliminate Count Ciano, Mussolini's son-in-law, because he is a "traitor," but later in the story phones to say goodbye in case they do not speak again.

Contextualizing films in the 1980s continued to invoke Hitler as a symbol for evil. However, it should be noted that Hitler's demonic nature is not stressed to the same extent as films from the 1970s. While this is partly a facet of the relatively short portrayals found in contextualizing pictures, it also suggests a slowly escalating tendency to avoid the outright demonizations found in earlier films. In these contextualizing films, filmmakers often avoided the issue of Hitler's humanity. Although evading such issues does not undermine the symbol of Hitler as extreme evil, it does carry the possibility of casting this evil in a more normal light where Hitler is merely a political or military enemy. At the same time, the absence of a definite argument *against* a demonic Führer lends itself to the default representation of Hitler in popular culture.

The use of Hitler as only a minor character in most films bespeaks the inherent difficulty in portraying such a figure – seemingly banal actions would be accused of eliciting sympathy for Hitler. Filmmakers dealt with this dilemma by either portraying him in fantastical/satirical movies or by using only safe scenes of short duration in serious films. These safe scenes generally took the form of political or military meetings, speeches and other (generally) historically documented events that do not suggest that Hitler was normal. It can be posited that many filmmakers therefore avoid portraying Hitler because any representations that stray from the established standards of dealing with him will be accused of sympathizing with or humanizing him. Those films that do

feature Hitler tend to avoid lengthy – or prominent – representations because such representations run the risk of humanizing Hitler. Any film that deals with Hitler at length or as a main character needs to clearly portray him as an abstract mythological creature, or risk humanizing him, at least in the eyes of the public. In the 1980s, the growing aptitude for treating Hitler seriously, coupled with films that featured extended screenings of Hitler, resulted in accusations of humanizing Hitler.

The 1980s produced five prominent motion pictures: *The Bunker* (1980); *Inside the Third Reich* (1982); *The Winds of War* (1983); *War and Remembrance* (1988); *Countdown to War* (1989). If *The Winds of War* and *War and Remembrance* are counted as one production, three of the four prominent films from the 1980s screen Hitler's "last days." A number of stock scenes or characteristics seem to have become requisite when presenting these "last days" on film: Hitler's suicide, the poisoning of Blondi and her pups, military conference tirades, etc. Although it is likely these scenes have been repeatedly used simply because they constitute available historical knowledge (recollections of the last days in the bunker, Albert Speer's memoirs, Trevor-Roper's work), they have become standard devices through which Hitler's humanity is explored. The nuances and slight discrepancies between films presenting these scenes, as evidenced in the opening to the previous chapter, can dramatically alter the nature of the resulting Hitler representation.

Indeed, modified portrayals of many of the same scenes described in the opening to the previous chapter place *The Bunker*, starring Anthony Hopkins as the Führer, in a unique position among the many films under discussion. One of the most successful and prominent Hitler portrayals, *The Bunker* is based on James O'Donnell's book of the same

name which was based almost entirely on interviews with survivors of the bunker.[51] However, most of the scenes directly dealing with Hitler were based on Albert Speer's recollections, who reportedly also served as an unofficial consultant for the production.[52] While originally broadcast on CBS television January 27, 1981 – and subsequently released on HBO Home Video – *The Bunker* was a co-production of SFP France and the television division of Time-Life. Unlike other films which narrate the story of Hitler's refuge underneath the Reich Chancellery, *The Bunker* does not restrict itself to the last few weeks but instead ranges over the 105 days before Hitler's suicide.

While Albert Speer is a central character, Hitler is seen independently of him – although never alone – as the film employs many points of view. Interestingly, there is no voice-over, save for O'Donnell's at the beginning and end of the film. This is noteworthy because most films employing Hitler as a main character utilize a voice-over; as has been discussed, the use of a voice-over often serves as a syntagmatic device to demonize Hitler.

Although *The Bunker* is indeed a humanizing motion picture, it certainly borders on demonizing – at times Hitler can be seen as approaching diabolical and insane evil. What situates this film in the humanizing category is that, despite all of Hitler's evil acts, he is still *human*. Indeed, Hopkins' has been credited with being "able to convey a weak and defeated Hitler as a human being but one who is unworthy of any sympathy or pity."[53] In fact, the actor received an Emmy award for his portrayal, and his rendition, along with the scripting, is among the strongest of any cinematic portrayals. The physical

---

[51] Mitchell, 25.
[52] Mitchell, 25.
[53] Mitchell, 29.

appearance is adequate and the mannerisms, from the mood swings to the shaking and feebleness, are extremely well done.

With a running time of over two hours,[54] Hitler occupies the most screen time of any one character. As such, it would be tedious to recount every moment in which Hitler appears. Instead, the focus will be on the representative examples. While Hitler appears calm and subdued at times, he also launches into vicious tirades. Several in particular stand out. Hitler is upset about a break in the German forces outside Berlin, exacerbated by repeated requests for him to retreat to his mountain retreat:

> "I will not go to Berchtesgaden! You and all of your incompetents can go to hell! I will stay in Berlin. You hear me! I will stay in Berlin! The Army has betrayed me! (gesturing with arms and hands violently) I will fight in Berlin! My orders were not carried out. I will fight to my last breath. I will die in Berlin. The Third Reich is totally finished. (He chokes out some words, as if he is about to break down sobbing) I'll die in Berlin. I've been betrayed. The war is lost. (Slumps down into chair) The war is lost . . . the war is lost (Hitler trails off, and the camera stays on him as he stares downward in a melancholic fashion, and the scene fades to intermission)."

This scene is joined by those where Hitler meets with Speer to discuss the latter's refusal to carry out the "scorched earth" policy (Appendix C(i)), and histrionics after Speer tells Hitler that he believes the war to be lost (Appendix C(ii)). What these rants have in common is the manner in which Hitler delivers them – the actual content is not excessively demonic if compared to other films. Nor are his rages as excessive as generally replicated, and by the end of these rants Hitler tends to calm down, if not gain composure. Furthermore, the film contends that Hitler has become virtually an empty shell, an exhausted man stretched to his physical, mental, and emotional limits. This contention is not to excuse Hitler in any way, but rather to help explain his deteriorating

---

[54] While the film runs for over two hours, including an intermission, the cassette box perplexingly lists the length at 89 minutes.

behaviour in the bunker. His hand is constantly shaking, he slurs, and he has some type of nervous tick – probably a reference to one of the medical conditions now believed to have afflicted Hitler, such as Parkinson's disease – which makes his head twitch when he is upset. He releases strange little laughs and noises, and his lips and tongue twitch even when he is not upset.

Hitler is so worn down that he appears to be manipulated at times by Bormann, Goebbels and the steady stream of injections and drugs. This manipulation strays dangerously close to the evils of modernity (the drugs) and a variant of the evil of supernatural forces (controlled by others), but in the end Hitler still makes his decisions for himself. Nevertheless, he is almost artificial in a way because of the drugs and injections that are required to keep him going; there are several scenes where the only purpose is to show Hitler being treated by Dr. Morrell. At one point while talking to Speer, Hitler's head and eyes jerk suddenly towards the corner as if he has heard a noise. Speer, puzzled, also looks at the corner. However, this is an isolated incident, and the point is only to illustrate that Hitler is on the verge of a breakdown, if it has not indeed already occurred.

Hitler is often exhausted and enjoys energetic spurts only when in the context of certain relationships: Albert Speer, Eva Braun, Goebbels' children and his dog. These relationships feel awkward, but genuine nonetheless. Charles P. Mitchell provides an exemplary summarization and appraisal of *The Bunker*, but his description of Hitler's relationship with Eva – "[h]is relationship with Eva Braun in the bunker is strangely empty and nonexistent. There are no words of affection or kindness between them, only a

shadowy vacuum."[55] – is definitely off the mark. True, there are no *words* of affection between them, and there are several scenes, including the wedding, where Hitler looks to be in an expressionless stupor. However, his manner and temperament changes when he is with Eva. When she arrives, he stands at the door looking without saying anything, but pleasure radiates from his face as he tries to suppress a hint of a smile. He is almost at a loss for words as he goes over and kisses her hand.

Then there is a flashback scene by Albert Speer, as he daydreams of happier times at Berchtesgaden. This is a recreation of the "home video" sequence: Hitler is downright jovial as he and Albert enthuse over architectural models, and the Führer becomes excited when told that Eva has arrived and rushes out to meet her. Speer watches from the window as the infamous footage of Hitler and Eva is recreated. The camera shows (from Speer's point of view at the second floor window) Hitler go outside to greet Eva, cuts for several seconds to Speer watching, and then back to Hitler and Eva being filmed from the angle of someone sitting on the patio, with a shot of them both from approximately the knees upwards. The camera moves with them as she feeds him cake, and Eva films him as he hops around with strange little bursts (throughout the scene little chuckles and gasps can faintly be heard). Eva hands Hitler the camera – he looks around to see if anyone is watching – and gives him a flower, he gives her the camera, and then hands back the flower which she puts in her hair as she continues to film him. Hitler again looks to see if anyone is watching – clearly concerned that someone might catch him in this unscripted moment – and turns back to her as the scene fades back to Speer in the present.

---

[55] Mitchell, 28.

Like his relationship with Eva, Hitler's friendship with Speer is awkward but real. Speer himself concludes that Hitler must actually like him, a fact evidenced by Hitler's demeanor around Speer and his loyalty to his favoured architect. He reveals thoughts to Speer that he does not to others, such as his fear of being captured by the Russians and being exhibited like an animal. Hitler's affection for Speer shows through in several scenes, such as the aforementioned flashbacks and when Speer does not carry out Hitler's "scorched earth" policy. Even though the National Socialist dictator yells at him, he had first surprised Speer by remembering that it was his birthday and presenting him with a present. Granted, this present may have been partly a ruse to compel Speer to follow his orders, but Hitler appears bashful and embarrassed as he gives the present: "I signed it to you personally. My hand shakes, you know. Ha, ha. My hand shakes, but I've signed it, to you. I hope you can read it." In fact, Hitler always appears to be trying to catch himself before he reveals too much emotion, although his emotions are evident at other points. The dictator is broken-hearted that Speer does not think the war can be won, but when the latter fakes believing in military success, Hitler effuses: "I never doubted it (with a close-up of his face, shown almost head on, and then the camera tracks back to side profile of both facing each other). I knew I could rely on you. I knew it. I knew it. Thank you, Speer. Thank you."

This scene is emblematic of the language that is used when films do attempt to stray from mythological interpretations. Generally, Hitler's relationship with his dog, relationships with Eva (often taking the form of the "home video") or Albert Speer, and the minutia of everyday life (such as selecting his wardrobe) are some devices that are employed to humanize Hitler. At another point in the film, Albert comes to see Hitler,

who he finds with (in what looks like cuddling) Blondi and her new pups, seeming like a proud parent wanting to share his pleasure with a friend: "[w]hat do you think, Speer? The little bitch has done very well." Even later when the cyanide pills are tested on the dog, it appears to be the doctor's idea, and Hitler waits until the deed is done before coming in to look, with dark circles under his eyes and a pained expression.

Like *Hitler: The Last Ten Days*, *The Bunker* contains several moments involving Hitler and the Goebbels children. However, in *The Bunker*, these scenes appear devoid of ulterior motives (Appendix C(iii)). Since *The Bunker* does not frame Hitler as an actor in his last few months, the sequences with children are assumed to be sincere, which is the opposite of other movies that have been perused. In a recreation of the last newsreel footage of Hitler, which can be found in other films, Hitler inspects members of the Hitler Youth. He appears sentimental as he puts his hands on one boy's face and tells him "I wish my generals had your courage." Hitler then pats him on the cheek and says "Good boy." This scene can be contrasted with its counterpart in *Hitler: The Last Ten Days*, where Hitler abruptly tells the Hitler Youth member to go back and fight.

As a whole, *The Bunker* is humanizing not simply because of a lack of demonizing, but because it contains overtly humanizing behaviour, attested to, albeit in an inadvertent manner, by complaints that the film "is also curiously disturbing as it creates the specter of a day when total understanding or psychological truth might allow Hitler to emerge, dramatically of course, as a hero."[56] Mitchell states that Hitler is "a mere shell of his former self, devoid and incapable of any genuine human emotion other than rage and regret,"[57] which captures Hopkins' rendition nicely, aside of the contention

---

[56] John J. O'Connor, "The Bunker," The *New York Times* (June 27, 1981, v.130), p. C19.
[57] Mitchell, 28.

made here that this Hitler is *not* devoid and incapable of genuine human emotion. He does appear capable of showing friendship and caring and, even if Hitler's personality and relationships are pathetic, they are still at times recognizable as those of a human being.

The Bunker is joined by *Countdown to War*, which was originally a British telefilm later shown in North America on PBS, as a humanizing film. Chronicling the events from March 15, 1938 to September 3, 1939 – the lead-up to the Second World War – Hitler occupies a prominent role along with the British, French, and Russian leaders. *Countdown to War* bases the majority of its dialogue on documented sources and includes seven noted historians as official advisors, including Jonathan Haslam, Anthony Reed and David Irving (who has since become infamous for his revisionist views).[58] Thus, it is strong historically but rather colorless and bland, especially in regards to the humanizing/demonizing paradigm. Charles P. Mitchell writes that:

> McKellen portrays Hitler in a more dry and business-like fashion than most other performers, with a minimum of tantrums and histrionics. Although argumentative, he is more often pensive, calculating, and unemotional as he attempts to bluff and outmaneuver his opponents. On occasion, since the actor makes no attempt to disguise his British accent, his reading as Hitler seems rather droll. . . . Although McKellen presents Hitler with a more human personality, his actions lead to the same abhorrent results, which renders his matter of fact tone rather chilling.[59]

Countdown to War is not at all *overtly* humanizing – many of the possible scenes or devices used to humanize Hitler in other films, such as his relationships, are not present. Hitler is basically just treated as a political actor and diplomat and is not explained by de-humanizing characteristics. *Countdown to War* is rather ambiguous, emerging only as *subtly* humanizing because it does not invoke any aspects of the various Hitler myths and

---

[58] Mitchell, 34.
[59] Mitchell, 35.

treats Hitler as a normal political leader. This is more an attempt to be historically accurate than to make a profound statement about the nature of Hitler, and it should be kept in mind that *Countdown to War* is relatively unknown compared to the other films in the prominent category. This largely explains why such a portrayal of Hitler generated little media attention.

The small reception given *Countdown to War* is contrasted by 1983's *The Winds of War*, which is considered one of the greatest mini-series of all time. [60] Split into seven episodes amounting to approximately 940 minutes covering the lead-up to America's involvement in the Second World War, *The Winds of War* was based on Herman Wouk's novel and ensuing screenplay of the same title and was directed and co-produced by Dan Curtis. Largely following the travails of the Henry family, the story cuts between different countries and leaders, including Churchill, Roosevelt, Stalin and Mussolini. Hitler is also portrayed but, interestingly, is the only leader shown independently of Victor "Pug" Henry, the father of the family and a naval officer who serves as one of the main protagonists. Pug is an American naval attaché in Europe who earns the ear of President Roosevelt after predicting the German-Soviet Non-Aggression Pact of 1939. Other major characters include his wife Rhoda, his children Warren, Byron, and Madeline, as well as the various people they become involved with on a personal level, including Natalie Jastrow and her uncle, Professor Aaron Jastrow, who are both Jews.

Relatively speaking, the Hitler representation in *The Winds of War* is a plot/literary device; there are seventeen Hitler appearances, but given the overall length of the production, this amounts to only several minutes in each episode. In the scenes

---

[60] Mitchell, 243.

where he is actually pictured, the film's authors intriguingly show different sides of Hitler. The same is done paradigmatically and syntagmatically. Hitler carries a constant scowl and the music used during Hitler scenes is ominous and foreboding, and is even more noticeable when compared to the scenes featuring Stalin. By comparison, the Soviet leader is presented as affable and non-threatening, which is surprising given the state of historical knowledge on Stalin that was available by the early 1980s (and considering that this was an American production and the Cold War had not yet ended).

A large portion of the Hitler appearances are as necessary plot devices, for one could barely imagine undertaking a Second World War story of this scope without including the primary driving force behind the events. However, as in other contextualizing films, Hitler can be historically portrayed with little perspicuity provided concerning his basic nature. Many of the Hitler scenes show the dictator on screen while a voice-over informs the viewer of what is transpiring (i.e. Hitler meeting with Count Ciano) and only a few snippets of actual dialogue are included. As the voice-over only factually states what is occurring, the viewer is largely left with the paradigmatic devices already described, such as the background music. However, there are sequences where character development occurs, and this is where *Winds of War* diverges from most plot/literary device films.

For example, Hitler is shown taking a walk with his dog, Blondi, and Hermann Göring on June 23, 1941, the day after Operation Barbarossa (the invasion of the Soviet Union) has begun. This sequence is preceded by documentary shots of the invasion, accompanied by a voice-over speaking of the assault's success, and a short military conference scene doing likewise. Beginning with a medium-long shot, the two Nazi

leaders walk along a dirt road in full daylight with a mixture of tanks, fortifications and trees in the background. As they approach close-up range, Göring informs Hitler about the actions of the Einsatzgruppen, the "Special Actions" groups assigned to the elimination of the Jews. Upon learning that Heinrich Himmler will be sending in "daily figures" from these "Special Actions," Hitler insists that he be informed of them immediately.

It is clear Hitler has full knowledge of the Final Solution; he says in reference to the discussion, "[s]o begins the fulfillment of a dream" to which Goring replies "[o]f a glorious and heroic vision, mein Führer A purified Europe. And in time, a purified world." The camera has been alternating between side profile shot and direct frontal head shots, and as Göring mouths this line, Hitler turns toward him and stares solemnly without saying a word. The shot is a low angle, with Hitler's face in full view, although his face – especially his eyes – are shadowed by the brim of his hat. This combination of shadow and angle gives a very dark and sinister appearance, as does the long stare Hitler casts at Göring after the latter speaks. From this point, Hitler looks down and crouches to pet his dog, saying, "[l]ately, I've neglected the dog most cruelly. Blondi, good dog, Blondi. Good dog." The interaction is now shot from an even lower angle, so the faces of both the crouching Hitler and standing Goring are simultaneously visible. Goring continues where he left off: "[m]ankind will one day understand your lofty aims and honour you for them, mein Führer."

This sequence is quite paradoxical – Hitler concurrently calls the impending elimination of the Jews a dream come true and laments his treatment of the dog. A number of explanations can be imagined to provide for such an attachment to Blondi; the

need for loyalty, the need to dominate, etc. However, the only explanation that matters in this context is the explanation provided by the film itself, and there is really no explanation given, leaving one to assume that this was a normal attachment to an animal. The placing of Hitler's affection for the dog is more pointed – it is a contrast to his willingness to exterminate a race of people. Of course, Hitler's attitude towards the dog is so overwhelmingly overshadowed by the Final Solution that it is in some respects ludicrous to compare. However, the point is that despite Hitler's horrendous acts, he still appears human in at least some respects.

A similar duality can be derived from a scene where Hitler holds a little girl at a party; this scene can be read a variety of ways, each with demonizing and humanizing potential. On a denotative level, Hitler is playing with a little girl and derives great satisfaction from it. However, the connotative meaning includes the possibility that this is Hitler acting and his behaviour is merely a function of the charisma he uses to hide his demonic nature. It has been shown in *Hitler: The Last Ten Days*, for instance, how sequences with children are actually the inverse of their superficial appearance. The impression one receives from studying this film is that Hitler is an actor. This claim is further substantiated by Gunter Meisner, the actor portraying Hitler, who stated that he approached the role by deciding that Hitler was an "actor."[61]

Subsequently, Hitler enters a room lit by the fireplace where Pug has been waiting (along with American banker Luigi Gianelli and several Nazi officials). Near the end of a lengthy harangue, Hitler becomes especially heated, shouting as he alternates between comments about peace or destruction. He argues: "I was born to create. Not to destroy –

---

[61] Gerald Clark, "The $40 million gamble (Winds of War TV production)," *Time Magazine*, February 7, 1983, v.121, p. 70(6).

I am an artist," but soon after begins yelling that other countries must not stand in the way of rejoining all Germans together under Hitlerism, for he has been building:

> planes, planes, planes, U-boats, U-boats, U-boats. Bombs! Bombs! Bombs! Tanks! Tanks! Tanks, to the sky! . . . out of strength, I offered the outstretched hand of peace. I was rejected, scorned. At the price of peace, our foes demand my head . . . my conscience is clear before the bar of history. So let the test of fire come, Germany will emerge victorious. If not, we'll all go down together, and Europe as we know it will cease to exist!

Hitler violently gesticulates during much of this tirade, and at points there are extreme close-ups of only his mouth and eyes. Considering this scene comes so closely on the heels of Hitler playing with the child, the conception of Hitler as an actor is emphasized. However, which is the real Hitler? Does he genuinely want peace or destruction? Ultimately, the latter receives more of an endorsement in this sequence, for the close-ups of his face while he rages seem indicative of a serious and obsessed manner.

The question remains as to whether the apparently humanizing comments or actions are meant to be ironic. The tension between contradictory scenes – in terms of the representation dyad – is well illustrated by the scenes already discussed, and by the reoccurring question as to Hitler's sanity. This question is answered in the affirmative – Hitler is crazy – by several characters throughout the film: Natalie Jastrow makes the comment that her father is "terrified that Hitler is a devil" and Mussolini states that Hitler's "hatred for the British and French ruling classes is maniacal." At the same time, there are other comments that suggest the alternative. Victor "Pug" Henry writes that Hitler "is a very able man;" he is not the "half-crazy, half-comical gangster that [the American public] has been reading about."

The plot very much suggests that Pug's judgment is the most astute of any of the characters, considering not only his proximity to the main historical figures but also President Roosevelt's unwavering trust in his intuition. At a White House dinner party, President Roosevelt asks if Hitler is a "madman," and after Secretary of State Welles replies that: "I looked hard for such evidence, Mr. President. But, as I reported I found him a very cool, very knowledgeable, skilled advocate," Henry says: "I'm afraid I must agree with Mr. Welles. Face to face, the man has a powerful presence with an incredible memory and a remarkable ability to marshal the facts when he speaks." However, the very last time the subject is broached in the film – as Germany declares war on America – Professor Jastrow declares that he always though Hitler "play-acted" but now thinks he is a "maniac." The appraisals of Hitler's sanity by other characters within the film affect the viewer's impression. This pattern of denying Hitler's insanity, only to realize in the end that he is a "maniac" when it is perhaps too late, is a reference to the filmmakers' conception of Hitler as an actor and, one can assume, is meant to mirror appeasement policies. *The Winds of War* skirts the middle ground between the humanizing and demonizing categories; the movie does not undermine or negate the denotative meaning of Hitler as evil, and the connotations – while not overwhelmingly – ultimately buttress this conception.

The Winds of War was followed in 1988 by its sequel, *War and Remembrance*,[62] which was again penned by Herman Wouk and directed by Dan Curtis. *War and Remembrance* was "the world's longest (32 hours), costliest ($110 million) and most

---

[62] *War and Remembrance* was twelve chapters long and the mini-series was initially broadcast in two separate runs: Chapters 1-7 appeared on ABC in November 1988 with 8-12 following in May 1989.

grandiloquent television mini-series,"[63] and received "deserved praise for its frank presentation"[64] of the plight of the Jews and it also received a considerable number of awards and nominations.[65] However, it was not near as successful as its earlier counterpart, and in fact has been called "one of the great disappointments in the history of TV."[66] *The Winds of War* far surpassed *War and Remembrance* in both critical and popular acclaim, although it has been pointed out that being only "half as good [as *The Winds of War*] is still a remarkable achievement."[67]

Mitchell argues that Stephen Berkoff more closely resembled Hitler than had his predecessor, Gunter Meisner.[68] At the same time, Mitchell states that the role of Hitler is not near as well written as in *The Winds of War,*[69] and this assessment holds true upon reviewing the mini-series. The character of Adolf Hitler is not developed to near the same extent as in *The Winds of War*, and functions as more of a plot/literary device in many instances; he figures prominently in only episodes 5,9,10, and 12, briefly in 1,2,4,6,7, and 11, and is missing entirely from episodes 3 and 8. In fact, the role of Hitler diverges so significantly that *War and Remembrance* is actually more demonizing than was *The Winds of War*. This demonization may be due in large part to the situations that Hitler is generally found in during films covering the period after 1941; Hitler is increasingly stressed and worn down from spending the majority of his time dealing with military situations.

---

[63] *The Economist*, (December 3, 1988, vol.309, n.7579) p.105(1).
[64] Mitchell, 233.
[65] Mitchell, 233.
[66] Jeff Jarvis, "War and Remembrance (television program reviews)," *People Weekly* (May 8, 1989, v.31, n.18) p.13(1).
[67] Mitchell, 230.
[68] Mitchell, 232-34.
[69] Mitchell, 234.

In the vast majority of occasions where Hitler is shown in *War and Remembrance*, it is in a military conference or briefing scenario. Hence, the Nazi dictator is generally either calmly or hysterically discussing military matters. In Parts 1 through 3 Hitler is portrayed as a rather stock figure, giving orders not to withdraw and throwing occasional fits. These tirades are well done throughout, for Berkoff is able physically to mimic the Führer quite well: he pushes back the forelock, sweats profusely, is seething spittle at the lips, and displays intense eyes. Hitler makes comments concerning the elimination of traitors or generals who do not follow orders, but otherwise little is provided in the way of ascertaining whether Hitler can be understood as a human.

Part 4 is fairly innocuous until the end of the Hitler appearance, for after saying that "America is one big bluff" he launches into an extended cackling that is quite unnerving. This scenario repeats itself to an extent when Hitler watches a film of executions for those involved in the July assassination plot; he and Göring laugh in delight as others look on in somber silence, some of them aghast. This behaviour, most notably in the latter example, is indicative of diabolical evil. Other remarks by Hitler during the mini-series can also be construed as diabolical evil. After the bomb explosion from the assassination attempt, Hitler states, "[p]repare the list, Göring, of those who will die" and later to Albert Speer he asserts that "if the war is lost the people of Germany are lost!" However, these passages could be attributed in part to the stress Hitler was under due to the war, and may not alone be sufficiently demonizing. What moves them from merely violent and sinister comments towards demonic utterances is the picture on-screen of Hitler that accompanies them. Hitler gesticulates violently, jerking his body as he sits up and down or moves around, he stretches his voice to the point of breaking because he

is yelling or rasping so extremely, he sweats profusely, and he finishes exhausted and panting. It is the out-of-control wildness of his outbursts that inflect his comments, and perhaps no behaviour is more powerful than the intensity of his seemingly permanently wide-open eyes which, at times, are highlighted by the use of extreme close-ups on Hitler's face.

While Hitler is made out to be ruthless and evil in a variety of other tirades – such as in his exchange with Erwin Rommel during Part 7 (Appendix D) – these types of scenes do not fully render him demonic. Nor do they humanize him, however, for there is little in the way of overt humanizing in *War and Remembrance*. In a short scene with Hitler walking along a mountain path at Berchtesgaden while the voice-over talks about the coming of Operation Overlord and the German defence of the Atlantic Wall, he is accompanied by his Alsatian dog. As is often the case, showing Hitler's affection for Blondi is a common way of commenting on his humanity, albeit with differing effects depending on the movie. Granted, in this scene Hitler is only pictured walking her, but the deliberate inclusion of the dog infers that the relationship was important to Hitler. Hitler's suicide does seem humanizing, but only when compared to other filmic interpretations of the same subject. The scene opens with a close-up of Eva's shoes lying on the ground, then zooms back to reveal them sitting on a couch (Hitler picks up and puts back down a gun), and then zooms in on Hitler's hand going to his pocket for the cyanide pill box; his hands shake as he takes the two capsules out and gives one to Eva. They look at each other, Hitler picks up the gun, and they stare at each other again. Hitler raises the gun to his head and puts the capsule in his mouth, and the camera quickly

zooms in so only his hand as he pulls the trigger can be seen; the scene then cuts to outside the bunker.

In other cinematic treatments, Hitler and Eva argue as they prepare to die. However, in *War and Remembrance* they say nothing and exchange long stares. While it is difficult to extrapolate from this scene, as nothing throughout the film implies anything about their relationship, this ending does leave open the possibility that Hitler was capable of normal human relationships. The suicide scene also displays the need to contextualize and compare filmic Hitler representations, for in some respects Hitler is being measured against himself. Hitler's behaviour while he commits suicide does not seem humanizing in and of itself or compared to what might be expected from a group suicide scene in any other context but, compared to depictions of Hitler's suicide on film, it is arguably humanizing.

The syntagmatic effect of the voice-over can be felt throughout the film. In addition to further references to the Final Solution – a voice-over says that Himmler has been carrying out "Hitler's monstrous massacre called the Final Solution" and relays that he has ordered the evidence of death camps eliminated – the use of the voice-over pushes the Hitler portrayal in *War and Remembrance* closer to demonizing. For instance, after the executions following the July 20, 1944 assassination attempt: "[a]nd so begins the bloodbath. Adolf Hitler will slaughter all surviving opposition, more than 5000 Germans, most of them innocent." Near the end of the war, he commands "armies that exist only in his fevered imagination," and is described as "a lunatic, hysterical despot," and "to the last, he is the fanatical, hate-filled street agitator."

While the use of a voice-over to influence the reception of Hitler is syntagmatic, the Hitler reading is also affected by paradigmatic devices. For instance, the positioning of the camera and the subject: Hitler is usually seated throughout *War and Remembrance* and is often filmed from a low angle. The purpose is to literally and figuratively display that he is a worn-out shell of his former self. Aside from films that deal specifically with Hitler's last days in the bunker, filmmakers who portray Hitler in the last few years of the war appear fairly constricted in the material they have to work with. As the war begins to turn against Germany after the initial defeats in Russia, Hitler increasingly becomes a shell of his former self, worn-out and dependant on drugs and medication. His only waking concern is the war and, given the general nature of the war after 1941, he is understandably upset most of the time. Hitler becomes less and less human as the grind and stress of the war gets to him, the perception that *War and Remembrance* creates. While Hitler is not *overtly* demonized, he is nonetheless represents diabolical and insane evil. Paradigmatically, this Hitler portrayal is in flux between humanization and demonization, but the syntagmatic effects – most notably the voice-over – progressively demonize Hitler.

The ambiguity present in so many of the films under discussion stems from the nature of both Hitler as a historical figure and film as a medium. While film has the capability to be more expressive, or even more realistic, than written works,[70] the medium also presents the capability to be less explicit in terms of presenting an appraisal of Hitler. For instance, films can provide suggestions or hints while avoiding unequivocal statements about Hitler's humanity. Conversely, historians – because of the medium of

---

[70] Monaco, Chapter 3.

the written word – have to use written language, which leaves less room for a grey area. Therefore, one could presuppose that filmmakers are at times ambiguous because they are in some ways bound by the conventions of film, while in other respects they take advantage of these conventions. The latter case is more applicable here: filmmakers want to avoid outlandish demonizing and mythologizing representations without being accused of rehabilitating or humanizing Hitler, or they themselves believe the figure of Hitler to be too paradoxical to fully explain. Hence, many filmmakers purposely portray Hitler ambiguously.

A demonizing portrait by virtue of ambiguity is characteristic of *Inside the Third Reich*. An American television mini-series, *Inside the Third Reich* depicts and relies heavily on Albert Speer, most notably his memoirs of the same title as the film (with "additional information" taken from John Toland's *Adolf Hitler*, William Shirer's *Berlin Diary: The Journal of a Foreign Correspondent, 1934-1941* and *The Rise and Fall of the Third Reich: A History of Nazi Germany*, and Joachim C. Fest's *Hitler*). The film opens with a sub-title stating that "the following is a dramatization of the life of Albert Speer, who was Adolf Hitler's personal architect, confident, and protégé in Nazi Germany. It is based on Speer's autobiography, interviews and other source material." The film consists of extended flashbacks from Speer's cell at the Nuremberg trials, with Speer played by Rutger Hauer.

Derek Jacobi is widely seen as providing a stellar Hitler characterization, with critics calling his reading "the most well-rounded of all screen Hitlers"[71] and contending that Jacobi "evokes the Führer with a masterful verve."[72] Jacobi manages to capture

---

[71] Mitchell, 125.
[72] Harry F. Waters, "Inside the Third Reich," *Newsweek* (May 10, 1982, v.99), p. 65.

Hitler's speaking style and charisma – as well as the ensuing ability to manipulate people, such as Speer – quite remarkably. Mitchell contends that Jacobi integrates the bourgeois side of Hitler into elements of his portrayal – including Hitler's relationship with Eva Braun – which some historians characterize as "Hitler in slippers."[73] This appraisal holds true after considered reflection upon what is shown of Hitler and Eva's relationship in *Inside the Third Reich*. Hitler is shown in tuxedos with white gloves, and then wearing glasses, a tie, and suspenders, practicing gestures in front of the mirror, and mimicking his speeches as he sits watching them in the projection room. He even does imitations of Benito Mussolini and Neville Chamberlain at a New Year's Party.

However, the film contends that Hitler is really just an "empty vessel," a shell of a man who is constantly putting on an act. Even Speer does not feel like he really knows Hitler or has a real relationship with him. Speer is told that if Hitler has a best friend he is it, but yet their relationship – aside from their mutual love for architecture – comes across as very superficial. Hitler's penchant for acting renders other scenes which have the possibility of humanizing as empty gestures. Hitler pulls up in a horse-drawn carriage and picks up one of the Goebbels children in his arms. However, given that the scene takes place in full view of many people, it is reasonable to conclude that Hitler is again acting.

There is a scene which could conceivably be legitimately humanizing. As Speer is inside on the telephone, he watches Hitler and Eva play fight in the snow. Hitler rushes toward Eva (doubling over in laughter), pushing snow on her and falling down. Eva helps him get up and he picks her up in a bear hug, they hold hands and run from Blondi until they are off screen (the view is from the window where Speer talks on the phone, so the

---

[73] Mitchell, 125.

view is somewhat obstructed). This scene is humanizing, if it is assumed that no one is watching and Hitler is behaving naturally. Even if this is the case, it is still overwhelmed by demonizing effects throughout the rest of *Inside the Third Reich*.

Some commentators have implied that *Inside the Third Reich* humanized Hitler, for "[a]udiences conditioned to seeing Hitler depicted as a crazed Caligula may find Jacobi's interpretation unsettlingly sympathetic."[74] However, most others do not share this opinion, calling Hitler "a master psychotic, whose depths and demons the world still wants to decipher"[75] and stating that " Jacobi is able to keep his Hitler from being even slightly sympathetic. He is basically a hollow man, filled with nothing more than his own self-importance, yet lacking in any shred of genuine humanity."[76] Aside of once again illustrating the subjectivity of a project of this nature, this last quote is a keen summarization of this Hitler performance.

Whereas in *The Bunker* Hitler showed the capability to forge human relationships with Eva, Speer, and Blondi, these interactions are not genuine in *Inside the Third Reich*. Aside from the snow-fight scene, Eva just floats around – to Hitler, her purpose is akin to window dressing. Speer eventually realizes that his friendship with the Führer is predicated on a mutual interest in architecture and what each can do for the other. Hitler even throws a subtle threat at Speer while talking about a Dr. Todt: "the man's a defeatist. I won't tolerate that – from *anyone* (cocks his head and eyes at Speer)." Even Blondi, a common device to show or imply that Hitler has a human side, is used sparingly, and appears little more than a superficial prop, for Eva refers to Hitler

---

[74] Waters, p. 65
[75] Richard Corliss, "Inside the Third Reich," *Time Magazine* (May 10, 1982, v.99), p. 82.
[76] Mitchell, 125.

complaining that he does not like the dog as much as he used to because she is not a "purebred."

Hitler is demonized most effectively by his own behaviour. Aside from the bankruptcy of his relationships, his charisma erodes as the war progresses. In a well-orchestrated shot, a train pulls up beside Hitler's dining car and, looking through the window at wounded soldiers, Hitler is superimposed over their image in the reflection of the mirror. Hitler snaps his fingers ordering the blinds to be closed – earlier comments in the film indicate that he will not listen to any news about casualties because he does not care. The tirades are generally sparse, and not near as physically intense as other cinematic portrayals, but their content is noteworthy (Appendix E).

The National Socialist leader symbolizes primordial and diabolical evil above all else. In doing so, *Inside the Third Reich* joins nine other films from the 1980s as demonizing: *The Winds of War; War and Remembrance; Great Escape II: The Untold Story*; *Order of the Black Eagle*; *Hitler's SS: Portrait in Evil*; *The Dirty Dozen: The Next Mission*; *Highway to Hell*; *Hard Rock Zombies*; *To Be or Not to Be*. There is one strongly humanizing film (*The Bunker*), one subtly humanizing film (*Countdown to War*), with two satirical-humanizing films (*That's Adequate*; *Under the Rainbow*). There are also four contextualizing films which are *between* humanizing and demonizing: *Indiana Jones and the Last Crusade*; *The Plot to Kill Hitler*; *Mussolini and I*; *Mussolini: The Untold Story*. However, these four films do not sufficiently undermine or negate the demonized image of Adolf Hitler. Hence, it can be argued that they contribute in an indirect manner to the Führer's demonization. Finally, both *History of the World, Part I* and *Zelig* cannot be placed under either the demonizing or humanizing heading.

73

In the 1980-1990 period, four films engage in humanizing, with ten demonizing pictures, and four representations that are ultimately demonizing by virtue of a lack of humanization. Thus, roughly a quarter of the films are humanizing to some extent. In the 1968-1979 period, under a third of the films were humanizing. However, virtually all of these films were satires which only humanized indirectly by ridiculing Hitler. Conversely, in the 1980s two of the humanizing representations are prominent films, which is significant, and when Hitler was portrayed as outside of humanity, this was generally done so less overtly. However, while the beginnings of a language for humanizing started to become apparent in the 1980s, Hitler was still nevertheless generally portrayed as a symbol for extreme evil in film.

Chapter Four:
Conclusion

In his groundbreaking work from 1983, historian Ian Kershaw delved into the "Hitler Myth," exploring the manner in which Adolf Hitler had achieved a supernatural status for Germans.[77] In many ways, "Hitler myths" have continued since the fall of Nazi Germany and its Führer and, while these myths have taken decidedly different forms, the historical figure of Hitler has retained a supernatural status. Whereas this status had positive implications during the Nazi era – Germany's saviour – in post-war America Hitler has come to symbolize virtually the exact opposite: the benchmark of evil. As a historical ghost, Adolf Hitler has not lost his mythical status – on film Hitler remains a figure seemingly beyond human.

The celluloid ghost of Hitler grew out of a variety of trends – both popular and scholarly – and an outgrowth of this explosion of fascination with the Führer resulted in a plethora of filmic representations: thirty-five films featuring a Hitler representation, where the Nazi leader is played by an actor, were released between 1968 and 1990. fifteeen of these films were released between 1968 and 1979, with the remaining twenty coming in the period 1980 to 1990 (Appendix F). In the 1968 to 1979 period, four films employed prominent Hitler representations, five films satirized Hitler, with six contextualizing (or plot/literary device) films. The 1980s played host to five prominent representations, six satires, and nine contextualizing films. In total, there are nine prominent representations, eleven satires and fifteen contextualizing films.

---

[77] Ian Kershaw, *The Hitler Myth: Image and Reality in the Third Reich* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1987).

Out of these thirty-five films, twenty-three can be labeled as demonizing and nine as humanizing (Appendix F). In addition, there are three films which cannot be appropriately located in either category. One of these films, *Zelig*, falls in the plot/literary device category while the other two, *Blazing Saddles* and *History of the World, Part I*, are satirical films. The majority of films carry demonizing representations of Hitler, which is further exacerbated when taking into account that six of the nine humanizing films are satires, which are only pseudo-humanizing (although one of the satires is *The Producers*, borders on the prominent category). Satire has the capability to demonize, humanize or *neither* – making Hitler a ridiculous figure does not necessarily provide insight into the nature of his humanity, but can leave it ambiguous. The satires that do humanize tend to do so only indirectly. Moreover, one of the humanizing films is a contextualizing film, leaving only two of the humanizing films as prominent representations. Conversely, eight of the ten prominent films are demonizing and virtually all the contextualizing films can also be placed within the demonizing paradigm.

Between 1968 and 1990, Hitler became such a strong sign that he acquired denotative meaning; in other words, Hitler was associated with demonic evil to such an extent that filmmakers had only to present him on-screen and the association was virtually automatic. The 1968 to 1979 period formed and shaped this sign, and its acceptance is demonstrated by the fact that the number of films using the Nazi leader as a sign for demonic evil relatively increased in the 1980s. Furthermore, in the 1980s, there are more films (twenty films in an eleven year period compared to fifteen in twelve years) featuring Hitler or using him as a major character. The 1968-1979 period featured four prominent demonizing representations, with three such films between 1980-1990,

and virtually all contextualizing films between 1980-1990 use Hitler as an icon of evil while a larger proportion of satirical films do the same.

However, the appearance of two prominent films which humanized Hitler – although it should be noted that *Countdown to War* does not seem to have enjoyed a large audience in North America, comparatively speaking[78] – is significant. These two films hint at a decrease in the hegemony of the Hitler sign. Furthermore, in some cases in the 1980s where Hitler is ultimately demonized, this conception is more sophisticated and less outlandish than in previous years. In many of the cases where Hitler is ultimately de-humanized, there are glimpses of normal or human behaviour and it is not always immediately obvious whether a representation engages in demonizing or humanizing. This increased ambiguity also suggests the beginning of a shift away from the types of representations produced prior to the 1980s.

A cursory examination of the post-1990 period suggests that a number of films – *Conversation With the Beast* (1996); *The Empty Mirror* (1999); *Hitler Meets Christ* (2000); *Full Frontal* (2002)*; Hitler the Rise of Evil* (2003)*; Max* (2003) – also exhibit attempts to examine Hitler more as a human than as a monster. The fact that these films all fall within a relatively short temporal period suggests that Hitler as a sign of demonic evil may well have entered a stage of flux in the late 1990s. If, indeed, a shift has begun to take place, humanizing films from the 1980s would likely be included as formative events, in addition to influences such as trends in historiography, the breakdown of the Cold War geo-political structures, and the contemporary temporal distance from the Nazi

---

[78] *Countdown to War* was a British telefilm played in North America on PBS and later released on home video.

era. Nevertheless, Hitler as a sign for demonic evil is well established between 1968 and 1990.

This study has concentrated on *if* and *how* Hitler has been demonized but, at this point, further insight into *why* is in order. There is an obvious trend in the production of English-language films featuring Hitler representations: filmic representations of Hitler were increasingly predominated by American companies (Appendix G), which was partially a product of the increasing ascendancy of Hollywood and American television networks, but is also a facet of the rising American fascination with Nazism, the Holocaust and the Second World War. It is also related to scholarly literature concerning Hitler, which brings up the inevitable question of whether historiography helped to shape popular culture, or vice versa? To fully answer such a query would necessitate another study, but it does appear that filmic representations of Hitler do show definite corollaries with academic history.

A complete overview of historiography concerning Hitler and the various aspects of Nazism would require a book-length effort, and indeed has.[79] If the focus remains solely on academic studies that concern Hitler's humanity or lack thereof, as this study has done, there still remains an enormous body of literature to consider. For the most part, biographical works about Hitler have played the leading role in shaping questions about his humanity. The most useful overview for the purposes of this study is Ron Rosenbaum's *Explaining Hitler: The Search for the Origins of His Evil*, which – as the

---

[79] There are a variety of trends and debates concerning National Socialist historiography, such as the "intentionalist-functionalist" dispute, the *Historikerstreit*, etc, which will not be dealt with in this study. For detailed treatment of these and other historiographical topics, consult: John Hiden and John Farquharson, *Explaining Hitler's Germany: Historians and the Third Reich*, 2nd ed. (London: Batsford Academic and Educational Ltd,, 1989); Ian Kershaw, *The Nazi Dictatorship: Problems and Perspectives of Interpretation*, 4th ed. (New York: Oxford University Press, 2000); and John Lukacs, *The Hitler of History* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1998).

subtitle suggests – pays close attention to the question of Hitler's "evil." Rosenbaum explores the various scholars who have provided influential Hitler studies, constantly concerned with whether these scholars consider Hitler to be "off the grid," that is, outside the human spectrum or continuum.[80]

While there is not space here to determine the extent of the relationship between historiography and popular culture, there are striking similarities between the two. In addition to subjects such as Hitler's "last ten days" and the Hitler "survival myth," scholars have tended to present a portrait of Hitler that is demonizing. Rosenbaum identifies how in the 1950s and 1960s, prominent authors such as Alan Bullock, Hugh Trevor-Roper, and John Toland variously demonized Hitler, a trend further exacerbated by the psycho-historical studies of the 1970s.[81] This trend is exemplified by the comments of two prominent historians: Martin Broszat and Joachim C. Fest. In 1985 Broszat called for a "humanization" of Hitler,[82] and in the 1995 edition of *Hitler*, Fest writes that Hitler has "not at all become historical" and "has been unduly 'demonized' and that a 'historicization' of Hitler is missing."[83]

The conception of Hitler as a demonic or ahistorical figure was therefore supported – if not directly formed – by scholarly literature in the three decades after the Second World War.[84] The impact of scholarly literature on popular culture is tenuous, but

---

[80] Rosenbaum, xiii.

[81] The most prominent of the psycho-historical studies include Robert Waite, *The Psychopathic God: Adolf Hitler* (New York: Basic Books, 1977); and Walter C. Langer, *The Mind of Adolf Hitler: The Secret Wartime Report* (New York: Basic Books, 1972).

[82] Lukacs, 5.

[83] Lukacs, xii.

[84] The biographical and political approach was most common in the twenty-five-odd years after the end of the war, and the "Hitler-Welle" of the 1970s which saw a dramatic increase in popular culture representations of Hitler also gave rise to an outpouring of academic literature. The "Hitler-centric" studies which characterized historiography before the 1980s gave way to social and structural history, as relatively few analyses concentrated on Hitler proper in the 1980s and 1990s.

it appears that cinematic representations of Adolf Hitler were influenced, to at least some degree, by historiographical representations. It is most likely that this influence was strongest in the 1970s, before historiography became significantly less "Hitler-centric." Beginning in the 1970s:

> 'two cultures' of discourse have emerged. While the specter of Hitler looms ever larger as an icon and embodiment of ultimate evil in popular culture, on the other hand, in academic and scholarly literature a focus on Hitler (often characterized as a quaintly 'Hitler-centric' perspective) has become increasingly unfashionable and déclassé, regarded almost disdainfully as a relic of the much-reproved Great Man Theory of History. Disparaged in favor of purportedly more sophisticated explanatory modes – Great Abstraction theories, the ones that emphasize 'deeper trends' in history, society and ideology.[85]

Furthermore, in *Imagining Hitler*, Alvin Rosenfeld writes that the "dramatic, cinematic image of Hitler"[86] in Hugh Trevor-Roper's *The Last Days of Hitler* "was the defining image of Hitler, the ur-Hitler for the decades of fiction that followed, and the chief source of the overheated, gothic, demonic vision that has dominated postwar literature, pulp, and film."[87] Indeed, one of the most well known and watched cinematic treatments of the Nazi leader, *Hitler: The Last Ten Days*, was based directly on Trevor-Roper's work. In addition, films such as *The Bunker* and *Inside the Third Reich* cite various historical literature in their credits, and it can be assumed that many other filmmakers also consulted the wide range of scholarly sources.

It is obvious that academic appraisals of Hitler have exerted influence upon popular representations. To return again to the Hitler "survival myth," it appears to have origins in scholarly works, such as Trevor-Roper's, but took on new forms and increased popularity through popular culture. However, it is also possible to argue that since the

---

[85] Rosenbaum, xxvii.
[86] Rosenbaum, 66.
[87] Rosenbaum, 66.

1980s, popular sources such as cinematic and television movies have been as influential in terms of shaping the popular memory. It would seem that until the 1970s (or possibly the 1980s) historiography was the leading medium in shaping mainstream conceptions of Hitler; this assertion is based on a relative lack of Hitler representations in popular culture mediums until the 1970s, and that through the 1970s film representations do not appear to stray too substantially from academic representations of Hitler. However, the 1980s witnessed a large relative decrease in the amount of scholarly attention paid specifically to Hitler, while filmic renditions of Hitler continued to increase both qualitatively and quantitatively. Furthermore, Saul Friedländer has argued that:

> during the seventies, film and literature opened the way to some sort of 'new discourse.' Historiography followed and the mid-eighties witnessed heated debates about the new interpretations . . . and, in more general terms, about the proper historicization of National Socialism.[88]

While the reciprocal relationship between film and historiography is in need of further research, it is evident that historiography played a role in shaping cinematic representations of Hitler. Partly a facet of the historiography of Nazism, but increasingly an entity unto itself, the rise of American Holocaust consciousness in the past thirty-odd years – what has been dubbed the "Americanization" of the Holocaust – has also served as a formative force. Since the ghost of Adolf Hitler is so inextricably intertwined with the Holocaust, the vagaries of Holocaust memory impact the memory of its chief author. In fact, the popularity of the Führer within American popular culture mirrors that of Holocaust consciousness in most respects. While there were relatively few academic Holocaust studies in the immediate post-war decades, both popular and scholarly interest

---

[88] Friedländer, 2.

became piqued in the late 1960s and into the 1970s. Furthermore, interest in both the Holocaust and Hitler have only continued to increase since the 1970s.

Several authors have provided exemplary accounts of the history of the Holocaust in American popular culture,[89] highlighting events such as *The Diary of Anne Frank* in its film and stage versions, the Eichmann trial, the Six-Day War, the 1978 television mini-series *Holocaust*, and the founding of the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum.[90] In addition,

> a shift in the very conception of America as a paragon society . . . with the advent of the civil rights movement and the war in Vietnam . . . opened up the prospect of seeing America not as a shining example to the world but as a country that caused suffering at home and abroad . . . in this context, it is not surprising, then, that the Holocaust eventually became the ultimate analogy for reflecting on the evils humans have afflicted upon other humans . . . upon the Jews was conferred the dubious moral prestige of being the ultimate victims of historical evil.[91]

The Holocaust became an "artifact of American culture"[92] and as such, has "attained power stature as a moral paradigm in America's public culture"[93] and become a "moral reference point."[94] For example, "the right [wing] has invoked the Holocaust in support of anti-Communist intervention abroad: the agent of the Holocaust was not Nazi Germany but a generic totalitarianism, embodied after 1945 in the Soviet bloc."[95] For the

---

[89] Alan Mintz, *Popular Culture and the Shaping of Holocaust Memory in America* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2001); Hilene Flanzbaum, ed. *The Americanization of the Holocaust*, (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1999); Peter Novick, *The Holocaust in American Life* (New York: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1999).
[90] Mintz, 9-10.
[91] Mintz, 10.
[92] Flanzbaum, 8.
[93] Shandler, 33.
[94] Novick, 13.
[95] Novick, 12.

left, the Holocaust is used to show the moral bankruptcy of the right, linking genocide historically to right-wing (i.e. Fascist) regimes.[96] It has been stated that:

> in the United States the Holocaust is explicitly used for the purpose of national self-congratulation: the 'Americanization' of the Holocaust has involved using it to demonstrate the difference between the Old World and the New, and to celebrate, by showing its negation, the American way of life.[97]

The moral and political uses of the Holocaust in America also apply to Adolf Hitler in many respects – the Jews as the "ultimate victims of historical evil" – and there are other identifiable reasons for understanding Hitler as demonic. While the focus in this study is on the production rather than the reception of Hitler representations, some aspects of how the viewer will receive the film need to be invoked. Although the focus has been on each film as the product of individual authors (filmmakers), there are a variety of societal and cultural reasons for demonizing Adolf Hitler in addition to those associated with Holocaust memory.

The American intervention in the Second World War entailed an enormous loss of American life and expense. Since Hitler is seen as the catalyst of the war, his demonization serves to justify this intervention.[98] Concurrently, the Second World War is viewed as a "just war": a war fought for idealistic and important principles such as democracy, freedom and liberty. Such a war creates two moral poles – the Allies on the one hand, and the Fascists on the other – which necessitates that Hitler and the Nazis be

---

[96] Novick, 12.
[97] Novick, 13.
[98] This theme is touched upon by M. Paul Holsinger and Mary Anne Schofield, *Visions of War: World War II in Popular Culture and Literature* (Bowling Green, OH: Bowling Green State University Popular Press, 1992).

identified as the evil or immoral pole.[99] Hence, the argument made here is that Hitler has become a signpost for immoral and political evil in popular culture. The demonization of Hitler also serves to legitimize the post-war geo-political structure.[100] America assumed the leading economic and political power role after the Second World War, so in both the Cold War and post-Cold War period, Hitler has often been seen as the antithesis to the American system.[101] Furthermore, the uniqueness of Adolf Hitler as a historical figure and the fact that he was invested with mythological and supernatural qualities or status before he even died, which surely contributed to his post-war mystique, must be taken into consideration. When Hitler seems inexplicable within the limits of normal modes of explanation, authors and filmmakers resort to the mythologies covered throughout this study. In addition to the various uses of the Führer as a sign in American popular culture which have been described, there also exists the strong possibility that the majority of people do not *want* to confront a humanized Hitler, for such a figure inherently suggests that Hitler could happen again, or that there is some "Hitler" in all of us.

It is apparent why the German leader has become such a power symbol for demonic evil in American culture: Hitler serves as the epitome of evil in order to justify and provide the foundation for the American way of life, and as a moral benchmark for extreme evil. This is not to suggest that each cinematic rendition of Hitler can simply be reduced to this explanation, for not only do some representations fail to demonize Hitler,

---

[99] A variety of authors who have produced historiographic monographs have touched on the "uses" of Hitler in American culture, and the assessment here includes a synthesizing of these authors combined with intuitive observations. These authors include: John Hiden & John Farquharson; *Explaining Hitler's Germany: Historians and the Third Reich*, 2nd ed. (London: Batsford Academic and Educational Ltd, 1989); and Roderick Stackelberg, *Hitler's Germany: Origins, Interpretations, Legacies* (New York: Routledge, 1999).

[100] Among the many authors who touch on this: Hilene Flanzbaum, ed., *The Americanization of the Holocaust* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1999), Introduction.

[101] A number of authors touch on this subject or allude to it, such as Stackelberg, Lukacs, and Rosenfeld.

but filmmakers also exercise independent thought and artistic license in their portrayals of the Führer.[102] Nor does it suggest that viewers will automatically be predisposed to conceiving Hitler in this manner. What this study has assumed is that filmic renditions have both created and been subject to Hitler as a symbol for evil, and that Hitler is by *default* seen as demonic evil. On numerous occasions in this study, representations that by themselves only *border* on demonizing, but have taken into account the presumed preconceptions of a viewer, have been identified. It is in these cases where a Hitler representation is not clear-cut, relative to the humanizing/demonizing paradigm, that the societal meaning of Hitler can most strongly alter a viewer's conception, for audiences are more prone to accepting Hitler as a sign for demonic evil.

The medium of film demonstrates that Hitler is by default seen as demonic evil in American popular culture. While the use of Hitler as a sign for demonic evil predates the 1968-1990 period, filmic representations of Adolf Hitler have played a dominant role in articulating and dispersing this popular conception. Not only were there thirty-five films featuring a Hitler portrayal produced during this period, which indicates the level of fascination with Adolf Hitler, but the majority demonize the Nazi leader. Indeed, the medium of film has continued to breathe life into the ghost of Adolf Hitler, supporting the various myths that surround the "Hitler of History." These myths in turn are sustained by a variety of cultural forces with an interest in perpetuating the demonic Führer.

---

[102] It is difficult to determine if films were influenced directly, indirectly, or not at all, by the societal, cultural, moral, political, etc. reasons for using Hitler as a sign for demonic evil. It does not seem that there is a uniformity, as we can surmise that filmmakers could be somewhat handcuffed by the political/moral role Hitler serves in American culture, or that they may be culturally conditioned to view Hitler in this role, or perhaps filmmakers are unencumbered by preconceptions – their own or those of the theoretical audience – and simply research or decide for themselves as to the nature of Hitler's humanity.

It is difficult to say whether this fascination has already somewhat subsided or whether it will in the future. The past fifteen-odd years have seen a decrease in the number of films featuring a Hitler character, although in the last half-decade a number of films employing Hitler as the main character have been released. What does seem more certain is that the Hitler myth is slowly changing; while films cover much of the same ground as their predecessors, nuances and subtleties in their representations alter the sign of Hitler. These complexities and subtleties, which started to arise in the 1980s, have become more prominent in recent films as filmmakers, like historians, are delving deeper into the different meanings of Hitler**.** The breakdown of the Cold War power structure, coupled with the historical distance from the Nazi era, has perhaps relativized Hitler to the extent that people are willing to reconsider his humanity. This will likely be exacerbated in the post-9/11 era if Hitler is replaced as a signpost for evil, which could be possible. At the same time, the demonization of Hitler in many ways remains a necessity, for it stems from both the inability to more fully explain Hitler and the various needs to portray Hitler as a demon.

APPENDIX A

FILMS BEFORE 1968

Before investigating films from this period, it is necessary to give a brief background of filmic portrayals of Hitler before 1968. Films produced under National Socialism have been ably contemplated by a number of scholars and will not receive attention here. Outside of Germany during the pre-1945 period, Hitler was generally ridiculed as an object of satire, such as in Charlie Chaplin's *The Great Dictator* and various efforts from the Three Stooges. In 1944, the first serious attempt to portray Hitler was *The Hitler Gang*, starring Bobby Watson – who would go on to play Hitler a number of times, although in comedic roles. This film attempted to be historically accurate but, given that it was made in 1944, there were many educated guesses and inaccuracies. These films essentially served as propaganda counterparts to those being produced by the Nazis, for they were meant to arouse opposition to Hitler and his regime.

In the decades immediately following the Second World War, cinematic depictions of Hitler generally waned, and Hitler was usually employed only as a gag in a comedy or as a plot/literary device. Fourteen English-language films featuring a Hitler character between 1945 and 1967 can be identified; three of them employ the aforementioned Bobby Watson as Hitler in satire roles, while actor Luther Adler plays Hitler in two of the other films, *The Magic Face* and *Desert Fox: The Story of Erwin Rommel.* Both of Adler's appearances were as plot/literary devices.

Only two of these twelve films, *He Lives* (1967) and *Hitler* (1962), feature Hitler as a prominent character, while another, *They Saved Hitler's Brain* [aka *Madmen of Mandoras* and *The Return of Mr. H*] (1963/68), attributes him a somewhat prominent role. The film *Hitler* contends that the dictator had an Oedipus complex that shaped his

behavior, which predates many of the psycho-historical explanations that would arise in the 1970s. In *He Lives*, the plot involves a surviving Hitler in South America, a myth cinema definitely helped to establish. *Hitler* (also known under the titles of *The Private Life of Adolf Hitler* and/or *The Women of Nazi Germany*) is demonizing in its overall effect while *He Lives* (aka *The Search for the Evil One*) uses Hitler as more of a plot device, although with decidedly sinister insinuations. In the latter, Hitler is a senile shell of his former self twenty-two years after the end of the war, and is controlled and manipulated by Martin Bormann. Without going into detail, these two films can be considered demonizing.

It is worth noting that there were also approximately ten European-language films released in the twenty-five-odd years after the war. Almost half were Communist films that were not exhibited to an audience outside of the Soviet sphere. As would be expected, these films carried strongly communist-inflected interpretations, portraying Hitler as an agent of capitalism and, in doing so, ascribe an abstract – and absolving of responsibility – explanation to the rise of Hitler. There also exists an interesting Austrian film, *The Last Ten Days*, dating from 1955.

A Foreign Affair (1948); *The Whip Hand* [aka *The Man He Found*] (1951); *The Magic Face.* (1951); *The Desert Fox: The Story of Erwin Rommel* (1951); *The Story of Mankind.* (1957); *The Two-Headed Spy* [aka *The Spy Without A Face*] (1958); *The Thirteenth Room* (1950's?); *On the Double* (1961); *Hitler* [aka *The Private Life of Hitler* or *The Women of Nazi Germany*] (1962); *They Saved Hitler's Brain* [aka *Madmen of Mandoras* or *The Return of Mr. H*] (1963/68); *What Did You Do in the War, Daddy?* (1966); *Is Paris Burning?* (1966); *The Search For the Evil One* [aka *He Lives*] (1967); *Flesh Feast* [aka *Time is Terror*] (1967).

APPENDIX B

FILMS, 1968-79

The Producers (1968); *Battle of Britain* (1969); *Which Way to the Front?* (1970); *The Death of Adolf Hitler* (1972); *Hitler: The Last Ten Days* (1973); *Hitler Superstar* (1974); *How To Seduce a Woman* (1974); *Blazing Saddles* (1974); *Undercovers Hero* [aka *Soft Beds, Hard Battles*] (1974); *The Gathering Storm* (1974); *Inside Out* [aka *Hitler's Gold*] (1975); *Lisztomania* (1975); *The Lucifer Complex* [aka *Hitler's Wild Women*] (1975/78); *Rogue Male* (1976); *Ring of Passion* [aka *Countdown to the Big One*] (1978); *Boys From Brazil* (1978).

FILMS, 1980-90

The Bunker (1980); *Under the Rainbow* (1981); *History of the World, Part I* (1981); *Inside the Third Reich* (1982); *Winds of War* (1983); *To Be or Not to Be* (1983); *Zelig* (1983); *Hard Rock Zombies* (1984); *Mussolini: The Untold Story* (1985); *The Dirty Dozen: The Next Mission* (1985); *Hitler's SS: Portrait in Evil* (1985); *Mussolini and I* (1985); *Order of the Black Eagle* (1986); *That's Adequate* (1986/1990); Great *Escape II: The Untold Story* (1988); *War and Remembrance* (1988); *Indiana Jones and the Last Crusade* (1989); *Countdown to War* (1989); *Highway to Hell* (1990); *Loose Cannons* (1990); *The Plot to Kill Hitler* (1990).

THE BUNKER

(i) Hitler says, "Speer you will now order every official of every town, I want every Gauleiter to know that there must be total destruction. I have given you complete authority over every one of them, and they must all comply without questions. In those areas where the enemy is now approaching there must be total destruction. Is that understood?" (The camera cuts between face shots and upper-half shots, with Speer and Hitler not usually shown in same frame) Speer sits down, starting to say, "I keep thinking . . ." but he is cut off by Hitler, who yells: "If the war is lost, the people of Germany will be lost also! How dare you sit down in my presence! Stand up!" He is literally foaming at the mouth, gesturing, with his face beet red; after he finishes yelling, his head shakes a few times as if he had a nervous tick.

(ii) This is followed by histrionics after Speer tells Hitler that he believes the war to be lost: "Speer you must convince yourself that the war is not lost." Speer replies: "My Führer, the war is lost." Hitler yells (he is standing up, Speer sitting, cuts between the two, both shown from the chest upward): "The war is not lost! The war is not lost! The war will never be lost! (Cuts to Speer) We will defeat them! (Cuts back to Hitler) We will defeat them all! (Pauses) I will destroy Bolshevism! I will wipe out the scourge and pestilence of Jewish Marxism. (Hitler pauses; he is shaking and bug-eyed, red-faced, then takes a few breaths) I will defeat them all! I will defy the entire world! You hear me?" Hitler then turns to the side and leans with his head down, stands back up, and states calmly: "Now Speer. Speer, you have faith in me. If you say you have faith in me, you may continue."

(iii) Approximately halfway through the film, the children rush towards Hitler, who is seated at a couch. With a look of pleasure on his face, he pulls one little girl up onto his lap and puts his arm around another. Later, Hitler can be seen sitting on the same couch, flanked on all sides by the children and with one in his lap, expressively reading from a book. In this relatively short scene, he reads: "the wolf says: 'my friends, it is not I who killed. It is him, him (pointing at children). He looked at me . . . . " Granted, it should be noted that this was immediately preceded by the hanging of Hermann Fegelein (a high-ranking SS member and Eva Braun's brother-in-law who Hitler had originally pardoned until learning of Göring's "treachery"), who was found drunk and deserting with a woman. The purpose of the syntagmatic contrast of these signs is to show the duality of Hitler, rather than show that the time with the children is an empty gesture.

WAR AND REMEMBRANCE

Filmed with a long shot from the side, the "Desert Fox" enters Hitler's huge office, which is half flooded by sunlight with a fire crackling off to one side. The purpose of this long shot appears to be to stress how alone and how worn out Hitler is, as he slouches in a leather chair in front of a large desk situated peculiarly in the middle of the spacious room. Rommel sits down and begins to talk about the failed campaigns in North Africa – the view alternates between shots where one of the two characters is in a full frontal view while the other can partially be seen from behind in the foreground of the shot, and then side shots of both – and Hitler surprisingly admits that "I should have listened to you." Hitler says that "there's not much chance of winning the war, I know that. I would make peace tomorrow (gesturing) but nobody will make peace with me. So, what can I do, but fight to the end?" Of course, this is a veiled reference to the Nazi treatment of the Jews. Rommel suggests stopping "certain activities" in Poland done by the SS and Himmler. Hitler – annoyed and seeming offended – asks what activities the German Field Commander is referring to, and flies into a rage, calling "the Jews our implacable and eternal enemies . . . if the German people are incapable of wining this war, then let them rot!" (Brushes hair, pauses and sits down) The best are dead anyway. (says this quietly, then starts yelling after standing up) I will fight for every street, every house! Nothing will be left! If a great race dies, then it has to die heroically!!! (Sits down calmly) The immediate question is: where will the Allies land next?"

Hitler then gives orders for reviewing Operation Citadel; Rommel questions about starting an attack in the East after Stalingrad, and Hitler yells: "Especially after Stalingrad! They are too cocky now to make a decent separate peace. So I must tear a

great hole in their front! One great bloody nose and Stalin and I will be doing business again. Attack! Attack! Always attack. The blacker things look: attack, attack, attack! (Pauses, brushing forelock) Operation Citadel begins in late June."

INSIDE THE THIRD REICH

During a speech over the radio about the July 20 assassination attempt, Hitler rages that the conspirators and their families will be "killed like cattle, unworthy of my greatness . . .till German soil is running hot and wet with German blood." In regards to the "scorched earth" policy (beginning with a medium shot of Hitler sitting down, and then walking around while the camera follows him, the scene cuts at times to others present. He sits down again, followed by extreme close-ups of his face), Hitler rambles on viciously about everything he wants destroyed so the Russians cannot use it – "kill all the cows! . . . kill all the pigs!" – eventually yelling; "I want nothing but death and annihilation and hatred to meet [the enemy]!"

APPENDIX F

TOTAL FILMS, 1968-1990: 35
1968-79: 15   1980-90: 20

PROMINENT FILMS	
Demonizing	Humanizing
The Death of Adolf Hitler (1972) (B) (TV) Hitler: The Last Ten Days (1973) (B/Italy) The Lucifer Complex (1975/78) (A) The Boys From Brazil (1978) (A) Inside the Third Reich (1982) (A) (TV) Winds of War (1983) (A) (TV) War andRemembrance (1988) (A) (TV)	The Bunker (1980) (A/Euro) (TV) Countdown to War (1989) (B) (TV)
SATIRIZING	CONTEXTUALIZING
The Producers (1968) (A) Which Way to the Front? (1970) (A) Blazing Saddles (1974) (A) How to Seduce a Woman (1974) (A) Undercovers Hero [aka Soft Beds, Hard Battles] (1974) (B) History of the World, Part I (1981) (A) Under the Rainbow (1981) (A) To Be or Not to Be (1983) (A) Hard Rock Zombies (1984) (A) That's Adequate (1989) (A) Highway to Hell (1990) (A)	Battle of Britain (1969) (B) Gathering Storm (1974) (A/B) (TV) Lisztomania (1975) (B) Inside Out [aka Hitler's Gold] (1975) (B) Rogue Male (1976) (TV) (B) Ring of Passion [aka Countdown to the Big One) (1978) (TV) (A) Zelig (1983) (A) Mussolini: The Untold Story (1985) (A) (TV) The Dirty Dozen: The Next Mission (1985) (A) (TV) Hitler's SS: Portrait in Evil (1985) (B) (TV) Mussolini and I (1985) (W.Germany/B/A/Fr/Italy) (TV) Order of the Black Eagle (1986) (B/A) Great Escape II: The Untold Story (1988) (A) (TV) Indiana Jones and the Last Crusade (1989) (A) The Plot to Kill Hitler (1990) (A) (TV)

Producers, The (1968) – satire (humanizing)
Battle of Britain (1969) – contextualizing (bordering on demonizing)
Which Way to the Front? (1970) – satire (humanizing)
Death of Adolf Hitler, The. (1972) (TV) – prominent (demonizing)
Hitler: The Last Ten Days (1973) – prominent (demonizing)
How To Seduce a Woman (1974) – satire (bordering on humanizing)
Blazing Saddles (1974) – satire
Undercoves Hero [aka Soft Beds, Hard Battles] (1974) – satire (bordering on
        humanizing)
Gathering Storm, The. (1974) (TV) – contextualizing (bordering on demonizing)
Inside Out [aka Hitler's Gold] (1975) – contextualizing (bordering on demonizing)
Lisztomania (1975) – contextualizing (demonizing)
The Lucifer Complex [aka Hitler's Wild Women] (1975/78) – prominent (demonizing)
Rogue Male (1976) (TV) – contextualizing (humanizing)
Ring of Passion [aka Countdown to the Big One) (1978) (TV) – contextualizing
        (bordering on demonizing)
Boys From Brazil (1978) – prominent (demonizing)
Bunker, The (1980) (TV) – prominent (humanizing)
History of the World, Part I (1981) – satire
Under the Rainbow (1981) – satire (humanizing)
Inside the Third Reich (1982) (TV) – prominent (demonizing)
To Be or Not to Be (1983) – satire (demonizing)
Zelig (1983) – contextualizing
Winds of War, The (1983) – prominent (demonizing)
Hard Rock Zombies (1984) – satire (demonizing)
Dirty Dozen: The Next Mission, The (1985) (TV) – contextualizing (bordering on
        demonizing)
Mussolini and I [aka Mussolini: The Rise and Fall of Il Duce] (1985) – contextualizing
        (bordering on demonizing)
Mussolini: The Untold Story (1985) – contextualizing (bordering on demonizing)
Hitler's S.S.: Portrait in Evil (1985) – contextualizing (demonizing)
Order of the Black Eagle (1986) – contextualizing (demonizing)
Great Escape II: The Untold Story, The (1988) (TV) – contextualizing (bordering on
        demonizing)
War and Remembrance (1988) – prominent (bordering on demonizing)
Countdown to War (1989) (TV) – prominent (humanizing)
That's Adequate (1989) – satire (humanizing)
Indiana Jones and the Last Crusade (1989) – contextualizing (bordering on demonizing)
Highway to Hell (1990) – contextualizing (demonizing)
The Plot to Kill Hitler (1990) (A) (TV) – contextualizing (bordering on demonizing)

APPENDIX G

COUNTRIES IN WHICH FILMS WERE PRODUCED.

In the 1968-79 period, the breakdown of the films is:
      7 American
      1 British/American
      1 British/Italian
      6 British.

In the 1980-1990 period, the breakdown of the films is:
      15 American
      1 American/British
      2 American/ various European countries
      2 British

FILMOGRAPHY

The Producers. Directed by Mel Brooks. Produced by Joseph E. Levine. 88 minutes. Embassy, 1968. DVD.

Battle of Britain. Directed by Guy Hamilton. Produced by Harry Salztman & S. Benjamin Fisz. 133 minutes. United Artists, 1969. DVD.

Which Way to the Front? Directed and produced by Jerry Lewis. 96 minutes. Warner Bros., 1970. Videocassette.

The Death of Adolf Hitler. Directed and produced by Rex Firkin. 107 minutes. London Weekend Productions, 1972. Videocassette.

Hitler: The Last Ten Days. Directed by Ennio De Concini. Produced by Wolfgang Reinhardt. 108 minutes. Paramount Pictures, 1973. Videocassette.

Blazing Saddles. Directed by Mel Brooks. Produced by Michael Hertzman. 93 minutes. Paramount Pictures, 1974. Videocassette.

The Gathering Storm. Directed by Herbert Wise. Produced by Jack LeVein. 76 minutes. BBC, 1974. Videocassette.

How To Seduce a Woman. Directed and produced by Charles Martin, Cinerama, 108 minutes, 1974. Videocassette.

Undercovers Hero [aka *Soft Beds, Hard Battles*]. Directed by Roy Boulting. Produced by John Boulting. 105 minutes. Lion International, 1974. Videocassette.

Inside Out [aka *Hitler's Gold*]. Directed by Peter Duffell. Produced by Judd Bernard. 97 minutes. Warner Bros., 1975. Videocassette.

Lisztomania. Directed by Ken Russell. Produced by Roy Baird & David Putnam. 106 minutes. Warner Bros., 1975. Videocassette.

The Lucifer Complex [aka *Hitler's Wild Women*]. Directed by David L. Hewitt and Kenneth Hartford. Produced by David L. Hewitt & David E. Jackson. 91 minutes. Vista Films, 1975. Videocassette.

Rogue Male. Directed by Clive Donner. Produced by Mark Shivas. 100 minutes. BBC, 1976. Videocassette.

Boys From Brazil. Directed by Franklin J. Schaffner. Produced by Martin Richards & Stanley O'Toole. 123 minutes. Artisan Home Entertainment, 1978. DVD.

Ring of Passion [aka *Countdown to the Big One*]. Directed by Robert Michael Lewis. Produced by Lou Moreheim. 97 minutes. 20th Century-Fox, 1978. Videocassette.

The Bunker. Directed by George Schaefer. Produced by Aida Young, George Schaefer & David Susskind. 145 minutes. Time-Life Productions, 1980. Videocassette.

History of the World, Part I. Directed and produced by Mel Brooks. 92 minutes. Brooksfilms, 1981. Videocassette.

Under the Rainbow. Directed by Steve Rash. Produced by Fred Bauer. 97 minutes. Orion, 1981. Videocassette.

Inside the Third Reich. Directed by Marvin Chomsky. Produced by E. Jack Neuman. 257 minutes. ABC Circle, 1982.
    2 videocassettes.

To Be or Not to Be. Directed by Alan Johnson. Produced by Mel Brooks. 108 minutes. Brooksfilms, 1983. Videocassette.

The Winds of War. Directed by Dan Curtis. Produced by Dan Curtis & Barbara Steele. 14 hours and 39 minutes. Paramount Pictures, 1983. 7 DVDs.

Zelig. Directed by Woody Allen. Produced by Robert Greenhut. 79 minutes. Orion/Warner Bros., 1983. Videocassette.

Hard Rock Zombies. Directed and produced by Krishna Shah. 90 minutes. Paramount Pictures, 1984. Videocassette.

The Dirty Dozen: The Next Mission. Directed by Andrew V. McLaglen. Produced by Harry R. Sherman. 97 minutes. MGM/United Artists, 1985. Videocassette.

Hitler's S.S.: Portrait in Evil. Directed by Jim Goddard. Produced by Aida Young. 141 minutes. Metromedia, 1985. 2 videocassettes.

Mussolini and I [aka *Mussolini: The Rise and Fall of Il Duce*]. Directed by Alberto Negrin. Produced by Mario Gallo. 240 minutes. Filmalpha/HBO, 1985. 2 DVDs.

Mussolini: The Untold Story. Directed by William A. Graham. Produced by Stirling Silliphant. 290 minutes. NBC, 1985. 3 videocassettes.

Order of the Black Eagle. Directed by Worth Keeter. Produced by Robert P. Eaton & Betty J. Stephens. 93 minutes. Polo Players Ltd., 1986. Videocassette.

Great Escape II: The Untold Story. Directed by Jud Taylor and Paul Wendkos. Produced by Michael Jaffe. 93 minutes. Michael Jaffe Films, Ltd., 1988. Videocassette.

War and Remembrance. Directed by Dan Curtis. Produced by Barbara Steele & Dan Curtis. 25 hours and 40 minutes. Paramount Pictures, 1988. 5 videocassettes and 6 DVDs.

Countdown to War. Directed by Patrick Lay. Produced by Norma Percy. 78 minutes. Granada, 1989. Videocassette.

Indiana Jones and the Last Crusade. Directed by Steven Spielberg. Produced by George Lucas & Frank Marshall. 127 minutes. Paramount Pictures, 1989. Videocassette.

Highway to Hell. Directed by Ate de Jong. Produced by Mary Anne Page & John Byers. 93 minutes. Hemdale Films, 1990. Videocassette.

Loose Cannons. Directed by Bob Clark. Produced by Aaron Spelling & Alan Greisman. 94 minutes. Tri Star, 1990. Videocassette.

The Plot to Kill Hitler. Directed by Lawrence Schiller. Produced by Alfred R. Kelman & David L. Wolper. 94 minutes. Warner Bros., 1990. Videocassette.

That's Adequate. Directed by Harry Hurwitz. Produced by Irving Schwartz & Harry Hurwitz. 83 minutes. Adequate Productions, 1990. Videocassette.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adler, Renata. Review of "The Producers", p. 3742. *The New York Times Film Review, 1913-1968, vol. 5*. New York: The New York Times and Arno Press, 1969.

Avisar, Ilan. *Screening the Holocaust: Cinema's Images of the Unimaginable*. Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1988.

Baldwin, Peter, ed. *Reworking the Past: Hitler, the Holocaust, and the Historians' Debate*. Boston: Beacon Press, 1990.

Bergmann, Peter E. "Daniel Goldhagen in Germany: An Exploration in German Historiography." *Historical Reflections* vol. 26, no.1 (2000): pp. 141-159.

Bullock, Alan. *Hitler: A Study in Tyranny*. Great Britian: Odhams, 1952.

Bracher, Karl Dietrich, 'The Role of Hitler: Perspectives of Interpretation', in Walter Laqueur, ed., *Fascism: A Reader's Guide* (Harmondsworth, 1979), pp. 193-212.

Broszat, Martin. *Hitler and the Collapse of Weimar Germany*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1987.

Camby, Vincent. Review of "Battle of Britain", p. 90. *The New York Times Film Review, 1969-1970*. New York: The New York Times and Arno Press, 1971.

Camby, Vincent. Review of "Hitler: The Last Ten Days", p. 51. *The New York Times Film Review, 1973-1974*. New York: The New York Times and Arno Press, 1975.

Carr, William. *Hitler: A Study in Personality and Politics*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1979.

Clark, Gerald. "The $40 million Gamble (Winds of War TV production)" *Time Magazine* (February 7, 1983, v 121); p. 70(6).

Coates, Paul. *Film at the Intersection of High and Mass Culture*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.

Combs, James E. and Sara T. Combs. *Film Propaganda and American Politics: An Analysis and Filmography*. New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1994.

Corliss, Richard. "Inside the Third Reich," *Time Magazine* (May 10, 1982, v.99), p. 82.

Davis, Peter G. Review of "Lisztomania", pp. 109-110. *The New York Times Film Review, 1975-1976*. New York: The New York Times and Arno Press, 1977.

Douglas, Roy. *The World War 1939-1943: The Cartoonists' Vision*. New York: Routledge, 1990.

Easthope, Anthony, ed. *Contemporary Film Theory*. New York: Longman, 1993.

Eco, Umberto. *A Theory of Semiotics*. London: Indiana University Press, 1976.

The Economist (December 3, 1988, vol.309, n.7579), p.105(1).

Eley Geoff. *The "Goldhagen Effect." History, Memory, Nazism: Facing the German Past*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2000.

Ellwood, David, ed. *The Movies as History: Visions of the Twentieth Century*. Great Britain: Sutton Publishing, 2000.

Ferro, Marc. *Cinema and History*. Translated by Naomi Greene. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1988.

Flanzbaum, Hilene, ed. *The Americanization of the Holocaust*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1999.

Friedländer, Saul. *Reflections of Nazism: An Essay on Kitsch and Death*. New York: Harper and Row, 1984.

Friedländer, Saul, ed. *Probing the Limits of Representation: Nazism and the Final Solution*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1992.

Goda, Norman J. "A. J. P. Taylor, Adolf Hitler, and the Origins of the Second World War." *The International History Review* XXIII: 1 (March 2001): pp. 97- 124.

Goldfarb, Alvin. "Adolf Hitler as Portrayed in Drama and Film During His Lifetime." *Journal of Popular Culture* 13:1 (Summer 1979): pp. 55-66.

Herlihy, David. "Am I a Camera? Other Reflections on Films and History." *American Historical Review* 93 (December 1988): pp. 1186-1192.

Hiden, John and John Farquharson. *Explaining Hitler: Historians and the Third Reich*. New Jersey: Barnes & Noble, 1983.

Hill, Geoffrey. *Illuminating Shadows: The Mythic Power of Film*. Boston: Shambhala Publications, Inc., 1992.

Himmelfarb, Milton. "No Hitler, No Holocaust." *Commentary* vol. 77 (Jan-June 1984): pp. 37-43.

Holsinger, M. Paul and Mary Anne Schofield. *Visions of War: World War II in Popular Literature and Culture*. Bowling Green, OH: Bowling Green State University Popular Press, 1992.

Insdorf, Annette. *Indelible Shadows: Film and the Holocaust*. Toronto: Random House, 1983.

Jarvis, Jeff. "War and Remembrance (television program reviews)," *People Weekly* (May 8, 1989, v.31, n.18), p.13(1).

Kautz, Fred. *The German Historians: Hitler's Willing Executioners and Daniel Goldhagen*. Montreal: Black Rose Books, 2003.

Kaes, Anton. *From Hitler to Heimat: The Return of History as Film*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1989.

Kellner, Douglas. *Media Culture: Cultural Studies, Identity and Politics Between the Modern and Postmodern*. New York: Routledge, 1995.

Kershaw, Ian. *The 'Hitler Myth": Image and Reality in the Third Reich*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1987.

Kershaw, Ian. *The Nazi Dictatorship: Problems & Perspectives of Interpretation*, 4th ed. New York: Oxford University Press, 2000.

Koppes, Clayton R. and Gregory D. Black. *Hollywood Goes to War: How Politics, Profits, and Propaganda Shaped World II Movies*. New York: The Free Press, 1987.

Lowery, Shearon and Melvin L. De Fleur. *Milestones in Mass Communications Research*. New York: Longman Inc., 1983.

Lukacs, John. *The Hitler of History*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1998.

Marrus, Michael. *The Holocaust in History*. London: Penguin Books, 1987.

Maser, Werner. *Hitler's Mein Kampf: An Analysis*. Translated by R.H. Barry. London: Faber and Faber Limited, 1970.

McKenna, Kevin J. *All the View Fits to Print: Changing Images of the U.S. in Pravda Political Cartoons, 1917-1991*. Toronto: Peter Lang, 2001.

Metz, Christian. *Film Language: A Semiotics of the Cinema*. Translated by Michael Taylor. New York: Oxford University Press, 1974.

Minear, Richard H. *Dr. Seuss Goes to War: The World War II Editorial Cartoons of Theodor Seuss Geisel*. New York: The New Press, 1999.

Mintz, Alan. *Popular Culture and the Shaping of the Holocaust in America*. Seattle, University of Washington Press, 2001.

Mitchell, Charles P. *The Hitler Filmography: Worldwide Feature Film and Television Miniseries Portrayals, 1940 through 2000*. Jefferson, North Carolina: McFarland & Company, Inc., Publishers, 2002.

Monaco, James. *How to Read a Film: Movies, Media, Multimedia*. 3rd ed. New York: Oxford University Press, 2000.

Mukerji, Chandra and Michael Schudson, eds. *Rethinking Popular Culture: Contemporary Perspectives in Cultural Studies*. Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1991.

Nicholls, David. *Adolf Hitler: A Biographical Companion*. Santa Barbara, California: ABC-CLIO, 2000.

Novick, Peter. *The Holocaust in American Life*. New York: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1999.

O'Connor, John J. "The Bunker," *The New York Times* (June 27, 1981, v.130), p. C19.

O'Connor, John E. "History in Images/Images in History: Reflections on the Importance of Film and Television Study for an Understanding of the Past." *American Historical Review* 93 (December 1988): pp. 1200-1209.

Pflaum, Hans Günther. *Germany of Film: Theme and Content in the Cinema of the Federal Republic of Germany*. Translated by Richard C. Helt and Roland Richter. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1990.

Portman, Jamie. "Human Side of Hitler," *Saskatoon Star Phoenix*, 25 January 2003, p. E10.

Pronay, Nicholas. "The Moving Picture and Historical Research." *Journal of Contemporary History* 3 (July 1983): pp. 365-395.

Raack, R.C. "Historiography as Cinematography: A Prolegomenon to Film Work for Historians." *Journal of Contemporary History* 3 (July 1983): pp. 411-438.

Reed, Donna K. *The Novel and the Nazi Past*. New York: Peter Lang, 1985.

Reimer, Robert C. and Carol J. Reimer. *Nazi-retro Film: How German Narrative Cinema Remembers the Past*. Toronto: Maxwell Macmillan Canada, 1992

Rollins, Peter C., ed. *Hollywood as Historian: American Film in a Cultural Context*. Lexington: University of Kentucky Press, 1983.

Rosenstone, Robert A. "History in Images/History in Words: Reflections on the Possibility of Really Putting History into Film." *American Historical Review* 93 (December 1988): pp. 1173-1185.

Rosenbaum, Ron. *Explaining Hitler: The Search For the Origins of His Evil*. New York: Random House, 1998.

Rosenfeld, Alvin H. *Imagining Hitler*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1983.

Rothberg, Michael. *Traumatic Realism: The Demands of Holocaust Representation*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2000.

Santner, Eric L. *Stranded Objects: Mourning, Memory, and Film in Postwar Germany*. London: Cornell University Press, 1990.

Saunders, Thomas J. *Hollywood in Berlin: American Cinema and Weimar Germany*. Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1994.

Schonberg, Harold. C. Review of *"Boys From Brazil"*, p. 245. *The New York Times Film Review, 1978*. New York: The New York Times and Arno Press, 1979.

Schramm, Percy Ernst. *Hitler: The Man and Military Leader*. Translated and edited by
        Donald S. Detwiler. Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1971.

Shirer, William. *The Rise and Fall of the Third Reich: A History of Nazi Germany*.
        New York: Simon & Schuster, 1960.

Short, K.R.M., ed. *Feature Films as History*. London: Croom Helm, 1981.

Skirball, Sheba F. *Films of the Holocaust: An Annotated Filmography of Collections
        in Israel*. New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1990.

Smallwood, James. "A Historiographical Debate of the 1960s: World War II
        Historiography – The Origins of the War, A. J. P. Taylor and his Critics."
        Australian Journal of Politics and History vol. 26 (1980): pp. 403-410.

Smith, Paul. *The Historian and the Film*. Cambridge: Oxford University Press, 1976.

Snyder, Louis L. *The Third Reich, 1933-1945*. *A Bibliographical Guide to German
        National Socialism*. New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1987.

Sorlin, Pierre, ed. *The Film in History: Restaging the Past*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell,
        1980.

Stackelberg, Roderick. *Hitler's Germany: Origins, Interpretations, Legacies*. New
        York: Routledge Press, 1999.

Staiger, Janet. *Interpreting Films: Studies in the Historical Reception of American
        Cinema*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1992.

Stam, Robert, Robert Burgoyne, and Sandy Flitterman-Lewis. *New Vocabularies in Film
        Semiotics: Structuralism, Post-Structuralism, and Beyond*. New York: Routledge
        Press, 1992

Steiner, George. *The Portage to San Cristobal of A.H*. New York: Simon and Schuster,
        1981.

Story, John. *An Introduction to Cultural Theory and Popular Culture*. 2nd ed. Athens,
        U.S.A.: University of Georgia Press, 1998.

Strinati, Dominic. *An Introduction to Theories of Popular Culture*. New York:
        Routledge, 1995.

Strinati, Dominic. *An Introduction to Studying Popular Culture*. New York: Routledge,
        2000.

Syndor, Charles. W, Jr. "The Selling of Adolf Hitler: David Irving's *Hitler's War*. "
        Central European History vol. 12 (1979): pp. 169-199.

Thomas, Howard. Review of "Which Way to the Front?" p. 208. *The New York Times
        Film Review, 1969-1970*. New York: The New York Times and Arno Press,
        1971.

Toplin, Robert Brent. "The Filmmaker as Historian." *American Historical Review* 93
        (December 1988): pp. 1210-1227.

Trevor, Roper, H.R. *The Last Days of Hitler*. New York: Berkley Publishing Corp.,
        1947.

Trevor-Roper, H. R.   "Hitler Revisited." *Encounter* vol. LXXI, no. 5 (December 1988):
        pp. 17-19.

Unidentified author, "Wages of War (The Winds of War Television Program),"
        Time Magazine (February 28, 1983, v.121), p. 63(1)

Vidal, Gore. *Screening History*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1992.

Waite, Robert L. *The Psychopathic God: Adolf Hitler*. Canada: Basic Books, 1977.

Waters, Harry F. "Inside the Third Reich," *Newsweek* (May 10, 1982, v.99), p. 65.

Watt, D.C. "Appeasement: The Rise of a Revisionist School?" *Political Quarterly* vol. 36 (1965): pp. 191-213.

White, Hayden. "Historiography and Historiophoty." *American Historical Review* 93 (December 1988): 1193-1199.

Whittock, Trevor. *Metaphor and Film*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1990.

Wollen, Peter. *Signs and Meaning in the Cinema*. 4th edition. Great Britain: British Film Institute, 1998.

Wordworth, Araminta. "Germans Flock to New Hitler Film. " *National Post*, 21 September 2004, p. A3.

Wyke, Maria. *Projecting the Past: Ancient Rome, Cinema, and History*. New York: Routledge, 1997.