

## **A film has ended when the reel is empty**

Interview with Friedl Kubelka

By Dietmar Schwärzler and Sylvia Szely

Vienna June 14, 2006

(Translated by Helga Just Christoffersen & Tobi Maier for Ludlow 38, New York, November 2009)

*How did you come to filmmaking? Before you have been photographing for a longer time?*

I started photographing when I was 16 and was accepted to a graphics school and laboratory in Vienna when I was 19. After four years I graduated and passed my trade test. In the last year I had two weekly hours of film technique and our teacher Professor Dirnhofer lent us his Eumig C16 camera. I started to make films with my college Erwin Reichmann, greatly influenced by the Nouvelle Vague. That was the beginning. In the first film I made I filmed Erwin and for that reason the film is simply called *ERWIN*. The camera I was filming with - the Eumig C16 - was borrowed from the film center in the 7th district.

*You have shown ERWIN in combination with two other early films, TONI and ILSE...*

Toni the small kid with the pistol is my brother. And Ilsa was a friend, ten years younger than I, that had a recently tried to commit suicide. I also made photographs of her. Later she tried once again to take her own life and in the end she also succeeded.

With *ILSE* I noticed for the first time that an emotion arise during the film. That is what mostly interests me in comparison to making photographs. Photography has a suspending camera eye - and this disadvantage I wanted to turn into an advantage: Thus the idea of serial photography developed - taking many similar shots and comparing the images, very much influenced by the lectures of Hans Neuffer and Peters (i.e. Peter Kubelka). Neuffer, who supported my work a lot at that time, liked my idea with the yearly portrait - to take a photo of myself every day - thinking that I would not manage to realize it all, that I was not consequent enough. And then I thought - what I often think - well, we will see about that. I wanted to use the mediums specifics - like Peter did with film ... from there I arrived at making the portrait in a thousand pieces - to make photos in which only the thoughts changed and nothing else.

*Unlike the photos where you have made day portraits, weekly portraits and yearly portraits, when watching the films I had the impression that the serial processing was less apparent - it does not appear. When did you decide to photograph something and when did you think, here I'll take a 16mm camera?*

That is such a big difference for me! Filming was something incredibly exiting... my heart started beating faster, also because it was expensive. And because of the continuity between the single images and the moments that are always so painfully interrupted in photography. I have always been interested in people and their psyche - that stays fragmentary in photography. I became more conscious of this the longer time I took photos, also because of the commissioned portraits. When the people saw the final negatives they always said: I don't look like that... or: I look as depressing as my mother... psychologically that was somehow interesting. I then started my occupation as psychoanalyst, with a sort of 'photo-therapy'. Actually my clients brought me to this because once they saw their own expressions reproduced on photo paper they spoke so openly about their weaknesses like never before. The idea from working in series also came from viewing the negatives. It always happened that people did not recognize themselves in the photos even though it obviously was them. Clearly the photo is fit to produce many images and show them all together so that - and I have adapted this technique from Peter - the articulation in the photo can be found between one image and the following one. In film articulation lies between the cadres and is nestled between tone and image. It is a matter of what happens in the viewer when he or she looks at one photo - and then the next. Psychoanalysis has influenced me a lot and the idea of "intervention", that is confronting my characters with an unexpected action from my side while filming them, has come to my mind 'on the couch'. It was the grabbing-backwards, the forbidden act or yet perhaps the fantasy that the analyzer would grab for me.... really an incestuous action, something very forbidden...

*In your early films ERWIN, TONI and ILSE the portrayed figures are shown in relative isolation from you behind the camera; but already with GRAF ZOKAN, the portrait of Franz West, one gets the impression that he reacts to you.*

Yes, I got a tantrum... the film was so expensive and he didn't do what I wanted him to.

*How did the selection of people occur? They are mostly from your immediate circle of friends and relatives...*

Filmmaking for me is a very passionate and dangerous act but I am also cold-blooded at the same time. I consider very carefully which faces I film, because there are some faces where I think that there won't be any interesting results...

*Do you direct the people, do you tell them what they have to do?*

They only have to look into the camera.

*You don't say look in the camera no matter what I do?*

No I don't say that! For god sake! Then they would already be warned - only: Look in the camera. I am always very nervous when I film and I cannot hide it, everybody

feels that. I experience what I do also as an attack on the feelings of my characters. This was particularly extreme when filming MUTTER and VATER. I have never embraced my father and in years only fought with my Mother and never put my cheek to hers. And I knew how much she longed for that. And then I did it partly because of the film, as my actions during the filming are also an outlet for longing; and you also see how her facial expression changed - I don't know if you could see that - how she gets a disappointed and hard facial expression. She also got up and left. The only person that did not stay in the seat like glued to it. There was a minister of councils, I gave him a slap in the face and he faithfully stayed sitting - only I wasn't allowed to show the film...

*But do you already know that before this person gets a slap in the face or you lay your hand around them...?*

Yes with the minister of councils I knew in advance because I had thought that it would be a strong piece.

*And how is that for example with the portrait of PETER KUBELKA AND JONAS MEKAS? One keeps the impression that they had the instructions, whatever happens now - just look into the camera...*

No, I didn't say, that I was doing something. "Can I film a double portrait of you?". And then I went to Peter that I hadn't spoken to in three days because we were quarreling and gave him a kiss. That was actually quite cold-blooded because Peter always felt that he had to induce the reconciliation and that I never did - what he is quite right about.

And then I had thought: so, now we do reconciliation in front of the camera. One can see how he straightens up and becomes quite pleased during the film.

*How did you come across Franz West?*

I was friend with him. I was the only friend that was reasonably normal during that time with so many drugs... He took care that his mother became my dentist and then I was always in his home - because I had bad teeth - and she would repair them. But she did that for me to keep my relation to West going. He gave me many works of art. Only because of this it was possible for me to buy the workshop space in Paris, I have virtually West to thank for that. And for that reason I keep giving him things back, because I cannot forget him that, to have this possible escape to Paris. Away from Vienna.

*I would like to return to the idea of "intervention": On one hand there are your gestures and actions through which you put yourself in the picture, on the other hand there are also films where you appear as reflection in the mirror, for example in LE BAROMETRE that we watched in conjunction with EINGREIFEN...*

...I didn't want that, it just happened. I was very horrified that you can see that.

*I find it very interesting also in other parts of EINGREIFEN or in SECRET IDENTITIES where you strip in the background. I had to think about your photographs in which you also took up erotic poses and subsequently feminists for surrendering to the male gaze accused you. In retrospect you have taken side with the feminists. In itself I also would look at it that way; but watching your films for example in this mirror scene, I had the feeling that it works differently, that you are a very self-determinate subject that is playing intensely with the idea of eye contact. In a certain way have the eye contact under a very strict control even though you undress... that you are not subjugated to the eye contact but rather act or agitate with it.*

That is much too complicated. It is determined much more by life... In *LE BAROMETRE* it was not clear to me that I was visible in the freshly cleaned tiles, I wanted to make a portrait of the boxer. But because the room was so small I couldn't put the camera anywhere else. And then I exposed myself quite a bit... because it was never really certain whether the portrayed men understood the context correctly.

*But the camera is there...*

... Well, I nevertheless allowed total strangers inside in the room.

*But don't you create a very specific frame through the presence of the camera? Also by asking the men if you can do a recording...*

Often I first photograph my characters, then they get the photos and then I ask if I can film a portrait.

*In so doing it is strictly defined what is going on...*

... Yes, but in Paris it's somehow different!

(Laughter.)

I am playing a bit with the fire, I take the photo as an excuse (there is also an article with this title) to do different things that you normally cannot do: making contact or refusing contact or whatever... And with the filming it is similar. With the camera I do things that seems forbidden to me and in addition to that I have a filmic document.

*For you, when is a film actually finished?*

Once the 30m reel is empty. I try to edit in the camera and I always want it to be one piece. In most cases it is also like that...

*There are also films that you combine with each other... like with ERWIN, TONI, ILSE... How does that come about?*

They are joined.

*And how is it with EINGREIFEN or OHNE TITEL...?*

There were two 30m reels in *OHNE TITEL* and Henny Fischer helped me cut them. I have never learned that myself. On the one role there are 186 male portraits that I recorded at the Frankfurt main train station standing at the end of the escalator. Only shortly pulling the trigger. I later tried it again in Paris but didn't make it - I was too much a coward. I also got threatened... Actually I almost think that this film is better alone than in combination with the part filmed at Hotel Orient, where you see a sex scene between a woman in a mask and a man. Only these 186 short male portraits. Nevertheless we cut them together... I shot the film in the 1980's and didn't edit and finish it before 2001. Otherwise I mostly - as I said before - edited directly in the camera.

*Films like SECRET IDENTITIES OF A PSYCHOANALYST or SCHLEUSEN and also EINGREIFEN consist of more parts. How do you decide about these combinations?*

Actually all are original 30m reels, mostly shot after each other...

*And you also didn't fade in and out between them, but filmed as long as the film ran?*

No I didn't fade out, but what I very much like - and I did this with a.o. the film *20. NOVEMBER 2005* - is deliberately stopping the camera and opening it during the shooting. Thereby this flickering of light arises and the image becomes white. That is the influence from Warhol's *SCREEN TESTS* is also traceable. Georges Méliés has also repeatedly used the persistence of the camera in his small "magical art pieces"... that has always inspired me. *MIRJAM PLOTENY UND ARIANE* is influenced by Carl Theodor Dreyers film *ORDET* though they are founded on a misunderstanding... There I was – briefly said – concerned with generating a spatial and timely continuity that didn't exist already.

*In the early films, meaning in the "expanded" portraits, you actually use a very simple but nice method on the filmic level: the successive approaching to the portrayed figure by increasing the size of the suspension.*

When photographing I do it like that, also in portraits. The people are often shy in the beginning. Thus with the technical suspension I start out from a distance and then I try to get as close as possible. I have more or less done the same when filming.

*That is a process where you get closer to your subjects...*

Yes, it is a changing relationship. The tension increases while photographing and

filming and during this process I try to get closer, or: because the tension increases I dare to move closer.

*While watching, you mentioned that you did something very mean in the film SEBASTIAN MEKAS...*

Yes but you don't see it – or perhaps you see something... He is a particular shy person. I hired an actress for the film instructed to address him as I started filming. Unfortunately she didn't follow the instructions. I was going around the corner to film a hedge that should be the beginning of the film – and when I came back she had already started speaking to him. I was furious; he was however pleased and proud that I saw a beautiful young woman approaching him – I know him since his childhood, he was always very shy... Then I thought that I had to provoke a reaction in some way and I walked up to him and kissed her on the shoulder, she wore a T-shirt with shoulders exposed. Perhaps I should have filmed that, but in my attempt to keep a distance and only show a reaction on his face I didn't. You see that he looks to the side and by the way how he looks back again you see that something happens, he realizes that she didn't really approach him but that it was staged.

*All this one doesn't know when seeing the film. One now and then interprets something completely different in these facial expressions...*

But that doesn't matter. I just wanted to say that all the works are developed under an enormous tension and also feelings of blame from my side. And also when I do something affectionate with people. Because I stage them in a situation where they cannot do anything else then let their feelings be caught on film. But then again I am very honest because I always let the subjects see the film and ask them for permission to show it.

*But is your concern really the emotional? And what is it exactly, the face, the play with expressions...?*

It is a psychological interest, a bit like in PEEPING TOM where the sadistic father (acted by Karlheinz Böhm) has frightened the child to produce scientific records. I want to see something that hasn't been seen before in this form on film. And at the same time I want to have – but that is more an analytical consideration – a reflection of myself and about myself. Urgently. As proof that I exist, that I am a woman or what kind of woman I am...

*It is not simply about some sort of a reaction? To see what opposes you when you act or make a gesture?*

Yes, I want to see a mirror, a reflection actually. And because I am so shy with bodily contact it naturally also appears stronger. And it is all people – from the boxer to the Businessman...- they all know me since many years. But there was never any bodily contact between us.

*How is it with the film SPUCKEN where it is primarily about the action, about the spiting itself?*

I didn't get to know this young man. In Paris I was looking for an Arab because the Arabs are told to be particular good at spitting, but do not like to be portrayed as such. In the end I picked out the most handsome man in the supermarket – there were a lot of Arabs – and thank god he did it... My idea was actually to make the viewer believe that the cherry stone flies into his eye. But my camera is far too slow - so this did not really work. Furthermore I had glued a filter to protect my objective – and that is also the reason why the effect could not be realized...

*Are you also occupied by theoretical literature?*

Just a little bit.

*To begin with you spoke about the photo and about how the photo cannot do everything... There is a French philosopher that was much more interested in the photo than in film, one that also – as far as I remember – trusted the photo more, that is Roland Barthes in Camera Lucida...*

I have read it back then... and I read it again now and then because I use it in my teaching. In many cases I however do not share his opinion, I look differently at the photo.

*Would you also look differently at the ontological truth and the bodily, substantial presence of the objects (or subject) in the photo?*

No, some things I have taken over from him. When he says that the photo is connected to the one represented, as by an umbilical cord, that is true in any case ... but that naturally also counts for film. I like very much his ideas on 'punktum' (full stop) and the 'study'.

I like his notions of the "end point" and the "study". I have even used ideas about the punktum – but in other words – in my info-material. When the students talk about the photos in the portfolio-workshop then they actually speak about themselves. And Barthes also says that. You can only speak about the punktum when you speak about yourself – but I have only read very little film theory. A bit of Vertov, but that was too much for me...

*For a long time you haven't made any films. How come?*

The conscious reason was that I have watched many Avant-garde films. Hans Neuffer has often taken me along to the film museum; he has by the way also introduced me to Peter (Kubelka). And then – as I got to know Peter in 1974 and he got a visiting professorship at San Francisco Art Institute – I meet many filmmakers

and also photographers... Kenneth Anger, Robert Nelson, Jack Smith, Hollis Frampton, Paul Sharits... I watched their films and was very impressed. In Vienna I had also attended Peters lectures. He had lectured the first time in 1974, not in the film museum, but in the Galerie vom Kalb, in the basement, it was ice cold. I saw how these people had devoted their lives to film and how many considerations were involved in their occupation ... And then I had thought: I cannot do that. I quit filming. That was the conscious. And unconsciously I have probably felt that I would face big difficulties with Peter when I wanted to film. For that reason I actually started secretly to film again in 1993. In 1994 I filmed Peter and Jonas Mekas with the C16 that Neuffer had given me as a present and that had been dormant in the basement for years. Out of this group of films Peter had only seen his own portrait, HEIDI and ELTERN that I once showed in a photo exhibition.

*In ELTERN there is the decision to film the mother in color and the father in black and white...*

Pure coincidence. I couldn't get any black and white films in Vienna and I absolutely wanted to film. I like black and white much better. I think I anyhow filmed everything in black and white apart from VATER and on more, I am not totally sure. Perhaps I somewhere happened to make a color film. But this has nothing to do with the personalities of the parents.

*From my perspective – I watch these films without your primary knowledge – I would interpret them rather brute, there is a close relationship to the mother, and with the father you show a rather cold gesture, certainly a colder one than with the mother – and then the portrait of the father is in black and white and that of the mother in color...*

Yes, it fits very well to their temper, because the mother is very expressive in her facial figures and the father is rather rigid like a mountain. But to be honest it was a coincidence.

*What is actually black and white for you? What is the quality of black and white?*

First of all because it survives, while color changes over time, I also don't value that in photography. I only make the erotic photos in color or when commissioned to do so. But for myself rarely use color. Black and white belongs to me as part of my identity. It is probably also because I don't make color magnifications in the darkroom myself, and because the magnification makes the photo so intimate for me. The craft is part of this process. The photographing alone doesn't interest me – even though it is very difficult to be in the dark room, with the age even more difficult, my eyes have become worse from being in the dark room, but this work for me belongs to the process.

*The craft seems in general very important to you. You have told that you partially develop your films yourself. Is that connected to the intimacy?*

I want to be able to touch the material. Even when I suffer doing so – to spool in a 30m film is horrible. It sometimes takes ages...!

*You have shown us your films and after the presentation you talked about how it is almost unpleasant for you to show them. You have also decided not to show part of your films in Austria... What kind of feeling is this?*

There are also films that I don't show at all. Alexander Horwath has – I think – seen the most unpleasant of them all ... but he has also not seen them all.

*What do you mean by "the most unpleasant"? The ones that get to close to you?*

Yes, or when circumstances get to close to me... not necessarily those that affect me the most, but rather where you experience too much about me. I don't want that. All artists have works that, for various reasons, they don't show. Either - for example - the drawings mean a lot to them, but they feel that they don't have the quality to be shown; or there are emotions in them that are not determined for others, but that were converted into the material because it is a necessary outlet. For me all the films are, with only a few exceptions, outlets for something that I wanted to get rid of. Mostly the re-building of the studio into a practice for psychoanalysis. It was such a pressure! As soon as I had made the film it got better. There are naturally also films that I didn't show you because they in my eyes are somehow crab. Perhaps that isn't true, I have also often thought that the films you have seen are crab... and then other people have told me: no they are very nice. HEIDI – where the girl is sitting in Schönbrunn – is totally out of focus, but it's anyway a nice film...

*That is the one where a lot is happening with the sharpness?*

It is out of focus that is what is happening with the sharpness!

*Yes, well you say that it happens but one thinks however that you are consciously working with these effects...*

When I showed my films at the Anthology Archive New York, amongst others P. Adams (Sitney) and Annette Michaelson came traveling to see what films Friedl, the wife of Peter, makes. After the screening Annette Michaelson said that she was struck by the sudden change in brightness in *MIRJAM PLOTENY UND ARIANE* or also in *VATER*; actually similar to student films. In my case that is unfortunately a technical defect in my camera and I simply leave it, also enforced by the Warhol Films. Nevertheless I want to continue using the camera even though the light meter cannot be fixed...

*Is it still the same camera? Or did you buy a new one in the mean time?*

I have a second Eumig C16 that also has a defect. With that I shot *ALLEGORIE*

where the women pass behind me... Actually that is also a bit of a crab film and still I like it very much. It was a test film of the camera, through which I saw that the celerity was defect, the 24 images are too slow - it almost looks like slow motion... Did you not see that it is slow motion?

*I did feel that it is very slow but that was like a dance, a ritual to and from marching in the background... - do you actually go to the cinema? Do you also watch new films?*

Yes, but rarely. I always want to learn something. Robert Nelson has recently said something in the course of his retrospective at the film museum that deeply hit me. He thought that the people rent his films to steal ideas. And I do exactly the same. I have a notebook that I write in, in the darkness, when I get ideas for my own films. Although I then don't adopt them one to one, one does not see that in my films – with exception from *DREYER'S ZITAT*. I don't get any ideas from the commercial films. There are much less ideas in them that is obvious... but camera wise there are sometime some very good moves...

*You founded the photo school in 1990 at a time where there were very few or no educational programs for purely artistic photography in Austria or Europe. In 2006 you founded the school for independent films that starts this fall (2006). What were the reasons for this idea?*

Partly that is because increasingly people came to photo school and want to make films. I have said that its no good, I cannot teach film this is a photo school. But the students wanted it nevertheless. So I have seen that there is a need. Many were also so frustrated about the film academy... And then: With the photo school I founded the school that I myself would have liked attend when I was young. From the atmosphere and the density... I have learned that from the American art schools, what kind of tension that ruled there! Because they are so expensive and the people there absolutely want to bring something further. I wanted to copy that. And with the film school it is actually very similar. I founded the film school that I can myself attend.

*You do everything yourself, the entire administration and everything...*

I do everything myself. This week I have to do the accounting for the ministry and for tomorrow I must summon a board meeting for which I will also cook... I have to invite an accountant, all that I do myself...

*... Catering included so to say...*

Yes.

*On the home page of the photo school is mentioned: "Foremost it is about the attitude to dare, to approach a work with ones entire energy, in which case one is*

*mostly very lonely and the success is doubtful.” In a certain way that sounds brutally honest.*

Well. No illusions. I'm not saying that it is a vocational school. I always say that they cannot become an artist afterwards – or only when they are very good – and they cannot live from it. And it is very difficult, first of all for women. I know that from my own experience. That is written in the spring-info-material that it takes just as much energy to integrate the creative work in life as it does to produce the artistic work. There is a lecture series at the school where past students come and talk honestly, where they really give information about how they survive, how their relationship is going or marriage or children. I am always in favor for that you don't sacrifice your private life. I tell that to the woman, the men have lesser difficulty with that.

*And how is it with commissioned work, how have you handled that?*

When I was a commercial photographer? - I was doing that for a long time! Then I had my studio in Gartengasse. It was difficult.

*What did you photograph there?*

In the beginning you accept everything. Actually I wanted to become a fashion photographer, but have only been able to for a very few number of clients... to deliver what they could use...

*You mean so that they were also satisfied?*

Yes, there was always a psychological factor with the models... it was a very different way to photograph back then; there was no other *staff* around and the model had to pick out her own clothes and put on make up and the two of us went to the Gloriette in the sunset to photograph in backlight. In advance the Models have always told me how things looked in their lives – and what they told me one could then also see on the photo... I could no longer get rid of that. And the clients did of course not like that.

*That was then not particularly representative or glamorous ...*

Exactly, it was not superficial. – And otherwise I photographed for artists. That was more pleasant because I had entered the artist circle at that point. I also did passport photos, back then you still had them taken. Weddings were a disaster because missed shooting when the couple exchanged the rings...

*... Sabotaged the central moment...*

Yes, somehow I didn't manage.

*You really have tried out everything, all different genres.*

You accept all jobs in the beginning to be able to live from it. And I have also lived from it. It stopped suddenly in 1974 when I started to travel with Peter. I was a one-man-business and when the one man is no longer there then the orders disappear...

*Is there a format or a medium –photography, filmmaking or painting – you also paint -, the psychoanalysis or your post as director of the schools... is there one that is closest to you?*

In the psychoanalyses I have the most responsibility, I don't allow myself to get ill. The school is the second feeling of responsibility because there mental processes also take place. My identity however is that of a photographer. I don't dare myself to be called a filmmaker, or I don't want to be. But in the recent years it is certain that the seminal has flown into the films. I have photographed less then I have filmed. I haven't made any yearly portraits, now and then a commission or a small sketch but the whole seminal feeling has been in film. I want to keep my freedom, if that should disappear, if I feel that it doesn't matter anymore, if the thing with the "intervention" or the eternal catalogue of male reactions starts to bore me: then I don't really know how it proceeds... And I am even now standing a bit on the edge. I think I have to recover and find the energy to make a turn. The film *MENSCHEN AM SONNTAG* should actually be something like that... I don't know if I should show it. That was a sign of trust in you that I showed it to you now.

*You also said right away that you have many scruples concerning the editing...*

Yes I have in fact only taken out material and not really edited. Peter has told me that I should not cut at the cutting table but I should rather take notes to each scene. And then find out in I my head what I want. Because it then becomes more uneven. But meanwhile in *MENSCHEN AM SONNTAG* not once did something occur to me in my head... I simply want this exiting moment during the film. And then the film was done. Until now it was like that. And I don't know if I can change that... But I don't need to change it because I am not a filmmaker. I can also simply quit...

*In the school for independent films you are primarily focused on film formats, Super8 and 16mm. Actually both formats are increasingly rare, at least in the cinema and in film festivals.*

That is not important to me... or perhaps that's exactly why.

*You have also no intention to deal with digital media?*

No, I follow the principles of my desires. I have already made little short films on my mobile phone but it doesn't excite me at all to make something serious.

*That would actually also be totally counterproductive for you... with the idea that is*

*so exiting and the reel is so and so long and that it cannot be made again... that would be lost if you should make it on video.*

I think it was Hans Bellmer who said that when the blood pressure in the system is too low that you have to tie for a congestion to occur and for you to feel something. An absolutely neurotic notion. But for me it is very clear that the artistic works originate from the neurotic because otherwise one could enjoy life! And one would not have to make such an effort.

*Gerhard Amanshauser also says it... in the film portrait REISEN IM EIGENEN ZIMMER by Gerhard Gross and Bernhard Braunstein he says that when life made sense then there would be no literature and art.*

I agree. The senselessness of life is very clear to me since a long time...

*He says that the question for sense in life is a total impertinence.*

Well, the assertion that there is a sense is the impertinence. You are allowed to ask...

*He really says that the question for sense is already a total impertinence. We really liked that.*

... Quasi, when you ask in an interview: And what sense does your life have, could you tell me that?  
(LAUGHTER.)

List of films: (SELECTION)

ERWIN, TONI, ILSE, 1968/69, b/w, 9 min

GRAF ZOKAN (Franz West), 1969, b/w, 3 min

HEIDI, 1974, b/w, 3 min

OHNE TITEL, 1981, b/w, 5 min

PETER KUBELKA UND JONAS MEKAS, 1994, col, 2:30 min

ELTERN (MUTTER, 1997, col; VATER, 1999, b/w), 5 min L'ECLUSE – DIE

SCHLEUSE, 2000, b/w, 7:30 min

SPUCKEN, 2000, b/w, 2 min

DREYER'S ZITAT, 2001, b/w, 7 min

MIRJAM PLOTENY UND ARIANE, 2003, b/w, 4 min

SEBASTIAN MEKAS, 2003, b/w, 2 min

ALLEGORIE, 2004, b/w, 3 min

EINGREIFEN, 2001-2005, b/w, 10 min

20. NOVEMBER 2005, 2005, b/w, 2 min

SECRET IDENTITIES OF A PSYCHOANALYST, 1995-2005, b/w, 6 min

MENSCHEN AM SONNTAG, 2006, b/w, 3 min

(All films on 16mm)