

WILEY



Handke's and Wenders's Wings of Desire: Transcending Postmodernism

Author(s): David Caldwell and Paul W. Rea

Source: *The German Quarterly*, Vol. 64, No. 1, Focus: Literature and Film (Winter, 1991), pp. 46-54

Published by: Wiley on behalf of the American Association of Teachers of German

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/407304>

Accessed: 27-06-2016 04:23 UTC

REFERENCES

Linked references are available on JSTOR for this article:

http://www.jstor.org/stable/407304?seq=1&cid=pdf-reference#references_tab_contents

You may need to log in to JSTOR to access the linked references.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at

<http://about.jstor.org/terms>

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



Wiley, American Association of Teachers of German are collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The German Quarterly*

DAVID CALDWELL
PAUL W. REA
University of Northern Colorado

Handke's and Wenders's *Wings of Desire*: Transcending Postmodernism

I

Wings of Desire (*Der Himmel über Berlin*, 1988) opens with a shot of a hand writing while a voice intones, "Als das Kind Kind war . . ." As the speaker continues, the image of the hand dissolves into an extreme close-up of a human eye. Moments later, the film's two angels compare what they have written. One angel closes his journal and confesses to a desire: to experience the world with childlike wonder. Later in the film Peter Falk also carries a book in which he sketches.

Through interplay between such supposed opposites as word and image, child and adult, Wim Wenders's *Wings of Desire* returns repeatedly to issues of epistemology and memory, to questions about the past and the future. The film's central polarity of images and words, along with its implications for how and what we *know*, creates important opportunities for discussing broader tensions and turning points in contemporary culture. Thus *Wings of Desire* both illustrates and transcends tensions between modernism and postmodernism. More significantly, just as this film encourages reconciliations between opposites, so too does it herald a world moving beyond the divisions of the past.

In *The Conditions of Postmodernity* (1989), David Harvey treats *Wings of Desire* as a postmodernist text, albeit one with modernist moments in its second half, which he describes as an attempt "to resurrect something of the modernist spirit of human communication, togetherness . . ." (320). But are "communication" and "togetherness" essential themes of modernism? It would seem more accurate to

argue that tensions between postmodernist and other conventions—in fact between oppositions of various sorts—shape every aspect of this extraordinary film.

The very pervasiveness of such polarities indeed suggests that *Wings of Desire* has its roots in such canonical modernist thinkers as Hegel, Marx, Nietzsche, and Freud. As E. Ann Kaplan points out, these fathers of modernism established paradigms that in one way or another depended on oppositions although "they each constructed different kinds of processes for dealing with (or in some cases working through) the oppositions" (3). Conversely, Kaplan and others observe that postmodernism tends to move beyond these tensions, toward what Fredric Jameson terms "the effacement of opposites" (Kaplan, 14). "The aesthetic of *Blade Runner*" and of postmodernism, Harvey contends, involves "the explosion of boundaries" (311).

Handke's and Wenders's *Wings of Desire* transcends both modernism and postmodernism. It moves beyond paired opposites: earth and sky, metaphysical and physical, child and adult, angelic and human, black-and-white and color, male/male and male/female relationships, past and present, war and peace, word and image and, above all, modern and postmodern. The film is a multi-layered masterpiece that explodes both film genres and easy oppositions; though tensions are never fully resolved, its movement is toward the human, the childlike, and the present. The setting, the story, and especially the style of the film embody this interplay between polarities. But in the end *Wings of Desire* moves beyond oppositions.

Nowhere are this tension and movement more apparent than in Wenders's handling of setting. It might appear that, like postmodern films such as *Blade Runner* or *Brazil*, *Wings of Desire* could be set in any modern metropolis. But much as Carol Reed set his classic *The Third Man* in a war-ravaged, divided Vienna, Wenders appropriately chose Berlin, the city of East/West polarities. He directs Alekan's camera as it easily soars over the Wall, surmounts old oppositions, and fluidly penetrates barriers to foreshadow the new connectedness the angels will experience. In many ways *Wings of Desire* evokes Walter Ruttmann's *Berlin: Die Sinfonie der Großstadt* (1927), for it is a visual poem to Berlin and its unique history. Wenders exploits the tensions between the generic and the specific, the global and the local, the foreign and the German. During the first half of the film he offers unrelated shards of urban life in all its banality, alienation, and ennui. These fragments—plus Peter Falk's musings on his itinerary: "Tokyo, Kyoto, Paris, London, Trieste, . . . Berlin"—suggest an unrooted internationalism. Similarly, English and French are spoken as well as German, and two of the main characters are foreigners.

As several commentators have shown, postmodern films typically do not present strongly individualized characterizations. The first half of the film is postmodern in this respect: the two angels, Daniel and Cassiel, are not highly individualized, and they listen in on a great many lost Berliners. But once their aerial eavesdropping is done, the angels become more personalized, and they interact with distinct and engaging human characters. Not surprisingly, the humans turn out to be more interesting than the angels—one source of Daniel's discontent and desire to become more human. This affirmation of humanness sets this film apart from typical postmodern works, which tend to depict humans largely as the victims of social decay and spiritual exhaustion.

Essentially *Wings* depicts the movements of two angels, Daniel and Cassiel, played sensitively by Bruno Ganz and Otto Sander. By

intercutting black and white with color film stock, the film explores the tensions between the celestial and the earthly, between different ways of knowing and living. After nearly an hour of restrained, distanced black and white photography, Wenders cuts to color for the first time as Daniel sits watching Marion, the trapeze artist, disrobe in her trailer. Thus associated with earthly delights, color becomes increasingly prevalent after this point and dominates the film after Daniel descends to earth, gladly becoming a fallen angel. However, it is significant that the film does not just switch to color at the moment of his descent, for the other angel, Cassiel, remains ambivalent and does not take the plunge. At the end of the film Cassiel sits isolated in a colorless circle watching as Daniel and Marion learn to play. Continuing to intercut the two film stocks provides a correlative to Cassiel's vascillating feelings and, importantly, keeps the film from becoming overly schematic. In *Wings*, the unpredictability principle remains operative until the very end, when man and woman come together in full color, putting aside unresolved questions.

Daniel's first moments as a human are touching and telling. As he strides along the Wall on his first walk, Daniel marvels at the garish graffiti, asking a passerby to identify the colors. The passerby, probably unused to such questions and possibly dulled by middle age, seems unimpressed with the colors to the point that he is not certain how to identify them. This provides one among many examples of the film's opposition of childlike wonder to adult imperceptiveness. As we have seen, this motif appears early in the film when Daniel speaks of the woman who walked in the rain and the teacher who was "astonished" at the child's description of a fern. Throughout the film, it is only the children who notice the angels; most adults trudge through their existences, too glazed to savor the rain or notice the ferns. As Daniel notes in his journal, humans once enjoyed an angelic state when they were children but did not know they were children. By presenting the city through the sensitive eyes of the angels, the film not only

extends the German tradition of subjective camera so well described by Kracauer in *From Caligari to Hitler* or Eisner in *The Haunted Screen*; it allows us to see things freshly—literally from a childlike point of view. In this respect, *Wings of Desire* moves beyond both the modern and the postmodern. These new-found possibilities for seeing and for understanding fulfill the promise of the opening close-up of an eye.

Paired oppositions are evident again in the story line. The narrative drive from the celestial to the earthly parallels the film's movement from male/male toward male/female relationships. Continuing a pattern evident in many of Wenders's earlier films, *Wings of Desire* begins as a "buddy" film, albeit one in which any eroticism disappears and the buddies seldom even converse. As the focus shifts to Daniel's pursuit of Marion, Cassiel nearly drops out of the picture. Little attention is given to this decline in the apparently long-term relationship between the male angels. Perhaps the viewer is to assume that the angels, disembodied as they are, have not made a strong emotional bond, though the film provides considerable evidence that they do feel deeply. In any event, by having one of the males leave to pursue a life of the senses and a woman—a pursuit that was either non-existent or met with a dead end in *Im Lauf der Zeit* (1975), *Der amerikanische Freund* (1977), and *Paris, Texas* (1984)—*Wings* marks a departure for Wenders.

However, Marion is not an ordinary woman. Her free flying on the trapeze in her winged costume makes her angel-like at times, yet she is linked to the earth and thus connects angelic and human existences. In an interesting role reversal, she keeps her vocation at the end, and Daniel assumes the "womanly" watcher's role—he holds the grounding rope to prevent her from "flying away." She is a human with physical desires, but she exhibits strong metaphysical longings; Daniel is not merely an ethereal angel, for he also experiences physical desires. Marion wants to become something more; Daniel wants to experience the human condition.

Thus woman and man become reciprocals and fuller beings by transcending boundaries.

II

The angels are not merely the disembodied spirits of individuals; they carry knowledge and memory. Their favorite haunts include the towering 1871 *Siegessäule* and the *Staatsbibliothek*, where the camera pans the orb-like lights to suggest the celestial connection. Since the angels already know everything, they are often content to watch humans read and look at pictures. Yet Daniel longs to see beyond what is known—"*Endlich ahnen statt immer alles zu wissen*"—as he indicates in his soliloquy on the prehistoric past.

The theme of the burden of the past and the need to transcend it finds expression through Homer, the old man who also frequents the library. Homer represents "the immortal singer abandoned by his mortal listeners." Like the angel who accompanies him, Homer sees that the Potsdamer Platz no longer exists, and he recalls when history turned ugly. "*Und dann hingen plötzlich Fahnen, dort . . . Und die Leute waren gar nicht mehr freundlich und die Polizei auch nicht.*" But this recollection is not enough; Homer, the poet of memory, desires more. Like Daniel, who upon his descent experiences such earthly sensations as *Imbisskaffee* and borrowed cigarettes, the old man desires to savor again the coffee and tobacco once sold in what is now a void in the middle of Berlin.

Whereas Daniel knows that the Potsdamer Platz was destroyed in the War, Homer has incomplete human knowledge of history. It is significant that Homer's otherwise good memory seems to fail for the years 1933-45. Like Daniel, Homer would like greater vision or foresight ("*Ahnung*"): he needs to understand why no one has written the great "epic of peace" and why peace does not hold a more enduring appeal. While Daniel descends to live a life of the senses, Homer puffs his way up the library steps, aspiring to angelic knowledge. This is one of the few ascents Wenders permits his human characters, who are typi-

cally seen moving downward (Peter Falk landing at Tegel, a suicidal man leaping from a building, stuntmen falling through the floor of a movie set). Once Homer arrives at the upper reaches of the library, where planetary globes are displayed, he reveals his angelic affinities. His bald head seems to fit well among the celestial orbs, and his obsession with memory links him to the angels. Indeed, he and Daniel are reciprocals. In postmodern fashion the film again eclipses traditional boundaries: it interfaces angels and mortals to suggest overlappings.

War and peace are counterpointed too—often ironically. As we have seen, the docile angels roost in monuments to warfare: the ruins of the Kaiser Wilhelm *Gedächtniskirche* and the *Siegestsäule*, replete with a huge angel bearing an olive branch. Wenders frames Peter Falk, who is making a war movie, against the ruins of the *Anhalter-Bahnhof*. In establishing his dynamic between war and peace, Wenders even plays with names: Falk, meaning “hawk,” is recognized by Berliners as “Colombo,” meaning “dove” in Italian. (The Italian spelling rather than the American “Columbo” appears in the published script.)

Using words and images, *Wings of Desire* presents a dialogue between past and present. The library, the war monument, the shots of bombed-out buildings, Homer’s ruminations on the Potsdamer Platz, and the clips of documentary World War II footage all point to Wenders’s concern with troubling memories and the weight of the past. In the opening shot, Daniel perches atop the steeple of the *Gedächtniskirche*; later Daniel and Marion meet in the Esplanade, once a gathering place for high-ranking Nazis during the Third Reich.

The interplay between past and present becomes manifest in the sub-plot in which Peter Falk, a fallen angel now thoroughly in love with life and art, attempts to make a film without a script. For him the significance of the German past is forgotten, muddled, or reduced to trivialities. His mish-mash of thoughts includes Emil Jannings, Kennedy, and von Stauffenberg, whom he terms a “helluva guy.” “What difference does it make, it happened?”

Falk’s voice-over continues. Downplaying language, Falk is associated with the visual: he frequently sketches people he meets, and he often appears on television. On his movie set actors in SS uniforms and Jews wearing Stars of David stand side by side, chatting nonchalantly. Falk is apparently not alone in his ignorance of history.

However, Falk’s ignorance about the past also implies a freedom to define himself in the present; this becomes humorously apparent when he tries on numerous hats before finding the right one. Similarly, the French trapeze artist Marion also breaks with her past as an acrobat by sliding down the rope and leaving the ring. For Daniel, Falk exemplifies the angel who has literally fallen in love with earthly delights, but Falk’s freedom from the past is not complete. Berliners still refer to him as “Colombo,” limiting him to a hat he wore in the past. Thus the opposition of the past and present, like the other tensions in the film, is not completely resolved; *Wings* both meditates on the past and affirms the present.

The central, ongoing paradox of the film, however, is that of pictures and words. As we have seen, *Wings* establishes this polarity at the very outset with images of the eye, the handwriting, and the voice-over narration. This tension between word and image emerges from the very genesis of the film: it is the creation of Peter Handke, a writer, and of Wim Wenders, a visual artist. Together they balance a literary script with classic cinematography.

From the outset and repeatedly throughout their film, wordsmith Handke and image-maker Wenders establish a dialectic, an interplay first between the spoken and the written language and then, pervasively, between words and images. Similarly, this interplay of word and image creates tensions for both angels and humans. As we have seen, the angels Daniel and Cassiel write down observations; they love words but move toward seeing. On the other hand, humans also experience such tensions between the verbal and the visual. Falk never fails to find an audience

when he talks, but he also struggles to express himself visually through doodling and acting. Homer, the poet of memory who has lost his listeners, turns to examining photographs in Berlin's *Staatsbibliothek*.

Angels and humans alike feel the limits of both word and image and thus seek fuller means of perception. The disjointed and idle observations from the angels' journals seem as incomplete and unsatisfying as the humans' inexpert dealings with pictures. The angels put down their journals to observe the lives of Berliners. Peter Falk remarks concerning one of his drawings, "This picture stinks." The angel Daniel expresses most forcefully the desire for a more complete existence when he confesses to his colleague Cassiel his desire to become human. Making this change will enable him not only to know things (*wissen*) but also to guess, suspect, and foresee (*ahnen*): "*Endlich ahnen statt immer alles zu wissen.*"

Both visual and verbal knowledge alone are inadequate. As Homer searches vainly for Berlin's Potsdamer Platz in what is now an empty space near the Wall, he *knows and recalls* the location of the former Platz, though it no longer can be seen. It is precisely this knowledge that evokes the need for foresight, for intuition. Should the cataclysms of German history not have been more clearly foreseen? If Berlin can lose its historic center, what else stands to be lost to ongoing historical processes?

The question of how to acquire knowledge forms the theoretical center of the film. Whether or not they were familiar with Jacques Derrida's deconstruction of "the myth of presence," Handke and Wenders seem to understand that, especially since the time of Gutenberg, oral transmission has fallen into decline. Thus their film explores the two remaining choices. Does one subscribe to the authority traditionally invested in the written word, despite lingering questions about the adequacy of language to convey ideas and despite an unfortunate tendency to believe anything that is read or heard often enough? Or does one follow Western culture's insistence

on the primacy of visual evidence, assuming that "seeing is believing"? The film's skepticism about the reliability of all means of discourse suggests a postmodern sensibility; in fact, Linda Hutcheon's *Politics of Postmodernism* contends that all forms of discourse are "ex-centric" or marginal.

Together and separately, Handke and Wenders have addressed this question before. Pictures of words and word pictures suggest a role reversal in Handke's 1970 novel *Die Angst des Tormanns beim Elfmeter*, which Wenders adapted to film in 1971. Wenders later thematized this dynamic between the visual and the verbal in *Alice in den Städten* (1974)—in which the main character, a writer, displays a penchant for photography—and again in *Der Stand der Dinge* (1981-82), where the script has as its point of departure the shooting of a film within the film.

The importance of both written and pictorial sources pervades *Wings*. Along with Cassiel and Daniel, Rilke's angels hover in the background; the idea of the angels may be derived from Rilke's *Duineser Elegien*, especially the second elegy. Wenders inserts documentary war footage of a bomb-damaged building. Its residents stare into the street. The accompanying narration describes an apartment exposed to the world because a wall is gone. This suggestive image parallels a similar description of the exposed interior of a building in Rilke's novel *Die Aufzeichnungen des Malte Laurids Brigge*. Concerned with history and epistemology as it is, *Wings of Desire* alludes frequently to both verbal texts and visual icons. However, the film clearly reduces the self-conscious reflexivity that characterized many of Wenders's earlier works, and that has led Kathe Geist and others to see his films as postmodernist.

Not only do Handke and Wenders find ways to emphasize both the visual and the verbal in their film, they also make parallel references to widely divergent cultural sources. Allusions to Rilke and the German literary canon occur in the same film that features a contemporary American character actor best known for his work in a popular television

series. Moreover, by populating the film with angels Handke and Wenders inevitably forge a link to that genre of popular film in which celestial visitors interact with mortals. *Topper* (1937), *Here Comes Mr. Jordan* (1941), and *It's a Wonderful Life* (1946) are a few examples. Again, a postmodern sensibility is evident in the range of cultural references so broad in scope and time that it lacks a clear center.

Handke and Wenders are asking how best to understand both the past and contemporary cultural crosscurrents. Words and images are bearers of culture, the means by which cultural literacy is acquired and transmitted. Russell Berman has traced the recent commingling of German literature and film, and the Handke-Wenders team figures prominently in his study. The general tendency toward video-based comprehension, Berman notes, might seem most difficult for literature to accomplish, yet Handke in particular has shown remarkable ingenuity in breaking down boundaries (220-21). But film as a visual medium would seem to have the least difficulty with rendering word into image. Certainly the interest in language has soared to new heights in *Wings of Desire*: it is both very literary and very cinematic. Handke and Wenders ascribe ascendancy neither to word over image nor to image over word.

Taken as a whole, this dynamic of the two media suggests that neither should be granted primacy in our understanding of reality—indeed it suggests that both are subject to manipulation and distortion, and that both are in their own ways limited. Language is less universal than imagery, and film was never more able to cross linguistic boundaries than when it was silent. Since words are tied to historical contexts and since they evoke different images in different individuals, they are more subject to multi-interpretations—as Derrida has pointed out. The shortcomings of the visual are, in David Harvey's words, inevitable in the cinema because “the very act of using it well always entails reducing the complex stories of daily life to a sequence of images upon a depthless screen” (323). Brecht's fa-

mous comment concerning the photograph of a factory is a case in point: such a photo, he wrote, presents reality subsumed in functionality. The human relationships that make up the factory system become reified in a photograph, making the photo little more than artifice (Brecht 161-62). Yet Brecht understood how contexts empower images, and he provided for the use of photographs in his plays, whether in concert with or in contrast to words.

The characters in *Wings of Desire* demonstrate that over-reliance on one means of comprehending reality distorts our understanding of past and present. Homer's name suggests that he is a blind poet, a man of words; indeed he cannot make much meaning from the pictures he examines in the library. (Wenders apparently enjoys ironic reversals such as having the blind man of words, abandoned by his listeners, seek refuge in the library where he looks at pictures!) The amount of time the film devotes to Homer's quest for stories from the past might give the impression that Wenders sees language as the only way to make meaning. Marion, however, counterweights Homer's tendency to equate stories with words, for a cluster of photographs encapsulates her life, and she considers finding a new identity in a photomat. Falk is a good talker, but he also sketches. Neither words nor images alone suffice.

III

Wings of Desire searches for ways out of the postmodern condition, the contemporary malaise of fragmentation and disconnectedness that the film represents by the incompleteness of both images and words. The snatches of language that the angels overhear in the library are no more useful than the fragmented television images that Daniel later observes as they flicker across TV screens in a shop window. Similarly, the poignant words heard in voice-over laments are just as memorable and anonymous as the shots of the silent faces of subway passengers. Wenders leads up to the climax of Mar-

ion's and Daniel's quest for each other by insisting that the viewer spend long minutes in the disconnected atmosphere of the rock club, where humans stand unaware of each other like tombstones.

But unlike typical postmodern works, *Wings of Desire* is anything but a dead-end film. In an unusually light moment, Derrida parodies these end-of-the-line tendencies of postmodernist aesthetics:

It is not only the end of this but also . . . the end of history, the end of the class struggle, the end of philosophy, the death of God, the end of religions, the end of Christianity and morals . . . , the end of the earth, *Apocalypse Now*, . . . the fundamental earthquake, the napalm descending from the skies by helicopter, . . . the end of literature, the end of painting, art as a thing of the past, the end of the past, the end of psychoanalysis, the end of the university, the end of phallogocentrism and phallogocentrism and I don't know what else. (20-21)

After the slow sequence of stark alienation at the club, man and woman enter the more traditional decor of the Esplanade. The warm lighting and sumptuous interior, the woman in the red dress meeting the stranger at the bar, all arouse expectations of traditional romance. Like the film as a whole, this scene exploits tensions between opposites: black and white versus color, past and present, romance and reality, man and woman. But contrary to filmic conventions, the woman does the talking, affirming the need for a companion but affirming more strongly her need to grow, explore, and become. In doing the talking, however, Marion assumes the allegorical mantle of "the new woman." Marion seeks a way of coming together that offers a more universal meaning, a way of saying "my man" that will enhance understanding. Even more significantly, neither sight nor sound leads the lovers to turn toward each other; instead, they are propelled by forces that emerge strongly during the second half of the film: intuition and *Ahnung*.

Nietzschean romanticism is working here in the form of an opposition not between man

and woman, but between old and new relationships. Marion's and Daniel's quest leads toward a relationship with future implications: "*Wir sind die Zeit*," she soliloquizes. "*Sie sind das Bild der Notwendigkeit, der Zukunft aller auf dem Platz*." Paradoxically, as she speaks she affirms the visual. As David Harvey notes, Nietzsche and others paved the way for modernism with notions of "creative destruction," by which a new world can be ushered in without destroying the old. It is significant that Wenders and Handke fail to provide a complete resolution—clearly they believe that this new synthesis has not emerged fully—for the film ends with the anti-conclusion "To Be Continued." In a recent interview in *Cineaste* Wenders remarked: "I felt the film ended with its beginning" (Fusco 17). Ongoing processes and future developments help to form the context for concerns with old and new, past and present, enabling the filmmakers to transcend both modernist and postmodernist beginnings and endings.

Operating on the margins of the Daniel-Marion union, Homer and Peter Falk complement and amplify the nature of that union, expanding the possibilities for defining it and giving it less distinct boundaries than are typical of either modernist or postmodernist discourse. Similarly, the gentle, sensitive angels elide the usual boundaries between genders as they affirm new notions of manhood—much as, by demonstrating abilities at both aerial spirituality and earthly physicality, Marion extends conceptions of womanhood. Falk's uncertain descent into Berlin to make a movie is matched by Homer's belabored ascent of the library stairs, where he looks back on a German past in which "peace had no enduring appeal." Neither man is complete; one is limited by images, the other by words. Falk and Homer, as descending and ascending figures, as figures to whom both *wissen* and *ahnen* apply, together suggest new dimensions of insight and creativity beyond the limits of postmodernism. "To be continued" invites our continued growth toward new encounters with Dead End situations like those met by Homer at the Wall, by Falk with his sketch-

book, by Daniel with his jottings about humans, and by Marion upon the closing of the circus.

In the final scene of the film Marion has resumed her place in the air as an upward-looking acrobat, with Daniel steadying the line from below. Wenders and Handke are operating in a realm where it is possible not just to swing backward and forward in the historical continuum but also to move up and down, to spin about and gain new perspectives on familiar polarities. At the end Marion's precarious performance on the rope is possible because she remains connected to the earth. In fact, the film challenges usual Western assumptions about up and down, literally standing conventional notions of "higher" and "lower" on their heads.

Wings of Desire, then, moves beyond most postmodern films in that it celebrates growth and implies a positive future. Unlike even such a visually creative film as Terry Gilliam's *Brazil*, *Wings* does not seem to mark time, to wait for the aesthetic millennium. Rather, it begins with a colorless world of exhaustion, disconnection, and decay, then transcends the condition of postmodernity, using it as an impetus for rebirth. Like postmodernists, Wenders and Handke have eroded the borders of modernist polar opposites, but they have also used postmodern conditions and aesthetics such as the wasteland and allusiveness to move beyond postmodernism. By transcending supposed oppositions in a divided city Wenders and Handke have anticipated an era of reconciliations, celebrating life and affirming a future.

During the 1980s increasing numbers of people became painfully aware that humans hold the power to undo themselves with weapons or through environmental abuse. Seizing the historical moment, Handke and Wenders understood what Carl Jung had perceived as both a responsibility and a challenge:

He can no longer wriggle out of it on the plea of his littleness and nothingness, for the dark God has slipped the atom bomb and chemical weapons into his hands and given him the power to empty

out the apocalyptic vials of wrath on his fellow creatures. Since he has been granted an almost godlike power, he can no longer remain blind and unconscious. (Jocobi 353)

While Wenders and Handke do not dwell on the opposition of the conscious and unconscious dimensions of the mind, like Jung they do suggest that with its end in sight, the world can begin again.

Considering the astounding changes occurring in recent years and the real possibility of a reunified Germany and a unified Europe, it appears that European civilization may again be undergoing what Thomas Kuhn has called a "paradigm shift." While redrawing political boundaries or collapsing distinctions between capitalism and communism do not in themselves constitute a paradigm shift, they may be metaphors for the dissolving of old habits of mind. In *Wings of Desire* Wenders and Handke not only resolved some of the problems in their cinematic art but apparently participated in historic changes as these began to occur.

Works Cited and Consulted

- Barthes, Roland. *Writing Degree Zero*. Boston: Beacon, 1970.
- Berman, Marshall. *All That Is Solid Melts into Air: The Experience of Modernity*. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1982.
- Berman, Russell A. "Language and Image: Cinematic Aspects of Contemporary German Prose." *Film und Literatur. Literarische Texte und der neue deutsche Film*. Ed. Sigrid Bauschinger, et al. Bern: Franke, 1984.
- Brecht, Bertolt. "Der Dreigroschenprozess." *Gesammelte Werke*. Vol. 18. Frankfurt a.M.: Suhrkamp, 1967.
- Corrigan, Timothy. *New German Film: The Displaced Image*. Austin: U of Texas P, 1983.
- Conner, Steve. *Postmodernist Culture: An Introduction to Theories of the Contemporary*. London: Blackwell, 1990.
- Derrida, Jacques. "Of an Apocalyptic Tone Adopted in Recent Philosophy." *Oxford Literary Review* 6.2 (1984): 3-37.
- Dieckmann, Katherine. "Wim Wenders: An Interview." *Film Quarterly* 37 (1984-85): 2-7.
- Eagleton, Terry. "Awakening from Modernity." *Times Literary Supplement* 20 February 1987. Review of Jean-François Lyotard. *Le Postmoderne explique aux enfants* (Paris: Galilee, 1987); and Lyotard and Jean-

- Louis Thebaud. *Just Gaming* (Manchester: Manchester UP, 1987).
- Fusco, Coco. "Angels, History and Poetic Fantasy." *Cineaste* 16.4 (1988): 14-17.
- Geist, Kathe. "Women in Wenders' Films: A Structuring Absence." *Schatzkammer* 14.2 (1988): 87-94.
- _____. *The Cinema of Wim Wenders: From Paris France to Paris, Texas*. Ann Arbor: UMI, 1988.
- Habermas, Jürgen. *Der philosophische Diskurs der Moderne*. Frankfurt a.M.: Suhrkamp, 1985.
- Hutcheon, Linda. *A Politics of Postmodernism: History, Theory, Fiction*. New York: Routledge, 1988.
- Handke, Peter. *Die Angst des Tormanns beim Elfmeter*. Frankfurt a.M.: Suhrkamp, 1970.
- Harvey, David. *The Conditions of Postmodernity*. London: Blackwell, 1989.
- Jaehne, Karen. "Angel Eyes." *Film Quarterly* 24.5 (1988): 18-20.
- Jacobi, Jolande, and R. F. C. Hull, eds., *C. G. Jung: Psychological Reflections*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1978.
- Lawson, Hilary. *Reflexivity: The Post-modern Predicament*. LaSalle: Open Court, 1985.
- Kaes, Anton. *From Hitler to Heimat: The Return of History as Film*. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1989.
- Kaplan, E. Ann. *Postmodernism and Its Discontents*. New York: Verso, 1988.
- Kuhn, Thomas. *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1970.
- Nicholson, Linda. *Feminism and Postmodernism*. London: Routledge, 1989.
- Paneth, Ira. "Wim and His Wings." *Film Quarterly* 42.1 (1988): 2-8.
- Pflaum, Hans Günther. *Germany on Film: Theme and Content in the Cinema of the Federal Republic of Germany*. Trans. Roland Richter and Richard Holt. Detroit: Wayne State UP, 1990.
- Rilke, Rainer Maria. *Werke in drei Bänden*. Frankfurt a.M.: Insel, 1966.
- Sorokin, Pitirim. *Social and Cultural Dynamics*. 4 vols. New York: American Book, 1937-41.
- Wenders, Wim, and Peter Handke. *Der Himmel über Berlin. Ein Filmbuch*. Frankfurt a.M.: Suhrkamp, 1988.