The Man in the High Castle or the History that Never Happened:

The Conflation of Alternative History, Memory, and Ideology

by

Kelsey Taylor Abele

A Dissertation Presented in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Philosophy

Approved March 2020 by the
Graduate Supervisory Committee:

Daniel Brouwer, Chair
Adina Carlson
Ana Hedberg Olenina

ARIZONA STATE UNIVERSITY

May 2020

ABSTRACT

I center my analysis on Amazon's recent foray into alternative history *The Man in the High Castle* premised on Philip K. Dick's 1962 novel of the same name. Amazon Studio's production *The Man in the High Castle* builds upon the premise of an alternative history where World War II ends differently. Here, the diegetic narrative depicts a United States split into three distinct regions: the east coast, now part of the German Reich; the Neutral Zone, or most of the Midwest and the Rocky Mountains; and the west coast, controlled by Japanese Empire. The film version debuted in 2015 as a series extending to four seasons of 10 episodes a piece by 2019. I argue that the show takes cues from modern political tensions, the rise of the alt-right and "post-truth" media manipulations, to intentionally destabilize viewers' memories of the historical past. By blurring the boundaries between the diegetic reality of the show and our accepted version of history, *The Man in the High Castle* disrupts the facility in which the viewer assumes alignment with memory and past, opting instead for a complicated refiguring of the political present. Here I articulate how film as a medium tampers with the viewer's ontological understanding of image by collapsing history and fiction together. Additionally, the capacity of film to provoke empathy from viewers complicates the universal condemnation of Nazism we are familiar with and permits viewers to see the banality of evil in this reimagined history. Finally, I discuss how film as a medium capitalizes on the incompleteness of memory and the loopholes of history to fabricate viewer memory.

.

DEDICATION

To family- near and far. Especially Wanda, who I don’t know if she would have liked it, but she would have liked that I finished it.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Think of these 'Thank yous' like the Oscars. They're probably too short, and I probably forgot some.

To my committee who patiently waded through this messy project and helped me reorganize my brain. Grad school is unsung work, but you all are the wizards behind the curtain that make it happen.

To Dan who listened to the babble of chaos from my mouth and managed to distill something every time. For this project and many more, you deserve superhero acclaim for your superhero powers.

To my parents, who nodded along, and sometimes watched the show out of curiosity.

To Burke, my cat. Thanks for the hairballs and the antics. Comedy is important.

To The Cohort with the Flaxen Hair, I love you, you are smart, and talented, and pretty, and going to survive it all. Munch munch munch.

To the Sapphires, thank you games, thank you food, thank you laughter, and perspective.

To friends far away, thanks for letting me know what life outside sweaty AZ is like. I hope to see you in person soon.

Z- thanks for visiting the desert and teaching me games I can lose. Not everything is academic gibberish, though academic jabberers play games too.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

LIST OF FIGURES vi

CHAPTER

1 A HISTORY THAT NEVER HAPPENED 1

Film: Vocabulary and Representation 4

Vocabularies for Passing Through Screens 4

Historical Film 8

Film Studies in CinemaScope 10

Viewer Investment in Film 11

Memory: Remembrance from Where 16

Memory Typology 17

Justification of Approach 23

Rhetorical Impact 24

Methological Considerations 27

Structure and Chapter Distinctions 28

2 ONTOLOGY OF THE IMAGE AND THE SUBSEQUENT

"AUTHENTICITY" 30

A Shift to the Moving Image 35

Documentary-Getting Close to the Real 36

Newsreel-Real 37

Audiencing Film, Fact, and Fiction 39

The Historical Film 43

CHAPTER Page

Shrodinger's Film.. 51

3 HISTORICAL REVISIONISM 62

Memory Studies: The Gateway to Revisionism.. 62

Uncertainty of "The Man in the High Castle" films.. 64

Surrogate Histories.. 70

The First Film.. 71

The Second Film 78

Dealing in the Other Worldly.. 84

Under Nuclear Threat.. 90

Testing Testing.. 112

Travelers.. 115

Conclusion.. 119

4 DOMESTICATION OF THE NAZIS: EMPATHY AND PROJECTION.... 121

Construction of Immersion and Empathy in Film Narrative.. 121

Domestication of the Nazis.. 128

VA-Day 129

The Filmic Banality of Evil 133

A Fracture in the Family Foundation: Thomas Diagnosed.. 135

Grieving of State Martyr.. 141

Finding 'American' In the American Reich.. 144

Year Zero.. 145

Conclusion.. 150

CHAPTER Page

5 CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS, AND THE FEAR OF RETURN......... 152

Edelweiss and Projection 152

Allusions... 158

Once Upon a Time in Hollywood... 162

Jojo Rabbit.. 163

Season 4 Backlash- What about the SJWs?... 164

The Future of the Past 166

Conclusion.. 170

REFERENCES 172

APPENDIX

A CHARACTERS, DESCRIPTIONS, AND ACTORS... 179

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure Page

1. Battle of Antietam-Matthew Brady, 1962 32

2. Assassination of the Crown Prince S1 E5..55

3. Jacqueline Kennedy and Robert Kennedy Accompany Coffin, 1963..................56

4. Crown Princess of Japan Waiting in Hospital S2 E5 57

5. Swearing in of Lyndon B. Johnson, 1963..57

6. Juliana Watches the First Film S1 E1 59

7. *The Man in the High Castle* still S1 E1 First Film- Aviator 65

8. *The Man in the High Castle* still S1 E1 First Film- Churchill..............................66

9. *The Man in the High Castle* still S1 E1 First Film- Stalin, Roosevelt, and Churchill 67

10. Tehran Conference 1943- Stalin, Roosevelt and Churchill................................69

11. *The Man in the High Castle* still S1 E1 First Film- Destruction of Nazi Symbols 72

12. *The Man in the High Castle* still S1 E1 First Film- Destruction of Nazi Symbols73

13. *The Man in the High Castle* still S1 E1 First Film- Destruction of Nazi flag.....73

14. *The Man in the High Castle* still S1 E1 First Film- Japanese Surrender Aboard USS Missouri 74

15. *The Man in the High Castle* still S1 E1 First Film- Japanese Surrender 75

16. *The Man in the High Castle* still S1 E9 Second Film- Atomic Bomb Shadows 82

17. *The Man in the High Castle* still S1 E9 Second Film-Franks Double Shadow ..82

18. *The Man in the High Castle* still S2 E2- Tagomi's Secret Books.......................86

19. *The Man in the High Castle* still S2 E5- Tagomi Meet Juliana 2 88

Figure Page

20. *The Man in the High Castle* still S2 E5- Times Square Kiss 89

21. *The Man in the High Castle* still S2 E5- Historybook Hiroshima USA Timeline 90

22. |Joe at Dressing Rack| 93

23. |JFK on Screen in the Second Narrative|...94

24. |Reverse Shot Rally Goers| 95

25. |Obergruppernführer Smith and Helen in Bed| 96

26. |Dixon and Juliana Sit in Truck Drinking Beer| 97

27. |JFK Address on Livingroom Screen| 99

28. |Tagomi Peeks around Corner| 100

29. |USA 1962 Livingroom, JFK Address| 101

30. |Joe Puts on Jacket| 102

31. |Thomas Look at South American Atlas| 103

32. |Thomas Atlas, Proud| 104

33. |USA Livingroom Tagomi's Son| 105

34. |Tagomi Wife USA Livingroom| 106

35. |Tagomi| 107

36. |Reverse Shot back to Wife| 108

37. |Reverse Shot Tagomi| 108

38. |Joe in Mirror with Nazi Arm Band| 109

39. |Joe Looks in Mirror| 110

40. *The Man in the High Castle* still S2 E9-Nuclear Test Island 112

41. *The Man in the High Castle still* S2 E9- Tagomi Reaction to Nuclear Footage113

Figure Page

42. *The Man in the High Castle* still S2 E9- Tagomi Reaction to Nuclear Test through Projector Light 114

43. *The Man in the High Castle* still S2 E6- Helen Confronts John in his Office ..136

44. *The Man in the High Castle* still S2 E6- Helen's Teary Reaction to the Plan to Kidnap Their Son 137

45. *The Man in the High Castle* still S2 E6- Helen Cries with John in Background 138

46. *The Man in the High Castle* still S3 E10- Jahr Null Riots 149

47. *The Man in the High Castle* still- Title Sequence Mount Rushmore Parachutists 154

48. *The Man in the High Castle* still- Title Sequence Statue of Liberty in Smoke.155

49. *The Man in the High Castle* still- Title Sequence Statue of Liberty Ships 155

50. *The Man in the High Castle* still- Title Sequence Double Eagle 156

51. *The Man in the High Castle* still- Title Sequence Double Eagle Projection.....157

CHAPTER 1

A HISTORY THAT NEVER HAPPENED

A lanky brunette runs into her basement apartment out of breath, locking the door behind her. Her shaking hands open the confiscated package. Someone had wanted this pretty desperately to go through all of this trouble. Recognizing the medium, she pulls out a heavy boxed projector, hangs a semi-clean sheet on the wall, and threads the found object into the appropriate slots. The whizzing and click of man-made images hums through the rest of the scene. But we only see her face. Panning the room in covert steps, we, the audience, watch as the brunette's face changes with the topic of the film she so carefully smuggled here. The cold flap of the spool's end wakes her from her captivation and she begins the projection again. Over the course of seven viewings, the viewer gets additional information about the film. We see glimpses of war footage, bombs dropping, men surging onto a deadly beach--images that are familiar to us. Those images are what colloquially understand to be news bulletins from movie houses, recycled into modern blockbusters. But for the brunette, entranced on the floor, these are new images, old but unfamiliar, strange, almost as if from a dream. The film begins again accompanying the sound of her boyfriend entering the apartment, he asks about the unfamiliar ghostly projection: "It shows us winning the war".

In this reality, the reality of the Amazon 2015 show *The Man in the High Castle,* the images on the film cannot be true. Premised on Philip K. Dick's novel from the 1960s, the show envisions a world in which the Allied powers lose World War II, dividing the United States into three contentious factions: the east coast, controlled by the German Reich, the west coast, controlled by the Japanese Empire, and a separate strip of

the midwest and Rockies called the “neutral zone.” Twenty years after the end of the war, the lanky brunette (Juliana Crane played by Alexa Davalos), her boyfriend Frank Frink (played by Rupert Evans), and an assundry of other characters become embroiled in a contest for freedom, attempting to shirk the rule of both German and Japanese forces and return to an ostensibly free United States. Yet where this plot could cater to high intensity action sequences common in espionage film, it plays instead to the ethereal and complicated tensions among history, memory, viewership, and morality. Even the crux of the first episode described above raises questions about “where did this film come from” and whether it belongs to the diegetic world of the show? Later in the show other temporal and historical glitches complicate our viewer understanding of the show-world. One such glitch shows a world the viewer recognizes as the 1960s with newspapers reporting on the Cuban Missile Crisis and Ronald Reagan advertisements for cigarettes. These kinds of historical collisions complicate how viewers trust in the world creation of the show. They then must tread a thin line, constantly balancing between rationalizing the show’s diegetic world with their own historical knowledge. This complex reconfigurement is ripe for a rhetorical film analysis questioning the impacts of this conflation of fiction and history that re-imagines a different world order.

While the novel debuted into a political sphere fraught with protest and civil action, Amazon’s production aired approximately a year before the contentious 2016 presidential elections. The second season aired a month after the elections, and the fourth season most recently debuted in November 2019. Within that three-year time frame, concern over the rise of the political far-right, appearance of neo-nazi rallies that resulted in the death of a bystander in Charlottesville, and corresponding hate groups circulate in

the news regularly. While the show does not directly engage any modern news events such as those in Charlottesville, it does provide a resonant and topical backdrop to an already contentious mediascape. Fraught with "deep-fakes" and threats of "post-truth" circulating daily news and social media, *The Man in the High Castle* manages to poke at the soft undercarriage of modern media concerns. Theorists of popular culture have long contended that mainstream narrative films give shape to audiences' deep-seated concerns and anxieties, modeling various situations and providing a kind of road map of possible responses to burning issues (Bordwell & Thompson, 2013). Indeed, film and other popular media reflect political and ideological struggle at any given time. Based on Kenneth Burke's (1967) conviction that literature provides necessary tools for living, Brummett (1984) extends the call to describe *media* as our "equipment for living" as it helps to guide our complicated realities. *The Man in the High Castle,* while a contentious piece of film, reflects on our socially embedded fears of an unstable or historically altered world. It also provokes viewers to contend with multiple realities, those off the screen, and those layered within the narrative presented, each viable, realistic, and hauntingly close to the bone. Where film can provide a heuristic for untangling our day-to-day problems, it also visually seeps into our consciousness, creating visual memories that look terribly similar to our lived memories. It is this startling reflection that I am drawn to in filmic representations of alternative history, as they conflate and restructure collective understandings of history and memory.

Due to the scope of the show both in terms of plot and duration (thus far four seasons at ten episodes each lasting an hour), I aim to approach this analysis through a thematic lens, parsing out elements of image and authenticity of image, impacts on

historical understanding, and empathic response to the complicated villain characters. While this requires close textual analysis, rather than combing through each episode scene by scene, I will opt for a medium shot, attending to specifics that attend to the following components of my analysis: alternative history, ideological tensions, and embedded historic imagery. This approach is not unlike that of Claire Sisco King's work on *Fight Club* and *The Brave One* (2009, 2010) where she parses out the investments of representation and genre as well as the inlayed ideological messages. In this chapter I will discuss relevant vocabularies and analytical approach before justifying my rhetorical methods and outlining the following chapters.

Film: Vocabulary and Representation

While film theory and analysis is replete with technical terms that aim to describe the medium, my intention in this section is less to serve as an indexical account of vocabulary in film theory broadly, and more to note specifically the complex weavings I will use here. These vocabularies include designated viewer perspectives as opposed to the narrative encapsulated on the screen. For its emphasis on vocabulary and utility, I follow Corrigan's text *A Short Guide to Writing about Film* (2012). It is my intention to use conventional, easily understood film terms in colloquial ways as to avoid audience alienation. For the more complicated, less conventional terms and phrases, I have noted them in the following section.

Vocabularies for passing through screens.

The temporal gaps and glitches in *The Man in the High Castle* stem from viewer understanding of narrative function in filmic spaces. Campora articulates a difference between multiform narratives and multi-strand narratives (2009). Where multi-strand

narratives have multiple protagonists, multiform narratives contain multiple narratives, yet they also have mixed realities, which makes it both structurally different and ontologically different from a uniform narrative (Campora, 2009). As Campora delineates, "multiform films feature parallel or alternate realities in one or more of their strands" (2009, p. 121). As a viewer becomes immersed in a film, "illusionism" allows the viewer to determine their own sense of space as ontologically separate from screen, whereas "realism" undermines the separation between the two, meaning there is no perceived ontological difference (Egginton, 2001). In films with fantastical elements, or settings noticeably different from the viewer's current location, it might be easy from an illusionistic perspective to delineate between the two spaces. However, in "realism," the two spaces intentionally bleed together, emerging from the same ontological premise.

In order to better understand the construction of *The Man in the High Castle*, it is pertinent to unpack the filmic terminology that applies. Initially, intradiegetic narrative "is the primary level at which the story is being told and is one level up in the narrative hierarchy from the extradiegetic" (Campora, 2009, p. 124). Some films may use intradiegetic narrative in terms of a narrator who introduces the following action from a different perspective. For example, *film noir* commonly uses this narrative device. Films such as *Double Indemnity* (Wilder, 1944) begin with the protagonist in a location reflecting on, or narrating a flashback over, the course of the remaining film (Ferenz, 2005). In this example, the character who introduced the story still has a role in the flashback; it is merely a retrospective in order to demonstrate distance between past and present, or as in *film noir*, to emphasize causality. For the duration of this paper, intradiegetic narratives will refer to the show as a whole, *The Man in the High Castle*,

whereas encapsulated narratives, or the story within the story elements such as the films made by the character the man in the high castle that the brunette watched are metadiegetic.

Metadiegetic narratives are embedded narratives within a larger structure (Campora, 2009). Essentially, the play-within-a-play trope can evolve through character memories, dreams, or even internal-subjective narratives (Campora, 2009). *The Man in the High Castle* includes multiple metadiegetic narratives. Tagomi's meditative displacement functions as a metadiegetic plot where he escapes from the intradiegetic constraints to discover both, broadly, an altered perspective and, specifically, the man in the high castle films themselves.[1] Not only are they films-within-a-film, but they present additional narratives and plot lines consisting of characters from the intradiegetic level. Both of these metadiegetic disjunctures connect to extradiegetic understandings of the viewer imposed on a fictionalized medium. Extradiegetic narratives happen at "level at which the narration happens, and in film, [are] represented by the camera-narrator" (Campora, 2009, p. 124). Essentially, this is the level where those outside of the immediate scene look in and potentially influence the way the scene is understood. For example, the director, the camera person, or the viewer all have extradiegetic views of the intradiegetic narration. In many film-centered discussions, analysis of diegetic levels begins with analysis of sound and soundtracks; other analyses center narrative levels. In discussions of sound, intradiegetic sound happens within the context of the film itself

[1] I will more thoroughly explain this in subsequent chapters- the short version is that there is a character, "The man in the high castle," who creates controversial and revolutionary films such as the one Juliana watches. The origins of the actual footage are a mystery.

such as the crunch of gravel under a character's foot. Extradiegetic sound would include any scoring adaptation such as a soaring violin melody to accompany the character's driveway stroll. For my purposes here, it is more conducive to characterize diegetic levels in terms of narrative.

Campora describes how diegetic levels, or the levels at which narratives or film elements (such as sound) occur, can be differentiated through illocutionary or ontological means (2009). For example, a character's flashback to a previous scene, would shift between the metadigetic level and the intradiegetic level but maintain the same ontological understanding. While the ontology doesn't shift in this example, the boundary between the two levels is an illocutionary one (Campora, 2009), a separation which designates a temporal, ontological, and spatial shift between the intradiegetic level and the metadiegetic level. Alternatively, if the metadiegetic level is fictional or a different ontology than then intradiegetic level such as a dream, a hallucination, other film, then the levels are ontologically different (Campora, 2009). In this case they are separated by a boundary that dictates the way the characters understand the two metadiegetic events and ultimately help to guide the extradiegetic viewer. Diegetic levels may also be illocutionary, temporally, or spatially distinct, but ontologically similar, such as in a flashback situation (Campora, 2009). Egginton furthers, "illusionism, the filmic technique of presenting the medium (the filmic image) as if it were the object--reality itself" (2001, p. 210). Campora warns that if metadiegetic narrative is fictional, or ontologically different from the intradiegetic narrative, that traversing that level becomes an ontological boundary (2009). Naturally, we are "cognitively and culturally predisposed to discriminating between the real and fictional status of represented entities"

(Yacavone, 2012, p. 30). Especially in realistic film where the intention is to be easily transposed from an intradiegetic stance to an extradiegetic experience, the audience has to forget if only for a second that what they are watching is a representation to make it real (Egginton, 2001).

Historical film.

My approach leads me to tango with research that engages filmic representation of the real, and historical film portrayals in works such as Rosenstone (1995). Dealing with the genre of alternative history requires conceptual clarity in sorting a variety of means by which film narratives may evoke, allude to, and represent the past. Though a historian at heart, Rosenstone (1995) offers a useful distinction between three historical film categories: drama, document, and experiment. The first, drama, can be subdivided into the documentation of a person, or set a fictional character in a historical setting. For example, a film like *Elizabeth* (Kapur, 1998), which depicts Queen Elizabeth I and her historical setting, is more of the first subdivision: a documentation of a person in a dramatic form. However, *Saving Private Ryan* (Spielberg, 1998) is a dramatic film that takes the premise of WWII to heighten a fictionalized drama of a group of soldiers aiming to save one man from the war at the behest of his grieving mother. "Document" under Rosenstone's categories would adhere to any kind of historically grounded experience that utilizes footage as historical evidence from Ken Burns' *The Central Park Five* (Burns, Burns, & McMahon, 2012), to the recent documentary series on Netflix *Wild Wild Country* (Way & Way, 2018). Rosenstone's (1995) category of "Experiment" relies on depictions of history that are "revisionary" and have to do with ideological frameworks. While Rosenstone stops short of acknowledging alternative history

representations, as he might just call them fiction, “experiment” is a useful phrase to address the kind of work *The Man in the High Castle* accomplishes with its material. For engaging historical representations in film, Rosenstone (1995) provides an entry point, but the larger discussion of how experiment in historical film renegotiates viewer understanding remains under the surface. Rosenstone’s invocation helps to delineate in this work the purposes and functions of the differing diegetic approaches to history. Where the inclusion of historical footage attributed to “the man in the high castle” may serve as document, they still function within the larger fictional alternative history frame, complicating the viewer’s relationship with historical imagery.

The efforts of telling historical stories, even in their “experimental” frameworks, necessarily contends with individual and collective community memories of events. Film scholars such as Plantinga (2009) and Grodal (2009) take on important considerations dealing with discussions of how memory of events intersects with events portrayed in a film. Memory, while specific to the individual, also is shared through a community, verbally discussed and passed to those who do not remember the experience so much as the story of the experience. Thus while the memory may remain consistent, the retellings of it shift focus and context making it a malleable entity. Should memory be an individual and malleable medium, then the questions become why do we recall events, and what emotional impact do they have? Grodal’s (2009) contention that movies work like simulations, something that we experience in bodily fashion and not merely moving images, seems to support that our bodily memories are likely tied to our visual

experiences.[2] Thus when watching historical film, our connection to those events is embedded within our own sensory memory and cultural horizon. Bordwell (1985) would advocate similarly under the concept of schemas, where our past experiences are constantly measured against our current ones, guiding us to make certain decisions based on the outcomes of the events from before.

Film studies in CinemaScope.[3]

Film studies approaches largely depend on the embedded academic context. For this project, I recognize my own embedded context as steeped in communication studies with tours in film classes in other departments. What this ultimately means is as a scholar of communication, I wish to acknowledge the variety of influencing disciplines to this work and the various investments of scholars working with film from other perspectives. Where some scholars study specifics of craftsmanship in an effort to understand how a cohesive film is constructed, others aim to delve into the creator psyche, much in the vein of psychoanalytic criticism. Disciplinarily, film studies finds kinship with: art historical approaches which tend to the historical, salvaged, and reiterations of style or medium; literary theory for its attention to craft, era, and theoretical lens; and communication

---

[2] It is important to note that film as a medium relies heavily on a "sighted" experience. In my readings, I have not encountered film criticisms leveled at the medium for its inherent accessibility issues as it predominantly caters to sighted folks. Many of the contained scenes in the show depend on the silent watching and re-watching of footage deemed authentic or historical. *The Man in the High Castle's* visual reliance on these plot points also undercuts the legacy of memory recall. For a description of current and proposed technologies that aid movie going for the visually impaired, attend to Viswanathan (2011).

[3] The product CinemaScope allowed for distorted or compressed images on 35mm to expand to essentially a "wide screen" format. Think of this metaphor as expanding the frame. For more check out: A Complete History of CinemaScope (Renée, 2013).

studies for its critical, communicative properties for mass audiences, and tendency toward ideological reflection. Due to its broad residency, I find it pertinent for this project to utilize literatures from a variety of disciplines. One challenge this entails is the specificity of vocabularies that get nuanced in each of these academic homes. For the purposes of this project, I will tend toward communication studies, though when vocabularies that are not pervasive in communication emerge, I will contextualize their relevance and comprehensively define the word. For example, when historian Rosenstone writes about film, he tacks toward the historical prevalence and documentation of history in film, where Levin's (2018) discussion of time constricts on the filmic interpretation rather than the theoretical component. While Levin (2018) locates her analysis within a specific era of film historically, and documents the sociological rise to this artistic enterprise (not unlike Claire Sisco King's contextualization work for *The Brave One,* 2010), her interest is not in the historical accuracy component that Rosenstone demands. While there are many iterations of disciplinary approaches toward film analysis, for my purposes, my goal is a comprehensible read without playing departmental politics.

Viewer investment in film.

One approach that will help in distinguishing the direction of this project is to clarify the audience role as I see it in this context. Where our historical knowledge is in constant play with the images we encounter on the screen, how we as the audience then digest or understand these images is dependent on multiple factors. White (1988) describes that, in the past, we have thought of visual means as supplementary to written forms of communication. There are, in fact, tools that help scholars to "read" visual images in much the same way we come to understand written semiotics. Davi Johnson

(2007) uses some such tools to examine Martin Luther King Junior's Birmingham campaign as an image event. She uses visual language and compositional descriptions such as, "a geometrical quality to the image, implied by the stark lines suggesting an orderly grid. Yet, the grid is overlaid with a clouded and obscured scene that overwhelms the implied order" (Johnson, 2007, p. 9). While Johnson (2007) contends that an image event may be tied to a social movement, her analysis closely couples a close textual approach to understanding the visual image and relating her visual decoding to the event tensions depicted. This coupling does significant labor in terms of unpacking the resonance of the image in the service of understanding why these event images speak to a larger understanding of the Civil Rights Movement and the Birmingham campaign. White (1988) contends that written history is an undertaking similar to the shortcuts prevalent in film as both are representations of reality. How we unpack or decode those representation is taken up by Goodwin (1994) in his description of understanding visual images as "professional vision" which occurs in three steps: coding which shifts an object observed to an "object of knowledge" relatable to the profession or field (Goodwin, 1994, p. 281); highlighting which marks specific elements of the observed event in a way that makes them salient to the continued discussion; and "producing and articulating material representations" which cements the organized ways of seeing into applications relevant to the "distinctive interests of a particular social group" (Goodwin, 1994, p. 281). For example, Goodwin (1994) describes how archeologists learn to "read" excavation sites, or how police officers relay their understanding of a brutal arrest based on perceived aggressive actions.

Yet professional training is not the only way we can begin to understand a series of images. Most people who go to watch a movie are not driven by aesthetic nuance, or critical examination of the dialogue, or even how that film provides intellectual commentary for a previous or political event. Rather, we are attracted to stories on film because we find them relatable and captivating in some way. There are two primary perspectives as to why viewers are drawn to films. The first is Bordwell's (1985) constructivist assumption that we are pulled through a movie as a viewer because of our inherent curiosity to piece things together. Our experience of a film or narrative is based on our personal schematas or previous experiences. A viewer therefore is never passive, instead constantly recalling and revising past experiences to interpret the present images. For example, if in my experience as a child, I had a frightening encounter with a dog, future encounters with dogs would be shaped by that experience. Even when watching a movie, a shot of a muscular dog lunging at the camera with its jaws open would have an effect on me based on that previous experience. Conversely, someone without that frightening childhood experience may not react to the same scene in the same way. How I understand the movie-dog's aggression is then premised on my knowledge and remembrance of that memory-dog's aggression. Grodal's (2009) contention that film, as a visual and auditory medium, seeps into our sensory experience suggests that when watching a film, the same memory processes must be at play. This means that while we may not be facing the physical wrath of the movie-dog, the construction of the scene and our symptomatic response to the image may ignite the same memory schemas as in non-film experiences. My recollection of a terrifying movie image can translate in the same way to a similar movie image later. Having watched *Silence of the Lambs* (Demme,

1991) as an admittedly sheepish horror movie goer, my memory of Anthony Hopkins' portrayal of Dr. Hannibal Lector has altered my perception of every other character Hopkins has played--even the non-scary ones. While I watched *The Silence of the Lambs* alone in my apartment in Manhattan, Kansas, I was in no physical danger from the incarcerated cannibal. Still my watching of *The Elephant Man* (Lynch, 1980) which falls earlier in Hopkins career, remains colored by my prior experience watching Hannibal on the screen. In *The Man in the High Castle* the use of commonly recognized historic images in new contexts plays with the viewer's understanding of both the original image and the new presentation. Where viewers may feel a patriotic surge of pleasure at the sight of celebrations in Times Square on V-E day, filmic renditions may not entirely reference the event, but will capitalize on the emotions connected to it.

Grodal (2006) presents what he calls the PECMA flow, or perception (seeing something), emotion, cognition, and motor action. For his purposes, perception gets filtered through emotion, impacting our understanding and ultimately determining whether or not we physically are moved to action. Since he contends that we experience film like real life, we witness things that are linked to memory and our emotions are activated. He argues that viewers watching a film are not driven by curiosity about the plot as Bordwell (1985) suggests; instead, we are moved to connect to character concerns. We are story driven. Where Bordwell (1985) would suggest that our primary question watching a film is "what will happen next?", Grodal (2006) might instead frame our question as "what will the character do?" The thing that is then at stake in shifting the emphasis of the spectator is how that spectator will be moved to action post film viewing. If all we care about in the plot is what happens (will James Bond catch the bad guy) as

opposed to concern about the character as a whole (will Lady Gaga's character Ally in the 2018 version of *A Star is Born* recover from this trauma?), it still demands an answer to the question, "so what?". If we only care about wrapping up plot lines, our emotional connections are limited to the self-satisfaction of "figuring it out" rather than exploring the depth of identification with a character.

Grodal's later (2009) work argues that film, because of its simulation-like presentation, has impact on the world. His contention that film so closely aligns with real life that it appears as a kind of flight simulation, something we as viewers react to in real time (Grodal, 2009). Additionally, films are produced ideologically to be absorbed the same way as they are reflective of cultural and historical times (Grodal, 2009). While I find that Bordwell's (1985) construction of curiosity is useful for understanding the draw of some films, for me, the more interesting impactful concept is Grodal's (2006; 2009), which opens up opportunity to consider the consequences of film viewing. Reacting emotionally and physically to a film in real time operates differently than a placid curiosity at the events on screen. Grodal's construction provides an avenue for investigation in impact as well as considers the viewer an active component of the film-going experience.

Plantinga (2009) is highly concerned with emotion in film, both how it is expressed and how it is elicited from an audience. He coins the phrase "concern based construal," or how our concern elicits or prompts our emotional involvement. If I care about the character on screen, I am more likely to personally invest emotion as opposed to if I do not care for them. Axelson (2015) takes this notion a step farther, arguing that the actions of the protagonist can provide a kind of moral code that operates alongside the

aesthetic and empathetic evaluations the audience makes. These emotion-laden perspectives rebuke the structured plot based constructivist approaches such as those in Bordwell (1985), Branigan (2013), and Bacon (2011) who all emphasize the role of the viewer as piecing together a plot. While these stances play an integral part in film studies broadly, my intention here is to shift away from the constructivist perspective toward an effort of memory and resonance.

Memory: Remembrance from Where

Much of the memory research has been focused on discussions of the Holocaust (Lenz, 2011; Levy & Sznaider, 2002; Welch & Wittlinger, 2011). While particularly relevant for this project, additional memory scholarship about history more generally helps to broaden the component of the project as it relates to film. More so, research as to how historical knowledge is passed from one generation to the next, not necessarily tied to the traumatic events of the Holocaust, eases the burden of traumatic memory inheritance to memory as it exists in everyday interactions. This naturally ties in with representations of historical events, as much of our understanding of history has been consumed through filmic and written texts meant for explanation and comprehension, but not always for emotional or personal application.

More concretely, I contend that theorists like Hirsch (2012) and her discussion of postmemory has interesting intersections with what Landsberg (2004) calls prosthetic memory. Where Hirsch is interested in generational memory as stories are passed from parent to child, in what she and others call the second generation, Landsberg proffers a way that familial and cultural inheritance of events branches beyond family units to scales of mass communication in film. Hirsch (2012) acknowledges that these

postmemories are inherently distinct from "the recall of contemporary witnesses and participants" (p. 4). Here it may be useful to quote at length Hirsch's definition and utility of postmemory:

> "Postmemory" describes the relationship that the "generation after" bears to the personal, collective, and cultural trauma of those who came before—to experiences they "remember" only by means of the stories, images, and behaviors among which they grew up. But these experiences were transmitted to them so deeply and affectively as to *seem* to constitute memories in their own right. Postmemory's connection to the past is thus actually mediated not by recall but by imaginative investment, projection, and creation. (Hirsch, 2012, p. 5)

Hirsch (2012) negates the linear conception of generational passing, though maintains that in this iteration of postmemory, the generation separation is important. So while Hirsch (2012) highlights the inheritance of memory in a generational fashion, Landsberg's prosthetic memory is not reliant on a linear transmission, and instead can be circulated through mass culture in perpetuity, making it neither demanding of exacting recall of personal experience nor genetic association. The circulation of memory on familial and cultural mass media scales becomes then an important component to how historical legacy takes root in later generations.

Memory typology.

Discussions of memory are broadly categorized based on elements of circulation. For this section I will define collective memory, postmemory, prosthetic memory, and nostalgia before relating to why memory is considered rhetorical. First, collective memory is intrinsically tied to cultural and communicative memory (J. Assmann &

Czaplicka, 1995). Communicative memory is an everyday action akin to oral history as it is socially mediated and related to the group it shares (J. Assmann & Czaplicka, 1995). As this kind of memory is contingent on first person recounting, it only lasts somewhere between 80 and 100 years according to Assmann and Czaplicka (1995). By comparison, cultural memory is distant from the everyday, pointing to a fixed historical event or point and can become institutionally commemorated. Though they do not explicitly draw this distinction, both communicative memory and cultural memory rely on a shared communal understanding of an event, making it a kind of collective memory. Levy and Sznaider (2002) frame cosmopolitization of memory as something that expands beyond the nation-state, which also works on a collective level. Their examination looks at three regions and temporalities which shift the recollection of the Holocaust (Levy & Sznaider, 2002). Cosmopolitization of memory begins to branch into postmemory and prosthetic memory, though these authors do not use the same terminologies.

Second, Hirsch (2012) describes postmemory as in relationship to the second generation of personal/collective/cultural trauma. Her iteration is immediately tied to her experience as the daughter of Holocaust survivors, where she did not directly experience the trauma, but has heard stories and vividly "recalls" the Holocaust through "imaginative investment, projection and creation" (Hirsch, 2012, p. 5). Her argument is that as this kind of memory operates by transposition, where second generation individuals place themselves in the context of first generational lives, thereby creating a kind of double reality, or allo-identification. She also argues that postmemory is mediated by a variety of influences, technology, literature, photography, and testimony, meaning that understanding of the first generation memory is represented in a variety of ways,

couched for different consumption and retellings. Adding the additional mediated layer of fictionalized portrayals with historical resonance where viewers identify with characters on screen amplifies the potential impacts of allo-identification in a prosthetic memory context.

It is this mediation that particularly intrigues Landsberg (2004). Prosthetic memory is then the memory that has been communicated (presumably from an original source) through consumption of mass media such as television, movie, or museum, to someone who did not experience the memory first hand. For example, a former student (at the time a junior in college and young for her age) comes up to me to describe in vivid detail the events of Pearl Harbor. She, recently 20, has no first-hand experience of the disaster at the naval base, nor do any of her immediate family. Yet her descriptions, and thereby memory, are driven by her recent viewing of the film *Pearl Harbor* (Bay, 2001), the Michael Bay film with its romantic plotline and heightened special effects. Her recounting of the film is a memory for her, made prosthetic by its roots in a mass media platform ungrounded in authentic retellings. Under Landsberg's (2004) direction, prosthetic memory has three important features. First that prosthetic memory does not have to be culturally linked. Where postmemory for Hirsch (2012) is embedded in familial and cultural proximity to the events remembered and separated only by generational distance, Landsberg articulates that the mass media component does not discriminate by cultural involvement. So my watching of the film *Tangerines* (Urushadze, 2013) about the war in Georgia featuring an Estonian man creates a memory that need not be tied to any cultural heritage or knowledge of the war or the region. Second, prosthetic memory does and can do political good. Landsberg (2004) gives the

example of the Holocaust Memorial and Museum in Washington DC. The affective resonance of this emotional museum intends to do political good by recounting the atrocities of the Holocaust in an effort to deter future harbingers of hatred. In fact the final room in the exhibit (from my memory at least) is a list of other genocidal acts globally since WWII. Her argument is then that these mass mediated events can have broader impact on political goals, circulated to larger audiences with a political agenda. Third, Landsberg (2004) contends that prosthetic memory reorients collective memory as the mediated memory can be shared across generations, cultures, and borders. This relies on the spectator buying into the film or museum experience. In essence, my memory of visiting the Holocaust Museum in Washington DC becomes like that of memories of those also visiting the same place, regardless of generational separation or temporal distance between visits. We now share a memory of an historical event that has been mediated through the curation of a museum exhibit. Similar premises happen for film viewing. My emotional connection to the film *Pearl Harbor* (Bay, 2001) though at a different time and place from my student's viewing, can still resonate to the point of our shared, collective understanding of this historically geared film. Hollywood has relished in creating historically based films with a singular focus on one or a group of heroes who manage to defeat all the odds to succeed for their country. The approach encourages viewers to identify with the heralded, rather than the common, an already very narrow version of history.

Where memory is embedded and recalled typically in a narrative form, nostalgia better characterizes a sense of longing for a sensation of the past. Boym describes, "is a longing for a home that no longer exists or has never existed. Nostalgia is a sentiment of

loss and displacement, but it is also a romance with one's own fantasy" (Boym, 2001, p. xiii). So while nostalgia is rooted in memory, it is not necessarily a particular event-centered memory, but more commonly the emotional shading of a real or imagined past. Boym further contends that there are two types of nostalgia. First, restorative nostalgia which encourages the return of the original, to reconstruct the past homeland in the present. The second is a reflective nostalgia, to cherish the past and to use it as a guide for a new future. By these descriptions, restorative nostalgia is easily connected to a type of nationalism, looking to "make America great again", which relies on a mythic history. The veneer that film can create about past events while a mediated memory in some aspects, also colors a particular sentiment about the past. *The Man in the High Castle* uses the same ideological legacies to encourage viewers to reminisce about the past since the alternative history does not align with viewer understanding of history. Reflexive nostalgia has the ability to be critical of nostalgic impulses for their incompleteness. Filmic nostalgia under Rosenstone's (1995) explaination will always be incomplete as the film itself can never be comprehensive of our historical understanding. Therefore, the mediated history as depicted in film intentially blurs viewer ability to understand history, imposing a level of comforting nostalgia in place of fact. Mediation of history through filmic means adds to the already existing ability for film to manipulate images through assemblage and captions. Boym's (2001) iteration of reflexive nostalgia opens for consideration critical gaps in understanding history. For example, Biesecker (2002) suggests that the film *Saving Private Ryan* "functions rhetorically less as a medium for the demystification of the so-called Good War than as a vehicle for the production of a new national sensibility that is predicated on retooling the category of citizenship"

(Biesecker, 2002, p. 395). For Biesecker, citizenship here includes sacrifice, or "domestication of civic responsibility" (Biesecker, 2002, p. 397). Where other critics claimed the film as an unblinking look at the horrors of war (especially the chaotic and graphic first scene), Biesecker's argument rejects the overt nostalgia to focus on the underlying ideological principles at play in the film.

Given the interpretive goals at play in Biesecker's (2002) work, it is important to note here the rhetorical leanings of this kind of memory scholarship. Biesecker focuses primarily on three arguable very different memory texts: *Saving Private Ryan*, *The Greatest Generation* (book), and the Women in Military Service Memorial. Though they are three different genres of material, Biesecker, using a rhetorical frame, is able to align them under one mode of analysis. Thinking of rhetoric as a persuasive framework, examining multiple mediated and prosthetic memory texts makes sense for a contribution to work in the memory field. While memory broadly may be investigated by psychology, memory texts are a prime venue for rhetorical scholarship.

In their examination of rhetoric, place, and memory, Blair, Dickinson, and Ott (2010) argue that rhetoric can make memory public into Public memory which get then taken up in place (such as memorials). They argue six pressing features. First, public memory is activated by present issues. In essence, recollection of an event is sparked by the material happenings in the present. Second, public memory helps to narrate shared community identity. Third, public memory is animated by affect. Fourth, public memory is always inherently partial, partisan, and contested. Therefore, no singular memory, or that crafted and endorsed by the public is taken as the whole impartial truth, demanding acknowledgement of oppositional views. Fifth, public memory relies on material and

symbolic support. Essentially, without such things as memorials, movies, narratives, written histories, and oral tradition, public memory gets forgotten. In order to remain memorialized, public memory requires circulation of semiotic material. Finally, public memory has a history, as in public memory is not a singular stagnant event but malleable through contestation and revision. In this study, I follow Blair, Dickinson, and Ott in their call for rhetorical inquiry of ideological and discursive change over time. Rhetoricians invested in memory studies are frequently drawn to historical, ideological, and mediated texts such as films, monuments, and memorials. Within the context of *The Man in the High Castle,* the contestation of memory becomes a particularly ripe for analytical engagement, questioning the interactions between viewer and historically based medium.

Justification of Approach

While much of memory scholarship has taken on rhetorical shape, I argue that both film and orally transmitted memory do rhetorical persuasive work within communities. Therefore, I offer a rhetorical analysis of *The Man in the High Castle* as a path to discussions of the ideological, historical, and memory implications of alternative history films. Pertinent for this analysis are rhetorical tools including those from ideological criticism. Wander (Wander, 1983) suggests that those looking to conduct an ideological criticism should aim to "critique rhetoric legitimizing actions, policies, and silences relevant to the great issues of our times" (Wander, 1984, p. 199). Crowley (1992) advances that ideological criticism need be concerned with "ethical or political" elements (p. 452). The show's modern release date surrounded by the rise of the alt-right and hostile political rhetoric coupled with the show's dark historical re-imaginings make it an apt artifact for an ideological lens. Claire Sisco King's work on *The Brave One* (2010)

does critical work in positioning the film within a larger discourse of historical events and ideological beliefs. By investing in the contextual historical work, she is able to draw out an analysis that is both ideologically grounded and pertinent to the modern context.

Given the efforts of rhetoricians to extend beyond the confines of oratory, it is important to consider the rhetorical opportunities present in film criticism. First that films are cultural, creative texts that have bearing on modern political sentiments. Consider the 1970s in Hollywood film. What went from ideological cohesive and neat stories in the 1950s and 60s, the late 60s and 1970s turned to gritty realism full of complex political plots with frightening undertones and distrust of media. Post classic Hollywood famously begins crafting difficult and blurry villains with complicated backstories and motivations for similar reasons. Boym's (2001) reflexive nostalgia enables criticisms of contentious and fabricated heroes and villains who fill the gaps of otherwise sparse history. The champions of war films, and the dastardly villains come about through speculations of history and biased revisionism, but it complicates the notion of evil in ways that are not as obvious as the classic Hollywood duality. Brummett (1984) articulates a similar principle in his analysis of films that use (as he terms them) xeroxing motif which capitalizes on the social fears of being replaced by duplicate (often extraterrestrial) others. Phillips (2005) argues that for films to live in a cultural legacy, they must resonate with political and social climates. Therefore film is a ripe artifact broadly for critical ideological rhetorical analysis.

Rhetorical Impact

If we consider rhetoric to be a persuasive enterprise, then we equally assume that it will have impacts beyond the emotional and immediate present. Couching film and

television as rhetorical artifacts that do work in the world has been a contested subject. Though I concede the tenuous studies of graphic violence, I still contend that visual mediums distributed to broad and diverse audiences have ideological impacts. In this particular medium, one of the persuasive impacts is a visual one, capable of showing rather than telling. Johnson (2007) articulates as much in her work, describing how the circulation of the photographic and televisual images associated with the Birmingham protests as image events created a new sentiment about the national response to this kind of brutality. Images depicting the gnashing teeth of dogs, the reactive curvature of spines to the hostile fire hoses creates an emotional response that newspaper phrases like "police forces used water hoses to deter protesters" cannot do. When further contextualized and emboldened by viewer empathy for a character, visual depictions of horrific events become unsettling, haunting, the point of action. Yet for Johnson's (2007) labors, the descriptive and highly visual language aids in making her claims about the work of the images. In similar fashion, I intend to model my descriptive work on Johnson for her keen sense of composition. For example, in the first few episodes, a main character Joe (played by Luke Kleintank), receives help from a state patrolman wearing a Nazi armband for a flat tire. Though we as an audience recognize the midwest terrain and climate to be late fall, the clear calling of snow seems to take Joe by surprise. Remarking at his shock, the officer comments that it's not snow they're witnessing; it's ash, as they burn the cripples on Tuesdays. What seemed like a kind deed, changing a tire and sharing a sandwich, pivots to a disturbing comment viscerally reminiscent of the gas chambers and furnaces in concentration camps twenty years earlier. The officer further laments that

while he fought in the war, he doesn't even remember what they were fighting for, passively accepting the jarring inhumane experience the viewer can scarcely imagine.

If like Plantinga (2009) suggests, we are motivated to watch based on our empathy for characters on screen, then connecting with characters puts us into similar moral dilemmas. One complicating compassionate figure is Helen (played by Chelah Horsdal), the wife of the Obergruppenführer John Smith (played by Rufus Sewell), an authority figure in the American Reich. Helen as a character is pictured predominantly in the first season as the queen bee of housewives, loyal to husband and country, keeper of family and PTA. She is stoic and coolly maternal, organizing the home elements in a highly gendered iteration of family. In the second season, the Obergruppenführer discovers that his oldest son is terminally ill with a degenerative disease that will eventually incapacitate him. As a viewer, we have seen the son Thomas (played by Quinn Lord) as the epitome of Nazi youth. He is patriotic, loyal, a good student, and wants desperately to serve country no matter the cause. Given the previous inclinations in the show, we also know that this diagnosis is terminal, not in that Thomas will die eventually, but that he will be taken by the state and killed immediately as he can no longer serve the greater purpose of the Reich. As an audience we are emotionally moved as both Obergruppenführer and his wife covertly work to smuggle their beloved son out of the reach of the Reich. Even though we may disagree with their political leanings, our emotion remains invested in the idea that even a loyal Nazi teenager should not be destroyed by the state for his illness. Given the constant narrative encounters with the normalcy of the Smith family, regardless of their villain status, does not detract from our empathic distraughtness at seeing Helen weep at the thought of never being able to see

her child again. This plot line brings into contrast the viewer's potential ideological beliefs and our empathy for a character on screen. The moral challenges framed between rule adherence, distaste/wishing harm on the characters following a racist and hateful ideology, and pity for a sick child give us no clear option for moral superiority. We cannot in this instance simultaneously cheer for the defeat of the Nazi family and the murder of their child. It feels grossly inhumane to celebrate the death of a child, and equally uncomfortable to betray ideological morality. Our memory schemata remind us of the wholesome and maternal encounters we have had prior, and simultaneously apply them to the Smith family, regardless of their tenuous actions.

Methodological considerations

In terms of methods, this project takes the shape of a rhetorical film analysis. Though film analysis is broadly painted as rhetorical criticism, I find the work of Claire Sisco King to be a useful frame. Her analysis of *The Brave One* (2010) not only contextualized the film as a feature, but also within genre and historical precedent. This kind of complex interweaving is sort of dance between acknowledging the close textual script and directing choices while also heeding to the broader ideological and national frames that make such a reading of a film possible and poignant. Where other scholars more closely adhere to the close textual elements (see Frentz & Rushing, 2002; Frentz & Rushing, 1993; Kirby, Riforgiate, Anderson, Lahman, & Lietzenmayer, 2016; Rushing & Frentz, 1989, 2000), I think that *The Man in the High Castle* speaks poetically on a close textual level and on a broader ideological level to our political modernity.

I view this project as ideologically focused in the analysis which will require additional imagery for a fuller analysis. The most salient historical images, and

potentially the hardest to identify, are those that the intradiegetic films and diegetic narratives reference. One such instance is the film that Juliana Crane watches in the opening episode. This film, as a text within a text, clearly references a cultural encounter and event in viewer-history: the Allied invasion of Normandy. While I have made it my task to track down the provenance of these images as to whether they are actual D-Day footage, I believe that an argument as to their "authenticity" as they resonate with audience memory. Where possible both physically and financially, I have included the historic images. Otherwise I have put a note to describe the image or to make it searchable. Another such example that occurs within the diegetic narrative is the visual resemblance of the John F. Kennedy assassination in Dallas. In the show, the Japanese Emperor and his wife visit San Francisco in an open area where one main character holds a gun, yet another gunshot rings out. This likeness to the "second shooter" narrative is not a coincidence of imaginative plot given the visual similarity to the Empress in a pale delicate pink kimono cradles the head of her husband wearing a charcoal grey suit. Unmistakable in its inspiration, these kinds of images coupled with the great efforts of the show to blur the lines between alternative history and historical memory make for a rich line of analysis.

Structure and Chapter Distinctions

In chapter two, I have outlined an ontological foundation that aims to help articulate the structure and purpose of images and how audiences understand them. Additionally, this chapter introduces elements of historical framework that *The Man in the High Castle* manipulates for viewer impact such as the alignment of allusions with the President John F. Kennedy assassination, and historic footage from the end of WWII.

Chapter three begins the analytical chapters broken up by thematic components. Here I articulate how *The Man in the High Castle* does historically revisionistic work through manipulation of historic film and plays into character confusion as to the 'reality' of the show. Chapter four rounds out the analysis chapters discussing the empathic quality of film and how it is employed here to create emotional connections to the Nazi family, the Smiths. Both analysis chapters aim to unpack the ideological and tenuous relationship the show builds with viewers. Finally, chapter five extends the capacity of this analysis by relating it to other films and the impact on viewer understanding of history.

CHAPTER 2

ONTOLOGY OF THE IMAGE AND THE SUBSEQUENT "AUTHENTICITY"

And I grant you anyone who pokes around in history long enough may well go mad.
- *The Historian* by Elizabeth Kostova (2005, p. 26)

In the rise of photography, the aesthetic importance of the image changed. Centuries prior, the goal of art had been to create an ever more realistic image in a variety of mediums. Artists like Bernini and Albrecht Dürer created more and more realistic looking works, from the fine strands of hair on a marble sculpture, to the depth perception of an engraving, these aesthetic inclinations strive toward a more realistic depiction of the world, a world as we see it in its rawest, unfettered form. Yet, the invention of photography alters the technique of depicting the real. Now, a series of lenses, sensitized plates, and chemical solutions reveal the world as it is, displaced from the location and the time. In this technological revelation, the ontology of the image had to change. Art, created by hands of carefully taught and masterful technicians, was clearly an interpretation of the real even as it played with realistic portrayals. An ornately carved marble sculpture still retains the austerity of rock. When positioned, a camera an automatic reproduction of a scene (at least in theory) could not lie about the objects, people, or expressions in front of the lens. An artist facing a model, chisel in hand, certainly could interpret an expression differently.

Years later, images from daguerreotypes turned to moving celluloid to be cast upon a screen.[4] Audiences had to alter their understanding of the moving, flat image in

---

[4] Here I am blatantly skipping over years of technological advances in the pictorial arts. There is the story of Eadweard Muybridge figuring out how to capture a moving image in the famous horse racing bet, and a variety of mechanisms such as the zoetrope that

front of them. While there are some fabled testimonies about the first motion picture of a moving train captured by the Lumière brothers frightening the audience out of their seats in fear for their lives, these are largely apocryphal though not without incentive. No matter how strange the new paintings in galleries were at the turn of the twentieth century, they did not lunge at you in your seat. Audiences who had understood paintings and sculptures in galleries as constructed and refined images created in part, if not entirely, from the imagination of the artist needed to turn their perspectives about the factual, or presumed factual understanding of photography. Where viewers assumed that photography could not or did not lie, what they did not account for were the photographers. Photographs must be at least the trace of something real (Sontag, 2003), but the trace may be construed or manipulated in a variety of ways prior to the capturing of the image. For example, Sontag (2003) describes the photographs taken by Mathew Brady and his employees after massive Civil War battles. The Brady crew, in an effort to create the most dramatic and empathetic images, staged corpses from the battle's aftermath.

---

created the sensation of moving images by flipping or rotating through still ones. The thrust of this preamble is to illustrate the new, and altered perception of images from the painterly created to the photographically captured. For more detailed and substantiated theoretical nuance, Walter Benjamin's "The Work of Art in the Age of its Mechanical Reproduction" (1955), Tom Gunning's "In Your Face: Physiognomy, Photography, and the Gnostic Mission of Early Film" (1997), and Hayden White's "Historiography and Historiophoty" (1988).

Figure 1 Battle of Antietam, Mathew Brady 1862 (Brady, 1862)

The images themselves are jarring, frightfully positioned for the gore of war, but they do not accurately portray the battle as it was fought. While moving, and maybe even well-intentioned, they are not documentary of the battle. Soldiers have been staged and captioned in ways that cannot accurately reflect the events that have taken place, but they do evoke a particular sense of loss and disdain for war. Perhaps Brady's intonation that the "camera is the eye of history" (Sontag, 2003, p. 53), while not accurate to the events or the forensic evidence, still maintains a kind of pathos-truism, evoking the sympathies for war atrocities, the dead as evidence themselves. The camera in this instance is still a tool, a witness to the horrors of war, though not an inherently factual harbinger.

Decades later, war photographs are still staged in WWII. The most famous exemplar is likely the hosting of the flag at Iwo Jima. The photographer, Joe Rosenthal, retook an image raising the second, larger flag at the summit of Mount Suribachi.[5] By the time of the Vietnam War, camera and journalistic access is so prevalent that photographic staging fades to the background. The horrors of war are ever present, happening in front of a lens without the additional overt directorial effort on the part of the photographer. Another additional consideration is the new-found mobility of photographic and filmic equipment. Where early photography demanded prolonged stillness, pristine chemical environments, and heavy, cumbersome equipment, every passing decade made photography easier. By the Vietnam War, cameras could be carried by soldiers themselves in addition to war journalists feeding images worldwide. What this altered mobility meant is that while early war photography specifically made efforts for pathos appeal and historic posterity, constant photographic access means perpetual news broadcast to the public. So while early photograph viewers lauded clarity and consistency of the image, the same rigorous belief in accuracy extended from what the image depicts, but also to belief in the spontaneity of the image as well.

As a viewer, Sontag (2003) argues that "we want the photographer to be a spy in the house of love and of death, and those being photographed to be unaware of the camera, 'off guard'" (p. 55). The spontaneous photographer who happens to be in the

[5] There is quite the rumor mill about this Pulitzer Prize winning photograph mostly surrounding its origins. While the photo was not staged (as in Rosenthal direction the action), it was also not the first flag raised on that spot, nor Rosenthal the only photographer present. There are account of at least three other photographers and one videographer equipped with a 16mm camera angling for the same shot (Patterson, 2016).

right spot at the right time to capture an unprecedented and unplanned image dominates our imagination. Photographs under this perspective are organic products of the serendipitous aligning of event and photographer. The masterwork of the photographer at that range must then be luck coupled with instinctual eye to capture an aesthetically pleasing work. Seemingly unlikely, the viewer's inherent belief that each photograph is a natural and spontaneous event leads viewers to also automatically assume the authenticity of the image as something that both happened without interference, and occurred in the manner the photograph suggests. Therefore, images like Brady's Civil War photographs take on the legacy of documentary without the encumbrance of imaginative craftsmanship as would a painting or a sculpture. The technological ability to capture in the moment adds to the authenticity-mystique of the photograph. As Bazin confirms "photography does not create eternity, as art does, it embalms time, rescuing it simply from its proper corruption" (2005, p. 14). Rescuing an image from the onslaught of time additionally presumes that time alone is the corrosive element at play. This "rescue" then must preserve the authenticity of the original event, disregarding the potential tampering of the image by the photographer.

Despite the viewer's assumed authenticity of the photograph in terms of its history and conception, a second question pertains to the "realism" of the image. In painting, this evolution of the image as more and more realistic changed with the burgeoning of perspective and depth of canvas. However, the mechanics of photographic equipment demand less of the photographer's personal knowledge of a single vanishing point, and more on the charisma of the composition, or the photographers selection (Bazin, 2005). The machine filled with lenses and sensitive templates takes most of the

burden of perspective away from the photographer and requires them to be able to compose an interesting image. Bazin articulates, "realism in art stems from a misunderstanding from a confusion between the aesthetic and the psychological; between true realism, the need that is to give significant expression to the world both concretely and its essence, and the pseudorealism of a deception aimed at fooling the eye (or for that matter the mind)" (2005, p. 12). A photograph can be so realistic that it fools the eye, absorbing in its clarity and specificity.

A Shift to the Moving Image

Beyond the assumptions of the stagnant photographic image, the premise of photography or capturing the moment as realistically as possible extends into moving images or film as well. Initially, this technology involved stacking multiple sequential photographs and flipping through them using rudimentary rolodex-like mechanisms. Not unlike original animation sequences, moving images quickly segued into still frames captured quickly on roll-able celluloid, allowing projectors to cast the same concept onto a screen where moving shadows jumped and danced in seemingly real time. Of course there are pitfalls as to its reality as well: the speed of the projector or the speed of the manually cranked camera impacts the velocity of the daring Buster Keaton stunts on screen. Again, mechanization comes into a stable relationship, making 24 frames per second (Rosenstone, 1995), or the speed of movement undetectable by the naked eye, the standard for filming and projecting moving pictures. Even with the technological advances and the mesmerizing result of moving image, the basic assumptions of "reality" and "accuracy" still plague the industry. As captivating as moving images are, the viewing setting also heightens hypnotic acceptance. Given the mechanics and setting of

the medium, “the huge images on the screen and wrap around sounds tend to overwhelm us, swamp our senses and destroy attempts to remain aloof, distanced, or critical. In the movie theater we are, for a time, prisoners of history” (Rosenstone, 1995, p. 27). Film, moving or still, did not deter the viewer’s assumptions as to the authenticity of the image.

Documentary-getting close to the real.

The influx and capacity for film heightened the potential of documentary work as well. Documentary, intended to display accurate accounts of history took on the additional burden of implying that the viewer is watching the events as they happened to unfold in front of the conveniently placed camera. These filmic “facts” “would cease to be interesting if the episodes did not actually occur in front of the camera, that is to say in documentary films that approximate reporting” (Bazin, 2005, p. 51). Essentially, the validity of the documentary is premised on not only the factual information presented, but also on the ontological legibility of the images as temporally unaltered during filming as well as preserving a feeling of “being there” for the audience. In the dark, overwhelming experience of the theater, film allows us to “stare through a window directly at past events, to experience people and places as if we were there” (Rosenstone, 1995, p. 27). The more captivating the image and storyline of the documentary, the more believable the experience becomes. Yet documentaries are not free of directorial craft; they are works that are “consciously shaped into a narrative which—whether dealing with past or present—creates the meaning of the material being conveyed” (Rosenstone, 1995, p. 32). Noting the recent influx of documentary work and “true crime” in the modern age, these same rubrics hold true. But now instead of costumed actors and a patient narrator, documentaries progress based on the splicing of real testimony from various characters

and the scenic set up of the events as captured in the recent filming. Following the footsteps of not only the events, but, in the case of true crime, the uncovering of the events, allows the viewer to connect with the documentary on an ontological level beyond the presentational. In an age of documentary, the cautionary trope remains:

> however much film utilizes footage (or still photos, or artifacts) from a particular time and place to create a "realistic" sense of the historical moment, we must remember that on the screen we see not the events themselves, and not the events as experienced or even as witnessed by participants, but selected images of those events carefully arranged into sequences to tell a particular story or to make a particular argument. (Rosenstone, 1995, p. 34)

The filmic frame in documentary directs our attention to see the components that the director intends us to see, to understand, and to eventually empathize with according to their filmic agenda. Even the strategy of presenting a 'neutral' case carries with it the labor of a balanced sense of time, and representation of the various sides of the conflict. Directors and writers are never neutral entities; they package interesting and slanted arguments into resonant persuasive images.

Newsreel-real.

Newsreel and reporting has taken on similar constructive components. No longer are the early days of film where "reconstructions of actual events were acceptable…[and it] is a clear indication that there has been an evolution in the attitude of the general public" (Bazin, 2005, p. 51). The advent of war photography gave the ability for news to be disseminated regionally, nationally, and eventually internationally making events real to those not immediately present (Sontag, 2003). With the growth of news circulated via

image, the viewer's alteration of memory corresponds to the image and not necessarily the events as the viewer experienced them. As the news-prompted image comes with the assumption that the image is both authentic and pertinent to the event, viewers presume that the image actively represents an element of a past or present reality. The description may lie, but the information derived from the image cannot. The catch of course is that over time, "all photographs wait to be explained or falsified by their captions" (Sontag, 2003, p. 10). This contention requires that the context of the image, both presentationally and descriptively, accurately articulate the picture. Our paratextual encounters of images greatly influence the way we understand the image and its meaning. Though Mathew Brady's images may inaccurately describe Civil War Battles, captioning them as "photographs taken after Gettysburg" greatly alters our current understanding of the image despite our prior knowledge of Brady's restaging of the battlefield. Altering the captions, or the textual entrapments of the image alters the message (Sontag, 2003). Captions, or in broadcast language, commentary, not only colors the photograph but the reception and therefore the resulting memory of the events depicted. As Sontag cautions, the caption alters whose children have died and who killed them, where the image only depicts the tragedy of the deceased.

The digital boom has additionally heightened the ability and desire for "on the ground" footage of nearly every major event. No longer restricted to the cumbersome camera set up, capturing the authentic as it happens becomes more viable with the availability of digital recording. News reports kick live feeds to airways for the presumed accuracy of "on the ground" reporting. Naturally, the coverage may be skewed in a variety of ways. When the live reporting is for weather, typically the only bias is against

the storm urging viewers to seek shelter. However, reporting during a conflict necessarily requires the person present to describe the events they are experiencing. The accuracy of those events, especially during a live broadcast are rarely questioned, nor is the slant by which the reporter, camera angle, or immediate context scrutinized. Photographs, films, and reporting necessarily maintain "objective" frameworks while still adhering to the perspective of the image-taker (Sontag, 2003). Reporters infiltrating protests or describing the forces at play in biased ways skips other journalistic methods of fact checking, relying on the viewer's willingness to accept the authority of the image. With the advent of social media, the citizen journalist may also have the ability to share video taken in the heat of an event. How that image, or film, is then distributed, characterized, re-contextualized, or severed of contextual threads also impacts how others may encounter or understand the image, relying on its authentic "on the ground" trappings instead. As Sontag warns again, "one day captions will be needed, of course. And the misreadings and the misrememberings, and new ideological uses for the pictures, will make their difference" (Sontag, 2003, p. 29). Repackaging footage from prior historical events takes on emotional baggage from the first reporting, shuttling viewers back to their prior emotional landscape. The re-airing of footage from September 11th, 2001, or the Challenger explosion catapults the viewer backwards. Newsreel from historically potent events is "prepackaged emotion: nostalgia" (Rosenstone, 1995, p. 52). The ever-present camera has returned viewers to the ontology of film as realistic, accurate, and authentic.

Audiencing film, fact, and fiction.

The burden of mass media is that it must attract and compel collectives and not simply individuals. From cable news networks to the now defunct Fairness Doctrine,

catering to the breadth of popular opinion and knowledge levels leaves gaps for filmic craftspersonship. Aiming to fill the 24-hour news cycle, reliance on "live" or "on the ground" footage caters to the innate need for immediacy packaged in frameworks of accuracy. Frankly, modern broadcasts, "even when they are, so to speak, 'live,' and not merely recorded[,] they are regularly organized [43] or 'staged,' and they address a wholly *anonymous* mass audience with which there is only very rarely a possibility of interaction" (Barash, 2016, pp. 42-3). Essentially, Barash claims that even the purported 'live' broadcasts are cut, restructured, and couched using methods that detach the event from the context making it palatable for the generalized mass audience. Barash's contention here additionally layers the broadcasting "live reel" with audience-based consumption. Audiences, either by the means of a theater or their home devices, consume film that is wholly intended for an anonymous mass audience, disregarding the specific interests and respondent voices of the viewers themselves. Film, even in its early iterations, was geared for broad audience appeal, responding only to the volatility of the box office.

Audiences provide an important position when discussiong *The Man in the High Castle* on both diegetic and extradiegetic levels. As a show produced by the megacoporation Amazon, it must have broad and immediate appeal to viewers. The streaming service boom does not yet have a good metric for success as it cannot be compared to the traditional Nielsen ratings.[6] Most streaming platforms, as they delve into

[6] For example, a show that had 8 million viewers in a sitting uses a Nielsen measure of how many people are engaged with that media at the same time, whereas services like Netflix and Amazon are more likely to count views over a period of time. Cable services can only show one episode at a time, but streaming services can provide thousands of

production, want viewers to watch what they have produced in-house and not simply the things they have leased from various networks. In order for them to continue pouring money into producing content and not simply housing it, viewership is key for continued production of the show. Amazon, however, calculates their products a little differently as the streaming platform is intertwined with the larger online product sales, and a "Prime" membership also includes benefits like two-day delivery and music streaming options. Therefore Amazon's calculations rely not on how many streams, but how much each first stream nets in product revenue. According to Reuters, Amazon calculates this as their "cost per first stream," or "the price to hook a customer on Prime. Amazon divides a show's production and marketing expenses by the number of people who stream that program first after signing up" (Dastin, 2018). For Amazon, the lower the numbers the better. For example, the first season of *The Man in the High Castle* was $63, while the second season was $829. This is thrown in to contrast based on both season's production costs: the first at $72 million, and the second at $107 million. Essentially, Amazon recouped more money on the first season than it did on the second season based on Prime subscribers and their subsequent purchases.

The adage, however, still stands. Like the earlier days of film needing mass appeal at the box office to float their products, so too do streaming platforms need to respond to the masses. Generically, *The Man in the High Castle* appeals to the typical tropes: pretty people performing in action roles. This continues to be the crux of nearly

---

different shows within the same hour slot. Naturally then, streaming services are less invested in the hours you spent binging *NCIS* and are more invested that you also consumed their in-house production content.

every cop or spy drama in the last ten years.[7] Here though there are additional historical appeals as Rosenstone suggests may be drawn into the medium in ways that traditional history may not. The bulk of Amazon's productions 2016-2018 were all catered to the detective/action subgenre, making the historical element particularly unique in Amazon's offerings. Even as it is, *The Man in the High Castle* will have its fourth and final season airing later in 2019. Whether that is due to lower viewership, or the limits of the written work, is still up for debate.

The second form of viewership contingent on the show is within the diegetic framework itself. Similar to the premise contained in Philip K. Dick's book of the same title, the subversive and highly prized man in the high castle product[8] circulates to a variety of people though only a few manage to know the contents. The man in the high castle films are not meant for popular consumption, but do address 'the people's' concerns in the resistance. In the first season they are treated as secret cargo to be verified in terms of authenticity but not watched by the operatives. Person after person, especially in the resistance, claims that they are not meant to watch the films, only get them to where they are going. Yet many of the main characters do watch the films with remarkable insight. Juliana Crane watches the film carried by her sister within the first episode, and Joe, carrying a copy of the same film, sneaks a peak in a dilapitated movie house by the second episode. Later in the same season, we witness Hitler watching the same secret footage amongst his collection of similarly covert films. By season three, the

[7] See some of my binge favorites: *NCIS, Covert Affairs, Law and Order SVU, The Americans, Burn Notice,* and *Bones.*
[8] In the book- they are books, in the film- they are films.

tides have shifted. What once was a covert, meaning-making enterprise has turned to a method of building resistance against both occupying forces. Frank Frink sparks a push to show the films broadly within the neutral zone in an attempt to raise the resistance profile. In a strange turn of season three, Obergroppenfürer Smith also watches the films in secret hoping for a glimpse of his deceased son Thomas. He meticulously hides them from even his wife, seeking solace in the filmic world in the same way the resistance seeks hope. The films produced by the man in the high castle have aura, they have power.

As viewers, we have double the stakes in watching the show. We are catered to by the corporate mechanism, and in turn reveal our watching desires, but we also tune in for the secrets of the film's passed between characters. While they are subversive mediums, we find glimpses of the patriotic and rebellious backbone of American engenuity, and quietly cheer for the characters to do the same. These are the same rebellious tendencies that Landsberg (2013) encourages us to coddle into existance between the film world and the change we seek from our livnigrooms. Our audienceship caters to two roles. We are fed by the mass appeal of the program, but find a kindled rebellion in the same scope.

The historical film.

Layered with the ontological understanding of the image as a social tool for comprehending the "real," comes to the nexus of historical film. Rosenstone cautions,

> no matter how serious or honest the filmmakers, and no matter how deeply committed they are to rendering the subject faithfully, the history that finally appears on the screen can never fully satisfy the historian as historian (though it may satisfy the historian as film-goer). Inevitably, something happens on the way

from the page to the screen that changes the meaning of the past as it is understood by those of us who work in words. (Rosenstone, 1995, p. 20)

Most historians, committed to the research of the events, also recognize that history can never be empirically true. Historians must interpret artifacts, testimonies, and other data to make claims about what happened. Film and history both tend to compress complex interwoven interactions into a single linear understanding of the past, predominantly reliant on memory. For better or for worse, as *homo narrans* (Fisher, 1984) we interpret and consume the world as it is storied. Historians are bound by the same confines: "the world/the past comes to us always already as stories and that we cannot get out of these stories (narratives) to check if they correspond to the real world/past, because these 'always already' narratives constitute 'reality'" (Jenkins, 1991, p. 11). Rosenstone (1995) proffers several arguments as to the limitations of historical film, all premised on the sacrifices film must make to both credit the medium and how it cannot fulfill the same void as written history. The first of which is that history, especially in written form, has the ability to express internal conflicts and detours of conflicting facts. One author in search for the truth may actively conjecture and also reject elements of the past in order to find a most likely scenario. When film becomes tied to the cohesive and non-obstructed narrative, it necessarily eliminates the contestable elements or contrary evidence in order to streamline the most consumable story. Naturally, the confines of the medium adhere to other obligations as well. Any self-respecting historian would struggle to condense years of material into a few hours, yet film does so willingly. Narratives that weave in and out for decades even with simplification suffer under the scalpel of a film editor who slices away at extraneous material non-essential to the filmic plot.

Compressing the entirety of Queen Elizabeth I's reign of decades into a film for a few hours necessarily takes liberties bridging particular events, or placing them at more convenient moments for the film coherence. Volumes of books that struggled to encapsulate the entirety of the virgin Queen demanded different rigor than a sensationalized film willing to tell parts of history, and bluntly ignore others. In that same sensationalizing fashion, film, partly by design and partly for profit, opts for accessible digestible narrative over accuracy of the plot. Therefore, directors and writers can easily lean into the fictitious elements while explaining them away as integral to the film as a whole.

Rosenstone (1995) describes a variety of ways that historical film can fall into fiction. The first is that compression, as noted above, where directors will short circuit the historical elements in favor of run times. The second is condensation where the same general events happen either under a shortened time scale, or they come about through an alternate path. Where compression may shorten the amount of time events take place, or the length of an engagement, condensation percolates the events into a more linear moment to enhance the dramatic impact. Third, alteration actively changes the events at play, though not typically in hyperbolic fashion. This could take shape as attributing an action to a previously introduced character rather than adding another cast member for accuracy, or conflating two minor characters into an archetype for narrative coherence. In the recent HBO special *Chernobyl* (2019), the female scientist who confronts the government in warning that the radiation will far exceed previous predictions is actually a composite of many working scientists during the historic events of the nuclear meltdown. Finally, metaphor, may work in a variety of ways to demonstrate the variety of characters

present, while only focusing on a few within the film. Any of these steps actively fictionalizes the historical basis of the film, though not necessarily in falsifying ways.

In addition to the fictional stretches of historical film, Rosenstone (1995) draws two more complaints about historical film. Historical film is rarely capable of being analytic in its representation of history in the same way that written history is. Film, unless stylized to be self-referential, does not typically comment on the happenings within the narrative, making it difficult to analyze content within the same framework. Finally, historical film due to the necessary time constraints makes "filmic 'literalism'… impossible" (Rosenstone, 1995, p. 70). There is no feasible way to depict grand historical narratives in real time while also maintaining responsible time limits. The medium while versatile and ornate, cannot manage to do everything within a given event, in the same way that language struggles to encapsulate entire eras.

Alternatively, Rosenstone (1995) also describes ways that historical film brings work, literally, to life in ways that traditional written history cannot. Film, he argues is the great draw toward history; it is how the masses get interested in the past (Rosenstone, 1995). The easy visual investment and accessibility of filmic work makes it far populous-friendly than stodgy, difficult to read academic tomes. He argues that other than the ubiquitous history textbook scattered around classrooms, historical film is likely one of the few places where the general population engages any particulars of history. While not ideal for the exacting historian, the gateway of film as a way to encounter history can be compelling for reasons other than the content. First, historical film can be experiential in its presentation, encouraging viewers to not only bear witness to the events, but sense them beyond the reading imagination. In film, while predominantly visual in its allure,

also invokes sound and implies texture and smell. The visceral ability of film draws viewers into the scene and setting in tactile ways that distant historical texts struggles to replicate. The rich visual medium allows a quick establishing shot to encapsulate pages and pages of written data into a few second. The meticulous crafting of setting and scenery within a film could better describe the context than any preamble simply because of the speed at which the audience may digest it. Rather than detailing the rolling hills and thorned thickets of a battlefield, a quick pan across the setting orients the viewer to the dangers without having to describe the impact of such a setting bodily. So while film may skew the representation of narrative and falsely distill history, it also captures it more viscerally than print.

Directors, performers, and writers within the context of a film typically strategize ways to make maximum emotional impact while still maintaining much of the historical context and veracity. Even with these factual shortcomings, "Film emotionalizes, personalizes, and dramatizes history" (Rosenstone, 1995, p. 59). Yet the ontological understanding of the film remains the same as before—to believe in the image as truthful regardless of the directorial imagination. While not necessarily factual in the same sense as a history in written form, it aims to capture the same belief in the dramatic portrayal of history as if it were factual. Watching historically geared films heightens a belief in the narrative drama as real. Viewers, attached to the actors on the screen, harbor a sentiment of familiarity where the character's displayed emotions in the fraught context are more easily understood by viewers than by similarly inclined readers. To witness Meryl Streep's emotionally devastating performance in *Sophie's Choice* (Pakula, 1982) draws viewers into a cathartic understanding of the heart-rending devastation of war. We as

viewers are absorbed into the emotional, albeit fictionalized narrative so sensitively crafted by Streep, uncaring as to the veracity of the plot as a whole. The compelling element is less about the historical truth to the letter, and more about the plausible, or even likely, occurrence of a historical Sophie-esque circumstance. The historical backing for such a character is not any less soul-wrecking in the performance than knowing the character to be a composite work of unverified similarities. Yet years or decades later, viewers continue to cite the emotional impact of this film when discussing World War II. The emotional, bodily knowledge and empathy for a character, historically based or not, connects to audiences on a primal level, unmarked by historical fact-checking.

Additionally, historical film as encapsulating the past has a unique potential to reframe political and controversial events. For example, Clint Eastwood's paired films *Letters from Iwo Jima* (2006b) and *Flags of Our Fathers* (2006a) intentionally reframes the deadly battle during World War II to incite empathy for both Allied and Axis soldiers. While maintaining the historical impact and horrors of one of the most gruesome battles in the Pacific Theater, the cinematic attention to individual plights of soldiers on both sides of the conflict enables audiences to delve into the emotionally fraught contexts rather than the exclusively historical recounting of wartime strategy and mortality statistics. This distinct ability to perspective take gives "historical film [the] …capacity to provoke political consciousness. In part, this potential results from the fact that historical films make truth claims. But the power of such films is also a product of the formal strategies they deploy" (2006). Directors and cinematographers adept in narrative and visual storytelling wield their skills in ways to encourage identification with characters, regardless of the explicit or implicit history therein.

Historical film commonly uses the moral message of hope, or the present and future will be better than the past in order relate to modern audiences. Narratives projected on screens have the ability to connect audiences to the characters, "immersing the former in historical events and in foreign political, social, and economic dynamics, or making them care about these things, and even of prompting them to feel that they have a stake in the events depicted" (Landsberg, 2013, p. 15). Films, while compelling and immersive for their medium, still have an obligation outside of the filmic world. Landsberg (2013) describes that for all of the immersive quality of the film *Hotel Rwanda* (2004), unless it compels viewers to reckon with their current political and world views making deliberate changes for social justice, the film falls short. It is not enough in her view to empathize with characters on screen then return to eating dinner un-phased by the atrocities just witnessed. The capacity for film to reach a larger audience takes on the responsibility of fomenting social justice work beyond the diegetic context.

Landsberg (2013) challenges the immersive quality of the film, warning that over-identification with the characters can lead to a place where the audience is not challenged to reconsider their own views on the topic. Therefore, we must warily approach identification with characters as the context and message of the film greatly relies not only on our identification with the characters on screen but also our support for diegetic change. But the message falls short if we do not additionally segue that change into our lived reality. Just because a viewer "gets to try out being someone else without having to grapple with, or even to understand, the distance that separates him or her from that other person" (Landsberg, 2013, p. 16) does not mean that this identification occurs without consequence. Rosenstone (1995) counters "in privileging visual and emotional data and

simultaneously downplaying the analytic, the motion picture is subtly--and in ways we don't yet know how to measure or describe--altering our very sense of the past" (p. 32). While emotionally compelling, the analytical leniency within a historical film ultimately restricts accurate representation of knowledge. On some level, "all filmed history has been 'a joke,' and a dangerous one at that" (Rosenstone, 1995, p. 27). Suckered into the likability of the characters, drawn toward their dramatically framed situations, and seeking cathartic release often leads viewers away from historical accuracy and toward emotional reward. In the most deliberate and persuasive way, "the great directors are first of all creators of form; if you wish, they are rhetoricians" (Bazin, 2005, p. 73).

Landsberg's perspective and inherent belief in the possibility of film suggests that not only are films capable of pulling emotions from viewers on screen, but they are able to manipulate us into critical engagement beyond the aesthetic. She argues "when what is being represented filmicly is an aspect of the historical past, the possibility emerges for viewers to engage deeply and critically, and quite possibly to embrace new political commitments, both in the present and in the future" (Landsberg, 2013, p. 12). However, Rosenstone (1995) adheres to the idea that film is so sensorially overwhelming that audiences are unable to come up for critical air, instead they are "swamped" (p. 27) to the point of blind acceptance. Viewers then seduced by memory of the images presented are unable to question or articulate the difference between fact and fiction. I take somewhat of a middle ground. I believe that film prompts us to engage critically, but only if we as viewers are prepared to meet the material there. We may also gorge ourselves on the flippant cinematic pleasures without considering the implications, motivations, or arguments of the film. The danger lies in the not critically considering the films that

demand a critical gaze. For example, I can approach *8 ½* (1963) by Fellini as a critic, or simply view it for amusement. Though if *8 ½* is my first engagement with Fellini and only for fun, I will likely not return to watch *La Dolce Vita* (1960), a far less 'heady' film. It is not the film that limits critical investment, only the viewer's willingness to engage it in that manner. For Rosenstone as a historian, the loss of factual standing within the historical discipline degrades the overall purpose and reception of the work. Yet the filmic medium, unlike written history, pioneers other persuasive capabilities, capturing the 'sense of' history without the burdens of authenticity in the same purview.

Schrodinger's Film

My concern here in this work is to understand how historically framed images, given their ontological legacy interact with, subvert, and coopt audience understanding of memory external of the film itself. Historical film, powerful in its appeal, and implicitly deceptive, captivates audiences through an undertow of visual subterfuge. We, viewers, are seduced into a dual ontology of the re(e/a)l. The ontological grounding of the image as an authentic, historical truth erodes our skepticism, simultaneously scaffolding our identification with the fictional world also presented in the film. The filmic 'likeness' of the image buys enough narrative credibility to placate film-going cynics. Audiences can be fully aware of the fictional rebar sustaining the plot and simultaneously willing to process that display as authentic history. The dual absorption of fact and fiction creates a complicated web of ontological nuance, one that is difficult to unweave. Within *The Man in the High Castle,* the historical film clips such as aerial bombing in the first episode challenge the viewer's presumed fictional understanding of the work. We gather as a viewer that Juliana Crane is a fictional character, set in the 1960s, but these 1960s are

unlike those of the real 1960s. Yet the inflection of these authentic historical film clips presented in the fictional packaging forces the viewer to reconfigure the reality of both images, making concessions on either side. The viewer must hold the show as simultaneously real and fake, a paradox of belief. In flippant terms, Schrodinger's movie: at once authentic and inauthentic.

Earlier in this chapter I used the word "paratexts" to describe the contextual surroundings of a particular image or film. Originally coined near the turn of the century, literary theorist Gérard Genette focused on paratexts as the other textual encounters that a reader has before or during engagement with the text itself (Genette, 1997). These items have the ability to code the views of the reader's interpretation or fondness of the text itself such as the book jacket, the paper it is printed on, and the advertising that accompanied publication. Most of Genette's concerns rested in the physicality of the textual encounter—what mediums did a reader have to negotiate for a clear picture of the novel. Naturally, as the publishing world and technology advanced, readers happened upon more and more things that were related to but not physically of the text in question. This led Genette (and other paratextual/paratextual-adjacent) scholars to investigate other texts that incorporate, reference, or derive from the text in question. Naturally, negotiating the "text" draws different scopes dependent on the definitions at play. Within *The Man in the High Castle*, paratexts could happen two-fold. Either by the original novel work by Philip K. Dick, its revamped and modernized cover, or my receiving the novel from a student may all count as paratexts. Yet focusing on the show version would then count the novel as a paratext, along with the other viewing frameworks such as

platform, ads, and in the case of the debut, a New York subway covered in graphics from the show.

Genette would likely refer to the historical film footage within the show as "intertexts" instead of paratexts. My concern is that even as intertexts or in some views, paratexts, these inclusions do particular and previously undescribed work within a film. Nestled in the overall fictional frame, historical footage provides a different angle at understanding the importance and immediacy of the issues displayed. While paratexts have the ability to sway the viewer or reader into new interpretations, most intertexts merely provide a connecting thread to another narrative reference. For instance, a novel that references "Sherlock Holmes" simply employs the well-known detective of Sir Authur Conan Doyle's handiwork as a connection or symbol, or metaphor for keen observation.

Other authors have used phrases like "memory image" (Barash, 2016), or "memory text" (Brouwer & Horwitz, 2015) to discuss particular connections of past and present using memory symbolism. For Barash (2016), a memory image is one derived from personal memory, like a filmic flashback that can only occur based on that individual's personal experience. Brouwer and Horwitz (2015) latch on to a specific kind of memory text, or a text that is reminiscent of a historical trauma in Auschwitz tattoos on young bodies. The tattoos themselves serve as texts intended to remind viewers (and wearers) of the legacy of trauma and hardship symbolized therein. While both useful definitions, neither helps to articulate the work done by the encapsulated imagery of *The Man in the High Castle.* The show develops memory references in two ways: through allusions, and second what I will call "mirror memories". My contention is that while

other historical films have the ability to toy with memory within their slightly fictional leanings, *The Man in the High Castle* takes this to an extreme by subverting viewer understanding of history in itself. An alternative historical film that additionally uses allusions and mirror memories fractures the foundation of viewer memory in ways that a more traditional historical film approach could not.

Allusions, within the context of the show, explicitly or implicitly reference particular historical images. While they are not clearly historical events, the implied *images* that persist in viewer memory take on new life within the diegetic context of the show. For example, during the first season, the Emperor of Japan comes to visit San Francisco and make a speech. While a highly contentious political event, the speech itself is interrupted by a gunshot from presumably the crowd. The Emperor falls to his knees and then his side as his wife, draped in a light pink kimono rushes to his side and is quickly covered in his blood. The violent and visceral imagery clearly mimics images from the assassination of President John F. Kennedy and first lady Jacqueline Kennedy in

her light pink wool suit covered in presidential blood on Dallas's grassy knoll.

Figure 2 Assassination of the Crown Prince, still from The Man in the High Castle *S1, E5*

Figure 3 Jacqueline Kennedy and Robert Kennedy accompanying the coffin of President John F. Kennedy at the Edwards Airforce Base November 1963 (Unknown, 1963)

Figure 4 Crown Princess of Japan waiting in hospital for news of the Crown Prince, still from The Man in the High Castle *S1, E5*

Figure 5 Swearing in of Lyndon B Johnson aboard Air Force 1 with Jacqueline Kennedy at his side, November 1963 (Stoughton, 1963)

The imagery is unmistakable, even though the location, setting, and contexts have changed dramatically. Yet, the usage of palpably famous images of the presidential assassination strikes a strangely familiar chord for the viewer. While the narrative is clearly still fictional, the imagery evokes a photographic truth from a different historical nightmare. As a viewer, the similarities between the two presumably historical events meld together and waver, demonstrating a very thin space between true fiction and true history. Without the color symbolism, the scene fades in with the rest of the show plot, but employing the vibrant pink costuming and grisly red calls to mind an equally horrifying day in November 1963. Strikingly, still frames from the now infamous Zapruder film that captured the President's final moments in Dallas were printed by *Life* Magazine in the first issue after the assassination. While then printed in black and white, the Zapruder film emblazoned in color became the most contested and valuable home video ever made. Richard B. Stolley, the reporter responsible for acquiring the film from the family for *Life* stated, "we showed them in still images, and those cemented themselves on the American psyche" (Hendrix, 2017).[9] I, a twenty-something PhD candidate having not been present on the that fateful day in November, nor present for any concurrent publication of media about the JFK assassination, am still vibrantly aware of the historic footage and subsequent stills from the day. My memory is not linked to the event as I lived it (since I did not); instead, it is connected to the historical event as broadcast to me in printed images and 8mm film. My memory is not event specific; it is

[9] The Zapruder film has a storied legal history in itself. Also to note that the first publication in *Life* excluded frame 313- the bloody last frame of the President's life. Later publications included this image.

image specific, making the show's visual trigger the perfect allusion to historic events that blur the boundary between history and fiction.

While allusions recall historic images by lacing them in with the narrative of the show, mirror memories capitalize on intertextual images that appear to have been extracted from a different reality. In the first episode, Juliana Crane watches a film clip over and over that seems straight out of a pre-movie war bulletin.

Figure 6 Juliana watches the first film, still from The Man in the High Castle *S1 E1*

Within the context of the show, none of the events on the celluloid could have happened, and yet they strike a familiar and haunting tone for the viewer. World War II began war photography in unprecedented ways, and the images from those fateful years have continued to circulate, replicate, and disseminate over the last 75 years. Within the context of the show, 'films' arrive through the mysterious "Man in the High Castle," though no one quite knows how he makes them or whether they have happened before. In other words, Juliana's ontological understanding of the Allied invasion she watches is

that it must be true: how could any image be otherwise? She falls into the same ontological trap the viewer does- we want to believe in the authenticity and accuracy of the image, no matter the incongruences. However, our understanding of Juliana's film adds a separate layer that tugs at our memory. For her, the film is fresh, untethered to history but seemingly real work. For us, the film is familiar, patriotically true to the core, but somehow fractured from the show's narrative as a whole. It requires us to maintain two separate world views simultaneously: to believe in the show's narrative, and still hold fast to history as we understand it. To cradle these two intentions, means that we must either reconcile that these are compatible but different realities or seek to discredit one of the realities. In our empathic willingness to relate to the characters on the screen, we begin to rationalize and internalize the ways that Juliana must understand the film she sees. It cannot be true, and yet our visual familiarity and willingness to accept image as fact places us in a tenuous position to wrestle with the narrative presented. We are presented with true-ish images and stand on shifting ground. The war-footage phenomenon places particular obligations on our memory, mirroring what we understand as historical in a tenuous, fictional packaging.

The mechanics captured by *The Man in the High Castle* that deliberately tamper with our memories serve as more than paratextual or intertextual concerns. They are tools that force the viewer to renegotiate their personal understanding of history that cooperates with the diegetic narrative presented. As the revisionist history demands a fictitious lens, reconciling the intertwined realities through a visual medium asks viewers to wrestle with their memories in personal and sometimes uncomfortable ways. As Landsberg (2013) suggests the need for film to reach beyond the exclusive timeframe of the narrative and

encourage political and social change, our personal tangling with history and memory clouds our daily and often fraught perception of reality. In the subsequent chapters, I intend to wrestle with the historical revisionist tendencies presented in *The Man in the High Castle* and how they twist our emotionally code viewer reactions to the domestication of the Nazis through the Smith family plot. Our emotional confrontation with disparate ideological approaches skews our personal perspectives on the moral quandary of the Smith household.

CHAPTER 3

HISTORICAL REVISIONISM

Only one same reason is shared by all of us: we wish to create worlds as real as, but other than the world that is. Or was.

- *The French Lieutenant's Woman* by John Fowles (1969, p. 81)

Memory Studies: The Gateway to Revisionism

September of 2020 will mark the 75th year anniversary of the end of World War II. With that comes the beginning of the end in terms of generational memory that has kept conversations of WWII circulating (Assmann, 2016). For memory scholars, generational memory lasts between 80 and 100 years, and family memory lasts anywhere from three to five generations (Assmann, 2016). The critical difference is the gap between social memory and individual memory. Where individual memory pertains specifically to the singular individual's experience, a social memory must circulate conversationally in order to maintain its relevance (Assmann, 2016). Personal or individual memory catalogues the individual experiences of that person without necessarily connecting them to the outside societal infrastructure of political or worldly events. As the episodic and biographical nature of individual memory entails, only that individual can actively verify those events. It is only through the secondary sharing of those events that the memory takes on new life in a social setting. Yet even that social capacity has limitations. As individuals who first circulated that memory pass on, or leave that social sphere, so do the memories fall out of common circulation and subsequently are forgotten. Assmann (2016) articulates that the episodic nature of memories takes on a perspectival element meaning that they are not interchangeable or transferrable to other individuals except through a particular point of view. These

memories are, however, interlinked with other people's memories, creating a community of fragmentary, decontextualized, and fleeting images or narratives, unless someone collaborates and repeatedly tells the story of that memory (Assmann, 2016). The function of media then includes the ability to publicize and widely circulate these memories without relying on the individual to be present. Further, "As long as memories are not articulated and stabilized in [37] external media, they are delicate and fragile. They often vanish within a lifetime: with the death of their carrier, they too are irrecoverably lost" (Assmann, 2016, pp. 36–37). Therefore, the cementation of memory through media allows for memories to extend far beyond the general oral life cycle.

The Man in the High Castle as a show uses the contextualization of narrative with in the diminuendo of salient memory about World War II to craft alternative imagery that resonates in the same valance. The show uses familiar, and authentic images from the World War II era and parallels them with alternative narratives as a form of both recrystallizing the diegetic narrative and unsettling the viewers' understanding of history. With fewer and fewer survivors to circulate personal memories in social arenas, only the media-adopted memories remain. They may be stabilized through the semi-permanence of media, but they also have ulterior obligations compared to the initial memory holder. Films, shows, and other visual media become the primary conveyors of what used to have been personal memory, becoming in Landsberg's words, "prosthetic memory" (Landsberg, 2004). With the decreasing number of memory carriers, the lure to fiction becomes all the more acceptable and enticing as a source of dramatization and even historical revisionism. Fiction in this case not only supplements existing or recalled accounts but supplants authoritative, authentic historical accounts for narrative appeal.

Shows like *The Man in the High Castle,* therefore, take on new and elaborate narrative plots with diminishing historical or memory grounding. The loss of first person accounts of history opens up the gates to gaudy interpretations and alternative histories.

Uncertainty of the "man in the high castle" films.

Within the original novel, the character "the man in the high castle" wrote novels that inspired dissent in occupied parts of the United States. In the show, the same character creates mysterious films sought by several parties for their revisionary qualities. The viewer predominantly encounters the films through the efforts of the Resistance who generally pass films to other unspecified hands. The initial encounter with the footage, made available by the man in the high castle, happens during the first episode where Juliana watches "The Grasshopper Lies Heavy" multiple times. What we see are glimpses of the screen and Juliana repeatedly restarting the film in the projector. Each turn, we gather different pieces of information about what she is witnessing, though the bulk of the scene is invested in watching her reaction. The reflection from the projection lights up her face and she comes to kneel in front of the images, either in awe or a kind of religious reverence. She hovers on the edge of tears piecing together what the film depicts. Up until this point in the show, the world-building premise has established that the diegetic 1960s is unlike the 1960s of viewer's memories. Established by the flagrant use of Nazi symbolism, including the swastika-altered American flag, the presence of occupying forces, and armed uniforms, the diegetic world appears so far from the familiar 1960s tropes in the US. So twenty minutes into the first episode when Juliana turns on the projector, we expect to see equally strange and unfamiliar settings that continue to construct the fictional world on screen. Instead, the footage (as I will refer to

for clarity, the first film) depicts a historical world that feels like a dream. For Juliana, this film holds the same believable characteristics as any film, with recognizable people and places, but for her, these events never happened. For the viewer, still trying to make sense of the diegetic world, we are stricken by our remembered images. Where Juliana immerses herself in a film with new and vibrantly different history, we are instead sucked into a tumultuous tug-of-war between belief in the diegetic world and relying on personal past knowledge. Where the first image we see is an obstructed view of an aviator, there is not enough detail in the shot to know anything more.

Figure 7 The Man in the High Castle still S1 E1 first film- Aviator

The mobility of the camera moving around the projector and Juliana in the scene creates dark shadows obscuring our view of the makeshift projector screen. We can see enough detail to discern something of the image, but not enough to trust it or make definitive claims. As she watches, the images we glimpse on the screen get progressively more specific and complete. The subsequent three images we catch are vaguely military

related, though no more specific in identifying (whose military) information. It is only by the sixth image that we catch a familiar face: Sir Winston Churchill, decked in a military cap and chomping on his ever-present cigar.

Figure 8 The Man in the High Castle still S1 E1 first film- Churchill

Even by this familiar token, Juliana's shadow remains on the screen, almost in conversation with the former British Prime Minister. Her outline reminds the viewer to remain in the diegetic frame with her instead of falling into the interdiegetic images she watches. This secondary removal complicates our unraveling of the image, never sure of our memory-footing. We are neither allowed to witness the full film, nor are we able to quickly index the historical footage we see in fleeting seconds. We are torn between the draw of historical and pictorial familiarity and the intentional diegetic distancing mechanisms. While the images appear similar in format to newsreel film, they do not appear to have any narrative continuity. The images, while thematic, do not necessarily illustrate a narrative that the viewer can follow. They are essentially an inventory of

personal and historically charged images strung together to intimate a broader conclusion: “they show us winning the war.”

Even with the historical faces on the screen, the splicing of more generic war footage makes it difficult to locate the particular event.[10] Given that constraint, there are several noticeably identifiable images included in the final viewings of the film, the first of which appears near the middle of the scene with three of the key political figures of the war era.

Figure 9 The Man in the High Castle still S1E1 first film- Stalin, Roosevelt, and Churchill

---

[10] As an aside, authenticating historic footage and images has become an increasingly difficult task. While still historic in origin, given the proliferation of reposted and re-embedded images in various internet sites, identifying the image and the photographer without any location, battle, or other identifying information is becoming a new sort of challenge, like playing the children’s card game “Memory” or “Concentration” with the internet. A simple Google search of “Tehran Conference” will return a plethora of sites, some of which are falsely illustrated with a similar-looking photograph of the three leaders at the Yalta Conference instead of Tehran.

The still, eerily recalls a famous photograph from the Tehran Conference in 1943 down to the windows in the background. Keeping Juliana's shadow in the frame reminds the viewer that this historic event not only has ripples far reaching the instant of the photograph in Tehran, but also that there are watchers of the event seemingly from another world history. At this juncture, it is unclear as to where in the historic narrative the diegetic world diverges from the extradiegetic viewer space. The two world frames seem to agree on some of the events of the second world war—namely the opposing forces, and ideological disagreements—but we do not understand as viewers whether all remembered events of the war have been altered or what proportion of them remain true in the diegetic space.

Figure 10 Tehran Conference 1943- Stalin, Roosevelt, and Churchill. New York Times Archives (US Signal Corps)

For example, given the historic reverence for D-Day as the tidal pivot of our remembered war, and recognizing that in the diegetic world the US did not win the war, we seem to conclude that D-Day never occurred. However, we do not know whether a less widely known image of another preeminent turning point in the war, such as the above Tehran Conference, references an actual event within the diegetic history or not. We cannot dismiss the entirety of our remembered history as non-viable in this narrative space, nor can we trust it as a useful backdrop to the filmic interpretation. We as viewers are asked to hold both understandings simultaneously, never allowing one to reign dominant.

Within the stretch of the first film, historical revisionism hits two-fold. For the viewer, the diegetic frame is necessarily fiction, and necessarily revisionary of the remembered past. Yet, within the diegetic frame, the perspective of historic realism reconfigures the diegetic framework for history. While the show as we encounter it appears to be "alternative history," the revisionist component in the film doubles down on the image's ontological uncertainty. We are reliant on the clues and observations embedded into the narrative to understand the purported impact to the show. As we cannot dismiss the credibility of the images flickering on Juliana's screen, we also cautiously buy into her interpretations as we have no ulterior understanding. The positioning of the images within the larger body of man in the high castle films distorts our historical memory, making it difficult to disentangle the original context from the new diegetic location. Like Sontag's (2003) contention about captions, the diegetic paratexts destabilize and reframe our understanding of historic events, and in some contexts, create what I will call surrogate histories.

Surrogate histories

Within *The Man in the High Castle,* surrogate histories meddle in the diegetic frames. The first is the filmic seepage from viewer history into the context of the show. The inclusion of historic footage tampers with the character understanding of history, and ultimately motivates a movement for a different world order. The fabrication of history through parallel universes and Abendsen's films nurtures a diegetic alternative. It is through these visual depictions of alternative histories that enables the characters to find hope for changing their current world. The character's emotional reliance on historical footage demonstrates the malleability of ideology and hope based on the believability of

images. The same works for we as viewers who witness the creation of a diegetic world that is different but not unlike our own world's history. The alternative history here plays on the viewer fear of what might have been, and given modern contexts such as the rise of white nationalism here in the United States, what still could be. In this way, surrogate histories take root and form viewer motivations that respond to the visual nature of these fabricated histories.

The visual believability of both the diegetic work and the interdiegetic images that connect viewer history directly stem from the ontological assumptions that accompany visual images. Not only are we inclined to believe the authenticity of the images (wanting to comprehend and also trust the narrative images on screen), but we accept them as either diegetic fact or historically true. In order to 'buy into' the world created on the screen, the viewer must trust that the images are at least diegetically real and relevant to the ongoing narrative. Trusting narrative images may be motivational in some aspects but also may have devastating consequences. For simplicity, I will first frame surrogate history in terms of character perspectives. This I will refer to as narratively-embedded surrogate history. In keeping with the progression of the overall show, I will weave in the analytical components of narratively-embedded surrogate history into the context of the remaining analysis.

The first film.

Even in the first film, historical revisionism plays an interesting interdiegetic role. The Allied destruction of Nazi symbols in the wake of Victory in Europe demonstrates a physical reminder of "wiping the slate clean," or removing the corrupt emblems of the Reich from prominent positions. As Juliana watches, the destruction of buildings, icons,

and flags appears to be the only unmistakably clear images in the film. Where others could be misconstrued without detailed research into our own historic knowledge, the demolition of Nazi icons make it abundantly clear who won the war, and what they were willing to do to eliminate even the symbols from their locations. The purging of symbols for the purpose of a propaganda film will return in season three as the American Reich aims to eliminate American history in a grandiose display of power.

Figure 11 The Man in the High Castle still S1 E1 first film- destruction of Nazi symbols

Figure 12 The Man in the High Castle still S1 E1 first film- destruction of Nazi symbols

Figure 13 The Man in the High Castle still S1 E1 first film- destruction of Nazi flag

The directness of the destruction images remains in contrast to the interpretative quality of the other images present. Where either the soldiers and aviators are unspecific, or the diplomatic context of the meeting of three key figures is unclear, the destruction of symbols indicates a specific outcome. Other images included are less overt. Where it

becomes easy to find parallels of recognizable figures in historic images (such as those of Churchill and President Roosevelt), it is more challenging to trace images that are known by event rather than person. For instance, the first film includes footage of the signing of the Japanese surrender aboard the USS Missouri in Tokyo Bay. However, visually, the best indicators are that the image includes military personnel and a military style vessel during some kind of ceremony. Based on contextual clues, we can assume that the document is some kind of international agreement, though who is surrendering to whom is unclear without the additional historic context. In fact, there are no overt indications that it is a US military vessel, nor specifically the USS Missouri. The interdiegetic images are too small, too distant to make out identifying features of the people involved other than the general presumption of men in uniform. It takes more nuanced and in depth historic knowledge to recognize these images beyond the diegetic context.

Figure 14 The Man in the High Castle still S1 E1 first film- Japanese surrender aboard the USS Missouri

Figure 15 The Man in the High Castle still S1 E1 first film- Japanese surrender

Given the contextual framework of the films, their provenance comes into question. For Juliana and others who see the film, it must first of all be created. The implication, though, is not that the films have been created in the same purpose or method as, say, a director or a photographer, but that they have been sculpted by this mythical reclusive man who splices and engineers together these disparate and unlikely images. They are manufactured in ways that are dissimilar to the more conventional film making process. It is almost as if the man in the high castle himself is compiling found objects into one reel rather than take part in the filming, staging, or directing work. By the time we encounter the man in the high castle (Hawthorne Abendsen[11] played by Stephen Root) in the first episode of season 2, Juliana notes that the warehouse of films that surround the mysterious title character is not to be believed. She walks by a shelf

[11] I will use "the man in the high castle" and "Hawthorne" or "Abendsen" interchangeably from this point forward.

labeled ‘1961’ and picks up a reel entitled “Fourth of July Fireworks- Phoenix, 1961.” She practically whispers, “that’s not possible” as according to her timeline, the war ended in 1952 with the Allies’ loss, and there would have been no further need for patriotic celebrations on the fourth of July. Hawthorne stares from behind his thick glasses, “But it is, you’re holding it.” The tangibility and tactility of the images, no matter their provenance or elusive construction, maintain a kind of historical certainty in their physical presence. The believability of film remains because of the physicality; it must be true because how could film lie?

Narratively-embedded surrogate histories follow the events as depicted in the show where characters witness films of the Allied powers winning the war. As previously mentioned, this alternative visual evidence of history other than the experienced history of the characters becomes the driving motive for the characters to enact change within the diegetic world. Abendsen’s compiled films such as *The Grasshopper Lies Heavy* from the first season, and subsequent circulated films encourage the characters to envision a new world order. The interdiegetic films shift the relationship of authentic film to the characters forcing them to reconsider the possibility of historical what-ifs. The initial alternative film Juliana encounters in the first episode lays the groundwork for a narratively-embedded surrogate history where the even the montaged and disordered images flickering on a screen are enough to spark the beginning of a movement. Over and over again, the flickering images resonate for more than Juliana, they spread and with them carry new histories, ideologies, and encapsulate hope. Juliana receives the first film from her sister who is almost immediately killed for carrying contraband. As she watches it in her basement apartment, she repeatedly comes back to the idea of “having a reason

for everything" or needing to continue to Trudy's pursuit of this film rationale. Juliana's motivation leads her to share the film with first Frank, then to the Resistance. With each subsequent circle, the message grows, though the Resistance attempts to distribute the work without having seen the film. By stifling the message but propagating the movement of the medium, they effectively make the film a form of prized contraband, dangerous enough to be politically ripe.

It is only through Juliana's persistence that others also begin to watch the film. By the time *The Grasshopper Lies Heavy* reaches Sabra, the covert Jewish community in the Rocky Mountains, does Resistance as a propagandized political force begin to take shape. Here image has taken a motivational spin through art as well. Frank's art work, or recreations of a sunrise have begun to circulate in the Neutral Zone. The resistance sunrise takes on symbolic power for those looking to create a new world, or one that more closely resembles that in the confiscated film. With each subsequent showing of *The Grasshopper Lies Heavy*, audiences of the film (not external audiences) must make a decision to either buy into the images on the screen, or to seek rebellion in other ways. Both the film and the sunrise paintings accumulate symbolic power, driving a resistance movement through the power of image. By the end of the third season and into the fourth, this same film has taken on national importance through duplication and smuggling operations on a massive scale. One of the Resistance smugglers, Liam, shifts his focus from entrepreneurial smuggling to capitalizing on a cause. He convinces his other black-market friends to not only believe in the film, but to help distribute the work far beyond the Neutral Zone. The opening scene of season four includes a Resistance battle over a train shipment of films captured by Reich forces. The attributed power of circulated

image of alternative history has the ability to move armies into action. Not only do these circulated films move armies in one world, the Nazi forces aim to mobilize their army into other parallel worlds by mechanical means.

The second film.

The second man in the high castle film takes on different revisionist properties than the first. Where the first film that Juliana watches questions the accuracy and historicity of the represented events due to the viewer's shifting diegetic or extradiegetic perspectives, the second[12] film neither engages in the diegetic revisionary perspective nor combats viewer memory. After a series of elaborate chases, Frank and Juliana hide out in a school and decided to watch the confiscated second film. The scene itself is laced with spliced images of Tagomi (the Japanese Trade Minister for the Pacific States) meditating on a bench in downtown San Francisco. The flickering black and white screen shows what we assume to be an atomic bomb explode; it topples cars, and leaves shadows of fleeing people on cinderblock walls. Skeletons litter the streets, and we see the now mangled Golden Gate Bridge, the first indicator that this is not a previous event in either timeline, but rather an ominous premonition. The shaky camera follows a line of soldiers

[12] Technically, there is a second film mentioned in the final episode of Season One where the film that Joe Blake brought to the Resistance and watched in the second episode was not (as was presumed) the same film that Juliana watched and described above. Rather, it was a Stalin propaganda film from 1954, when in the diegetic world, Stalin was assassinated in 1949, and in our extradiegetic world, Stalin died of a stroke in 1953. There is only one scene that describes this film, though we watch Joe watch this film in the S1E2. Since we as viewers only witness Joe's reaction to the film, and do not get to see it for ourselves and the only content we know of the film is from Joe's unreliable testimony, this film will remain in a footnote rather than fodder for extensive analysis. For my purposes, and for clarity, when I refer to the 'second film,' I will be speaking of a film that both Juliana and Frank watch repeatedly in S1E9, and becomes contentious for the third season as well.

marching a group of captives through the remaining rubble. One of the prisoners is clearly Frank Frink, who in this scene is both on the screen as a captive, and watching himself in the school auditorium. The prisoners are forced to their knees, and one by one, a Nazi agent shoots them point blank in the back of the head. In the final seconds, the film reveals the agent to be Joe Blake, the shifty double operative with whom Juliana has repeatedly risked her life.

For the bulk of the first season, the viewer comes to revere the strangeness of the first film as a historical peculiarity. It stokes the fires of hope for the Resistance and provides consistent motivation for Juliana to continue her haphazard pursuit of the truth. By the time they watch the second film, what could have been an inspirational spur to the remainder of the season turns to dread as Frank witnesses his own death and the unparalleled destruction of their home city. Now the fabled films, which still maintain a sense of realism, are cast into diegetic doubt. We can no longer believe the film to be an alternative history, but rather fracture our categorical understanding of the films into 'what could have been' and 'what might be.' The second film does not provoke or placate our confidence in the present, but rather forces us to confront our concerns for the characters on the screen. This film is crafted on the necessary empathy for the diegetic plot. The second film contrasts to the first; rather than providing a carrot of hope for the past, it spurs a penalty for the future. Instead of providing a world-building incentive, this second film provokes a series of actions that must be taken for the preservation of the world as it exists currently. Notably, the second film only gets introduced after the viewer has had roughly nine hours of a season to connect with the character's self-motivations

and interests. By this point, we are motivated as they are, looking for a resolution even in the disregard of our previous hope.

Additionally strange with this second film is the manner in which Juliana and Frank watch it. Where Juliana watched the first film repeatedly with a frantic almost compulsive manner, and the viewer spent the majority of the viewings with some visual block or shadow clouding the image, the second film is almost unobstructed. Instead of quick blips of footage, nearing a montage-state, the second film utilizes long shots, pristine cuts, and creates a specific narrative. Earlier, the montage of World War II imagery crafted a composite argument for a different historical ending. Here, the opening shot of the mangled Golden Gate Bridge only begins a scene of continued devastation including specific images indicating an atomic bomb blast. The specificity of the images in terms of cause and location make the reality of the film more palpable. While not reliant on viewer memory for particular events in the past, it relies on both the dialogic context and the vague imagery connected to 'nuclear shadows' such as those left after the bombing of Hiroshima. The subtle and specific iconography demands the viewer make

the same kind of intellectual leaps as Juliana and Frank do in their first viewing of the film.

Figure 16 The Man in the High Castle still S1 E9 film 2- Atomic bomb shadows

Where in the first film, Juliana watches several times and the viewer only catches glimpses of each image, the second film almost immediately lets the viewer in on the concurrent emotional experience as the characters. The diegetic distancing is the same which requires the viewer to consider the implications for the characters in the frame as well as question the origins of the film presented. While shocking for Juliana and Frank to consider the demolition of their home, the events depicted in the film are still removed, distant enough to contemplate without physical affliction until the second portion of the film. By the time that the line of captives appears on screen, the tone changes from placid, foreboding landscape, to a personal confrontation. A close up of Frank's face as he kneels in the dirt at the front of the line fractures the narrative from one of large scale warning for a city to the acute and personal loss. In the same manner as the first film

which included Juliana’s shadow as part of the lit screen, Frank’s shadow shows up as well. Here he plays a double role, that of the victim on screen, and the corollary shadow of the present. Haunting in this context, the shadow Frank casts on the projector screen mirrors the earlier nuclear shadows, all but erased from the flattened landscape.

Figure 17 The Man in the High Castle still S1 E9 film 2- Frank's double shadow

After the first viewing of the second film, it takes on new life within the diegetic world. Still sought by both the Resistance and the Nazis, the doomsday prophecy film becomes an international currency as Juliana sacrifices it for Joe to deliver to the Reich. The first episode of the second season capitalizes on the ethereal aspects of the second film by overlaying Juliana’s testimony describing the film to Abendsen while the screen vacillates between her meeting and Hitler’s initial viewing in his Berlin office. While much of Hilter’s viewing is in pantomime rather than full diegetic audio, the auditory cues for “film” such as the clicking of the projector and the whirr of film past the lens remain concurrent with Juliana’s monologue. Strangely, Abendsen’s provocation about

whether she remembers the other person next to Frank in the lineup cues for her a memory of the film rather than a reshowing of the film. These images are short, minimally sequential shots with intent focus on faces. Without the filmic click of a projector, it suggests these come instead from her memory, focused for responding to Abendsen's scathing questions. By the time she admits that the second man seemed familiar, Abendsen cues up a separate film, one where the same man, now dressed in a Nazi uniform, lies dead in an alley. Though he is still only vaguely familiar to her, it is enough of an image for her to begin her season long search for the same figure.

The dialogue during Juliana's confrontation with Abendsen illuminates several key frames around the production of the films. Whereas nearly all throughout the first season the films are presumed to be made or at least packaged by the illusive man in the high castle, Abendsen infers instead that the films simply exist in worlds similar to the diegetic one, but different—yet they all have some intrinsic property involving a fascist Nazi empire and global war. He hints, "Every film where the Japs won the war, sooner or later San Francisco is wiped out by an A bomb. Every one except this one. Where this bastard dies in an alley somewhere" (S2E1- The Tiger's Cave). This suggests that while the viewer understands the primary tenets of the diegetic world, there is something else beyond that reconstructs time and related events according to the characters at play. He notes, that "Some of us are just the same. Same rotten or kind in one reality, or they are rotten or kind in the next reality, but most people are different depending on whether they have food in their belly, or hungry, safe or scared" (S2E1- The Tiger's Cave). So while some of the circumstances change, the definitive impact derives from the corporeal security each key figure experiences. Yet this knowledge does not resolve our lingering

questions as to how these films come to be if they are not made by Abendsen himself. The implication is that he is simply the curator, the one who determines captions and narrative sequences searching for similarities across films. Therefore, he shifts the narrative, having the ability to characterize the entire experience of the nation and perhaps the world based on his interpretive stance on the film. His ontological grounding of the films does not change. He still believes that the films embody some sort of truth, though how that truth plays out in this reality is contentious and undetermined.

Dealing in the otherworldly.

Amid this ontological melee, the third season of the show opens up a vortex of new possibilities. Here I am going to pause in an attempt to break down the complications in these plotlines for future explanatory clarity. The first world that we encounter as viewers is the clear diegetic one. This world serves as home base to the major characters and their conflicts. Here, Juliana, Frank, and Joe all exist in a world order where the Allies lost the second world war and the United States has been divided between the two super powers the Nazi Reich and the Japanese Empire. Still set in the 1960s, this world serves as a contrast to the remembered viewer world of the 1960s, which I will continue to refer to as the extradiegetic space.

Complications arise in this two-dimensional understanding when Tagomi meditates his way into a world that eerily resembles 1960s San Francisco of viewer memory. Here there are banners of Ronald Regan selling cigarettes, blustering American flags, hot dog vendors listening to baseball on the radio, and President John F. Kennedy delivering press conferences on television. Tagomi's emergence into this second diegetic space initially feels comforting. There is an inherent familiarity to this space. Though the

set does not overtly change, the micro-clues that we seek for comfort such as the overly loud conversations on the sidewalk, and the irreverent appeals of capitalism have altered to a more familiar cadence. As we follow Tagomi in this space, it is clear that what is familiar to us on an almost cellular level is strange and unknown to him. After his first visit in season one episode ten (the closing image of the season), Tagomi's personal plotline in season two aims to unravel this new space. He returns to the original diegetic 1960s and seeks out a librarian to give him access to a special collection of books. The stoic, almost monk-like librarian escorts him to a similarly austere cell littered with books. Here he pours over familiar titles to us, from the complete works of Blake, to several books of W. B. Yeats poetry. What is strange here is the reason for the compiled secret library. Presumably, in this diegetic world, they present either a threat to the existing states, or they have not or could not have existed under this timeline. Outside of the obvious legacy of *A Brave New World* by Aldous Huxley, almost every other author present was attacked as a radical for their time.

Figure 18 The Man in the High Castle Still S2 E2- Tagomi's secret books

The seclusion of these books suggests one of two things in this context. The first is that they are banned in some way by either the Japanese Empire or the Reich, and this single drawer of titles contains the remaining few that have been spared destruction. A second option is that they have never existed in this world and must therefore come from a separate place. The second possibility aligns the lingering and sequestration of these books to the same realm as the man in the high castle films. What becomes interesting is knowing that Tagomi himself meditated to a new world order, seamless in his transference between the diegetic 1960s and the second remembered 1960s world. Knowing that material, literally Tagomi's body, can traverse these separate spaces opens the possibility that these books may have made similar journeys across the time-space gap.

Upon his second visit to the secondary 1960s timeline, Tagomi visits his home. There, he encounters his wife, though there are clear tensions in their relationship here. In

the diegetic world, the only acknowledgement of his family are the pictures on his desk or the family altar at his home. To see her likeness out of a stagnant frame seems shocking to both Tagomi and the viewer who frantically scraps together pieces of knowledge to make sense of this new order. Slowly, the new context becomes clear. Where our earlier familiarity with Tagomi constructs him to be reserved, understated, and devoted to a peaceful world order, the version of himself he has replaced in this second world has no such scruples. His wife is seeking a divorce, his son will barely speak to him, and the tension stems from a cup-shattering encounter with his infant grandson. The only person in the house who welcomes him back without question is Juliana Crain. Yes, this is where crossover becomes desperately tricky. In the second USA-version of the 1960s, Juliana as played by the same actress in a similar but separate role is married to Tagomi's Americanized son. Here she happily welcomes Tagomi home, and patiently (or naïvely) answers his questions about the couple's various Ban the Bomb rallies and activist stances. He clearly recognizes her as his research assistant, though she only sees him as her father-in-law as this world articulates. Where Tagomi experiences both worlds through a singular consciousness, Juliana, though recognizable physically to both the viewer and Tagomi, has two separate consciousness-es defined by the collinear timelines. Juliana becomes a central pivot to multiple timelines, either by her work with the Resistance in the diegetic world, or by her activism in another, both Juliana's seem to have concurrent and compatible goals, regardless of the contextual surroundings. Despite the external costuming differences, both representations of Juliana appear to be at their core, the same idealistic being.

Figure 19 The Man in the High Castle still S2 E5- Tagomi meet Juliana 2

In this second 1960s space, Tagomi enters a second hand bookstore looking for answers about this new place's background. He first picks up a copy of *Lolita* (which wasn't published until 1955- only three years after the end of WWII in the original diegetic timeline). He slowly makes his way to the history section of the store overhearing the conversation of a customer and presumably the owner who are discussing "duck and cover" drills, and if "Eisenhower had let him [Nikita Khrushchev] go to Disneyland back in '59 like he wanted" (S2E5- Duck and Cover). Tagomi removes a coffee table WWII history book from the shelf and settles into a chair. On the cover is the iconic Times Square kiss[13], and he begins to flip through the pages.

---

[13] This image has a contentious history about the non-consensual kiss that has since been immortalized in statue form as well as broadcast in almost every collection of WWII images pertaining to the US.

Figure 20 The Man in the High Castle still S2 E5- Times Square Kiss

Tagomi begins to see more things that are familiar to the viewer as a part of their history, but based on his reaction, they are shocking and strange. One is a posed picture with two soldiers with the demolished Nazi Imperial Eagle at their feet (not so different from that in the first film). Another is the famed shot of the Enola Gay- the fateful plane that would carry the atomic bomb to Japan, the signing of the peace treaty aboard the USS Missouri, a mushroom cloud and finally, the hollowed out destruction of Hiroshima after the atomic bomb. The captions at the bottom of the page at the corner of the screen guide both Tagomi and help the viewer re-remember what events have taken place in this world. The effects of the images are no less shocking to Tagomi. He quivers in the chair at the bookstore, beginning to imagine the destruction of his home country. Suddenly the "Ban the Bomb" protesters from outside the store seem relevant, viable, and critical to continued harmony on this planet in this timeline.

Figure 21 The Man in the High Castle S2 E5- History book Hiroshima USA timeline

Different from the films that the viewer has encountered thus far, the examination of the history book has fewer distancing mechanism. The camera gives a tilted and slightly cropped but unobstructed view of history here. The captions in the bottom corner serve as a reminder that these are pictures in a book, articulated and guided by an unknown collaborator who guides our understanding. Even though this book is presumably on Tagomi's lap, there are no shadows, the images are still clear and well lit, and after the cover shot, even his hands are completely out of the frame. Only the tilted angle of the open book in his lap keeps us at bay. This history is close, tactile, and certain. Where the films flicker and problematize our narrative understanding, there is a kind of fearful reassurance on paper. Printed and bound, these images are more concrete than those projected on a wall or screen.

Under nuclear threat.

Tagomi's investigation of this second, more familiar, world brings together other fruits. Clearly, the resurgence of his son and his wife (in the original diegetic world presumed dead) presents a new familial complication. However, the new familial legacy that includes both his son and his newfound daughter in-law Juliana is one that protests nuclear warfare in 1960s fashion. The couple hosts "ban the bomb" rallies and poster-making parties, and has unexplained connections to journalists. At one point, Tagomi witnesses Juliana encouraging multiple poster-makers as they make arrangements for the next rally. Here she seems to float, almost angelic in her patience, and almost perpetually wears white in this world narrative. Ban the bomb rallies right in the middle of the Cuban Missile Crisis provides a particular sense of urgency in this timeline as to the critical nature of the events. In fact, at the end of season two episode six, Tagomi's family and several of the rally volunteers gather around the television to watch the now famous Kennedy address for the Cuban Missile Crisis. The President's voiceover leaks into the previous scene, where Joe wanders around his room in his father's Berlin house inspecting the weaponry and continues through both the scene where it stems (the rally-ready living room at Tagomi's house), and every other check in on narrative characters. The speech text follows:

> Tonight, I call upon Chairman Khrushchev to halt and eliminate this clandestine, reckless, and provocative threat to world peace and to stable relations between our two nations. I call upon him further to abandon this course of world domination, and to join in an historic effort to end the perilous arms race and to transform the history of man. He has an opportunity now to move the world back from the abyss of destruction -- by returning to his government's own words that it had no need to

> station missiles outside its own territory, and withdrawing these weapons from Cuba -- by refraining from any action which will widen or deepen the present crisis -- and then by participating in a search for peaceful and permanent solutions. ...
>
> My fellow citizens: let no one doubt that this is a difficult and dangerous effort on which we have set out. No one can foresee precisely what course it will take or what costs or casualties will be incurred. Many months in which both our patience and our will will be tested -- months in which many threats and denunciations will keep us aware of our dangers. But the greatest danger of all would be to do nothing. ...
>
> Our goal is not the victory of might, but the vindication of right -- not peace at the expense of freedom, but both peace and freedom, here in this hemisphere, and we hope, around the world. God willing, that goal will be achieved. (John F. Kennedy's public address on the Cuban Missile Crisis October 22, 1962)

While it important to linger on the words of the late President Kennedy, the show manipulates the above speech by positioning particular characters and their inherent motivations over the President's text. By inlaying contrasting images and narrative scores with a rich text that make bold claims about "right" and "peace" through potentially catastrophic weaponry, the diegetic characters are thrown in to a shockingly different relief. Positioning the famous Presidential address with new imagery, regardless of the hostility present, alters the overall impression of the speech. As a viewer, hearing familiar words juxtaposed with alarming visceral footage tampers with viewer memory of the speech and subsequent events. To illustrate this point, I will annotate the same text as

above, but denoting what visuals accompany the text, and the prior motives of the characters up to this juncture.

Figure 22

|*Joe at dressing rack*| "Tonight, I call upon Chairman Khrushchev…"

At this point, Joe has been sent to meet his father, Reichsminister Martin Heusmann (played by Sebastian Roché), who is a high ranking engineer in the Reich. At Heusmann's house in Berlin, Joe confronts the idea of working for a government that bombed the vessel that smuggled him out of San Francisco. Here he contemplates the suit his father's house keeper Frau Silvia (played by Gabrielle Rose) in her devotion to Joe as a lebensborn[14] and heir to the Reich has set out for him to wear. While Chairman

[14] Lebensborn: a person bred for genetic perfection of the Aryan race by the Nazis. Two prominent characters are known lebensborns: Joe and Nicole. The shady birth houses during the war aimed to create a kind of revered super-specimen of the Reich. Both Joe and Nicole have fathers who are extremely high ranking in the Reich and essentially call Himmler their Godfather. Himmler will eventually use lebensborns as assassins.

Khrushchev is not an immediate combatant in this narrative line, the image does present an intriguing alignment between the Chairman and Joe, both sitting on the precipice of a world war.

Figure 23

|*JFK on screen in the second narrative where Tagomi is- presumed USA 1962*| "to halt and eliminate this clandestine, reckless, and provocative threat to world peace"

This is accurate footage of the final minutes from the original broadcast on October 22, 1962, in the middle of the Cuban Missile Crisis. Within the scene, the television sits in a living room crowded with people who were making ban the bomb signs earlier in the same episode. The camera reverses to show the living room from the opposite angle, noting the attention of each individual glued and un-fidgeting to the screen.

Figure 24

> |*same scene, reverse shot rally goers*| "and to stable relations between our two nations. I"

As the sentence continues, the camera zeros in on Juliana and her husband in the front center of the room. Both are engrossed in the message from the President, knowing that their personal and activist activities hang in the balance. For this plotline, the President's press conference makes internal sense in term of time, and which characters would tune in to such a broadcast. It is the other plotlines that this message takes on new subtext.

Figure 25

|*Obergruppenführer Smith & Helen in bed*| "call upon him further to abandon this course of world domination, and to join in an historic effort to end the perilous arms race and to transform the history of man. He has an opportunity now to move the world back from the abyss of destruction"

As Obergruppenführer John Smith (played by Rufus Sewell) and his wife Helen (played by Chelah Horsdal) crawl into bed, this season has been particularly taxing. Amid the secrecy of their son's genetic defect, this couple has clung together in an attempt to weather the scrutiny of the state. Earlier in the season, Obergruppenführer Smith murdered his son Thomas's diagnosing doctor with the sedative cocktail he prescribed. They are the picture perfect white suburban couple, with devastating secrets. Amidst this melee, the Smith family has sponsored Juliana in her asylum appeal to the Reich. Subsequently she has become a tentative staple in the Smith day-to-day functions, especially for Helen. Their marital intimacy here, including a tender shot of Helen

stroking John's chin and planting a sensual goodnight kiss on his lips is one that hallmarks their loyalty to each other. Knowing the kind of power that John's position wields, and the potentially devastating secret they harbor, the speech text plays a dual role in suggesting both world domination, and a change for mankind all from the domesticated bedroom of a powerful figure. Obergruppenführer Smith has the power to back away from this abyss, but only in the safety of his own castle. Moreso, the Smith family as engaged in a "perilous arms race" is a race against the state, one that will surely end in disaster for their family.

Figure 26

> |*Dixon and Juliana sit in truck drinking beer*| "by [here there is a textual edit of the speech. The original contains: "returning to his government's own words that it had no need to station missiles outside its own territory, and" but the show, either for continuity or simplicity has removed the clause] withdrawing these

> weapons from Cuba -- by refraining from any action which will widen or deepen the present crisis”

Here during the President’s plea and agenda for how the Chairman can deescalate the situation, Juliana sits with fellow Resistance operative, and Trudy’s real father George Dixon (played by Tate Donovan). He has been her contact and vouchsafe in the Reich-based Resistance while demanding that she use her position as the Smith’s ward to spy on Helen and the family. The Resistance recognizes the potential power that Obergruppenführer holds in the region if not the world, and obtaining some sort of leverage would make their fight easier. Juliana at this point has tentatively agreed to spy on Helen and give reports to the Resistance, but here we see her cautiously reconnecting with a family friend over a beer. In this moment, they both appear paused or “refraining from any action,” which is a direct contrast to the typical combustive scenes with the Resistance. Yet, the Resistance attempts to move people to action, rather than waiting for either the Japanese Empire or the Reich to make the first move.

Figure 27

|*JFK address on living room screen*| "and then by participating in a search for peaceful and permanent solutions."

This shot returns us to the context of the President demanding permanent, peaceful solutions to the rising tensions about Cuba. The emphasis on "peaceful solutions" reconnects us to the world tensions of nuclear power. At this juncture in the show, while the existence of nuclear power is present in the diegetic space (the known destruction of Washington DC by an atomic bomb), it is not an eminent threat, only a diegetic fact. It is not until later in the season where multiple plotlines will converge to emphasize the nuclear impact in the diegetic space.

Figure 28

|*Tagomi peeks around corner*| “My fellow citizens: let no one doubt”

Tagomi, in the 1962 USA narrative, peeks around the corner of his own home where the broadcast plays on the television. A shot of Tagomi that overlays “fellow citizens” highlights his tenuous space in both this world and his own diegetic narrative. Here, he is a “traveler” one who can meditate to other narrative plains. He does not technically belong to this world. His personal attitudes to the tensions in his own diegetic space about who belongs and how people should be treated stands in contrast to his more militant foil, Inspector Kido. The diegetic Japanese governance line is one of domination and separation of Americans and the superior Japanese, though they continue to tread a fine line with Nazi acceptance. Picturing Tagomi over a line about citizenship highlights the impacts of potential nuclear war across multiple worlds. For Tagomi, this threat plagues every element of his existence regardless of the comparative stability of his current location.

Figure 29

|USA 1962 *living room, JFK address*| “that this is a difficult and dangerous effort on which we have set out.”

Redrawing attention to the rally party, the overlay text seems to bolster their efforts toward peace. Of course, their efforts are not the thing that the President acknowledges here, as they propose global nuclear disarmament. But the contextual shift and viewer knowledge of this group’s goals, along with the fear that Tagomi feels from his own world, positions the two directives side by side. This/these tasks will not be simple, they instead by their very nature, will be dangerous.

Figure 30

|*Joe puts on jacket*| "No one can foresee precisely"

This line coupled with Joe's decision to don the suit laid out for him earlier carries a duplicitous take. First, it appears that he has made his decision to side at least with the proffered services of the Reich, accepting the maternal, albeit indentured, care of Frau Silvia. Compared to his vacillating dejected posture from before, here Joe stands taller, looks himself easily in the mirror, and swings the tailored jacket onto his frame. Yet Joe up until this point has played several characters. He is spawned of and for the Reich, holds a lofty position as a lebensborn, and has the ear of a very powerful Nazi figure as Heussmann's son. He works for, though sometimes contentiously, Obergruppenführer Smith as an elite member of several Nazi operations. In those he has played an active member of the Resistance including luring Juliana into acquiring the film. With each turn, Joe's stance shifts just slightly, keeping his balance, but parrying every attempt by

the viewer or by Juliana to pin him down. Joe, in essence, is a character who “no one can foresee precisely.”

Figure 31

> |*Thomas look at South American atlas*| “what course it will take or what costs or casualties will be incurred. Many months in which”

Obergruppenführer Smith and his wife Helen at this point both know of their son Thomas’s genetic defect that will eventually leave him a ‘drag on the state.’ In an attempt to maintain their dignity and to potentially save Thomas’s life, they have concocted a scheme that will send Thomas to South America as part of a Hitler’s youth exercise where he will be kidnapped and never returned. Away from the stringent reporting laws, and far distant from the press, their hope is that Thomas will be able to live out the remainder of his life as well as possible. Here, Thomas, a poster boy for Nazi youth, eagerly looks over a map of South America where we can see designated the pink region of the Reich, the yellow neutral zone, and the thin west coast blue of the Japanese

Empire. Next to the atlas is a less obvious life insurance policy portfolio. By the end of the season, Thomas has found out about his condition and in fanatic adherence to the ideals of the state, commits himself to be euthanized against the will of his parents. He is both the cost and the casualty in just under four episodes from this moment.

Figure 32

|*Thomas atlas proud*| “both our patience and our will”

Thomas’s determined, almost carved face expresses a kind of stalwart drive that flies in the face of most plotlines here. His parents from earlier sought each other’s tender company, but he, blind to his medical condition, presses on under the premise of duty and esteem. Other character especially by this point have a highly tenuous view of the future. They are characteristically uncertain, making cautious, sometimes even desperate moves in hopes that something good will come out of it. Thomas, on the other hand, is collected, and clear eyed. He is the anchor in the middle of a complicated storm of political currents, but his actions are always clear. Thomas’s plotline here and forward does test

both patience, and will—though not in the capacities of national security. The battle of wills between Thomas in his drive to serve the state, and his father's determination to protect his family are at this juncture diametrically opposed. Under the function of the state, both of them cannot win. At this point though, the future seems bright, it is possible that Thomas will escape the all-seeing eye of the state and live remotely for the remainder of his life.

Figure 33

|*USA living room Tagomi's son*| "will be tested"

Tagomi's son, Nori (played by Eddie Shin) looks back at his father here almost checking to see if he will object to the crowd or the television station. In Tagomi's diegetic world, he reveres the memory of his son, with memorials stationed on his desk and around his home. Walking into a new landscape with an adult son who is married and has an infant changes the presumed dynamic of the two. In Nori's space, his father has been inattentive, with even the illusion of abusiveness. This episode is titled "Kintsugi," or the

Japanese practice of binding broken items such as pottery back together with gold or other precious metal. In one of his purported rages, the USA version of Tagomi shattered his grandson's baby mug. The Tagomi we know discovers it in this episode and later goes on to repair it in this method as an act of reconciliation. The kintsugi method is also indicative of how these disparate plots have been stitched together using President Kennedy's speech. A golden familiar thread to anchor together disparate pieces.

Figure 34

|*Tagomi wife USA livingroom*| "months in which many threats and denunciations" The following images are a series of shot/reverse shot encounters between Tagomi and his wife. They repeatedly look at each other, not in an attempt to find solace, but more in an attempt to find an anchor. The prior months before Tagomi's travel here, their contentious relationship has been nothing but threats, dangers, and likely denunciations. Tagomi in his role in the diegetic world as Japanese Trade Minister carries a particular power with access to people in high places. Prior to this, he put a spy, Rudolf Wegner, in

a position to smuggle plans for an atomic bomb into the Science Minister's hands. Now, watching the fear of a nuclear war unfold on his family's faces puts those prior actions into new light.

Figure 35

|*Tagomi*| "will keep us aware of our dangers."

Figure 36

|*reverse shot back to wife*| "But the greatest danger of"

Figure 37

|*reverse shot Tagomi*| "all would be to do nothing."

This will become his talisman of action going forward. Tagomi's purpose will be to do something in the face of oncoming nuclear threats. He will pressure and cajole others in the Japanese Pacific States and even the Reich to work for disarmament. His efforts, guided by the things he has witnessed here from the photographs in the history book to the presidential speech in this scene have motivated him through the experiences in another world to make changes in his own. The danger will be for him to not use this new information for potential good in his world. The devastation could be worse than even President Kennedy has yet to imagine. The danger to do nothing counters the earlier comment overlaid on Juliana and Dixon in the truck. Where Tagomi has the political clout to make decisions and actively rebut nuclear expansion, the Resistance, unsanctioned and chaotic, does not nor should have the same power to change the world order.

Figure 38

|*Joe in mirror with Nazi arm band- mirror*| "Our goal is not the victory of might, but the vindication of right -- not peace at the expense of freedom, but both peace and freedom, here in this hemisphere, and we hope, around the world. God willing, that goal will be achieved."

Figure 39

|*Joe looks in mirror*|

The above text morphs over the above two shots. The first of Joe finding a Nazi swastika armband in his jacket pocket and turning it over, and the second with a slow close up of Joe looking at himself in the mirror. Notably, the close up excludes the armband or what Joe has decided to do with it. Placing phrases like "the vindication of right" as well as "peace and freedom" into the frame with a Nazi asset unsure of his political stance redirects a powerful symbol. Where President Kennedy appeals to a larger moral issue of nuclear weaponry, the moral superiority embodied by the Nazi Reich harbors its own "vindication of right." Joe's continued persistence adhering to Nazi orders even if he

visibly disagrees or argues about them indicates a willingness to play into the established moral framework. Of course placing a quotation seeking peace and freedom in a hemisphere and perhaps the world in the same context as a Nazi spy shifts the optimistic and patriotic tone to a darker more minor key. Joe's father, Heussmann, intends later in this season to entirely annihilate every non-Aryan person around the globe in a sweeping display of military might. Heussmann himself frames peace as an ultimate goal after shedding the blood of millions of people. The tens of millions of deaths for the cost of peace seems palatable to him, and his nuclear arsenal is poised to do so. The question that the final frame of the episode leaves us with is peace—but at what cost and for whom?

The directorial work that anticipates and selects a critical presidential text and allows it to speak for a variety of character pivots is another way in which the show twists the viewer's understanding of memory. What phrases may be familiar within our extradiegetic context such as "victory of might, vindication of right" or "both peace and freedom" get skewered into new and hostile frames. The additional layering of a familiar other world narrative that so closely, even seamlessly, traces our remembered 1962 events can cloud our perception of what history includes. Our memory, now tangled with tracing character's behaviors and a half dozen plotlines falls into disarray, taking logical connections between sound and image as meaningful without bothering to disentangle the origin of either audio or image. In much the same way that a layering of Juliana's narrative description of the second film and watching a pantomime of Hitler play through the film has the ability to compound the meaning of a single text, so does the layering of historical footage within the show's narrative scope. Building logical, composite layers of multiple narratives tied together by a single through thought, or voice, automatically

forces us to tie those images into one cohesive package. President Kennedy's final remarks to the nation and his directive for Chairman Khrushchev get bundled into the missive for Joe Blake, the Nazi spy whose father at the very least is intent on world domination.

Testing testing.

In the same way the other "man in the high castle" films begin, the bright lights and clicking sounds of a projector fill the screen. After looking over the mechanics of the film whirring past the lens, the camera comes to rest on a portable screen in the same living room as the Cuban Missile Crisis address. Except this time, it is only Tagomi's close family members and a few trusted friends.

Figure 40 The Man in the High Castle still S2E9- Nuclear Test Island

Similar to the other films projected within the show, there are obstacles to a clear view of the screen. Here, the projector blurs the foreground of the image. So while our attention is drawn to figuring out what is on the projected screen, the device itself looms as a

reminder of what can be fabricated for show. As the demonstration continues, images flash on the screen that indicate some kind of bomb test: a metal cage, scaffolding reaching many stories high, several military vehicles, and finally a landscaped target as seen from the air. While the setting itself remains unclear, or at the very least ambiguous, the set up for the film leads the viewer to hypothesize a context: nuclear test at Bikini Atoll.[15] As the projector continues to click, we witness the bomb drop, the subsequent fireball and ominous rippling of waves charging toward the beach, and Tagomi's reaction.

Figure 41 The Man in the High Castle still S2 E9- Tagomi reaction to nuclear test footage

[15] Nuclear test footage is unsurprisingly hard to track down in this magnitude. Despite the recent mass declassifications of nuclear test footage, finding the linked sequence presented here has alluded me. Some Reddit users believe this sequence to show a Hydrogen bomb test at Bikini Atoll. The tropical coastline that appears in some frames would align with that, though it is much more difficult to demonstrate that the "target" image and the "beach" and the "mushroom cloud" all come from the same test. Perhaps this comment repeats more of the same, but images are tricky bastards.

In fact, he shies away from the screen, stepping backward and into the chair behind him. For him, this is not a hypothetical film, this is a likelihood much closer to the surface of his diegetic world.

Tagomi's son explains that he got the film from a journalist friend who says the US has been testing nuclear bombs 100 times more powerful than Hiroshima. In reaction to this piece of information, Tagomi sits down, yet the camera follows his movement through the light of the projector.

Figure 42 The Man in the High Castle S2 E9 still- Tagomi reacts to nuclear test through projector light

Framing Tagomi's reaction through the light of the projector layers the experience of both viewing the footage, and also that he will make decisions based on that film regardless of the origin. He is caught in the light, simultaneously captive by the image, and in service to it. As a viewer, we barely distinguish his shape as we must look through the projected light to witness his reaction. In every way, our view gets obscured by additional images in transmission toward the screen.

With the threat of expanding nuclear weaponry, a second element of narratively-embedded surrogate history takes shape. The Japanese Empire through the first season struggles to maintain parity with the Reich in nuclear weapons. The film made of this test works as a fear tactic for nations within this filmic space, but Tagomi repurposes the film as a bluff by the Japanese Pacific States. He recognizes the power of the test film not only as a display of might, but a translatable work beyond one world and into the next. Thus, he transposes this film into his original, the diegetic world space in order to imply nuclear parity to the Reich. The test film eventually travels to Kido's hands, and then to a meeting with Obergruppenführer Smith, who rationalizes the film as authentic to this timeline, not another. Tagomi's adoption of the other world's test film literally transposes a historical event into an alternative world history. His actions create a narratively-embedded surrogate history that operationalizes political and military forces.

Travelers.

During the second season with Tagomi's trip to the more viewer-familiar USA 1962 comes the show mechanic of the "traveler."[16] A traveler, like Tagomi, has the ability to transport between worlds, or multiverse plains. Though we have encountered other "travelers" prior to this, Tagomi's transposition introduces the first time we witness *how.* As the show progresses, how the travelers are able to move between worlds becomes critical for whether the Nazis are able to replicate the process. There is some contention as to what makes this possible is the death of one of the traveler versions of

[16] I think of "mechanic" as the premise or rule that is introduced through Tagomi. A traveler has the ability to transverse worlds through intense concentration. Permitting certain bodies to relocate becomes a function of *The Man in the High Castle* world building.

themselves. For example, a single line in season 2 in the USA world suggests that the Tagomi who was there committed suicide by jumping off a bridge, but there is no further supporting evidence of his death. A second traveler is Juliana's half-sister Trudy Walker (played by Conor Leslie). In the very first episode, Juliana witnesses her sister's death at the hands of the Kempetai. Later she imagines her sister walking through the market. In order to confirm her death, she takes a bus to a mass burial site in the country where Trudy's body has been unceremoniously dumped. Yet by the end of season 2, Trudy, in living form, reappears alongside Hawthorne. It is not until the beginning of the first season that we get an explanation of the events. Apparently, this Trudy, has traveled from another world where her sister Juliana has died. Both sisters, reunited and with different memories of each other consistently refer to "my Trudy" or "in my world" but still cling to a sisterly bond. As a part of the travel between worlds, it is important to note that part of the travelling process includes the ability to transport basic hand-held items as well. A solution at long last as to how these unidentifiable films come to be.

While both Tagomi and Trudy may travel to other world by strength of will, what is strange is the appearance of familiar characters in the diegetic world in other films. Hawthorne suggests that nearly every film that he has encountered includes Juliana, or at least a version of Juliana, right in the center of the action. Indeed, she witnesses herself in various perilous situations that she has never personally experienced, but the image is unquestionably her. By the third season, there are lingering memories or dreams that she has as her other self in these unfamiliar locations. A primary plotline of season three includes the search for a mine in the Pocono mountains of Pennsylvania. While Juliana has seen a third film's footage with Tagomi, she can come up with details that are not

included in the film in her memory. While they are not clear or easily prompted, the details she is able to string together suggest a kind of generalized consciousness between each worldly parallel. It additionally helps to explain how nearly exact physical replicas of people living worlds apart would have similar but not exact memories of each other in those other spaces. Hawthorne's invocation earlier about rotten or kind adheres to circumstances, but the relationships remain generally intact.

In the third season after his death, Thomas routinely makes appearances in the stockpile of footage designated to Oberst-Gruppenführer[17] Smith. While Smith does not intend to do much with the archives of footage put under his care, late one night he notices Thomas in a film set at a lake with a speed boating competition. The duration of the season Smith spends sleepless nights replaying this film and frantically searching others for similar occurrences. Without telling Helen, he uses this as a work-disguised grieving process, seeking Thomas in any form he can. Logically, he cannot assume that this is the same Thomas, though he also cannot dismiss that the other Thomas(es) fell to the same fate as his son. So he scans the faces of crowds at parades, and carnivals, and boat shows for any indication that the likeness of his son is doing well.

The hope of his son comes to a different light with the technological hope that there will be a mechanical process to breach to these other worlds. At the juncture of the

[17] At the end of season 2, Obergruppenführer Smith gets a promotion to a higher post: Oberst-Gruppenführer. By the end of season 3, he will be Reichsmarschall Smith, another promotion in rank. The prior two ranks were on a paramilitary side of the Reich, the Reichsmarschall rank tends to denote political work instead. For my purposes and continuity, I will use these terms interchangeably based on his position at the narrative point I reference, though they all refer to John Smith. (Season 1-2 Obergruppenführer; Season 3 E1-E5 Oberst-Gruppenführer; Season 3 E6-10 Reichsmarschall)

third season, the only people who can reach into other worlds do so through a meditative stillness and near spiritual connection. In an attempt to militarize this process, there must be a more efficient and reliable means to transport people and weaponry to secondary worlds from the first diegetic one. The tunnel mine that Juliana continues to dream about and that appears in the third film is the mechanism by which the Nazis aim to conquer the other worlds. Smith in his promotion to Oberst-Gruppenführer is briefed on this particular research, as doctor Josef Mengele does tests on a captured traveler, Fatima. With this potential technological windfall, Smith eyes the opportunity of reconnecting with the other filmic Thomas(es), and renews the hope that one of them does not contain the genetic defect. The films once more provide substantial hope for a faltering and winded Nazi officer.

A third and final narratively-embedded surrogate history occurs with Oberst-Gruppenführer Smith's third season obsession with seeing his son in other man in the high castle films. After Thomas's death in the second season and his subsequent sainthood, Oberst-Gruppenführer Smith seeks solace from his grief in finding replicated images of his son in an alternate world. Night after night, he searches man in the high castle films for signs of Thomas, any form of Thomas. Where initially the images seem like day dreams or wishful thinking on the part of a grieving father, they take on new meaning as the Reich prepares mechanical ways to breach into the subsequent parallel worlds. The surrogate history here motivates Smith's continued search for relief, to repair the relationship with his son, or at least reconnect to a son he lost. Smith's frantic search for visual reassurance of Thomas's wellbeing in another world plays into the same illusion created by film. By seeing Thomas on screen, he can believe if only for a

moment, that his son is alive and well. The illusion of the screen simultaneously creates a salve for the grieving father, and a narratively-embedded surrogate history for Smith to believe in.

Further, Smith uses the glimpses of alternative universes as a motivation to propel the Reich's search for mechanical means of traveling between worlds. Upon learning of the other worlds and their relatively Nazi-free environments, the Reich seeks to disrupt other world orders in an effort to colonize one planet, but the other parallel planets as well. However, to travel between worlds, either mechanically or through meditative practices as Tagomi and Juliana do, the parallel identity must be deceased. For example, in order for Juliana to travel to the USA 1960s, the "Juliana" in that world can no longer exist. To transport or attempt to transport between worlds where the duplicate persona already exists destroys the other in transit. The first mechanical attempt made by the Nazis at the end of season three includes a platform of test subjects only one of which survives the trip. The others, disintegrate in the test, their dog tags left at the bottom of the platform. For the Nazis to conquer the next world, they must develop troops that can transport though world boundaries knowing their paradox is not on the other side. Smith's personal involvement sends scouts into the USA portal to learn more about his duplicate family including Thomas.

Conclusion

With the 75th anniversary of the end of World War II fast approaching, the ability for film to intentionally blur the lines between fact and fiction becomes ever more pressing. *The Man in the High Castle*'s resonance for viewers relies on the ability of familiar images and frames to seep into consciousness through alternative historical

contexts. Yet the filmic work surrounding the interdiegetic display reminds the viewer of the obstacles and shadows cast on the provenance of film. Speculating the implications of film as it travels through the diegetic worlds of the show further highlights the impact of visual imagery on the political and social imagination. The ability of *The Man in the High Castle* to juxtapose relatable memory images with new fictional frames tampers with viewer memory of both diegetic and extradiegetic events. The following chapter will entail how those images and characters impact viewers on an emotional level through empathic resonance.

CHAPTER 4

DOMESTICATION OF THE NAZIS: EMPATHY AND PROJECTION

She reminded me of a warning I was fond of repeating: *do not,* under *any* circumstances, belittle a work of fiction by trying to turn it into a carbon copy of real life; what we search for in fiction is not so much reality but the epiphany of truth.
- *Reading Lolita in Tehran* by Azar Nafisi (2004, p. 3)

Construction of Immersion and Empathy in Film Narrative

Sitting in a theater, the popcorn now gone and some scattered unwittingly on the floor, I stare at the screen. The other handful of people at this evening showing have disappeared and the only prominent figures are the characters on the screen. In the last hour and a half, I have watched them laugh and dance, throw food and play music. They have had intimate conversations while I have surreptitiously listened from my seat in the back middle of the theater. And when the fateful moment comes, when my heart beats in time with the lead on the screen and she weeps at her sister's death, I weep too. We have spent so much time together, it is as if I am her sister too, or maybe I am her, and it is my sister we are mourning. A mere thirty minutes later, the lights come up in the theater, I nod to my companion, a co-traveler in cinema experience, and we make our way to the exits as the credits roll past. While sharing a space, we have seeped into the diegetic world if only for a few hours to live into the lives of the characters on screen.

In order to frame the viewer's emotional draw to filmic narratives, I will briefly sketch out the components and rewards of immersion into a film before discussing the ability of film to evoke empathy from viewers. First, total immersion occurs when viewers essentially lose themselves in the film to the point where they will not notice other things around them (Bjørner, Magnusson, & Nielsen, 2016). Quantitative or

experimental studies often measure this by how readily a film watcher will respond to external stimuli like their name, or a non-filmic sound. How long that process takes for a viewer to find a connection and remain entranced in film viewing is difficult to measure or completely control. Instead, filmmakers rely on narrative components to hook viewers into identifying with the characters on the screen. Immersion can also occur through a narrative link that self-references the film industry or other current events (Elaesser, 2015). Emotional immersion, by juxtaposition, involves an emotional investment in the narrative (Bjørner et al., 2016). Where some have described film as a window into another world, emotional connection to a film is more transportive than a mere window. Film is not really a window or a mirror to the world; rather, it is a door or a portal to another world.

Compared to other narrative mediums such as novels or music, narrative film introduces an intrinsic reliance on bodies as a form of storytelling. While true of film broadly, silent films are particularly reliant on communication through body and gesture (Petersen, 2016). Film is a more physical form of thought expression as it relies on multiple sensory perceptions (Petersen, 2016). Sound, sight, and often the inclusion of tactile or haptic filmmaking challenge the audience to experience the scene with their whole bodies as a fully engaged conduit. Communication, especially through a haptic medium like film, is intensely tied to emotion (Petersen, 2016). Therefore, the sensory impact of film allows for viewers not only to immerse themselves within the context of the film but also to find connections with the characters on the screen. Where some written narratives give the reader glimpses into the mental and emotional state of the character, film has the ability to quite literally show the emotional ramifications on that

character instead of tell. Using active, responsive bodies on screen as a channel for viewer emotional response provides a deeper connection to the narrative context.

When immersion in a film is high, so too are the emotional connections (Visch, Tan, & Molenaar, 2010). There are two directions of emotion as they exist on the screen. The first is the representation of emotion, or where an actor displays an emotion that can be understood by the audience. Through our daily interactions, we develop schema for recognizing emotions felt by others. This schema helps us then interpret the emotions of the actors in a film (Feng & O'Halloran, 2013). While schema help viewer determination of the emotion portrayed, the viewer also simultaneously evaluates their perception of the character alongside their perception of the character portrayal (Seel, 2018). For example, when watching Saoirse Ronan play Jo in the most recent version of *Little Women* (Gerwig, 2019), the viewer may recognize her emotional devastation at the loss of her sister,[18] but they also evaluate her performance as an actress, assessing whether that devastation rings true. Second, film may prompt an elicited emotion or an empathic response to the events happening on the screen. Spectators take in the work through sensory connections and often also take on the emotional qualities imparted from the film (Seel, 2018). Aesthetics of cinema "raises the question of how *its* motion is or, rather, can be connected to *our* emotion" (Seel, 2018, p. 129). Thus the director's job is to aesthetically lure the audience into feeling the emotions they intend for the audience. In some ways, that emotion can be repulsion from the character. For example, while I as a viewer may recognize the emotion displayed by Joaquin Phoenix in *Joker* (Phillips,

[18] I don't feel bad about spoilers here. You've had 151 years to read the book or nearly a century to see any of the prior film iterations. Beth dies. Yes, I cried.

2019), I do not necessarily align my emotions the same way; I need not feel as the Joker feels. Instead, I may distance my emotions, finding repulsion in the Joker's actions rather than empathy. A director may well intend for that to be the audience reaction to a particular character act. Films that have strong antagonist roles use this technique. Conversely, directors may also work to create an antagonist that provokes an empathic response. If the audience can connect with the antagonist, then we have the strange experience of rationalizing their behavior, and even emoting with them despite their sometimes overtly evil actions. In *The Man in the High Castle*, we as an audience feel connected to both the Resistance ideologically, but empathize with the Nazi family plotline. Yet the tension between ideological abhorrence and compulsion to care for family and children leaves the viewer conflicted emotionally.

Directors may create empathetic connections with characters through specific filming techniques. In an effort to create close connections between characters and the audience, directors may use an "empathic shot" to put the audience very close to the character (Rushton, 2014). For example, a director may stage a shot/reverse shot to give the audience a chance to see the character's reaction up close, then the thing that they see from their perspective. The closer the shot, the more likely the audience is to catch the minutia of the reaction and feel emotionally closer to the character. Greta Gerwig does so exceptionally during Beth's death sequence in *Little Women* (2019). Over the course of the night, she shows two sisters and their mother fretting over the youngest March sibling. Yet half of these shots are "memories" replayed from Beth's prior illness. As time elapses, we see a close shot of Jo sleeping in a chair and waking to her sister's empty bed. She rushes down stairs calling for her mother who sits at the kitchen table. As

matriarch March moves (played by Laura Dern), she reveals Beth sitting on the other side of the table. Gerwig duplicates this scene immediately after in the present timeline.[19] A tight shot on Jo's face as she wakes, except this time, instead of letting the audience see Beth's empty bed, we remain in a medium shot on Jo as she moves to the stairs. Down she walks in a less frantic pace, to see her mother at the kitchen table. As a viewer, our wish is for mother March to turn and reveal Beth just as before. But instead, she turns and leans back to reveal an empty kitchen chair. The camera stays with Jo [shot] until the bottom of the stairs, turns to the kitchen table [reverse shot] to reveal the empty seat, then pivots back to Jo's reaction [shot]. This simple film technique essentially allows the audience to feel the same emotion as if they were the main character in that moment. Gerwig's camera work places us in Jo's shoes as she learns of her sister's death, then smartly remains on Jo's reaction so that we (Ronan and the audience) experience that loss together. Empathic projection then takes on the "suggestion of deep interior feeling, a depth that was sensed and projected by viewers" (Rushton, 2014, p. 312). For those of us who are well versed in Alcott's story, we know the youngest March sister dies over the course of the work, but the filmic work encourages us to buy into the narrative the same way we did reading it the first time.

Of course, while the audience may be moved to tears at the death of a beloved character, our emotional response is only a fabrication of what the experience may truly feel like. Empathic projection allows the viewer to try "stepping into someone else's

[19] The subtle difference here is Jo's hair length. In the first run of Beth's illness her hair is short, the second, long but pinned back. So they look different but only slightly- adding to the illusion of a repeat scenario.

shoes, but only imaginatively or projectively. It is never to actually *be* in those shoes, but is a matter of imagining what it *might be like* by way of projecting our own thoughts and feelings onto or into another person" (Rushton, 2014, p. 315). We imagine into being the experience of the character based on our immersion into the story. Empathy with a character takes on the character's psychological perspective through imagination which simulates a character's feelings (Bjørner et al., 2016). The connection that we form with the character and their filmic trials forms a broader connection to the film as a work. Unlike sympathy, empathy for a character encourages viewers to mirror the psychological drama of the film. As the Smith family drama unfolds in *The Man in the High Castle*, for example, the viewer finds more and more connection with Helen Smith, whose clear and persistent love for her children begins to cause friction with the standards of the Reich. As viewers find equal repulsion for the Reich methods, Helen's perspective becomes an appealing connection.

Ultimately, the influence of empathy for characters on the screen influences not only our emotional connection but also our evaluation of the film as a whole. As scholars, we have an impulse to look at film under strictly rational lenses, rather than lean into the emotional impact of film (Gerbaz, 2010). Instead, our evaluations can and should be influenced by the way that films make us feel as viewers; they work through pathos not just logos (Gerbaz, 2010). Allowing the impact of the film to wash over the viewer in its entirety surpasses the strictly intellectual engagement and influences viewers on a deeper level. Dependent on the narrative, films may influence particular ideological frames. War films in particular play to a sense of morality and sentimentality to be on the right side of history (Burnetts, 2016). Films depicting historically and emotionally charged topics like

World War II in the decades after pitch the war as a moral conflict much in the same way that the original propaganda did. Viewers buy into the moral intensity of which side is right and wrong and align their empathy with the soldiers who are fighting for good. When Clint Eastwood pivots that empathic connection to align with the Japanese soldiers in *Letters from Iwo Jima* (2006), viewers face an internal ideological conflict. The filmmaking draws viewers to empathize with Japanese soldiers, but historically recognize the moral tensions between the Allies and the Axis powers. Viewers must simultaneously empathize with the singular narratives of the specific soldiers and rationalize their deaths as part of the larger moral success. Burnetts (2016) further argues that postmodern film brackets emotions brought on by nostalgia. Under this frame, violence is the necessity evil to embrace democracy.

The magnitude and mass audience of film viewers permits a different kind of persuasive tactic. Where the emotional appeals are contingent on the level of performance and narrative, the distribution of film encourages unprecedented numbers of people to be reached by the same medium. Film essentially changed how artists were able to persuade audiences in mass (Petersen, 2016). With the new persuasiveness of film speaking directly to mass audiences, public opinion shifts with the attitudes of the audience rather than through reasoning (Petersen, 2016). The fact of massive audiences reacting to the emotional touchstones of the film enables artists to use pathos appeals to influence audience ideological standings. Manipulating empathic responses alters cognitive frameworks.

The challenging and ideologically fraught context of *The Man in the High Castle* provides a difficult plot to find empathetic connections with characters. While it is easy to identify with the Resistance, in particular Juliana for her work in uncovering the

regardless of their complicated and politically dubious allegiance.

Domestication of the Nazis

The first viewer introduction to Obergruppenführer Smith is through a militant and, frankly, frightening lens. He stands stoically in the raid on the first Resistance location as Joe makes a getaway, and later unflinchingly asks why one of the men taken captive was not still being beaten. Characteristically, he almost never raises his voice, opting instead for the calculating politician or disappointed father demeanor. Even his threats get posed as questions, or simple sentences rather than a snarling or screaming zealot. By contrast, both Hitler's and Himmler's vociferous screaming speeches and extreme volumes makes Smith's seemingly patient demeanor appear soothing. The difference casts him in a role where he comes across as even-keeled externally, but cradles an internal and hostile power that does not flinch at the prospect of torture or bodily harm. Within the first episode, it is abundantly clear that while Juliana and Frank are hopeful for a new and kinder world order, Obergruppenführer Smith is the clear arch-nemesis, one who is authoritarian, cruel, and without compassion. While he never seems to bloody his own hands at this juncture, it is obvious that in this space, his word is law and he is not a man to be trifled with or asked favors without something to give in return. His chilling external presence, lack of overt facial expressions, and the cutting whispers that he orders his men around with present him as a calculating sleaze only in service to the Reich.

Early in the second episode, however, the viewer sees Obergruppenführer in a new light. He sits at the breakfast table with his three children before they head off to school. In picturesque suburbia, his wife Helen clad in apron, serves a full breakfast for the busy doting family. The oldest, Thomas, who is about 16 and clearly a type-A student sits down across from his father clutching a history textbook. The family rule, as the middle child points out, is no textbooks at the table as it would disrupt family time. Thomas confesses that he wants to review so that he can get the highest score in the class instead of his obstinate anti-authoritarian classmate, Randall. In a true teaching moment, Obergruppenführer Smith asks why his son wants to get a better score than Randall. Thomas responds that he wants to make his "family proud" and to "serve my country." Admirably, he has directed his goals outward instead of for personal glory. Within the Reich, this is not only acceptable, it is the ideal. He has internalized messages of the state at the cost of his own interior voice, believing the rivalry between he and Randall to be an honor of state ideals rather than a personal rivalry for grades. Thomas, in his pristine, crisp Nazi youth uniform—a deliberate meld between Boy Scouts and his father's state-sanctioned plumage—has chosen correctly. He gets to keep his book at the table, but just this once. Coded in the packaging of a normal fatherly pep-talk is the state-sponsored message to do all things in the service of the state.

VA- Day.

For the first season, the separation of Obergruppenführer Smith's family life and his professional violence can remain distinct. He is successful by employing hostile tactics in his work on the Resistance and other less loyal operatives, but at home, he remains an unfaltering father. However, in his political game, his family plays a

particular piece. Iconographically, the domesticity of the Smith family[20] serves as an easy way to goad others into believing the domestic success of the family and therefore also let their guard down. The idyllic nature of the Smith family home on Long Island surrounded by neatly trimmed yards, white picket fences, and immaculate homes seduces both visitors and the audience into the easy American-dream simplicity of the scene. The 1950s version of utopia comes to life and features the mundane issues of "homework at the table" rather than the larger family squabbles. The power and potential of this perfect household is none better exemplified than how it operates during VA-Day, or Victory in the Americas Day. The holiday celebrations themselves appear to be much like the fourth of July including parades and backyard cookouts along with any number of public speeches or events. A patriotic holiday, the streets are lined with Nazi American flags[21] and Nazi American flag themed banners. Joe, invited to the Smith household for the celebrations, carries white lilies down a pristine sidewalk. Upon his arrival, Obergruppenführer Smith promptly introduces Joe to his wife Helen, who looks positively Betty-Crocker in a red dress with petticoats and a floral apron. She teases that Joe need not call her "ma'am," "I'm not your mother you can call me Helen," and then beckons the kids. In prompt fashion, all three arrive dressed for photographs. Both girls are in clean pressed plaid or checkered dresses, and Thomas wears his full Nazi youth regalia. They make introductions as a happy, well-fed golden lab bounds into the room.

[20] They have the most rudimentary white names you can imagine: John and Helen Smith, parents to Thomas, Jennifer, and Amy. They even have a golden lab name Max.
[21] These flags are basically the same red and white stripes except the 50 white stars on a blue background have been replaced with a white swastika instead. The American Reich armbands that most service persons wear including Obergruppenführer Smith are red and white striped with a black swastika in a center white circle.

The family has projected the perfect, unwavering image of the home-ideal. Everything Joe encounters down to tossing a baseball with Thomas suggests that they are the Nazi catalogue version of home life.

Obergruppenführer Smith suddenly announces that he has been tasked with picking up Helen's mother from the airport, and Joe sportingly tags along. There, they run into Obergruppenführer's old family friend, Rudolf Wegner, who we know to have just returned on his unsanctioned mission to the Japanese Pacific States where he gave blueprints of an atomic bomb to the Japanese Science Minister. Having his flight delayed, Rudolf accepts the Smith's offer of VA-Day hospitality, and the three return with the bad news that Helen's mother did not make their connecting flight. The now accumulated family and presumed political allies gather around a pristine and festive table set up in the backyard. There, as many conversations with intersections of life stories happen, Obergruppenführer Smith and Rudolf begin telling stories from their long history as friends. Helen gamely encourages the boasting and frivolity like a good hostess. All of this frivolity serves as a way for the political people present to let their guard down under the comforts of a secure and apparently loving home. Helen is genteel, the children are well behaved, and the conversation charming. Even for the viewer having seen Obergruppenführer Smith at work interrogating witnesses under the lash, and threatening political opponents, we begin to let our own guard down in willingness to follow the obvious American dream unfolding in this Nazi family.

As the VA-Day party unfolds and winds down, the three men are left discussing business in the living room. Wegner, for all of his esteem as a Nazi trade ambassador, clearly has regrets about the things that he committed during the war. He implicates John

Smith in the same way asking if he, too, feels remorse for the kinds of hostilities they committed both personally and as a party. Smith's response in true, almost iconic Nazi fashion is to fold to the pressures of the higher-ups. The differences in guilt and their relative actions lead the viewer to believe that Wegner has turned a corner, deliberately seeking peace without further bloodshed, and Smith's loyalty to the Reich continues to demand violence and results by any means necessary. Smith's loyalty eventually leads him to turn over his long-time friend Wegner for conspiracy based on his actions in the Pacific States. When Wegner's cab arrives, it is instead an armored transport to prison. Personal guilt succumbs to the outright party loyalty. One is punished, and the other rewarded in full esteem. The kicker happens when Joe asks how Smith knows of the treason, and Smith responds that it was the only reason they went to the airport. Helen's mother has been dead for years, the domestic only served as a willing pretext for Wegner's trap.

Later that night, Joe, set on finding out what secrets the Obergruppenführer has sequestered in a file with the same title as the man in the high castle film, dares to sneak into his home office for a peek. Of course, Joe is caught red handed opening the locked cabinet for the empty file. The domestic setting once more lured a well-meaning man into a dastardly trap. Joe and Wegner, both by believing that the home life of Obergruppenführer Smith would make him soft, were rewarded with a severe penalty. Smith, knowing well the seductiveness of a stable home and family can have on two men who do not have similar experiences, manipulated a celebratory day of family and good food to goad them into making critical errors in judgment. Both men misjudged Obergruppenführer Smith, and presumed that his sensitivity toward his wife and kids was

extended toward guests in the same house. The same walls that protect and harbor his family are dangerous to those who are there under false pretenses. Domesticity, while his family is complete and whole, makes for an easy tool to use on unsuspecting visitors. Joe's private life as we later will learn is full of dysfunction. Joe is the perfect Aryan lebensborn bred for the state but is brought up by a single mom desperate to escape the reach of Joe's father Martin Heussmann. His childhood and an equally dicey situation with his girlfriend and her child in New York positions Smith's family as an ideal for Joe that is only tangible through work with the Reich. Without the support and political clout of the party, the picturesque Smith family is as likely as a magazine advertisement. Rudolf Wegner, despite his guilty conscience, holds a similarly precarious family life. In his diplomatic work, he frequently leaves home, leaving behind a hostile wife and two young children. On the one visit we do see him make, his youngest will not even speak to him without prodding from his mother. Wegner's children, not much different in age from Smith's, bear a stark contrast to the whole family ideal presented in Long Island. Wegner's clearly failing marriage demonstrates the perceived outcomes of a flawed political belief. As a traitor to the cause, he must also fail in other aspects. A failure that Smith's party career cannot endure.

The Filmic Banality of Evil.

By this juncture, Smith's overwhelming normalcy appears not only as a token of the Nazi institution, but also at the service of his exceedingly normal family. Arendt's (2006) invocation of the "banality of evil" (Arendt, 2006, p. 252) rings true here as well. While she describes the 1960s trial of Eichmann, a low-level Nazi coordinator who had been found hiding in Argentina, Smith's position carries the same kind of traits.

Especially in the Long Island house, Obergruppenführer Smith plays the marital game of the happily married man with a demanding job in a nice neighborhood. Never mind the number of times that Nazi transport vehicles stop by the house, or the festooned officers that escort him to and from work. He adheres to Nazi policy, and that alone serves as a protective blanket for much of the first season. He is unmarred by the kinds of conscious guilt plaguing his peers, and therefore unquestioningly loyal. Arendt sums up her claims astutely here:

> The trouble with Eichmann was precisely that so many were like him, that the many were neither perverted nor sadistic, that they were, and still are, terribly and terrifyingly normal. From the viewpoint of our legal institutions and of our moral standards of judgment, this normality was much more terrifying than all the atrocities put together, for it implied--as had been said at Nuremberg over and over again but the defendants and their counsels--that this new type of criminal, who is an actual fact *hostis generis humani*, commits his crimes under circumstances that make it well-neigh impossible for him to know or to feel that he is doing wrong. (Arendt, 2006, p. 276)

Smith embodies all components described by Arendt. He follows the orders of his superior, he has a normal, happy family, and if you saw him in the street, you may even wave. The type of criminal that glides under the radar, so much so it is easy as a viewer to fall into the same emotional trap. He easily and readily follows the orders of his superiors regardless of the atrocities that it implies. While we know him to be the bad guy, maybe even evil incarnate, the emotional pull we feel for his family and personal life humanizes him beyond the scope of the job. He cannot be purely evil with a house

that perfect, or children that devoted to him. Our willingness to buy into the same family façade pulls at our hearts and dilutes our ability to hold the same man accountable for the atrocities he has committed in the name of the state. In fact, our allegiance to his family makes Thomas's plot line all the more potentially redemptive. The more we empathize with the plots of Helen and the kids, the more we hope that he will change, or not be the evil we suspect.

A Fracture in the Family Foundation: Thomas Diagnosed.

For all the safety and security of the Smith family home, Thomas's diagnosis with a genetic disorder fractures the family's security. Where before, the home had been a lure for corrupt men to come clean under the sanctity of a well-tempered home life, now the home front must be closed off and screened for any kind of potential damage. Thomas's genetic defect means that the state will have him eliminated under their eugenics policy regardless of his father's rank in the Reich. Dr. Adler, Thomas's diagnosing physician, tells Obergruppenführer Smith of his son's fate, and passes him a deadly drug cocktail intended for a peaceful passing at home rather than under the microscope of the state policy. Obergruppenführer Smith, keeping this information to himself, later returns the drug to Dr. Adler through injection instead. It is not until after the doctor's murder that Helen learns about Thomas's illness. Knowing that the doctor's death will likely be investigated, Obergruppenführer Smith begins a cover up campaign which both stifles the evidence against him for the murder, and he fabricates a method by which to smuggle Thomas out of the country under false pretenses in hopes that he will be able to live a normal life. Using state-sponsored means, even if they are fabrications, lends a veneer of professionalism to Thomas's trip. Outside of the house, the only thing that can continue

to protect him will be the empowerment of the state. A father, knowing that security for his only son lies in duping the state to ignore their own rules, gambles with the very substance that gave him power to do so. Most conversations about Thomas are confined to the walls of the house, but on the singular occasion that Helen barges into her husband's office at work, he must actively turn off all listening and recording devices to keep their son alive. He hushes Helen until he has safely disconnected the system and they speak in muffled tones about their son's future. The scene itself pivots between shot and reverse shot frames that intentionally take Helen's perspective when talking to her husband. Where he sits on his desk, the camera looks up at him, but looks at her straight on rather than from his perspective.

Figure 43 The Man in the High Castle still S2E6- Helen confronts John in his office

Subtly, the camera work encourages the viewer to step into Helen's shoes, seeking her reaction at the elaborate plan John has put in place to surreptitiously save their son. At the most vulnerable moments that the camera pivots from her reaction, her profile stays in

the frame, close enough that John’s downward glance includes her and the camera. With each turn in John’s plan, it is less the plan that we as viewers should respond to, but the heartbreak written on Helen’s face. By the time John suggests that Thomas be “kidnapped by Semites,” the camera slowly zooms in on her face, drawing us closer to her emotional response.

Figure 44 The Man in the High Castle still S2 E6- Helen's teary reaction to the plan to kidnap their son

Hearing John’s curt explanation of their son’s new life in exile, the camera remains with Helen, focusing a tight shot on her revelation and emotional distress.

Figure 45 The Man in the High Castle still S2 E6- Helen cries with John in background

Recognizing the severity of the single saving step they are willing to take, the camera focuses on Helen's teary profile while John leans on the windowsill in the background. The camera has forced the viewer to ignore the ideological evils of the Reich and instead simplifies the conversation away from the swastikas and Nazi regalia to the hard conversation between parents. Of course, the conversation simply reacts to the evils of the regime, but in this moment, we viewers are positioned to mourn with Helen instead of lamenting the cruelty of the state. This is the image of parents stuck making an impossible decision for their teenage son, one no parent should have to consider.

Thomas's illness must be kept under wraps, especially from the new asylum-seeking Juliana. She becomes a ward of the Smiths and dutifully plays the role of novice learning about the Reich for the first time. Much to Helen's disapproval, she is invited to family dinner. There, the family continues to perform the ideal household even under the cloud of foreboding. The two girls ask questions about living in the Japanese Pacific

States, and Juliana teases answers back. Initially, Helen is alarmed that the girls would ask about stereotypical assumptions and would appear impolite, but Juliana plays back and the dinner conversation settles to a tentative but easy pace. Juliana only discovers Thomas's illness by mistake when he has a mild seizure at the funeral for Dr. Adler. She catches him before he falls down the stairs and almost immediately is sworn, or rather, pressured to secrecy. Juliana will remain the key to both the Reich and Thomas discovering what is wrong. Her dormitory housing has been wired for surveillance, so when Thomas arrives seeking answers, he is caught on camera. She demurs that his family loves him and he should ask his parents, but the damage has already been done. The Reich has video feed, and Thomas has more questions.

As the signs of Thomas's illness progress, he takes agency for himself, looking for reasons in his father's medical encyclopedia. Soon, he stumbles upon something that resembles his symptoms and confronts his parents. Sitting together in the study, they confess to him that he has a form of muscular dystrophy and that his symptoms will get worse. His first response, and one demanded by the state is "I'll be a useless eater. I'm defective" (S2E10). What was a productive slogan for the state suddenly has personal implications. The same system that his father has devoted countless hours to will destroy their son, and he knows it, too. Hours after that seemingly tender family moment confronting the future head on, Obergruppenführer is called to Berlin. Under the wrath of Helen, who is nearly unhinged trying to confront the possibility of losing her son, John packs his bag and walks out the door. By the end of the day, a live broadcast shows Obergruppenführer Smith receiving an award for discovering and stopping the traitor Martin Heussmann from launching World War III. There in the astonishingly large

coliseum, praised by tens of thousands of people, Obergruppenführer accepts his reward from the state. Simultaneously, across the world, Thomas has dressed in his best suit, slipped on a Nazi arm band, and signed over his rights to the paramedic at the door. He says a calm farewell to his mother and walks to the medical van as Helen screams and wails held back in the arms of two soldiers. Thomas has committed to the rules of the state without question, and the home life of the Smith family will never be the same.

As a viewer it is hard to watch the scene of Thomas walking out to the medical van. His mother, someone we know to be complicit in the methods of the Nazis and silent when it comes to confronting her husband's work, weeps openly on her front step. It is hard not to feel a twinge of pain, a stab of empathy on Helen's behalf as we imagine the indescribable heart-rending agony it must be to watching your son sign his own state-sponsored death certificate. It's harder still to remember that Thomas up until this point has been nothing but the idealistic Nazi youth, everything the state has aspired for him to be. He studies hard, worships his father, and knows all the commandments of the Reich by heart, and yet his body failed him. Had he been well, he would have very easily grown up to be the same kind of violent calculating pawn of the Reich, he would likely condone torture, seek violent retribution, and coldly eliminate even his closest allies at the behest of the state. But a clean-cut sixteen-year-old kid walking to his death leaves us with nothing but pity for his misguided beliefs, and the visible pain of his mother. We cannot focus on the potentiality of Thomas as the perfect emblem of the state because we feel so terribly for the loss of a young life. Part of the viewer's emotional response to Thomas's narrative is recognizing the untenable stance of the Reich's willingness to kill even the most ideologically loyal of their ranks. Thomas's illness overshadows his potential for

productivity in society. Like Juliana in her refusal to let the Resistance capitalize on the Smith family weakness, we too choose to view Thomas as an innocent victim of a hostile state, and not a willing accomplice to their atrocities.

Grieving of State Martyr.

During season three, the Smith family attempts to deal with the loss of Thomas and manage the pressures of the state. Heralded as a martyr for Thomas's personal willingness to adhere to the letter of the law at the expense of his own life, the state lauds his memory with ornate memorial services, commissioned portraits, and propaganda documentaries. The first episode places a grieving, intoxicated mother into a state-sponsored ceremony to commemorate Thomas as a martyr. Instead of losing face for their son's disorder, he has become the poster-child of sacrifice. Willing to give up his own life at the service of the state, Thomas makes himself an icon, an emblem for Nazi youth to revere. Thus at this ceremony, Reichsmarschall George Lincoln Rockwell[22] gives a eulogy for Thomas that describes his sacrifice and what that means in the service of the state. Nicole, filming the entire production from an elevated platform, captures the moment of reverence. As Rockwell finishes his speech and reveals a large portrait of Thomas on the state, Amy, the youngest Smith child stands at attention and salutes her brother's image. Slowly, other Nazi youth stand to salute Thomas until even the adults join. The last to stand are John and Helen, clinging to each other in a midst of lofted arms. The state and the community have recognized Thomas's selflessness, but of course recognition does not conquer grief. The remainder of the season wrestles with the forces

[22] Yes, this is his name. Yes, he is the Reichsmarschall before Smith takes over the position.

of familial grief and the will of the state. Helen, at the nexus of this contention, struggles to cope with her grief while also providing a healed mask for the state.

In an effort to find healing, Helen begins to go to therapy. The devout Jungian[23], Dr. Ryan (played by Jeffrey Nordling), attempts to have her focus on the loss of her son. Helen's attempt at absolving her own mental health and seeking comfort in talking to a psychiatrist plays to our personal sense of normalcy. She clearly needs help, and going to a medical professional seems an apt way of doing so. The ways that she expresses and manages her grief including bouts of rage, unchecked tears, and sullenness ring true to our own depictions of grief. Where earlier she seemed the depiction of cold housewife, now Helen is three-dimensional. She is authentically maternal on screen, at least in the grieving of her son. What is striking about Chela Horsdal's portrayal of Helen is that it runs counter to the typical demonization of Nazis as cold-hearted evil-doers capable of immeasurable evil. Where Helen attempts to reign in her clearly emotional response, her husband's grief parallels the more stereotypical emotional range of a Nazi: cold, calculating, robotic, and most importantly numb to feelings. Decades of crafting an easily detestable straw figure in this form makes Helen's sensitive teary portrayal especially in the second and third seasons jarring. Rather than steely calculation, she expresses genuine care for her family. The juxtaposition between the expectation of steel-cast Nazi and the properly grieving mother places the viewer at an intersection: we must modify our

[23] Note that Carl Jung gets revered as an Aryan as opposed to Freud. The only way that Dr. Ryan continues to practice is through the blessing of the Reich, and that means selecting hereditary esteem over practical advice. So while the state permits Helen's visit to Dr. Ryan, the content is constantly questioned for loyalty to the state. Her "emotional deviance" is scrutinized in this place, but condoned so long as she does not question state policy. Any patriotic deviance would devastate the already shaky Smith ship.

visions of villainous Nazis, or we must accept our own callousness to Thomas's death. Helen's authentic emotional response to the death of her son suggests that our view of Nazis is either incorrect or incomplete. The sheer emotionality of Helen's (Chelah Horsdal's) performance draws us into an unsuspecting, and sometimes unwilling, sense of empathy for her loss. By countering the stereotypical embodiment of Nazi demeanor through Helen's loss, we have an empathetic response, considering her a mother first, and a victim of the state second rather than a forceful state mechanism.

The second mechanism of the state aims to claim Thomas as a martyr rather than a victim. During his memorial service, a propaganda camera crew hovers over the audience to capture the spontaneous reverence for the high school boy. The state-run memorial noticeably distances the tactile grief of the family into a more manageable, regulated, and made-for-distribution message. In the film, shown later at a similar grandiose state function, we do not see Helen grappling with alcoholism, her contentious therapy sessions, or the depressive mornings where she struggles to emerge from her darkened room. Nor do we see the more understated grieving of John, who throws himself into his work and spends sleepless nights searching for glimpses of his son on man in the high castle reels. Rather, the state has capitalized on his death for national purposes, ignoring the necessary grieving of the family. Repeatedly, Himmler reminds then Reichsmarschall Smith that he must get his home life under control; otherwise, it will reflect poorly on the state. It is clearly in the state's best interest for the controlled, even icy image of the Reich citizen to remain intact. A crack in the façade, or Helen's noticeable grief, is a credible threat to the upper echelons of the Reich. After all, a failing family leads to perceptions of a failing Reich.

Finding 'American' in the American Reich.

Over the course of the show there are several juxtapositions of the superior state in Berlin and the Americanized Reich. The grandiose nature of the rebuilt Berlin focuses on the elaborate and the domineering. The roundabouts going up to the capital are expansive and surround an impressive sculpture; the coliseum venue that Himmler fills for Obergruppenführer Smith fits probably close to 150 thousand people. The visual confirmation of the seat of the empire conveys a sense of enormous power, far beyond the cramped streets of New York City. While the government building in New York is visible, even noticeable, it is one of many crowding the skyline as opposed to the singular monolith structure of the capital in Berlin. In similar frame as the architecture, the demeanor of Nazi officials varies in accordance with their location. Those in Berlin are reserved, dogmatic, and austere, while the faction of the American Reich seems to be more congenial, temperate, and never up to Berlin's standards. The obvious counters to both Reich locations are those stationed in the Pacific States as ambassadors. These officers are crass, fraternity boyish, and simple by comparison. Given the subtle differences, the separation between Berlin and New York creates a chasm of belief. The New York personnel, while still cruel and undeniably members of the Reich, appear less austere, less elite than those in Berlin.

The same differences play in the family contexts and personal interactions of the varying citizens. Where the Smith family projects a sense of normalcy through their white-picket fence home in Long Island, Wegner's family has a distanced and austere quality. His wife avoids him (so does his younger child) while his older daughter, whimsical in her solitude, occupies her time with cross-stitching instead of the more

social activities of the Smiths. Wegner, still holding a prestigious position in the Reich, cannot make the same kinds of interpersonal connections as Smith has with his family. He is an outsider, unconnected to the family home base, which loosens his political ties to the Reich, and ultimately makes him expendable in the eyes of the state. John Smith by comparison must remain tied to his wife and prodigy, even at the expense of the emotional distress from hiding his grief. The implicit value of family in the Reich helps to normalize the actions of the political climbers as the narrative shows them both in hostile work environments and the domesticated sphere.

Year Zero.

As Himmler takes over as Reichsführer (played by Kenneth Tigar), the new propaganda push for Nicole (played by Bella Heathcoate) is to essentially wipe the slate clean of American history. They spin a campaign for "Jahr Null" or Year Zero.[24] In this campaign, the goal is to obliterate all Americana icons and either replace them or leave them as dust to create a platform for a future that does not include American historical influence, but only relies on the history of the Reich. Nicole, brilliant in her propagandist work, pitches the idea of filming the demolition of iconic artifacts and the subsequent rise of Reich approved works. The first indication is as she films a group of muscled men sledgehammering what appears to be a former sculpture. She directs the camera to be

[24] There is a 1949 Roberto Rossellini film entitled (English translation) *Germany Year Zero* that describes Berlin immediately after the end of the war. While an exceedingly dark perspective, the contrast that this film provides to *The Man in the High Castle* optimism should be noted. Rossellini's frame depicts a struggling family who cannot put food on the table except through theft or the black market, costing them their lives. *The Man in the High Castle* iteration deals less with the physical fall of a city and more with the ideological build.

taken off the stand, and to get in the middle of the rubble, to feel the kinetic energy of the destruction, and to "shoot up" at the men to make them look heroic. This is a behind the scenes take on how to make the destruction of priceless work look majestic. Of course the filmic destruction of national monuments is not new. As early as 1927, Russian director Sergei Eisenstein crafted an opening scene of his famed work *October* that built on the kinetic energy of a hostile crowd dismembering the statue of the Czar in the town square. Nichole's work by comparison minimizes the frenetic energy of the people, and capitalizes on the stoic and monolithic power of the state. She aims to demonstrate the contribution of people to the state apparatus, rather than the power of the individual. Scattered throughout the third season, and between Nicole's nightly dalliances with reporter Thelma Harris (played by Laura Mennell), the Reich prepares for the grandiose display of the demolition of the Statue of Liberty.

The first major destruction is the demolition of the iconic Liberty Bell. With a crowd of elite, uniformed onlookers and Nicole's camera crew, the one-ton Bell is hoisted over a smoldering mold, melted, and poured into a new, separate mold: a large swastika. Himmler stands to the side proclaiming in his native German, "fantastic" in a sense of reverential awe. The second, and far more bombastic, destruction is that of the Statue of Liberty. Late one night, with a yacht full of Nazi elite including Himmler, now Reichsmarschall Smith, and a chorus of Nazi youth, the military scale operation begins. Himmler's parting words to the crowds include a futuristic message, "Those who will anchor you to the past must be eliminated to make room for the new. Führer's gift to you- a new beginning. Jahr Null" ("Jahr Null", S3 E10). Nicole begins rolling the cameras and Smith gives the cues to the pilots who fly in formation to swoop around Lady Liberty,

leaving red and white trails behind them, and an exuberant "An die Freude" (or "Ode to Joy" as sung in German) plays in the soundtrack.[25] As they dive a second time, the base of the monument blows out, tottering as Liberty tilts and crashes into the harbor. Her welcoming torch breaks from her hand and skids across the water creating a massive wave that nearly connects with the yacht. Of course, it stops, and sinks to the depths of the harbor. Liberty has welcomed her last batch of "huddled masses"; freedom means something different now.[26]

Amid the frivolity, there are deadly undercurrents. As Reichsmarschall, Smith is expected to bring his family with him to all public events. Helen and the girls have left unexpectedly, and Himmler is greatly disappointed with the failures of the Smith household to uphold decorum. In a different betrayal, Nicole, recently caught with her girlfriend Thelma in a lesbian club, faces the consequences of Himmler's wrath in full public view. While the display and her filming goes off without a hitch, she is called to him as he orders her escorted away for mandatory re-education for "perversion." She, an esteemed lebensborn and prodigious director for the Nazi propaganda machine, cannot escape the wrath for her evidently deviant sexuality. The amount of work she does visibly

---

[25] Interestingly, while written by a German poet, the most famous adaptation of Schiller's work is in the chorus of Beethoven's *Ninth Symphony*. The tune later became the "Anthem of Europe" in 1972. The same tune has been played as anthem and protest ranging from Pinochet's dictatorship, Tiananmen Square, and the fall of the Berlin Wall (Gold, 2013).

[26] In our own dystopic political landscape, senior White House policy advisor Stephen Miller also framed Lady Liberty and her sonnet pedestal as an addendum to the original bronze work. While true that the poem was added in physical form to the statue in 1903, 17 years after the statue became a fixture in the harbor, Emma Lazarus (poet) wrote the work to raise funds for the pedestal (Stark, 2017). Her sonnet, "The New Colossus" shares a title with Season 3 Episode 5, which is actually not the episode that begins Jahr Null or marks the destruction of The Statue of Liberty.

and publically supporting the Reich does not nullify her private infractions. Even as a direct and purposeful product of the Reich as a lebensborn, she is declared faulty, and must be "re-educated" through torture tactics and Reich lessons. She may be capable of producing media to represent the mission of the Reich, but as her authentic bisexual self cannot be a worthy representation, and must therefore be corrected.

Jahr Null as an event does something striking to memory. It attempts a public and state-enforced method of forgetting. The simple rewriting of history books, re-captioning of photographs, or passing on alternative oral histories is not enough. Instead, there must be a mass demolition of the past, to wipe the slate clean for a new, more worthy history to take its place. As the people from the yacht make their way to the landside party, there are people rioting in the streets. They torch cars, loft Nazi banners, and beat anyone who stands in their way. Smith speaks to Himmler suggesting that they send some armed forces in to minimize destruction. Himmler's response is to let it happen, after all, "this is their night to express their passions." The riots have targeted institutions of memory. They have attacked and looted museums and set fire to the public library. Himmler, instead of calling the fire department, says to "let it burn. People need to be reminded who to fear" (S3 E10- "Jahr Null"). This suggests a pivot, to fear not eras of accumulated knowledge, or written works, but rather to fear those willing to do damage, to do violence in the name of an idea. The crowd of rioters down the street continue to chant "blood and soil" as they remind observers what it is to fear the nationalist agenda.

Though this season debuts in 2018, the violent chanting of "blood and soil" alongside heavy Nazi banners and torch wielders, looks more recent than stills from the 1930s and 40s. It looks like Charlottesville 2017.

Figure 46 The Man in the High Castle still S3 E10- Jahr Null riots

With modern political tensions surrounding the push for removal of Confederate statues and monuments, *The Man in the High Castle* push for a state-cleansed history hits a striking note. On the one hand, advocacy for removal of memorabilia and commemorative landmarks that champion a painful and racist past aims to acknowledge and shift modern ideological discourse. By taking down Confederate statues, it signals a purposeful turn from racist monumentalism toward (hopefully) a more equitable future. Jahr Null in its formation intends not only an ideological shift, but one that removes all of American history in one fell swoop. To erase national ideologies through demolition of national icons intensifies a need to avoid any rebellious "boot-strap" and "revolutionary" tendencies of the population. A "clean slate," while maybe tempting, ignores the elements that have set a foundation for all future political enterprises. Jahr Null additionally relies on adopting the European-German understandings of the world, pivoting away from the role of the United States in all prior World Wars. In a purely

Reich context, it represents a token of forgiveness for their former enemies. Restarting the clock in any capacity shuns all prior historical frames and ideologies. So while destruction of Confederate monuments demonstrates a turn from the past, the Charlottesville rioters also desperately cling to an alternative ideological and historical narrative.

Conclusion

The empathic project that encourages the viewer to take on the perspectives of those on the screen cannot be limited to empathy for the good guys. In fact, as the series wears on, the most compelling character becomes Helen Smith, who desperately seeks subtle ways to thwart the Reich for the loss of her son. She changes her ideology and faith in the Reich which we feel more readily because of the empathy-inducing cinematography. Intensifying the relationship between viewer and character/performance through camera work holds serious sway over the ways an audience will respond to the inlaid message of the film. Without Helen's change in belief, the same camera techniques will lure an audience into empathizing for a character while disregarding their ideological pitfalls. And perhaps, this is teaching compassion, a recognition of humanity and emotional pain over disagreements on what is morally right or wrong. Of course here, it is easy to connect with a stereotypical, devoted mother and her plight surrounding her child's death. While we see Helen buy into the Nazi ideology implicitly, we do not see her act out the kinds of policy aggressions and violence that her husband does. In this way, Helen is the standard, the innocuous banality that permits the system to continue, and still we long to empathize with her. For all the empathy we build for characters on

the screen, the danger of implicitly adhering to ideology at the behest of the state remains just under the surface.

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS, AND THE FEAR OF RETURN

> We undress, strip off our layers
> and plunge into the hot tub. *Hate has been unleashed,* Daughter No. 1 says.
> Daughter No. 2 says that we must withstand it because it's our turn now.
> *But I don't like it. I want to understand. How did this happen?*
> *What can we do?* Daughter No. 3 says.
> *Everything is changing.* The mothers are quiet.
> This is their world now, we think. We don't want to intrude.
> Daughter No. 3 says she's frightened. She wakes up in her sleep.
> *What will we do in the face of the vile and vengeful? How will we*
> *live in a world without ethics? Why has the clock turned back*
> *instead of forward?* It won't do. We fire up the hot tub.
> -excerpt from the poem "Hot Tub After Skiing, December, 2016" by Jill Bialosky

*The Man in the High Castle'*s capacity for provoking audience thought through time-warped images and empathetic characterization makes it an insightful and provoking artifact. Where audiences encounter alternative history compressed into a format that both heightens the instability of images and endorses our emotional reliance on them, so, too, does it tamper with memory reliance. Already unstable imagery flits back and forth for viewers trying to grapple with the believability of the images before their eyes. *The Man in the High Castle*, while forty hours of complicated tensions in alternative history, also only scratches the surface of potential implications for filmic work as it relates to historical accuracy and memory. For my purposes here in this chapter, I aim to illuminate how elements from my earlier analysis can operate in film work outside of this artifact.

Edelweiss and Projection

The only true consistent theme present in every episode is the title sequence filled with hints of film projection, which directs the viewer to cue into thematic elements.

While not unique to the entirety of the show, elements of historical allusions and filmic instability shine through the title sequence for the show. The show theme begins with an ominous click of a film scrolling through a projector. As it builds up speed, a dreary downbeat version of *Edelweiss* performed by Jeanette Olsson. The lyrics, originally written for *The Sound of Music* by Richard Rodgers and Oscar Hammerstein read in part as played in the title sequence:

> Edelweiss, edelweiss every morning you greet me.
>
> Small and white, clean and bright, you look happy to meet me.
>
> Blossom of snow may you bloom and grow, bloom and grow forever.
>
> Edelweiss, edelweiss, bless my homeland forever.[27]

While not exclusively creepy, the title sequence relies on imposing contrasting images on familiar objects using iconic landscapes and national monuments as projection screens. Ranging from Mount Rushmore in South Dakota[28], to the Statue of Liberty, to the Golden Gate bridge, each serves as a surface for a projector to cast alternative moving shadows.

---

[27] A little etymology- the name edelweiss derives from the combination of two German words: "edel" meaning noble, and "weiß" meaning white. Make what you will of that. The tune itself however is neither a "Nazi" song, nor an "Austrian folk tune," it was written for the musical for the dashing Captain von Trapp to sing as a loyalty pledge to Austria after the Nazis had taken over the local government. Chronologically, this could not have been a Nazi anthem because Rodgers and Hammerstein did not write it until 1959 for the Broadway debut of *The Sound of Music.*

[28] I think it important to note here that while we may recognize Mount Rushmore as a national icon for its impossibly large presidential portraits, it comes at the destruction of the Six Grandfathers (a Sioux name) mountain face which has been sacred to Indigenous peoples for much longer.

Figure 47 The Man in the High Castle still- Title sequence, Mount Rushmore Parachutists

In almost every title shot, an off screen light source streams into the image, casting shadows of unlikely combinations. Here, a series of parachutes fall down the side of George Washington's face like tears. His eyebrow hides a propeller-driven fighter plane presumably dropping the airborne troops. However, we only see their images, not their physical substance, reinforcing the projected sense of the real. The sequence continues with similarly crafted shots of the Statue of Liberty stuck in a projected plume of smoke, then a close up of her gown harboring a fleet of ships. By air or by sea, Lady Liberty gets caught in the crossfire of an illuminated landscape.

Figure 48 The Man in the High Castle still- Title sequence, Statue of Liberty in smoke

Figure 49 The Man in the High Castle still- Title sequence Statue of Liberty ships

Importantly, these icons of the United States become physically implicated in the war imagery. On the behest of the state, troops roll out of planes, paddle through rough waters, and potentially crash, all for patriotic ideals. Where projection works in these

images as a way to demonstrate implications and link the title sequence to other events in the show such as the "man in the high castle" films, the strangeness of the projection surface obscures the images just enough to inhibit any direct linkage to historical footage. The ships look militaristic in formation, and in quantity enough to mimic the landing at Normandy Beach, but without further identifying information, they remain emblematic rather than referencing a specific event. Similarly, the falling parachutists on Mount Rushmore, the plane, and the parachutes mimic models from the early 1940s, but without a concrete identifier, they remain as an allusion to the war. The grainy quality of the projection blends into the rough rock face, blurring the distinction between the filmic and the tactile.

The only time the sequence strays from the specific monument is when using a still sculpted eagle icon in flight while projecting a Nazi Eagle clutching a wreath and swastika.

Figure 50 The Man in the High Castle still- Title sequence, double eagle

Initially, the second illuminated eagle gets obscured by the physical form of the eagle in flight. Recognizing the projection light, the movement of the camera and shift of the light projection clears the illumination in the second image.

Figure 51 The Man in the High Castle still- Title sequence, double eagle projection

Now instead of recognizing two separate eagles and patterning their national references, they have seamed into one icon. The separation between a presumably “American” symbol and a “Nazi” symbol in the first shot demonstrates the difference between the physical and the projected; one is in artistic motion, and the other in a stagnant glaring light. But the second image shifts that recognition to the point it is harder to distinguish between the two. The new eagle in concrete form has less artistic movement, and the light literally paralyzes the sculpture. Where one tried to escape, the second has been immobilized by projection, frozen by film. While the swastika is still obscured at the eagle’s feet, it is clear enough that to impose the opposed understandings of what the

eagles symbolize. The once two contrasting eagles have through a projection become one.

The diegetic clicking that accompanies the beginning of the title sequence mirrors the same sounds as each man in the high castle viewing. The clicking reel of a projector cues that guide the viewer to think “this is a film and not reality,” making the title sequence a microcosm of what to expect in the show writ large. Through the title sequence, the viewer understands the ideological tensions and filmic interludes that the show will contain. It overlaps the real and the reel, making it difficult to disambiguate between what we know and what we see. We can recognize Mount Rushmore, but have to recontextualize or reinvestigate whether or not paratroopers ever cascaded down the stony rock face.[29] In some capacities, the additional framing device of the projector reel that prefaces the title sequence obscures for the viewer the fictional quality of the show. The same sound cues often historical footage, leading the viewer to blur the distance between the filmic real, and the filmic fiction. In a narrative that shifts boundaries between historical facts and fiction through projection.

Allusions

Allusion as they appear in *The Man in the High Castle* reference historical elements that bleed into the diegetic space of the fictional world. Viewers experiencing allusions such as the historical footage that Juliana watches in season 1 episode 1, must consciously disambiguate what has happened within the diegetic world and within the extradiegetic space. Toeing the line between believability and fiction challenges the

[29] And unless you are Cary Grant or Eva Marie Saint, you really shouldn’t climb or parachute down Mount Rushmore (Hitchcock, 1959).

viewer to hold both premises simultaneously, flitting between fictional and functional realities. Allusions such as those with the attempted assassination of the Japanese Crown Prince draw realistic connections in the fictive world to historical events without direct imagery. The uncertainty of image only exacerbates the already unstable diegetic understanding. Viewers rely on their accumulated visual knowledge in order to help untangle the things they witness on the screen without any certainty that the remembered images are historically accurate. Allusions appear as implicit references to historic or other earlier filmic events as a way to connect or imply similar emotionality and affects of that prior iteration. The Crown Prince assassination attempt brings with it the fear and uncertainty both politically and personally of the Kennedy assassination through visual references to a pink kimono, and a second shooter. Allusions then both operate on an intellectual level and an emotional one, playing on the affects from previous images.

Allusions as they appear in historically based films have the ability to skew the understanding of the work or at least make new and nuanced interpretations. Implementing historical or historical adjacent narratives into film productions not only reaches a broader audience than the average history textbook but also reaches a younger audience. Films have the ability to reach through history to younger viewers without the same baggage as personal stories passed down through generations. Even autobiographical texts such as *Maus (I and II)* by Art Spiegleman question the mediation of narrative as passed through generations, and the painful prodding of memory. The legacy of film breaches the confines of generational memory by reaching third and fourth generations organically, or at least in the same form the earlier generations encountered it. This allows for viewers such as my aforementioned student to find solace in a Michael

Bay movie because of the perceived historical accuracy and emotionality embodied in the film. The ability for historical hints and allusions to influence the way that audiences perceive and understand history should be further questioned for its impact on viewer understanding of memory.

Younger generations consuming historically framed films allows for a skewed sense of historical accuracy. The believability of film as an authentic representation of fact permits novice viewers who may not have the educational background to distinguish fact from fiction, the emotional persuasiveness encourages viewers to buy into the narratives regardless of verifiable fact. Without the background knowledge to parse out the factual from the realistic, viewers are dangerously susceptible to replacing history with an emotional connection to the characters on the screen. Wanting to connect to characters and accepting emotional trials as historical nuance, unsuspecting viewers are duped into a false sense of historicity. The then viewer memory as they recall the film prompts them to circulate the film as a prosthetic for lived history (Landsberg, 2004). The same core memory gets replicated within the minds of the viewer as a piece of their personal memory, regardless of the veracity of the narrative. After all, "memories do not exist as a closed system; they are always already affected, strengthened, inflected, modified, and polarized by other memories and by impulses to forget within the context of a given social reality" (A. Assmann, 2016, p. 6). So individuals as they personally compile their memories do so in the same capacity as their filmic memories.

As film has the ability to impact audiences emotionally, the combined potency of audience memory and the empathetic connection to characters on the screen makes for a dangerous combination. Audiences, lured in by the character connection, take on the

kinds of emotional ties that impact later decisions. In *The Man in the High Castle*, building empathy for the Smith family directly reflects audience likelihood of sympathizing or even empathizing with a similar ideological frame. As Rushton describes, “Sympathetic emotions may also encourage critical thought about social and political conditions” (Rushton, 2014, p. 311). Blurring the distinction between the historical evils and the plight of Helen Smith makes it challenging for the audience to hold both factual and fictional connections simultaneously. Empathy with a character has the ability to leak into sympathy for a movement, and in this case, a movement that dangerously replicates state endorsed genocide.

In the last year of award winning movies,[30] I believe there to be two prime examples of how allusions come to fruition and complicate audience reaction. These examples are by no means the only examples with in the last year, but they are two that have been recognized on a national scale and circulated widely, making them an accessible starting point for future discussions about the impacts of allusions in cinema. First, I will discuss the double elements in *Once Upon a Time in Hollywood* (Tarantino, 2019) for its inclusion of not only a historical setting and implied parallel plotline, but also the technological ability to impose modern actors into historic Hollywood footage. Second, I will discuss the use and reframing of Hitler as the imaginary friend of a ten-year-old boy in *Jojo Rabbit* (Waititi, 2019). Both films, while strikingly different in tone and concept, I think both imply memory frames that the viewer must negotiate in order to best interpret the film.

[30] We’re talking 2019.

Once Upon a Time in Hollywood

In the most recent wash of Academy Awards season, Tarantino's latest film took a typical stand in the major category nominations including Best Picture. *Once Upon a Time in Hollywood* depicts the story of a washed up actor, Rick Dalton (played by Leonardo DiCaprio) and his stunt double Cliff Booth (played by Brad Pitt) as they go about their lives in a 1969 Hollywood. Tarantino's inclusion, however, parallels this guy-friend film with the timeline of the Manson murders. For the unaware viewer, references to Spahn Ranch and Sharon Tate are merely a backdrop for the clearly more pertinent plotline of Rick Dalton's collapsing career. For others, who have either read or seen a variety of chronicles documenting the Manson murders, even the inclusion of Sharon Tate (played by Margot Robbie) evokes a sense of pending doom and general unease. Tarantino, creating an entirely fictional character premise, manages to include historical frames to evoke a sense of studio system nostalgia and hypersensitivity to landmark events. While he does not cave to the same historical pressures,[31] he does manage to craft a narrative that relies on allusion for emotional impact. Tarantino also includes a strange scene that references Rick Dalton's previous audition for a famous Steve McQueen movie, *The Great Escape* (Sturges, 1963). Rather than have his actor Leonardo DiCaprio simply recite some of the script in a similar costume, he digitally reanimates a pertinent

[31] SPOILER ALERT: The end of the film flips the assumed death of Sharon Tate in favor of a gore-tastic home invasion gone wrong. Tarantino lets Sharon live, and the two washed up actors defend their home in graphic glory. No, this is not how the Manson murders really went down, but it's an interesting subversion of history. If you want a perspective on how the Manson murders were influenced by 1950s-60s Hollywood, I highly recommend Karina Longworth's podcast *You Must Remember This*. She has a 12 episode series on this topic alone (Longworth, n.d.).

scene with Rick Dalton imposed over the image of Steve McQueen. For the average movie buff, rugged bad boy Steven McQueen is an easily recognizable name and catalogue. However, imposing an equally well known actor, Leonardo DiCaprio, into the 1963 scene creates a flash of a previous, or maybe alternate timeline where DiCaprio takes on McQueen's roles instead. The production team used the same footage from *The Great Escape,* then reshot DiCaprio using the same lenses and angles on a green screen, to impose him later in the 1963 footage (Guerrasio, 2019). This historical backdrop of the film only enhances the allusion and technological layering makes it possible to imply two versions.

Jojo Rabbit

Another 2019 Oscar contender Waititi's *Jojo Rabbit* frames historical figures in a new and imaginative way. Here, a ten-year-old boy, Jojo (played by Roman Griffin Davis) in 1945 Berlin has Hitler (played by Taika Waititi) as an imaginary friend. While pitched as a black comedy, the imagery of Hitler through the doe eyes of a ten-year-old spins the typical sentiment of the leader of the Third Reich. The audience sees Hitler wearing funny hats, hiding in Jojo's bed, and bantering with Jojo in an almost cartoonish fashion. He still wears the same military uniform, the iconic mustache remains, but the character is softer, more pliable and patient with Jojo's whimsical ideas. Having watched *Jojo Rabbit* in theaters, the audience wants to laugh at the semi-absurdity of the situation, but the iconography imprints so strongly that they pull back unsure if even farce is too soon for such an evil historical character. While far different from the emotional ploys leveraged in *The Man in the High Castle* through the Smith family, there is an endearing and childish quality to Jojo's narrative that we want to find charming. Film's ability to

charm an audience into a sense of normalcy even using the most hated man in history is a testament to the persuasiveness of film. The architect of the largest mass genocide in history under Taika Waititi's vision becomes playful and innocently comedic.

Season 4 Backlash- What about the SJWs?

Admittedly, season four goes off the rails in terms of plot. Where seasons one and two both focus on the Resistance work and the abilities of film to persuade others to fight back against occupying forces, and season three centers on the ability to travel between worlds that may have susceptibility to Nazi occupation, season four does almost none of that. There are still elements of Nazi troop invasion into other worlds, and even some of the travel work between worlds, with a touch of film interest. The fourth season turns toward a previously unmentioned group called the BCR or Black Communist Rebellion and their work in the Japanese Pacific States. Though they are not directly affiliated with the Resistance, they have parallel goals and cross paths depending on the situation. However, the inclusion of the Black Communist Rebellion has made substantial waves in the comment section.[32] A quick skim of the "Reviews" section reveals a body of viewers who are extremely opposed to the "social justice warrior propaganda" purportedly contained in this season. Some rage against the abridged "SJWs," and other lambast a show that would include such a political agenda. Seasons one and two have longwinded laudatory comments about how this show has mastered science fiction, or has kept them on the edge of their seats. Season three reviewers lament the technological shift and the

[32] While it's true that the BCR is unmentioned in any prior season, I agree that the shift in focus for the major plot of the show seems dramatic, and even out of character. That does not warrant the kind of commentary that has circulated on the reviews.

clear new direction of the show through critical and sometimes wordy evaluation. Then season four devolves into single sentence, or ranting monologues about how Amazon has corrupted a show with "Soviet propaganda" and "authoritarian agenda." The comments section as a whole reads as abrupt pivots from the far left to the far right, falling along with star ratings.

What I find intriguing here is less about the reviews of the content of season four (regardless of how unrelated the major plots lines are), but the sudden recognition that this show does political work. When *The Man in the High Castle* explicitly framed good and evil as the mostly Caucasian Resistance versus the Nazis, the show was heralded as an alternative history with fascinating commentary about patriotism and the power of good. But when the show writers shift protagonists to people of color, and lean into complicated but ultimately sympathetic Nazis, alt-right reviewers balk and screech at the politics within the show. This leads me to believe either that the Resistance as it appears in the first three seasons more closely aligns with white reviewer's self-image, or politics are exclusively race related regardless of the governing spectrum. While I have no interest in dissecting the reviews of each season in magnitude, I do want to acknowledge that even with the narrative shifts in the show, the season that includes the most people of color has the worst reviews with both one-star and 5-star reviews nearly equal at 36 and 37% respectively.[33] This polarized response seems to mirror a similarly polarized population that vacillates between political extremes.

[33] This is a dramatic shift from season 1 which had a 68% five-star rating, and a 3% one-star rating. Season 2 had a 77% five-star, and 1% one-star, and season 3 fell to a 36% five-star and 37% one-star. One compounding factor is the decreasing number of

While I still believe film to do emotional work especially in framing particular characters as empathetic, I wonder if these responses correlate with overt political or racial ideologies. So long as the physical and ideological similarities between the viewer and the character are consistent, then so, too, should their emotional response to that character be. As Helen's ideology about the Reich shifts, so, too, do likelihoods of finding connection with that character. Where Helen has a character arch that changes her first season perspective of the Reich, perhaps her emotional connection to the audience is limited to only some aspects of her character. The audience can empathize with her for the loss of her son, but not for her political shifts. Where other viewers based on their own ideological approach may find more relation to Helen as she moves away from the power of the Reich. So while the show does emotional work, it does not have the necessary cure-all for ideological change. The social justice warrior films need only apply to overt historical rights and wrongs, but have been limited from doing modern emotional labor without the added approval from history.

The future of the past

In November of 2019 at our National Communication Association national convention in Baltimore, MD, I attended a panel that included Dr. Kendall Phillips and Dr. Michelle Holling that spoke about film and memory. The discussion panel proffered a question about what to do with historical film that lingers in archives and how does it speak to today. Whirring with dissertation fever, I asked about what to make of modern films that intentionally include historic footage or even build on or mimic historic

---

reviews: season 1: over 110,000; season 2: 36,000; season 3: 2,500; and season 4: 2,800. This is as of March 1, 2020.

footage. The panel seemed intrigued by the question, but provided no concrete answers. The reality is that our film catalogue is growing exponentially in comparison to the celluloid that still disintegrates in storage lockers around the country. Continued reliance on film as an entertainment and news medium even in digital form will permit for more visual and iconographic recognition of events, cinema, and their subsequent emotional ties. Already we do this on a microscale with single image memes. By reusing the emotional valence of a particular situation and recontextualizing that to a new captioned expression allows viewers to expand on an already established emotional and political platform. Moving images merely have the lengthened duration to build in additional memory references, emotional characterization ties, and can statically include photographic works as well.

When considering the ever-growing film catalogue, it has the potential to change how we connect with the work. The number of movies I personally have watched since the beginning of my graduate school career easily numbers in the high triple digits.[34] The internal filmic references to iconic characters, plots, historical situations, and prior films litter modern cinema. It only takes a burgeoning background (or obsessive) knowledge of twentieth century film to see and hear modified or honorific allusions to earlier works. The more cinema viewers encounter the more robust their personal memories of scenes, characters, and costumes becomes. For example, the 2018 rendition of *A Star is Born*

---

[34] Yes, I am the human who watched all the American Film Institute's Top 100 films (both 1997, and 2007 lists), and have methodically worked through the catalogue of Best Picture nominations. Of the roughly 550 nominations, I've watched 375 of them. I don't do much math, but I bet I've watched a movie of some sort 2-3 times a week over the last six years, and intend to do a lot more than that in the next six months after I finish this degree.

(Cooper, 2018) intentionally built on the three prior iterations. Lady Gaga sings part of "Somewhere over the Rainbow" before the title sequence which references Judy Garland's career including her 1954 (Cukor, 1954) performance in the film of the same title. The final sequence[35] of the 2018 version uses similar cut and color to dresses from the 1954 version. Having watched all four versions of the film, picking up useful emotional elements to relate to new audiences both creates a deeper connection with the shared text and, for those viewers in the know, heightens their emotional connection to the new work. Novice viewers, on the other hand, may experience the connections backwards, seeing a reference before witnessing the original work. For instance, Judy Garland's frenetic living room recreation of her new number in *A Star is Born* for her depressed husband Norman Main includes her slipping and sliding around in tights and a pink button up shirt. She uses various items to help flesh out her costume from lampshades to pillows, but sings along to her rehearsal record in the background. Early Tom Cruise movie *Risky Business* (Brickman, 1983) uses the same costume premise (this time tube socks and a pale pink button up), and commits to the same goofy private performance in the most iconic scene from the film.

Similarly, our shifting and ever more visually reliant news circulation seeps into fictional works. In some films it helps to establish context or location much like an establishing shot of a skyline or an aerial shot of a landscape. But decontextualizing footage from historic events also has the ability to shift perceived timelines or reactions, or even misrepresent the events entirely. The boundaries between creative or

---

[35] And if you're looking for films to cry to, the 1954 and 2018 versions of *A Star is Born* get me every time.

argumentative endeavor and intentionally misleading fabrication are never precise. Therefore, while viewers can find solace in the familiar footage, they should always maintain a skeptical approach to the intention of the work and whether or not it aims to manipulate the viewer into a false sense of nostalgia. We as communication scholars should attune ourselves to the potential of memory messaging that leaks into modern cinema. Communication scholars who locate their research in memory studies should also attend to the visual work that triggers memory in our everyday encounters.

Kenneth Burke with Brummett's (1984) addition of media as "equipment for living" invites viewers to attempt to make sense of the world by experiencing plots vicariously through a screen. Absorbing, adapting, and accommodating divergent ideas and high pressure plotlines theoretically enables viewers to understand and perhaps react better to situations they encounter. The evolving mediascape we currently inhabit, full of dissident "facts," fake claims, and salacious headlines reads more similarly to fiction with each passing day.[36] With each turn of the television programming, pundits shift talking points, blatantly lie through yesterday's warnings, and dangerously imply new untested cures or flagrant origin stories intended to move mass audiences to the whims of state optics. This "equipment for living" though a media lens is ever more necessary as we viewers confront unknown and unparalleled circumstances.[37] With the rise of the alt-

---

[36] I write this in the middle of COVID-19, a flu-like pandemic that is ravishing the world and keeping all of its students quarantined at home. A perfect time for movie loving introverts, a terrible time for extroverts and people who are averse to technologically mediated forms of communication.

[37] As a side note, the minute that COVID-19 became serious in the US, those stuck at home with subscription media services drudged up many "pandemic" and "post-apocalypse" films to find solace in uncertain times. I'm not saying I recommend these films (now or ever), just that finding complete narratives offered a medium to cope and

right, neo-Nazis, and other extremist groups finding voice in the highest offices in the nation, a dystopic alternative historical work such as *The Man in the High Castle* provides a pertinent approach to daily life. The show is full of aggressive and subtle ways to subvert an authoritarian state. When viewers can then recognize the manipulative tools of the state such as reframing visual images in historical contexts, allusions to historical pasts, and nostalgic frames makes them capable of discerning the input and capacity of images controlled by the state. These tools are not simply rhetorical conveniences for film nerds to discuss, they are the very substance of how to unveil the unscrupulous workings of an unjust system. Our ability as viewers to recognize and respond to the media manipulation of the state demands our adept use of rhetorical tools. Film, criticism, and rhetoric are our "equipment for living."

Conclusion

As the projector clicks back off, this analysis will come to a close. Flickers across a screen open a world of image, ideology, and the question of history. No longer a simplistic response, or idealized in a textbook caption, film has the ability to transpose and transport image into new contexts that readily tamper with the viewer perspectives. Over the course of this project, I have discussed the impacts and implications of *The Man in the High Castle* as a work of alternative history and the abilities of film work to continue tampering with visually encoded history in this fashion. As viewers, our continued attention to the influences of film both emotionally and on ideological levels

---

perhaps disaster plan. I do think that Burke would appreciate *Station Eleven* by Emily St. John Mandel as a way to use literature and the arts after disaster befalls the Earth (Mandel, 2015).

and where those frames originate should be of paramount importance in an era of fake news and ideological dichotomies. Our attention to the manipulations of historical footage directly impacts the reception and recognition of that work. Where Juliana finds herself in repeated films, Abendsen tells her that her ability to transpose willingly into the other historic spaces and her continued fight against oppression in any form is where to find hope. May we, too, find the audacity to hope, and rebel, and find solace in the darkest of theaters in the darkest of times.

REFERENCES

Arendt, H. (2006). *Eichmann in Jerusalem: A report on the Banality of Evil*. New York, NY: Penguin Books.

Assmann, A. (2016). *Shadows of Trauma: Memory and the Politics of Postwar Identity* (1st edition; S. Clift, Trans.). New York, NY: Fordham University Press.

Assmann, J., & Czaplicka, J. (1995). Collective Memory and Cultural Identity. *New German Critique*, (65), 125–134. https://doi.org/10.2307/488538

Axelson, T. (2015). Vernacular Meaning Making Examples of Narrative Impact in Fiction Film Questioning the "Banal" Notion in Mediatization of Religion Theory. *Nordicom Review*, *36*(2), 143–157. https://doi.org/10.1515/nor-2015-0022

Bacon, H. (2011). The extent of mental completion of films. *Projections*, *5*(1), 31–51. https://doi.org/10.3167/proj.2011.050104

Barash, J. A. (2016). *Collective Memory and the Historical Past*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Bay, M. (2001). *Pearl Harbor* [DVD]. Buena Vista Pictures.

Bazin, A. (2005). *What is Cinema? Volume 1* (H. Gray, Trans.). Los Angeles, CA: University of California Press.

Benjamin, W. (1955). The work of art in the age of its mechanical reproduction. In *The Cultural Studies Reader* (pp. 59–81).

Biesecker, B. A. (2002). Remembering World War II: The rhetoric and politics of national commemoration at the turn of the 21 st century. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, *88*(4), 393–410. https://doi.org/10.1080/00335630209384386

Bjørner, T., Magnusson, A., & Nielsen, R. P. (2016). How to Describe and Measure Obstacles of Narrative Immersion in a Film? *Nordicom Review*, *37*(1), 1–18. https://doi.org/10.1515/nor-2016-0004

Blair, C., Dickinson, G., & Ott, B. L. (2010). Introduction: Rhetoric/Memory/Place. In *Places of public memory: The rhetoric of museums and memorials*. Tuscaloosa, AL: University of Alabama Press.

Bordwell, D. (1985). *Narration in the fiction film*. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press.

Bordwell, D., & Thompson, K. (2013). *Film art: An introduction* (10th ed). New York, N.Y: McGraw-Hill.

Boym, S. (2001). *The Future of Nostalgia*. New York, NY: Basic Books.

Brady, M. (1862). *The Battle of Antietam* [Photograph]. Associated Press.

Branigan, E. (2013). *Narrative comprehension and film*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Brickman, P. (1983). *Risky Business* [DVD]. Warner Bros. Pictures.

Brouwer, D. C., & Horwitz, L. D. (2015). The Cultural Politics of Progenic Auschwitz Tattoos: 157622, A-15510, 4559. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, *101*(3), 534–558.

Brummett, B. (1984). Burke's representative anecdote as a method in media criticism. *Critical Studies in Mass Communication*, *1*(2), 161–177.

Burke, K. (1967). *The Philosophy of Literary Form* (2nd ed). Baton Rouge, LA: Louisiana State University Press.

Burnetts, C. (2016). Of basterds and the greatest generation: The limits of sentimentalism and the post-classical war film. *Journal of Film and Video*, *68*(2), 3–14.

Burns, K., Burns, S., & McMahon, D. (2012). *The Central Park Five* [Documentary, DVD]. Sundance Selects.

Campora, M. (2009). Art cinema and New Hollywood: Multiform narrative and sonic metalepsis in Eternal Sunshine of the Spotless Mind. *New Review of Film and Television Studies*, *7*(2), 119–132. https://doi.org/10.1080/17400300902816812

Cooper, B. (2018). *A Star is Born* [Drama, DVD]. Warner Bros. Pictures.

Corrigan, T. (2012). *A Short Guide to Writing about Film*. Boston, MA: Pearson.

Crowley, S. (1992). Reflections on an Argument That Won't Go Away: Or, A Turn of the Ideological Screw. *The Quarterly Journal of Speech*, *78*(4), 450–466. https://doi.org/10.1080/00335639209384010

Cukor, G. (1954). *A Star is Born* [Drama, DVD]. Warner Bros. Pictures.

Dastin, J. (2018, March 15). Exclusive: Amazon's internal numbers on Prime Video, revealed. *Reuters*. Retrieved from https://www.reuters.com/article/us-amazon-com-ratings-exclusive-idUSKCN1GR0FX

Demme, J. (1991). *The Silence of the Lambs* [Horror, DVD]. Orion Pictures.

Eastwood, C. (2006a). *Flags of Our Fathers* [Drama, DVD]. Paramount Pictures.

Eastwood, C. (2006b). *Letters from Iwo Jima* [Drama, DVD]. Warner Bros. Pictures.

Egginton, Wi. (2001). Reality is Bleeding: A Brief History of Film from the Sixteenth Century. *Configurations*, *9*(2), 207–230.

Elaesser, T. (2015). Immersion between recursiveness and reflexivity: Avatar. In *Immersion in the Visual Arts and Media* (pp. 251–277). https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004308237_012

Feng, D., & O'Halloran, K. L. (2013). The multimodal representation of emotion in film: Integrating cognitive and semiotic approaches. *Semiotica*, *2013*(197), 79–101. https://doi.org/10.1515/sem-2013-0082

Ferenz, V. (2005). Fight Clubs, American Psychos and Mementos. *New Review of Film and Television Studies*, *3*(2), 133–160. https://doi.org/10.1080/17400300500213461

Fisher, W. R. (1984). Narration as a human communication paradigm: The case of public moral argument. *Communication Monographs*, *51*(1), 1–23. https://doi.org/10.1080/03637758409390180

Frentz, T., & Rushing, J. H. (2002). "Mother isn't quite herself today:" myth and spectacle in The Matrix. *Critical Studies in Media Communication*, *19*(1), 64–87. https://doi.org/10.1080/07393180216551

Frentz, T. S., & Rushing, J. H. (1993). Integrating ideology and archetype in rhetorical criticism, part II: A case study of Jaws. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, *79*(1), 61–82. https://doi.org/10.1080/00335639309384019

Genette, G. (1997). *Paratexts: Thresholds of interpretation*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Gerbaz, A. (2010). Enjoying Film Studies: The Necessity of Emotion. *Screen Education*, (59), 88–94.

Gerwig, G. (2019). *Little Women* [Drama, DVD]. Sony Pictures Releasing.

Gold, D. M. (2013, October 31). The Ode Heard Round the World. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from https://www.nytimes.com/2013/11/01/movies/following-the-ninth-explores-beethovens-legacy.html

Goodwin, C. (1994). Professional Vision. *American Anthropologist*, *96*(3), 606–634. https://doi.org/10.1525/aa.1994.96.3.02a00100

Grodal, T. (2006). The PECMA flow: A general model of visual aesthetics. *Film Studies*, (8), 1–12.

Grodal, T. K. (2009). *Embodied visions: Evolution, emotion, culture, and film*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Guerrasio, J. (2019, July 29). How "Great Escape" scene in "Once Upon a Time in Hollywood" was made—Business Insider. Retrieved February 26, 2020, from Business Insider website: https://www.businessinsider.com/the-great-escape-scene-in-upon-a-time-in-hollywood-2019-7

Gunning, T. (1997). In Your Face: Physiognomy, Photography, and the Gnostic Mission of Early Film. *Modernism/Modernity*, *4*(1), 1–29. https://doi.org/10.1353/mod.1997.0003

Hendrix, S. (2017, October 27). Zapruder captured JFK's assassination in riveting detail, fueling decades of conspiracy theories. *Washington Post*. Retrieved from https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/retropolis/wp/2017/10/25/zapruder-captured-jfks-assassination-in-riveting-detail-it-brought-him-nothing-but-heartbreak/

Hirsch, M. (2012). *The Generation of Postmemory: Writing and Visual Culture after the Holocaust*. https://doi.org/10.7312/hirs15652

Hitchcock, A. (1959). *North by Northwest* [Drama]. Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer.

Jenkins, K. (1991). *Re-Thinking History*. London, UK: Routledge.

Johnson, D. (2007). Martin Luther King Jr.'s 1963 Birmingham Campaign as Image Event. *Rhetoric & Public Affairs*, *10*(1), 1–26.

Kapur, S. (1998). *Elizabeth* [DVD]. Gramercy Pictures.

King, C. S. (2009). It cuts both ways: Fight Club, masculinity, and abject hegemony. *Communication and Critical/Cultural Studies*, *6*(4), 366–386. https://doi.org/10.1080/14791420903335135

King, C. S. (2010). The Man Inside: Trauma, Gender, and the Nation in The Brave One. *Critical Studies in Media Communication*, *27*(2), 111–131.

Kirby, E., Riforgiate, S., Anderson, I., Lahman, M., & Lietzenmayer, A. (2016). Good Working Mothers as Jugglers: A Critical Look at Two Work–Family Balance Films. *Journal of Family Communication*, *16*(1), 76–94.

Landsberg, A. (2004). *Prosthetic memory: Transformation of American remembrance in the age of mass culture*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press.

Landsberg, A. (2013). Politics and the historical film: Hotel Rwanda and the form of engagement. In R. A. Rosenstone & C. Parvulescu (Eds.), *A Companion to the Historical Film* (1st ed., pp. 11–29). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons, Incorporated.

Lenz, C. (2011). Genealogy and Archaeology: Analyzing Generational Positioning in Historical Narratives. *Journal of Comparative Family Studies*, *42*(3), 319–328.

Levin, O. (2018). The cinematic time of the city symphony films: Time management, experiential duration and bodily pulsation. *Studies in Documentary Film*, *12*(3), 225–239. https://doi.org/10.1080/17503280.2018.1504370

Levy, D., & Sznaider, N. (2002). Memory Unbound: The Holocaust and the Formation of Cosmopolitan Memory. *European Journal of Social Theory*, *5*(1), 87–107. https://doi.org/10.1177/1368431002005001002

Longworth, K. (n.d.). *You Must Remember This*. In *Charles Manson's Hollywood*.

Lynch, D. (1980). *The Elephant Man* [Drama, DVD]. Paramount Pictures.

Mandel, E. S. J. (2015). *Station eleven* (First Edition). New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

Pakula, A. J. (1982). *Sophie's Choice* [Drama, DVD].

Patterson, T. (2016, February 23). The inside story of the famous Iwo Jima photo. *CNN*. Retrieved from https://www.cnn.com/2015/02/22/world/cnnphotos-iwo-jima/index.html

Petersen, J. (2016). Regulating film, regulating emotion: The emotional history of public opinion. *Critical Studies in Media Communication*, *33*(4), 324–337. https://doi.org/10.1080/15295036.2016.1225966

Phillips, K. R. (2005). *Projected fears: Horror films in American culture*. Westport, CT: Praeger.

Phillips, T. (2019). *Joker* [Drama, DVD]. Warner Bros. Pictures.

Plantinga, C. (2009). *Moving Viewers: American Film and the Spectator's Experience*. https://doi.org/10.1525/j.ctt1ppc9d

Renée, V. (2013, August 30). A Complete History of CinemaScope with Film Historian David Bordwell. Retrieved March 2, 2020, from No Film School website:

https://nofilmschool.com/2013/08/complete-history-of-cinemascope-david-bordwell

Rosenstone, R. A. (1995). *Visions of the past: The challenge of film to our ideas of history*. Boston, MA: Harvard University Press.

Rushing, J. H., & Frentz, T. S. (1989). The Frankenstein Myth in Contemporary Cinema. *Critical Studies in Mass Communication*, *6*(1), 61–82.

Rushing, J. H., & Frentz, T. S. (2000). Singing over the bones: James Cameron's Titanic. *Critical Studies in Media Communication*, *17*(1), 1–28. https://doi.org/10.1080/15295030009388373

Rushton, R. (2014). Empathic Projection in the Films of the Dardenne Brothers. *Screen*, *55*(3), 303–317. https://doi.org/10.1093/screen/hju027

Seel, M. (2018). Film as Emotion. In *The Arts of Cinema* (pp. 125–144).

Sontag, S. (2003). *Regarding the pain of others*. New York, NY: Picador.

Spielberg, S. (1998). *Saving Private Ryan* [DVD]. Dreamworks Pictures.

Stark, L. (2017, August 3). White House policy adviser downplays Statue of Liberty's famous poem. Retrieved February 17, 2020, from CNN website: https://www.cnn.com/2017/08/02/politics/emma-lazarus-poem-statue-of-liberty/index.html

Stoughton, C. (1963). *Lyndon B. Johnson is sworn in as the President of the United States* [Photograph]. Associated Press.

Sturges, J. (1963). *The Great Escape* [Drama, DVD]. United Artists.

Tarantino, Q. (2019). *Once Upon a Time in Hollywood* [Drama, DVD]. Sony Pictures Releasing.

Unknown. (1963). *USA President Kennedy Coffin* [Photograph]. Associated Press.

Urushadze, Z. (2013). *Tangerines* [DVD]. Allfilm.

Visch, V. T., Tan, E. S., & Molenaar, D. (2010). The emotional and cognitive effect of immersion in film viewing. *Cognition & Emotion*, *24*(8), 1439–1446. https://doi.org/10.1080/02699930903498186

Viswanathan, L. N. (2011). *Enhancing movie comprehension for individuals who are visually impaired or blind*.

Waititi, T. (2019). *Jojo Rabbit* [Drama, DVD]. Fox Searchlight Pictures.

Wander, P. (1984). The third persona: An ideological turn in rhetorical theory. *Central States Speech Journal*, *35*, 197–217.

Way, M., & Way, C. (2018). *Wild Wild Country* [Documentary]. Netfliz.

Welch, S., & Wittlinger, R. (2011). The resilience of the nation state: Cosmopolitanism, Holocaust memory and German identity. *German Politics and Society*, *29*(3), 38–55.

White, H. (1988). Historiography and Historiophoty. *The American Historical Review*, *93*(5), 1193–1200.

Wilder, B. (1944). *Double Indemnity* [Noir, DVD]. Paramount Pictures.

Yacavone, D. (2012). Spaces, Gaps, and Levels: From the Diegetic to the Aesthetic in Film Theory. *Music, Sound, and the Moving Image*, *6*(1), 21–38.

APPENDIX A

LIST OF CHARACTERS, DESCRIPTIONS, AND ACTORS

Character	Relation/description	Actor
Juliana Crain	Main character- Shows up in many HC films, traveler, Resistance	Alexa Davalos
Joe Blake	Nazi agent/spy- son to Heussmann	Luke Kleintank
Frank Frink	BF/ex to Juliana	Rupert Evans
Ed McCarthy	BFF to Frank/Childan's business partner	DJ Qualls
Nobusuke Tagomi	Japanese Trade Minister for JPS	Cary-Hiroyuki Tagawa
Obergruppenführer (after season 2 promotion, Oberst-Gruppenführer, Part way through season 3, Reichsmarschall) John Smith	High ranking official in the American Reich	Rufus Sewell
Helen Smith	Wife to John Smith	Chelah Horsdal
Thomas Smith	John and Helen's oldest son	Quinn Lord
Inspector Kido	Lead inspector for JPS in San Francisco	Joel de la Fuente
Sergeant Yoshida	Kido's right hand man seasons 1-2	Lee Shorten
Kotomichi	Tagomi's assistant	Arnold Chun
Robert Childan	Owns an antique shop in San Francisco, business partners with Ed/sometimes Frank	Brennan Brown
Reinhard Heydrich	Nazi official seeking to take over post-Hitler	Ray Proscia
Adolf Hitler	Really bad dude	Wolf Muser
Lemuel Washington	Resistance operative in Neutral Zone (runs diner)	Rick Worthy
Karen Vecchione	Resistance operative in San Francisco (runs flower shop)	Camille Sullivan
Gary Connell	Resistance operative in San Francisco	Callum Keith Rennie

Hawthorne Abendsen (MITHC)	The Man in the High Castle	Stephen Root
Rudolph Wegener	Nazi official turned asset to smuggle bomb plans to JPS, friends with John Smith	Carsten Norgaard
Nori Tagomi	Tagomi's son- USA 1962 plot	Eddie Smith
George Dixon	Trudy's real father, Resistance operative in American Reich	Tate Donovan
Nicole Dörmer	Lebensborn, propagandist, bisexual party girl	Bella Heathcoate
Reichsminister Martin Heussmann	Joe's dad, engineer for the Reich, takes over after Hitler's death, traitor	Sebastian Roché
Arnold Walker	Trudy's "dad", step dad to Juliana, works at the "post office" but really works for the JPS version of NSA	Daniel Roebuck
Trudy Walker	Juliana's half sister, traveler, Resistance operative	Conor Leslie
Wyatt Price (Liam)	Smuggler in the Neutral Zone, Resistance fixer	Jason O'Mara
J. Edgar Hoover	Same premise as the real Hoover, just works for the Nazis.	William Forsythe
Reichsmarschall George Lincoln Rockwell	Nazi official in American Reich. Higher ranking than John Smith (though political instead of paramilitary)	David Furr
Reichsführer Himmler	Chancellor post-Hitler	Kenneth Tigar
Thelma Harris	Column/Tabloid writer, crush on Nicole, blackmailed by Smith	Laura Mennell
Tamiko Wanataba	Painterly friend of Tagomi	Tamlyn Tomita
Dr. Daniel Ryan	Helen's psychiatrist	Jeffrey Nordling
Mark Sampson	Smuggler, Resistance operative, Jewish, Frank's teacher	Michael Gaston
Josef Mengele	Nazi doctor and researcher	John Hans Tester

Lila Jacobs	Sabra leader (Jewish community in the Rocky Mountains)	Janet Kidder

182