

INTRODUCTION



In 1988, at the border between East and West Germany, military officers working for the Ministry for State Security (Ministerium für Staatssicherheit, MfS or Stasi) compiled a dossier of single officers aged twenty-eight and over in the East German Border Command South. The documents detail twenty-five soldiers' personal lives: their relationship histories, appearance, hobbies and interests. The dossier's aim is to explain why these soldiers are single:

Approaches to women unsuccessful for various reasons: 4 officers

Unattractive to women: 2 officers

Negative experiences with former partners that have caused reluctance towards new relationships: 3 officers.¹

The document groups all twenty-five officers in this way, before adding: 'no sexually abnormal behaviours by any of the 25 single officers, including signs of homosexuality, were identified'.² The investigations appear motivated by concern about homosexuality in the ranks, but also by a preoccupation with men who deviate from the military's image of masculinity in other ways. This book explores that preoccupation, and this dossier encapsulates many of my arguments about East German masculinity. The document shows the National People's Army (Nationale Volksarmee or NVA) actively seeking to understand soldiers' complex and individual masculinities, with the army command troubled by and suspicious of even minor deviations from its soldierly ideals. It demonstrates that the NVA was not only concerned with

shaping soldiers' bodies through exercises and drill; it also sought to understand, categorize and influence members' feelings and desires. Above all, it shows that masculinities that did not fit easily within military norms were not marginal anomalies. The interplay between disruptive military masculinities and institutional norms sustained investigations like the above, shaped the NVA's self-presentation and had lasting effects on soldiers' identities.

This book analyses portrayals of East German soldiers in film and literature since the introduction of conscription in 1962. By examining a diverse corpus of works, from officially sanctioned publications to literature by an exiled ex-soldier, comic films to post-reunification life-writing, I investigate the variety of identities presented in images of the NVA. These works present military masculinities not as norms imposed from above, but as individually embodied practices negotiated by soldiers alone and collectively. Literature and film suggest that gender, and especially masculinity, was essential to East German citizens' interactions with institutions and the state. Just as individuals' negotiations of gender shaped state institutions, so too did these environments affect citizens' gender identities in lasting ways, prompting continuing engagement with East German institutions long after the state's dissolution in 1990. By centring analysis on disruptive and even queer masculinities, we can gain new understandings of gender in East German society and military organizations.

The East German example also has important implications for our understanding of masculinity in contemporary society, and especially the impact of masculine ideals and institutional structures. In the second decade of the twenty-first century, images of masculine bodies in advertising, magazines and social media are more prevalent and noticeably more muscular than in previous decades. In 2014, Mark Simpson identified a shift from the age of the 'metrosexual' to that of the 'spornosexual', a body type that merges professional sports with pornography.³ Male bodies in the 2010s have been on display topless, open-shirted or in clothes that hint less than coyly at the musculature beneath. The spornosexual body is also linked with less normative masculinities, showing the pervasiveness of this ideal, but also gesturing to potentially queer dynamics that underpin this fascination with hardened masculine bodies. In Luca Guadagnino's blockbuster *Call Me by Your Name* (2017), for example, Armie Hammer plays the gay Jewish American Oliver as a 1980s-revival pin up in a distinctly contemporary muscled, open-shirted mode and in infamously revealing shorts.⁴ Alongside these more visibly muscled masculine bodies, news coverage has also focused on men's mental health and the punishing effects not just of body-image standards, but also of wider societal shifts.⁵ Since the financial crisis of 2008, people of all genders have been exposed to precarity and increased competition in education and the workplace. Austerity regimes and constitutional upheavals have placed

social and political institutions under strain, with these pressures mirrored in the insecurity and intense self-scrutiny of contemporary subjects. These trends are by no means most severe in their impact on men; standards of masculinity have detrimental effects across what Raewyn Connell terms the 'gender order'.⁶ This impact is not merely abstract. Masculinity shapes the assumptions and expectations of institutions, as well as our interactions with institutional cultures from schools and the workplace to job centres and medical services.⁷ The more we understand of the relationship between standards of masculinity, institutions and the lives of individuals, the better we can make sense of inequalities in contemporary society.

Literature and film depicting the German Democratic Republic (GDR) have important roles to play in conceptualizing the relationship between the individual self, cultures of masculinity and the institutions that sustain them. Around the twentieth anniversary of the fall of the Berlin Wall in 2009, GDR scholars began asking about the relevance of their work so long after the state's collapse.⁸ Ten years later, amid renewed scholarly and popular interest in East Germany across the world, the question is different: the GDR clearly speaks to our contemporary concerns, but how and why? Recent representations of East Germany have flourished: from the television series *Deutschland 83* and *Deutschland 86* (2015–18), which have been especially successful outside the German-speaking world, or novels like Simon Urban's *Plan D* (2011) and David Young's *Stasi Child* (2015), to Hollywood blockbusters like *Bridge of Spies* (2015) and *Atomic Blonde* (2017).⁹ The works in this transnational reimagining of East Germany do not always fit within other trends in post-GDR film and literature. They move away from autobiographical or family narratives into the extravagantly fantastical, and are interested in the seediness or retro potential of 1980s East Berlin rather than historical fidelity. Yet they are linked with other portrayals of the GDR by their interest in the interplay between repressive institutions, cultural norms and ideals, and individual values and agency. It is no accident that spy films and crime thrillers have proliferated: at a time when concepts of masculinity are debated so openly, literature and film invent characters who negotiate the masculine-dominated institutions involved in espionage, policing, international relations and defence.

Representations of East German soldiers thus offer a compelling model for exploring the relationship between individual subjectivities and wider socio-political institutions. Military institutions are closely connected to a society's ideals of masculinity. Where conscription is the norm, as it was for the overwhelming majority of young East German men, military service highlights the negotiations required to navigate conflicting personal, institutional and societal values and expectations. For many men, military service may be the only time in their lives that they become conscious of their practice of

masculinity. Literary and filmic depictions of East German military masculinities can therefore reveal much about how we conceive of, regulate, imagine and invest in certain versions of masculinity.

Of the institutions that feature in the recent revival of portrayals of the GDR, the Stasi has received substantial and illuminating scholarly attention.¹⁰ Soldiers have been largely overlooked, despite their prominence in literary, filmic and even scholarly works. The NVA was considered the Warsaw Pact's most efficient army after the Red Army, even by its West German adversaries, and conscription made it part of almost all young men's lives.¹¹ It was involved in the GDR's most repressive episodes, from the building of the Berlin Wall in 1961 to the policing of protests in the autumn of 1989.¹² Yet the wider implications of the NVA's culture of masculinity for GDR and contemporary societies have yet to be fully explored. While soldiers do stand as 'the sign, the representation of the state' in some works, to use Andrew Bickford's phrase, the complexities of what are often ambivalent portrayals deserve closer attention.¹³ As I will show, military service and the NVA's system caused serious conflicts in conscripts' self-understandings, so that more performative or even theatrical sides of military masculinities cannot be separated from young men's embodied and emotional experiences.

Representations in literature, film and television are not only echoes of lived masculinities in East Germany; rather, they have been central to their construction and their changing forms in the GDR and the contemporary world. As Kaja Silverman argues in her discussion of the 'dominant fiction' of unimpaired and impervious masculinity, representations create the images of masculinity through which men and women come to understand themselves, while retaining the potential for limited challenges:

Although I have defined [the dominant fiction] as a reservoir of sounds, images, and narratives, it has no concrete existence apart from discursive practice and its psychic residue. If representation and signification constitute the site at which the dominant fiction comes into existence, then they would also seem to provide the necessary vehicle for ideological contestation – the medium through which to reconstruct both our 'reality' and 'ourselves'.¹⁴

For Silverman, literature and film are essential to understanding gender. These representations do not just mirror society, and their fictionality, wilful construction or artistry do not render them irrelevant to lived experience. Rather, these images are part of our negotiations of gender in two senses: as an attempt to find a path for ourselves among competing gender ideals and, simultaneously, as a means of rearticulating and recasting those ideals.

Silverman perhaps places too much importance on images of unimpaired masculinity; as Julia Hell and Lilya Kaganovsky have shown, masculine

power in the Stalinist cultures of Central and Eastern Europe draws primarily on images of impaired, even broken masculinity.¹⁵ Writing and film in these contexts present flawed characters negotiating gender within the limitations of genre and circumstance. These characters can promote or challenge dominant masculinities, and sometimes both, but above all they explore ways of negotiating gender in our own lives. As Rita Felski argues in *The Limits of Critique* (2015), representations have agency in their responses to and influence on our understandings of ourselves and the world:

No doubt we learn to make sense of literary texts by being schooled in certain ways of reading; at the same time, we also learn to make sense of our lives by referencing imaginary or fictional worlds. Works of art are not just objects to be interpreted; they also serve as frameworks and guides to interpretation.¹⁶

Given the strict censorship that influenced East German film and literary production, the makers of cultural policy clearly shared Felski's belief that representations are 'guides to interpretation'.¹⁷ Recent work by Stephen Brockmann, reviving scholarly interest in socialist realist literature of the early GDR, has emphasized literature's role in the lively political, social and cultural debates of the postwar period, which amounted to a 'large-scale attempt to use literature to shape the German future'.¹⁸ Yet Brockmann's argument does not account for the continued preoccupation with GDR culture after the state's collapse. Silverman's argument that engagement with such works shapes our self-understanding and subjectivity helps conceptualize this enduring interest. In many of the cases in this book, writers and filmmakers are candid about the lasting influence of the GDR, and specifically military service, on their identities, and about the urgency of rearticulating the East German past in order to understand it and themselves better. In others, recasting the GDR after reunification places it in dialogue with debates and concerns around masculinity in the present.

Seeing literature, film and television as active forces in shaping GDR masculinity means paying heed to the complex masculinities that they construct, which exist less in an ideal form than in the embodied negotiations of individuals. The interest especially in uniformed East German masculinity highlights a trend that has existed since the first depictions of conscription in the 1960s. These works resist the idea that soldiers simply represent the GDR's normative understanding of masculinity. Images of East German soldiers encourage us to challenge and break down ideas of conformity and resistance to norms or to the GDR state. The literature and films that I analyse in this book explore the instability of masculine institutions and their dependence on conflicts between individual identities, institutional cultures and mediated depictions of masculinity. This book focuses on the fraught relationship

staged by texts and films between individuals' identities and their conflicting loyalties: to personal values, to institutions, and to norms and ideals. Literature and films present the effects of such negotiations in physical and emotional terms, and these representations affect the form and importance of the GDR's ideals. This image of identity, as a shifting product of embodied negotiations among the requirements of institutions and wider values, helps us understand masculinities today, when men's bodies and feelings are a focus for the conflicts and precariousness of twenty-first-century society.

The well-worn phrase *Comrades in Arms* exemplifies my central arguments. It describes military comrades or other colleagues with whom one has worked closely in pursuit of a cause. The currency of the phrase in civilian contexts demonstrates the pervasiveness of military values of common purpose and togetherness across society. The phrase's martial metaphor underlines the gendered connotations of these values, yet it shifts the emphasis in military masculinities from violence or aggression to the intimate bonds between men that shape soldiers' and ex-soldiers' lives. The term 'arms' links military arsenals to the bodies that make up the ranks, resonating with the vulnerability of the phrase 'babe in arms' or the close physical intimacy of holding someone in one's arms. The phrase signals that military communities depend on close physical, psychological and emotional bonds between men, and even shared desires and intimacies. In the East German context, the word 'comrade' takes on particular nuances that highlight the disruptive nature of military service and its challenge to conscripts or recruits to reimagine their masculinities and identities. While the term 'comrade' (*Genosse*) was used in civilian society only for members of the ruling Socialist Unity Party (Sozialistische Einheitspartei Deutschlands or SED), young men were uniformly identified as 'comrades' on conscription, forcing on them an identification with the state and its repressive structures. In this book, I argue that conscription forces soldiers to become conscious of how they negotiate identities within the military institution and GDR state. The reshaping of soldiers' identities is embodied, psychological and emotional, which helps explain the ongoing negotiations of military service and of the East German state that remain fraught to this day. Above all, the vulnerability, intimacy and emotions of these 'comrades in arms' place marginalized and even queer masculinities at the centre of military institutions and shape the norms they promote, with implications for understandings of military communities worldwide.

The National People's Army

The NVA offers an illuminating case study for investigating East German masculinities more broadly, as young men were confronted most strongly

with the state's ideal masculinity during military service. After 1962, when conscription came into force, the overwhelming majority of young East German men were conscripted. Although in post-reunification interviews many ex-conscripts emphasize their individuality and agency within the NVA's system, the everyday brutality of military service had profound physical and psychological effects on many.¹⁹ As I will argue, young East Germans from the 1960s onwards developed a mix of passive conformity and inward scepticism, so that most conscripts had a complex relationship between military and civilian conceptions of themselves. Understanding East German soldiers helps conceptualize the different ways in which men over the GDR's forty-year history incorporated institutional experiences into their identities. Literature and films even show individual embodied performances influencing the military's ideals and self-presentation. The NVA is also illuminating as a way of placing the East German state in a global postwar context. Although the NVA was exceptional for its use of violence in peacetime and its support for a repressive surveillance state, it was unremarkable in its approach to training and military rhetoric.²⁰ Through its military, East Germany can therefore improve our understandings of military institutions and the place of masculinities in contemporary society more broadly.

Although the NVA was only officially constituted in 1956, seven years after the GDR's foundation, the state's development after 1945 had been closely tied to militarization. Rearmament in Germany began soon after the war as tensions escalated between the Soviet Union and the Western Allies. As Detlef Bald has argued, fear of the other side's rearmament quickly transformed perception into reality as each side increased its military capabilities in Germany.²¹ During the Berlin Blockade in 1948, Soviet occupying forces on Stalin's orders added militarized police units to their expanding police force.²² With these units began the SED's efforts to fashion a specific socialist variety of German military masculinity focused around the 'working-class officer', which laid the groundwork for later pronouncements on the 'socialist soldier personality'.²³ Initially, the GDR's militarization occurred largely in secret, as it conflicted with the SED's protestations about rearmament in the Western zones and with Stalin's stated aim of uniting Germany under Communist control.²⁴ However, as the incorporation of the Federal Republic (FRG) into Western alliances appeared increasingly inevitable, the GDR leadership received orders in 1952 to 'create a People's Army – without a to-do'.²⁵ The Garrisoned People's Police (Kasernierte Volkspolizei or KVP) was formed in July. However, its subsequent failure to control the workers' uprising on 17 June 1953 led the SED to purge the KVP of 'unreliable elements' and prepare for the foundation of the NVA in 1956, although the timing was delayed until after the official establishment of the West German Bundeswehr.²⁶ The importance of the 1953 uprising for the NVA's development cannot be

overstated, and the memory of the uprising was central to the SED's concern with promoting the right kind of socialist masculinities that were committed to the state and to protecting its form of socialism.

Conscription, which further developed the NVA as a training ground for socialist masculinity, was introduced soon after the closing of the border with West Berlin in 1961, before which point such a measure would have been unenforceable. The 1962 Conscription Law introduced compulsory eighteen-month military service for men aged eighteen to twenty-six, and reserve service for men under fifty.²⁷ To meet recruitment targets, men were frequently pressured to enlist as noncommissioned officers (NCOs) for three years or as officers for four, and doing so could dramatically improve educational or career prospects.²⁸ In addition to service in the navy, air force or army, men with no known links to the West who declared themselves willing to fire a weapon could be conscripted to the Border Guard, where conscripts were subject to enhanced scrutiny and surveillance.²⁹ The Stasi could also fore-shorten service or ensure better conditions for informants.³⁰ Well-connected men could complete alternative military service in police units, although the basic structure of this service differed little from conscription into the army.³¹ Rising numbers of conscientious objectors and pressure from churches led to an ordinance in 1964, which permitted men 'who object to armed military service due to religious beliefs or for similar reasons' to be conscripted into construction units as so-called *Bausoldaten*.³² However, *Bausoldaten* were still part of the NVA, and their work was gruelling and humiliating, despite brief improvements between 1975 and 1982.³³ The structures of military service and forms of conscription changed little before 1990; a further 1982 law mostly legislated for already established features such as the oath and conditions of eligibility.³⁴ Even this brief exposition indicates overarching commonalities – harsh discipline, rigid hierarchies, a stark change from civilian life – that were shared between men with otherwise substantially different experiences of military service, including conscientious objectors.

Since reunification, many ex-conscripts have emphasized these universal aspects of military service.³⁵ Historical sources, memoirs and fiction all describe conscripts finding their place in a new environment, navigating hierarchies of rank and experience, and being exposed to violence by other conscripts. Conscription affects young men from many countries, and young women in some, and East German experiences are relevant to many conscript armies. Writers and filmmakers often gesture to similarities between military service in the NVA and conscription in other national contexts, a comparison supported by similarities in scholarly accounts of conscription in different countries.³⁶ Most importantly, all contexts, even those in which women are conscripted alongside men, share the connection between military service and the development of certain forms of masculinities.³⁷ I therefore draw in

my analyses on theories from other militaries, and my conception of military masculinity can illuminate other contexts. At the same time, the NVA offers a distinct and instructive case for three reasons.

First, the NVA was never involved in direct combat. The rhetoric of peace was central to official discussions of the NVA, which was styled as the defender and guarantor of peace in Germany, apparently without conscious irony.³⁸ From the NVA's inception, the GDR's premier, Walter Ulbricht, emphasized its peaceful mission:

The National People's Army of the GDR shall be an army of working people, who love peace as much as they love their own freedom. All members of the future army, air force and navy of the GDR shall ... be on the front line defending peace [*an vorderster Front auf Friedenswache*].³⁹

Paradoxically amidst this peaceful rhetoric, the SED's propaganda also glorified the NVA's later participation in the Soviet-led invasion of Czechoslovakia after the Prague Spring in 1968. However, sources have shown since reunification that Moscow ordered the NVA's regiments to stand down at the last minute.⁴⁰ A second flashpoint occurred in 1981 amidst protests by the Polish Solidarity movement, but a planned NVA invasion was averted when the Polish regime imposed martial law. Thus, the NVA never saw direct military involvement, although repeated military exercises were a common feature of military service and many thousands even experienced full mobilization in 1968 or 1981.

In the absence of active combat, representations of the NVA focus on military training, which wider scholarship on military masculinities frequently overlooks in favour of a narrower focus on war. Training offers compelling insights into the place of masculinity within military institutions. On the one hand, scholarship on the warzone generally explains intimacy between soldiers and alternative masculinities as products of the extreme circumstances of war.⁴¹ On the other hand, the profound psychological effects of war are often attributed to the extraordinary nature of the warzone. Representations of military training show that marginalized masculinities are fundamental to military environments more generally, including outside the warzone. Such accounts also make it impossible to ignore the role of the institutional environment itself in the suffering of conscripts and recruits.

In this context of peace, and among countries in peacetime more broadly, the Border Guard represents an anomaly that sits uneasily with the NVA's peaceable rhetoric. The Border Police of the GDR was founded in 1950, but after the construction of the Berlin Wall in August 1961, it was subsumed into the NVA as the Border Command of the NVA. In 1974, the Border Guard of the GDR was separated from the NVA proper, but remained under

the control of the Ministry for National Defence.⁴² Peter Joachim Lapp attributes this cosmetic restructuring to concerns that disarmament agreements during the *détente* of the 1970s might affect numbers at the border.⁴³ The NVA's most infamous policy was that deserters, would-be escapees and even trespassers at the border could be shot on sight. Debates about this policy have placed border soldiers at the centre of contemporary discussion of the NVA. Since the 1960s, Western discussion of the GDR has presumed the existence of an order to shoot on sight (*Schießbefehl*), and after 1990, journalists and archivists began searching in earnest for a directive.⁴⁴ Historians have countered that the NVA relied on obscure, ambiguous or nonspecific commands, and Pertti Ahonen suggests that this structure placed the initiative on ordinary soldiers, albeit while instilling in them fear of commanding officers' reactions.⁴⁵ Even without a written order, the brutality of the Border Guard is undisputed, and the highest echelons of the SED must have supported the policy, for violence at the border continued unchecked, was largely hidden from the public, and border guards were not tried under GDR law. However, Ahonen cautions that such brutality must be viewed against a broader background of violence at the border and across GDR society.⁴⁶

A second factor that distinguishes the GDR is overwhelming popular antimilitary sentiment. The population of both German states reacted to the end of the Second World War with fatigue, which translated into indifference and even hostility towards militarization.⁴⁷ Many conscripts shared this scepticism, as Sylka Scholz has argued. She analyses the post-reunification life narratives of East German men and suggests that most viewed military service with resignation, as a burdensome but necessary phase, with little identification with military roles or values.⁴⁸ Ambivalence towards militarization, and the effectively unavoidable nature of conscription, meant that many attempted to retain civilian identities and existing masculinities while in the NVA. The resulting resistance to the military's ideal masculinities could enhance the personal conflicts caused by military service, a fact reflected in the particular prominence in film and literature of masculinities that contravene or transgress ideal masculinities.

A third and final factor that differentiates the NVA from other conscript armies is its dissolution and integration into its one-time enemy, the West German Bundeswehr, in 1990. Bickford has emphasized the importance of reunification as a rupture in the lives of NVA officers, who suddenly became the 'military other' in the Berlin Republic as the NVA was redefined as 'bad' and 'illegal'.⁴⁹ The shift to a focus on illegality was influenced by the border guard trials of the early 1990s. From September 1991 onwards, around 3,000 cases of violence at the border were investigated, overwhelmingly involving former border guards.⁵⁰ Although many defendants were convicted – in Berlin over 200 out of 297 – they were not sentenced harshly, usually

receiving suspended sentences of up to two years.⁵¹ The trials' main impact was the heated discussion and media attention they generated. The cases raised complex questions that have continued to influence legal debates into the twenty-first century, and this discussion framed the NVA as a whole in terms of legality and morality.⁵² These trials, along with those of high-ranking SED officials, focused discussion of the GDR military on the distribution of guilt along the chain of command. This shift faced many ex-convicts, not only ex-border guards, with their own guilt and complicity, and forced many to ask whether their subordinate position entirely absolved them of responsibility for the NVA's violent culture.

The shift to a legalistic and moralistic understanding of the NVA appears to have caused ex-convicts to re-evaluate the place of military service in their life trajectory and to assess the morality of their actions and those of others. Scholz demonstrates the difficulties that some of her interviewees had, most of them ordinary convicts, in articulating the place of military service in their lives after 1990. She argues that military service remains a discrete episode in men's narratives, even for those who explicitly emphasize the military's positive effects on their lives.⁵³ She concludes that military masculine ideals did not always fit the life stories that men were constructing after reunification, but that the inclusion of conviction as a discontinuity in men's narratives indicates its formative role.⁵⁴ Though military service may have remained discrete, its effects were never wholly separate from ex-convicts' later lives. The wealth of documentary films and autobiographical or semi-autobiographical literature that continue to engage with GDR military service suggests that military service had profound effects, which prevented convicts from putting the NVA behind them.

For some men after 1990, the NVA became a focus for nostalgia.⁵⁵ For others, military service was a source of self-reproach, no longer just a nuisance, but a form of participation in an institution that supported and defended a repressive regime. This preoccupation is particularly prominent in autobiographical narratives, but it also influences the characterization of convicts in post-reunification fiction and feature films. The need since reunification for men to reassess their complicity or subordination within the military's hierarchies of masculinities makes the East German context remarkable. While films and literature produced within the GDR were strictly controlled and rarely show evidence of soldiers' scepticism, works produced outside the GDR and after reunification generally display a rejection of the NVA's ideals. Post-reunification narratives therefore show that East German military and civilian masculine ideals continue to be negotiated in the Berlin Republic.

From the Margins to the Centre

One of this book's central claims is that masculinities commonly considered to be marginalized – those marked by vulnerability or victimhood, theatricality, shame, same-sex intimacy or desire – are in fact central to military institutions and the wider gender order. The literature, films and television that I analyse in the following chapters, even works that promote the normalizing power of military service, centre around these transgressive, troublesome or inadequate masculinities. In each chapter, I explore aspects of masculinity that are not commonly associated with normative masculinity, and show how central they were to the representation of masculinity and the creation of military ideals in the NVA. As a particularly normative, even repressive environment, the East German military provides an ideal case study for showing just how important marginalized masculinities are in the representations that create, structure and disseminate gender ideals.

Work within queer studies has recently supported the idea that marginalized, or even repudiated, aspects of masculinity are in fact important structuring elements in masculine norms. In her 2015 book *Not Gay*, for example, Jane Ward argues that 'homosexuality is an often invisible, but nonetheless vital ingredient – a constitutive element – of heterosexual masculinity'.⁵⁶ Ward analyses hazing, initiation and bonding rituals in the US military, university fraternities and sports teams, and explores how sexual acts between men are understood not as gay sex, but as part of men's creation and upholding of standards of heterosexual masculinity. Her argument focuses on the constitution of heterosexuality, but her work has important implications for work on masculinity in a broader sense. In this book, I expand on Ward's approach by foregrounding a wider range of marginalized masculine traits that go beyond sexual acts. The works I analyse centre around these traits, as 'constitutive elements' of military norms, but also as demonstrations of the impossibility or even undesirability of living up to those norms. Ward's work focuses on the repudiation of homosexuality through straight white men's recourse to gay sexual acts. Yet in the chapters that follow, I suggest that repressive normative structures like that of the NVA also create spaces for the productive exploration of alternative masculinities and same-sex intimacy.

As the book title *Comrades in Arms* suggests, my interest in military masculinities combines embodied, individual aspects of masculinity with a focus on gender as a set of socially produced conventions and practices. Amidst the turn in the last decade to affect and emotion, embodiment and phenomenology, it can be tempting to isolate aspects of gender that originate in the embodied experience of individuals, and to contrast such experience with the institutions and systems through which gender is negotiated. Since

the beginning, though, and particularly in the work of Raewyn Connell and Kaja Silverman, masculinity studies has conceptualized gender at the interstice between embodied experience and wider social structures.⁵⁷ By rereading these founding works of masculinity scholarship and bringing together Connell's sociological approach with Silverman's psychoanalytic model, I will outline an understanding of gender as a product of embodied negotiations, which I explore more fully in the subsequent chapters. These negotiations are performative in Judith Butler's sense: performances construct both bodies and gender while being constrained by the limits of the body, and these negotiations refer to and are in dialogue with ideals and assumptions about gender that are not always conscious.⁵⁸

As an institution, the NVA linked its standards of masculinity closely to the male body: its ideal of the 'socialist soldier personality' was never as gender-neutral as the SED's jargon might imply. Women could serve voluntarily from the 1950s, primarily in administrative, medical or communications roles. The 1982 Military Service Law then extended the roles available to women and allowed them to serve anywhere in the army. The Law even provided for conscription of women in wartime, although this provision was never implemented.⁵⁹ Yet despite increasing legal equality, restrictions remained on the military roles available to women. These inequalities were epitomized by new uniforms in 1983 that accentuated women's femininity and their difference from male comrades by adding a skirt and different caps.⁶⁰ Outside the GDR context, the relationship between military masculinities and women soldiers has attracted scholarly attention, raising intriguing questions about gender in the military.⁶¹ Yet film and literature about the NVA neglect women soldiers almost entirely, perhaps because conscription was a near-universal rite of passage for men, but enlisting was an unusual step for women. The lack of representations of women soldiers in the NVA demonstrates the powerful links between the military, masculinities and the male body, and suggests that military masculinities were incompatible with official conceptions of femininity and womanhood. The close connection between the GDR's ideal forms of masculinity and the NVA as a training ground makes the military a productive context for a closer investigation of the complexity of East German masculinities. I have restricted my investigation to male soldiers due to the paucity of sources depicting women soldiers, but I nonetheless aim to challenge the association of military masculinities with idealized male bodies by paying attention to multiple, often deviant, ways of embodying military masculinities.

Connell's work on 'hegemonic masculinity' is particularly useful for understanding how individual masculinities relate to ideals and norms of soldierly behaviour.⁶² The term is most often used as a label for dominant forms of masculinity, without sufficient attention to the hegemonic structure

she describes. For Connell, consensus on and complicity with gender norms are powerful forces in sustaining hegemony, but this hegemony is far from fixed and depends on relationships of subordination for its power. Connell defines masculinity and femininity as plural and relational ‘*gender projects*’, in which institutions, representations of men and women, and the everyday actions of individuals play a part.⁶³ Drawing on Antonio Gramsci’s concept of hegemony, Connell emphasizes the imbalance of power in gender practice. She argues that the power of certain men and male-dominated institutions, including the military, depends on specific configurations of masculinity that are privileged over other masculinities as well as femininities.⁶⁴ Only very few men, in Connell’s analysis, ever practise hegemonic masculinity fully, and most are ‘complicit’ in the hegemonic form by striving to emulate it in numerous ways, albeit incompletely. These complicit men avoid challenging the gender order, whether because they admire or aspire to dominant hegemonic forms, or whether protecting themselves from marginalization or exclusion.

Recent debates around GDR masculinities in history, literary studies and social sciences focus especially on the plurality of hegemonic forms, informed by Connell’s work.⁶⁵ The multicentric nature of GDR masculinities has been suggested by Mark Fenemore, who disputes the existence of a single dominant hegemony.⁶⁶ Furthermore, Scholz has investigated competing hegemonic masculinities in East Germany, which I discuss in detail in Chapter 1: the socialist soldier personality, the working-class hero (*Held der Arbeit*) and the affectionate father.⁶⁷ Even within the single ideal of the socialist soldier personality, the influence of German and Soviet traditions produced multicentricity. These traditions often complemented one another. Muscular, honourable, proletarian images of the ideal Soviet man, such as the monument to Soviet war dead erected in Berlin’s Treptower Park, differed little from a bourgeois German masculinity based on self-control, bravery, honesty, strength, courage and discipline.⁶⁸ Soviet influence was clearest in the NVA’s structure and rhetoric: it was modelled on the Red Army, and the so-called brotherhood in arms of socialist nations was an important tenet of conscripts’ political training.⁶⁹ The two traditions clashed above all in the contrast between continuities from Nazism and official rhetoric of renewal and de-Nazification. In particular, the NVA’s uniform resembled that of the Nazi Wehrmacht, a fact greeted with considerable scepticism by conscripts and civilians.⁷⁰ The different influences on the NVA’s hegemonic masculinity suggest a need for attention to soldiers’ individual embodied negotiations of these overlapping and competing traditions.

Connell later admitted that her theory that a majority of men are complicit in masculine dominance is ‘rather bleak’, and she has been criticized for suggesting the permanence of masculine hegemony.⁷¹ However, her model does

emphasize the potential for hegemonic masculinities to be changed or challenged, and she establishes a detailed account of masculinities that conflict with hegemonic models. For her, hegemonic masculinities are always related to, and even dependent on, what she terms 'subordinate' and 'marginalized' masculinities. She argues that subordinate masculinities, such as those associated with gay men, are disadvantaged by the gender order itself. By contrast, 'marginalized' working-class or black masculinities exist in a parallel gender order with internal relations of dominance and subordination; nevertheless, the whole parallel gender order is marginalized with respect to hegemonic racial or class groups.⁷² Connell's fine distinction between subordinate and marginalized masculinities is not always useful or clearly defined. She later hints at subcultural forms of hegemony within gay and lesbian groups, collapsing the distinction between subordination and marginalization.⁷³ This move away from her initial categories allows for multiple sources of power across the gender hierarchy, such that forms of hegemony can reside even in otherwise subordinate masculine positions.

Connell thus depicts hegemony and subordination as a complex system that resists categorization. The importance of consensus, and of actions and interactions between individuals, means that her model already addresses the question of how individual masculinities relate to gender systems. Implicit within her analysis, and explicit in subsequent work with Connell's ideas, is the possibility for multiple different hegemonic masculinities, even if hegemonic forms tend to share certain bodily and temperamental characteristics: bodily strength, physical skill, bravery, endurance, the potential for aggression and so on. For Connell, masculine hegemony depends on the everyday practice of men aspiring to comply with or reject the ideal. Subordinate and marginalized masculinities are at the centre of Connell's case studies, which show that hegemony depends on relations of subordination and marginalization, but also that there can be multiple sources of hegemony. To use a hypothetical military example, a conscript may well be older, more intelligent, bigger, stronger and fiercer than a man employed as a career officer. Where the second derives his power from his position within an institutional hierarchy, the first might call on his other hegemonic attributes to contest the officer's power or elevate himself above other conscripts. The boundary between power and subordination in Connell's model is more fluid than many commentators have allowed. The officer may, for example, feel it necessary to assert authority over this powerful conscript especially strongly, resulting in more testing training, higher expectations and even ritual humiliation. The conscript's power, then, might also become his weakness by attracting undue attention.

Silverman's *Male Subjectivity at the Margins* (1992) also centres analysis on what she terms 'marginal' masculinities, but she emphasizes their unsettling

and subversive potential more explicitly than Connell. Silverman outlines the concept of a 'dominant fiction', a network of ideals that govern the subject's position in society.⁷⁴ She argues that ideal masculinities are intimately connected to the dominant fiction and exert a normalizing force on femininities and on masculinities that deviate from the 'phallic standard'.⁷⁵ Silverman analyses marginal masculinities in order to counter, as well as simply understand, the workings of this dominant fiction. Viewing the Oedipus complex as the primary way in which subjects are subordinated within the dominant fiction, Silverman argues that 'even in the most normative of subjective instances the psyche remains in excess of that complex, and that in other cases desire and identification may actually function as mechanisms for circumventing or even repudiating the dominant fiction'.⁷⁶ Silverman and Connell agree that the power of ideal masculinities depends on the repudiation of subordinate and marginalized masculinities. It is therefore impossible to understand the GDR's gender ideals without investigating subordinate, transgressive and even queer aspects of masculinities.

The importance and complexity of subordinate masculinities within military hierarchies has been suggested by Paul Higate's sociological work inspired by his experience as a clerk in the Royal Air Force. Higate argues that rank hierarchies make explicit power relations that remain naturalized or concealed in other contexts, and he analyses masculinities that are subordinated within the military, including administrative and support roles.⁷⁷ In turn, Bickford has drawn on Higate's work to examine the relative prestige of different NVA occupations, and he describes the dual hierarchies that operated in the NVA.⁷⁸ The first was the traditional rank hierarchy. The second, unofficial hierarchy was the so-called 'EK' movement, where 'EK' stands for 'Entlassungskandidat', a soldier nearing the end of his service.⁷⁹ Power depended on the time remaining in a conscript's service, divided into six-month segments. Conscripts in their first six months were called 'rookies', 'smooth' after their ironed epaulettes or the rather unsavoury 'Spritzer' or 'squirts', which referred to their need to be snappy (*spritzig*), but also had connotations of urination or ejaculation. In the penultimate six months of their service, they were called 'vices' (*Vize*), and EKs in their final six months. EKs subjected new recruits to hazing, beatings and exploitation that were more brutal than official discipline and often loom larger than official punishments in post-reunification accounts.⁸⁰ Interactions between hierarchies were complex: officers tolerated the EK movement because it promoted deference and subordination, yet EKs themselves were still subject to discipline from above in the rank hierarchy.⁸¹ Conscripts' individual positions within these competing hierarchies determined their experiences. Masculinities that were subordinated within these hierarchies have hardly been investigated in scholarship on the NVA, even though some scholars have addressed them

in other militaries.⁸² Literature and films depicting the NVA place subordinate or marginal masculinities at the centre of their portrayals and therefore demand an analysis that focuses on masculinities that fail to approximate military norms.

The above approaches tend to neglect the embodied nature of masculinities in the experience of military service, even though Connell and Silverman both gesture to bodies being read as more or less masculine. The context of military training focuses attention particularly on the body as a limiting factor in negotiations of masculinity, as well as on the physical pain that serves to punish deviations from masculine standards. Butler's concept of performativity, on which later masculinities scholarship has built, resembles Connell's understanding of 'gender practice', but more clearly articulates the role of the body. She writes that bodily sex is 'a process whereby regulatory norms materialize "sex" and achieve this materialization through a forcible reiteration of those norms. That this reiteration is necessary is a sign that materialization is never quite complete, that bodies never quite comply with the norms by which their materialization is impelled'.⁸³ Bodily materiality, in other words, is never fixed or free of cultural meanings; bodies are shaped through performative negotiations of gender, just as gender is shaped in turn by the possibilities and limitations of the body. The history of how cultural ideals and concepts of masculinity have shaped the male body has been the subject of much research, most notably in the German context by George Mosse in his discussion of the spread of the nineteenth-century gymnastics movement.⁸⁴ But it is important to bear in mind Butler's insistence that bodies can never fully comply with standards of masculinity and that even concepts of maleness are culturally imposed. Bodies limit conformity with gender norms as much as they can suggest conformity when properly sculpted and worked.

Sara Ahmed has taken Butler's argument further in discussing what she calls the bodily horizon: 'the horizon marks the edge of what can be reached by the body. The body becomes present as a body, with surfaces and boundaries, in showing the "limits" of what it can do'.⁸⁵ Much as Silverman looks to marginal cases to understand masculinity, Ahmed recommends that we look to moments of bodily failure, overreach or impossibility to understand the body and the norms it reaches towards. In military cultures, the need for recruits to push their bodies is clearly articulated throughout training through the orders of superiors, with more immediate punishments than in civilian society for coming up short. The body is sculpted performatively through such routines in the way Butler describes. Yet even when a soldier deliberately strives to reach a target, Butler and Ahmed both emphasize the inevitability of failure, and require us to consider masculine ideals in relation to a cycle of bodily failure, inadequacy and deviation.

In order to centre analysis on supposedly marginalized masculine traits, this book proceeds from three premises in its understanding of masculinities. First, marginalized masculinities are central to gender norms because masculinity always consists in a reciprocal relationship between individual practice and overarching ideals. Although ideals may be broadly shared, the degree of commitment versus cynicism is important, as is the fact that some ideals may be more conscious than others. Military service is particularly fruitful for analysing masculinity because it frequently makes men conscious of ideals of behaviour and achievement because of the stark differences between civilian and military life. The second point is that masculinity is built up through embodied performativity. Individuals enact their gender in performative ways through bodily actions and interactions with other bodies. Masculine bodies are shaped by these actions, their limits are defined by interactions, and the body defines the bounds within which conformity with ideals is possible. Third, far from a tension between discursive or systemic models of gender and individual practice, the relationship between individuals and institutions is paramount to understanding gender, especially within the military, but also in civilian society. As I demonstrate throughout this book, masculinity emerges as a negotiation between overarching ideals, specific institutional demands and practices, and extra-institutional factors such as individual traits, values and beliefs.

Contemporary Negotiations of GDR Masculinities: *Deutschland 83* and *Deutschland 86*

Deutschland 83, a 2015 television series cowritten by American Anna Winger and German Jörg Winger, and its 2018 sequel *Deutschland 86* illustrate trends in representations of GDR military masculinities, support the model I have outlined and raise questions that guide my investigation.⁸⁶ This drama suggests the need to return to portrayals of GDR military service in order to advance our understanding of East German society and our current fascination with its legacy. The transnational genesis of the two series indicates the importance of the GDR's appeal even outside Germany as a way of understanding the contemporary world. The script was first written by Anna Winger in English and translated into German by her husband, Jörg, and was coproduced by the American cable television network SundanceTV and the German private broadcaster RTL. *Deutschland 83* premiered on SundanceTV to rave reviews and decent viewing figures for a foreign-language series on a small cable channel in a crowded market.⁸⁷ Disappointing ratings for its German premiere on RTL created doubt about the series, and especially its potential to sustain the two planned sequels: 3.2 million viewed the

first episode in November, but this fell to 1.63 million by the finale in December.⁸⁸ Yet in the UK on Channel 4, *Deutschland 83* soon became the most-viewed foreign-language programme ever with 2.5 million viewers live and online.⁸⁹ Its international success probably contributed to Amazon's decision to pick up *Deutschland 86* on its German platform, although its success is difficult to quantify because Amazon does not release viewing figures. *Deutschland 86* premiered on 19 October 2018 on Prime in Germany and SundanceTV in the US. It received similar plaudits from reviewers, especially in the English-speaking world, and the new series contains large portions in English, a thematic nod to its international audience. The two series' success has depended on this international distribution, and there seems to be a better market outside Germany for the show's depiction of the GDR in the spy genre.

The transnational production and distribution of *Deutschland 83* and *Deutschland 86* is mirrored in their unusually transnational plots. While the Stasi drama in *Das Leben der Anderen* (*The Lives of Others*, 2006) is confined to East Germany with only occasional border-crossing characters gesturing to links with the West, *Deutschland 83* unfolds primarily in West Germany and *Deutschland 86* is set substantially in Cape Town, Paris and rural Angola and Libya.⁹⁰ The settings suggest that our current image of East Germany is inseparable from post-reunification mediations and representations of the state, often from Western perspectives. At the opening of *Deutschland 83*, Martin Rauch, an NCO in the Border Guard, is approached by his aunt, Lenora, to take an assignment as a Stasi mole in the office of the Bundeswehr's NATO liaison, General Edel. Believing his mother's kidney transplant will be expedited as a result, Martin leaves his mother, Ingrid, and girlfriend, Annett, in the East and travels to Bonn as Bundeswehr Oberleutnant Moritz Stamm.⁹¹ He embarks on a series of missions, depicted with playful nods to spy thrillers and with retro appeal created by the 1980s soundtrack and costumes. By situating Martin's mission in West Germany, and cutting between his family in Kleinmachnow and his missions in Bonn and Brussels, the series sets Martin's relationships with East German institutions in an international context. *Deutschland 86* expands on this theme by focusing on East Germany's dealings with West Germany and with African states and resistance movements. As the GDR's economy suffers, Martin, Lenora and South African agent Rose Seithathi facilitate illegal arms sales between West Germany and the apartheid government in South Africa. In East Berlin, Annett, now rising through the ranks of the Stasi's inner circle, establishes drugs trials in East German hospitals for a West German firm. In the first episode, Annett sums up the contradiction in her superiors' economic schemes: 'But it sounds as if you are talking about capitalism.'⁹² In *Deutschland 86* military and surveillance structures are not the only networks

that transcend the borders of the GDR; economic structures and patterns of colonialism also entangle East Germany in transnational flows of people and capital.⁹³

Deutschland 83 shows Martin negotiating masculinity within military and surveillance institutions in both East and West. Any culture shock is primarily a comic touch, and allows the inclusion of retro details from West and East and playful jokes around East German language, as in the training montage at the Bonn villa of Professor Tobias Tischbier, Martin's Stasi contact in the West: 'This is an orange. If you say "Apfelsine", she'll think, what's going on here' (Episode 1, 20:47–20:51).⁹⁴ Tischbier's blasé tone adds to the impression that such differences are largely cosmetic, and that there are substantial parallels between the institutions of West and East and their influence on characters' identities. Figures on both sides of the border are shaped physically and symbolically by institutions, but their own values and sense of self ensure that the negotiation of masculinity is a multifaceted and multi-directional process: their actions and interactions in turn shape and influence masculine institutional cultures too. Of these institutions, the military is most prominent as a backdrop to the masculine identities of characters. *Deutschland 83* suggests that depictions of the GDR military not only shed light on how the NVA itself has been represented during and since the GDR, but can also illuminate the complex negotiations through which we articulate masculine identities in the West.

The representation of Martin's masculinity in *Deutschland 83* draws on stereotypes of the East German army, as well as on masculine stereotypes from other genres, in particular the spy thriller. The first episode introduces Martin in the second scene, cutting from Lenora at the GDR's Permanent Representation in Bonn to a dimly lit corridor in a facility at the border. Martin and a colleague have arrested two Western students for smuggling out volumes of Shakespeare bought with money changed on the black market. As he interrogates the students, Martin is filmed from a low angle, in medium shots and medium close-ups that ensure his uniform is always in view. The authority he gains from costume and camerawork is enhanced by his stern tone and laconic take on the language of state socialism: 'Shakespeare stays here. You can take Marx with you, you might just learn something' (Episode 1, 2:41–2:45). Martin's harsh admonishment appears hyperbolic, given the harmless nature of the students' crime, and this line hints that he may not be taking it entirely seriously. This suggestion is borne out when Martin and his colleague burst into laughter once the students leave. The film thus creates a disjunction in Martin's masculinity, between his enthusiastic embodiment of a strict soldierly masculinity with an inherent threat of violence and his lack of underlying sincerity that suggests a more complex relationship to the scripts of the Border Guard.

Martin's ambivalence towards the GDR's masculine ideals is enhanced by his Stasi mission, which takes him out of the NVA and positions him in the Bundeswehr. Whatever genuine commitment to state socialism might lie behind his admonishment of the students, he cannot reveal such ideological positions while undercover. Yet his new role requires a similar approach to masculinity to the one he learned in the NVA. On arriving in the Bundeswehr, he expresses ideological commitments as part of a performance of authority and loyalty, even though he is not committed to these positions. When he first meets his roommate, General Edel's son Alex, Martin declares his allegiance to NATO and echoes Western justifications of the arms race in the early 1980s: 'We have to build up our nuclear arsenal to keep the Soviets under control. We just have to show those assholes who's boss. If we're not prepared to do that, we might as well forget all this, right?' (Episode 1, 23:40–23:53). As Martin moves in and out of shot, the camera remains focused on Alex Edel's serious face and upright posture, inviting the viewer to scrutinize whether Martin's performance is successful. The humour and confidence of the interrogation scene are gone; he appears to believe that articulating such ideas sincerely is essential to passing as a West German soldier. Alex's serious face initially suggests that he is testing Martin, but his hollow laugh suggests that Martin has overestimated the need to parrot such ideological positions: 'You sound like my father' (Episode 1, 23:55–23:57). Alex rejects West German arms policy, anticipating Martin's own later disillusionment with the GDR's surveillance apparatus, and he greets Martin's ideological sincerity with exasperation. Martin's response to Alex's question is almost too sincere, lacking cynicism and distance. Such an attitude places military ideals at one remove: far from striving to conform to or vehemently reject them, both Martin and Alex are, in Connell's terminology, 'complicit'. They conform in what they consider to be superficial ways, which nonetheless shape their own masculinities, perpetuate standards of masculinity and bolster military systems.

Deutschland 83 draws close comparisons between the military masculinities promoted in the Bundeswehr and the NVA, yet by exploring this relationship, the series also highlights its broader interest in pluralizing forms of hegemonic masculinity. On the level of genre, the series investigates the close relationship between the masculinities of soldiers and of Stasi spies in contemporary imaginings of GDR culture, each representing not just a hegemonic form of masculinity, but a symbol of the GDR's repressive system more broadly. *Deutschland 83* constructs Martin's soldierly masculinity out of references to both sets of stereotypes and generic expectations. The interrogation scene in Episode 1, for example, echoes scenes of interrogation by Stasi officers in *Das Leben der Anderen*, especially the first medium shot of Martin filmed by a camera at desk level, along with the room's grey and beige

décor. Later scenes in *Deutschland 83*, in which Stasi agent Schweppenstette interrogates Annett's friend Thomas, occur in a near-identical setting with similar camera angles, further blurring the distinction between Martin's job as a border guard and the role of Stasi officer.

The blurring of military and spy stereotypes is also key to Martin's relationships. Annett initially appears as the unfaithful military girlfriend, a trope familiar from military films such as *Pearl Harbor* (2001) and *Jarhead* (2005), who becomes faithful after discovering that she is pregnant with Martin's child.⁹⁵ Yet much of the plot revolves around Martin's fleeting James Bond-style relationships with NATO secretary Linda and Yvonne, the daughter of Martin's boss at the Bundeswehr, General Edel. Just like women in the Bond films, both are strong characters wooed by Martin's charm and both get into compromised situations because of their relationships with Martin, including Linda's dramatic death in Episode 4. Like Bond films during Judi Dench's tenure as M, Martin's often incompetent attempts to follow his missions are directed by a more senior woman, his aunt Lenora. Like M, Lenora frequently emasculates Martin by withholding information and, for much of the series, ignoring his analysis of the situation in the Bundeswehr.⁹⁶ Women rarely occupy positions of power in military films, which instead tend to focus on mothers, wives and daughters of soldiers, and including a woman in Martin's Stasi command structure focuses the story on his complex negotiations of spy and military masculinities. Moreover, Martin's frequent incompetence makes him dependent on Lenora and Tischbier, often conflicting with the precision and professionalism of his persona as a military officer.

Characters' relationships to hegemonic masculinity in *Deutschland 83* are not just plural because of the different genres they draw on; rather, many characters develop a complex combination of subordinate and complicit masculinities. Martin does not substantially challenge West or East German hegemonic masculinities, a complicity that allows him to blend in, and his conscious performance of conformity mixed with good-humoured distance preserves his individual values even while acting for the Stasi. By revealing in Episode 7 that he is a Stasi mole, Martin asserts his principles against both states' bellicosity, ending the first series on the run from both regimes. Yet the circularity of his return to his mother's garden in Episode 8, echoing the first episode, suggests that his status within the masculine hierarchy is not substantially compromised.

However, Alex's homosexuality represents a greater challenge to the military gender system in the Bundeswehr and, in line with Silverman's argument, his more marginal position reveals the fragility of military masculinities. His active resistance to the arms race is explicitly connected to his homosexuality through his relationship with Tischbier, who also leads the resistance movement at the University of Bonn. Alex's desire to impress Tischbier leads him

to kidnap an American general in Episode 6 and join a protest outside his own base in Episode 7. Their relationship also exposes Alex to HIV: this storyline is handled awkwardly, but creates the possibility that Alex's subordination will end in exclusion from society and eventually death. The series ends on a cliffhanger: Alex's diagnosis is not revealed in *Deutschland 83*, and an unexplained gunshot in the Edel house leaves open the question whether Alex kills himself. The other potential victim of the gunshot is General Edel, whose rigid adherence to his military career has resulted in his entire family leaving him. In *Deutschland 86*, we learn that Alex is HIV negative, but that he was about to shoot himself when General Edel walked in. In his surprise, Alex accidentally shot and injured his father, who survived but was paralysed from the waist down.⁹⁷ While Martin emerges from his mission without damaging his complicity in hegemonic masculinity, and by 1986 has even gained celebrity, West German forms of hegemonic masculinity are unsettled at the end of *Deutschland 83*. With his injury and absence from the second series, General Edel encapsulates the impossibility of truly embodying hegemonic ideals, and Alex's decision to leave the military to work in AIDS hospices mirrors Martin's decision to go on the run, emphasizing individual agency in negotiating masculinities over any normative power of military ideals.

The power of these ideals in the series is determined by citizens' negotiations of ideal masculinities and the institutions that promoted them. As in Silverman's work on marginal masculinities, in which she describes the pleasure and temptation in the punitive function of the subject's own superego, censure and repudiation of subordinate aspects of masculinity seem in *Deutschland 83* to occur within the individual psyche.⁹⁸ Neither the military nor the Stasi actively repudiates subordinate masculinities in the series; rather, characters grapple with reconciling their own values, the pressures placed on them by institutions and other individuals, and broader assumptions about masculinity. The potential consequences of marginalization within the gender order are clear, in the anger Alex faces from his father, his manipulation by Tischbier and the danger of the HIV epidemic. Yet marginalization never seems inevitable; there is room for Martin and Alex to retain aspects of their identity from outside their military roles, as well as for cynicism and even principled resistance. The focus in *Deutschland 83*, as in other literary and film narratives, is on individual ways of existing within, challenging and accommodating oneself to the military and its gender norms. Such narratives depict gender practice, but their production and dissemination are also part of a society's gender practice, and GDR institutions and gender norms thus inform our understanding of masculinity in the present. *Deutschland 83* and *Deutschland 86* offer new perspectives on gender in East Germany and show how memories of the GDR continue to shape our negotiations of German and global cultures in the twenty-first century.

Deutschland 83, with its emphasis on cynical and often deliberately transgressive responses to ideals of masculine behaviour, points to four principles that a discussion of masculinity in the GDR must adopt. First, it insists on the importance of East Germany for understanding the contemporary Western world more broadly. Second, it places masculinity at the centre of the GDR's most pervasive, and most repressive, total institutions, suggesting that the effect of these institutions on masculinity and subjectivity was more lasting than the institutions themselves. Third, it proceeds from the assumption that even committed soldiers within the NVA – and indeed the Bundeswehr – approached the requirements placed on them with a degree of distance and self-awareness. This approach forces us to move beyond arguments based on soldiers being mere representatives of state repression, and requires discussion of literary and filmic images of masculinity as a set of embodied negotiations of institutions and state structures. A division between the state and the individual becomes impossible, not only in the terms used by Mary Fulbrook in her description of the GDR as a 'participatory dictatorship', but also in characters' embodied, gendered subjectivities.⁹⁹ Fourth, and finally, it suggests that focusing on representations of subordinate aspects of masculinity in the GDR, an under-researched area of East German culture, also helps us understand mechanisms of marginalization within our own societies.

This book takes these positions as its starting point and looks back at the longer history of representations of masculinities in the NVA since the advent of conscription in 1962. Literature and film depicting the NVA can help us understand how masculinity was conceived and negotiated in the GDR, as well as the fraught relationship between military identities imposed by the state and the values, concerns and principles of individuals. I take as my focus masculinities that come into conflict with the NVA's military ideals, revealing the limits of those ideals and expanding our understanding of masculinities in the NVA and in the GDR more broadly. My chapters are thematic, and each points to continuities that stretch across GDR and post-reunification representations. In order to elucidate the negotiations of masculinity that operate on the level of individual texts and individual characters and episodes within films or prose works, I focus on select examples. My case studies are selected for their representative nature, but also for their unique perspectives on each chapter's theme. By approaching each theme from numerous perspectives, I allow for complexities and differences in the construction and reconstruction of GDR masculinities over the almost sixty-year span of my corpus.

This book offers a new conception of the GDR dictatorship that places masculinity and its mechanisms of complicity and marginalization at the centre of individuals' relationship to the state. Chapters 1 and 2 probe the limits of ideal masculinity in both official literature of the NVA's own publishing house and in films depicting violence at the border. Chapters 3 and

4 focus on the interplay between the performativity of military service and soldiers' bodies, while Chapters 5 and 6 look closer at the effects of military service on soldiers' feelings and desires. The book offers insights from film and literature into questions poorly served by the historical record; the role of bodily vulnerability in Chapter 3, for example, and especially experiences of same-sex desire in Chapter 6. My investigation has important consequences for our understanding of contemporary societies. It offers an explanation for the ongoing, even increasing, fascination with the GDR in contemporary society that accounts both for the playful, retro appeal of East German culture, which I analyse in Chapter 4, and for the profound emotional and psychological effects that military service had on conscripts, as I explore in Chapter 5.

The book looks beyond 1989 as a caesura, focusing instead on lines of influence that link approaches to the GDR in today's Federal Republic with East German writers and filmmakers, influences that illuminate the ongoing fascination with and continuing difficult negotiations of the GDR past. It suggests a model for GDR studies that accounts both for the specificity of the East German state and for its essential and unavoidable presence in the contemporary imagination. And most broadly, it develops our understanding of marginalized masculinities in the context of military and other male-dominated institutions. This book's central rationale is that, by centring analysis around masculinities conventionally studied only as marginal within such organizations, norms themselves become pluralized, and individual embodiments of masculinity can be prioritized over the normalizing forces of institutions.

Notes

1. Berlin, Bundesbeauftragter für die Unterlagen des Staatssicherheitsdienstes der ehemaligen Deutschen Demokratischen Republik (BStU), MfS HA I/16793, 'Analyse über ledige Offiziere im Verantwortungsbereich des Grenzkommando-Süd, die älter als 28 Jahre sind bzw. das 28. Lebensjahr erreicht haben', 19 April 1988, fol. 3.
2. Ibid.
3. M. Simpson, 'The Metrosexual Is Dead: Long Live the "Spornosexual"', *Daily Telegraph*, 10 June 2014.
4. L. Guadagnino (dir.), *Call Me by Your Name* (Sony Pictures, 2017). See Y. Desta, 'Armie Hammer Has the Most Ridiculous Digital Editing Story of the Year', *Vanity Fair*, 29 November 2017.
5. M.I. Black, 'The Boys are Not All Right', *New York Times*, 21 February 2018; B. Barth, 'The Good Men: Inside the All-Male Group Taking on Modern Masculinity', *The Guardian*, 18 June 2018; A. Wendt, 'Bist du gesund, Mann?', *Focus Magazin*, 30 June 2018, 70–77.
6. R.W. Connell, *Gender and Power: Society, the Person and Sexual Politics* (Cambridge: Polity, 1987), 98–99.

7. See *ibid.*, 119–42.
8. See the articles from a 2009 conference in K. Leeder (ed.), *Re-reading East Germany: The Literature and Film of the GDR* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015).
9. S. Urban, *Plan D* (Frankfurt am Main: Schöffling, 2011); D. Young, *Stasi Child* (London: twenty7, 2015); S. Spielberg (dir.), *Bridge of Spies* (Disney, 2015); D. Leitch (dir.), *Atomic Blonde* (Focus, 2017).
10. See e.g. S. Jones, *The Media of Testimony: Remembering the East German Stasi in the Berlin Republic* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014); A. Ring, *After the Stasi: Collaboration and the Struggle for Sovereign Subjectivity in the Writing of German Unification* (London: Bloomsbury, 2015).
11. D. Abenheim, 'German Unity and Military Professionalism: The Officer Corps of the German Armed Forces Confronts the Legacy of the *Nationale Volksarmee*, November 1989–January 1993', in D. Wetzel and T.S. Hamerow (eds), *International Politics and German History: The Past Informs the Present* (Westport, CT: Praeger, 1997), 103–26 (at 105).
12. See A. Wagner, 'Stacheldrahtsicherheit: Die politische und militärische Planung und Durchführung des Mauerbaus 1961', in H.-H. Hertle, K.H. Jarausch and C. Kießmann (eds), *Mauerbau und Mauerfall: Ursachen – Verlauf – Auswirkungen* (Berlin: Links, 2002), 119–37; and H.-H. Hertle, *Der Fall der Mauer: Die unbeabsichtigte Selbstauflösung des SED-Staates* (Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag, 1996), 111–14.
13. A. Bickford, *Fallen Elites: The Military Other in Post-unification Germany* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2011), 3.
14. K. Silverman, *Male Subjectivity at the Margins* (New York: Routledge, 1992), 48.
15. See J. Hell, *Post-fascist Fantasies: Psychoanalysis, History, and the Literature of East Germany* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1997); L. Kaganovsky, *How the Soviet Man Was Unmade: Cultural Fantasy and Male Subjectivity under Stalin* (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 2008).
16. R. Felski, *The Limits of Critique* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2015), 168.
17. On censorship and its effects on GDR writers and filmmakers, see D. Berghahn, *Hollywood behind the Wall: The Cinema of East Germany* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2005); and S. Jones, *Complicity, Censorship and Criticism: Negotiating Space in the GDR Literary Sphere* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2011).
18. S. Brockmann, *The Writers' State: Constructing East German Literature, 1945–1959* (Rochester, NY: Camden House, 2015), 9.
19. S. Scholz, *Männlichkeit erzählen: Lebensgeschichtliche Identitätskonstruktionen ostdeutscher Männer* (Münster: Westfälisches Dampfboot, 2004), 190–91 and 194–95.
20. Bickford sets out this tension between the extraordinary and the universal in *Fallen Elites*, 9–10.
21. D. Bald, 'Militärpolitische Restauration: Zur Wehrpflicht im geteilten Deutschland', in E. Opitz and F.S. Rödiger (eds), *Allgemeine Wehrpflicht: Geschichte, Probleme, Perspektiven* (Bremen: Temmen, 1995), 75–87 (at 82).
22. R. Wenzke, *Ulbrichts Soldaten: Die Nationale Volksarmee 1956–1971* (Berlin: Links, 2013), 31.
23. R. Wenzke, 'Auf dem Wege zur Kaderarmee: Aspekte der Rekrutierung, Sozialstruktur und personellen Entwicklung des entstehenden Militärs in der SBZ/DDR bis 1952/53', in B. Thoß (ed.), *Volksarmee schaffen – ohne Geschrei! Studien zu den Anfängen einer 'verdeckten Aufrüstung' in der SBZ/DDR 1947–1952* (Munich: Oldenbourg, 1994), 205–72 (at 249–60).

24. W. Eisert, 'Zu den Anfängen der Sicherheits- und Militärpolitik der SED-Führung 1948 bis 1952', in Thoß, *Volksarmee schaffen*, 141–204 (at 172–73); Wenzke, *Ulbrichts Soldaten*, 32.
25. Wenzke, 'Auf dem Wege', 261.
26. Wenzke, *Ulbrichts Soldaten*, 36–37 and 41; T.M. Forster, *Die NVA: Kernstück der Landesverteidigung der DDR* (Cologne: Markus, 1980), 29.
27. 'Gesetz über die allgemeine Wehrpflicht (Wehrpflichtgesetz) vom 24. Januar 1962', *Gesetzblatt der Deutschen Demokratischen Republik*, vol. 1, 1962, 2–6.
28. C.T. Müller, *Tausend Tage bei der 'Asche': Unteroffiziere in der NVA – Untersuchungen zu Alltag und Binnenstruktur einer 'sozialistischen' Armee* (Berlin: Links, 2003), 54.
29. S. Kolditz and U. Egger, interview, in Egger (dir.), *An die Grenze* (Colonia, 2007), additional material, 9.38–10.00; P.J. Lapp, 'Die Grenztruppen der DDR (1961–1989)', in T. Diedrich, H. Ehlert and R. Wenzke (eds), *Im Dienste der Partei: Handbuch der bewaffneten Organe der DDR* (Berlin: Links, 1998), 225–52 (at 226); P. Ahonen, *Death at the Berlin Wall* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), 220.
30. E.g. M. Sollorz, 'Der IM "Georg Schröder": Jens Dobler im Interview mit Michael Sollorz', in J. Dobler (ed.), *Verzaubert in Nord-Ost: Die Geschichte der Berliner Lesben und Schwulen in Prenzlauer Berg, Pankow und Weißensee* (Berlin: Gmünder, 2009), 248–55.
31. J. Steike, 'Von den "Inneren Truppen" zur Bereitschaftspolizei (1953–1990)', in Diedrich, Ehlert and Wenzke, *Im Dienste der Partei*, 69–95 (at 81–82).
32. T. Diedrich, 'Gegen Aufrüstung, Volksunterdrückung und politische Gängelei: Widerstandsverhalten und politische Verfolgung in der Aufbau- und Konsolidierungsphase der DDR-Streitkräfte 1948 bis 1968', in R. Wenzke (ed.), *Staatsfeinde in Uniform? Widerständiges Verhalten und politische Verfolgung in der NVA* (Berlin: Links, 2005), 31–195 (at 149–51); 'Anordnung des Nationalen Verteidigungsrates der Deutschen Demokratischen Republik über die Aufstellung von Baueinheiten im Bereich des Ministeriums für Nationale Verteidigung (Bausoldatenanordnung) vom 7. September 1964', *Gesetzblatt der Deutschen Demokratischen Republik*, vol. 1, 1964, 129–31.
33. B. Eisenfeld and P. Schicketanz, *Bausoldaten in der DDR: Die 'Zusammenführung feindlich-negativer Kräfte' in der NVA* (Berlin: Links, 2011), 127–31, 144–46 and 167–94.
34. 'Gesetz über den Wehrdienst in der Deutschen Demokratischen Republik (Wehrdienstgesetz) vom 25. März 1982', *Gesetzblatt der Deutschen Demokratischen Republik*, vol. 1, 1982, 221–29.
35. N. Leonhard, 'The National People's Army as an Object of (Non) Remembrance: The Place of East Germany's Military Heritage in Unified Germany', *German Politics and Society* 26(4) (2008), 150–63 (at 158).
36. E.g. D. Morgan, "'It Will Make a Man of You': Notes on National Service, Masculinity and Autobiography', special issue, *Studies in Sexual Politics* 17 (1987); A. Ahlbäck, *Manhood and the Making of the Military: Conscriptio, Military Service and Masculinity in Finland, 1917–39* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2014).
37. For example, in the Israeli and American contexts, see respectively U. Klein, 'The Military and Masculinities in Israeli Society', in P.R. Higate (ed.), *Military Masculinities: Identity and the State* (Westport, CT: Praeger, 2003), 191–200 (at 191–92); and E.A. Disler, *Language and Gender in the Military: Honorifics, Narrative, and Ideology in Air Force Talk* (Amherst, NY: Cambria, 2008), xvii.
38. A. Bickford, 'The Militarization of Masculinity in the Former German Democratic Republic', in Higate, *Military Masculinities*, 157–73 (at 158).

39. W. Ulbricht, 'DDR setzt Bemühungen zur Verständigung fort: Rede Walter Ulbrichts am ersten Sitzungstag der Konferenz in Prag', *Neues Deutschland*, 28 January 1956, 1–2 (at 2).
40. See R. Wenzke, *Die NVA und der Prager Frühling 1968: Die Rolle Ulbrichts und der DDR-Streitkräfte bei der Niederschlagung der tschechoslowakischen Reformbewegung* (Berlin: Links, 1995).
41. Discussions of masculinities that deviate from military ideals are especially prominent in the context of the First World War: T. Kühne, "...aus diesem Krieg werden nicht nur harte Männer heimkehren": Kriegskameradschaft und Männlichkeit im 20. Jahrhundert', in T. Kühne (ed.), *Männergeschichte – Geschlechtergeschichte: Männlichkeit im Wandel der Moderne* (Frankfurt am Main: Campus, 1996), 174–92; S. Das, *Touch and Intimacy in First World War Literature* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005); J. Crouthamel, *An Intimate History of the Front: Masculinity, Sexuality, and German Soldiers in the First World War* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014).
42. P.J. Lapp, *Gefechtsdienst im Frieden: Das Grenzregime der DDR* (Bonn: Bernard & Graefe, 1999), 233–37.
43. Lapp, 'Die Grenztruppen', 234.
44. Ahonen, *Death at the Berlin Wall*, 42. See e.g. B. Hans, 'Schießbefehl-Streit: Honecker, Heuchelei, Hysterie', *Der Spiegel*, 13 September 2007.
45. Ahonen, *Death at the Berlin Wall*, 219. See also P.J. Lapp, 'Verwirrung um den "Schießbefehl"', *Deutschland Archiv* 40 (2007), 773–75.
46. Ahonen, *Death at the Berlin Wall*. I discuss violence at the border further in Chapter 2.
47. Bald, 'Militärpolitische Restauration', 80.
48. Scholz, *Männlichkeit*, 189.
49. Bickford, *Fallen Elites*, 7 and 12.
50. R. Grafe, *Deutsche Gerechtigkeit: Prozesse gegen DDR-Grenzsoldaten und ihre Befehlsgeber*, 2nd edn (Munich: Siedler, 2004), 18.
51. Ahonen, *Death at the Berlin Wall*, 261 and 273.
52. See S. Hobe and C. Tietje, 'Schießbefehl an der DDR-Grenze und ius cogens', *Archiv des Völkerrechts* 32 (1994), 130–48; A.J. McAdams, *Judging the Past in Unified Germany* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001); A. Künzler, 'Judicial Legitimacy and the Role of Courts: Explaining the Transitional Context of the German Border Guard Cases', *Oxford Journal of Legal Studies* 32 (2012), 349–81.
53. Scholz, *Männlichkeit*, 188.
54. *Ibid.*, 257.
55. J. Hasselmann, T. Loy and N. Garrelts, 'Wenn die Stasi-Garde in Berlin trainiert', *Der Tagesspiegel*, 11 May 2013.
56. J. Ward, *Not Gay: Sex between Straight White Men* (New York: New York University Press, 2015), 5.
57. In historical scholarship, Josie McLellan's *Love in the Time of Communism: Intimacy and Sexuality in the GDR* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011) is an excellent example of how to account for the relationship between bodies and institutions.
58. See e.g. J. Butler, *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity* (New York: Routledge, 1990); J. Butler, 'Introduction', in *Bodies that Matter: On the Discursive Limits of 'Sex'* (New York: Routledge, 1993), 1–23.
59. 'Wehrdienstgesetz 1982'.
60. C. Lemke and G. Neugebauer, 'Frauen und Militär in der DDR', *Deutschland Archiv* 18 (1985), 411–26 (at 419–20).
61. See O. Sasson-Levy, 'Feminism and Military Gender Practices: Israeli Women Soldiers in "Masculine" Roles', *Sociological Inquiry* 73 (2003), 440–65; R. Woodward and

- T. Winter, *Sexing the Soldier: The Politics of Gender and the Contemporary British Army* (New York: Routledge, 2007), 74–76.
62. Connell, *Gender and Power*; and R.W. Connell, *Masculinities* (Cambridge: Polity, 1995).
63. Connell, *Masculinities*, 72. Emphasis in original.
64. *Ibid.*, 77–78 and 79–80.
65. J. Tosh, ‘Hegemonic Masculinity and the History of Gender’, in S. Dudink, K. Hagemann and J. Tosh (eds), *Masculinities in Politics and War: Gendering Modern History* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2004), 41–58; E. Newlands, ‘Preparing and Resisting the War Body: Training in the British Army’, in Kevin McSorley (ed.), *War and the Body: Militarisation, Practice and Experience* (New York: Routledge, 2013), 35–50; C. Duncanson, *Forces for Good? Military Masculinities and Peacebuilding in Afghanistan and Iraq* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013).
66. M. Fenemore, *Sex, Thugs and Rock ‘n’ Roll: Teenage Rebels in Cold-War East Germany* (New York: Berghahn Books, 2007), 11–12. See also S. Satjukow and R. Grieds (eds), *Sozialistische Helden: Eine Kulturgeschichte von Propagandafiguren in Osteuropa und der DDR* (Berlin: Links, 2002).
67. S. Scholz, ‘“Sozialistische Soldatenpersönlichkeiten” und “Helden der Arbeit”: Hegemoniale Männlichkeiten in der DDR’, paper presented to the first conference of the Arbeitskreis für interdisziplinäre Männer- und Geschlechterforschung (Stuttgart, 2001). Retrieved 30 May 2019 from https://www.fk12.tu-dortmund.de/cms/ISO/Medienpool/Archiv-Alte-Dateien/arbeitsbereiche/soziologie_der_geschlechterverhaeltnisse/Medienpool/AIM_Beitraege_erste_Tagung/Scholz.pdf; and S. Scholz, ‘Vom starken Helden zum zärtlichen Vater? Männlichkeit und Emotionalität in der DDR’, in M. Burotta and N. Verheyen (eds), *Die Präsenz der Gefühle: Männlichkeit und Emotion in der Moderne* (Bielefeld: Transcript, 2010), 203–28.
68. See G.L. Mosse, *The Image of Man: The Creation of Modern Masculinity* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996), 17–39.
69. E.g. *Vom Sinn des Soldatseins: Ein Ratgeber für den Soldaten*, 16th edn (Berlin: Militärverlag der DDR, [c. 1974]), 34–39.
70. D. Niemetz, *Das feldgraue Erbe: Die Wehrmachteinflüsse im Militär der SBZ/DDR* (Berlin: Links, 2006). See Chapter 3.
71. R.W. Connell and J.W. Messerschmidt, ‘Hegemonic Masculinity: Rethinking the Concept’, *Gender and Society* 19 (2005), 829–59 (at 833). See e.g. S.M. Whitehead, *Men and Masculinities: Key Themes and New Directions* (Cambridge: Polity, 2002), 92–94.
72. Connell, *Masculinities*, 78–79 and 80–81.
73. *Ibid.*, 154–57.
74. Silverman, *Male Subjectivity*, 15–51.
75. *Ibid.*, 1–3.
76. *Ibid.*, 2.
77. P.R. Higate, ‘“Soft Clerks” and “Hard Civvies”: Pluralizing Military Masculinities’, in Higate, *Military Masculinities*, 27–42.
78. Bickford, ‘The Militarization of Masculinity’.
79. The reasons for the widespread use of the term ‘movement’ (*Bewegung*) are unclear, but may reflect the notional conception of these informal hierarchies as surreptitious challenges to formal military structures.
80. Bickford, ‘The Militarization of Masculinity’, 166.
81. C.T. Müller, ‘Die “EK-Bewegung” in den Kasernen der NVA: Eine Form von “sekundärer Anpassung” in “totalen Institutionen”’, in H. Ehlert and M. Rogg (eds), *Militär, Staat*

- und Gesellschaft in der DDR: Forschungsfelder, Ergebnisse, Perspektiven* (Berlin: Links, 2004), 559–83.
82. See Raz Yosef's work on the Israeli context: *Beyond Flesh: Queer Masculinities and Nationalism in Israeli Cinema* (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 2004), 48–83.
 83. Butler, 'Introduction', 2.
 84. Mosse, *The Image of Man*, 40–55.
 85. S. Ahmed, *Queer Phenomenology: Orientations, Objects, Others* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2006), 55.
 86. A. Winger and J. Winger, *Deutschland 83*, dir. by S. Radsai and E. Berger (FremantleMedia International, 2015): hereinafter referenced in the text. A. Winger and J. Winger, *Deutschland 86*, dir. by F. Cossen and A. Feldhusen, premiered on SundanceTV (USA) and Amazon Prime (Germany), 19 October 2018.
 87. A. Fry, 'Sundance Struggles with Language Barrier', *Drama Quarterly*, 14 August 2015. Retrieved 30 May 2019 from <http://dramaquarterly.com/sundance-struggles-with-language-barrier>.
 88. M. Ehrenberg and J. Huber, "'Deutschland 83" endet mit Quotientief: Diese Serie passt nicht ins deutsche Fernsehen', *Der Tagesspiegel*, 18 December 2015.
 89. 'Deutschland 83 Becomes UK's Highest Rated Foreign-Language Drama', Channel 4, press release, 12 January 2016. Retrieved 30 May 2019 from <http://www.channel4.com/press/news/deutschland-83-becomes-uks-highest-rated-foreign-language-drama>.
 90. F.H. von Donnersmarck (dir.), *Das Leben der Anderen* (Buena Vista, 2006). Most famously, W. Becker (dir.), *Good Bye, Lenin!* (X Filme, 2003) dramatizes its own role in the ongoing Western mediation of the GDR. See also P. Cooke, 'Performing "Ostalgic": Leander Haußmann's *Sonnenallee*', *German Life and Letters* 56 (2003), 156–67.
 91. I use German rank names throughout to avoid confusion caused by translation: see the Glossary for US and UK equivalents.
 92. Winger and Winger, *Deutschland 86*, Episode 1, 9:28–9:30.
 93. For historical discussion of East Germany's involvement in Africa, see L. Madureira, "'Kalashnikovs, Not Coca-Cola, Bring Self-Determination to Angola": The Two Germanys, Lusophone Africa, and the Rhetoric of Colonial Difference', in V. Langbehn and M. Salama (eds), *German Colonialism; Race, the Holocaust, and Postwar Germany* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2011), 275–93; and S. Gehrig, 'Reaching out to the Third World: East Germany's Anti-apartheid and Socialist Human Rights Campaign', *German History* 36 (2018), 574–97.
 94. 'Das ist eine Orange. Du sagst Apfelsine, dann denkt sie, was ist'n jetzt los'. Unless otherwise stated, all translations are mine.
 95. M. Bay (dir.), *Pearl Harbor* (Buena Vista, 2001); S. Mendes (dir.), *Jarhead* (Universal, 2005).
 96. See Jack Halberstam's brief discussion of James Bond: *Female Masculinity* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1998), 3–4.
 97. Winger and Winger, *Deutschland 86*, Episode 3, 6:02–6:24.
 98. Silverman, *Male Subjectivity*, 190–91.
 99. M. Fullbrook, *The People's State: East German Society from Hitler to Honecker* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2005), 11–12.