

Chapter 4

RETRO MASCULINITY AND MILITARY THEATRICALITY



The portrayal of the NVA in *Der Reserveheld*, *Ein Katzensprung* and to a lesser extent *Fassonschnitt* reveals a second feature of military masculinities that potentially conflicts with the ideals promoted by most military organizations. By portraying uniform as costume, the works foreground the theatrical nature of military masculinities. Like many armed forces, the NVA nurtured a public display of strength and technological prowess through parades, documentaries and news bulletins. This spectacle was bound up with ideals of masculinity: documentaries and official images depict rows of barely distinguishable, uniformed men and occasionally women.¹ Photographs in military publications reproduce close-ups of handsome, well-groomed faces or images of strong, capable soldiers working or helping in the community.² In addition to these ubiquitous images of the ideal soldier, the NVA had strict rules governing comportment while on leave. Conscripts were to wear uniforms at all times and could be punished for compromising the NVA's reputation. The curious fact that women recruits were not required to wear uniform away from barracks underlines the importance of masculinity within the NVA's spectacle when soldiers returned to their communities.³ During training, conscripts were expected to demonstrate compliance with the military's masculine ideals. Not only was the ideal soldier physically strong, he also meticulously maintained his dress uniform, participated in choreographed rituals, and marched and saluted with overstated gestures. These embodied rituals and performances asserted and maintained the hegemony of soldiers in uniform, while performatively constructing masculinities that conformed to the NVA's ideals.

However, there is only a fine distinction between acts that assert gender ideals and those that reveal their nonessential nature. *Zum Teufel mit Harbolla* (*To Hell with Harbolla*, 1989), directed by Bodo Fürneisen (b. 1950), and *NVA* (2005), directed by Leander Haußmann (b. 1959), present stylized and exaggerated images of the NVA for comic effect, set in the GDR's past in a retro style.⁴ At first glance, these comedies appear to present a sanitized and even flippant portrayal of the NVA, and yet their emphasis on the theatricality of military masculinities potentially challenges the NVA's ideals. In Fredric Jameson's and Jean Baudrillard's influential theories of retro cinema, they criticize retro films for their superficial approach to history. *Zum Teufel mit Harbolla* and *NVA*, which combine humour and slapstick with more sombre depictions of military hierarchies and discipline, complicate Jameson's and Baudrillard's accusations that retro is a purely superficial mode of engagement with the past. In fact, as Kaja Silverman's analysis of retro clothing and gender identity suggests, a retro aesthetic can potentially unsettle the power of ideal military masculinity.

Defining Retro

Retro is an analytical category that draws attention to the theatricality of these films, but it also challenges the dominance of the term *Ostalgie* that persists in post-reunification scholarship. Since the mid 1990s, comic treatments of the GDR, including the film *NVA*, have often been described with the term *Ostalgie*, playing on the words 'east' and 'nostalgia'.⁵ The term has been used in many ways, most frequently to disparage portrayals of the GDR for being too sentimental or avoiding discussions of the state's oppressive institutions.⁶ More recently, interviews have found that the term *Ostalgie* remains ubiquitous in respondents' descriptions of their relationship with the GDR, even though most accuse only other Eastern Germans of *Ostalgie*, whilst denying being 'ostalgic' themselves.⁷ Some scholars have attempted to rehabilitate *Ostalgie* as a form of resistance to consumerism or to dispute its status as a purely postsocialist phenomenon.⁸ These revisions notwithstanding, labelling comic depictions of the GDR as nostalgic too often closes down detailed analysis. The category of *Ostalgie* poses particular problems for these two films. On the simplest level, *Zum Teufel mit Harbolla* cannot be nostalgic for the GDR as it was produced in 1988 when the state's collapse was generally unforeseen. This earlier film has numerous parallels with post-reunification comedies, showing that trends in these comedies – and many of the jokes – were not new after reunification, even if their context changes after the events of 1989. Moreover, the emotive longing of nostalgia cannot be easily reconciled with the self-consciously irreverent

play that defines Fürneisen's and Hausmann's approaches to the past. The works are better understood through theories of retro, which can account for both Fürneisen's light-hearted style and Hausmann's more bitterly ironic portrayal of the NVA, while suggesting ways in which retro portrayals could challenge military ideals. Above all, a retro aesthetic is defined by theatricality, which can unsettle ideal military masculinity when used to depict military service.

A retro aesthetic in cinema is created by combining material from or symbols of the past, whether in the film's editing, mise-en-scène or other filmic techniques. Retro describes a detached and ironic approach to the past, which unashamedly and self-consciously presents itself as stylized and constructed. It is difficult to distil a list of the salient characteristics of retro, which vary from artwork to artwork, but Simon Reynolds's four criteria provide a useful starting point. Reynolds focuses on music, but his categories can be easily adapted for retro films. First, he argues that retro deals with the 'relatively immediate past', usually within living memory. This characteristic distinguishes retro film from heritage film or costume drama, which tend to deal with earlier periods. Second, Reynolds points to the advent of recording technology and digitalization, which enable the 'exact recall' of older music in a later production. In film, this 'exact recall' might entail using original documentary footage. The remastering of older material with contemporary technology can create aesthetic differences between the original and newer versions, ranging from minor differences in sound or image quality to more substantial changes in lighting or colour. If older footage is simply embedded within later material, a different incongruity emerges between the finishes of the different pieces of footage. Third, Reynolds describes retro's use of 'artifacts of popular culture', which in film frequently dominate the mise-en-scène in the form of objects or fashions. Fourth, Reynolds emphasizes that retro 'tends neither to idealise nor sentimentalise the past, but seeks to be amused and charmed by it'.⁹ This final criterion accounts for the detached, light-hearted irony of retro.

The concept of retro, based on Reynolds's definition, has four main advantages over *Ostalgie* in conceptualizing a subset of comic depictions of the GDR past. Above all, it locates comic depictions of East Germany within global aesthetic trends, in line with other playfully stylized stagings of pastness from *Grease* (1978) to *Mad Men* (2007–15). Second, retro overcomes the reliance on reunification as a caesura: there are substantial stylistic continuities between comic works about the GDR past from the 1980s and those produced since reunification. Third, retro explicitly designates an aesthetic approach, which directs the focus to the form of an artwork. Finally, the sentimental attachment implied by the root of *Ostalgie* in 'nostalgia' is not appropriate for representations of repressive institutions. Elizabeth Guffey has

most clearly summed up this crucial distinction between retro and nostalgia: she describes retro as a form of ‘unsentimental nostalgia’, differentiating the irony and playfulness of retro from nostalgia as a concept that is emotional and sincere.¹⁰ The Stasi, the police and the military have repeatedly featured in comic representations and it is difficult to describe a discussion of oppression, particularly a detached and humorous one, as sentimental or nostalgic. Many works that have been labelled ‘ostalgic’, including *NVA*, are overtly theatrical, playfully ironic and defiantly unsentimental. In other words, if the term *Ostalgie* is to be applied to such works, it must be emptied of the connotations of ‘nostalgia’. Retro, by contrast, denotes just such a playful, self-conscious and distanced comic portrayal of the past.

Retro treatments of the GDR have been an important trend since the 1980s: *Zum Teufel mit Harbolla* is one of several late 1980s films dealing with the 1940s and 1950s, including Frank Beyer’s *Der Bruch* (*The Break-in*, 1989), a crime comedy set in postwar Berlin.¹¹ Since reunification, too, the term ‘retro’ has often been used off-hand to describe films’ approach to the GDR past, particularly with reference to *Sonnenallee* (*Sun Avenue*, 1999) or *Good Bye, Lenin!* (2003).¹² However, critics generally have not explored in depth the effects of this retro aesthetic on the depiction of the GDR.¹³ In *Zum Teufel mit Harbolla* and *NVA*, the theatricality and bricolage associated with retro present ideal military masculinity as stylized and constructed. Acts of conformity are represented ironically as staged, even parodic gestures, a technique that presents men’s negotiations of masculinity as a series of embodied performances. The two films acknowledge the profound effects of military training, while partially unsettling the *NVA*’s masculine ideals with their retro style. Retro can be used naively, but these works suggest that a retro aesthetic can accommodate a nuanced representation of military service and challenge gender ideals.

Superficiality and Surface

Much existing theoretical work on retro cinema has been more critical than Reynolds’s analysis of music. Baudrillard, one of the first theorists to use the term, applies it to historical films from the 1970s produced in a style he considers too glossy and idealized. Baudrillard accuses these productions of emptying out the substance and meaning of history through a hyperrealism ‘that makes it so that fundamentally they no longer resemble anything, except the empty figure of resemblance, the empty form of representation’.¹⁴ Baudrillard accuses the films he describes of demonstrating a fascination with history, fascism and war that empties them of their historical importance and turns history into myths on screen. These myths are divorced from history, and yet

as they circulate they come to stand in for history in the popular imagination. These myths are produced as 'perfect remakes' with 'extraordinary montages' that simulate history and mask the complexity of the subject.¹⁵ Baudrillard disparages retro films for their aesthetic that delights in the surface qualities of representation, but he does not discuss the ironic tone of retro or explore its play with authenticity.

Even though Baudrillard is dismissive of the retro style of historical films, his analysis can broaden Reynolds's definition. His reference to 'montages' suggests in more concrete terms how a retro aesthetic might manifest itself in film. Baudrillard mostly refers to the contrast between historical material and current styles and technology, but retro can also juxtapose historical material from different periods using sound and editing as well as the visual image. Films can also mimic older styles of filmmaking, although as Baudrillard suggests, the quality of these retro productions generally marks them as present-day imitations. Just as Reynolds emphasizes 'exact recall', Baudrillard associates retro with hyperrealism, but argues that the retro image is too perfect and, he implies, stylized. However, he does not explore the self-conscious play with stylization and stereotype that Reynolds emphasizes more prominently. Indeed, Baudrillard allows for no self-awareness on the part of the filmmaker. As he describes it, retro is serious and disingenuous in its appropriation or 'simulation' of the past. He ignores the possibility for retro films to acknowledge and play with traces of their own inauthenticity, so that this key feature of retro is sidelined within his analysis.

Jameson pushes Baudrillard's argument further in his discussion of post-modernism. He discusses cinema, which he categorizes as 'nostalgia film', which:

was never a matter of some old-fashioned 'representation' of historical content, but instead approached the 'past' through stylistic connotation, conveying 'pastness' by the glossy qualities of the image, and '1930s-ness' or '1950s-ness' by the attributes of fashion.¹⁶

As Guffey has suggested, the distinction between retro and nostalgia is complicated, but rests primarily on the contrast in tone between the detachment of retro and the sentimentality of nostalgia. Under this definition, Jameson's description of an abstract and stylized 'pastness' seems to resemble retro more closely than nostalgia. While Baudrillard argues that retro film attempts to simulate reality, Jameson asserts that nostalgia films are never concerned with realism at all. For him, their stylized nature is not a by-product, but the primary means of engaging with the past, or rather with 'pastness'. Moreover, his reference to the 'attributes of fashion' suggests that the importance of material culture discussed by Reynolds has direct application to film not just

through props and objects, but also through other aspects of *mise-en-scène*, including costume and make-up. Jameson's account of nostalgia film opens up retro to include an extravagant and self-conscious play with material and stylistic signifiers of pastness. Jameson's tone is nevertheless almost identical to Baudrillard's: just as Baudrillard disparages retro, so too does Jameson criticize nostalgia films for placing the past at a distance and confirming viewers' separation and safety in the present.

One of the primary criticisms of retro films, then, is their superficiality and obsession with manipulating and delighting in surface elements. However, *Zum Teufel mit Harbolla* and *NVA* are both examples of retro being used to deal with more sensitive subjects. These films combine the 'amused and charmed' approach to the past identified by Reynolds and the 'stylistic connotation' described by Jameson with a discussion of one of the GDR's repressive institutions. The reception of both films was mixed and involved many of the same negative attitudes to retro demonstrated by Baudrillard and Jameson. Reviewers criticized both films for their unsubtle humour and their superficial and nostalgic outlook.¹⁷ In the case of *NVA*, such accusations dominated its reception. Many of Fürneisen's and a handful of Hausmann's reviewers did praise their humour, but positive reviews generally focused on the supposed authenticity of the films' portrayals, often neglecting their stylized nature.¹⁸ Critics only briefly commented on the films' retro aesthetics and their play with stylized symbols of the past, particularly with reference to the films' soundtracks.¹⁹ At first glance, *Zum Teufel mit Harbolla* and *NVA* seem to reduce military service to a retro play with surface, but their use of retro is more complex when its effect on the representation of military masculinities is taken into account.

Zum Teufel mit Harbolla is based on a screenplay by Flegel, was produced in 1988 and premiered in February 1989.²⁰ It was only DEFA's second *NVA* comedy after *Der Reserveheld*. Subtitled 'A Tale of 1956' ('Eine Geschichte aus dem Jahre 1956'), *Zum Teufel mit Harbolla* is set in the year of the *NVA*'s founding. The plot therefore unfolds before conscription was introduced, and its main conflict is between representatives of the old *KVP* and new recruits to the *NVA* who were better trained but inexperienced. The film opens showing Unteroffizier Harry Harbolla, who has apparently absconded from barracks, dancing to rock 'n' roll in a rural pub in his *KVP* uniform. Outside, military police wait to arrest him for absconding. The film then cuts to the other main character, Leutnant Gottfried Engelhardt, being fitted for the newly redesigned *NVA* uniform for his commissioning parade. Engelhardt is placed in an artillery regiment, where he assumes command of the platoon formerly led by Harbolla. His first task is to collect Harbolla from military prison in Oranienburg, where he is being held after his arrest, and escort him back to barracks.

Fürneisen depicts Oranienburg as a hub of clumsy black-market activity because of its proximity to West Berlin. Indeed, the film parodies SED rhetoric justifying the existence of the Berlin Wall as a barrier against Western corruption and ‘ideological diversion’.²¹ Old men are smuggling cigarettes over the border and even nuns are hiding records in their habits (*ZTH*, 10:18–10:55). When Engelhardt arrives, he instantly falls for the first woman he sees, Anita. Engelhardt’s efforts to escort Harbolla back to barracks are repeatedly thwarted as Harbolla refuses to cooperate and leads him on an odyssey around Oranienburg. They are ushered in by mistake to speak at an FDJ meeting and then attend a dance in the restaurant where Harbolla’s love interest, Heidelore, works. When a brawl breaks out, Harbolla rescues Engelhardt and continues to lead him around Oranienburg. Eventually, having missed the final train that evening, the two of them go back to Heidelore’s apartment to spend the night with Anita and Heidelore. Somewhat incredibly, Anita turns out to be a sex worker and leaves Engelhardt heartbroken. Heidelore then throws Harbolla out for his insincere approach to their relationship and the two men finally find each other on the train back to the barracks as the film ends.

Haußmann wrote the screenplay for *NVA* in collaboration with the author Thomas Brussig.²² The plot describes the military service of protagonist Henrik Heidler and his comrades in the late 1980s, among them Krüger, a rebellious figure obsessed with women, and Traubewein, a religious young man who develops a physical allergy to military service. The other cluster of characters consists of Henrik’s superiors: the base commander Oberst Kalt, the propaganda officer Hauptmann Stummel, the gay couple Oberfähnrich Lenk and Leutnant Laucke, the brash Hauptfeldwebel Futterknecht and the quieter, somewhat obsequious Unteroffizier Aurich. The officers are ridiculous, unintelligent, sinister and yet not inhuman. As in *Fassonschnitt* and many military films, novels and memoirs, Henrik’s arrival at the barracks is followed by a medical examination, uniform distribution, roll call, drill, punishments, abuses of power by more experienced soldiers and the first military exercise. During this exercise, Henrik becomes disorientated in his gas mask, falls into a river and is rescued by a group of nurses. He immediately falls in love with one of them, Marie, who turns out to be Kalt’s daughter. Meanwhile, Krüger is desperate to meet women, so feigns illness in order to escape the barracks and go dancing. He is eventually caught and sent to the notorious military prison in Schwedt, returning a broken man.

Unbeknownst to the ordinary soldiers, the protests and upheavals of the autumn of 1989 unfold in the background of the film, mediated via the officers’ radio. Soon after Krüger returns from Schwedt, for example, the officers hear the news of the decision to allow East Germans at the West German

embassies in Prague and Warsaw to enter the FRG (*NVA*, 1:13:54–1:14:36). At the end of the film, Henrik refuses to declare ‘I serve the German Democratic Republic’ in an official ceremony, leading to the young men simply walking away from the army without the officers doing anything to stop them. Henrik describes this dissolution of the unit happening in parallel to the opening of the Berlin Wall: ‘Then I discover that lots of others showed courage at that very moment, and that the country that they had forced us to serve and defend suddenly ceased to exist’ (*NVA*, 1:26:53–1:27:03). With the officers alone on the base, the film ends with a giant explosion when the entire arms stockpile is accidentally detonated and parts of the base are destroyed. The closing shot shows a dusty sepia image of the officers’ mess, as if frozen in time.

In line with Reynolds’s categories, both films deal with events in living memory, specifically the memories of Flegel and Hausmann. The unreliability of memory is even contemplated in Hausmann’s fantastical scenes involving Henrik and Marie, which are often shot in soft focus or blurred at the edges, a common technique in romantic films that in this case makes these scenes seem fantasized (e.g. *NVA*, 40:58–42:33). Both films playfully present a stylized version of the past: to adapt Jameson’s terminology, 1950s-ness in *Zum Teufel mit Harbolla* and 1980s-ness in *NVA*. Both are light-hearted comedies whose irony prevents them from being sentimental or maudlin about military service. Above all, both films refer extensively to popular culture, in the form of objects, music and original recordings that generate the ‘exact recall’ that for Reynolds is characteristic of retro. Soundtracks are particularly influential in creating the retro aesthetic of each film. Fürneisen and Hausmann experiment with music from the recent past, which is essential for constructing the films’ very different approaches to retro. These soundtracks show how the films move beyond the superficiality that Baudrillard associates with a retro ‘simulation’ of the past.

Fürneisen described *Zum Teufel mit Harbolla* as a ‘comedy with depth, surrounded by retro colour with an ironic twist’.²³ However, many reviewers disputed the depth of his comedy and focused entirely on the film’s retro aesthetic, which indeed appears to be the film’s organizing principle. Fürneisen saturates the film with details from 1950s popular culture, and his soundtrack particularly encapsulates the film’s self-conscious play with its own authenticity. The opening scene depicts a jukebox selecting and playing a record, a stereotypically 1950s image that signals the importance of music to Fürneisen’s evocation of the 1950s. The song clearly recalls the music of Elvis Presley, but is in fact a rock ‘n’ roll-style pastiche by Karl-Ernst Sasse, who wrote the score for the film. Sasse uses derivative Elvis-inspired riffs and formulaic and clumsy English lyrics, presumably for comic effect: ‘I wanna be your part/I wanna be your heart/I wanna be a part of your lovely heart’

(*ZTH*, 1:06–1:11). These lyrics are perhaps a wry comment on American music becoming garbled in performances by early GDR musicians who were not necessarily proficient in English.

Elsewhere, Fürneisen uses a *Schlager*-singing duo who reprise GDR songs from the 1950s in Heidelore's restaurant: Irma Baltuttis and Hanns Petersen's 'Wenn du wüsstest, ach, wie ich dich liebe' ('If You Knew, Oh, Just How Much I Love You', 1952) and 'Spatz und Spätzin' ('Mr and Mrs Sparrow', 1953), and Sonia Siewert and Herbert Klein's 'Wenn der Hafen Schlafen geht' ('When the Harbour Goes to Sleep', 1956) (*ZTH*, 31:34–34:13; 35:09–37:44; 44:19–46:50).²⁴ These numbers are interspersed with more of Sasse's rock-'n'-roll pastiche, this time with English-sounding nonsense lyrics (*ZTH*, 37:54–39:27). The singers are played by Katrin Sass, better known for her later role as Christiane Kerner in *Good Bye, Lenin!*, and Walter Plathe, who starred as Riedel in *Ein Katzensprung*. Their performance is heavily parodic, complete with cheesy grins, maracas in 'Wenn du wüsstest' and unruffled expressions as a brawl breaks out during 'Spatz und Spätzin'. The 1950s songs are characteristic of Fürneisen's use of historically accurate retro details of 1956 to lend authenticity to his portrayal more generally, including a Sparkasse advert and a radio announcement of famous East German cyclist Gustav Schur winning a race (*ZTH*, 18:07–18:48). Yet Sass's and Plathe's exaggerated delivery of the *Schlager* songs clearly renders them ironic, as does the abrupt contrast with Sasse's rock-'n'-roll pastiche. With this irony in mind, Fürneisen's aesthetic cannot be described in Baudrillard's terms as an attempted 'simulation' of the 1950s. Combined with Sasse's deliberately derivative 1980s score, the *Schlager* performances are part of the film's conscious play with retro, which clearly foregrounds its rejection of an authentic or historical depiction of the 1950s.

In contrast to Fürneisen's use of original items and recordings from the 1950s in his portrayal, the retro aesthetic of *NVA* is not confined to evoking any singular historical period. Hausmann enigmatically locates the film 'Somewhere in East Germany in the late 1980s' (*NVA*, 0:46). From this opening shot, he playfully anchors the film in GDR history while rejecting any link between the film and any specific historical reality. He even links it to his own biography, provocatively showing his own military identification card in the closing credits (*NVA*, 1:33:51) and saying in an interview that he had the idea for a film during his own military service: 'What on earth is this?, I thought, and imagined it was all unreal, it was a film.'²⁵ Whilst relating the film to his own military service, Hausmann emphasizes not the authenticity of his portrayal, but the unbelievable and surreal nature of the experience. Further resisting any simple equation between *NVA* and his own biography, he has insisted that the film is not a GDR film, but a critique of narrow-minded attitudes in the present, and has commented repeatedly that his cultural influences in the East were the same as those of his Western contemporaries.²⁶

Haußmann's ambivalence about the importance of a specific GDR past affects his use of retro, as exemplified by the soundtrack to *NVA*, which draws on a wider range of influences than that of *Zum Teufel mit Harbolla*. Instead of using songs from only one period, Haußmann combines Western songs from various decades, from Creedence Clearwater Revival's 'Bad Moon Rising' (1969) and Cat Stevens's 'Oh Very Young' (1974) to Polyphonic Spree's 'Light and Day' (2003). The latter is a clear anachronism within the diegesis, while the other tracks were already retro by the late 1980s. The recurring use of the folk song 'My Bonnie Lies over the Ocean' perhaps sums up Haußmann's approach to the past. The version in the film is a 2006 cover in a retro synth style by Element of Crime, originally a West German band. The cover's more unusual lyrics, 'My Bonnie is over the ocean', draw on a version popularized in East Germany by Dean Reed, an American émigré to the GDR.²⁷ This network of covers and rereleases encapsulates a retro approach to the past based on constant sampling and revival, and demonstrates the extent of musical influences between the GDR and the West. Unlike in Fürneisen's film, retro songs in *NVA* are almost always nondiegetic, so there is no opportunity for ironic or parodic performances. Yet the *NVA* soundtrack is self-consciously and performatively retro through its playful combination of music from different eras. Haußmann's soundtrack demonstrates that memories and representations of a certain period are always refracted through later perspectives, meaning that experiences and cultural artefacts from many different eras interact and coalesce.

The soundtracks of the two films therefore challenge Baudrillard's and Jameson's mistrust of films that depict the past through popular culture. Far from attempting a glossy 'perfect remake' or a disingenuous 'simulation' of the past, each film foregrounds its playful and provocative disregard for authenticity. Thus, retro need not be understood only as a superficial obsession with surface details that signify pastness. The theatricality with which these two films exhibit their own inauthenticity is particularly important in their depiction of military masculinities. In an essay from 1986 on fashion, Silverman explores the theatrical quality of retro and argues for its radical potential for articulating gender identities.²⁸ For Silverman, retro's portrayal of the past is always 'stagey', in deliberately and provocatively taking artefacts of the past out of their original context and inserting them into incongruous combinations. Retro, she suggests, puts 'quotation marks' around the past to recontextualize it, retaining ironic distance and performing the citation and textual mediations that determine our access to the past.²⁹ She presents retro as a tool in the articulation of a feminist gender identity through clothes: retro displays the 'decades of representational activity' that coalesce to form identities as subjects continually represent themselves in varied and changing ways.

Silverman's discussion of retro perhaps places too much faith in its radical nature. She neglects the extremely popular and marketable nature of retro, which is now no longer as anti-establishment or as resistant to co-option by the fashion or advertising industries as she suggests in 1986.³⁰ Rather, Stephen Brown argues that the popularity of retro has boosted the advertising industry.³¹ GDR retro is an excellent example of the success of retro as a marketing tool. The satirical use of state symbols was not new with reunification: the language, insignia and even uniforms of the SED and its institutions were parodied in film, literature and cabaret in the 1980s long before they were commodified after 1990.³² After reunification, militaria and other official symbols were among the first aspects of the East German past to be commodified as retro kitsch, as in other postsocialist countries.³³ Even thirty years later, medals, uniform items and other military paraphernalia are on sale at the Brandenburg Gate and Checkpoint Charlie. Websites selling real and pastiche NVA uniforms have developed, targeting collectors, nostalgics and even the film industry.³⁴ Silverman's argument for the radical anti-establishment potential of retro must therefore be qualified. *NVA* was a film made as a consumer product, commercially funded and marketed as the sequel to *Sonnenallee*, and even *Zum Teufel mit Harbolla* used its comic, retro mode to achieve popular success.

Notwithstanding such qualifications, Silverman's account of retro sheds an important light on the aesthetics of the two films. Her emphasis on the self-conscious theatricality of retro and its play with authenticity and identity helps to explain the films' soundtracks. The music in *Zum Teufel mit Harbolla* and *NVA* is not simply a superficial element in the films' 'simulation' of history; rather, it is an important element of the directors' self-conscious and ironic approach to the NVA and to ideal military masculinities. Silverman's argument that retro can be used to explore identities outside conventional gender roles directs attention especially towards the representation of military masculinities in these films. The two films suggest that retro can indeed disrupt hegemonic masculinities, but they also highlight the difficulties and problems with combining the light-hearted tone of retro with a representation of an abusive and oppressive institution like the NVA.

Staging Ideal Military Masculinity

Zum Teufel mit Harbolla and *NVA* both show theatricality to be central to military masculinities in the NVA. In *Zum Teufel mit Harbolla*, depictions of everyday military life are rare, with most of the film set in civilian environments. Where the military does feature, it is as spectacle. The film's second scene shows Engelhardt admiring the NVA's new uniforms in



Figure 4.1
Behind glass and on pedestals, uniforms are put at a distance from actual soldiers in *Zum Teufel mit Harbolla* (1989). © DEFA Foundation.

early 1956 (*ZTH*, 2:29–3:11). This cut creates a sudden contrast with the previous scene, accentuating and exaggerating the differences between the masculinities associated with Engelhardt and Harbolla. Harbolla had been dancing drunkenly in a darkened pub with rock 'n' roll in the background, his uniform unkempt and dirty, representing the old KVP and its apparent lack of discipline or clear leadership. By contrast, Engelhardt is the new face of the NVA's first newly trained officer cohort. He is in a light, spacious room, filled with immaculately dressed mannequins in the NVA's new uniform, as one of the NVA's official marches plays in the background: Beethoven's March for Military Band No. 1, the so-called 'Yorck March'.³⁵ This contrast between Harbolla and Engelhardt is a central feature of the film, mirroring the contrast between the new NVA and the KVP, with the NVA portrayed in a positive light through Engelhardt and the KVP as more brutal and obsolete.

However, the newly formed NVA is presented in ridiculous and theatrical ways, and Engelhardt never really convinces as an effective officer. This portrayal begins with the scene featuring Engelhardt and the mannequins in the new NVA uniforms (2:34; see Figure 4.1). The mannequins are in glass display cases, which model and show off the new uniforms, but also make the room resemble a museum exhibition. Behind their glass cases, the uniforms are separated from actual soldiers and quite literally put on pedestals, making clear the stylized and idealized nature of the masculinity that they represent. The film cuts between high-angle shots of the exhibition space and low-angle close-ups of the mannequins, creating the sense that the uniforms are on display, their smart, pristine appearance unattainable for the soldiers on the other side of the glass. The close-ups show the mannequins' androgynous facial features accentuated as if wearing make-up, likening the uniforms to fashion. The fashion comparison is enhanced by the following

scene, in which Engelhardt is fitted for his uniform in a room that resembles a department store fitting room with long, high clothes rails and incidental background music. Two silent men bring Engelhardt one jacket after another as each proves too large for his slight physique (*ZTH*, 3:11–3:31). Fürneisen thus makes explicit the theatrical qualities of ideal military masculinities by staging the establishment of the new NVA as a fashion show. Not only do the mannequins' made-up faces jar with the rugged, masculine appearance required of soldiers, but the trainee officer Engelhardt also finds the dress uniforms incompatible with his own body.

The association between theatricality and the ideals of the new NVA is continued in the following scene at Engelhardt's commissioning parade. Newly commissioned officers are addressed by a commanding officer, whose speech is repeatedly interrupted by a vintage 1950s camera (*ZTH*, 3:31–4:06). The interruptions are both acoustic, through the shutter click, and visual, with shots showing the camera alongside the officers, or cutting to the camera in close-up on its own. The vintage camera is itself a retro object from popular culture, but it also reveals the creation of military spectacle, as the new army visually choreographs and records the commissioning of its first officers for posterity. The film's own camera angles mimic the composition of official photographs, by cutting abruptly between static wide-angle shots that take in the soldiers in formation with the officers and flags on the steps of a building. The speech itself is less important: the commanding officer's platitudes are eventually drowned out by a plane flying overhead. Fürneisen thus introduces ideal military masculinities as a spectacle from the film's opening. This spectacle valorizes the officers' masculinities in part, but it also exposes the NVA's careful construction of images of socialist soldier personalities. Conformity with the military's masculine ideals therefore appears dependent not on prowess in military training, which Fürneisen does not depict, but on display and the composition of photographs for posterity.

In the rest of the film too, Harbolla represents the now-superseded KVP and Engelhardt embodies the NVA's self-presentation as a smart, dynamic new military based on socialist principles. The film creates a stark contrast between these different masculinities. Yet the two men's friendship, which develops over the course of the film, appears to be based on parodic acknowledgements that they are less different than the military's values and hierarchies would have it. Their relationship involves a range of interactions from coldness and mistrust to friendliness and even intimacy, while conventional rank hierarchies are only acted out for comic effect. Indeed, the comic reversal of hierarchies is enhanced by the incompatibility of the men's physical differences with their roles in the rank hierarchy. Despite his inferior rank, Harbolla's physique, authority and confidence demonstrate that he has spent longer in military training than Engelhardt. Engelhardt,

by contrast, displays few signs of ideal military masculinity: he is clever and witty, but slight and rather incompetent, which diminishes any authority he gains through his position. In most of their interactions, the rank hierarchy is reversed, with Engelhardt frequently following Harbolla and being given instructions. Set against this inversion of rank hierarchies, Engelhardt makes theatrical attempts to assert himself and Harbolla parodically performs exaggerated subordination. These comic touches destabilize and denaturalize the rank hierarchy and the presumed superiority of ideal military masculinity by associating it with Engelhardt's awkwardness and ineffectualness.

Engelhardt enacts the NVA's ideals as a performance, which never appears natural and is frequently laughed off or ignored by other, more junior soldiers. For example, when he collects Harbolla from military prison, the two soldiers on duty cast aspersions on Engelhardt's authority: 'Tell him [Harbolla] that the Leutnant has a pistol.' The other responds: 'Well I suppose that's something, at least he's got something *there!*' (*ZTH*, 14:15–14:25). The soldiers' insulting joke implicitly relates Engelhardt's lack of strength or authority, via the comparison to the potentially phallic pistol, to a genital inadequacy that reflects a lack in Engelhardt's masculinity. Engelhardt responds by playing a role more befitting of an officer, bellowing 'Enough!', but the performance of power that follows is bizarre and incongruous. He shakes a matchbox by the two soldiers' ears, asking: 'Do you hear that humming?' (*ZTH*, 14:34–14:44) The two reluctantly answer with military propriety: 'Yes sir, Comrade Leutnant, humming' (*ZTH*, 14:44–14:49). Engelhardt replies, with a more laidback and confident tone: 'It's not a hum, it's a rattle. Surely you should have heard that' (*ZTH*, 14:56–15:00). Engelhardt assumes temporary control of the scene by acting out banal orders and calling for blind obedience, actions more usually associated with his rank. Engelhardt's exercise of power appears absurd as well as sinister: he abuses his power as an officer to embarrass junior soldiers over a trivial point of semantics. Yet this triviality ensures that the scene remains humorous and even ironizes Engelhardt's power. The effect of his performance of authority is short-lived: the soldiers' attitude to Engelhardt in the remainder of the scene is neither respectful nor subordinate. While Engelhardt can assert his power by enacting an ideal officer masculinity that befits his position, the implication is that this performance does not subvert or supersede the other soldiers' sense of superiority based on their experience in the military.

Harbolla, by contrast, parodies his subordination to Engelhardt in potentially subversive ways, each time undermining and ridiculing Engelhardt's authority. After Harbolla rescues Engelhardt from the brawl in the restaurant, Engelhardt tries once more to escort Harbolla to the train by barking orders: 'Get your things together. Jacket, belt, cap!' (*ZTH*, 50:00–50:04). When Harbolla laughs raucously, the camera cuts to show that Engelhardt

has accidentally picked up Harbolla's cap, which dwarfs his head and undermines his assertion of authority. Engelhardt again tries to assert himself: 'You'll be back in jail if you don't follow me!' (*ZTH*, 50:09–50:11). Harbolla barks his reply loudly and with a full salute: 'Yes sir, Comrade Leutnant, sir!' (*ZTH*, 50:11–50:13), before relaxing and wandering off, ignoring Engelhardt. Harbolla's exaggerated performance of obedience challenges Engelhardt's authority. His parodic citation of formulaic orders and salutes exposes the emptiness of the words and gestures, revealing that Engelhardt's authority rests on performative repetitions of predefined words and phrases. Engelhardt can easily enact the ideal military masculinity he has been taught during training. Yet with Harbolla's greater experience and the physical differences between the two men, Engelhardt's utterances become simply another humorous part of the film's light-hearted, retro portrayal of the NVA. Engelhardt's performances fail to bolster his authority over Harbolla, suggesting that authority and respect cannot simply be commanded theatrically, but are constructed performatively over time.

The relationship between theatricality and performativity in the construction of gender, which Fürneisen appears to explore in *Zum Teufel mit Harbolla*, has been discussed most influentially by Judith Butler. Butler's work is ambivalent regarding the potential for parodic performances to destabilize normative gender categories. In *Gender Trouble*, her discussion of drag opens up the possibility for performances to expose the constructed nature of gender. She writes: 'Although the gender meanings taken up in these parodic styles are clearly part of hegemonic, misogynist culture, they are nevertheless denaturalized and mobilized through their parodic recontextualization.'³⁶ Her emphasis on parody and recontextualization has clear resonances with the theatrical approach to gender in retro military films such as *Zum Teufel mit Harbolla*. Even though the characters perform ideal military masculinity to assert power over one another, the theatricality of their actions reveals the contingent nature of the hierarchies. To quote Butler again, '*drag implicitly reveals the imitative structure of gender itself – as well as its contingency*'.³⁷ The irony and parody of Fürneisen's retro aesthetic unsettle the military's attempts to naturalize the power of its masculine values and suggests, at least at first glance, that ideal military masculinity is insubstantial. Butler's account of drag has been widely criticized for privileging drag as uniformly or uniquely subversive of gender norms.³⁸ In line with such critiques, *Zum Teufel mit Harbolla* shows that the theatrical assertion of ideal military masculinity does more than just make military gender roles appear ridiculous or artificial. As the contrast between the figures of Engelhardt and Harbolla demonstrates, exposing the performances that underpin ideal gender constructions can also reveal the longer-term, more profound changes that construct authority and military gender over time.

In *Bodies that Matter* (1993), Butler acknowledges that her earlier work left open the possibility for the concept of gender performativity to be confused with her discussion of the parodic performances of drag. She argues that:

performance as a bounded ‘act’ is distinguished from performativity insofar as the latter consists in a reiteration of norms which precede, constrain, and exceed the performer and in that sense cannot be taken as the fabrication of the performer’s ‘will’ or ‘choice’; further, what is ‘performed’ works to conceal, if not to disavow, what remains opaque, unconscious, unperformable.³⁹

Like Silverman, Butler associates theatrical performance with a sense of choice, in stark contrast to the unwilling, and often unconscious, performative acts that constitute gender. However, her distinction still allows for parodic imitations of gender roles to highlight their constructed nature and destabilize their power. Performances, in Butler’s definition, can work against the concealment and naturalization of gender by exposing the performative structure of gender. Butler’s account thus helps to explain Silverman’s suggestion that retro exposes the ‘decades of representational activity’ that constitute gendered subjectivity: this activity amounts to the performative construction of gender over decades. *Zum Teufel mit Harbolla* shows that retro can indeed denaturalize ideal military masculinity through its focus on theatricality in the way Silverman and Butler suggest. Yet the performative constitution and reconstitution of masculinity during military service is still revealed in the relationship between Engelhardt and Harbolla.

In *NVA* too, the theatricality of military masculinities is used to disrupt the military’s ideals while still suggesting the more profound performative effects of military service. The officer figures offer some productive examples. In the previous chapter, I suggested that *Ein Katzensprung* associates officer masculinity stereotypically with certain physical attributes, but Haußmann shows that the performance of officer masculinity depends on more than just appearance. Officers’ assertions of authority are shown as a combination of gestures, utterances and tone, which appear affected and incongruous because the officers in *NVA* are otherwise incompetent and boorish. Haußmann’s irony here is generally unobvious, subverting more idealized images of officers in *NVA* publications and in literature such as *Härtetest* and *Es gibt kein Niemandsland*. Haußmann instead draws on the common joke that *NVA* officers lacked intelligence, a prominent stereotype across a range of post-reunification depictions of the *NVA*, as Mark Allinson has suggested.⁴⁰

The portrayal of Oberfähnrich Lenk and Leutnant Laucke is a key example of Haußmann’s negative portrayal of officer masculinities. Over the course of the film, it emerges that the two are in a gay relationship. Haußmann constructs these characters out of a series of performances of stereotypically

affected behaviour, from singing *Schlager* songs in a lecture to sharing skin-care tips (*NVA*, 15:28–15:36; 1:02:18–1:02:50). Perhaps because of their clear deviation from the NVA's ideal military masculinity, Haußmann does not show them giving orders at all: their entire characters appear theatrical and insubstantial. Lenk and Laucke are presumably included more for comic effect than to subvert or queer military command structures; after all, the gay stereotypes they act out are crude and potentially offensive. These figures are characteristic of a stylized and antirealist retro aesthetic, but are more superficial than the rest of Haußmann's film. Yet through these characters, Haußmann derides ideal military masculinity as insubstantial, a configuration of gender practice that, at least for some of the officers, depends on a combination of brutal discipline and camp performance.

Haußmann's officers also maintain authority through exaggerated performances of military rhetoric. Edith Disler has described how the formulaic use of language in military situations contributes to the construction of hierarchies and masculinity.⁴¹ Disler focuses on honorifics: in the GDR, these either took the form 'Comrade [rank]' or '[rank] [name]', as in 'Comrade Soldat' or 'Soldat Heidler'. The officers in *NVA* apply the honorific 'comrade' (*Genosse*), reserved only for SED members in wider GDR society, instantly and overzealously to the new conscripts. Henrik's discomfort with the term highlights the differences between civilian identities and the ideal military masculinity being rehearsed through such linguistic formulae. When he argues that he is not a 'Genosse', the propaganda officer Stummel emphasizes the military's control over language and its attempt to determine conscripts' identities: 'Who is a comrade is our decision, and our decision is that everyone here is a comrade' (*NVA*, 5:15–5:18).⁴² The confusing and circular syntax of Stummel's comment is characteristic of Haußmann's ironic use of language in characterizing the officers. Their authority is also asserted linguistically through repeated performances of official rhetoric and jargon. In the short opening scene, for example, the officers sit having tea in the mess and Stummel exchanges the following formulaic phrases with Futterknecht:

Stummel: 'Comrades, the geopolitical situation is extremely tense.'

Futterknecht: 'As ever [*Wie eh und je*].'

Stummel: 'Not as ever; more tense than ever before.'

Futterknecht: 'Exactly.' (*NVA*, 0:58–1:09)

Stummel imitates GDR rhetoric on 'the geopolitical situation', twice emphasizing the extraordinary and superlative nature of the threat, while never revealing what the threat actually is. Futterknecht's brief and equally formulaic replies set the tone for the officers' exaggerated and sometimes even meaningless language throughout.

The conscripts' first roll call shows this language to be part of the theatricality of hegemonic military masculinities. When the officers see that Krüger has avoided having his hair cut, Aurich bellows 'helmet off' (*NVA*, 3:59–4:03). His voice instantly changes to a roar, which renders the words incomprehensible, producing a parody of military orders that are commonly stretched or abbreviated beyond recognition. A shout of 'Attention!' then announces the arrival of Kalt, who marches with Stummel from the nearby building to the unexplained nondiegetic sound of a side drum (*NVA*, 4:15–4:23). The drumbeat suddenly foregrounds the film's careful use of military clichés to construct the officers' masculinities throughout these initial scenes. For example, Laucke and Aurich make an exaggerated show of saluting and announcing themselves and the platoon, formalities that Kalt interrupts and waves aside (*NVA*, 4:23–4:34). True to his name, Kalt is cool and distanced, although this seems to stem from melancholy rather than an unfeeling attitude. Haußmann subverts the trope of the emotionless commander by explaining Kalt's abruptness and strictness with oblique references to his emotions after his wife left him. Kalt's melancholy complicates what is otherwise a relatively superficial portrayal of officers. In contrast to his subordinate officers, who adhere to rituals and formalities as a protection from 'the geopolitical situation' as the GDR collapses around them, Kalt seems to exploit the theatrical nature of military masculinities in order to go through the motions while remaining melancholic about his ex-wife. His display of ideal military masculinity therefore does not disguise the more profound emotional effects of his time in the military.

The first roll call shows the officers teaching a sort of military performance to their conscripts as part of their socialization into the military system. In addition to the argument over Krüger's hair, Lenk and Laucke surround Krüger and Henrik to correct their posture after they are called to attention. The two officers talk over one another, barking instructions: 'Hands clenched in a fist ... eyes straight ahead, face tensed and expressionless' (*NVA*, 5:21–5:50). In a scene shortly afterwards, Haußmann makes clear that the conscripts are aware of the need to perform ideal military masculinities when Henrik and Krüger recite the Rifleman's Creed from the United States Marine Corps in the washroom. The two men stand facing one another and salute as Henrik shouts in English: 'This is my rifle. There are many like it but this one is mine'. Krüger replies, 'Sir, yes sir!' (*NVA*, 7:59–8:07). In the novel *NVA*, which Haußmann wrote at the same time as the film, he refers explicitly to Stanley Kubrick's *Full Metal Jacket*, a retro detail as it was released in the United States shortly before *NVA* is set.⁴³ *Full Metal Jacket* was largely responsible for establishing public awareness of the Creed, but Haußmann does not make the reference explicit in the film. Kubrick's film was never screened publicly in the GDR, so few conscripts

would have seen it, but Haußmann uses the reference to the Rifleman's Creed to emphasize the importance of Western influences on East German identities. Henrik and Krüger enact an ideal soldierly masculinity associated in Western popular culture with the Marines and with ritualistically chanted refrains. In the NVA, however, their exaggerated performance of US military masculinity works against the construction of US soldiers as enemies. The reference to *Full Metal Jacket* suggests the universality of military experiences and indicates that military identities are constructed in dialogue with films and other representations of soldiers. The incongruity of this reference and their exaggerated repetition of the English words further ridicule the NVA and its masculine ideals.

In both films, the playfulness that Silverman identifies with retro is combined with an equally irreverent approach to ideal military masculinity. Socialist soldier personalities are shown in both films to be constructed through performances of stereotypes and through ritualized gestures and utterances, but the irony that characterizes retro cinema means that these actions become parodic and laughable. The military ideal no longer appears natural or stable, even if its power is never entirely disrupted: Harbolla ultimately acquiesces to Engelhardt's efforts to return him to base and the conscripts in NVA are only able to overthrow the officers due to the collapse of the GDR. One way in which assertions of military power are parodied is through exaggerated contrasts between the characterization of officers and their extravagant issuing of orders. In *Zum Teufel mit Harbolla* more than in *NVA*, this contrast draws attention not only to the theatrical nature of military masculinities, but also to the way in which authority and respect from subordinates are constructed over time and with experience. The theatricality of military masculinities highlights the performative nature of training, but the military's ideals are never purely superficial. The figure of Harbolla, like Weißenbach in *Ein Katzensprung*, demonstrates the physical effects of the military's performative training techniques. This performative construction of military masculinities affects soldiers' bodies as well as their authority within the military hierarchy. *NVA* attempts most clearly to dismiss the masculinities constructed by the military as ridiculous, and yet even in this film, characters such as Oberst Kalt gesture to potential negative effects of military service: melancholy and relationship breakdown.

Silverman attributes the radical potential of retro to its theatrical approach to identity, showing it to be a collage of experiences, memories and representations over several decades. At least with reference to these two works, Silverman appears to be justified in arguing that retro can highlight the construction of gender identity through its appeal to a range of artefacts and representations from various historical periods. Fürneisen and Haußmann

denaturalize ideal military masculinity in part through their retro portrayal. They present military discipline and hierarchies being sustained through exaggerated displays, which undercut the military's attempts to naturalize its gender ideals and promote strong and stoical masculinities. However, this playful approach to discipline and hierarchy is combined with sober depictions of the performative construction of military identities in *Zum Teufel mit Harbolla* and of physical and psychological hardships in *NVA*. In this respect, Silverman's defence of retro perhaps overemphasizes subjects' conscious control over their own identities and creates an impression of freedom and choice. Retro in these films works more subtly, in line with Butler's discussion of drag and performativity. Neither director consigns military ideals to the past as a trivial retro detail, but rather they show them as part of ongoing, performative negotiations of gender, in which the films themselves play a role. The retro aesthetic allows the filmmakers to ironize and play with these negotiations while continuing to acknowledge their effects. This is clearest in the films' use of a light-hearted retro aesthetic to portray the abuses of military service, a technique that suggests productive ways in which retro can be used to heighten a depiction of everyday interactions with repressive institutions such as the NVA.

The Limits of Retro?

The abuses that feature in so many other accounts of NVA military service are not absent from these comedies, and they appear to play an important role in attempts to construct ideal soldiers. The acknowledgement of abuses, and the more sombre tone that often accompanies such scenes, is part of the collage of allusions and incongruity that characterizes retro. Both films intersperse sobering scenes with more farcical ones, and *NVA* even layers farce and more serious reflection on the hardships of military service within the same scene. The playfulness of retro remains, but juxtaposing light-hearted passages with portrayals of abuse heightens the contrasts in the film and makes the NVA's harsh discipline seem all the more absurd and senseless.

The storyline of *Harbolla* takes place primarily in civilian environments, and the everyday abuses of military service therefore play a minor role. Where the barracks are depicted, they are unwelcoming. Engelhardt is sent to an artillery base and arrives in the driving rain. When he peers out of the truck in curiosity, he is doused with the water that has collected on the truck's roof (*ZTH*, 4:39–4:42). The base's corridors are long, dark and empty (*ZTH*, 4:44), in stark contrast to the bright spaces of earlier scenes at Engelhardt's commissioning parade. The use of light and framing to create darker, more restrictive spaces immediately suggests that everyday military life is more

difficult and unpleasant than the spectacle and ceremony of the parade ground. Apparently due to the oppressive environment, the commanding officer whom Engelhardt meets appears weary and repeatedly takes pills, presumably to manage symptoms of stress (*ZTH*, 6:15–6:30). His tiredness and resigned tone again contrast with the energized, if formulaic speech of the officer at the commissioning parade. The association of weariness with military masculinities in an operational context serves to make the ideal military masculinity performed by Engelhardt and others in the film seem idealized, theatrical and unrealistic.

The officer entrusts command of Harbolla's old platoon to Engelhardt, before sending him to collect Harbolla from prison. Engelhardt's platoon is shown watching and jeering at a film, namely a nude bathing scene from Arne Mattsson's film *Hon dansade en sommar*, originally released in Sweden in 1951 (*ZTH*, 5:05–5:57).⁴⁴ Mattsson's open depiction of nudity and sexuality was controversial with censors and extremely successful with audiences.⁴⁵ In 1952, it was released in Britain as *One Summer of Happiness* and in both German states as *Sie tanzten nur einen Sommer*, the dubbed version that the soldiers watch in *Zum Teufel mit Harbolla*. The film is part of Fürneisen's interest in including touches from the 1950s, but the choice of this scene reveals more undesirable aspects of life in the newly created NVA. The men's whistles and jeers at the actor Ulla Jacobsson show the misogyny and homosociality of the military environment in a negative light; the platoon appears crude and even threatening. Their poor discipline and hostility to Engelhardt demonstrate the unpleasant climate created by masculine rivalries on the artillery base. When the commanding officer introduces Engelhardt, the men's response to the religious resonances of his name is a repeated 'Amen', drawn out sardonically in mockery (*ZTH*, 8:23–8:32).⁴⁶ The recruits' lack of respect for authority corresponds to the irreverent irony of Fürneisen's retro aesthetic: the men empower themselves by subverting Engelhardt's authority and render Engelhardt's earnestness ridiculous. Fürneisen thus humorously subverts the military hierarchy while suggesting that authority cannot be based only on a performance of lessons from training, as reinforced by Engelhardt's later exchanges with Harbolla. From Engelhardt's point of view, military life is unpleasant, oppressive and requires him to negotiate masculinity and authority repeatedly, and theatrically, in power struggles with his superiors and subordinates.

The most sombre scene in *Zum Teufel mit Harbolla* occurs between two of the film's more light-hearted and retro scenes, the FDJ meeting and the dance in the restaurant. As usual, Harbolla is walking on ahead of Engelhardt and refusing to go to the station. He ignores orders to halt and instead places a bottle in the road, and encourages Engelhardt to shoot at it and even at him:

First the warning shot, then aimed at me, do you hear? Those are the regulations. But it works the other way round too: first aimed at me, and then the warning shot. No one can check. Bullets aren't numbered. Try it. Go on, try it. (*ZTH*, 29:43–30:07)

Harbolla's cajoling tone does suggest that his actions are intended as black humour, but his calm, hushed voice creates an intensity that is only accentuated as Engelhardt's voice rises in despair, repeating the order 'stand still or I'll shoot!' (*ZTH*, 30:21–30:40). The long, darkened street recalls the darkened artillery base corridors and once again shows Engelhardt at a loss, as his theatrical assertions of authority fail to have any effect. The camera focuses on Harbolla walking away in medium close-up when a shot rings out with the sound of glass breaking, so that the viewer's surprise mirrors Harbolla's (*ZTH*, 30:41). As Flegel writes in the screenplay: 'Harbolla walks on, does not quicken his pace at all, but his face appears tense.'⁴⁷ In the end, there is no direct confrontation between Engelhardt and Harbolla, but this scene represents the closest that the two come to violence. Attached to this scene in one of the DEFA studio's copies of the screenplay, a note remarks: 'This shooting nonsense [*Ballerei*] is not very pleasant either.'⁴⁸ There is no indication of the source of this note, but it shows the potential discomfort caused by the disjuncture between the intensity and suspense of the shooting scene and other scenes in the film so far. As if to underline the importance of such contrasts, the film then cuts to the *Schlager* singers in Heidelore's restaurant. The light-hearted mood of the following scene only enhances the effect of the shooting scene, which shows brutality and violence to be a more sinister way in which military hierarchies are created and sustained.

During the production of *Zum Teufel mit Harbolla*, censorship was still in place and military films were created in close collaboration with the NVA, so it is unsurprising that Fürneisen's portrayal stops short of showing physical abuse.⁴⁹ Nonetheless, he combines retro details like the scene from *Hon dansade en sommar* and humorous touches like Engelhardt being drenched by the rain with scenes that suggest that the military was an oppressive environment. Presumably the film's generally positive presentation of the new officer cohort in 1956 enabled its criticism of the oppressive environment of military service to pass the scrutiny of the NVA. The film could thus be interpreted as showing only the KVP as oppressive, while the socialist soldier personalities of the new army established a new, more professional atmosphere. However, in the shooting scene even the film's main subject, the power struggle between Engelhardt and Harbolla, is shown in the context of violence and abuse. By creating stark contrasts in tone, lighting and setting between scenes, Fürneisen jolts the viewer out of more sobering scenes and

prevents the film from lingering on abuses, while enhancing the impact of the starker scenes.

NVA focuses more explicitly on the brutality of military service, particularly through older soldiers' abuse of Krüger. The company's EKs punish Krüger for his cheekiness when the new conscripts move into a dormitory after basic training. Krüger and Henrik stand up to the EKs when they lock Traubewein in a locker and demand that he sing, a hazing practice known as 'music box'. When Krüger and Henrik repeatedly ask insulting questions, the EKs call reinforcements and the film cuts to the aftermath of a fight. By editing out the fight, Haußmann avoids depicting the violence, while also suggesting a gap in memory or conscious perception. The film only shows Henrik and his comrades after their beatings, with Henrik hanging from the lockers by his clothes (*NVA*, 21:52–24:25). This stylized and somewhat humorous tableau undercuts the tension of the preceding scene. However, the sudden switch in tone enhances the impact of the violence: an uncomfortable effect results from Haußmann's combination of dark, ironic humour and a serious representation of hazing with editing that passes over the moment of violence itself.

Although Haußmann's retro does not subvert the power dynamics in the dormitory scene, he suggests one way of doing so in a later scene in which Krüger is singled out for more abuse. EKs strap helmets to Krüger's knees and elbows and slide him along the corridor, a practice nicknamed 'tortoise' (*NVA*, 25:28–26:02). The film shows Krüger crash into a metal radiator at the far end of the corridor, but he remains irreverent, once more asking: 'I've got one more question.' Krüger's face is bloodied and injured, and yet by baiting the EKs, he gives the impression that he is enjoying the punishment. Krüger's pleasure appears to result not from submission to the beatings, but from his endurance and the increasing frustration of the EKs. His performance of defiance and continuing good humour subvert this unofficial military hierarchy and prevent these violent and abusive scenes from developing into pathos. Krüger's denial of pain or injury while his face streams with blood mirrors the stark contrast between the physical damage suffered by the men and the film's repeated reassertions of a light-hearted retro tone. This juxtaposition renders the abuse absurd: rather than reducing it to a joke or a retro detail consigned to the past, the film heightens the brutality of the NVA through the uncomfortable contrast between humour and violence.

Krüger's return from the penal unit at Schwedt combines the film's potentially subversive insistence on the theatricality of ideal military masculinity with sombre depictions of abuse that emphasize the profound effects of discipline and training. Haußmann does not show Krüger's time in Schwedt, unlike other less comedic representations, such as Uwe Tellkamp's novel *Der Turm* (*The Tower*, 2008).⁵⁰ The profound psychological effects of

Krüger's time at Schwedt are visible only when he returns to the barracks, immaculately dressed and with a regulation haircut for the first time in the film. Krüger responds to his roommates' friendly chatter with silence and an expressionless face. The contrast with Krüger's formerly extroverted and talkative character reveals the psychological effects of Schwedt. Krüger speaks only to bark out formulaic phrases: 'Attention! Comrade Unteroffizier, room 11 restoring the quarters to order [*bei der Herstellung der inneren Ordnung*]. Soldat Krüger reporting!' (*NVA*, 1:09:16–1:09:21). In suddenly sincere terms, the film shows Krüger to have internalized the discipline enforced in Schwedt, which appears to have imposed on him an 'internal order' (*innere Ordnung*) of another sort. Unlike Harbolla's theatrical displays of obedience, Krüger's obedience is not parodic but poignant, showing the profound psychological effects of the NVA's harsh discipline and rigid enforcement of masculine ideals. The brutality of the penal unit appears to have silenced aspects of his personality that contravened military norms. This moving scene clashes with the film's otherwise light-hearted tone in a way that accentuates the portrayal of the abuses suffered by Krüger.

The sobering mode of Krüger's return from Schwedt is resolved towards the end of the film by the return of a retro tone. His comrades attempt to restore him to his gregarious self by inviting dozens of women to visit him. Bemused and still silent, Krüger arrives at the visitors' room to find just one woman who has sent the others away: the nurse, Sonja, with whom he danced when he escaped from barracks. Krüger looks at a loss and, after the scene with the other women's frenzied arrival, the sudden slow pace of this scene again foregrounds his psychological torment. He does not respond to Sonja's advances, nor at first to her dancing along to a song on the record player. Suddenly, however, he hugs her desperately and cries on her shoulder (*NVA*, 1:17:24–1:18:57). Krüger's sudden crying appears to be in response to a change of mood caused by Sonja's appeal to retro. The music she plays on a scratchy record is a 1950s-style scat song from their earlier rendezvous, and is the only instance of diegetic retro music in the film. The memories and emotions connected with this music contrast with the generally more detached tone of retro, so it is difficult to determine whether Haußmann ascribes a therapeutic function to retro itself or just in this specific context. However, as in previous scenes, the film combines a retro touch with a serious and unflinching depiction of the hardships in the NVA. The film does not depict the rest of Krüger's recovery, but when he next appears in the final scenes, he seems back to his former irreverent self as the men escape the barracks.

Reynolds's definition of retro emphasizes the importance of a portrayal that is not sentimental about the past, but 'amused and charmed' by it. However, a retro film that remains entirely light-hearted and portrays the past only as charming would struggle to engage with the abuses and repression of the

NVA and would risk reducing it to a caricature. Fürneisen and Haußmann adapt retro for their own purposes in order to acknowledge the violence and abuse that were central to many experiences of military service in East Germany. *NVA* portrays abuse more directly and more frequently, undoubtedly due in part to the freedom afforded by Haußmann's perspective fifteen years after the NVA's dissolution. While the two films use retro in different ways, the techniques used to combine a retro tone with depictions of the brutality and hardships of military service are remarkably similar. Editing and lighting create stark contrasts by visually interspersing more humorous scenes with those depicting more unpleasant or harmful aspects of military service. The inclusion of retro objects or recordings integrates these scenes with the rest of the film, even though the light-hearted tone more usually associated with retro disappears momentarily.

These two films thus counter Baudrillard's and Jameson's accusations that films depicting a retro version of the past are superficial. Their representations of military masculinities remain stylized, based on displays of the power and authority associated with the NVA's ideals, but the irony and humour of retro still leaves room for portraying the violence experienced by recruits and conscripts over the NVA's history. In cases like the shooting scene in *Zum Teufel mit Harbolla* or Krüger's abuse by EKs, violence is in itself a theatrical assertion of ideal military masculinity and is therefore inseparable from the films' retro aesthetics. Particularly in *NVA*, the tone becomes more serious as the film moves from superficial outward displays of military ideals to suggestions of the more profound physical and psychological effects of violence and discipline. Ultimately, representing unpleasant or abusive aspects of the NVA is an important part of the films' attempts to subvert the hegemony of ideal military masculinity by portraying the negative effects of abuses within the NVA.

Conclusion

In the works analysed in the previous chapter, the reduction of uniform to costume did not pose a challenge to the military's masculine ideals or its attempts to transform conscripts physically and psychologically. *Zum Teufel mit Harbolla* and *NVA* explore the theatricality of military masculinities in more detail, focusing not primarily on the interaction between the uniform and the body, but on the place of performance, gesture and ritual in constructing military masculinities more generally. Both films look to the past in their depiction of the NVA, respectively to its foundation and its end, in an ironic rather than a nostalgic or historicizing way. Each presents a playfully self-conscious retro portrayal, which is essential to foregrounding the

theatricality of military masculinities and to the films' subversive treatment of the NVA's masculine ideals. Viewing these films through the lens of retro accounts for their irony and draws attention to the exaggerated, parodic performances of military identity that both films stage. The assertion of military hierarchies or of the socialist soldier personality through gestures or rituals is combined with such parodic irony in these films that ideal military masculinity appears insubstantial and artificial.

In this way, the two films attempt to subvert the hegemony of ideal military masculinities, with a limited degree of success. Officers are a particular target, although Engelhardt's failures to embody the military's ideals are treated with rather more nuance and sympathy than the caricatured, ridiculous officers in *NVA*. Exaggerated performances of an ideal military masculinity are in both films an important means of negotiating the power structures and hierarchies of military service. The intentions and success of these negotiations vary substantially. In *Zum Teufel mit Harbolla*, Engelhardt ostentatiously performs the commands and gestures that he learned during training in an attempt to assert his authority. His performances generally fail to convince, due to the clear disparity in experience between him and Harbolla. By contrast, Harbolla's own, more clearly parodic performances of subordination directly subvert military hierarchies and ridicule the seriousness with which Engelhardt interprets his mission in Oranienburg and the military's ideals more generally. In *NVA*, officers' assertions of authority are also rendered ridiculous, this time by Haußmann's use of caricature, which robs the characters of any seriousness at all. The retro aesthetic of the two films thus foregrounds the theatrical form that military masculinities often take. This focus tends to make the military's ideals appear ludicrous, while simultaneously revealing the way in which conscripts, recruits and officers construct individual identities partly through such performances.

One more sinister aspect of the performances of ideal military masculinity in both films is violence. As discussed earlier in *Julia lebt*, *Drei Stern rot* and *An die Grenze*, violence plays an important role in establishing the boundaries of the military's gender ideals and in policing and punishing infringements. Fürneisen and Haußmann demonstrate the extent to which violence is one way of enforcing adherence to the NVA's ideals, but also a way of negotiating positions within a hierarchy of military masculinities. Both Fürneisen and Haußmann intersperse more flamboyantly retro scenes with threatening behaviour or violence, a technique that suggests an attempt to balance light-hearted retro with a sincere discussion of problems in the NVA. Scenes of violence are most prominent in *NVA* and the film combines a potentially disruptive emphasis on performance with a portrayal of the profound physical and psychological effects of military service. Combined with the clear suggestion in *Zum Teufel mit Harbolla* that military authority

is built up performatively over time rather than through spontaneous individual performances, the films thus suggest that the theatricality of military masculinities does not make them temporary or superficial.

The performative construction of military masculinities is once more at the centre of these films. Far from being covered up by a superficial retro 'simulation' of the past, as Baudrillard might argue, the embodied performativity of gender is exposed by the films' retro aesthetic. Fürneisen and Haußmann suggest a more nuanced and politicized way of using retro to reveal the constructed nature of gender identity and to denaturalize hegemonic masculinities. In the military context, they also demonstrate that combining irony with more sombre depictions of abuses can accentuate the impact of abusive acts on screen. These films both work by creating stark contrasts that break the flow of the narrative and encourage the viewer to engage with disparities and incongruities in the portrayal. In short, retro is not incompatible with more serious or politicized messages, and can be used to present those messages more effectively. Not all viewers will inevitably respond in this way: sudden shifts to a more light-hearted mode might eclipse the films' portrayals of abuse, particularly in *Zum Teufel mit Harbolla*, which only hints at abuse obliquely. However, the attention paid in both works to violence and to the performative effects of military service demonstrates an attempt to use retro in a more complex way than Baudrillard, Jameson or even Silverman have suggested.

An important feature of these films is their appeal to a wide audience: retro has been an extremely popular and marketable force in the last thirty years, and *NVA* in particular uses a wide range of international references to broaden the film's audience. Other post-GDR films use similar techniques, such as Haußmann's previous film *Sonnenallee* or Wolfgang Becker's acclaimed *Good Bye, Lenin!* These films differ in their subject matter, but both use retro to accentuate, albeit mostly ironically, GDR citizens' negotiations of state institutions. Christiane Kerner in *Good Bye, Lenin!* spends her days writing petitions to protest against clothes and products that are poorly made or conceived, while Micha in *Sonnenallee* continually uses charm and wit to avoid trouble with school, the police and the FDJ. *Zum Teufel mit Harbolla* and *NVA* show these negotiations more clearly in light of the gender negotiations that go on alongside and as part of these negotiations of institutions. While Engelhardt develops his identity through theatrical performances of ideal military masculinity, Christiane's petitions respond directly to the ignorance of and disregard for women's bodies by the state's clothing production monopolies.⁵¹

In all these examples, a retro aesthetic is used to ironize, often in the form of self-irony, the apparently trivial and everyday ways in which citizens negotiated institutions and went along with them where possible in order to

make life easier. Debates over the term *Ostalgie* or its applicability to films such as *Sonnenallee* or *Good Bye, Lenin!* have often been polarized and remain inconclusive, and these films' light-hearted tone and emphasis on theatricality is better understood using theories of retro. Retro portrayals of the GDR's more oppressive institutions also suggest that ritualized and theatrical actions contributed to bolstering the system through people's limited conformity, even when these actions were performed with ironic intent at the time. More than other contexts, the military shows that negotiations with GDR institutions were also negotiations of masculinity in a state whose institutions were so heavily reliant on images of strong, hardworking men and women.

In a contemporary world where satire and detachment are widespread in engagements with politics – nowhere more so than in the spike in viewing figures for *Saturday Night Live* and *The Daily Show* in the United States before and after the 2016 elections – these films remind us that ironic or detached interactions with power structures are not sufficient to subvert them. Retro's turn to the past can provide respite from the politics of the present, but these films demonstrate that it can also say rather more about how identities are built and shaped, and that retro narratives need not remain superficial.

Notes

1. See e.g. Potsdam-Babelsberg, Deutsches Rundfunkarchiv, AC 14026/1, VHS, 'Festveranstaltung 40 Jahre Grenztruppen', *Aktuelle Kamera*, 28 November 1986.
2. See e.g. *Vom Sinn des Soldatseins*, 101.
3. See Freiburg, Bundesarchiv-Militärarchiv, DVW 1/39515, minutes and agendas of the *Nationaler Verteidigungsrat* (1978), Dienstvorschrift 010/0/003 Innendienstvorschrift, para. 56.
4. Fürneisen, *Zum Teufel mit Harbolla*; L. Haußmann (dir.), *NVA* (Universum, 2005).
5. C. Dieckmann, 'Zonenkindereien', *Die Zeit*, 29 September 2005, 49; D. Koch-Haag, 'Ostalgieische Milde', *tip*, 22 September 2005, 48.
6. E.g. T. Stecher, 'Sexy DDR', *Die Weltwoche*, 18 November 1999, 49; J. Bisky, 'Zonensucht: Kritik der neuen Ostalgie', *Merkur* 58 (2004), 117–27.
7. C. Hyland, "'Ostalgie Doesn't Fit!': Individual Interpretations of and Interactions with Ostalgie', in Saunders and Pinfold, *Remembering and Rethinking*, 101–15.
8. On *Ostalgie* as anticonsumerist, see C. Sadowski-Smith, 'Ostalgie: Revaluing the Past, Regressing into the Future', *GDR Bulletin* 25 (1998), 1–6; M. Blum, 'Remaking the East German Past: Ostalgie, Identity, and Material Culture', *Journal of Popular Culture* 34 (2000), 229–53. On *Ostalgie* as a Western phenomenon, see A. Plowman, 'Westalgie? Nostalgia for the "Old" Federal Republic in Recent German Prose', *Seminar* 40 (2004), 249–61; T. Ahbe, *Ostalgie: Zum Umgang mit der DDR-Vergangenheit in den 1990er Jahren* (Erfurt: Landeszentrale für politische Bildung Thüringen, 2005).
9. S. Reynolds, *Retromania: Pop Culture's Addiction to its Own Past* (London: Faber & Faber, 2011), all xxx.
10. E.E. Guffey, *Retro: The Culture of Revival* (London: Reaktion, 2006), 11 and 21.
11. F. Beyer (dir.), *Der Bruch* (DEFA, 1989).

12. L. Haußmann (dir.), *Sonnenallee* (Highlight, 1999); Becker, *Good Bye, Lenin!*. See e.g. N. Hodgkin, *Screening the Past: Heimat, Memory and Nostalgia in German Film since 1989* (New York: Berghahn Books, 2011).
13. Lynn Marie Kutch does not use the term ‘retro’, but her analysis deals with similar questions of popular culture, stylization and irony: ‘The Comic-Book Humor of Leander Haußmann’s *Sonnenallee*’, in J.E. Twark (ed.), *Strategies of Humor in Post-unification German Literature, Film and Other Media* (Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars, 2011), 202–23.
14. J. Baudrillard, *Simulacra and Simulation*, trans. by S.F. Glaser (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1994), 45.
15. Ibid.
16. F. Jameson, *Postmodernism, or, The Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism* (London: Verso, 1991), 19.
17. P. Ahrens, “‘Mensch ist ein Dienstgrad...’”, *Weltbühne*, 4 April 1989, 425–27; S. Andrer, “‘Problemchen’ der Anfangsjahre?”, letter in *Filmforum*, *Filmspiegel* 36(9) (1989), 30.
18. H. Knietzsch, ‘Oranienburger Odyssee anno 56 aus den Babelberger Studios’, *Neues Deutschland*, 27 February 1989; J. Grübl, ‘Heerscharen mit Pauken und Raketen’, *Süddeutsche Zeitung*, 29 September 2005, SZ-Extra, 1.
19. E.g. P. Claus, ‘Rendezvous am Nierentisch’, *Junge Welt*, 24 February 1989.
20. Fürneisen, *Zum Teufel mit Harbolla*: hereinafter referenced in the text as *ZTH*.
21. See e.g. E. Honecker, ‘Schlußbemerkungen Erich Honeckers auf der Tagung des Thomas-Müntzer-Komitees’, *Neues Deutschland*, 20 January 1989, 5. A recording of this speech is featured in Haußmann, *NVA*, 33:57–35:24.
22. Haußmann, *NVA*: hereinafter referenced in the text as *NVA*.
23. B. Fürneisen, ‘Auf der Suche nach neuen Wegen’, interview with K. Fiedler, *Neue Zeit*, 16 February 1989: ‘Komödie mit Tiefgang, umgeben von ironisch gefärbtem Zeitkolorit’.
24. On the function of *Schlager*, a genre of light rock and pop, in the GDR, see R. Rudolf, ‘Schlager in der DDR’, in S. Helms (ed.), *Schlager in Deutschland: Beiträge zur Analyse der Populärmusik und des Musikmarktes* (Wiesbaden: Breitkopf & Härtel, 1972), 121–29; A.W. Herkendell, “‘Ein himmelblauer Trabant’: Studien zum DDR-Schlager”, *Beiträge zur Populärmusikforschung* 21/22 (1998), 139–59; C. Köhne, ‘Schlagerrevue und Schlager-ABC: Hörfunksendereihen zwischen Partei und Publikum’, in S. Trültzsch and T. Wilke (eds), *Heißer Sommer – Coole Beats: Zur populären Musik und ihren medialen Repräsentation in der DDR* (Bern: Lang, 2010), 139–58.
25. L. Haußmann, ‘Rote Seelen’, interview with K. Decker, *Der Tagesspiegel*, 29 September 2005: ‘Was ist das denn?, habe ich gedacht und mit [sic] vorgestellt, das ist alles gar nicht wahr, das ist ein Film.’
26. See e.g. L. Haußmann, ‘Schnecke und Grashüpfer’, interview with H.G. Pflaum and F. Göttler, *Süddeutsche Zeitung*, 29 September 2005, 15.
27. D. Reed, ‘My Bonnie Is over the Ocean: Lyrics’. Retrieved 30 May 2019 from <http://www.deanreed.de/texte/mybonnie.html>.
28. K. Silverman, ‘Fragments of a Fashionable Discourse’, in T. Modleski (ed.), *Studies in Entertainment: Critical Approaches to Mass Culture* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1986), 139–52.
29. Ibid., 150–51.
30. See e.g. L. Cochrane, ‘The Sweet Scent of Success: Calvin Klein is Back to the Future’, *The Guardian*, 13 January 2014.
31. S. Brown, *Marketing: The Retro Revolution* (London: Sage, 2001), e.g. vii and 7.

32. See e.g. S. Klötzer, *Satire und Macht: Film, Zeitung, Kabarett in der DDR* (Cologne: Böhlau, 2006).
33. M. Nadkarni and O. Shevchenko, 'The Politics of Nostalgia: A Case for Comparative Analysis of Post-socialist Practices', *Ab Imperio* 5 (2004), 487–519 (at 499).
34. SCHA, 'DDR-Militaria: Im Supermarkt der NVA', *Berliner Kurier*, 5 July 2012.
35. The Yorck March ('Yorckscher Marsch') was one of the compulsory marches in the repertoire of every NVA band: Wenzke, *Ulbrichts Soldaten*, 634.
36. Butler, *Gender Trouble*, 188.
37. *Ibid.*, 187. Emphasis in original.
38. See e.g. J. Prosser, *Second Skins: The Body Narratives of Transsexuality* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1998).
39. Butler, 'Critically Queer', 234.
40. M. Allinson, 'Life in the Army: Reported, Represented, Remembered', in Saunders and Pinfold, *Remembering and Rethinking*, 229–44 (at 235).
41. Disler, *Language*.
42. 'Wer Genosse ist, bestimmen wir, und wir bestimmen, bei uns sind alle Genossen.'
43. L. Haußmann, *NVA: Roman* (Cologne: Kiepenheuer & Witsch, 2005), 24; Kubrick, *Full Metal Jacket*.
44. A. Mattsson (dir.), *Hon dansade en sommar* (Nordisk Tonfilm, 1951).
45. A. Lund, 'The Story of a Bad Girl! *Summer with Monika*, Sexploitation and the Selling of Erotic Bergman', in E. Björklund and M. Larsson (eds), *Swedish Cinema and the Sexual Revolution: Critical Essays* (Jefferson, NC: McFarland, 2016), 11–20 (at 12).
46. 'Gottfried Engelhardt' draws on the German words for God ('Gott'), peace ('Friede(n)') and angel ('Engel').
47. BArch, DR 117/4378, *Zum Teufel mit Harbolla*, screenplay with annotations, 16 December 1987, 65.
48. *Ibid.*, note attached to page 65.
49. See e.g. BArch, DR 117/29445, letter from Armeegeneral H. Keßler, 13 January 1988, with attachment: 'Gutachten zum Szenarium der DEFA-Filmkomödie "Zum Teufel mit Harbolla"'.
50. U. Tellkamp, *Der Turm: Geschichte aus einem versunkenen Land* (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 2008). See my discussion in Chapter 5.
51. Becker, *Good Bye, Lenin!*, 1:05:50–1:08:49.