Although I have focused so far largely on violent, exploitative and even manipulative relationships between NVA members, military service is also an experience shaped by desire and even intimacy. In the works I have analysed so far, desires for women have consistently been used to disrupt or at least contrast with discipline and the development of ideal military masculinities, from Fichtner’s desire for Friederike in *Es gibt kein Niemandsland* to Kian’s relationship in *Tausend Tage*. However, close, even physically intimate friendships between men also feature prominently in twenty-first-century representations of GDR military service. These works draw on existing depictions of intimacy, such as Fuchs’s narrator washing Jugel’s back in *Fassonschnitt* and Harbolla washing Engelhardt in a momentary relaxation of their rivalry in *Zum Teufel mit Harbolla*.¹ Recent literary and historical scholarship has emphasized that such intimacy and even desire between men are common features of military experiences, with significant implications for military masculinities.² Jason Crouthamel has even argued that service in the trenches made homosexual soldiers identify with military masculine ideals and contest the simple identification between military masculinities and heterosexuality.³ However, military training is often ignored or sidelined in such work, with love or desire between soldiers being attributed to the uniquely extreme conditions of the warzone.

Literature and film depicting queer experience and same-sex desire during NVA training present an important contribution to such debates by showing desire and intimacy as products of military environments more widely, rather
than just the extreme situations of war. Since 1990, numerous fictional and autobiographical accounts show negotiations of masculinity during military training that include and are shaped by men’s desires and sexualities. These negotiations are often mirrored or performed in the texts, which demonstrate particular difficulties with writing retrospectively about experiences that were largely closeted at the time. In this final chapter, I contrast two works that foreground these tensions: the novel Neue Leben (New Lives, 2005) by Ingo Schulze (b. 1962) and the memoir Hinterm Horizont allein – Der ‘Prinz’ von Prora (Alone beyond the Horizon – The ‘Prince’ of Prora, 2005) by Stefan Wolter (b. 1967). Schulze and Wolter both present narratives made up of letters and other sources, and explore ways of revealing queer sexualities and same-sex desire.

Because of the importance of sources in both works, we can describe them as archival narratives, albeit with contrasting approaches to the documentation and articulation of desire. Same-sex desire emerges through gaps in the sources, suggesting the influence of closet dynamics on processes of documentation and archivization. José Esteban Muñoz’s discussions of queer evidence and Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick’s theory of the closet provide useful insights into both texts, while also revealing a close relationship between the structures of the archive and the closet. As other post-1990 texts have shown, negotiations of military ideals did not cease with reunification. Ongoing tensions and engagement with military service are central to Schulze’s and Wolter’s texts, even once same-sex desire could be discussed with greater openness. These texts reveal the performative, often textual nature of these negotiations, by experimenting with masculinity, identity and the notion of authentic selfhood. Schulze’s novel playfully satirizes post-reunification biographies by creating a complex, multilayered narrative that shows identities being changed and rewritten after 1990. His fictional editor scours biographical sources for evidence of same-sex desire, which he uses to attack his protagonist. By contrast, Wolter’s memoir subverts the association of sources with revelation or authenticity, using them instead to prompt a considered, empathetic engagement with his own same-sex desire during his service and with questions of queer evidence and archivization.

**Archival Narration and Same-Sex Desire**

*Neue Leben* is an epistolary novel, presented as a collection of the letters and writings of Enrico Türmer, a businessman in the town of Altenburg in the 1990s, edited by ‘Ingo Schulze’. Links soon emerge between Enrico and the editor from their schooldays: he describes his romantic interest in Enrico’s sister, Vera, and his envy and admiration for Enrico’s attempts to become
a writer before reunification. The integration of the editor into the fiction reveals the distance between the author and his editor alter ego. The editor introduces Enrico as the head of a substantial business after reunification. When it collapses in 1998, Enrico disappears, leaving only his letters to Vera, his best friend, Johann, and a Western journalist, Nicoletta, with whom he became romantically involved. Letters to Vera and Johann document Enrico’s business ventures in early 1990, while those to Nicoletta describe his upbringing in the GDR. The editor compiles the letters chronologically, supplementing them with a foreword, acknowledgements, footnotes and an appendix. The appendix consists of seven stories, supposedly written by Enrico, which echo events in the letters. The editor claims that Enrico abandoned the stories and wrote to Nicoletta on the reverse of the paper, a device consciously drawn from E.T.A. Hoffmann’s Lebens-Ansichten des Katers Murr (The Life and Opinions of the Tomcat Murr, 1819–21) and reminiscent of a similar conceit in Irmtraud Morgner’s Leben und Abenteuer der Trobadora Beatriz (The Life and Adventures of Trobadora Beatrice, 1974).

The resulting structure is extremely complex, with the reader skipping between chronological levels, paratexts complicating the boundaries of Schulze’s fiction, and letters to each recipient adopting a different tone. The juxtaposition of perspectives reveals discrepancies and omissions, raising questions about how to understand the source material presented. The editor positions the text in part as an archive of Enrico’s life: he claims to have gathered and ordered the sources for the first time and to present them with minimal changes (NL, 9–12). An archive might be defined as a repository for source material that is preserved, ordered, grouped and presented for consultation, much like the editor’s narrative. However, the text is also presented as a scholarly edition that interprets and evaluates Enrico’s documents, complete with editorial clichés: ‘Errors in spelling or grammar have been emended without comment’ (NL, 12). The novel therefore does not fall entirely into the category of an archive, since these interpretative steps and amendments are generally outside the remit of the archivist. Nevertheless, processes of archivization shape the narrative in significant ways, so that it might be described as an archival narrative.

I will use the term ‘archival narrative’ for a text structured largely or entirely around interplay between different types and levels of sources, and governed by similar processes to an archive. Archives of the GDR come in various forms, from the large official archives of the Stasi and other institutions, which have received the greatest attention from scholars, to smaller private archives collected and organized by individuals, sometimes in secret or in opposition to official archives.10 These diverse archives are all shaped by power dynamics: as Michel Foucault has argued, processes of archivization ensure that sources ‘group themselves together in distinct figurations,
arrange themselves according to their multiple relations with one another, maintain their integrity or blur [se maintiennent ou s’estompent] according to their specific regularities'. In other words, archivists select and preserve sources while also organizing them within systems of categorization, which can establish the value of a given archival trace or diminish its integrity or individual significance, for example, by merging files. In the case of same-sex desire, dynamics of ordering and collection are combined not just with the possibility that sources ‘s’estompent’ (fade or blur), but with the potential for the archive or archivist to actively suppress material. In some ways, all narratives depend on processes of selection and organization, but archival narratives are distinguished by their range of sources and their explicit focus on archival processes.

As Schulze’s novel indicates, archival narratives stand in a complex relationship to archives. Archivists preserve sources and reveal information, but also relegate some material to less easily accessible sites and even reject or destroy material that cannot be accommodated or that goes against the archive’s institutional focus. In many archives, this suppression of material is invisible to the user, whereas narratives may more clearly display acts of suppression. In *Neue Leben*, for example, the rehabilitation of Enrico’s stories demonstrates the complex relationship between preservation and suppression in the dynamics of archivization. Like a narrator or autobiographer, many archivists also reserve the right to advance the first interpretation of archival material, and yet these interpretations do not generally become part of the archive itself. An archival narrative can therefore differ from an archive in combining sources with interpretations or evaluations: Schulze’s novel presents itself simultaneously as the first collection of Enrico’s documents and as an edition with interpretations. Furthermore, an archival narrative is also shaped by the qualities of narration. For example, *Neue Leben* brings the stories and letters into a linear, paginated structure that determines the order in which sources are read. Crucially, an archival narrative can be fictional while still staging the operation of archival dynamics. Schulze creates fictional sources that raise questions of authenticity and demonstrate the layers of text that constitute a life, but he writes these sources with narrative dynamics of suspense and digression in mind, as well as a clear circular structure.

The play with fiction and authenticity is central to Schulze’s archival narration, which fragments the story into multiple partial perspectives. He saturates the novel with autobiographical references, with Enrico and the editor both displaying obvious parallels to Schulze’s life, beyond just the editor’s name. Before reunification, Enrico is an aspiring writer and dramaturg in Altenburg, like Schulze was. The novel begins with Enrico’s depression after the utopian excitement that he and his partner, Michaela, experienced in October and November 1989. His depression only lifts when he renounces
his literary ambitions. Instead of writing literature, he sets up a newspaper, the *Altenburg Weekly News* (*Altenburger Wochenblatt*), and converts it into a more profitable advertising sheet during 1990, almost exactly matching Schulze’s own biography. In the novel, the business achieves great success, primarily because of the input of a mysterious Mephistopheles figure, Clemens von Barrista. During this time, Enrico meets and falls in love with Nicoletta and leaves Michaela, who marries Barrista. The novel closes when the letters finish in July 1990, but the editor explains that Enrico later goes bankrupt and disappears at the ‘turn of the new year 1997/98’ (*NL*, 7), exactly the time when Schulze’s previous novel, *Simple Storys*, was published. In the fictional conceit of *Neue Leben*, then, the editor’s work occurs in the same time period as the novel’s actual production by Schulze.

Parallel to this story, Enrico narrates his upbringing and life in the GDR in letters to Nicoletta, including a substantial section recounting his military service. His attitude to military service is another autobiographical echo, this time of Schulze’s hope of finding ‘his own unmistakable voice’ as a writer while in the NVA (*NL*, 423). In his 2007 Leipzig poetics lecture, Schulze describes his struggles with articulating his identity in relation to military service:

> the actual feeling [*das Eigentliche*], the thing that weighed heavy on my soul and had me lying awake long before the alarm, this feeling remained silent. Only on very rare occasions did I experience how satisfying it is to capture in writing something that otherwise remains unspoken and can only be spoken in a story.17

The difficulties in describing the profound experiences of military service, which Schulze describes as an ineffable ‘Eigentliche[s]’, dominate many portrayals of the NVA, particularly regarding violence or shame. Schulze’s final comment asserts the importance of fiction in expressing what ‘otherwise remains unspoken’, but despite his confidence in storytelling, he describes his difficulties with the structure of *Neue Leben* in the same lecture. Schulze therefore suggests that military service not only affected his literary negotiations of identity at the time, but also his later efforts to write about military service. Plowman has demonstrated Schulze’s particularly playful approach to fictionality and authenticity in sections set in the NVA. The result is a novel less about military service than about someone failing to write about it, and within the narrative Enrico’s desires are central to these difficulties.

Same-sex desire in *Neue Leben* has received little attention, despite being a prominent theme, particularly during Enrico’s military service, which encapsulates the novel’s formal fragmentation and questions around archival narration. Enrico’s descriptions of the NVA are particularly diffuse, split
between his letters to Nicoletta and three of his seven stories. Schulze has explicitly described the importance of desire for Enrico’s rewriting of his life and for the novel’s structure around letters to Vera, Johann and Nicoletta: ‘The three addressees … represent for [Enrico] three possible loves, three different versions of his life [Lebensentwürfe].’ The novel’s epistolary structure itself points to the importance of desire: letters actively seek a reader, just as desires often seek reciprocation by an object. The reciprocal nature of Enrico’s desires for all three addressees is always in question: Johann appears never to share Enrico’s love; Nicoletta appears not to have responded to Enrico’s letters; and his apparently incestuous desire for Vera seems entirely one-sided. Enrico’s potentially unrequited desires may partially explain the compulsiveness of his letter writing. More importantly, his relationships with the addressees determine the content of his letters, resulting in inconsistencies and contradictions, which the editor highlights with apparent glee: ‘It will not escape the attentive reader that the letter writer Türmer depicts one and the same event in wildly differing versions, depending on the addressee. Evaluating this is not a matter for the editor’ (NL, 11). Nonetheless, the editor’s footnotes do draw attention to these inconsistencies throughout the novel.

However, the novel is structured by desire in two further ways, which relate more specifically to Enrico’s desire during his service. First, Enrico’s letters are shaped by attempts to suppress same-sex desire, particularly in letters to Nicoletta, which rewrite his upbringing within the GDR’s institutions. This suppression is clear from comparison with Enrico’s stories, which represent queer experiences during military service more clearly, perhaps playing with the potential for greater freedom and distance in fictionalizations of autobiographical experiences. Although the editor suggests that Enrico discarded the stories because of their poor quality, the wider suppression of desire in Enrico’s letters suggests that the urge to suppress his transgressive desires may also have been a motivating factor. Second, as suggested by the editor’s elevation of the stories to the same narrative plane as Enrico’s letters, Neue Leben is structured by the attempts of an antagonistic editor to use Enrico’s desires against him. He reinstates the stories and instructs the reader to use them, ‘from time to time to improve the understanding of matters that are left out or only touched upon in the letters’ (NL, 11). His footnotes then seize eagerly on inconsistencies and comment on the gaps in Enrico’s letters.

Enrico’s relationship with Nikolai in the NVA offers the clearest example of the structural influence of Enrico’s suppression of same-sex desire on the novel and on his negotiations of identity. Nikolai moves into Enrico’s dormitory and he and Enrico become close. Nikolai’s name resonates with Nicoletta, perhaps suggesting that Enrico’s unrequited love for Nicoletta offers a chance to suppress past desires by writing his affection for Nikolai.
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out of his biography. Nikolai himself appears in two forms. First, in a letter to Nicoletta, Enrico describes ‘perhaps the most remarkable physiognomy in the company. The end of his long, thin nose pointed harshly downwards and gave his face something of a ram-like quality [etwas Widderhaftes]’ (NL, 289). ‘Widderhaft’ also resonates with the more common ‘widerlich’, or ‘repulsive’, underlining the negative and even racialized nature of Enrico’s description of Nikolai, who is half-Armenian. This first description contrasts starkly with Nikolai’s appearance in letters to Vera and Johann as ‘my handsome Nikolai’ and ‘the handsome Armenian’ (NL, 517 and 522). In case the reader misses this inconsistency, the editor adds a footnote to the letter to Vera: ‘This characterization of Nikolai differs substantially from the one T. [Enrico] gave to N.H. [Nicoletta]’ (NL, 517). The editor does not explain the discrepancy, but Enrico’s concern to play down same-sex desire in letters to his new female love interest provides one explanation.

The editor frequently uses footnotes to reveal Enrico’s attempts to suppress his desire for Nikolai in letters to Nicoletta. First, Enrico describes a business relationship, with the two men creating pornographic portraits and love letters for comrades’ girlfriends. However, Enrico supposedly decides after an argument over creative differences ‘not to tolerate him near me in future’ (NL, 294). Nevertheless, as the editor points out, in Enrico’s next letter to Nicoletta, he is already sharing Nikolai’s art studio as a safe space in which to write (NL, 307–8). It is unclear how Nikolai obtained an art studio, as this was hardly standard practice in the NVA, and this episode seems to signal a combination of memory and fantasy. Enrico’s description of young men modelling for Nikolai adds to this impression: ‘you will hardly believe my naivety, but I did find it curious that his models were all very boyish and often confusingly similar looking’ (NL, 308). Only when Enrico makes explicit his naivety, albeit probably feigned, does the editor comment on Enrico’s concealment of his desire: ‘T. attempted, understandably, to conceal his homoerotic relationship with Nikolai, but clearly does not wish to dispense with Nikolai as a character’ (ibid.). The editor highlights and affirms Enrico’s attempts to suppress same-sex desire as ‘understandable’, and points to the tension between concealment and his apparent compulsion to include Nikolai in the narrative of military service. The editor intends to discredit Enrico for his desire, and in doing so reveals Enrico’s attempts to adapt this aspect of his military service in order to reconstruct his masculinity and identity through his epistolary exchange with Nicoletta.

Nikolai’s final appearance in letters to Nicoletta is after military service when the two men holiday together. While Enrico claims ‘I did not know how I would survive these two days with him’, the editor comments: ‘According to matching statements by V.T. [Vera] and Johann Ziehlke, Nikolai and T. seemed like a couple in the early days after the army’ (NL, 313). By quoting
Vera and Johann and drawing out inconsistencies, the editor attempts to give his project more authenticity than Enrico’s letters alone, once again demonstrating Schulze’s play with fiction and authenticity. Enrico’s ambivalence about his attraction to Nikolai and secrecy about the nature of their relationship demonstrate an attempt to reconcile the centrality of same-sex desire to his military experience with the need to suppress it, perhaps due to prohibitions in the NVA and his pursuit of Nicoletta. The editor’s footnotes then supplement the letters with other sources of information on Enrico’s life, asserting knowledge and therefore power over Enrico as editor, but also as an archivist selecting texts and determining how they should be ordered. The structure of the novel therefore draws attention to Enrico’s same-sex desire by foregrounding inaccuracies and incompleteness in Enrico’s attempts to rewrite and recontextualize his military service to fit his new masculine values in the 1990s. The interplay between letters and stories, as well as the dialogue between these sources and the editor’s interpretative commentary, reveal and refuse Enrico’s attempts at suppression. The editor uses this technique to expose, discredit and attack Enrico, with the apparent assumption that the reader will reject his same-sex desire.

In contrast to Schulze’s playful fictional text, Wolter’s memoir presents itself as an autobiographical, even historical contribution to documenting the NVA. The generic conventions within which the two authors operate are therefore substantially different. Yet despite clear differences in the two texts’ relationship to facticity and historical accuracy, Wolter’s memoir demonstrates remarkably similar concerns to Schulze’s novel, including authenticity, the relationship between sources, and the place of same-sex desire in the NVA and later negotiations of masculinity.

Wolter describes his service as a conscientious objector in an NVA construction unit and focuses especially on his intimate relationship with a fellow Bausoldat named Thomas. This text too is governed by archival dynamics of collection, preservation, organization and suppression, but draws on genuine sources from Wolter’s military service amassed over his life. He reproduces letters and photographs primarily, but also documents, drawings and poems, which he describes having numbered, grouped together and stored at his parents’ house (HHA, 18). Wolter supplements these sources with narrative reflections based on his memories. Yosef Hayim Yerushalmi has insisted that: ‘The documents in an archive are not part of memory; if they were, we should have no need to retrieve them; once retrieved, they are often at odds with memory.’ Wolter’s archival narrative indicates ways of including memories among more conventional written sources, while retaining the tension that Yerushalmi describes. He uses his memories for an ‘unsparing reflection’ on the sources, an interpretative step that marks the book as an archival narrative rather than simply a published archive of sources (HHA, 32). As in
the editor’s critical commentary in *Neue Leben*, Wolter evaluates his sources and dispenses with the idea that archive sources can guarantee authenticity. Rather, the sources documenting his military service are associated with the suppression of his relationship with Thomas.

Another important difference that distinguishes *Hinterm Horizont allein* not only from *Neue Leben*, but also from the other texts I have analysed, is Wolter’s focus on *Bausoldaten* rather than soldiers in regular units. He describes his eighteen-month construction service between 1986 and 1988. From 1964, conscientious objectors in the GDR were conscripted into construction units.24 The men still wore military uniforms, lived in barracks and were trained by NVA officers, but were unarmed and worked on infrastructure projects in gruelling conditions. Wolter worked on the harbour in Prora on Rügen. The Prora site was conceived as a National Socialist holiday camp in the 1930s, but was still unfinished when war broke out. During the war, the partially finished constructions housed a police battalion, communications workers and even forced labourers.25 The GDR converted the partially completed buildings into a military base in 1956, and by 1982 they housed the largest contingent of *Bausoldaten*.26 Construction units comprised a higher proportion of political and religious dissidents than other NVA units, meaning that solidarity between conscripts and resistance to the NVA hierarchy are more explicit in *Hinterm Horizont allein* than in other texts. Post-reunification museums and historical accounts initially neglected *Bausoldaten*, and Wolter conceived his book as an urgent and personal contribution to the history of the GDR and of Prora: ‘On the life of *Bausoldaten*, there is generally very little information’ (*HHA*, 18). Professionally, Wolter is an historian, so his concern for factual accuracy and his detailed attention to the reliability of sources must be understood in the context of the memoir’s historical aims.

In light of the substantial generic and contextual differences between *Neue Leben* and *Hinterm Horizont allein*, the similarities between the two texts are compelling. Like *Neue Leben*, Wolter’s memoir is structured around interactions between different types of sources. The theme of same-sex desire only emerges from the dialogue between Wolter’s memories and the archival material he accumulated after his service. In a prologue, he describes his inspiration to write about his time in Prora after visiting again in 2004. The prologue also describes events before his conscription, interspersing his reflections with photographs from his 2004 trip and documents from 1986: a reproduction of his conscription order and transcriptions of diary entries and letters. Wolter divides the rest of the narrative into chapters by month and depicts in strict chronology the monotony of daily life and his interactions with other *Bausoldaten*. Each chapter begins with Wolter’s reflections, followed by transcriptions of the letters he wrote to his family. Photographs
are interspersed throughout the text, along with facsimiles of documents and pages of letters.

In addition to displaying Wolter’s collection and organization of material, his alternating structure between reflections and letters directs attention to experiences suppressed from the documents. Rather than using sources to demonstrate the authenticity of his memories, he explicitly identifies the bias in his archive. For example, moments of happiness and natural beauty assume a disproportionate place: ‘In my letters, I liked to mention experiences that made life sweeter’ (HHA, 122). Wolter’s reflections thus comment on and supplement the somewhat sanitized portrayal of Prora in his letters. Conventional archival sources become inseparable from their omissions and gaps, and the interplay between these sources and Wolter’s reflections structures the entire work. The most prominent omissions in his letters concern his same-sex desire and intimacy. Wolter’s reflections present his relationship with Thomas as a positive experience that made his time in Prora more bearable. Yet this experience is almost entirely suppressed by his letters, in which Thomas appears only as a friend.

The clearest example of such an omission is their first kiss. Although a letter from the previous day announces ‘I was going to go on day leave with Thomas tomorrow’ (HHA, 293), Wolter’s next letter neglects the evening entirely. Unlike Wolter’s other evenings in the local town, his leave on this occasion is omitted from his correspondence with his parents. However, it is described in vivid terms in his reflections. Wolter remembers dancing with Thomas because no girls would dance with them. Wolter’s portrayal is extremely intimate: ‘Our eyes found each other, having seen so many of the same things [so viel Gleiches] of late, and our hands found each other, seeking comfort in sameness [in Gleichem]’ (HHA, 285). Repetition of ‘gleich’ (same) gestures to same-sex desire, but more importantly suggests a relationship of equals and relates their intimacy to their shared experience of Prora and their shared subordination within the NVA hierarchy.

They are eventually ejected from the bar for their physical intimacy: ‘We don’t need gays here’ (HHA, 286). When they then stumble and fall walking through the woods on the way back to barracks, they land on top of one another: ‘As I felt a hot flush from being so close to someone with whom I had long had an inward connection, I felt a gentle bite on my neck … Our lips met. Trusting my older friend, I gave way to this tenderness’ (ibid.). Unlike the heat of anger that rushed through Christian in Der Turm, Wolter’s flush is a physical manifestation of desire and closeness. He is initially reluctant when Thomas kisses him, before he gives way and experiences a physical and emotional release. The language of these passages is incongruous, using a less matter-of-fact tone than earlier reflections and relating their physical intimacy with great pathos. Wolter’s reflections thus reinstate experiences
of desire that were suppressed from his personal archive, while his flush and intense, incongruous prose gesture to physical and emotional qualities that remain unarticulated.

Schulze and Wolter each explore the different ways in which same-sex desire during military service in the NVA can be negotiated as part of ongoing constructions of identity and masculinity through writing. Instead of turning to archival sources to legitimize or support their accounts of military service, they reveal their inadequacies and omissions, which become particularly noticeable in sections describing same-sex desire. *Neue Leben* and *Hinterm Horizont allein* both use archival narration to create a dynamic of suppression, revelation and interpretation that foregrounds the difficulties in reconciling desire and intimacy between soldiers with accounts of military service. As I will go on to discuss, the strategies and motives for focusing on same-sex desire in these texts are contrasting, if not directly contradictory. However, both signal the need for representations of military service to account for the presence of such desire, and to engage with the reasons for and nature of its suppression from archival sources and personal accounts.

**Queer Archives and the NVA’s Closet**

Initially, the association between archive sources and omissions in Wolter’s narrative recalls Jacques Derrida’s prominent discussion of suppression in the functioning of archives. Derrida describes archival structures in psychoanalytic terms as an interplay between disorderly and contradictory drives: an archive drive to recover and preserve and a destruction drive, associated with the loss that occurs when something is articulated. These drives produce a mania that he calls ‘archive fever’ or ‘mal d’archive’. Material that is not preserved, he argues, is not simply repressed, which would amount to archivization in the unconscious, but suppressed, a more conscious and destructive silencing.\(^27\) Derrida’s essay does not differentiate particularly between different forms of archive, and although his model offers a productive way into a more personal archive like Wolter’s or a fictional case like Enrico’s, an application of Derrida’s analysis requires some qualification. As the archive of an individual, Wolter’s can plausibly be understood in terms of individual drives and compulsions, and it is equally possible to extend psychoanalytic interpretations to the archival relationship between Schulze’s editor and Enrico. Yet the suppression of experiences of desire and intimacy in sources across both texts cannot be solely accounted for in terms of the archive’s structural dynamics, even where these relate to the psychology of an individual. The wider context must be considered, as the expression of same-sex desire in the
NVA and after reunification is circumscribed in specific ways that influence the appearance of desire and intimacy in the two narratives.

There are a number of potential reasons for Wolter’s suppression of same-sex intimacy in his letters during military service. Conscripts could never be sure whether their post was being read by officers, which in fact seems to have been unusual, or the Stasi, which was very common. Wolter may have worried about repercussions if his commanders discovered his relationship with Thomas by reading his letters. Yet elsewhere the letters describe his working conditions at length, despite the prohibition on describing military installations, so the omissions of his same-sex desire from letters cannot be explained by fear of punishment alone. More probably, same-sex desire is suppressed because of wider prohibitions on homosexuality in GDR society, which are exacerbated by the fact that Wolter’s family was religious and did not accept homosexuality: ‘In Eisenach, in my religious circles, there was no place for that’ (HHA, 42). In this context, Wolter’s letters may well have suppressed same-sex desire even if he had not been a Bausoldat at the time.

Yet the highly normative context of the NVA appears to intensify Wolter’s fear of leaving traces of same-sex desire. The military was seemingly more concerned than wider society to prosecute homosexuality, with its leaders vigorously opposing the GDR’s liberalization of antihomosexuality laws when prosecutions were effectively stopped in the 1950s and homosexuality was finally legalized in 1968. Even after decriminalization, homosexuals were considered unsuitable for military careers and were routinely dismissed. Yet institutional archives reveal that same-sex desire was by no means ignored; homosexual acts, at least, were discussed extensively in official investigations into soldiers suspected of homosexuality. After a 1988 reform established legal parity between homosexuality and heterosexuality, the military even issued secret guidelines on surreptitiously circumnavigating the law to continue dismissing homosexuals from full-time military careers. Wolter’s reflections repeatedly place his relationship with Thomas in the context of the NVA’s rejection of homosexuality. Even though he and Thomas find space to express their desire, this is always in hidden, unobserved places: ‘Whenever we were alone, one of us would take the other into a dark corner, where we would embrace, unnoticed by the others’ (HHA, 288). Wolter thus foregrounds the difficulties in expressing same-sex desire in the construction unit and relates them to his struggle to integrate his relationship with Thomas into his account of his service and his later identity.

The NVA’s prohibitions on same-sex desire appear less central to Neue Leben, perhaps due to the novel’s fictional nature: Schulze playfully combines realistic and fantastical elements, as in Enrico’s relationship with Nikolai, without the concern for historical accuracy that shapes Wolter’s memoir.
However, the fact that Enrico’s letters are written in the first half of 1990 is significant. By early 1990, queer East Germans not only had legal parity with heterosexuals, they could also travel freely and experience the Western gay and lesbian scene. One might therefore expect Enrico’s stories, supposedly begun during or shortly after military service, to conceal and suppress same-sex desire, and for his letters to reveal these omissions retrospectively. Yet the dynamics of suppression in *Neue Leben* are precisely the opposite of those in *Hinterm Horizont allein*. Wolter’s letters are written at the time of his service and his post-reunification treatment of his military service reveals and compensates for the desires suppressed in his letters. Although Enrico’s letters also suppress same-sex desires, they are written after reunification as a revision of his more candid, albeit fictionalized, representations of desire in his stories. This difference highlights the generic differences between the short story, the letter and the memoir. Like Wolter’s letters, Enrico’s present a partial and edited view of himself that depends on the recipient and the intended effect. However, unlike Wolter’s reflections, which attempt to present a truer version of his construction service, the layers of fictionalization in Enrico’s stories mean that they offer only an oblique view of his desires, even when parallels to his own experiences are obvious.

Whereas Wolter explores his desires in the openness of post-reunification Germany, Schulze sets Enrico’s suppression of his desires in the context of his reinvention of himself as a businessman. His life in 1990 is dominated by environments associated with hegemonic capitalist masculinities. He takes his sister to Monte Carlo on Barrista’s insistence, for example, where she is given a menu without prices in it, presenting the ostentatious display of wealth and generosity towards women as masculine traits (*NL*, 381). Even Enrico’s love for Nicoletta is part of these negotiations of capitalist masculinities, given that she is a successful Westerner whom Enrico is keen to impress. Enrico thus uses his letters to reconcile his life in the GDR with his capitalist aspirations in the early stages of reunification, and his same-sex desire seems as difficult to reconcile with ideal masculinities in Western capitalism as it was with the NVA’s military masculine ideal.

The suppression of same-sex desire in *Neue Leben* and *Hinterm Horizont allein* must therefore be interpreted in the context of wider prohibitions in the GDR, which act alongside and through the archival dynamics of suppression described by Derrida. In the two narratives, prohibitions on the expression of same-sex desire appear to be internalized and the desire closeted. In *Epistemology of the Closet*, however, Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick emphasizes the interplay between this internalized need to suppress queer desires and the spaces and freedoms that the closet can create. The queer subject engages in recurring, performative acts of concealment or coming out, and others also participate in this play of knowledge and ignorance by exposing or refusing.
to acknowledge queer desires. The workings of knowledge and power in Sedgwick’s concept coalesce around the figure of the ‘glass closet’:

The glass closet can license insult (‘I’d never have said those things if I’d known you were gay!’ – yeah, sure); it can also license far warmer relations, but (and) relations whose potential for exploitive is built into the optics of the asymmetrical, the specularized, and the inexplicit.

Sedgwick’s metaphor emphasizes the power imbalances implied by the open secret of same-sex desire, as the walls of the closet can be more or less transparent. By describing relations centred on ‘the inexplicit’, she relates these power imbalances to uncertainties around evidence of queer desires: these uncertainties generate space for same-sex intimacies by protecting them from prohibitions, but they also present difficulties for the documentation and articulation of same-sex desires in narratives such as Schulze’s and Wolter’s.

The closet governing same-sex desire in the NVA and wider GDR society is thus an important structuring factor in Schulze’s and Wolter’s archival narratives. The uniquely fraught place of same-sex desire within archival structures has been explored by the queer theorist José Esteban Muñoz, whose work helps illuminate the particular combination of closet and archival dynamics in Neue Leben and Hinterm Horizont allein. According to Muñoz,

leaving too much of a trace has often meant that the queer subject has left herself open for attack. Instead of being clearly available as visible evidence, queerness has instead existed as innuendo, gossip, fleeting moments, and performances that are meant to be interacted with by those within its epistemological sphere.

For him, the expression and archivization of queerness are shaped by danger: rather than simply suppressing or effacing queer desire, as Derrida’s model might suggest, archivization enables evidence to be mobilized against the queer subject. This danger shows how archives and their structures of revelation and concealment are complicit in, and yet also shaped by, the exploitation of knowledge and ignorance that defines the power of the closet.

Neue Leben could therefore be seen as a representation of the danger of ‘attack’. Enrico’s repeated fictionalization and suppression of his same-sex desire is an attempt to sustain a closet around his desires, which transfers the closet’s dynamic of concealment and revelation to the writings he leaves when he disappears. The editor exploits the glass walls of this closet by scouring the sources for evidence of Enrico’s indiscretions, especially highlighting his attempts to suppress his same-sex desire. More urgently than in Enrico’s fictional case, Wolter’s suppression of same-sex desire in his letters is one response to the danger that any textual trace of his relationship with
Thomas might be used to punish him and to define his sexual identity against his wishes. However, Wolter’s archival narrative in fact suggests ways of acknowledging this suppression while negotiating a post-reunification masculinity that allows space for queer experiences as well as memories of military service. The dynamics of both texts are set in motion by the closeting of same-sex desire during military service, but the negotiations of masculinity and desire appear to be sustained by the lasting effects of closet dynamics once transferred to archival traces of military service.


Chronologically, Enrico’s first narrative negotiations of his masculinity take the form of short stories, which the editor appends to the letters and which epitomize the dynamic of suppression and revelation that characterizes both the archive and the closet. The stories contain the clearest evidence of Enrico’s same-sex desire and are the height of Schulze’s structural play. Five of the seven stories deal with military themes: ‘Schnitteljagd’ (‘Schnitzel Hunt’) describes a military-style manoeuvre in a GDR youth organization, ‘Titus Holm’ describes a schoolboy’s failure to resist conscription and ‘Jahrhundertsommer’ (‘Summer Heatwave’), ‘Der Spitzel’ (‘The Snitch’) and ‘Letzte Übung’ (‘Last Exercise’) describe military service directly. Within the stories, Enrico is fragmented into numerous alter egos, so that the close relationship between Enrico’s fictional protagonists and his own biography mimics his fictionalized biographical links with Schulze. The stories also contribute to Schulze’s play with aspects of his own biography: ‘Titus Holm’ began as a draft novella dealing with Schulze’s schooldays (*NL*, 699–782). Schulze thus foregrounds his fictionalization of his biography and draws attention to the potential consequences of Enrico’s own efforts to convert his experiences into fiction. The stories demonstrate Enrico’s attempts to fragment his identity and to absolve himself of certain traits and desires by projecting them onto his characters. In addition to practising writing to develop ‘his own unmistakable voice’ (*NL*, 423), Enrico uses fiction at once to explore and suppress desires that arose during military service. ‘Jahrhundertsommer’ and ‘Der Spitzel’ offer the most productive examples of Enrico’s fictional negotiations of same-sex desire, which are echoed in the events described in the letters.

‘Jahrhundertsommer’ suggests that underlying the homosocial relationship between two conscripts is latent desire, which expresses itself in the projection of effeminacy onto a third conscript and ends with an orgiastic simulation of sex (*NL*, 667–72). The two conscripts, Vischer and Salwitzky, are alone in the dormitory and Vischer is writing at the window. The two accuse each other of desiring a younger conscript, referred to only as ‘Rosi’ and ‘d[ie] Tunte’, a
usually insulting word similar to ‘queen’ or ‘sissy’ in connotation (NL, 670). The young conscript apparently gave massages to the men, who now argue over who enjoyed them more. Salwitzky accuses Vischer: ‘I saw how you were lying here and couldn’t control yourself anymore’ (ibid.). Salwitzky also accuses Vischer of ‘moaning all over the place’ and of masturbating afterwards. Vischer counters that Salwitzky was even more ‘excited to be massaged by Rosi’ (ibid.). Despite their insulting language, the figure of Rosi suggests that physical intimacy and the young conscript’s perceived queerness are accepted by the two other characters. Rosi’s feminine name and their loud and vehement protestations may even allow this intimacy to be enjoyed tacitly.

In a queering of Sedgwick’s analysis of relationship triangles to demonstrate the homosocial desire that operates between men, Schulze has Enrico depict Vischer and Salwitzky using their argument over Rosi to assert their own adherence to military ideals and their dominance over one another. Their dialogue implies that loss of self-control is more damaging to the men’s abilities to conform to an ideal military masculinity than physical intimacy with Rosi. However, sexual desire is entirely rejected: accusations of groaning, masturbating and arousal are used to accuse the other of not living up to standards of homosocial masculinity. Yet Sedgwick suggests that homosocial desire between men is intimately bound up with their assertions of power over one another and, collectively, over women. By transferring femininity onto the absent Rosi, Vischer and Salwitzky sublimate their latent desire for each other into an argument over who desired Rosi most. The text only hints that they watched each other being massaged, but this implication adds to the suggestion of eroticism between the two conscripts.

The end of ‘Jahrhundertsommer’ appears to confirm and externalize this latent desire. Salwitzky rocks his bunk and pushes against the top mattress with his feet, repeatedly shouting ‘Rosi, you bitch [Sau]!’ as the bed rocks, squeaks and ultimately collapses (NL, 671). The scene transforms the implications of the men’s arguments – that they desire Rosi or each other sexually – into a loud, destructive mock sex scene. Rosi’s presence in the story demonstrates the failure of the insults and accusations in ‘Jahrhundertsommer’ to truly establish the soldiers’ adherence to the military’s strongly heterosexual masculine ideals. Nor does transferring queerness onto Rosi allow the two to closet their desire for one another, which is revealed in Salwitzky’s exaggerated sexual pantomime.

‘Der Spitzel’ is another example of displaced same-sex desire and sexual pleasure, this time with narrative perspective playing a greater role in suggesting eroticism (NL, 673–81). The third-person narrative is focalized through the perspective of Edgar, a conscript cleaning the floor of the barracks corridor on Christmas Eve. In one dormitory, a crowd of men are watching the punishment of a suspected informant, referred to only as ‘snitch’ or ‘Spitzel’,
a word for a Stasi informant. Edgar describes how the conscript’s writing and note-taking drew the attention of an older conscript, Mehnert, who planned the attack apparently out of a mixture of suspicion and anti-intellectualism: ‘you know so many words, intellectual words, lovely little snitch words’ (NL, 674). Edgar overhears Mehnert and the assembled crowd interrogating the conscript, insulting him by highlighting his weakness – ‘he’s just going to start blubbing’ (NL, 675) – and suggesting homosexuality: ‘He only gets letters, Mehnert said, from his mother and from a guy’ (NL, 679). Intellectualism, emotional weakness and a lack of a girlfriend are all ways in which the alleged ‘snitch’ has failed to live up to military ideals, and this deviation from ideal masculinity seems to motivate the punishment more than his note-taking.

The physical and sexual abuse of the ‘snitch’ is described through Edgar’s perspective, which is limited due to the men’s jeering and his viewpoint from the corridor where he is still polishing the floorboards. First, he hears the young conscript being forced to eat his notes. After this point, Edgar no longer hears what is going on, but as he polishes with an ever-quicker rhythm, he imagines the sexual abuse according to the graphic details of Mehnert’s original plan. He imagines the ‘snitch’ being stripped and tied to a bed while his buttocks are coated with shoe polish and buffed with shoe brushes. Finally, ‘Mehnert was going to “milk the snitch”’ by stimulating his penis with the brushes (NL, 680). Plowman has linked Edgar’s ‘masturbatory frenzy’ here to the ‘pleasure of furtive observation’.41 Edgar’s pleasure gradually ceases to be the pleasure of the voyeur and becomes that of the sadomasochistic fantasist as he increasingly cannot see or hear the beating. Edgar’s rhythmic buffing of the floor with his own brush suggests sadistic pleasure in imitating the humiliation of the ‘snitch’ and imagining himself as the aggressor. This sadistic fantasy alternates with suggestions of an eroticized admiration of Mehnert ‘in the role of his life’, a metaphor that draws on the motif of performance and theatricality discussed in Chapters 3 and 4 (NL, 679). Edgar even displays masochistic envy of and desire for the ‘snitch’: ‘The snitch came out of the room. The snitch did not seem angry or furious, not even sad. The snitch had not cried out, he had not even cried’ (NL, 681). Edgar stops spellbound and repeats ‘the snitch’, apparently in admiration of the man’s calm acquiescence to humiliation and the silent power of his abject position.

The dynamics of same-sex desire in these two stories are complex and based on rejection, disidentification and abjection. Enrico’s use of the fictional mode allows these desires to be expressed without them being clearly attributed to him. However, his short fiction is a site not only of expression of these desires but also of the repeated violent suppression of same-sex desire and queerness. The insults of ‘Jahrhundertsommer’ and the humiliation of ‘Der Spitzel’ perform the suppression associated with the closet, even as fiction opens up the spaces for queer desires that Sedgwick describes.
However, in early 1990, when Enrico abandons his identity as a dissident and a writer, the stories themselves are overwritten and rendered abject within the archive of Enrico’s writings. By writing on the reverse of the stories, Enrico conceals the desires they reveal within the archival traces of his life, while reinterpreting his military service in letters to Nicoletta on the other side. The stories are suppressed, and yet writing on the reverse ensures that they remain inseparable from Enrico’s epistolary reimagining of his life. His act of concealment preserves the stories as an alternative archive, recalling Derrida’s discussion of virtual archives, archives that might have been, which are created by the suppression of material within the archive.42

Enrico’s drive to write letters bears evidence of a ‘mal d’archive’, as he manically rewrites his GDR past, suppressing previous versions in the process. Enrico’s depression and writer’s block in early 1990 stem from the loss of his ambitions and purpose, parodying the ‘Furor melancholicus’ attributed to GDR intellectuals after their hopes for a reformed GDR socialism collapsed: ‘What was I, a writer, to do without the wall?’ (NL, 447).43 Enrico emerges from his depression with an epiphany, realizing ‘I did not have to write or read anything anymore’ (NL, 653), while converting his authorial energies into frantic letter writing. The tensions in Derrida’s concept of ‘mal d’archive’ are encapsulated in the irony that this decision not to write resulted in the eighty-one letters compiled by the editor. Just like Derrida’s archive drive, Enrico’s drive to write furthers the suppression of his past, despite creating more layers of documentation.

Enrico’s suppression of his past identity, by turning the stories over to produce a blank page on which to renegotiate his identity, is further ironized by a scene of exaggerated pathetic fallacy. In his first letter, in which he describes renouncing his literary ambitions, a snowfall covers the landscape with white, submerging and effacing the past and prompting a desire for renewal and reinvention.44 As Enrico writes, ‘we now had the white field in front and the grey-pink sky above us’ (NL, 13). The snow symbolism exemplifies the dynamic of suppression and documentation that defines Derrida’s ‘mal d’archive’, which this scene relates most clearly to Enrico’s negotiations of identity. The scene is described to Vera in the novel’s first letter and to Nicoletta in the final letter, completing a narrative circle. Whereas Enrico’s exaggerated pain when hit by a snowball makes him seem weak and pathetic in the letter to Vera, his letter to Nicoletta reinvents his tears as tears of joy, in line with his attempts to present a more hegemonic masculinity. Enrico’s compulsive renegotiation of his identity is thus framed through the twin metaphor of the snowfall and the blank page, and yet these letters preserve his past on the reverse of the paper.

Enrico’s descriptions of military service in letters to Nicoletta most clearly demonstrate that suppressing same-sex desire is central to his ongoing
negotiations of masculinity. Enrico’s descriptions of his abuse by Knut, the senior soldier in Enrico’s dormitory, clearly present revised versions of scenes in his stories. These letters suggest that Enrico’s stories were not just fictionalized experiments, but were also based on his experiences during military service. His desires are largely suppressed within the letters, leaving only occasional traces. Enrico describes a nocturnal scuffle with Knut that ‘shattered my idyll’, referring to the space he had created in bed at night for writing letters and studies for his stories (NL, 284). His letters bear occasional traces of desire for Knut, who is described with awe as ‘a remarkably small, but powerful man, weightlifter in one of the lighter classes’ (ibid.). Knut, who sleeps in the bed below him, returns drunk from leave and begins kicking Enrico’s mattress, eventually hurling him out of bed. Enrico seems to delight in subordinating himself to Knut, describing their scuffle as a role play of rank difference: ‘This time, too, Knut was playing the Major again’ (ibid.). Enrico even provokes Knut by insulting him, resulting in a fight. Enrico’s description shows him as defiant and fearless, qualities in line with the masculinity that his letters attempt to construct, but he also appears to take pleasure in fighting Knut. This episode recalls ‘Jahrhundertsommer’, except the clear sexual undertones of Salwitzky’s violent rocking of the bed are gone in Enrico’s letters, which suppress the potentially homoerotic nature of the events.

Enrico next describes Knut appearing on Christmas Eve with a group of conscripts, accusing Enrico of being an informant. Knut has seized Enrico’s notes on a conversation between two soldiers, which Enrico describes to Nicoletta as research for his writing: ‘dialogues, as I say, were my weakness’ (ibid.). Enrico’s comrades shout ‘snitch’ as Knut reads out Enrico’s notes and makes gay jibes: ‘What kind of friend was I writing to’ (NL, 288). Enrico indicates that he is beaten, thrown to the floor and someone shouts: ‘In his nuts!’ (ibid.). Yet he stops short of depicting the violence. Despite having promised to Nicoletta ‘to describe something for you that I have always kept secret until now’, Enrico breaks off his narrative: ‘I will spare you what happened next. You and me’ (NL, 286 and 288). Enrico’s beating is explicitly suppressed, but the episode clearly recalls ‘Der Spitzel’, which suggests once again that Enrico’s stories may be fictionalized or fantasized interpretations of his experiences. The letter retains hints, such as the shout for Enrico to be kicked in the testicles, that Enrico’s beating involved sexual abuse and humiliation like that described in ‘Der Spitzel’. Enrico also gestures to an abject pleasure in the beating that mirrors the calmness of the ‘snitch’ in the story: ‘with my sensitivity to pain, the anger came back too and a euphoric feeling of freedom’ (NL, 288). The letter is elliptical, concealing the beating and any abject desire, yet enough evidence remains to suggest the suppression of both.
Enrico’s letters thus closet his desire more completely than his stories, but still create space for revealing eroticism and desire. The relegation of clearer explorations of same-sex desire to the reverse of the paper visualizes Enrico’s attempts to overwrite more transgressive desires. His letters represent an attempt to narrate such episodes in a way that renders them compatible with the hegemonic capitalist masculinity that he attempts to construct in 1990. The archive that the editor compiles and edits does not provide any coherent image of what happened to Enrico. However, the interplay between two parallel versions foregrounds the differences between the accounts and therefore also Enrico’s repeated creation of different versions of himself in an attempt to negotiate his desires and various masculine ideals. Enrico presents same-sex desire, homoeroticism and even sadomasochism as central features of the military environment, even as his accounts suppress these desires through fictionalization and omission. His archive sources thus take on closet dynamics of concealment, potentially creating space for transgressive desires, but also attempting to protect them from scrutiny.

The open secret of Enrico’s desire and his inability to control the metaphorical transparency of the closet walls is clear in the editor’s scrutiny of Enrico’s sources. The editor refuses Enrico’s division of the stories and the letters by appending them after the letters and imposing linearity, although including them in an appendix also separates Enrico’s two attempts to narrate his life more completely than in their original form. The fictional material suppressed by Enrico is recontextualized as a subsidiary part of the editor’s archive of Enrico’s life, foregrounding the differences and interaction between layers of the archival narrative. Appending the short stories also emphasizes military service, which is only the subject of a handful of letters, but the overriding theme of the stories. However, the editor’s approach to same-sex desire goes beyond simply revealing the dialogue between archival layers. He exploits the metaphorical glass walls of the closet Enrico constructs around his desire, drawing attention to same-sex desire in the sources in order to attack Enrico in the way Muñoz describes.

The power dynamic between the editor and Enrico reveals a further ‘mal d’archive’ that structures the text and even points to desire between the editor and Enrico. The editor describes his frantic research in the foreword, apparently motivated by Enrico’s disappearance. Schulze’s conceit suggests a different sort of ‘mal d’archive’, in which the disappearance requires the archivist to take over continued reinterpretations of the author’s life and work. The editor continually negotiates his own identity in relation to Enrico’s, so that the finished novel ultimately represents a comment on the editor’s identity more than a final word on Enrico’s. Their personal relationship is one source of the editor’s claim to authority: he introduces himself as a former schoolmate of ‘the unremarkable Enrico, with whom I had once played football and sung
in a choir’ (NL, 7). However, the text suggests more than a neutral acquaintance. The editor’s references to his own minor place in the story make him seem fascinated by Enrico. For example, when Enrico describes receiving army stories to read from one of Vera’s admirers, the editor comments: ‘I would have liked to learn T.’s verdict on my texts, which he does not mention again in the following’ (NL, 315). He thus reveals himself as an admirer not only of Vera, but also of Enrico. The relationship between Enrico and the editor might even be compared to Vischer and Salwitzky’s relationship in ‘Jahrhundertsommer’, with their antagonism and their mutual love for Vera externalizing their homosocial desire. The narrative is thus structured both by the drives that shape Derrida’s conception of the archive and by attempts by the editor to suppress his own admiration of Enrico by attacking him and exposing his same-sex desire.

In Neue Leben, Schulze depicts Enrico and the editor negotiating identities after reunification, in which experiences of military service play an important role. As in Scholz’s interviews with East German men, conscription appears to be a source of biographical instability to be reconciled with post-reunification masculinities. Enrico’s same-sex desire appears to be the aspect of his military service that fits most uneasily with the military’s ideals of masculinity. Yet, as with his intellectualism and artistic ambitions, he appears to have found space to express these desires in his partnership with Nikolai, his masochistic fantasies about Knut, and his writing. Enrico’s desires are suppressed through fictionalization during and shortly after military service, but this suppression is redoubled in 1990 as Enrico reassesses his identity in the capitalist present. Focusing on Enrico’s erotic fantasies and intimate relationships also reveals that desire structures and motivates the editor’s work assembling and interpreting Enrico’s archive. The novel shows how prohibitions and closet dynamics that govern expressions of same-sex desire are transferred to archival sources through layers of suppression. At the same time, in line with Sedgwick’s discussion of the closet, Schulze’s novel explores ways in which this suppression can make space for more limited expressions of desire in the text and in negotiations of masculinity.


In Neue Leben, the editor’s approach to same-sex desire is generally censorious, and perpetuates and augments the closet surrounding Enrico’s desire by attacking him. This strategy recalls Muñoz’s description of the dangers of archival evidence for queer subjects, and yet Muñoz also suggests ways in which archives or, by extension, archival narratives might make space for
queer experience. He sets out a concept of ‘queer evidence: an evidence that has been queered in relation to the laws of what counts as proof’.46 As a fictional text, *Neue Leben* is less bound by ideas of ‘proof’, but nonetheless plays with this relationship between evidence and proof, disrupting any association between written sources and proof of same-sex desire. Muñoz suggests that queer evidence might entail a combination of conventional archival documents and ephemeral forms of evidence. In *Cruising Utopia* (2009), he analyses gesture and dance, and his earlier emphasis on ‘innuendo, gossip, fleeting moments, and performances that are meant to be interacted with’ points to further forms that ephemera might take.47 The memories that are so central to *Hinterm Horizont allein*, for example, might also be considered ephemeral evidence. Interaction is also central to Muñoz’s concept of the archive, and the interaction between sources that revealed the suppression of same-sex desire in the fictional example of *Neue Leben* could draw critical attention to the influence of closet structures on evidence and archivization in an autobiographical archival narrative like *Hinterm Horizont allein*. Wolter’s memoir combines conventional archive sources with reflections on his memories, and suggests queer approaches to evidence, the past and the military’s masculine ideals.

One decidedly queer approach to military masculinity in Wolter’s memoir is his reclaiming of his nickname. Comrades called him ‘Prince’ to mock his supposedly affected behaviour and the preferential treatment he received, because of a medical assessment that exempted him from drill and ensured he was allocated less manual labour. His comrades even feminized the nickname as ‘Princess and the Pea’ or ‘Princess Stefanie’, a reference to the recent single by Princess Stéphanie of Monaco (*HHA*, 114, 157 and 207–8). This use of feminine nicknames also recalls the character Rosi in Enrico’s story ‘Jahrhundertsommer’. Although the quotation marks in the subtitle, *Der ‘Prinz’ von Prora*, might recall Wolter’s comrades’ mocking, they also signal an ironic performance of the nickname’s positive connotations and an assertive refusal of the feminized form ‘Princess’. Wolter’s reflections recast the name in a positive light, notably when, curled up with Thomas, he feels like ‘a little prince’ (*HHA*, 199). Wolter thus suggests mastery over his experiences through his confident self-fashioning as ‘Prince of Prora’.

Wolter also depicts and reclaims certain affectations that elicited his comrades’ mocking by including photographs in which his poses exude confidence and care for his appearance. In the cover image, he displays a confident individuality, with a sideways glance towards the camera and the collar popped up on his coat (see Figures 6.1 and 6.2). This creative touch to the NVA uniform was an attempt to personalize it, which comrades appear to have mocked as an affectation. For the cover of the book (Figure 6.2), the background is cropped out of the original image and the frame is tightened.
to create a medium shot that focuses more directly on Wolter’s face and upper body. By removing his image from its original context and superimposing it onto the blue background, the book’s photographic editing techniques model the collage techniques of the book itself, which re-create and recontextualize Wolter’s experiences of military service. A shadow effect draws attention to these editing techniques, framing Wolter’s body and making it stand out from the background colours. A similar image of Wolter with three other soldiers on the beach further emphasizes his self-awareness: he is the only one who appears to be posing for the camera (see Figure 6.3). Rather than looking at the swan, he turns his profile looking out to sea, again with his signature raised collar. The shot’s canted angle draws attention to Wolter’s figure: the diagonal lines of the horizon, the shoreline and the men’s caps intersect at Wolter’s head, placing him at the centre of the composition. Photographs of him posing playfully like this display his maintenance of

Figure 6.1 With his raised collar, Wolter looks confidently into the camera on the beach on Rügen. From the author’s collection. © Stefan Stadtherr Wolter. Used with permission.
individuality and self-expression, turning previously ridiculed behaviour into performative and potentially subversive resistance to the NVA’s attempts at imposing ideal masculinities on its conscripts.

In line with the confident reclaiming of the ‘Prince’ nickname, Wolter’s memoir presents at first glance a coherent development that leads from

Figure 6.2 Reframed and refocused, Wolter’s cover image draws attention to his collage techniques in Hinterm Horizont allein (2005). © Stefan Stadtherr Wolter. Used with permission.

Figure 6.3 The canted angle and the shoreline place Wolter’s profile at the centre of this image from Hinterm Horizont allein (2005). © Stefan Stadtherr Wolter. Used with permission.
his initial naivety to his acceptance of his desires. This narrative appears to be initiated by military service and continues in the more open post-reunification environment. Wolter's prologue mentions Thomas four times without explaining their relationship, which suggests that the whole narrative emanates from these spontaneous recollections. Wolter's relationship with his best friend, Andreas, which in his sister's view made 'a gay impression' (HHA, 42), is then used to suggest a predisposition to intimate male-male friendship, as Wolter himself later comments. On entering the NVA, he believes that same-sex desire has 'no justification for existence' (HHA, 120), but exposure to gay and bisexual Bausoldaten challenges his views. His kiss with Thomas is a turning point, demonstrating Wolter's acceptance of his same-sex desire. Wolter's development could be viewed as a coming-out narrative, culminating in the publication of Hinterm Horizont allein. However, this interpretation oversimplifies Wolter's engagement with same-sex desire in the memoir. Hinterm Horizont allein is not a simple revision of the archive to accommodate same-sex desire; rather, his reflections perform and show the continuing impact of closet dynamics.

For example, Wolter's depiction of other conscripts varies across narrative layers. His ambivalent depiction of an openly gay comrade, Jan, is one such case. Wolter's letters describe Jan in homophobic tones that reinforce prohibitions on same-sex desire: 'Our little gay is sleeping in a corner. Michael and I avoid him as much as possible' (HHA, 129). Wolter's reflections complicate this picture, explaining how Jan pursued him, but also confessing to having played with Jan's desire: 'He played with me and I with him' (HHA, 120). Wolter even envies Jan for one consequence of the NVA's prohibitions on same-sex desire: 'Because Jan was openly gay, he was … one of the few who were excused from showers … That seemed enviable' (ibid.). Jan's case demonstrates that closet dynamics in Wolter's unit both suppressed and provided space for queer desires, in line with Sedgwick's definition.

Jan's openness provokes both censure and playful homoeroticism from Wolter and, surprisingly even in the late 1980s, the NVA does not dismiss Jan, but tacitly tolerates his desires in all contexts other than the communal showers. Wolter does not discuss whether toleration of Jan simply reflects the fact that dismissal or demotion was impossible because Bausoldaten were already the lowest rung of NVA hierarchies, although Bernd Eisenfeld and Peter Schicketanz have described the NVA's tendency to punish Bausoldaten by moving them large distances to different bases. Construction units also differed from regular NVA units because they were comprised of political or religious dissidents, and the limited toleration of Jan may suggest that they also included more gay or bisexual men in the late 1980s. Yet Wolter's intolerance of Jan in his letters demonstrates that the atmosphere in these
units was still not tolerant of same-sex desire. By supplementing his earlier insults with more empathetic reflections, Wolter perhaps atones for imposing a closet on Jan in his letters. He presents Jan, a conscript who explicitly identifies as gay, while maintaining greater ambiguity around his own identity and resisting categorizing himself or Thomas. This contrast demonstrates the relational quality of closet dynamics, whereby space for indeterminacy is created for Wolter’s sexual identity and relationship by comparison with Jan’s more clearly defined identity.

The interplay between closet and archival dynamics in the narrative results in layers of suppression that structure the narrative. The letters that Wolter includes hardly acknowledge his relationship with Thomas, and yet he occasionally quotes from other letters, particularly to Andreas. The quotations demonstrate that the narrative deliberately excludes other letters that Wolter has preserved. His letters to Andreas discuss the sexualities of other Bausoldaten with greater candour. As Wolter remarks in his reflections, this was ‘a subject, I gradually realized, which I would not be able to cheat my way past for long’ (HHA, 95). Wolter also includes facsimiles of a single page from his letters after each month’s chapter. The facsimiles show only minor differences from the transcribed versions collated in each chapter, demonstrating a process of editing and alteration that nonetheless preserves the meaning of the letters, at least in the examples Wolter includes. The inclusion of facsimiles shows that the transcription of letters produced a rewritten version, which nonetheless appears faithful to the original. This process of revision is intensified in Wolter’s reflections, which stand alongside the letters but also elucidate them and influence their interpretation. The potential readings and meanings suggested in the letters themselves are thus superseded by a more authoritative interpretation of events, similar to Enrico’s rewriting of his past in letters to Nicoletta. The archival dynamics of the narrative are thus not limited to collection and preservation. Rather, the text demonstrates a careful process of selection and rejection of material that resembles the work of an archivist, as well as repeated attempts to rewrite and influence the meanings of sources, which marks Wolter’s text out as an archival narrative.

The memoir’s complex structure, with its layers of selection and rewriting, is intensified in a second volume documenting its reception, entitled Der ‘Prinz von Prora’ im Spiegel der Kritik (The ‘Prince of Prora’ Reflected in Criticism, 2007). This later text is structured similarly to Hinterm Horizont allein, but makes more explicit the impact of closet dynamics and Wolter’s anxiety regarding same-sex desire on his repeated suppression and rewriting of experiences. As with Enrico’s and the editor’s writing in Neue Leben, Wolter’s anxiety might be conceptualized with Derrida as a ‘mal d’archive’. In a later volume, Wolter writes that losing influence over interpretations of his text after publication gave him panic attacks: ‘The book … had contributed
to finding peace with Prora. But finding peace with the book itself was a more difficult matter.\textsuperscript{50} The loss of control over his text appears to have prompted a drive to write about his story further to engage with and shape its reception. Same-sex desire is the primary object of Wolter’s anxiety: ‘My greatest worry was that the story with Thomas could distract from the political force of the book and it could become too personal.’\textsuperscript{51} Wolter even describes giving an interview after the publication of \textit{Hinterm Horizont allein} in which he denied any relationship beyond ‘intellectual and spiritual intimacy’.\textsuperscript{52} However, in remembering this interview, Wolter reasserts the importance of his physical intimacy with Thomas: ‘In fact, it was precisely the physical intimacy that helped with so much.’\textsuperscript{53} His later engagement with his memoir thus reveals multiple, recurring acts of coming out, repeatedly explaining and contextualizing the place of same-sex desire within his military service and his masculine identity. His desire for and intimacy with Thomas is by turns affirmed and downplayed, and Wolter continues to explore ways of representing this desire and negotiating a place for it in his present identity.

The autobiographical nature of \textit{Hinterm Horizont allein} allows historical conclusions that were not possible from Schulze’s fictional archival narrative. Wolter reveals that in some cases, conscripts and commanding officers were aware of desire and intimacy between soldiers. In Wolter’s case, a same-sex relationship was even integral to making military service more bearable. This single portrayal cannot be representative, particularly since \textit{Bausoldaten} were already outsiders in GDR society and may have included more queer conscripts than were present in ordinary units. Nevertheless, in this specific case, Wolter’s letters allow for limited openness and agency in asserting and exploring same-sex desire within the NVA’s broadly homophobic environment. By constructing his narrative out of layers of letters and later reflections, Wolter performs on a narrative level the dynamics of concealment and revelation over time that are so central to Sedgwick’s concept of the closet. The text therefore highlights the closet dynamics that governed same-sex desire within the NVA.

Schulze’s fictional play with evidence and with the representation and suppression of same-sex desire has drawn attention to the interplay between the archive and closet as structural forces, and Wolter’s text allows their relationship to be described in more detail. The dynamic of suppression and revelation, shared by the archive and the closet, was central to Schulze’s narrative. In Wolter’s text too, different versions of his identity emerge from the narrative’s layers, with letters, photographs and reflections suppressing and revealing same-sex desire in different ways. It is unsurprising that prohibitions on same-sex desire should have affected Wolter’s documentation of his relationship with Thomas, not to mention the impact of the material conditions of military service, in which writing had to be furtive and photography
was not permitted. However, the extent to which gaps in his archive map onto the closeting of same-sex desire is significant. The text reveals a complex dialectical relationship between archive and closet. In a society such as the GDR where same-sex desire is governed by the closet, the production of evidence of this desire is affected. This influence of closet dynamics can take several forms: official documents from the GDR are often silent about same-sex desire or else are concerned with proof and punishment. In Wolter’s case, the closet imposed by GDR politics and society results in more personal difficulties articulating queer desires. Even after reunification, his memories of military service show the impossibility of escaping the effects of the closet. Just like the frenzied writing and collecting that Schulze depicts in *Neue Leben*, the ‘mal d’archive’ that structures *Hinterm Horizont allein* seems driven by negotiations of closet dynamics. Even highly personal archival narratives such as this can therefore function not to preserve or exhibit desire, but to perpetuate its concealment and suppression. In short, the archive begins to function as a closet.

The relationship between archival and closet dynamics in Wolter’s text suggests possibilities for a queer archive that more adequately represents same-sex desire. By foregrounding not just his relationship with Thomas but also his difficulties writing about it, Wolter’s memoir highlights how same-sex desire is suppressed as well as represented in different sources. The text uses similar methods to those described by Muñoz, combining ephemeral sources – Wolter’s memories – with more conventional documentary traces of his military service. As in *Neue Leben*, the dialogue between these layers of evidence hints at Wolter’s desire. However, Wolter’s approach to archival evidence is diametrically opposed to the role played by evidence in *Neue Leben*. Where Schulze’s editor draws attention to same-sex desire in order to attack Enrico, the autobiographical mode of Wolter’s text leads to a nuanced and empathetic explanation and contextualization of his intimacy with Thomas and a candid attempt to reconcile it with his post-reunification identity.

By adding his memories to documentary sources, Wolter suggests how a queer personal archive might take shape out of layers of ephemeral and conventional material, with memories captured in order to contrast them with documents, letters, photographs and other sources. The authenticity or superiority of documentary evidence is refuted by Wolter’s text, as in Schulze’s, but Wolter goes further in blurring boundaries between memory and other forms of evidence. His memories are triggered by rereading his letters, but these memories also exceed the letters and reveal suppressed aspects. Wolter’s approach does not seek to overcome the effects of closeting on his desires. Instead, he critically demonstrates the different ways in which closet dynamics motivate the suppression of same-sex desire, denying that...
any of his epistolary or narrative negotiations of identity is more coherent or correct than any other.

**Conclusion**

Compared with the literature and films I have analysed in previous chapters, Schulze and Wolter deal most explicitly with the importance of narrative and evidence for the ongoing negotiations of identity in post-reunification writing about GDR institutions. The repeated, evolving textual constructions of identity that contribute to self and gender identity are portrayed with considerable scepticism in *Neue Leben*, in an ironic comment on the proliferation of autobiographies creating ‘new lives’ for their authors after the GDR. *Hinterm Horizont allein* appears equally conscious of the conventions for negotiating identity in post-GDR life-writing, which invariably draws on earlier writing and on evidence that is usually effaced in conventional memoirs. GDR institutions retain an important place in these narratives, particularly military service, which seems to be unusually difficult to interpret and to reconcile with later masculinities.

Same-sex desire is not simply a thematic or representational concern in these texts; rather, the suppression and revelation of desire structures these archival narratives. In Schulze’s novel, the threat that same-sex desire will resurface seems to motivate compulsive rewriting by Enrico and his editor. By contrast, in Wolter’s autobiographical case, the threat that closeting will have erased all documentary traces of same-sex desire results in a ‘mal d’archive’; collecting and attempting to interpret sources remains an ongoing concern even after the publication of *Hinterm Horizont allein*. Same-sex desire was not condoned by the military, and expressions of queerness of any sort were closeted in the NVA. However, as Sedgwick suggests, this closeting need not have prohibited limited expressions of desire or intimacy between men and nor did it prohibit the malicious exploitation of evidence of such desire. Despite the military’s rejection of homosexuality in official publications and in secret communications within the military, its inclusion in Schulze’s and in Wolter’s texts is not simply an attempt to subvert or disrupt the military’s ideals of masculinity. Both authors show desire as part of the relationships between men during military service, even when these are not sexual, intimate or even friendly, as in the homosocial dynamics depicted by Schulze. Indeed, Wolter’s text suggests an historical conclusion: that certain NVA officers, at least in the construction units, may even have explicitly tolerated homosexuality. Nonetheless, same-sex desire poses a challenge to the ideal in both works, given the punishments meted out on Enrico and his characters and given the prohibitions on Jan showering with his comrades. Particularly
in Wolter’s text, his relationship seems to have created spaces within the military institution for intimacy and emotional openness that he directly contrasts with the military’s attempts at control.

The relationship between Schulze’s fictional and Wolter’s autobiographical narratives provides productive insights into the role of evidence in establishing authenticity. There are clear differences in the genres being negotiated by Schulze and Wolter, with the latter drawing on real documents and the former creating fictionalized documents and playing with ideas of fiction and authenticity. Yet the similarities and points of contact between the two texts suggest that Neue Leben and Hinterm Horizont allein can shed light on each other, and more broadly on the relationship between archive sources and same-sex desire. The fictional archive constructed by Schulze’s editor performs the dynamics of the archive and the forces of closeting that theorists have discussed extensively. Schulze’s novel capitalizes on its fictional mode to stage the potential for evidence to be used against the queer subject, which helps shed light on the difficulties surrounding evidence and archivization in Wolter’s narrative. The fragmentation and multiplication of perspectives in Schulze’s narrative draw attention to the negotiation of identity through layers of textual sources, which in turn directs the reader to similar dynamics in Wolter’s text when the two are read together. Hinterm Horizont allein may even suggest a queer approach to evidence that is circumspect and allows for dissonances between different articulations of identity.

These two works also demonstrate the difficulties in applying theories of archivization to archival narratives, particularly when it comes to autobiographical works such as Wolter’s. Derrida’s account of suppression and drives proves useful to a point in explaining the structural influence of same-sex desire on both archives, particularly in Schulze’s playfully complex fictional example. However, in Wolter’s archive, the context and individual situation must be taken into account in greater detail than Derrida’s essay achieves. In the case of the NVA, the closet dynamics governing the expression of same-sex desire in the GDR must be considered, particularly given the impact of the closeting of desire on autobiographical writing in Wolter’s memoir and in the fictional negotiations of identity in Schulze’s novel. The suppression of desire must therefore be understood in terms of wider sexual and gender politics and tensions, as well as a result of the structural dynamics internal to a given narrative.

Schulze and, more directly, Wolter shed light on the place of queer experience in the GDR, revealing that the role of same-sex desire within institutions was complex and was not simply opposed to the demands and values of the state. Historians have begun to investigate the nuances of queer experiences of GDR institutions, but the role of same-sex desire within its most repressive institutions remains largely neglected. The representation of the
NVA in these works shows same-sex desire to be a crucial part of men's negotiations of the GDR's masculine values, even when this desire was simply repudiated. Moreover, the focus in both texts on the suppression of same-sex desire in archival sources suggests a way of investigating queer experience in the GDR's official institutional archives, namely with close attention to the forces that suppress and regulate expression of same-sex desire.

Ultimately, these texts present gender in the post-reunification context as relying, even decades later, on negotiations and reinterpretations of experiences within GDR institutions. Once former citizens were no longer required to negotiate GDR institutions in person, these negotiations did not cease, but continued in textualized and even fictionalized forms. Memories and archival sources trigger and influence these negotiations and, in Schulze's and Wolter's texts at least, acknowledging and accounting for the problems with such evidence becomes a central part of the post-reunification reconstruction of identity. The power of the GDR's ideals and the memory of its institutions to disrupt identity in the present can perhaps be counteracted over time through the repeated engagement and reinterpretation shown by Schulze and Wolter. Yet the texts I have analysed show former citizens' negotiations of institutions as a central experience that cannot be dismissed as obsolete or irrelevant.

**Notes**


4. I avoid ‘homosexual’, except when describing historical debates within the GDR, because of the term's loaded and pseudomedical associations at the time. For sexual identities based on same-sex desire, I use ‘queer’ where appropriate, a term that also implies a challenge to accepted identity categories or ways of thinking (see e.g. Butler, ‘Critically Queer’).


8. To avoid confusion, I use ‘Schulze’ for the author and ‘the editor’ for the character.


17. Ibid.

18. Ibid., 48.


31. Full discussion of same-sex desire in the NVA's institutional archives is beyond the scope of this chapter, but see e.g. BStU, MfS AOP 1761/80, files on an officer's desertion, 1978–79; BStU, MfS HA I/15134, reports on Operation 'Kapsel', 1977–82, fol 77–131.
35. Ibid., 68.
36. Ibid., 80.
40. Ibid., 1–27.
44. Enrico’s ‘snowbound field’ (‘verschneite[s] Feld’, NL, 655) recalls the central scene in Kaiser’s *Von morgens bis mitternachts*, suggesting that Enrico’s attempts to recast his identity may be as unsuccessful as those of Kaiser’s Kassierer.
50. Wolter, *Der Prinz von Prora* im Spiegel der Kritik, 12.
51. Ibid., 11.
52. Ibid., 74: ‘geistig-seelische Nähe’.
53. Ibid., 75.
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