On November 2, 1988, the short documentary film Die andere Liebe (The Other Love, dir. Helmut Kißling and Axel Otten) had its premiere. This historical event, meant as a cinematic introduction to a subsection of GDR society, marked the slow and monumental progress that had been made in the realm of gay rights in East Germany—though not necessarily on purpose—while it also illustrated the tragic backwardness of this country that was and is, in so many ways, stuck in time. Different from other nations that transitioned from communism to postcommunism, the GDR essentially dissolved into the FRG. Unlike the more popular feature film that appeared the following year (Heiner Carow’s Coming Out), Die andere Liebe (DaL) is often either left out of historical narratives or only briefly mentioned. In what follows, I examine the circumstances of the film’s production and appearance in East Germany while considering the role it plays in our understanding of the development of German lesbian and gay history. More specifically, this essay will provide a reading of the film that identifies its affective engagement with various parties: the anonymous individuals it profiles, the GDR audiences, and the official state-run apparatus of film production, among others.

DaL mobilizes a number of forms of affect in its sequences, engaging with its intended audience of primarily heterosexual viewers. In using “affect” instead of “emotions” here, I refer...
to what Clare Hemmings has called “states of being, rather than to their manifestation or interpretation as emotions.” Hemmings explains that affects, unlike drives, their fellow psychological entities, may be adapted; indeed, they can be transferred to a variety of objects instead of being oriented toward or fixated on one goal as drives are. Affect allows for a general analysis of the text’s provoked responses rather than one of specific audience members’ targeted emotional responses. Although DaL is ostensibly about “love,” as we could gather from its title, the original screenplay, and parts of the final voiceover narration, I interpret it as a work of the mobilization and deflection of shame— in other words, DaL takes gay shame and transforms it into homophobic shame. It is a kind (or sibling) of shame, homophobia, which calls for the film’s necessity, though that inclination is not explicitly named; the film was supposed to educate the GDR public about the homosexuals among them. While shame is the predominant affect that the film engages, one must also consider other related forms, as the homophobic or heterosexist shame on which the film is based— i.e., the shame that heterosexuals feel about homosexuals— requires or transforms into other responses as well, such as disgust, fear, and eventually pity. Shame is primary or foremost, I contend, but one can also see in DaL the fear of having one’s homosexuality discovered, parents’ nervous paranoia about seductive conversion (of nonhomosexuals into becoming gay), the fear that homosexuality is a contagious disease, the moralistic judgment of nonmonogamy or public sex, the embarrassment at coworkers’ prejudices, the sadness at the difficulty of finding partners, and the concern or sympathy for the
person who has attempted suicide. We witness what Sara Ahmed calls “the psychic as well as social costs of loving a body that is supposed to be unlovable for the subject I am, or loving a body that I was ‘supposed to’ repudiate.” The interviewees’ affective displays, whether they speak of their present or their past, serve to engage the audience and provoke sympathy. As will become clear, the filmmakers walked a tightrope between enlightened respect and indoctrinated prejudice.

Another way of thinking of DaL’s project is to classify it as managing while also displaying discomfort. At least since Walter Ulbricht penned the “10 Gebote für den neuen sozialistischen Menschen” (Ten commandments for the new socialist person) in 1958 and proclaimed commandment number nine, “Du sollst sauber und anständig leben und Deine Familie achten” (You shall live cleanly and modestly and respect your family), a particular moral worldview had become the norm in the GDR and was even printed in a placard format allowing for its display in the home. East Germany was a space of compulsory heterosexuality, if ever there was one, where heterosexual relationships were the scripted and implicit ideal that citizens were expected to meet. As Lauren Berlant and Michael Warner describe such a compulsion, “National heterosexuality is the mechanism by which a core national culture can be imagined as a sanitized space of sentimental feeling and immaculate behavior, a space of pure citizenship.” Disruptions of this standard could not only become uncomfortable but also potentially be considered patriotically unsuccessful at best or dangerous at worst. This was a country in which a
single party reigned over state-sponsored socialism; where gathering in large or small groups—and even “private” behavior—was subject to massive state-sponsored, public-complicit, and bureaucratically complex surveillance (this included active discouragement of gatherings of lesbians and gay men, in particular); and where asserting components of individual identity was often at odds with the dominant narrative of the nation’s political, social, and existential philosophy. I contend that approaching the history of East German homosexuality requires analyzing a history of disavowal and inconspicuousness. Doing so through the medium of film, which can render the unseen visible, will enable us to examine both the filmmakers’ choices—some of which were contentious—in the construction of the film and the audience reactions to the assemblage of approaches in the final product.

David Halperin and Valerie Traub have asked about the possibilities and limits of writing histories and offering interpretations that engage with the shameful, wondering with which elements and from which perspectives one must or ought to engage with this theme. Is “gay shame” the opposite of “gay pride,” the organizing principle—or affect—behind parades, festivals, and gatherings in the post-Stonewall era of gay rights and politics? One of the questions behind their inquiry is to what political effect does one write about shame and the shameful—in other words, what good does it do? A fruitful link between the project of scholarly examinations of gay shame and the subject of DaL and East German gay rights more broadly is the assertion that gay shame writings have only become possible in the post-pride era of
visibility and increased tolerance. In other words, as Halperin and Traub assert, “We no longer have to be defensive about aspects of gayness or of the social experience of gayness that don’t easily conduce to the production of propaganda on behalf of gay people, that don’t argue unambiguously that gay is good.”\(^9\) Their use of “we” here can be criticized, but they rightly point out that one long avoided ambiguous, ambivalent, or negative implications in discussions of different sexualities, in order to avoid providing ammunition to cultural critics. In DaL, as we will see, only a specific image of lesbians and gay men is worthy of dissemination on this public stage. Indeed, the image presented will be familiar to many: the melancholic (primarily male) homosexual who came to the realization of her or his sexuality, pulled her- or himself out of the depths of despair and self-loathing, now seeks or has found a steady monogamous partnership, and aims to be considered “normal” despite her or his discursive construction as anything but.

A productive consideration, which is also important as we consider the film here, is the direction of the shame that drives its narrative. When is it interiorizing or inwardly directed and when does it have collective implications for group identification, again for better or worse? As we consider texts from a different era and national context (East Germany in the late Cold War in media largely created by heterosexuals about homosexuals aimed at heterosexuals), we will have to remember to ask whose concern is being channeled in the production of the media and in its reception. This project, then, is also both implicitly and explicitly about the shame or discomfort of the researcher, who undertakes to examine the subject, and the bashful or
embarrassed reactions of the informants, who have first-hand experience of and within the
history. Shame and an attendant melancholy appear throughout explorations of queerness in East
Germany and in the materials related to it like recent examinations of lesbians’ and gay men’s
experiences in documentary film form. Shame can also be a useful theoretical tool when
engaging in discussions of the GDR and that country’s complicated legacy.

Conceptualizations of shame can allow us to see East German moments in a new way. A
1964 East German sexological definition of aspects of shame explains that one might feel “Ein
deprimierendes Gefühl beim Bewußtsein oder Beobachtetwerden der eigenen Unzulänglichkeit”
(A depressing feeling at the awareness or external observation of one’s own inadequacy) or, in
other words, “shame.” This latter definition is useful for understanding shame’s relationship to
social and interpersonal expectations, too, as it points to one’s own “Unzulänglichkeit.” I would
argue that the idea of shame, as both a noun and a verb, floated past or swam through—to
borrow Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick’s fluid metaphor—the waves of Ostalgie (nostalgia for the East)
that caught a great deal of popular and scholarly attention in the 1990s and early 2000s and were
variously bemoaned, despised, ridiculed, and celebrated for the skewed images and discourses of
the GDR that once flourished and still, in some quarters, linger on. In some of these one can
find narratives that run the gamut of representation, from reluctantly proud former East Germans
to overt commercialization, both of which end up producing varying alienations that make GDR
experiences extremely queer in contemporary contemplation. Freud of Das Unbehagen in der
Kultur (Civilization and Its Discontents, 1930) would tell us that one’s unconscious acceptance and internalization of the civilization’s standards produce the Freudian analogs to, or relatives of, shame: Schuld (guilt) and Reue (remorse).\(^{13}\) Put differently, the shame that both queer and nonqueer individuals felt in the GDR is perfectly normal, given what was valued in that heterosexist, monogamy-oriented setting; it is another visible clue to the invisible workings of social expectations and discipline. Shame is or was doing its “civilizing” job, making one feel uncomfortable about and distaste toward certain things (i.e., an external function) while also policing one’s own behavior (i.e., an internal function). Summing up this perspective succinctly, Janice Irvine observes that, according to Norbert Elias, with modernity “the shame threshold decreases while at the same time, awareness of shame [also] declines.”\(^{14}\) Thus, shame becomes ever more prevalent just as it also is in some ways automatic and unquestioned, because it remains unacknowledged.

In DaL we can see a prime example of this: a cinematic work ostensibly about “the other love” and those who exhibit it, but in actuality it is about the non-other-lovers who are making the film and who will view it. Ahmed has defined shame as “an intense and painful sensation that is bound up with how the self feels about itself, a self-feeling that is felt by and on the body” (103). Sedgwick went further, writing that “Shame floods into being as . . . a disruptive moment. . . . [It] is itself a form of communication. Blazons of shame, the ‘fallen face’ with eyes down and head averted . . . are semaphores of trouble and at the same time of a desire to
reconstitute the interpersonal bridge. But in interrupting identification, shame, too, makes identity.” Shame is “both peculiarly contagious and peculiarly individuating.” It strangely “can so readily flood me . . . with this sensation whose very suffusiveness seems to delineate my precise, individual outlines in the most isolating way imaginable” (Sedgwick, “Shame,” 50–51).

Again, if we turn to DaL, we see vivid illustrations of Ahmed’s and Sedgwick’s observations as the palpable discomfort among the nonqueer public works as a method of communication and shared identification but also alienation. These queer people are “other.” Or: “You queer people who might be watching this are different.”

<1>Die andere Liebe: Production, Analysis, and Reception

DaL did not take the customary route through the machinery of DEFA, the state-run studios. Instead, the film appeared under the auspices of the Deutsches Hygiene-Museum in Dresden (German Hygiene Museum in Dresden, DHMD). From the beginning, those involved in making the film conceived of it as an educational first step. Those two elements—that it was didactic and also just a primary entry into the subject—permeate all of the production documents as well as later accounts of the filmmaking process: this film was to be the GDR’s first foray into educating the heterosexual public about who “homosexuals” were and how they could fit into the East German socialist worldview. The filmmakers and consulting advisers in the process believed that
this first impression would be crucial in the GDR’s developing public tolerance of lesbians and gay men.

The DHMD is a singular institution and an odd yet somehow fitting location for this film’s origins. Founded in 1912 by a businessman in order to provide general education about healthy living to the masses through lectures, exhibits, pamphlets, and publications, the museum has a history of addressing diverse subjects. These include its uses in support of Nazi racial ideology and eugenics. In the GDR, it became the counterpart to the West German Bundeszentrale für gesundheitliche Aufklärung (Federal Office for Health Education). The DHMD’s educational purview transformed over the decades, as the postwar film subjects gradually moved from “Geschlechtskrankheiten und Tuberkulose” (sexually transmitted diseases and tuberculosis) to healthy lifestyle issues: “Ernährung, Rauchen und Alkohol” (nutrition, smoking, and alcohol). The short films, which the DHMD screened in its facility and also loaned to clubs and other institutions, focused on subjects like smoking among men, breastfeeding, genetic counseling for families, sexually transmitted diseases, teenage pregnancy, and eventually homosexuality. The DHMD’s most popular film is probably director Detlef Tetzke’s Mann und Frau intim (Man and Woman, Intimate, 1984), based on the bestselling advice book of the same name by sex educator and counselor Siegfried Schnabl, East Germany’s answer to West German Oswalt Kolle. (Schnabl was also involved in the production of DaL.) In the end, one has the pedagogical mandate of this institution to thank for the existence of DaL,
but homosexuality’s presence in this lineup of topics raises certain questions while also illustrating one of the ways in which same-sex affections have been discursively understood and, by association, pathologized—this, of course, not just in the GDR.

One of the film’s two heterosexual directors, Helmut Kißling (born 1945), was already familiar with making short documentaries for the purposes of the DHMD, as one of the directors in newly-formed Gruppe Kontakt (Contact Group) in the DEFA Studio for Documentary Films. Kißling, who ended up fleeing the GDR before DaL was completed then by codirector Axel Otten (born 1942), was drawn to the genre for its ability to reach viewers’ true feelings and expectations in ways that only documentary can. In 1986, two years before DaL’s release, Kißling laments in an interview that he would like to make a documentary about homosexuality, but it would not be possible to screen it, since it would only elicit a derisive response in the audience. This was an obstacle he must have felt that the GDR had overcome by the following year, or perhaps he found encouragement in the DHMD.

In the DHMD’s archival records, one can trace the film’s progression from idea to reality and finally to its public presentation. The film’s working title changed, as did the possibilities for what the film would include: options included “Partner V” (i.e., fifth in the series of partner/relationship films) in the Szenarium, or original treatment; “Die fremde Liebe” (The Different Love), also in the Szenarium and in letters supporting the film’s approval for production; and “Liebe zum gleichen Geschlecht” (Love for the Same Sex), a suggestion by
Siegfried Schnabl.20 Kißling and Otten are clear about their intended audience, the subject, and how they would go about portraying and reaching them. In order to discover the intent behind the film and link it to what we see on screen and audience reactions, we can examine DāL’s founding documents: the Szenarium and the expert testimonials collected from noted relationship and sexual counseling luminaries. This genealogy of sorts will reveal the degree to which affect, and managing affective responses, played a role in the film’s genesis.

In the treatment and proposed screenplay for DāL, Kißling and Otten describe the parameters for what they may be able to accomplish in the final product. It is clear from the filmmakers’ perspectives (and the concurring experts) that DāL should be a tool that will educate primarily heterosexual viewers about gay East Germans while working to dislodge and deconstruct the public’s prejudices toward lesbians and gay men: “die eigenen Gefühle und Urteile einer kritischen Prüfung zu unterziehen” (Szenarium, 1; subject one’s own feelings and judgments to critique). In a list of prefatory comments at the start of the treatment the filmmakers begin to describe how they will achieve this, and already here they assert the importance of anticipating and analyzing audience reactions. This text attests to the documentary nature of what the half-hour film will display: DāL “handelt von tatsächlichen Schicksalen, Lebensansichten, Erfahrungen und Erkenntnissen” (Szenarium, 1; is about real destinies, views of life, experiences, and realizations; original emphasis). The filmmakers describe two of their preliminary decisions, too: one about the people they choose to show and one about the inclusion
of HIV/AIDS in the film (discussed below). The former decision was to feature “nur äußerlich unauffällige Homosexuelle . . . (zumal sie auch die Mehrheit der Homosexuellen ausmachen), um die Akzeptanzschwelle möglichst niedrig zu halten. Wir sind grundsätzlich bei dieser Position geblieben, auch wenn wir in einem Falle davon abgewichen sind” (Szenarium, 1; only outwardly inconspicuous homosexuals . . . [particularly since they also comprise the majority of homosexuals], in order to keep the acceptance threshold as low as possible. In principle we have stayed with this position, even if we deviated from it in one case). The protagonist who is allegedly conspicuous in his homosexuality and was thus the exception was not included in the final version of the film. This excerpt makes abundantly clear the calculations involved in sculpting what the filmmakers thought would be the most successful first impression. While the reference to the “Akzeptanzschwelle” makes it seem like they might be testing vaccinations and looking for side effects, it also illuminates the affective dance everyone was doing. The specters of potential homophobic revulsion and shame were never far away. I will discuss DaL’s direct engagement of conspicuous homosexuals below in its questioning about Tunten (fairies) and thus the gendered embodiments it sought to depict. In this treatment, as we will see in the experts’ letters, the goal becomes and remains to assuage the uncomfortable feelings that might arise among the heterosexual viewing public.

As was customary for certain films in the GDR that would broach potentially controversial subjects, the filmmakers solicited support from authorities (in this case, three) who
provided feedback on the film’s idea and initial treatment: psychologist Kurt Bach; educator, author, and sex counselor Siegfried Schnabl; and sociologist and sexologist Kurt Starke. Beyond affirming their unequivocal support for the production of the film, the three experts responded to the Szenarium and highlighted elements of the film’s proposed construction that they saw as significant, while emphasizing, too, that such a filmic presentation of this subject was long overdue. One can read their comments as slightly veiled criticism of the general social order, but also—though they do not explicitly say this—as evidence that the GDR was remarkably regressive in its understanding of queer sexuality.

All three experts praise the film’s proposed concentration on the normality of lesbians and gay men and the related effort to deconstruct stereotypes and to foster tolerance among the viewers. A significant portion of the ordinariness they are praising and the film aims to show, however, is the noneffeminate, not-too-overtly-homosexual gay man—men who could “pass” for straight. Schnabl agrees with the limited inclusion of Tunten: “um schablonenhafte Vorstellungen von ‘typischen’ Homosexuellen abzubauen, andererseits um auf deren psychische Notsituation aufmerksam zu machen” (in order to deconstruct cut-and-dried preconceptions of “typical” homosexuals, on the other hand in order to bring attention to their psychic precarity). Perhaps the filmmakers could point out, he writes, “daß deren [der Tunten] äußere Erscheinung oft nur eine jugendliche Übergangsphase und grotesk übersteigertes Imponier- und Werbegehabe ist, wie es auch bei einigen heterosexuellen jungen Leuten vorkommt” (Schnabl, 3; that their [the
fairies’] outward appearance is often only a youthful transition phase and is a grotesquely exaggerated affection meant to impress and advertise). Interestingly, Schnabl here seems to be channeling an affective response himself, colored as it is by what is likely supposedly scientific evidence. Referring to the “fairies,” Schnabl pathologizes and infantilizes femininely-presenting men, thus also passing on the (implied) value judgment about femininity itself. In other words, not only are the Tunten a minority and likely to make people uncomfortable, but their behavior is usually only a stage in their life, after which they move on to more appropriate and authentic personality traits and gender characteristics.

Bach offers a more critical assessment, recommending that the filmmakers make clear that there are also heterosexual men who have “stark ‘weibliche’ Züge” (2; strongly feminine traits), a recommendation that the filmmakers do not take up. He argues,

Wie kommt es zur Ablehnung der Tunten? Sie weichen am stärksten vom männlichen Rollenklischee ab. Darum sind \( \frac{2}{3} \) der von Dannecker und Reiche befragten Schwulen gegen sie.\(^ {21} \) Das Idealbild des männlichen Homosexuellen ist der Mann, mitunter der Supermann. Aber viele Männer, auch Schwule, sind gar nicht so männlich wie sie sich geben (müssen!). So laden diese ihren Frust auf die ab, die sich das getrauen. . . . Wir müssen in unserem Film darauf achten, daß in dem o.g. Sinne nicht ‘gute’ und ‘schlechte’ Homosexuelle dargestellt werden.
[How does the rejection of fairies come about? They deviate most strongly from the cliché masculine role. That’s why ⅔ of the gay men surveyed by Dannecker and Reiche are against them. The ideal image of the male homosexual is the man, sometimes the superman. But many men, gay men, too, are not as masculine as they [have to!] act. So they heap their frustration on those who dare. . . . We have to be sure that in our film ‘good’ and ‘bad’ homosexuals in the above sense are not depicted.] (Bach, 2–3, original emphasis)

Starke does not specifically address the issue of Tunken, but he praises the filmmakers, because “der Film zwar einerseits die Konfliktsituation der homosexuellen Minderheit in der heterosexuellen Mehrheit und auch konkrete Schwierigkeiten sensibel und differenziert dokumentiert, aber andererseits die Normalität betont. . . .” (On the one hand the film documents sensibly and in differentiated fashion the conflict and concrete difficulties faced by the homosexual minority within the heterosexual majority, but on the other hand it emphasizes normality. . . .)—normality being the kind of behaviors to which homosexuals should aspire.22

Bach admonishes his colleagues and the filmmakers and seems to challenge them to move beyond the moralizing that they are supposedly criticizing or making visible in the first place. By avoiding the Tunken and justifying it, the filmmakers then confirm the good versus bad (i.e., masculine vs. feminine) appearance and description of queer people. We must note that the film aims to introduce queer people to the GDR public, but much of this behind-the-scenes, pre-
production debate revolves around concerns about, first, gay men, and second, their supposed effeminacy. We see in these and other passages some of the struggles the experts and filmmakers encountered as they envisioned both the “real” homosexual—as they understood her and him—and the imagined, anticipated audience members and general public. Put simply: be positive, while realistic. Naturally, these terms are highly contingent and problematic in this context. The filmmakers aimed to show a partial understanding of a misunderstood minority in a highly regulated format. The source of the fear here is clear: again, the future audience will not be as enlightened as “us,” the people involved in making the film, and they will be primarily embarrassed by and ashamed of effeminate gay men.

One of the ways the film shows the normality it prizes is to display homosexuals in situ. Although the goal is to show the ordinariness of the homosexuals, the slightly awkward sequences instead have an atmosphere of tourism, as everyone tries to act normally despite the presence of a crew, cameras, and equipment. In the screenplay, the filmmakers explain that the camera will observe a disco in which there are “Nur wenige Männer, denen man ansieht, daß sie schwul sind. Bei den Frauen deutet ohnehin nichts darauf hin, daß sie lesbisch sind” (Szenarium, 4; There are only few men whom one can tell are gay. Among the women there’s nothing that points to their being lesbian). Later, after showing the popular Berlin gay bar Schoppenstube, the film’s narrator again points to the hidden gay men among the greater population: “Eine große Gruppe schwuler Männer, von denen niemand weiß, daß sie Homosexuelle sind, meidet solche
Bars und Cafes. Sie leben unter dem Deckmantel normaler Ehen oder sexueller Bedürfnislosigkeit. . . Für sie reduzieren sich die Liebessehnsucht [sic] auf flüchtigen Sex im Verborgenen” (Szenarium, 18; A large portion of gay men whom no one knows are homosexual avoid such bars and cafés. They live under the cover of normal marriages or free of sexual needs. . . . For them, their desire for love diminishes with fleeting sex in secret.). In the final film, these disco and bar scenes deliver an anonymity or group feeling that contrasts with the individual interviews, as does the good time being had by those dancing and socializing in the club. Both the individual and group sequences do humanize—and make real and visible—Berlin’s queer population. Not meant to assuage fear, these moments and the film’s compilation of them demonstrate that there are fellow queer East Germans among the audience members (but only in Berlin), and they ought to be treated with respect.

The screenplay describes the introduction of another interviewee named Jens in a section called “Erfahrungen einer ‘Tunte’” (experiences of a “fairy”), a section and protagonist that do not make it into the film. The voiceover commentary explains, “Diejenigen, die den meisten von uns Homosexualität im Alltag ins Blickfeld rücken und die unser Klischee am stärksten bestimmen, sind die Tunten. Ihre Anlage ist offensichtlich, auch der Unbedarfteste kann sie bemerken” (Szenarium, 14-15; The ones who bring homosexuality into view for most of us and who confirm our cliché most strongly are the fairies. Their disposition is public; even the most naïve person can notice them.). The narrator’s script goes on to describe the lamentable position
of “Tunten,” even within the gay community, as they face homophobia from without and effeminophobia from within. Another technique to evoke sympathy on the part of the viewer, the planned display of Jens and his verbalized assessment of his place in East German society and experiences of homophobia could work to forestall the shame or disgust the audience might feel at seeing such a person on screen elsewhere or even in their everyday lives.

HIV/AIDS does not appear in the film either, which is another omission that could serve multiple affective purposes, like avoiding the provocation of disease-related fear but also to avoid the disease-caused shame it would most likely cause. In the Szenarium, Kißling and Otten write, “AIDS ist bei allen Homosexuellen, die wir (auch außerhalb des Films) kennengelernt haben, kein Thema” (1; AIDS is not a relevant topic among all the homosexuals that we met [including outside of the filmmaking]; original emphasis). Their comments, however, do not make clear whether “kein Thema” means only that there were no HIV-positive or AIDS-afflicted individuals among their interview partners or whether the filmmakers and their interviewees never mentioned HIV/AIDS or considered it in the process of producing the film. To build it into the film in any way, Kißling and Otten argue, would be to foster the incorrect belief that “AIDS eine Krankheit der Homosexuellen ist” (AIDS is a disease of homosexuals) and that “Homosexualität und AIDS nur die zwei Seiten einer Medaille sind” (Szenarium, 2; homosexuality and AIDS are only two sides of the same coin). In 2011 Kißling opines, “es [wäre] kontraproduktiv [gewesen], das Thema Homosexualität beim ‘ersten Auftritt’ in der DDR
in die Krankheits-Ecke zu stellen” (it [would have been] counterproductive to place the subject of homosexuality in the illness category already on its first appearance in the GDR).

The authorities who supported *DaL*’s approval and production with their letters agreed with the filmmakers. Bach was relieved that the film would not thematize HIV/AIDS. He writes, “Mit der Aufnahme von AIDS könnten sogar die von westlichen Medien verstärkt geführten Antihomosexuellen-Kampagnen ungewollt unterstützt werden” (By taking up AIDS [in the film], the western media’s antihomosexual campaigns might be unwillingly supported).

Starke, who was also a member of the central task force on AIDS for the Ministerrat (GDR’s Council of Ministers), emphatically agreed: “Der Film kann einen Beitrag zur Bekämpfung von AIDS leisten—obwohl diese nicht seine Hauptfunktion ist—indem er AIDS nicht erwähnt” (The film can make a contribution to the fight against AIDS—although this isn’t its primary function—by *not* mentioning it; original emphasis).

Schnabl’s letter does not address HIV/AIDS specifically. In their continuing efforts to avoid possibly negative attributes that could be linked to lesbians and gay men, thus creating a more positive—if fantastic—image, the filmmakers’ evasion of HIV/AIDS followed what the GDR had been doing for some time on a larger scale, though obviously for different reasons.

These experts’ comments on the portrayal of “Homosexuelle” point to the intended audience of the film, the viewers about whose reactions the experts were uneasy. In the Szenarium as well as the experts’ letters there is a palpable anxiety about how the film will be
received and what kind of impression it might make. It must be noted that here, too, the concerns about “Homosexuelle” evince the usual focus on men. Just as in Germany’s legal history (as in other countries), the fear of spillage of homosexuality—whether that is because of its existence or because of the potential for “seduction” of others—is almost entirely androcentric. Thus, not surprisingly, there is no voiced concern about how the depictions may affect the perception of lesbians; caution against showing “masculine” women is absent. These comments and the film’s structure support the filmmakers’ idea, as expressed somewhat obliquely in the screenplay, “von wem und für wen dieser Film gemacht ist” (Szenarium, 1; by whom and for whom this film is made), that is, by heterosexual directors and for the heterosexual viewers. The screenplay’s proposed epilog, most of which was either cut or not filmed, reiterates the documentary’s thesis:

Homosexuelle Männer und Frauen leben noch immer in einer Außenseiterposition! Es ist nicht zu verstehen, warum das so sein muß. . . . Unsere Gesellschaft hindert eigentlich nichts daran, daß homosexuelle Männer und Frauen sich in ihr den eigenen Lebensbereich schaffen, der ihren Interessen und ihrem Glückanspruch entspricht und daß dieser Anspruch von der Gesellschaft unterstützt wird. Heterosexuelle verstehen nie so ganz, daß die schwule und lesbische Liebe genauso schön ist, wie die Liebe zwischen Mann und Frau. Das ist nicht wichtig. Es bleibt Liebe, die zu den Menschen gehört.
Homosexual men and women still live in the position of outsiders! It is incomprehensible why that must be so. . . . Our society does not impede homosexual men and women’s creating their own area that would correspond to their interests and their right to happiness, nor that this right be supported by society. Heterosexuals never completely understand that gay and lesbian love is just as beautiful as the love between man and woman. That is not important. It’s love that belongs to human beings.]

(Szenarium, 19–20)

The film seizes on the areas of agreement with the audience, commonalities that could allow for the assimilation and perpetuation of tolerance for fellow “Menschen” who experience the same kind of love. The supposed universality of love becomes a way in which the filmmakers can add fuel to the fire of the sympathy that they have stoked throughout the previous thirty minutes, hopefully leading the audience to remember their viewing experience and to have it inform their lives. Emphasizing love, it seems, could be an effective tool to call attention to the shame that the filmmakers are trying to prevent; humanizing homosexuals could possibly lessen the likelihood of an affective response of disgust.

In its actual production and shooting process, the film grew somewhat organically, meaning that it arose in large part thanks to the collaboration of a young university graduate in theater studies. This insider guide made it possible to overcome some of the logistical obstacles of the film’s production, like identifying interviewees and navigating the lesbian and gay scene
in East Berlin, where the directors decided to situate the film (Kißling, 87). This milestone thirty-minute film was created by two men who knew very little about the community they were setting out to introduce to the uninitiated East German public. Ironically, because there was nearly no literature on the subject available in the GDR, the directors had to arrange for access to appropriate materials from the West (Kißling, 88). During the production process, Kißling was struck by the lack of opportunities for members of the GDR gay community to meet and interact with each other (92). The actual filming process was also hardly intimate in its execution. Because of the East German ORWO film stock and its low sensitivity to light, locations always needed a great deal of additional lighting, which required more crew members (Kißling, 92). One can imagine that this must have made aspects of participating in the film all the more difficult or uncomfortable for some of the interviewees, all of whom (except for the one mother who had her back to the camera) would be “outed” in some way by the time the film was released. Beyond that, though, there is a fitting allusion one can make to the “enlightening” work that the film itself was aiming to do, to shed light on a misunderstood group of people who feel compelled to live away from public scrutiny.

In order to illustrate the film’s construction and the ways in which the filmmakers engage in their antihomophobic work to manage the viewers’ affective responses, I will discuss a few of the film’s more revealing interviews. Kißling and Otten spoke with several Berlin lesbians and gay men, each of whom had something to add to the film’s intended display of homosexuals as
worthy of tolerance in GDR society.\textsuperscript{30} Most of the film’s interviews are presented in the same way. The interviewees are seen in medium-long—usually handheld—shots, often interacting with other members of the cast, or completing everyday tasks in their homes or out in public on cold, gloomy Berlin days. These sequences are establishing in the sense that they serve the filmic function of introducing the “who” and “where” of the moment but also in that they are seemingly—and almost ethnographically—supposed to establish that these homosexuals are normal people out among “us” (the viewers) and also in their own habitats. In the majority of these, those being filmed are conspicuously aware that they are being filmed. In these conversations, the interviewees touch on some of the customary milestones in narratives of coming out: feeling abnormal, discovering their own sexual feelings, trying to be heterosexual or trying to “pass,” self-hatred and suicide attempts, daring to meet others like themselves, first sexual and relationship experiences, the coming out process of disclosure to family and friends, and homophobic reactions from others, including coworkers and family members. These scenes—in the details offered by the interviewees as well as in the on-screen presentation—make visible the queer individuals’ past and present shame and add depth to the stereotypical homosexual.

<<Figure 11.1 about here>>

The first interview in the film features Helmut Kißling speaking to a nervous Dirk Kummer (who later starred in \textit{Coming Out}) and his boyfriend, Holger, in the two’s apartment.
Establishing tracking shots lead the viewer into the men’s apartment until we see Käßling sitting across from the others in a bedroom cluttered with books, records, wall decorations, and a guitar (see figure 11.1). With this interview clip, the filmmakers chose an abrupt and eventually paradoxical introduction to the film’s material. Framed in a medium shot, Dirk describes his first sexual experience, an unpleasant and almost violent encounter with a stranger in a building’s basement. Over the course of the film, we meet Holger and hear the two speak of their loving relationship that is more than Dirk (and so many queer individuals) thought they would ever be able to have. The common perception of many lesbians and especially gay men is that they could eventually have the kind of long-term relationships that some of them may have envied in their heterosexual acquaintances and that what they have seen portrayed in various media could actually become their own. These sequences, for one, aim to challenge the commonly held belief (pertaining primarily to gay men) that all homosexuals prioritize physical pleasure and actually seek out nonmonogamous sexual encounters.

Introducing more interviews, the voiceover narration points out that many believe that one is “seduced” into homosexuality. Instead, the film argues, one’s sexuality is there before any attempts are made to use it: “Auch die Richtung unserer Leidenschaften ist festgelegt. Man wird nicht homosexuell. Man ist es” (Even the direction of our passions is already set. One doesn’t become homosexual. One just is homosexual.). Nonetheless, we see interviews with men and women who say they were part of some kind of *Verführung* (seduction), either as the seducer or
the seducee, because they found one of the positions more comfortable or easier. Their
descriptions illustrate the relative importance of “initiation” in the sense that these individuals
speak to the ease with which one could be brought into a relationship by someone with more
insider knowledge and experience. Though the same kind of vocabulary can be used, what the
interviewees describe in these situations is a far cry from the fearful, melodramatic image of an
experienced queer preying on teenagers. Other interviews (like the one with Sven and Uwe)
confirm that this idea of seduction must not always be connected with age; that is, the older
individual is not always the instigator. This is one of the ways in which the film aims to
complicate and add detail to the viewer’s understanding of sexuality and sexual behavior without
making it threatening or too confusing. Some of the film’s interviews with lesbians also add to
this complicated view of sexual experience. Lydia had relationships with men, was engaged to be
married, and even had a child with her fiancé before it became clear to her that she was
interested in women.

<<Figure 11.2 about here>>

In one of the more compelling interviews, two gay men, one of whom, Andreas, has
already recounted the difficulties he experienced with coming out to his parents, are in a living
room with one of their mothers. The director, Kißling, prompts Andreas’s mother, whose back
remains toward the camera, to discuss the fear of loss that she perceived in her son—that she
might disown him—and the negative comments she hears about gays from her coworkers, to
whom she has not disclosed that her son is gay (see figure 11.2). The mother’s coworkers remind us of the policing, disciplinary nature of affective expectations—in this case, the anonymous coworkers’ assumption that everyone should share the disgust over homosexuals. For Andreas’s mother these coworkers’ verbalized opinions about gay people box her in, creating an unpleasant environment in which he moves through the undisclosed shame of her son. We see part of this interview in medium to medium-long shots; Kißling sits at the far left, barely in the shot, on a couch with René (apparently Andreas’s boyfriend), while the latter forms the left-most point of an inverted triangle: Andreas’s mother is the point and Andreas is at the other end. The back of her head is between the two. During one of her replies, the camera slowly zooms in on Andreas and lingers on his face, which reveals a quiet and downcast discomfort and shame. As the mother explains why she is reluctant to reveal to her coworkers that her son is gay, the camera cuts occasionally and rests on René’s and Andreas’s faces in close-up. In a medium shot with his mother’s head on the left, we see Andreas reacting as his mother says that she still thinks she should not out her son (and, by extension, herself), despite its being foolish; Andreas’s head falls and he looks to the floor in contained frustration, as if he had heard this many times before. In close-up, Andreas’s face occupies the screen while his mother describes her idea that she experiences a kind of discrimination because of all of this; at that the camera captures his quick change of gaze directly at his mother. In this scene, the filmmakers’ thematize and display one of the kinds of precarity in which queer people and their families can find themselves. The
emphasis on close-up shots of René and Andreas, both when they are speaking and when they are listening to Andreas’s mother, continues the film’s project of trying to anticipate and interact with the audience’s affective responses. Here, the film adds emotional depth to these young men and their everyday experience while also illustrating the effects on nonqueer members of society, which may even be more important to some viewers if they, for instance, feel sorry for what the mother has to endure indirectly because of her son.

Contrasting hidden adults with visible teenagers, the following sequence’s group interview with René’s classmates reveals mixed attitudes and forms of tolerance. One boy reluctantly admits the whole topic (homosexuality, having a gay classmate) makes him a bit afraid; another describes how one can feel what he calls embarrassment, but which sounds a lot like shame felt for someone else’s misbehavior. One girl bashfully says she was surprised, since René is good-looking and could have any girl he wants; another says it’s no big deal, and everyone is just different. That this kind of tolerance existed in the (late) GDR, especially among young people, is not necessarily news. The straightforwardness with which it is expressed, however, in this milestone, subject-broaching film illustrates the long-present disjunction between the GDR’s ruling elite and its populace, the “mutual mistrust” and misunderstanding that Karen Ruoff Kramer has called “a kind of auto-immune disorder.” On the state’s part, a paternal surveilling control maintained a prudish, often irrational, understanding of sexuality; among the public, the interviews demonstrate what people were really discussing—in this case,
young people are slightly more aware and tolerant of aberrant sexual behavior than many people thought. It is in this group interview that Kißling asks about what the young people’s reactions would be if they saw “eine richtige Tunte” (a real fairy) on the street. I mentioned the question of effeminacy and “conspicuous homosexuals” above, but this moment in the interview illustrates this behind-the-scenes concern that also contributed greatly to the structure of the film.

_DaL_ succeeds in its depiction of lesbians and gay men as a kind of “normal,” not alarmingly different from the average East German, which is definitely one of its goals. The interviewees are articulate and frank, though they become abnormal in their very exhibition in the scope of the film. In some moments like those in the living room interview or the school class, the gay interviewees’ functions shift, unintentionally positioning them variously as subjects and objects of shame.

Given the importance placed on the implicit goal of managing the audience’s reactions to lesbians and gay men, the preproduction opinions and ideas expressed by the filmmakers and the evaluating experts take on a greater relevance when we examine the documented responses. Also because _DaL_ was, at least theoretically, so historically important, it is enlightening to examine the responses to the film. Would the viewers be perhaps shocked, angry, afraid, or disappointed? We have three main sources for documentation of audience reactions to _DaL_: comments from Dr. Siegfried Keusch (DHMD employee) following the test screening, reviews and press after
the film’s official premiere and release, and a study completed by the Zentralinstitut für Jugendforschung (Central Institute for Youth Research) in Leipzig.

The film had a test screening on October 13, 1988, in the Babylon Cinema in Berlin. *DaL*’s test premiere was jointly scheduled, probably because of the films’ short length, as a triple feature; oddly, it appeared on the program following *Mit 15 schwanger* (Pregnant at 15, 1987, dir. Günter Lippmann) and *Zwei Herzen und ein Schlag* (Two Hearts and One Beat, 1988, dir. Günter Lippmann), two films about pregnancy. The audience consisted of some representatives from the East German film industry as well as about 90% “Homosexuelle,” according to an odd handwritten notation by Keusch, who worked in the DHMD’s Institut für Gesundheitserziehung (Institute for Health Education) and was present, along with the films’ directors, dramaturgs, and some of the actors.32 Also present was Rolf Borrmann, an educator known partly for his advice column “Professor Borrmann antwortet” (Professor Borrmann answers) in the young people’s magazine *Neues Leben*, in which he offered answers to readers’ questions about relationships and sexuality. Unfortunately, we have no documentation of how many people were in the audience or their ages, but we do know that about half of the viewers left immediately after the three films were over and did not stay for the subsequent group discussion (Keusch, “Bericht,” 1). In both a report following the screening and a letter to the head office of the DEFA-Studios, Keusch lamented the joint screenings, possibly because the feedback or critiques became unfocused or were combined in unclear ways.33 Most of the test screening audience’s feedback
pertained to the first two films. In a subsequent, smaller discussion, after the larger conversation, a group of “only homosexuals” spoke to the need for more films on sexual education like DaL (Keusch, “Bericht,” 2). In light of other audiences’ responses (like those reported by Weller below), we can presume that suggestions made to the DHMD may have included engaging with gay lives in a more holistic and complex way as well as approaching the topic of HIV/AIDS.

Although the ruling SED’s newspaper, Neues Deutschland, did not run a review of the film after its official premiere, perhaps in silent acquiescence to its existence, a slightly contradictory review in the CDU-aligned newspaper Neue Zeit praised DaL. The Neue Zeit reviewer refers to it variously as “frisch” (fresh), “natürlich” (natural), and “kein Lehrstück” (not a textbook), while also calling it “geschönt” (sugarcoated) and remarking that anything disturbing (“was abstößt”) was missing, including the apparently expected “schrille Töne” (shrill tones), “effeminiertes Wesen” (effeminate creatures), and “alt[e] Schwul[e]” (old gays). Codirector Otten responded, “Wir wollten erreichen, daß die Leute die Schwulen lieben, daß sie sie mögen” (We wanted to reach the point where people love gays, that they like them) to make them tolerant. Another brief mention in Neue Zeit criticizes the overly didactic voiceover narration; in the reviewer’s opinion, this important topic was discussed to death (“zer[red]et”).

The last documentation of audience responses to DaL comes in the form of a 1990 study by the Zentralinstitut für Jugendforschung (ZIJ). The study, written by Konrad Weller, revealed strong divisions in audiences at screenings the previous year with regard to how viewers received
the film in detail.\textsuperscript{39} According to these responses, a large majority of the viewers, both gay and straight, had favorable reactions to \textit{DaL}. These respondents found the film to be comprehensible and informative and “ganz und gar nicht langweilig” (not at all boring) (Weller, 14).

Nonetheless, those who were more informed about homosexuality and relevant topics pointed to some deficits in the film’s execution, including what they saw as a superficial treatment of the coming out process, the nonrepresentative sample of interviewees, and an absence of topics like public, anonymous sex and nonmonogamy (Weller, 17–18).\textsuperscript{40} Summing up the study, Weller writes, “Die Erkenntnis der Wesensgleichheit verschiedener Erscheinungsformen der Sexualität (heterosexueller und homosexueller) ist noch nicht Gemeingut” (23; The awareness of the equality of different forms of sexuality, heterosexual and homosexual, is not yet common knowledge). According to the study, large questions remain on the periphery in the audience’s minds, for example, about the relationship of same-sex eroticism to trendiness and whether it is or can be the result of seduction (a common preoccupation). The author of the study acknowledges the difficult educational work that must be done and points to the need for a more complex engagement with all aspects of lesbians and gay men’s experiences.

\textless 1\textgreater Conclusion

In the first (1981) edition of his landmark book \textit{The Celluloid Closet}, Vito Russo closed by writing, “There never have been lesbians or gay men in Hollywood films. Only homosexuals.”\textsuperscript{41}
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Russo had spent the foregoing chapters and hundreds of pages documenting and commenting on, decade by decade, the representation of the existence and experiences of the homoerotic (or lack thereof) in mostly American films. The book illustrates in encyclopedic detail the many ways in which films created by and for heterosexual audiences had demonized, vilified, pathologized, ridiculed, and done varying degrees of violence to homosexuals in their creation and perpetuation of a number of cultural discourses and stereotypes. His comment above sums up the positions in which straight and gay people found themselves with respect to (again, mostly American) cinema by the start of the 1980s: homosexuals may have been the objects of the cinematic sentence, even if veiled, but they were not the subject. Because of the GDR’s infrastructures of censorship, repression, and avoidance, the situation is different when one has to explain the emergence of a film in 1988 that was both novel and obsolete. Part of what Dal delivers is the trope of the melancholic homosexual which, by the late 1980s, was working its way out of cultural depictions in the US and western Europe. The GDR’s cinematic heritage took a different path from the West from 1946 on, one that almost completely avoided engagement with the image of the male (or female) homosexual.42

_Die andere Liebe_ is a complicated and contradictory entry in the European, German, and specifically East German chronology of so-called “gay rights.” Part of what I have examined in my essay are the joint and perhaps mutually constitutive causes for and effects of DaL. Borrowing from Heather K. Love in _Feeling Backward_, I find there is a need to point out and
analyze the “positive” and “negative” events associated with this cultural production, to appreciate the uncovering of both the affirmation and disavowal of queer existence. To illustrate this simply, we can observe that DaL is not only the first East German film to spotlight the experiences of lesbians and gay men, marking a kind of milestone, but it is also just the first and only East German documentary on homosexuality, a late arrival to the European and North American cinematic and televisual engagement with this topic. For better or worse, the film delivers and engages with shame in its various guises as well as in first- and second-hand forms.

Janice Irvine has argued that shame can entertain, sell, engage in politics (74–76). Here, DaL seems to be also telling us sotto voce that shame can or should educate. The parameters of what the film could discuss are also delimited by individual and collective shame. There is no mention of legal, political, social, historical background with regard to the GDR situation of lesbians and gay men. Although the director (Kißling) attested to the free hand he was given in making the film, the reality of the GDR, even the late GDR, circumscribed the possibilities or intelligibilities of the film’s structure and content.

Above I quoted Vito Russo’s critique of Hollywood cinema and his assertion that, prior to the early 1980s, there had been no lesbians and gay men in films, only “homosexuals.” Is it fair to say that this rings true in the GDR’s first gay-themed film that appears in 1988? Yes and no. In DaL, as in similar films meant to allow for homosexuality to publicly come out (specifically Liebe ohne Angst and Coming Out), we hear lesbians’ and primarily gay men’s own
abbreviated personal narratives in their own words. The history of the gay movement in the GDR is one of mostly trying to be inconspicuous, as the nation’s official doctrine required the disavowal, first, of homosexuals’ existence and, eventually, their problems and need to gather and express themselves. Kißling and Otten’s film continues the disavowal in some form, but with the idea that their intent is in homosexuals’ best interests, in order possibly to engender a sense of shame or guilt on the part of the heterosexual viewer at the thought of their fellow Menschen being excluded from their socialist nation on the basis of their human love.

____________________

1 *Die andere Liebe*, directed by Helmut Kißling and Axel Otten (1988), BArch FILMSG 1/35869. Many thanks to the Faculty of Arts at the University of British Columbia for research funding related to this project; Jonathan Allen; Lars Thiele, and archival staff at the Hauptstaatsarchiv in Dresden; Marion Schneider at the German Hygiene-Museum in Dresden; and Hiltrud Schulz at the DEFA Film Library at the University of Massachusetts Amherst for assistance in the research for this project. I also thank Dirk Kummer for discussing his involvement in the making of *Die andere Liebe* and Faye Stewart for her feedback on this essay.
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4 Silvan Tomkins, whose work on affect has influenced countless others especially in the so-called “affective turn,” labeled the following affects as primary, from which others may arise: interest/excitement, enjoyment/joy, surprise, distress/anguish, fear/terror, shame/humiliation, contempt/disgust, and anger/rage. See Silvan Tomkins, “What Are Affects?,” in Shame and Its Sisters: A Silvan Tomkins Reader, ed. Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick and Adam Frank (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1995), 74.
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As one might expect from the title, Schnabl’s book deals with heterosexual relationships.


Ibid., 7.


Bach refers here to Martin Dannecker and Reimut Reiche, *Der gewöhnliche Homosexuelle: eine soziologische Untersuchung über männliche Homosexuelle in der Bundesrepublik* (Frankfurt am Main: S. Fischer Verlag, 1974).
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This is a clear example of the way in which lesbians are invisible. See Ursula Sillge, *Unsichtbare Frauen: Lesben und ihre Emanzipation in der DDR* (Berlin: LinksDruck Verlag, 1991).

24 Helmut Kißling, “‘Die andere Liebe’: Erfahrungen eines Dokumentarfilmers,” in *Kamera! Licht! Aktion! Filme über Körper und Gesundheit 1915 bis 1990*, ed. Susanne Roeßiger and Uta Schwarz (Dresden: Sandstein Verlag, 2011), 87. Not to put too fine a spin on it, but this was homosexuality’s first appearance only in filmic form. His meaning is clear, but it can be argued that homosexuality had been in the “Krankheits-Ecke,” if not the “Verbrechens-Ecke” (crime category) in the GDR since the country’s inception.


27 Despite its less prevalent presence in the GDR, HIV/AIDS was known to many East Germans who consumed western media. The disease was not publicly mentioned on GDR television until 1987, the year the film was in production. An influential and widely read publication that was published the next year is Niels Sönnichsen, *Aids: Was muß ich wissen? Wie kann ich mich schützen?* (Berlin: Verlag Volk und Gesundheit, 1988).

28 Activist and sociologist Ursula Sillge’s study observed this at the end of the *Wende*. See Sillge, *Un-Sichtbare Frauen*. 
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The decision to focus exclusively on urban homosexuals living in Berlin was one source of criticism in later reception of *DaL*. Audience respondents (e.g., in Konrad Weller’s study, cited below) pointed out that this typical experience was by no means universal. A compelling presentation of this is the interview with John, a resident of a village in Thuringia, in the documentary *Unter Männern*. In retrospect, Kißling argues that many of the queer people living in Berlin were actually from elsewhere in the GDR (Kißling, 87).

When possible, I refer to the interviewees by name, although only a couple are actually named in the film. The film’s screenplay provides clues based on the content of the interviews.


Keusch, “Bericht,” 2; Siegfried Keusch to Gustav Materna, October 14, 1988, 1, Sächsisches Staatsarchiv – Hauptstaatsarchiv Dresden, 13658 DHMD, Nr. FVIII17.

Keusch offers no explanation of how he reached this conclusion or identified these people.

Walter Arnold, “Eine andere Liebe: Zu einem Dokumentarfilm der DEFA,” *Neue Zeit*, March 9, 1989, 4. *Neues Deutschland* does briefly mention *DaL* on two occasions. First, we learn that Axel Otten was to show the film to school students as part of a documentary festival in Rostock:

36 Ibid.


39 Konrad Weller, “‘Die andere Liebe’: Untersuchung zum Film” (Leipzig: Zentralinstitut für Jugendforschung, 1990), Sächsisches Staatsarchiv – Hauptstaatsarchiv Dresden, 13658 DHMD, Nr. FVIII117 M55 Anlage 431. The associated film screenings and surveys took place September to December, 1989. I am aware that data generated during the GDR must be considered with caution.
caution, since we know that many East Germans would not have revealed their opinions openly or completely when asked.

40 Weller writes that one respondent even called the film “zu schön” (too nice) and had also expected some engagement with safer sex practices and HIV/AIDS (Weller, 17).

