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Baby Boomers and older members of Generation X have vivid memories of the Cold War: duck and cover drills, fallout shelters, and the arms race. At the beginning of the Cold War, Winston Churchill coined a powerful metaphor to represent the emerging divide between Western and Eastern Europe: the Iron Curtain (Churchill). The “curtain” became more defined over the next several decades, both as an actual frontier and a metaphor of difference. The geographical boundary became even sharper in 1961 when the German Democratic Republic (GDR or East Germany) surrounded West Berlin with a heavily fortified border, which lasted twenty-eight years.¹ Images of the Berlin Wall, such as Peter Fechter bleeding out at its foot, are indelible. The media reinforced these images and used them to depict a contrast between (western) freedom and (eastern) repression. To those who grew up in the United States and other nations in the First World during this era, the Eastern Bloc, with the Soviet Union at the helm, was the enemy—and political Other par excellence.

As an older member of Generation X, I grew up with this binary view of the First and Second Worlds. Given that I like James Bond movies, my enjoyment of Deutschland 83 came as
no surprise. Set in Germany at a hot moment in the Cold War, this first Germanophone series to be aired in the United States is an entertaining spy drama—and far more. What is surprising to a viewer of the Cold War era: the drama’s hero is an East German spy. Martin Rauch, the lead character, leaves the GDR as an operative of the HVA\textsuperscript{2} to go undercover at a military base in the Federal Republic of Germany (FRG) as First Lieutenant Moritz Stamm. Nor do the surprises of the “Western” series end with its communist hero. Rauch’s crossings of the iconic border are not the only traversals as he forms relationships and acculturates to the FRG, a “foreign” land. \textit{Deutschland 83} performs a neat trick: while the series reconstructs a world starkly split between West and East, it simultaneously challenges this separation, as well as divisions between domestic and foreign, family and outsider, capitalist and communist, and hero and villain. Through the interweaving of actual media coverage of the events of 1983 with the fictional plot, the television narrative also chips away at the line between reality and fiction. The drama’s complexity warrants inspection. Moreover, as \textit{Deutschland 83} undercuts a clear Other and destabilizes foreignness, it could be a lesson in an increasingly nativist world.

\textbf{History, Theory, and \textit{Deutschland 83}}

Scholarship on communist Europe has become increasingly varied in its depiction of the region. The historian Patrick Major, in a nuanced appraisal of the GDR, challenges peers who have depicted a fully controlled populace behind the border (6–7) and peers whom he calls “anti-totalitarians,” who “have treated the Wall as a metonym for a reductionist, black-and-white stereotyping of the GDR, and thus a foil for greater historical complexity” (7). Major admits that the wall led to a greater loss of freedom of movement and tragic deaths. However,
the state relied on a degree of consent from its oft-vocal citizenry (123–25), and, although the border contained citizens, “the Wall was never truly a hermitic barrier” (188).

The media, and not just people, also crossed the two frontiers that separated the GDR from the FRG. Only the residents of the Valley of the Clueless³ were too far from West Germany or West Berlin to receive their television broadcasts. The GDR proscribed tapping into Western signals, but, in lieu of draconian measures, authorities typically tried suasion to stop trans-border viewing (Gumbert 2–3, 107). Western radio permeated the border as well, and at times—including a period of liberalization in the mid-1960s—the music of West saturated the media of the GDR (Major 168–74). Western television was also officially exported to the East, although the amount available varied by country and decade (Mihelj 15–19).

The GDR’s own media had characteristics that defied stereotypes. Recent studies suggest that the broadcasting in Eastern Europe was more “free” than assumed (Gumbert; Imre, TV Socialism). Television enjoyed a quasi-protected status: its “lower cultural status often allowed it to go under the radar of censorship” (Imre, TV Socialism, 9). Scholars also remind us that the media of the West were hardly free of propaganda and ideology (Gumbert 159; Imre, TV Socialism, 18–19; Britton 21–22). Even though differences existed, the view of a diametric opposition between Western and Eastern Europe in the communist era is harder to maintain.

Theory, as well as history, can help unpack the fictional Martin Rauch. However, theory on the Second World in relation to the First is less developed than that on the Third in relation to the First. In an examination of the shift in the depiction of German characters in American cinema, Christopher Thomas refers to the Soviet Union and the Cold War but elides the GDR
Wesley Britton has written extensively on espionage on television, but his *Spy Television* leaves unexplored the communist East as Other (Britton). In contrast, Kackman identifies the operation and vagueness of the Other in the popular culture of the Cold War: “As with all expressions of nationalism, the cultural logistics of the Cold War require an externalized Other, though the actual source of the threat is seldom clearly defined” (186).

It is possible that few works examine Eastern Europe as Other because the dominant paradigm of the East, something on the order of Said’s *Orientalism*, excludes Europe. When early in her career Anikó Imre attempted to make connections between the post-socialist East and postcolonial studies, she found that “reactions ranged from quiet shunning to angry outbursts” (Imre, “Socialist Historical Film,” 49). Imre is sympathetic: “Some of this was due to a rightful worry about the discursive dilution of postcoloniality and a compensatory effort to keep the field specific to the violent imperialism and racism of European empires” (Imre, “Socialist Historical Film,” 49). Yet her ventures into this politically charged territory, along with those of several other scholars, enrich an understanding of Eastern Europe. Milica Bakić-Hayden developed the theory of “nesting orientalisms,” which deserves a full quotation:

> While there are many overlapping images of “the Orient” or “the East” as “other,” I will focus on that which designates the Balkan lands of Ottoman-ruled Europe. The gradations of “Orients” that I call “nesting orientalisms” is a pattern of reproduction of the original dichotomy upon which Orientalism is premised. In this pattern, Asia is more “East” or “other” than eastern Europe; within eastern Europe itself this gradation is reproduced with the Balkans perceived as most “eastern”; within the Balkans there are similarly constructed hierarchies. I argue that the terms of definition of such a dichotomous model eventually establish conditions for its own contradiction. (918)

Orientalism thus need not be restricted to Asia or Africa, even if Asia is more “East” than the former Yugoslavia, which may be more “East” than the GDR.
The early modern era also holds lessons for a deeper understanding of *Deutschland 83*. The historian Larry Wolff provocatively argued that the Enlightenment shifted a major line of demarcation in Europe. “Civilization” lay along the Mediterranean for centuries, with the barbarians to the north. In the Enlightenment, this line rotated by ninety degrees. Western Europe became the standard for civilization and eastern Europe its exotic invention: “The crucial binary opposition between civilization and barbarism assigned Eastern Europe to an ambiguous space, in a condition of backwardness, on a relative scale of development” (360). Critical to a study of a series set in the Cold War, Wolff draws a direct line from the eastern Europe of the Enlightenment to that of the communist era and beyond (1–3). Wolff notes that Churchill’s metaphor of the Iron Curtain was potent because it drew on generations of “othering” by the peoples of the western side of the continent (3–4). With the Iron Curtain front and center, this paper now turns to an explication of the television show in which the iconic boundary has a lead role—and the binary oppositions therein are not what they seem.

Domestic and Foreign

The “inner” German frontier—both the inner border and the Berlin Wall—plays almost as large a role in *Deutschland 83* as Martin Rauch himself. When we meet Martin, he is a guard at the Berlin Wall and a model citizen of the GDR. He traverses the border on several occasions in the series, including the involuntary crossing of the first episode—after which he learns that he is being coerced into an undercover assignment as First Lieutenant Moritz Stamm in the Bundeswehr. This second identity causes some awkwardness at the frontier. He encounters an uneasy moment in his railway compartment with an East German “colleague” as he crosses the
border in the fifth episode, and shortly thereafter with another guard at a checkpoint. In the final episode, after he has blown his cover, and with the West German authorities in pursuit, he hides in a family’s car to cross the inner border in the direction “Germans” rarely fled. While spying Martin must learn new lingo and cultural markers so that “Moritz” can perform his undercover persona. These physical and cultural crossings raise challenging questions about the definition of “Germany”—namely, were East and West Germans different nationalities?4

This duality of nationalities plays out in Martin’s/Moritz’s character. He develops rapport with the “foreigners” on whom he spies and acculturates to his undercover post. Two scenes further illustrate this point formidably. First, as Martin rushes back to East Berlin to donate a kidney to save his mother, he must pass a canister to a man on the Kurfürstendamm (episode 5). Minutes later the French consulate in West Berlin explodes. Martin surveys the destruction and realizes that the man to whom he handed the contraband is the culprit. Martin pursues the terrorist and kills him à la 007 on the tracks of a U-Bahn station. At first it is unclear who will be the victor—the man almost overpowers him—but it is clear when a revived Martin charges the man for whom the viewer roots and what drives Rauch. Although he is on the “other” side of a divided city, this is his Berlin. His mother’s life hangs in the balance, but he will not let go unpunished terrorism against fellow Berliners. In the second scene, or technically group of scenes, Martin learns that the East misreads Able Archer as the prelude to an attack and may launch a pre-emptive nuclear strike (episode 7). Concerned that he cannot convince the HVA otherwise, he warns his superior in the West German military, which blows his cover. He tellingly says to General Edel that the East is going to attack “us,” showing his identification with the Bundeswehr and a separation from the HVA and the East.5
Other tensions in the narrative also challenge the distinctions between “us” and “them.” Ostensibly an ally of the FRG and a colleague of General Edel, the American general, Arnold Jackson, puts America first. His aggressiveness shows how American interests can diverge from those of the FRG and other allies. At a meeting of NATO, Edel wryly remarks to a Dutch man that should the Soviets invade the West, the FRG would be the first casualty (episode 3). In another scene, Edel points out that an American bomb dropped in Moscow and its fallout will be far closer to the FRG than to the States (episode 1). Footage in the series from an actual West German broadcast states the obvious: nuclear war in the region could annihilate both the FRG and GDR (episode 2). These scenes in the series, and its treatment of the peace movements in both the FRG and GDR, suggest that the two superpowers are the belligerents and the remaining countries of Europe share interests across the Iron Curtain.

If Deutschland 83 hints at General Jackson, an African American, as the Other, the depiction of the Asian spy in the second episode leaves no doubt. Posing as a waiter, the operative realizes that Martin is an Eastern spy when the proletarian hero fails to recognize cuts of beef. She later surmises that he holds intelligence from the West, and she is willing to kill him to get it. Unlike the terrorist in West Berlin, she survives the fight, but as when in the U-Bahn station, Martin is for whom viewers cheer. We want him to prevail. The association of these three characters (black American, Asian, and terrorist with probable connections to the Middle East) with the Other in a heavily white cast are unsettling, but it shows a limit to the elasticity of the separation between domestic and foreign. With General Jackson there is ambiguity, but the other two are not mere outsiders, but clear enemies.
Family and Outsider

Family has a prominent role in the show, and the visibility of these relationships implies a degree of “foreignness” between unrelated characters. Martin is close to his mother, Ingrid, and donates a kidney to save her (episode 5). The sisters Ingrid and Lenora also share a bond, and Lenora’s anguish while her sister is near death is poignant (episode 5). Martin and his pregnant girlfriend, Annett, appear very much in love. On the other side of the border, General Edel appears as the solid paterfamilias, loving husband to his wife, Ursula, and father to his son, Alex, and daughter, Yvonne.

Elements in the plot quickly complicate the opposition of family and outsider. Most notably, Martin’s character, Moritz in the FRG, develops ties with General Edel and Edel’s children to the point that they become his adoptive family. The general sees qualities in Martin that his own son lacks, and a paternal interest in his subordinate forms. Alex and Martin, both first lieutenants, develop a fraternal bond, and Martin and Yvonne’s relationship mirrors one of siblings before it turns sexual. When the Edel men learn that Martin is a spy, they feel betrayed.

Cracks in the familial relationships emerge in tandem with these elements. General Edel loves his family but is unable to leave his commander’s mien at the base. Alex and he are regularly at odds; most of the time Yvonne lives at an ashram with her new “family”; and, at the end of the series, Ursula has decamped for her sister’s house. Martin and Annett’s partnership also has obstacles, and not just because she is in the dark about his activities. Annett’s first loyalty is the to the GDR. Her informing on her friend Thomas puts Ingrid at risk (episode 7). She also abets the kidnapping of Yvonne, who is in East Berlin on a musical tour. Martin stumbles
upon this plot when he arrives from the West at his mother’s house. He asks Annett if she is working for “them” before he renders Agent Hartmann unconscious. Thereafter he realizes that Annett will not move aside, and he must tie up the woman carrying his child to take Yvonne to safety (episode 8). Later, Ingrid comes home to find Annett and Hartmann tied up in her house. Ingrid chides Annett, “You never should have gotten involved with those people.” Annett reminds Ingrid that “those” people are hers as well—several of them are part of her family—and then Ingrid admits that Schweppenstette, her sister’s colleague, is Martin’s father. This absurd sequence hints at a cleavage within Ingrid’s household, as well as a profound imbrication of family and outsider: almost everyone is Other and yet no one is Other.

Capitalist and Communist (or Freedom versus Repression)

At first glance, Deutschland 83 depicts a stark difference between capitalism and communism. Standard tropes make this point. After Martin flees his aunt and handler in Bonn, his dive into a fully stocked supermarket, stuffed with bananas and pulsing with the Eurythmics, leads to frozen awe (episode 1). Later at the hotel, the toiletries fascinate him (episode 2), as does a Walkman in Brussels (episode 3). Martin is privileged by Eastern standards: the home in Kleinmachnow marks him as elite. However, the consumer goods on the Unter den Linden cannot compete with the those on the Kurfürstendamm. The technology of the East is also deficient. The floppy disc that Martin purloins from the hotel must be read in East Berlin, which stymies the Stasi. In half-seriousness Schweppenstette wonders aloud, “Do you mean to tell me that we need American technology?” (episode 3)

Far more serious than the tropes and gags are the chilling references to the power of
the GDR. As Thomas and Annett discuss the forbidden books in Ingrid’s basement, Thomas says, “We can’t let the state censor our imaginations.” She responds, “The state just wants people to be happy” (episode 5). After Annett betrays him, he is examined in a room likely once used for this purpose by the Stasi (episode 7). Tischbier threatens Martin that the state will take away his unborn child if he refuses to cooperate (episode 7). Deutschland 83 also weaves in the Soviet bombing of Korean Air Lines Flight 007 in September 1983, and actual side-by-side coverage of the Western and Eastern media of this flashpoint of the Cold War reveals some bias and cover-up in the East German broadcasts (episode 6).

But the divide between the capitalist West and communist East is less simple. This series complements the work of scholars who have challenged the “absolute” character of the East German government. For example, Annett cooperates eagerly with the state, unlike the ill-fated Christa-Maria Sieland in the monumental Das Leben der Anderen (The Lives of Others). Eastern goods and electronics were poor, but Deutschland 83 recounts the GDR’s astonishing apparatus of espionage. Furthermore, the role of West German intelligence officer Werner Freisinger makes a key point. Alex Edel’s flirtation with treason captures the attention of the authorities and Freisinger visits the general to inquire about his son (episode 6). The prying interview and rifling through Alex’s books and other belongings could have been the work of the Stasi, which makes the interrogation of Thomas in the next episode eerily familiar. Freisinger functions as a stark signal that democratic governments also curtail civil liberties when they feel threatened.

Hero and Villain

Deutschland 83 challenges the line between hero and villain. There are exceptions: the
terrorist in West Berlin and Asian spy, both minor characters, have no redeeming qualities, and Ingrid has no real faults. Most other characters, on both sides of the border, are hard to classify. General Edel has integrity, but foibles in full measure. Tischbier is vile at times but possesses the moral fiber to warn Alex to be tested for HIV and to end their relationship (episode 7). Among the communist officials, Schweppenstette most resembles the apparatchik. Even so, as Martin and he discuss the duty to serve the GDR, this official admits to his detachment from his family and alludes to regret, possibly fed by his knowledge that Martin is his son (episode 6). Schweppenstette’s colleagues in East Berlin are also a complex lot. Aunt Lenora plays dirty as a spy and uses her nephew and sister—and yet shows them affection. Markus Fuchs stands out as admirable. He uncovers Schweppenstette’s suppression of intelligence and risks his own neck to call him out in front of other officials in the HVA. This bold move could have averted a nuclear disaster.

Last among the characters is Martin Rauch, the bona fide hero. While Freisinger questions Alex, the latter refers to Martin as “a natural-born soldier, like my father. You could say he’s everything I’m not. He’s loyal, understanding, honest” (episode 8). This praise comes before Alex learns that Martin duped them and is a spy. Unlike Alex, the viewer is aware of the blood on Martin’s hands—i.e., his role in the elimination of Linda Seiler, the secretary from NATO (episode 4). The viewer also sees Martin’s grief as he buries her body, as well as further evidence of this layered character, who, albeit young, resembles the most recognizable hero born of the Cold War, James Bond. Michael Dirda’s probing of 007 is relevant here:

Our institutions, as Foucault used to remind us, are designed to instill order and discipline, to create team players and salarymen, to compel our unruly hearts to abide by timetables and deadlines. But what man dreams of being safe and
respectable, or, God forbid, prudent? . . . Bond famously possesses a license to kill, but in some ways he also embodies license itself, the spirit of anarchy and transgression. No rules apply to 007. He lives beyond good and evil, outside the confining strictures of the biblical commandments.

Transgressive Martin is, but his appeal also lies in his sense of a global citizenry, something that the writers could not have known when they developed this character would become critical in January 2017. Although smarting from “Moritz’s” betrayal, General Edel is sufficiently clear-sighted to see that his aide would not have revealed his identity and risked capture unless war loomed (episode 8). As does the audience, through the deception Edel sees the young man’s integrity, his willingness to favor geopolitical well-being in lieu of his own safety and national allegiance. Martin is a patriot without borders.7 This is not the Other.

Fact and Fiction

Perhaps most intriguing of all about the series is its blurring historical events and the fictional plot. Recent works have addressed hybridity of television narratives, but this author does not find these works useful in mining Deutschland 83 (Hill; Pearson; Wood). The program is steeped in history: Able Archer, Pershing II missiles, Korean Air Lines 007, and the Maison de France play out on the screen. For those of a certain age, rekindled memories of 1983 abut the narrative. Televisual techniques reinforce the blurring. In the first scene Lenora Rauch watches a broadcast of Ronald Reagan vilifying Eastern Europe. Contemporaneous broadcasts such as this one appear regularly, often switching between West and East. Some viewers may be unable to tell which “side” is represented in a clip, which blurs the distinction between the First and Second Worlds. At other times a fictional scene gives way to a contemporaneous broadcast that fills our screens, which “suspends” or momentarily dissolves the fictional plot.
As with most good period and precinct dramas, the mise-en-scène painstakingly establishes the setting and uses compelling artifacts. The series uses the historic headquarters of the Stasi and its furnishings from the period. The actor Sylvester Groth, who plays Schweppenstette, escaped the GDR in the 1980s and was pursued by the Stasi for several years. Working in the former headquarters of his persecutors and portraying one of them created some unease (“Extras: The Creators,” Deutschland 83).

The soundtrack also toys with the line between fact and fiction. The creators chose contemporaneous songs with care. They create a mood and propel the narrative, and they are “factual” in that the creators avoided using a song in a scene that predates the release of the song. Deutschland 83 also obscures the distinction between diegetic and non-diegetic sound. At points it is difficult to tell if the soundtrack is part of the scene or external to it. And, at least once, a song that is diegetic in one scene connects another scene in which it is non-diegetic. This frequent blurring and other televisual techniques stop short of fooling the viewer into thinking the narrative is “real,” but they make Deutschland 83 resemble documentary. An informed exploration of this rich hybridity is beyond the scope of this paper, but this mingling of fact and fiction taps into the memories of those viewers who remember the Cold War—and those who see in this television show that lessons linger in this strained, not-too-distant period.

Frederick M. Dolan writes in an aptly entitled chapter, “Cold War Metaphysics,” that the Cold War was constitutive of American national identity. While it prevailed, its vocabulary shaped the nation’s tasks, policies, and pursuits, forming a frame through which issues as different from one another as civil rights, dissent, culture, education, and the economy could be weighed together in terms of their significance for the nation’s struggle with a worldwide communist movement. (60)
The Cold War was so significant to the United States that Dolan refers to it as “a fourth constitutional regime,” one marshaled to combat communism (61). The author explores the acute anxiety of the era, which, writing in the 1990s, he predicted would outlive the Soviet-American struggle (69). Simulation is an intriguing aspect of this anxiety, which he depicts through a reading of popular culture, including the original *Invasion of the Body Snatchers*. In the 1956 film “externally identical but deindividuated replicants” steadily replace residents of a small town in California via alien pods (70). Dolan continues,

> The question raised by this kind of film is not How do we kill the monster? but How do we know who is real and who a mere simulation? Real Americans are independent and self-reliant, but the victims in these films have been subordinated to higher powers and are individuals in appearance only. The fear of simulation—the fear of not being able to tell the difference between independent individuals and agents of larger powers—is also detectable in the logic that governs the most important legal instrument of the Cold War, the National Security Act of 1947. (71)

The parallel with Martin Rauch is excellent: the HVA has eliminated the real Moritz Stamm and “dropped” Rauch into the West German officer’s body.

Another corporeal example from popular culture may be germane. In an article on Michael Jackson, Michael Mario Albrecht writes, “The stories about Jackson attempt to ground him racially, sexually, genderedly, and humanly, while constantly reinforcing the impossibility of Jackson being easily reduced to one category or another. Jackson continuously exceeds the limits of such binaries and his body becomes the site of profound inquiry, scrutiny, and anxiety” (Albrecht 707–8). One should not compare too closely the fictional Martin Rauch and the late singer, but the difficulty of categorizing Rauch and other elements in the broader narrative of *Deutschland 83* is fascinating and worthy of “profound inquiry.”
The final scene of the series is key to understanding the deferred meaning of Martin and *Deutschland 83*. Martin returns home to see Ingrid warming herself at an outdoor fire. Mother and son greet each other warmly, but after she tells him that Annett is inside the house, only Ingrid enters. A solitary, pensive Martin stares into the fire, and his face and the non-diegetic music convey the profundity as the scene fades. Rauch is back in Kleinmachnow, but the leafy suburb is no longer a refuge in a world of certainty. Earlier in the day he tied up Annett to take Yvonne to safety, and he had a fracas with his superiors of the HVA. Schweppenstette, his biological father, showed utter disregard for his work. It is clear to Martin that Annett, who carries his child, is blindly ideological. It is less clear to him what to make of his time in the FRG and the persons whom he deceived. Albeit flawed, the Edels were a surrogate family to him, and each Edel had virtues and wished for a better world. Presumably “Moritz Stamm” also left behind friends at the base, persons whom he infiltrated and yet admired. Martin’s world has been upended. The line that he drew between West and East, marked by the border that he had patrolled and then crossed during the narrative, has been eroded.

A revolution in East Germany toppled the Berlin Wall in 1989 and thereafter the inner German border. East and West Germans joyfully crossed without peril the frontier that had divided West and East. The FRG and GDR were united in 1990. Today former members of the Warsaw Pact, along with major “Western” states, are part of the European Union. However, triumphalism is premature. The Iron Curtain is gone, but barriers remain, as does the threat of nuclear war. Writers continue to acknowledge divisions within Germany between the former West and East, a separation that hints at the colonialism analyzed in Backić-Hayden, Imre, and Wolff (Bennhold; Rennefanz). Within and beyond Germany one also sees the anxiety described
in Dolan playing out as Europe faces mass migration from the Middle East. The United Kingdom and European Union are negotiating a painful separation, which raises difficult questions about the relationship (and border) between Northern Ireland and Ireland, as well as Northern Ireland and Great Britain. And, on this side of the Atlantic, the current administration appears determined to fortify even further the border between the United States and Mexico. The Soviet Union and its satellite states—the West’s most visible adversaries—are defunct, but Dolan was right: the anxiety has not abated (69), nor has the almost universal human tendency to classify groups into opposing categories. The Berlin Wall continues to be a powerful symbol and site of memory, but an ironic dementia prevails: we fail to see the connection between the walls, physical and otherwise, that we erect today and this richly symbolic one of the Cold War.

In conclusion, and as a nod to the interrogative title of this panel, “Are These the Eighties?” I respond that this television program does a superb job of returning one to the Reagan era and imparts lessons along the journey. *Deutschland 83* reconstructs a binary world while it simultaneously deconstructs this world. It blends history and fiction, prompting questions about their relationship in this medium. Martin is a curiosity: he who should be the enemy is the hero. As Martin recognizes that the persons on whom he spies may not be “foreign,” viewers may rethink the boundaries that they erect to insulate themselves from the Other(s), a useful exercise in our own age of growing xenophobia. This exercise can be painful; it is hard to release the certainty of binary prejudices and accept a measure of instability. The coda of the series, Martin’s pensive gazing at the fire, illustrates this point. But, in the end, the fictional East German spy has preserved much of his integrity, and we the audience can have faith that he will live to see another day, a wish equally appropriate for ourselves.
Notes

1. The Berlin Wall encircled the exclave of West Berlin. The “inner” German border separated West Germany (not West Berlin) from East Germany and was erected in 1945. For an account of the strengthening in the early years of the inner border and two successive escapes over it during this period, see Willner. The elision of the inner border in her book’s title shows the degree to which many overlook the older, longer, but less iconic border.

2. HVA is the English acronym for the Hauptverwaltung Aufklärung, or Main Directorate for Reconnaissance, the East German foreign intelligence service. The HVA was part of the Ministerium für Staatssicherheit, or Stasi, a name better recognized today.

3. Tal der Ahnungslosen in German. The northeastern and southeastern corners of the GDR were too far from the West to receive its television signals. Gumbert notes that East German officials developed a standard frequency in line with the West German standard so that they could “share” socialist broadcasting over the border, although the common standard also meant that West German broadcasting penetrated East Germany more effectively. See Gumbert, p. 26.

4. Volumes could be written on the legal, political, and philosophical distinctions between the FRG and GDR of the period, and law and policy related to this issue changed over the four decades. For a concise discussion of most of these challenging distinctions, see Sarotte, pp. xv–xvi, and Banchoff.

5. I cannot understand German and relied on subtitles for all translation.

6. Christopher Thomas writes about the changing depiction of Germans in films made during the Cold War, which was partly the result of West Germany becoming a key American ally. I argue this shift is very different from the blurring of the categories of friend and enemy that one sees in Deutschland 83. See Thomas, pp. 238–39.
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