development of GDR literature during the years covered by the study. With its critical portrayal of the potential future of socialism (and capitalism), its satire on the rewriting of history to suit ideology, and its insistence on the individual as opposed to the collective, *Saiäns-Fiktschen* is far from the GDR literature written before the Honecker era under the strict dictates of socialist realism. Taboos remained, of course, given the Biermann affair of 1976 and the literary works banned under Honecker. The notes at the end of each chapter provide the German original of the quotes Reid has translated into English in his text. Appended to his book is an extensive bibliography of primary (also including English translations of GDR texts) and secondary sources, and an index.

It is the index which will be of much value to those interested in GDR literature who wish to use Reid's study for refreshing their memory of the themes in the major works of GDR literature written during the period in question. However, by no means is it my intention to relegate Reid's efforts to the status of a reference work. Although *Writing Without Taboos* concentrates on the Honecker era, in many ways it forms an English counterpart to Wolfgang Emmerich's *Kleine Literaturgeschichte der DDR* (1981 and 1989). Its essayistic style free of too much esoteric jargon makes for an eminently enjoyable and informative study. However, whereas Emmerich proceeds chronologically through GDR literature, Reid does so horizontally. From the thematic perspective of each chapter, he looks at all of GDR literature during the Honecker era. Thus, the same prose work may be mentioned and analyzed more than once as it relates to the themes of the various chapters. The chapters can be read autonomously, but reading them all together makes for a broad understanding of GDR literature after the taboo speech.

One might question Reid's apparent eagerness to have his study published before the direction of the GDR's political development in the fall of 1989 became more evident. The patience of another year (this is of course easy to say on my part!) and a corresponding addition to the manuscript could have included that final phase of literary production before the country's demise. Although this was no longer the literature of the Honecker era per se, it was not completely free of taboos. Including a final chapter from this perspective would have shed additional light on what ultimately still remained taboo during the time preceding the *Wende*.

I would like to add one further criticism of Reid's treatment of the year 1968. Although it is quite appropriate to focus on *Nachdenken über Christa T.* as the advent of a new GDR literature, Günter de Bruyn's *Buridans Esel* of the same year should have deserved more than just a mention in passing. Many of the themes in Wolf's novel are common to de Bruyn's as well. Along the same lines, *Christa T.* did not come about in a vacuum. It was preceded by such novels as Wolf's *Der geteilte Himmel*, Erwin Strittmatter's *Ole Bienkopp* (both 1963) and Erik Neutsch's *Spur der Steine* (1964), all of which demonstrated initial cracks in the hitherto solid foundations of socialist realism. Reid does mention all three novels and briefly discusses Wolf's earlier work. I believe, however, that a more detailed discussion would have done more complete justice to tracing the development of GDR literature under Honecker. After all, as Reid himself admits, Honecker's taboo speech merely gave blessing to literary developments already going on in the GDR.

I had some problems with Reid's placement of commas, but he presumably adhered to British English convention. The publisher's job with the book is impeccable. I discovered no printing errors.

Reinhard Andress
Alfred University

Wolf, Markus. *Die Troika. Geschichte eines nichtgedrehten Films. Nach einer Idee von Konrad Wolf.* Berlin/Weimar: Aufbau, 1989 (and Düsseldorf: Classen, 1989), 352 p.

As the subtitles indicate, *Die Troika* is Markus Wolf's attempt to realize an uncompleted project of his brother, the filmmaker Konrad Wolf, who died of cancer in 1982: to tell the life stories of three (actually four) boyhood friends, who, in the foreign environment of Stalin's Moscow of the 1930s, forged a lasting bond of friendship despite their differing backgrounds: Konrad Wolf (Koni) himself, son of physician/dramatist Friedrich Wolf, who, as a Jew and Communist, had sought exile in the USSR in 1933; Victor Fischer (Vitja), son of the American journalist Louis Fischer, who, a Soviet sympathizer, had moved to the USSR in the late 1920s and wrote for various liberal American newspapers; and Lothar Wloch (Lotka), son of the Berlin blue-collar worker and Communist activist Wilhelm Wloch, who continued his antifascist resistance from his new base in Moscow after 1933.

Konrad Wolf's film idea, which, according to his brother, dominated his mind and emotions in the months--even years--before his death, was to treat three *Schnittpunkte* in the lives of these friends: their common childhood/teenage years (1933-39/41) in Moscow; their chance meeting again in Berlin in 1945--one of the "horses" of the troika, Vitja, is replaced here by his older brother Jura (George Fischer); and the reunion of the three (four)--as 50-year-olds--in the United States in 1975.

The fascination of the idea derives from the very different (both outer and inner) development of the troika members, the direction of which was predetermined by their parents' and their own experiences in the USSR. Disillusioned by the Stalinist purges and then the Hitler-Stalin pact, Louis Fischer turned his back on the USSR, taking his family back to the United States, where his two sons were "Americanized"; both served in the US army during WW II and were part of the American occupation force in Germany in the immediate postwar period. A victim of the Stalinist purges, the antifascist activist Wilhelm Wloch died in Soviet imprisonment in 1941, with the result that his widow returned to Nazi Germany with her children: the "middle horse" of the troika, Lothar, fought in the *Wehrmacht*--on the Soviet front. Of the three families, only the Wolfs remained in the USSR and maintained their allegiance to the Soviet Union. Konrad Wolf returned to Germany in the spring of 1945 as an officer of the Red Army, even serving briefly as the mayor of Soviet-occupied Bernau (near Berlin). The boyhood friends had become "der Amerikaner," "der Deutsche," and "der Russe." The American (George Fischer) later went to Harvard and became an "establishment" professor of Soviet Studies; the German--Lothar--founded a construction company in West Berlin, profitting--albeit with a guilty conscience--from the postwar economic boom; the "Russian" Konrad Wolf assumed an active role in the construction of the German socialist state, becoming a leading figure in GDR cultural life and eventually president of the *Akademie der Künste*.

Konrad Wolf's work on the troika idea began in 1977, in the aftermath of the Biermann expatriation. It is clear from conversations with Wolf and comments of scriptwriter Angel Wagenstein documented in the book that Wolf intended to present the positions of all three men, without prejudgement. The result, which no doubt would have been highly controversial and may well have languished in the film archives, would have been both a gripping story and an important pre-Gorbachevian contribution to the opening up of GDR society: a critical look at Stalinist society and a juxtaposition of Eastern and Western points of view.

To reconstruct the three *Schnittpunkte*, Markus Wolf evidently worked from notes, photographs, and tape recordings contained in his brother's *schwarze Mappe*. Konrad Wolf's original sketch for the film and some 130 pages of documents are included in the volume, as well as many photographs. One of the most interesting parts of the book is Markus Wolf's epilogue to the volume, in which he discusses Konrad Wolf's last years and his plans for the film, and Konrad's--and his own--views on such important matters as the Biermann expatriation and the cultural upheaval that followed. Given Markus Wolf's shadowy past--until his retirement in 1987 he was head of the espionage division of the GDR's Ministry of State Security, a fact which caused him to go into hiding to avoid arrest after unification--one may, of course, question the credibility of this section (and other undocumented details of the book as well).

Still, as a pre-*Wende* book--it was published in the GDR in March 1989--*Die Troika* contains sufficient information and ideas to have been an impetus for change in the GDR. Markus Wolf's active participation in the fall reform movement is perhaps an indication that he published his brother's film project with this goal in mind. Seen from today's perspective, *Die Troika* belongs to a growing number of recent books by GDR authors that deal with the 1930s in the USSR, such as Trude Richter's *Totgesagt*, Hedda Zinner's *Selbstbefragung*, and Elfriede Brüning's oral history *Lästige Zeugen*. The epilogue, on the other hand, provides some insight into the cultural politics of the late 1970s and early 1980s. Both of these forms of *Vergangenheitsbewältigung*, which should have been part of public discussion much earlier, retain their relevance today as the former socialist state and its citizens are integrated into the Federal Republic.

Margy Gerber
Bowling Green State University

A RESPONSE TO BRENT O. PETERSON

Die inneren Schauplätze des real existierenden Sozialismus. Christoph Heins *Tangospieler*

Carl Niekerk
Washington University

Die Forschung über DDR-Literatur macht eine Legitimationskrise durch. Die DDR und ihre spezifische Gesellschaftsform, durch die DDR-Literatur sich bis jetzt definierte, sind seit der Wende nicht mehr da. Damit entfällt eine--und bis jetzt vermutlich die wichtigste--Möglichkeit, die Beschäftigung mit DDR-Literatur zu legitimieren; es gibt in Europa keine andere, sich vom Westen abgrenzende Gesellschaftsform mehr, die es verdient studiert zu werden. Orientierungslosigkeit wurde in bezug auf die Forschung über DDR-Literatur schon früher konstatiert.[1] Die Frage nach der Legitimation der Beschäftigung mit DDR-Literatur ist eng mit der Frage verknüpft, ob es der Germanistik gelingt, neue Orientierungen und damit verbunden neue Erkenntnisinteressen zu formulieren, die ihre Tätigkeit im Feld der DDR-Literatur rechtfertigen. Diese Problematik möchte ich in polemischer Auseinandersetzung mit einer Kritik zu Christoph Heins Roman *Der Tangospieler*[2] erörtern, die Brent Peterson im letzten Heft des *GDR-Bulletins*[3] veröffentlichte.

"Die Geschichte lehrt, aber sie hat keine Schüler," so heißt es bei Ingeborg Bachmann.[4] Peterson liest Heins *Tangospieler* als Bericht über eine politisch stumpfsinnige und sich sexistisch verhaltende Gestalt, die Hauptfigur Dallow. Er nennt den Roman historisch ("historical"). Dallow ist Historiker. Das Buch artikuliert für Peterson das Scheitern der Verarbeitung der eigenen Vergangenheit, was für ihn symptomatisch für den Umgang mit der Vergangenheit in der ganzen DDR ist. Petersons Endurteil ist eindeutig negativ: er wirft Hein Mangel an moralischer und politischer Relevanz vor und fordert stattdessen untersuchende, nuancierte und unendlich diskutierbare Texte.

Erschöpft Petersons Kritik damit das historische Erkenntnispotential des Textes (auch nur ansatzweise)? Mein Vorschlag geht in eine andere Richtung. *Der Tangospieler* läßt sich als genaue historische Analyse lesen, glaube ich; eine solche Analyse sollte sich aber--um nochmals eine Formel Ingeborg Bachmanns aufzugreifen--auf die "wirklichen Schauplätze, die inwendigen"[5] richten und auf die Frage, wie das, was auf diesen inneren Schauplätzen passiert, von äußeren Umständen, sozialgesellschaftlichen Bedingungen, beeinflußt wird. Der Text konfrontiert uns mit einer Denkaufgabe: vom Leser wird erwartet, Zusammenhänge zwischen inneren und äußeren Schauplätzen herzustellen, inneres Geschehen und äußere Faktoren miteinander zu verbinden.

Ein Beispiel: Dallows Sexismus. Peterson nennt Dallows sexistisches Verhalten unmotiviert ("gratuitous") und betrachtet es als unerklärlich ("inexplicable"), daß Hein nicht mehr Interesse für die Frauen in seinem Text und ihr Leben zeigt als sein Held ("his hero") Dallow. Dallows Verhalten ist tatsächlich eindeutig sexistisch. An der Beziehung zu seiner "Freundin" Elke interessiert ihn nur die Lust, die sie ihm einbringt. An seiner Knastzeit bereut er eigentlich nur, daß er dadurch eine Pyjamaparty verpaßt hat. Die Idylle auf der Insel Hiddensee besteht vor allem darin, daß er mit möglichst vielen Mädchen schläft. Auf welche Weise ist Dallows Verhalten--sein Sexismus--gesellschaftlich fundiert? Dallows Sexismus läßt sich durchaus mit dem Sexismus eines de Sade vergleichen. Ein kalkulierendes, unterwerfendes und leistungsorientiertes Verhältnis zum Geschlechtlichen ist, wie Horkheimer und Adorno in ihren Überlegungen zum Werke de Sades[6] zeigen, nichts als die Konsequenz einer Vernunft, die sich nur auf Beherrschung, Organisation und Verwaltung beschränkt, die ausschließlich leistungsorientiert ist und deshalb als "instrumentelle Vernunft" bezeichnet wird. Dieser Zusammenhang, den Horkheimer und Adorno an den Werken Kants, de Sades und Nietzsches nachweisen, wird in Heins *Tangospieler* für die DDR-Wirklichkeit demonstriert. Dallow wird dauernd mit Anforderungen eines leistungsorientierten Denkens konfrontiert: bei seiner Familie, bei seiner "Freundin" Elke, in seinen Gesprächen mit Schulze und Müller. Dallow widersetzt sich dem Zwang eines solchen Denkens. Er wählt die Existenz eines Arbeitslosen. Der Zwang kehrt aber wieder, wo er ihn nicht erwartet: in seinen Beziehungen zu Frauen.

Dallows Sexismus ist sicher verwerflich, jedoch erklärbar vor dem Hintergrund seiner sozialgesellschaftlichen Konditionierung. Dasselbe gilt für andere Aspekte seiner Biographie, sein Scheitern als Historiker, sein politisches Desinteresse. Es ist deshalb problematisch, den Text als eindeutige Verurteilung der Hauptfigur zu lesen. Peterson behauptet in Anlehnung an den mit dem "New Historicism" assoziierten Theoretiker Hayden White, die Linearität der Handlung--Anfang, Mitte, Ende--impliziere ein moralisches Urteil ("moral judgment," "moralizing certainty"), konkret: eine Verurteilung Dallows. Eine solche Behauptung ist auf Treibsand gebaut; man könnte sehr wohl argumentieren, daß *die Struktur der Handlung zirkulär oder spiralförmig ist*. Das Ende der Geschichte führt uns zurück zu einem Punkt vor dem Anfang, zu Dallows bevorstehender Beförderung zum Dozenten. (Die Handlung der Erzählung beschreibt also die Hälfte eines Kreises.) Ein neuer Kreis fängt an mit einer neuen Hauptfigur: Roessler wird von seinem Amt suspendiert. Kreis oder Spirale visualisieren eine Wiederkehr des Gleichen, aus dem niemand als moralischer Sieger