Introduction

'The Wall must go!' was one of the most arresting slogans of November 1989, and arguably of the twentieth century. The concrete scar across Berlin's cityscape came to define world politics, provoking repeated calls for its destruction. Its demolition in the early 1990s was almost unanimously greeted with enthusiasm by politicians, residents and town planners; this hated Cold War edifice was finally to disappear, allowing Germany's new capital city to look to the future. Yet in March 2013, a chorus of demonstrators at Berlin's East Side Gallery chanted 'The Wall must stay!', angered by the removal of a section of wall from one of few remaining historic sites. One protestor highlighted the historical irony of the situation, inscribing onto its concrete base an evocative plea to Berlin's mayor: 'Mr Wowereit – don't tear down this wall'.[1] The removal activity, sanctioned by the district council, enabled access to a building site between the wall and the river Spree, on which a luxury high-rise apartment block was to be constructed. Protesters objected not only to the damage caused to what has become a valuable historical document and unintended monument to the Cold War, but also to the plans to build a high-rise development in the former death strip, which could potentially dwarf the wall and belittle its historical importance. Revelations about the investor's involvement with the Stasi in the 1980s added further grist to the protesters' mill, and brought an extra layer of moral complexity to one of many recent East German memory debates.

As with other controversies in Berlin and the eastern *Länder*, this debate highlights the ever-present tensions between the shifting demands of past and present in the contemporary eastern German

landscape. Despite the increasing tendency of recent years to use the term 'site' to refer to non-spatial domains of memory, especially since Pierre Nora's seminal work *Les Lieux de Mémoire*, the built environment remains central to questions of memory and remembrance.[2] One need only recall the 9/11 memorial in New York and the Holocaust memorial in Berlin as recent examples of sites that have become central to a nation's self-understanding. Whereas the centres of European towns and cities in medieval and early modern times were marked by the construction of cathedrals and castles, one could argue that monuments and memorials have taken on this role today.[3] In contrast, the felling of statues of Saddam Hussein in Baghdad or Stalin in Ukraine demonstrates the extent to which concrete structures can come to symbolize entire regimes and provoke highly emotional responses. As this book demonstrates, however, monuments can become invested with multiple meanings and memories that are often far from intended at the moment of their construction.

Physical structures particularly acted as tangible sites and repositories of memory in former East Germany, where the socialist regime placed great importance on monuments and urban space in order to promote a collective socialist consciousness and a cohesive East German identity.[4] Since the demise of the German Democratic Republic (GDR), however, not only have the futures of many such structures become disputed, but new memorial projects have challenged accepted norms and historical narratives. A project in 2011 to erect stelae to victims of the border regime between the GDR and West Berlin, for instance, caused consternation in the village of Sacrow, a quiet suburb on the outskirts of Potsdam, where one victim had also been an unofficial collaborator (IM) for the Stasi. While this compromised his status as a 'victim' in the eyes of some, the project forced residents to rethink any clear-cut divides between the concepts of victimhood and perpetration. Similar questions also surfaced at Buchenwald, where the use of the site first as a Nazi concentration camp and then as a Soviet special camp caused numerous memorial controversies and conflicting understandings of victimhood. At the other end of the spectrum, however, efforts to commemorate the demonstrations of 1989 in concrete form on former East German territory have raised concerns over the potential dangers of heroization, particularly given the monumental socialist realist structures that formerly scattered the GDR landscape. In all such cases, it is the desire to create physical markers to the past, thus sites of memory in the truest sense of the word, that has caused debate and historical re-evaluation in the present. It is this process that forms the subject of this book.

As this introduction demonstrates, the broader context of GDR remembrance is complex and constantly shifting; there are few places where the past impinges on the present quite as much as in contemporary Germany. In this recently reunified nation, twentieth-century history bears heavily on domestic and international policy-making, as well as on the media landscape, cultural production and the built environment. The early 2000s saw a significant increase in the consumption of popular culture that draws on this history: historical films such as *Der Untergang* (*Downfall*, 2004), *Das Leben der Anderen* (*The Lives of Others*, 2006), *Der Baader Meinhof Komplex* (*The Baader Meinhof Complex*, 2008) and *Sophie Scholl – Die letzten Tage* (*Sophie Scholl – The Final Days*, 2005) became box office hits and were awarded prestigious prizes; TV films, dramas and series, otherwise dubbed 'histotainments', such as *Der Tunnel* (*The Tunnel*, 2001), *Die Mauer – Berlin '61* (*The Wall – Berlin '61*, 2006), *Speer und Er* (*Speer and Hitler*, 2005), *Unsere Mütter, unsere Väter* (*Generation War*, 2013) and *Deutschland '83* (2015) saw soaring viewing quotas; autobiographical memoirs topped bestseller lists; and historical exhibitions drew crowds through museum doors. This preoccupation with the past found expression above all in the so-called 'super commemorative year' of 2009,[5] in which numerous anniversaries fell together: twenty years of the fall of the Berlin Wall, sixty years of the Basic Law, seventy years since the start of the Second World War, and ninety years of the Weimar Constitution – not to speak of 160 years of the Frankfurt Constitution. Not only did this unleash a 'medial Tsunami',[6] but it saw Germany host several large-scale commemorative events, in which there was apparently genuine public interest and participation.

The twenty-year celebrations of the fall of the Berlin Wall on 9 November 2009 highlighted above all the significance of the changing physical landscape, with the high point of the evening being marked by the toppling of one thousand giant painted domino stones along part of the former course of the Wall – an area between Potsdamer Platz and the Spree that had changed beyond recognition in twenty years. It is, indeed, in the cityscape that the recent past – or its absence – is most immediately notable, and urban land has often become a battleground for different groups attempting either to overcome a 'divided memory' or to remember specific elements of this past.[7] As Rudy Koshar states, 'Reunification was not only a process of economic and political synchronization but also a struggle over symbols'.[8] Since the changes of 1989/90, Germany has thus witnessed impassioned battles not only over the GDR legacy, but also over elements of the National Socialist past, sites of which have been freed from entrenched Cold War positions. In

Berlin, the rededication of the *Neue Wache* (New Guardhouse) memorial, the building of the Memorial to the Murdered Jews of Europe, the development of the Topography of Terror exhibition on the former site of the SS and Gestapo headquarters, the demolition of the Palast der Republik (Palace of the Republic, the GDR's parliament building), the survival of socialist realist monuments and the proposals for a Freedom and Unity Monument have all filled endless pages of print, and represent only the tip of the iceberg. Other unexpected projects have also aroused a renewed interest in the intersection between art, politics and memory. Building work on a new underground station in central Berlin in 2010, for example, uncovered a considerable number of statues and sculptures that had been buried since the Second World War. As examples of 'degenerate art', spurned and banned in Nazi Germany, they gained heightened recognition, reminding us of the potentially huge political power of art.[9] Other contemporary projects have provoked considerable interest. Concept artist Christo's 'wrapping' of the Reichstag building in 1995, for instance, attracted millions of visitors, making this history-laden building – and future united parliament – paradoxically more visible through its veiling than it had been for years previously. Art projects in and around the Reichstag have also attempted to symbolize the basis of unification: Hans Haacke's installation *Der Bevölkerung* (to the population) in a courtyard of the Reichstag, and Dani Karavan's construction *Grundgesetz 49* (Basic Law 49) on the Spree promenade, for instance, both emphasize the democratic credentials of united Germany, the former deliberately providing a contrast to the inscription *Dem deutschen Volke* (to the German people) on the front of the Reichstag building.[10]

While much attention continues to be focused on Germany's difficult past, such installations suggest that a certain degree of 'normalization' is being achieved, in which identification with the German nation can be positive, while historical responsibility is not forgotten.[11] The seventieth anniversary events of the end of the Second World War, for instance, were not as contentious as those of the fiftieth anniversary, the Holocaust is increasingly being put in perspective alongside other experiences from that period (see below), and a monument erected in 2009 to the Bundeswehr in Berlin – although controversial – would have been unthinkable twenty years previously. Similarly, the proposed Freedom and Unity Monument in Berlin (discussed in Chapter 6) marks an evident break in the tradition of monuments to German shame, seeking to commemorate instead civil courage, freedom and unity. While some interpret the 'normalizing' process to mark a less sustained interest in memory,[12] others see it as indicative of the shift

from embodied communicative memories to institutionalized cultural memories, the latter maintaining less 'emotional resonance'.[13] What, then, of GDR memory, where the actors of history are still very present? Has this, too, been subject to 'normalization'? To what extent does this past compete with that of the National Socialist period for our attention today, and how does this manifest itself in the memorial landscape?

Memory Debates and the Built Environment since Unification

Our understanding of the GDR's material legacy must be placed within the broader context of German memory debates since unification, and specifically those that relate to the built environment. Four key areas raise significant questions for this book, and are notable for the fact that they all relate to the National Socialist past, yet also impact on the way in which the GDR is remembered today. The first and most important of these is the way in which unification changed the terms of official memory of National Socialism in both East and West, and placed it within a new context. While German division ensured that each side could regard itself as morally superior and view the other half as a continuation of National Socialism, unification meant that there was no longer a scapegoat: unified Germany as a whole had to take responsibility for the National Socialist past. The West German notion of *Vergangenheitsbewältigung* (mastering the past) increasingly lost currency, in favour of other terms, most notably *Aufarbeitung der Vergangenheit* (working through the past), a term to which Adorno gave preference in his famous 1959 lecture.[14] The shift in public discourse denoted a growing sense of attempting to come to terms with the past through critical self-engagement, rather than the idea of laying it to rest or, as Adorno saw it, silencing the past. The 1990s witnessed a surge of debates and controversies over the National Socialist past, ranging from the reception of Daniel Goldhagen's book *Hitler's Willing Executioners* and the controversial exhibition 'Crimes of the Wehrmacht', to heated debates over author Martin Walser's acceptance speech for the German Booksellers Association's Peace Prize, and deliberations over the Bundeswehr's active involvement in the Kosovo conflict.[15]

However, if unification caused a new sense of responsibility towards the past, it also brought with it two problems. First, how was the new Germany to be built on the foundations of shame for past injustices? As James Young writes, 'no other nation has ever attempted to re-unite itself on the bedrock memory of its crimes or to make commemoration of its crimes the topographical centre of gravity in its capital'.[16] To

a certain extent, Helmut Kohl attempted to bring together east and west in a common experience of totalitarian rule in the *Neue Wache* memorial, dedicated in 1993 as Germany's 'national memorial to victims of war and tyranny'. Although there are references to specific victim groups on the text outside the building, the general dedication remembers all victims together – whether, for example, of Nazism, of expulsion from Eastern territories after the war, of Stalinism or of socialism.[17] This highlights the second problem: to what extent should the GDR dictatorship and the National Socialist regime be placed alongside each other? References to Germany's 'double past', or the GDR as the 'second German dictatorship' naturally encourage such comparisons, and while the equation of the Third Reich with the GDR no longer serves the same political function as during division, it can still serve the purpose of devaluing socialist thinking and placing Nazi crimes within a broader European context. Yet, as Claus Leggewie and Erik Meyer state, 'only the comparison could clear up proportions', namely the fact that the crimes of the GDR's leadership were without doubt lesser than those of National Socialism.[18] Indeed, historians are largely of the view that with the passage of time it is still the 'first' dictatorship that has retained most historical focus and commemorative weight in the public domain.[19] This is evidenced by negotiations at some physical sites of memory where conflicts over a 'double past' cannot be avoided, as seen most prominently at Buchenwald Memorial Site (examined in Chapter 3), where a hierarchy of memory is central to its memorial concept. It is, however, the so-called 'Faulenbach formula', after historian Bernd Faulenbach, that is frequently referenced as the standard model for remembering Germany's 'double past', and which attempts to avoid any sense of hierarchy. This is seen above all in the *Gedenkstättenkonzeption* (Memorial Sites Concept) of 2008 and the earlier findings of the Bundestag's second 'special enquiry commission' (see below), which concluded: 'Nazi crimes should not be relativized as a result of addressing the crimes of Stalinism. Stalinist crimes should not be trivialized through reference to Nazi crimes'.[20] This question of comparison and equation is clearly most important at sites where the two pasts lie side by side, such as at Buchenwald, but this book demonstrates its significance for the development of GDR memorials – and GDR remembrance – more broadly, with numerous case studies revealing the entangled memory of these two pasts.

The second key area relating to memory debates since unification concerns an intensification and institutionalization of memory of the Holocaust, one that began in the Federal Republic of Germany (FRG) during the 1980s, but which gained strength during the 1990s. While

this can be witnessed in an increasing number of annual commemorative days, such as 27 January (marking the liberation of Auschwitz, which officially became a national day of remembrance in 1996), the intensification of Holocaust remembrance is above all evident in the physical landscape. Berlin, for instance, has not only witnessed high-profile projects such as Daniel Libeskind's Jewish Museum and Peter Eisenman's Memorial to the Murdered Jews of Europe (hereafter referred to as the Holocaust memorial), but a range of other monuments commemorating different persecuted groups, such as homosexuals, euthanasia victims and Sinti and Roma, as well as historical events such as the book burnings of 1933 (Micha Ullmann's 'Library'), the introduction of anti-Jewish laws in the 1930s (Renata Stih and Frieder Schnock's 'Places of Remembrance') and sites of deportation such as Grunewald station (Karol Broniatowski's 'Platform 17'). Outside Berlin, many other cities have also witnessed the erection of monuments to local victims and events, such as Munich (Ulla von Brandenburg's 'Monument to Lesbians and Gays Persecuted during National Socialism'), Frankfurt am Main (Heiner Blum's 'Wollheim-Memorial') and Duisburg (Gerhard Losemann's 'Deportation Memorial'). The proliferation of such projects, and in particular the extended debates over Berlin's Holocaust memorial, has led to the widely recognized argument that no single, central memorial will ever be able to represent the Holocaust in its entirety. Moreover, this is undesirable, for it would create a sense of finality and closure. The centrality of Holocaust remembrance in Berlin has, however, also led to criticism that the 'Holocaust industry' is tailored to tourism as much as to the demands of memory; indeed, Chancellor Schröder's much-cited comment in 1998 that the memorial should be a place where Germans 'like to go' caused much controversy.[21] Inevitably, such issues have influenced commemorative activities relating to other pasts, and as this book shows, questions of centrality, an over-abundance of memorials, the difficult combination of pleasure and commemoration, and the demands of tourism are all issues that challenge concrete memory of the GDR. Some projects, such as the temporary Freedom Memorial erected near the former site of Checkpoint Charlie, or the planned Freedom and Unity Monument in central Berlin, have indeed encouraged direct comparison with the Holocaust memorial, and can, to some extent, be seen as a response to the centrality of Holocaust remembrance (see Chapters 5 and 6).

Holocaust-centred memory appears to have dominated to a lesser extent from the mid-2000s, since other memories relating to the war and immediate post-war period have re-emerged. This change has been identified by Langenbacher, Niven and Wittlinger as a 'paradigm

shift', in which memories of German suffering and the period of division have found renewed resonance.[22] Above all, memory of German victimhood has found intensified expression, for as Niven states, growing distance from the Cold War means that German suffering may now be expressed as 'an existential experience – and without being bound up in political functionalisation'.[23] Indeed, such memories may have been labelled as 'nationalist' or 'revisionist' two decades earlier.[24] Although Kohl's *Neue Wache* project already placed victimhood in the foreground in the early 1990s, it was not until later, under Schröder's governments – which placed more emphasis on German perpetration and Jewish victimhood – that the public sphere appropriated the theme of German victimhood more fully.[25] The two main themes to emerge were Allied bombing and expulsion, both of which marked the return of a memory that was culturally hegemonic in the early post-war decades.[26] The former was symbolized by Jörg Friedrich's 2003 bestseller *Der Brand* (*The Fire*), which was serialized in the tabloid newspaper *Bild* and described the Allied bombing campaigns not only in emotive language, but also in terms usually reserved for the Holocaust.[27] Subsequent documentaries, numerous local publications and commemorative events in heavily bombed cities such as Dresden and Hamburg also raised the profile of Germans' plight during this period, and subsequently triggered several monument proposals.[28] The theme of the flight and expulsion of Germans from eastern territories during or after the end of the war was foregrounded above all by Günter Grass's 2002 bestselling novel *Im Krebsgang* (*Crabwalk*), on the sinking of a ship carrying Germans fleeing the Red Army in January 1945,[29] and a long and controversial campaign initiated by the League of Expellees to construct a Centre against Expulsions in Berlin.[30] Renewed memories of German victimhood during the war have, needless to say, cleared the way for other experiences of suffering, namely those connected to division and socialist rule. The republication of the anonymous diary *Eine Frau in Berlin* (*A Woman in Berlin*) in 2003, depicting a woman's experiences of rape during the Red Army's occupation of Berlin in 1945, and its subsequent adaptation into a film in 2008, provides one such example.[31] Other experiences of victimhood include those in the hands of the NKVD (Soviet secret police), the SED (Socialist Unity Party of Germany) and the Stasi, as well as victims of the GDR's border regime (as discussed in Chapters 3 and 5). The recent 'paradigm shift' has also, however, significantly blurred the boundaries between victims and perpetrators; while commemoration of victims may have increased, so too has the recognition that many Germans may, at different times, have been both. This book

demonstrates that memorialization of the GDR is increasingly contributing to the blurring of such boundaries, and that understandings of the East German regime are moving towards a more complex and less black and white picture.

The final key theme concerning recent German memory debates is the role of Berlin as the united nation's new capital, and particularly the way in which the urban landscape has showcased the concept of *Aufarbeitung*. During division, Berlin clearly held a special position as a divided city, and the display of power through architecture was no new concept, with the GDR's Television Tower, for example, representing the height of architectural prowess in 1969. The 750th anniversary of Berlin in 1987 also saw efforts on both sides to outdo each other, particularly in the East, where the showcasing of Berlin attempted to draw attention away from the dilapidated state of provincial towns.[32] Since unification, however, Berlin has attracted almost unrivalled international attention from architects, artists and town planners, and Andrew Webber suggests that it was the 'capital of the twentieth century', following Benjamin's similar claim for Paris in the nineteenth century.[33] Having previously been the stage of world conflict, the city is now challenged with reconfiguring and reimagining itself as the capital of a new, united Germany, and constructing a more 'normalized' cultural imaginary in the wake of four decades of division and two twentieth-century dictatorships. As the largest building site in Europe, the city authorities even marketed Berlin's *Baustellen* (building sites) as *Schaustellen* (viewing/exhibition sites) between 1995 and 2005, attracting thousands of visitors each year. In the words of its former mayor, Eberhard Diepgen, the city was – and still is – the 'workshop of German unity'.[34] However, the focus on Berlin brings with it two problems. First, the large influx of monuments and memory markers can have the result of diluting their effect and discouraging real engagement with the past; as Andreas Huyssen writes, 'The more monuments there are, the more the past becomes invisible, and the easier it is to forget: redemption, thus, through forgetting'.[35] Any new monuments – some of which are examined in this book – must thus be carefully placed amidst this increasingly cluttered landscape. Moreover, as this book argues, they are likely to respond to existing structures in numerous ways, and become bound up in a network of mnemonic meaning. Second, the focus on Berlin means that little attention has been paid to regional debates since unification, or indeed the relationship between Berlin and the regions.[36] As this book demonstrates, this relationship has become increasingly important in shaping the commemorative landscape of eastern Germany in recent years.

'Working Through' the GDR Past

The broader memory landscape of united Germany provides the essential context for understanding the memorialization of the GDR. The changing political and social landscape of eastern Germany more specifically, however, has presented the immediate impetus for many memorial projects, which not only become embedded in the extensive process of 'working through' the GDR past, but may also provide a means of *Aufarbeitung* themselves. Needless to say, this process is highly complex, and memory of the GDR provides a curious conundrum. On the one hand, research in the field experienced such a boom after 1989 that the extent of the secondary literature is overwhelming; as Wolfgang Thierse states, 'There is no other dictatorship in world history that has been researched so quickly and so thoroughly'.[37] On the other hand, however, there is still little agreement on the place that the GDR should occupy in the memory culture of the Federal Republic, and although the debates of the early 1990s – in which totalitarian paradigms of power and repression were pitted against social history approaches – have become less politically charged, there remains no single historical paradigm.[38] Instead, as historian Martin Sabrow suggested in 2009, the GDR has become a 'battlefield of memories', in which the voices fighting for specific interpretations of the GDR have been much louder and more varied than was ever the case in the first twenty years after the Nazi dictatorship.[39] The numerous media available today doubtless play a role here, for not only are the voices of professional historians and public figures to be heard through official channels, but those of individuals and a wide variety of interest groups are made public through online presences and social media, as well as through popular publications and the mass media; multiple fora allow for a multitude of competing memories. Despite this apparent plethora of voices, popular images of the GDR all too often become polarized into two extremes: on the one hand the grey, uniform police state marked by control and repression, and on the other hand the happy, colourful collective in which employment and social security maintained communal values. All too infrequently are the two connected in the public sphere, and despite the efforts of academics to complicate the picture through studies of everyday life, and through notions such as the 'welfare dictatorship' (Konrad Jarausch) or the 'participatory dictatorship' (Mary Fulbrook), it is rare that such terms are discussed in the media, let alone appropriated by the population at large.[40]

Official, government-led efforts to 'work through' the GDR past have, unsurprisingly, focused largely on control and repression, yet they also reflect the political colours of the ruling coalition. The findings of the Bundestag's first special enquiry commission to examine the East German past (Enquete-Kommission zur 'Aufarbeitung von Geschichte und Folgen der SED-Diktatur in Deutschland', 1992–94) thus served to establish, in Molly Andrews' terms, a 'didactic public history',[41] in which the totalitarian past was used to counter the democratic present.[42] This was perhaps little surprise, given that the commission was dominated by West German experts, members of the CDU/CSU, and members of the GDR's citizens' rights movement, all of whom held an inevitably critical perspective on the GDR. While the second parliamentary commission (Enquete-Kommission 'Überwindung der Folgen der SED-Diktatur im Prozess der deutschen Einheit', 1995–98) was to focus to a greater extent on stories 'from below', it clearly still served to legitimize the contemporary status quo and the politics of the ruling CDU/CSU-FDP coalition (1990–98). One of its direct outcomes was the creation of the Bundesstiftung zur Aufarbeitung der SED-Diktatur (Federal Foundation for the Reappraisal of the SED Dictatorship), which has received substantial financial backing to help rehabilitate former victims of the regime, and to promote research, exhibitions, events and political education on the GDR. Alongside centrally funded museums, its role in strengthening present institutions through the examination of the past is clear. In contrast, an 'expert commission' led by historian Martin Sabrow was appointed by the SPD-Green coalition government (1998–2005) in 2005 to examine the different institutions involved in GDR *Aufarbeitung* and to make recommendations on a decentrally organized network (*Geschichtsverbund*) of such institutions. The commission's report of 2006 unleashed an intensive debate, for although it criticized the 'trivialization of the GDR', it also advocated – among other things – a state-funded museum that would examine everyday life in the GDR dictatorship. The report concluded that the commission hoped its recommendations would set 'new standards for a plural and multi-perspective *Aufarbeitung* of German history in a "century of extremes"'.[43] While critics accused the commission of belittling the GDR and promoting a homeopathic version of the SED dictatorship,[44] it was a clear attempt to go beyond black and white portrayals of the GDR, and to encourage more serious engagement with the daily workings of the dictatorship. Interestingly, however, a new CDU-SPD coalition was in government by the time the report was published, and the Minister for Culture, Bernd Neumann (CDU), was keen to distance himself from it. Clearly, politics has a significant influence over the interpretation of the past.

This is perhaps nowhere more evident than in the debates concerning the role of the successor party to the SED, Die Linke (until 2007 the Party of Democratic Socialism, PDS), which continues to find support in the eastern *Länder*, much to the consternation of the centre-right. Its role as a coalition partner in a number of regional governments – in particular Berlin – has raised concerns that the process of 'reworking' the past is not always given adequate priority. Indeed, the party's opposition to numerous projects concerning the concrete legacy of the GDR – such as the rebuilding of the Prussian City Palace on the site of the former Palast der Republik, the Memorial Sites Concept concerning Germany's 'double past', and the Freedom and Unity Monument – has only confirmed this view in the eyes of its opponents, who see the party to be obstructing a reworking of the past.[45] However, the party has often gained support in the eastern *Länder* as a protest party, for after the initial euphoria of unification wore off, rising unemployment in the region, the loss of certain social benefits and services, as well as a large influx of managers, university professors and other such top-level professionals from the West caused a growing divide between east and west. A sense of colonization – or 'Kohl-onization' – of the east, particularly in the early years, led some to feel like 'second class citizens' and the common usage of derogatory terms such as *Ossis* (easterners) and *Wessis* (westerners) suggested the persistence of a much-cited 'wall in the head'.[46]

Alongside the world of politics, changing attitudes towards the GDR have been particularly evident in the cultural sphere since unification. The early 1990s, for example, were dominated by vociferous debates over the ideological complicity of GDR writers and intellectuals – triggered by the publication of Christa Wolf's *Was bleibt* (*What Remains*, 1990) and widely known as the *Literaturstreit* (quarrel over literature)[47] – as well as subsequent revelations over the alleged activity of some writers, such as Wolf, Sascha Anderson and Heiner Müller, as IMs for the Stasi. The later 1990s and early 2000s, however, saw the growth of a more light-hearted, and often ironic, engagement with the GDR past, typified above all by the phenomenon of *Ostalgie*, a conflation of the German words for 'East' and 'nostalgia'. While this could be seen in literary and filmic portrayals of the past – with box office hits such as *Sonnenallee* (*Sun Alley*, 1999) and *Good Bye, Lenin!* (2003) – it was also evident in the 'comeback' of a range of GDR consumer goods, TV shows, board games, popular publications and humorous glossaries, the iconization of symbols such as the *Trabi* and the *Ampelmännchen* (the GDR's infamous Trabant car and the East German traffic light man), as well as GDR-themed shops, pubs, nightclub evenings, and even a

themed hotel in Berlin named the Ostel.[48] While many critics deplored such developments as *Schönfärberei* (whitewashing the past) and endangering a true engagement with the realities of life in the GDR, others have been keen to point out that *Ostalgie* is not necessarily a form of identification with the GDR state per se, or indeed an obsession with this past, but it may rather demonstrate a sense of oppositional solidarity in the present, itself becoming an embattled site of memory in which individual experiences and biographies seek legitimacy.[49] Recent years have seen the growth of a younger generation of east German authors such as Jakob Hein, Jana Hensel and Claudia Rusch, all of whom have drawn on their own experiences of childhood in the east. In contrast to the earlier, more commercial *Ostalgie*, much of their work rather portrays the 'normality' of adolescence in the GDR, for example by interweaving references to the Stasi with humorous recollections of the everyday. The concept of 'normality' is one that has proved fruitful in research terms, as well as in increasing numbers of museum exhibitions that explore aspects of the GDR *Alltag* (everyday experience), for it allows recognition of the fact that the experience of 'normal' life in the GDR does not necessarily match up to western expectations of such.[50] As Paul Cooke highlights, 'inner unity' does not mean homogeneity,[51] thus growing recognition of biographical differences and experiences can only aid the unification project.

Attempts to reckon with the GDR legacy have, of course, been particularly evident in the physical landscape of eastern Germany. Some of the first efforts to do so symbolically concerned the renaming of streets, a decision made by local councils in the early post-*Wende* years.[52] Local authorities were also responsible for making decisions over whether monuments, memorials and commemorative plaques from the GDR should remain or be removed, and while many such decisions were made in the early years, numerous debates continued into the 2000s, only to be resolved almost twenty years after unification (see Chapter 2). Debates over GDR architecture were represented above all by the battle over the aforementioned Palast der Republik, which was finally completely demolished in 2008, in order to make space for a reconstruction of Berlin's City Palace.[53] As an emblem of state socialism, yet also representative of mass culture – housing restaurants, a bowling alley, a theatre and a large hall, at which numerous national and international artists had performed – the Palast became highly symbolic of the debate that pitted preservation against demolition. The complexity of this site was heightened not only because its future was also bound up with the reconstruction of a Prussian palace, and thus the attempt to create continuity with an older past, but also because it was appropriated for

creative art projects and displays before its demolition, making it truly a 'palace of the people'. Further high-profile debates concerning the physical legacy of the GDR have included the government's Memorial Sites Concept, originally drawn up in 1999 and revised in 2008 (see Chapter 3) and the Berlin Senate's *Gesamtkonzept zur Erinnerung an die Berliner Mauer* (Integrated Concept for Memory of the Berlin Wall) of 2006, which aimed to coordinate a decentralized memory landscape in Berlin relating to remnants of the Berlin Wall (see Chapter 5).[54]

With the passing of time, however, public debates concerning the built environment have begun to move away from questions concerning the destruction or preservation of GDR heritage towards those of construction: how should the GDR past be remembered through new commemorative structures? Here the memorial landscape differs significantly from that of the broader cultural sphere, for it predominantly highlights instances of state injustice or efforts to resist it. Thus, although the GDR *Alltag* has become a common feature of many national and regional museums – most notably Berlin's DDR Museum – it is thematized in very few monuments, the best-known example being Berthold Dietz's Trabant Monument in Zwickau, where the iconic GDR car was produced. Reception of this privately funded initiative has, however, been mixed, with critics viewing it as little more than an 'ostalgic fan project',[55] and in 2014 it was moved from its public town centre location to the grounds of the town's automobile museum, further out of town and protected from frequent graffiti attacks. Clearly, representations of the *Alltag* – especially those that may be regarded as ostalgic – prove controversial in symbolic concrete form, where contextual or interpretative media may be missing. In contrast, recent years have seen a growing number of plaques and monuments in memory of victims of the SED dictatorship, often marking the sites of former prisons or Stasi headquarters. One of the most striking examples is Sibylle Mania and Martin Neubert's Monument to the Victims of the Communist Dictatorship in Jena, located near the former building of the region's Stasi headquarters, where piles of archive boxes are cast in concrete, symbolizing not only the extensive administrative structures of the Stasi and its violation of victims' human rights through extensive surveillance, but also the challenges that face victims and their families in unified Germany. Other contemporary memorials to victims of state oppression commonly relate to the uprisings of 17 June 1953 and the GDR border regime (see Chapters 4 and 5); while such monuments have often proven controversial, it is notable that they continue a (Western and unified) tradition of memorialization that stresses German crimes of the past. It is for this reason that recent monuments in memory of the demonstrations of 1989

and German unity (see Chapter 6) have frequently provoked heightened debate, for they denote a move away from a memorial culture of regret to one that rather celebrates the achievements of recent German history. Discussions over Berlin's Freedom and Unity Monument, for example, have been ongoing for nearly twenty years, and despite the awarding of a final prize winner in April 2011, it still – at the time of writing in 2017 – remains to be built. Memorialization of the GDR has thus brought Germany to mnemonic crossroads, at which the well-trodden route of commemorating national crimes meets a new path of celebrating more positive achievements. As this book demonstrates, the decisions over future directions have not proven easy.

Whether in politics, culture or the built environment, the number of official, government-funded institutions and projects, as well as independent, commercial or community initiatives whose mission it is to represent elements of the GDR past is overwhelming today, yet their missions are not uniquely about memory. For some it is about recognition, while for others it may be about political influence, moral standing or even financial gain; as Wolfgang Thierse states, 'Scientific institutions, foundations, initiatives and memorial sites battle over the apportionment of the "*Aufarbeitung* cake"'.[56] While it is crucial not to lose sight of such motivations, it is also important to remember that these debates have changed over time. Sabrow identifies growing conflict in recent years to arise from the beginnings of a shift from embodied communicative to culturally codified memory, in which lived experience of the GDR can no longer be taken for granted; he claims that 'the GDR is increasingly disappearing from our natural world of experience. It has transformed into a place of projection, and has consequently become – in a literal sense – more questionable and more contested'.[57] Interestingly, this view contradicts Langenbacher's aforementioned argument that memory of Nazism is becoming less controversial as it passes into cultural form, a view which, since the mid 2000s, does seem to hold water. How, then, should we interpret the passing of time and its effect on memory? Does this depend on the subject matter and the media through which memory is transmitted, or does the cusp between 'communicative' and 'cultural' memory (discussed in Chapter 1) also prove influential?

A Shifting Memorial Culture

In light of the above discussions, this book examines processes of historical re-evaluation since 1990 through a range of monuments and

memorials relating to the GDR. Despite East German writer Stefan Heym's famous comment in 1990 that the GDR would become little more than a 'footnote in world history', its legacy continues to occupy a prominent place in the remembrance landscape of many eastern German cities. While symbolic reminders of the past adopt numerous forms in the built environment, ranging from street names and residential buildings to flagship architecture and traffic signals, this book concentrates on deliberate memorial structures, and examines both the creation of new monuments since 1990 and the decision-making processes concerning older socialist structures. The focus on monuments to the exclusion of museums and other memorial media allows for an in-depth examination of this genre and sustained reflection on the way in which memorial forms develop over time. Moreover, as symbolic – rather than functional – structures, they tend to become crystallization points of contemporary political and social concerns, thus functioning as useful prisms through which to view the process of *Aufarbeitung*. The case studies in this book thus shed light on two key areas: the contemporary negotiation of eastern German identities and the dynamics of collective memory and memorialization.

With reference to the first of these, this book demonstrates not only the continuing importance of GDR remembrance in united Germany, but also the role of monuments in aiding local communities to work through difficult pasts. In particular, a number of case studies highlight the role of 'memory activists', individuals who steer a project from its inception through to construction and beyond, with the aim of creating a lasting tradition of memory. Interestingly, many of the memory activists in this book are of a similar generation, having demonstrated for the overthrow of the SED regime in 1989; as such, we see the importance of individual biographies and lived experience in the shaping of the memorial landscape today. Perhaps ironically, this is not dissimilar to patterns witnessed in the early GDR, when memorialization was led by figures who had been active in the antifascist resistance movement. This book thus highlights a number of continuities with GDR memorialization, as well as identifying new memorial patterns and themes. In particular, it asks whether certain historical narratives of the GDR are emerging as more dominant than others in collective remembrance, and why. While it may be too early to speak of a 'canon' of GDR remembrance, the following chapters highlight not only a clustering around a select number of key dates, but also the importance of 1989 as an underlying leitmotif in the construction – and destruction – of monuments. Fundamental to this is the importance of demonstrating democratic narratives in the present, in contrast to

the SED dictatorship of the past. Such narratives play out not only in the history of 1989, but also through competition rubrics, efforts to ensure transparent processes, public discussion forums and resulting memorial forms. Moreover, projects that have grown from within a community – rather than being imposed from above – have generally also gained greater acceptance. The emphasis on democracy is thus seeing an increasingly complex and diverse memorial landscape, which challenges commonly accepted narratives. This is particularly evident concerning the interplay between Berlin and the regions, for commemorative activities have been especially prominent in Berlin, in order to help establish the city as Germany's new united capital. However, as other towns and regions seek to put their own histories on the commemorative map, the centrality of some narratives, such as the fall of the Berlin Wall, are beginning to be increasingly challenged. Through the inclusion of regional examples, this book thus also seeks to redress the balance of extant studies, which largely focus on the structures of memory in Berlin.

Second, this book seeks to demonstrate the highly dynamic nature of memory and commemorative practices, and in so doing, shows that existing models of memory (discussed in Chapter 1) relating to memorial structures are often too static in nature. In particular, it highlights the limitations of viewing the built environment as a palimpsest, in which the interaction between different 'layers' of history is largely overlooked. Similarly, the findings show that instances of cultural memory are always subject to the interventions of lived, communicative memory, thus suggesting a much more complex understanding of memory dynamics than is commonly accepted. Indeed, this book contends that we must understand memorial sites within their broader perspective – both diachronically and synchronically – if we are to uncover the complex layers and interconnections at play. On a diachronic level, it pursues the interplay between previous memorial traditions and contemporary structures dedicated to the GDR. Two particular traditions are notable here: the development of a countermemorial aesthetic originating from Holocaust memorial designs from the 1980s onwards, and the tradition of GDR socialist realist monuments (both of which are examined in more detail in Chapter 1). While much literature exists on the history of both – in particular Holocaust memorials and countermonuments – the way in which they have influenced subsequent memorial traditions is only now coming to light, and has hitherto received very little critical attention. On a synchronic level, the influence of the contemporary political sphere on the development of memorial projects, as well as the complex interplay between different

and sometimes competing projects, demonstrates the highly dynamic and entangled nature of memorial politics and collective remembrance. This book thus seeks to highlight the polyphony of voices that influence, and are influenced by, evolving sites of memory. As the selection of case studies testifies, monuments evolve over time; they 'become' rather than 'exist'. The extent to which attitudes towards the now largely absent Berlin Wall have changed, for example, demonstrates just how radically residents' relationships to the urban landscape and its history may evolve in a relatively short space of time. The stone or bronze in which they are frequently cast can thus be illusory; the perception of permanence and constancy often belies the dynamism of the memory debates that may begin years before their construction and continue long after their erection.

The broader parameters of the discussion around memory and memorial practices are introduced in Chapter 1, in which the 'memory boom' of recent years is examined alongside a critical overview of the key terms and concepts employed in the study of collective memories and memorial cultures. The following chapters are structured around selected case studies, which relate to five thematic areas: former socialist icons, Soviet special camps, the uprisings of 17 June 1953, the Berlin Wall and the 'peaceful revolution'. While monuments clearly exist that relate to other aspects of GDR history, in particular to local events or sites (as seen above, in the cases of Zwickau and Jena), these five areas have been chosen for the fact that they have provoked considerable debate since the demise of the GDR, and have been the focus of varied styles of monument projects. Moreover, they all relate to themes and events of significance across eastern Germany, enabling a comparison of projects across different regions. The case studies have been chosen for their contrasting natures and spread of geographical locations, and in each chapter care has been taken to examine both high-profile and less well-known examples. As a study that seeks to probe every stage of the memorial process, from the initial planning stages through to the period after construction, the availability of data and sources was also a motivating factor in the choice of case studies. The primary sources used in this study are thus varied, and include a range of archival materials (from local government papers to those of regional organizations, grassroots initiatives and private organizations), information gathered through conversations with artists, local politicians, regional organizations and the initiators of memorial projects, as well as published information, such as newspaper reports, readers' letters and online forums, memorial websites and the newsletters of organizations. As a qualitative study, this book does not aim to be a representative survey

that maps broad commemorative trends across eastern Germany, but rather one that uses a selection of in-depth case studies, many of which have hitherto attracted little attention outside of their locality, to examine deeper-rooted shifts in memorial culture and memory of the GDR.

Notes

1. In a speech at the Brandenburg Gate in 1987, President Reagan had challenged Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev to 'tear down this wall!'. Stefan Jacobs et al., 'Mr. Wowereit – Don't Tear Down This Wall', *Der Tagesspiegel*, 1 March 2013, http://www.tagesspiegel.de/berlin/bauarbeiten-an-east-side-gallery-eingestellt-mr-wowereit-dont-tear-down-this-wall/7856508.html (accessed 20 August 2013).
2. Pierre Nora (ed.), *Les Lieux de Mémoire*, 7 vols (Paris: Gallimard, 1984–92).
3. Jens Brockmeier, 'Remembering and Forgetting: Narrative as Cultural Memory', *Culture & Psychology*, 8 (2002) 1, 15–43 (19).
4. In order to avoid confusion, 'East'/'Eastern' and 'West'/'Western' will be capitalized throughout to refer to the period of division, but not for the post-unification period.
5. Katrin Göring-Eckardt, 'Für ein kritisches Geschichtsbewusstsein', in *Jahrbuch für Kulturpolitik 2009*. *Thema: Erinnerungskulturen und Geschichtspolitik*, ed. by Bernd Wagner (Essen: Klartext Verlag, 2009), pp. 95–99 (95).
6. Konrad H. Jarausch, 'Der Umbruch 1989/90', in *Erinnerungsorte der DDR*, ed. by Martin Sabrow (Munich: Beck, 2009), pp. 526–35 (526).
7. Jeffrey Herf, *Divided Memory: The Nazi Past in the Two Germanys* (Cambridge, MA; London: Harvard University Press, 1997).
8. Rudy Koshar, *From Monuments to Traces: Artifacts of German Memory, 1870–1990* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2000), p. 3.
9. See Matthias Wemhoff, *Der Berliner Skulpturenfund: 'Entartete Kunst' im Bombenschutt*, Staatliche Museen zu Berlin – Stiftung Preussischer Kulturbesitz (Regensburg: Schnell & Steiner, 2011).
10. See Michael Diers and Kasper König, *Der Bevölkerung: Aufsätze und Dokumente zur Debatte um das Reichtagsprojekt von Hans Haacke* (Cologne: Verlag der Buchhandlung Walter König, 2000); Eric Jarosinski, '"Threshold Resistance": Dani Karavan's Berlin Installation *Grundgesetz*', in *Walls, Borders, Boundaries: Spatial and Cultural Practices in Europe*, ed. by Marc Silberman, Karen E. Till and Janet Ward (New York; Oxford: Berghahn Books, 2012), pp. 61–76.
11. The concept of 'normalization' must be treated with caution, for the implication that 'normal' behaviour or standards exist is highly problematic. Reference to this term within the German context usually relates to Germany displaying exemplary western, democratic and liberal credentials while also showing remorse for past crimes. On 'normalization', see Stuart Taberner and Paul Cooke (eds), *German Culture, Politics, and*

Literature into the Twenty-First Century: Beyond Normalization (Rochester, NY: Camden House, 2006) and Gavriel Rosenfeld, *Hi Hitler! How the Nazi Past Is Being Normalized in Contemporary Culture* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014).

12. Gavriel Rosenfeld, 'A Looming Crash or a Soft Landing? Forecasting the Future of the Memory "Industry"', *Journal of Modern History*, 81 (2009), 122–58 (141).
13. Eric Langenbacher, 'The Mastered Past? Collective Memory Trends in Germany since Unification', in *From the Bonn to the Berlin Republic: Germany at the Twentieth Anniversary of Unification*, ed. by Jeffrey J. Anderson and Eric Langenbacher (New York; Oxford: Berghahn Books, 2010), pp. 63–89 (83-84).
14. Theodor W. Adorno, 'Was bedeutet: Aufarbeitung der Vergangenheit?', in *Gesammelte Schriften*, vol. 10/2, Kulturkritik und Gesellschaft II, ed. by Rolf Tiedemann (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1977), pp. 555–72.
15. See Bill Niven, *Facing the Nazi Past: United Germany and the Legacy of the Third Reich* (London; New York: Routledge, 2002); Gavriel D. Rosenfeld, 'The Controversy That Isn't: The Debate over Daniel J. Goldhagen's *Hitler's Willing Executioners* in Comparative Perspective', *Contemporary European History*, 8 (1999) 2, 249–73; Daniel Becker, 'Coming to Terms with *Vergangenheitsbewältigung*: Walser's *Sonntagsrede*, the Kosovo War, and the Transformation of German Historical Consciousness', in *Victims and Perpetrators: 1933–1945: (Re)Presenting the Past in Post-Unification Culture*, ed. by Laurel Cohen-Pfister and Dagmar Wienroeder-Skinner (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2006), pp. 337–61.
16. James Young, 'Berlin's Holocaust Memorial: A Report to the Bundestag Committee on Media and Culture, 3 March 1999', *German Politics and Society*, 17 (1999) 3, 54–70 (56).
17. See Karen E. Till, 'Staging the Past: Landscape Designs, Cultural Identity and *Erinnerungspolitik* at Berlin's *Neue Wache*', *Ecumene*, 6 (1999) 3, 251–83.
18. Claus Leggewie and Erik Meyer, 'Shared Memory: Buchenwald and Beyond', *Tr@nsit online*, 22 (2002).
19. See Charles S. Maier, 'Hot Memory… Cold Memory: On the Political Half-Life of Fascist and Communist Memory', *Tr@nsit online*, 22 (2002); Niven, *Facing the Nazi Past*, p. 7; Leggewie and Meyer, 'Shared Memory'.
20. Deutscher Bundestag, 'Schlußbericht der Enquete-Kommission "Überwindungen der Folgen der SED-Diktatur im Prozess der deutschen Einheit"' (Bonn, 1998), Drucksache 13/11000, p. 240.
21. As Niven points out, Schröder is usually quoted out of context, for he actually said he wished for a place where Germans 'like to go to remember and take issue'. This remark does, however, still reflect the notion that such remembrance should be a pleasurable experience. See Bill Niven (ed.), *Germans as Victims: Remembering the Past in Contemporary Germany* (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2006), pp. 9–10.
22. Eric Langenbacher, Bill Niven and Ruth Wittlinger, 'Introduction: Dynamics of Memory in Twenty-First Century Germany', *German Politics and Society*, 26 (2008) 4, 1–8. See also Robert G. Moeller, 'Germans as Victims? Thoughts

on a Post-Cold-War History of World War II's Legacies', *History & Memory*, 17 (2005) 1/2, 147–94.

23. Niven, *Germans as Victims*, p. 4.
24. Becker, 'Coming to Terms with *Vergangenheitsbewältigung*', p. 338.
25. Niven, *Germans as Victims*, pp. 7–8.
26. See Malte Thießen, *Eingebrannt ins Gedächtnis: Hamburgs Gedenken an Luftkrieg und Kriegsende 1943 bis 2005* (Munich: Dölling und Galitz Verlag, 2007); Robert G. Moeller, *War Stories: The Search for a Usable Past in the Federal Republic of Germany* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2001); Gavriel D. Rosenfeld, *Munich and Memory: Architecture, Monuments, and the Legacy of the Third Reich* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2000).
27. Jörg Friedrich, *Der Brand: Deutschland im Bombenkrieg 1940–1945* (Munich: Propyläen Verlag, 2002). See Robert G. Moeller, 'On the History of Man-Made Destruction: Loss, Death, Memory, and Germany in the Bombing War', *History Workshop Journal*, 61 (2006), 103–34.
28. On the plethora of local publications, see the review by Jörg Arnold, 'Bombenkrieg', for *H-Soz-u-Kult*, 28 June 2004, http://hsozkult.geschichte.hu-berlin.de/rezensionen/2004-2-062 (accessed 26 May 2011); see also Thilo Alexe, 'Neuer Plan für Denkmal zum 13. Februar' and Denni Klein, '"Trauerndes Mädchen am Tränenmeer" soll erinnern und Hoffnung geben', both in *Sächsische Zeitung*, 20 September 2010.
29. Günter Grass, *Im Krebsgang: Eine Novelle* (Göttingen: Steidl, 2002).
30. Federal funding made available in 2008 resulted in the foundation of the Stiftung Flucht, Vertreibung, Versöhnung, administered by the German Historical Museum. Among other things, its task is to establish a permanent exhibition on flight and expulsion, to be housed in the 'Deutschlandhaus'. See the Stiftung's website at: http://www.sfvv.de (accessed 18 July 2016).
31. *Eine Frau in Berlin: Tagebuchaufzeichnungen vom 20. April bis 22. Juni 1945* (Frankfurt am Main: Eichborn Verlag, 2003); Max Färberböck (dir.), *Anonyma – Eine Frau in Berlin* (2008).
32. See Michael Z. Wise, *Capital Dilemma: Germany's Search for a New Architecture of Democracy* (New York: Princeton Architectural Press, 1998), pp. 53–54.
33. Andrew Webber, *Berlin in the Twentieth Century: A Cultural Topography* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), p. 12.
34. Eberhard Diepgen, cited in 'Bananen billiger', *Der Spiegel* (1994) 26, 90–91 (91).
35. Andreas Huyssen, *Present Pasts: Urban Palimpsests and the Politics of Memory* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2003), p. 32.
36. On Berlin, see, for example, Karen E. Till, *The New Berlin: Memory, Politics, Place* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, 2005); Brian Ladd, *The Ghosts of Berlin* (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1997); Wise, *Capital Dilemma*; Elizabeth A. Strom, *Building the New Berlin: The Politics of Urban Development in Germany's Capital City* (Lanham, MD: Lexington Books, 2001); Jennifer Jordan, *Structures of Memory: Understanding Urban Change in Berlin and Beyond* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2006); Webber, *Berlin in the Twentieth Century*; Simon Ward, *Urban Memory and Visual*

Culture in Berlin: Framing the Asynchronous City, 1957–2012 (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2016). There have been efforts to look beyond Berlin, but such studies tend to focus on the years of division or on efforts to overcome the Nazi past. See, for example, Gavriel D. Rosenfeld and Paul B. Jaskot (eds), *Beyond Berlin: Twelve German Cities Confront the German Past* (Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press, 2008). The very few studies that examine GDR-related examples are largely efforts to catalogue individual case studies, e.g. Anna Kaminsky (ed.), *Orte des Erinnerns: Gedenkzeichen, Gedenkstätten und Museen zur Diktatur in SBZ und DDR* (Bonn: Bundeszentrale für politische Bildung, 2007) and Leonie Beiersdorf, *Die doppelte Krise: Ostdeutsche Erinnerungszeichen nach 1989* (Berlin: Deutscher Kunstverlag, 2015).

37. Interview with Wolfgang Thierse: '"Hinter den Attacken steckt etwas anderes"', *Der Tagesspiegel*, 19 August 2007, p. 7.
38. For an overview of historical debates, see Mary Fulbrook, 'Historiografische Kontroversen seit 1990', in *Views from Abroad: Die DDR aus britischer Perspektive*, ed. by Peter Barker, Marc-Dietrich Ohse and Dennis Tate (Bielefeld: Bertelsmann, 2007), pp. 41–51.
39. Martin Sabrow (ed.), *Erinnerungsorte der DDR* (Munich: Beck, 2009), p. 16.
40. Konrad Jarausch, 'Realer Sozialismus als Fürsorgediktatur: Zur begrifflichen Einordnung der DDR', *Aus Politik und Zeitgeschichte*, B20 (1998), 33–46; Mary Fulbrook, *The People's State: East German Society from Hitler to Honecker* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2005).
41. Molly Andrews, 'Grand National Narratives and the Project of Truth Commissions: A Comparative Analysis', *Media, Culture & Society*, 25 (2003), 45–65 (51).
42. See Paul Cooke, *Representing East Germany since Unification: From Colonization to Nostalgia* (New York: Berg, 2005), pp. 34–41. On the Bundestag inquiries, see also Andrew H. Beattie, *Playing Politics with History: The Bundestag Inquiries into East Germany* (New York; Oxford: Berghahn Books, 2008); A. James McAdams, *Judging the Past in Unified Germany* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001); Jennifer Yoder, 'Truth without Reconciliation: An Appraisal of the Enquete Commission on the SED Dictatorship in Germany', *German Politics*, 8 (1999) 3, 59–80.
43. 'Empfehlungen der Expertenkommission zur Schaffung eines Geschichtsverbundes "Aufarbeitung der SED-Diktatur"', 15 May 2006, p. 21, https://www.bundesstiftung-aufarbeitung.de/uploads/pdf/sabrow-bericht.pdf (accessed 15 December 2017).
44. On the debate, see Martin Sabrow et al. (eds), *Wohin treibt die DDR-Erinnerung? Dokumentation einer Debatte* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2007).
45. On the view of Die Linke, see Lukrezia Jochimsen, 'Die linke Gegenstimme zu: Erinnerungskultur und Geschichtspolitik', in *Jahrbuch für Kulturpolitik 2009*, ed. by Wagner, pp. 89–94.
46. On the concept of colonization, see Cooke, *Representing East Germany since Unification*.

47. Christa Wolf, *Was bleibt: Erzählung* (Munich: Luchterhand, 1990). On the debate, see Thomas Anz (ed.), *Es geht nicht um Christa Wolf: Der Literaturstreit im vereinten Deutschland* (Munich: Edition Spangenberg, 1991).
48. On *Ostalgie*, see Cooke, *Representing East Germany since Unification*; Thomas Ahbe, *Ostalgie: Zum Umgang mit der DDR-Vergangenheit in der 1990er Jahren* (Erfurt: Landeszentrale für politische Bildung Thüringen, 2005); Paul Betts, 'The Twilight of the Idols: East German Memory and Material Culture', *The Journal of Modern History*, 72 (2000) September, 731–65; Martin Blum, 'Remaking the East German Past: Ostalgie, Identity, and Material Culture', *Journal of Popular Culture*, 34 (2000) 3, 229–53; Daphne Berdahl, '"(N)Ostalgie" for the Present: Memory, Longing, and East German Things', *Ethnos*, 64 (1999) 2, 192–211; Patricia Hogwood, 'After the GDR: Reconstructing Identity in Post-Communist Germany', *Journal of Communist Studies and Transition Politics*, 16 (2000) 4, 45–67.
49. See Berdahl, '"(N)Ostalgie" for the Present'; Martin Blum, 'Club Cola and Co.: Ostalgie, Material Culture and Identity', in *Transformations of the New Germany*, ed. by Ruth A. Starkman (New York; Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006), pp. 131–54.
50. Research led by Mary Fulbrook at UCL has led the way in exploring the concept of 'normalization', particularly in the large Arts and Humanities Research Council (AHRC) project '*The "Normalisation of Rule"? State and Society in the GDR 1961–1979' from 2002 to 2007.*
51. Cooke, *Representing East Germany since Unification*, p. 202.
52. *Wende* is the term commonly used to refer to the period of political change in 1989/90.
53. On this debate, see Christos Varvantakis, 'A Monument to Dismantlement', *Memory Studies*, 2 (2009) 1, 27–38; Uta Staiger, 'Cities, Citizenship, Contested Cultures: Berlin's Palace of the Republic and the Politics of the Public Sphere', *Cultural Geographies*, 16 (2009), 309–27; Alexander Schug (ed.), *Palast der Republik: Politischer Diskurs und private Erinnerung* (Berlin: BWV, 2007).
54. See 'Gesamtkonzept zur Erinnerung an die Berliner Mauer: Dokumentation, Information und Gedenken' (Berlin: Senatsverwaltung für Wissenschaft, Forschung und Kultur, 12 June 2006), http://www.berliner-mauer-gedenkstaette.de/de/uploads/allgemeine_dokumente/gesamtkonzept_berliner_mauer.pdf (accessed 15 December 2017).
55. Beiersdorf, *Die doppelte Krise*, p. 186.
56. Interview with Wolfgang Thierse: '"Hinter den Attacken steckt etwas anderes"', *Der Tagesspiegel*, 19 August 2007, p. 7.
57. Sabrow, *Erinnerungsorte der DDR*, p. 20.