

Introduction

New Perspectives on the GDR

A Plea for a Paradigm Shift

Enrico Heitzer, Martin Jander, Anetta Kahane, and Patrice G. Poutrus



It took some time in the (pre-unification) Federal Republic of Germany for not only researchers but also educators, museums, and memorial policy-makers to begin asking critical questions. But there have been debates about National Socialism and its aftereffects since 1945. What started hesitatingly and then assumed increasing clarity and importance were questions about how many people were involved in criminal acts; the successes or failures of denazification; the comprehensiveness of compensation for Nazi wrongdoing; whether every victim group had been recognized; and whether the state and its citizens were meeting their material and moral obligations to Israel, among other issues. At first tentatively and then with increasing urgency, historians and other researchers—through their investigations and the ensuing public debate—completed the work initiated by the Allies at the Nuremberg Trials and the twelve tribunals that followed.

Critical inquiry on the aftereffects of National Socialism but also earlier periods in German history, including colonialism, continue. Whether football, the secret service, antisemitism, medicine, or immigration policy, no institution, phenomenon, subject, or concept should be excluded from critical scrutiny. The destruction of law and civilization and the establishment of megalomaniacal nationalism, racism, antisemitism, and other movements opposed to minorities and modernity as such demand that

the Federal Republic of Germany repeatedly address these legacies as long as it wishes to remain a democracy. Its democratic culture is nurtured in significant ways by the ability to pose questions of this nature.

The GDR: Soviet-Style Dictatorship and Post-National Socialist Society

The impetus for this book comes from our belief that critical questions about the aftereffects of National Socialism and other chapters in Germany's past, such as colonialism, are most definitely relevant beyond the rupture of 1945, not least with regard to the German Democratic Republic (GDR), its political system, foreign policy, society, culture, and everyday life. Researchers and publishers have addressed these issues, but not in the depth and breadth presented in this book.

In various ways, the contributors here wrestle with precisely how denazification was addressed, in what manner Nazis were excluded from or integrated into the GDR, how antisemitism cultivated by National Socialism was eradicated or persisted, and how surviving Nazi victims were compensated or not. It asks how communists deployed their history as victims of Nazi persecution to legitimize a new dictatorship, whether antifascism was underpinned by antisemitism, and whether antifascism and denazification can lay claim to a lasting contribution to the democratization of the Federal Republic of Germany. These questions have not yet received systematic analytical attention.

Today, journalists, schools, museums, and memorials have some catching up to do, given that the GDR and other "Soviet-style dictatorships" (Mlynar 1982–1989) did not adequately address National Socialism and its aftereffects. The extermination of European Jews, the mass murder of Sinti and Roma, and the war of pillage and extermination against the Soviet Union were only mentioned in the context of preserving the power of ruling elites and their ideological alliances in the GDR and other societies of the former Soviet Bloc. The often heroic communist and noncommunist resistance to Nazi Germany's policies and allies, the Warsaw ghetto insurrection of 1943, and the uprising led by the Polish Home Army in 1944 were equally neglected.

Indeed, the aftereffects of National Socialism and its historical antecedents were clearly observable in the satellite states of the Soviet Union until its dissolution. Large numbers of Nazi victims were never recognized, received no compensation, and faced persecution once again, while Nazi perpetrators were never held to account. The persistence of antisemitism, racism, homophobia, and antiziganism was conspicuous. Engaging

with origins and causes was possible only within strictly enforced limits. As closed societies, the communist SED state and other Soviet-style dictatorships that defined themselves as socialist were unwilling and unable to confront these problems and to allow public discussion and, with it, potential controversy (Amadeu Antonio Foundation 2010).

The GDR: Demonization, Limits of Discourse, and Germany's History of Suffering

This book makes a plea for a more intensive, systematic focus on the SED state as one of three successor societies to National Socialism (Bergmann, Erb, and Lichtblau 1995). It is also—but by no means exclusively—a plea for the rediscovery of history as a method of ideological critique. The SED (Socialist Unity Party of Germany) legitimized the existence of the GDR by adopting a highly idiosyncratic view of German history. Its narratives revolved around terms such as “capitalism,” “fascism,” “antifascism,” “imperialism,” and “Zionism.” Used in highly disparate ways, these terms had functions detached from their analytical meaning. Since free, controversial discourse was impossible, the terms of analytical critique that citizens were required to adopt, and that appeared in official prescriptions that limited permissible debate, were adversarial, even demonizing. The critical deconstruction and analysis of their propagandistic functions are tasks that are indispensable to our proposed shift toward examining the GDR as a post-National Socialist society.

Engaging in an ideological critique of terms like “fascism” and “anti-fascism” and their functions goes beyond engagement with the GDR. Neither the analytical concept of “fascism” nor the political concept of “antifascism” disappeared with the fall of the GDR. Their salient features, the “left-wing” relativization of Nazi crimes, and the demonization of Western democracies, particularly the United States and Israel, have persisted, though now under the conditions of social pluralism and the possibility of free and open debate.

Recovering contemporary historical research as a method of ideological critique proves indispensable in another context. In the eyes of many opponents of the German Soviet-style dictatorship, the origins and development of the SED state constitute a narrative of suffering for the German people.

Instead of critical reflection on the continuities of German history and ties to transnational contexts, or examining links to present-day society, criticism of the SED dictatorship was sometimes imbued with a more conservative, anti-communist national revisionism and, not infrequently, with forms of anti-Americanism and antisemitism.

This is why opponents of the SED in the (pre-unification) Federal Republic of Germany often called for a “reversal in commemorative policy” and a shift toward a historiography that was designed less to empower responsible citizens to form their own critical judgments and more to underpin a form of German nationalism. The ideological critique of this historiography should not only focus on the past; it must remain a work in progress.

Role Models and Productive Input

Our plea for a new perspective on the GDR draws on diverse influences. The first deserving mention is historian Helmut Eschwege. His research and writing focused on the GDR, the history of the Holocaust, and the history of the Jews in the GDR (Berg 2003: 442–447). Examining Jewish resistance to National Socialism, he criticized the antifascist tradition enshrined in the GDR’s historiography. His work, like other research on the history of the Jews in the GDR, could be published only in the Federal Republic of Germany. Some of his works have never been published at all.

We drew additional inspiration from the Crises in Soviet-Style Systems series, published in the 1980s (Mlynar 1982–1989). It advanced critical discourse on the Soviet Union and its satellite states, and the authors involved in this project came from across Eastern Europe. Their publications described the societies of Eastern Europe as examples of the shared category “Soviet-style dictatorship” on the one hand, but emphasized their disparate histories and crisis elements on the other.

Another important influence is *Schwieriges Erbe* (Difficult heritage), an anthology published by Werner Bergmann, Rainer Erb, and Albert Lichtblau in 1995. Six years after the fall of the Berlin Wall, authors from Austria and the (new) Federal Republic of Germany outlined and compared portraits of three societies in the post-Nazi era: the GDR, Austria, and the FRG. Seldom has a more accurate treatment of the history and structure of the GDR as a post-National Socialist society been achieved.¹

Historian Jeffrey Herf’s *Divided Memory* (1997), in which he compares the treatment of the Shoah in the FRG and the GDR, also informs this book. Although Herf has continued to publish on National Socialism and the Cold War, and has received international recognition for his research on National Socialism and antisemitism, among his books, only *Divided Memory* has been translated into German.

We also looked to the anthology *Fremde und Fremd-Sein in der DDR* (Foreigners and misfits in the GDR; Behrends, Kuck, and Poutrus 2003). Following racist riots after the demise of the GDR and in the 1990s, the

anthology's editors asked "whether the racist, nationalist and anti-Bolshevist stereotypes of Nazi propaganda, which were undoubtedly widespread among the population, had in fact been expunged simply because of the mantra-like repetition of the GDR's anti-fascist foundation myth" (Behrends, Kuck, and Poutrus 2003: 327).

Another reference point for this project was Salomon Korn's warning against the rise of an "equivalence mindset."² In 2004, Korn, pointing to the state of Saxony's memorial policy, cautioned against the general equating of National Socialism and the GDR in the commemorative culture of the new Federal Republic. Such an equation was analytically senseless, he argued, and showed a persistent need to avoid culpability. The goal was not a critical reflection on the past but its termination.

While these interventions have not yet triggered a paradigm shift in GDR studies, the rise of the popular movement PEGIDA (Patriotic Europeans Against the Islamization of the Occident) and the ascendant right-wing AfD party make clear that, as was true more than twenty years ago, the GDR and its political system and society cannot be detached from the history of National Socialism and present-day right-wing radicalism any more than the old and new Federal Republic can be.

New Inputs

The contributions collected here do not claim to fully fill the blind spots in existing research on Soviet-style dictatorships, the GDR, or its legacies. They are merely elements in a debate in the humanities about the GDR and a plea for a different perspective. The starting point for this volume is not the end of the Cold War and the reunification of the two German states, but the Third Reich, including its unprecedented crimes.

Since 1989, the history, structure, and ideology of the SED dictatorship have belonged to a shared postwar history. The heritage of the GDR as a post-National Socialist society has played an ambiguous role in a reunited Germany in quotidian contexts, historical research, and debates on commemorative policy. This book represents an effort to situate the GDR within the "major flows" of twentieth-century history and can be understood simply as a starting point for further research.

The book's first half features essays that engage with events, people, or social structures in the GDR. Historian Anette Leo opens with an empathetic portrait of the Jewish communist, folklorist, and Finno-Ugrian Wolfgang Steinitz. She describes his return to the GDR after his time in exile with friends and colleagues. In discomfiting detail, Leo illustrates the "trap of loyalty" that ensnared Steinitz and many of his companions.

Their journey, following the campaign against “cosmopolitans” and emigrants to the West in the early 1950s, ended in disillusionment and self-abnegation. Leo writes, “In constant danger of being caught between the millstones of the Cold War, pursued by the demons of the past, and clinging to messages of salvation for the future, there seemed to be no place for [Steinitz and his friends] in this Germany in which they could simply have lived in the present without abandoning their principles.”

Chairperson of the Amadeu Antonio Foundation Anetta Kahane reports on “the taboo of antisemitism,” picking up on Anette Leo’s story. Kahane recounts her parents’ return from the resistance in France and her own never entirely successful attempt, following the anti-Zionist/antisemitic purges of the 1950s, to embrace her Jewish identity and at the same time conceal it. Writing about the hidden history of Jewish communists in the GDR, Kahane says,

According to the logic of class struggle in the GDR, anyone who believed in God was a Jew. And anyone who did this voluntarily renounced the enlightened spirit of historical materialism. This meant that this person was regarded as reactionary, since religions were presumed to always suppress and manipulate the masses. The reduction of Jewish identity to religious faith not only demonstrated catastrophic ignorance but also served above all to exonerate the German working class, which had acclaimed the Nazis, thus becoming complicit in their crimes. The communists explained the seduction by Hitler almost exclusively in terms of economic and social factors, like mass unemployment. This explanatory model has served as a justification for right-wing extremist or right-wing populist movements up until the present.

Historian Gerd Kühling, a staff member at the Wannsee Conference Memorial, examines the beginnings of the GDR from yet another vantage point. He analyzes the rise of divergent commemorative cultures in East and West Germany, exemplified by new divisions in the city of Berlin. The instrumentalization of National Socialism for the reciprocal delegitimation of the two German states began early on. The discourse on the victims of National Socialism and forms of memorialization was crushed between the fronts of the Cold War.

Historian and political scientist Enrico Heitzer, a staff member at the Sachsenhausen Memorial and Museum, adopts a different perspective. He describes “systemic opposition from the right,” not only in the initial phase of the Soviet Occupation Zone/GDR but also up until the GDR’s demise. Until now, this phenomenon has been poorly documented. Researchers have hardly pursued the traces of this systemic opposition, which existed from the beginning to the end of the GDR, presumably

not least because the SED attempted to discredit its opponents as Nazis. Against the backdrop of this defamatory propaganda, researchers have largely overlooked opposition to the system from the right.

Historian and lawyer Klaus Bästlein, for many years an assistant to Berlin's commissioner for reappraisal of the SED dictatorship, examines the GDR's most infamous political trial: the proceedings against Hans Globke, Konrad Adenauer's senior advisor and the former author of the Nazi race laws. Bästlein shows that despite its utility for SED propaganda, the verdict against Globke (in contrast to other trials against prominent National Socialists) reflected knowledge that was available at the time concerning the extermination of the Jews, and Globke's role in it. He writes, "In contrast to the propagandistic exploitation of the proceedings, no objection can be raised to the verdict reached by the Supreme Court of the GDR. The only problematic aspect is the depiction of the GDR as the 'better' ('antifascist') German state."

Christoph Classen, a long-serving staff member at the Center for Contemporary Historical Research, investigates the origins of the GDR's antifascist foundation myth and its significance for engaging with the GDR in the reunited Federal Republic. After 1989, alongside criticism and support for antifascism, controversy emerged regarding the political meanings of the reunited Federal Republic. Classen writes,

One of the issues addressed here is the recent controversy between conservatives and left-wing liberals in the so-called *Historikerstreit* about how the anti-totalitarian foundation consensus of the old Federal Republic should be viewed. After the collapse of the communist bloc and amid fears of a resurgent Germany in the center of Europe, the political controversy over whether anti-communist or anti-National Socialist identity should constitute the main reference point for Germany entered a second phase under changed conditions.

Political scientist Helmut Müller-Enbergs, an expert on East German secret police documents, presents "empirical social research on a highly invisible group" in his contribution. Employing empirical evidence, Müller-Enbergs shows that the Ministry of State Security (MfS), in contrast to the secret services of the FRG, did not have ex-National Socialists on its permanent staff, though some of its informers were in fact former Nazis. Contrary to expectations, says Müller-Enbergs, professional spies tended to come from the upper echelons of the GDR's social hierarchy rather than from the purportedly preeminent working class.

Historian Jeffrey Herf, professor of modern European history at the University of Maryland, shares an essay that offers an overview of his book, *Undeclared Wars with Israel*, which was published in English. Draw-

ing on archival documents from the GDR, he follows a path from the expulsion of Jews from the GDR in the early 1950s to support for Arab countries and the PLO in the war to destroy Israel. Citing recently deceased Robert Wistrich, Herf analyzes the ideology of the SED as “Holocaust Inversion.” Former comrades in the war against the Nazis were declared enemies of socialism, and in the case of Israel, warred upon.

Agnes C. Mueller, professor of German and comparative studies at the University of South Carolina, examines the relationship between literature in the GDR and popular engagement with the Holocaust as exemplified by Christa Wolf and Fred Wander. Mueller explains her essay:

Holocaust trauma, Jewish identity, and the guilt of the perpetrators are allegedly spotlighted in Wolf’s fictional and essayistic work, but in fact are glossed over in terms of their relevance for future generations. The emotionalizing strategies displayed in Wolf’s texts, some of which utilize the literary theories of socialist realism, are then contrasted with those featured in the work of Fred Wander. He provides explicit descriptions of camp experiences, unmediated in their directness and affective impact, whereas in Wolf’s works, the figures, themes, and motifs concerned are more profoundly encoded.

Historian Katharina Lenski directs the Thuringian Matthias Domaschk Archives for Contemporary History, which she established in 1991. Today, she is a research associate at Jena University. Her contribution examines the stigmatization of political dissidents and young people searching for new lifestyles in the GDR. Her text focuses on a hitherto almost unknown public hair-cutting initiative in the Thuringian town of Pössneck in October 1969. Lenski writes,

The practice displays elements reminiscent of the Nazi era. Though the context of exclusion had changed, certain elements survived the 1945 “zero hour.” Compulsory haircutting was one of several disciplinary elements designed to punish nonconforming lifestyles. Labeling someone as “anti-social” was a simple (though spurious) solution. Using existing laws and their subordinate institutions, an exclusionary force was established in the GDR.

The contribution by sociologist Christiane Leidinger and education scholar Heike Radvan investigates the rarely addressed issue of lesbians and gays in the GDR. Focusing on self-organizing activities, which began in the 1970s, and on attempts to memorialize lesbian and gay victims of National Socialism, Leidinger and Radvan show how these initiatives contradicted the one-sided official commemoration of the communist resistance. Lesbians and gays were placed under surveillance and encountered

numerous obstacles. As shown by these initiatives, the authors examine how self-organizing activity had a democratizing effect. This contribution concludes by asking why lesbian and gay commemorative activities have gone largely unmentioned in public discourse, even until the present.

Ingrid Bettwieser, a staff member of the Ravensbrück Memorial, and Tobias von Borcke, a project executive in the Berlin office of the Documentation and Cultural Center for German Sinti and Roma, address another important and neglected subject. Turning to Sinti and Roma, their contribution draws on empirical research that examines perceptions of minorities in *Neues Deutschland*, the leading SED daily. Given the scarcity of available publications, the authors use the newspaper to analyze the history of Sinti and Roma in the GDR. Their verdict:

Disparate as the GDR and the FRG were, in terms of societal dealings with the Nazi genocide of Sinti and Roma and the continuation of antiziganism, the parallels are significant. In neither of these two states were these issues appropriately addressed, while survivors were subjected to renewed reprisals. Whereas in the GDR there was exigent pressure to conform, in the FRG, Sinti and Roma were in many cases socially marginalized.

Historian Martin Jander, a participant on the SED State Research Team at Berlin's Free University for many years and now a lecturer in various programs at American universities in Berlin, grapples with the relationship of left-wing and Christian GDR opposition to the "universalization" of German culpability during the collapse of the GDR in his essay. He shows that only small segments of the GDR's opposition—mostly around Helmut Eschwege and Lothar Kreyssig—were able to criticize the SED's antifascism, which was frequently imbued with anti-semitism. Most looked to role models who reproduced an antifascism that relativized German culpability. Yet there were some courageous individuals on the fringes of the GDR's left-wing and Christian groups, particularly from circles around the Reconciliation Initiative and the Jewish Cultural Association, which in 1989/90 were able to break with the GDR's position: an "antifascism without Jews" that "universalized" German culpability.

The second half of this book contains essays that offer a critical assessment of the reappraisal of the GDR in the reunited Federal Republic. This part of the anthology opens with the award-winning author Regina Scheer. In her essay, she reflects on the experience of interviewing diverse individuals from the GDR and gathering life stories from the five new federal states of reunited Germany. Her verdict: "It almost seems to be a law of human society that some things can only be expressed once the grandchildren have arrived. But the grandchildren, too, will become

mothers and fathers. I believe we should be asking ourselves about guilt and responsibility, not those who preceded us. And to understand our own history, we need to listen to those who came before us. Not least to the silences between the words.”

Günter Morsch has been the head of the Sachsenhausen Memorial and Museum and director of the Brandenburg Memorials Foundation. His contribution wrestles with the return of the totalitarianism paradigm in analyses of National Socialism and communism in Europe. In “many European countries, a stronger impulse has emerged . . . to unite disparate commemorative cultures with a new policy based on a shared European master narrative, and thus to instrumentalize the past for present-day political goals much more emphatically and unambiguously than before.” With the end of the Cold War, a “commemoration boom” took place in Europe. Alongside it, an “interpretation battle” was triggered. “The old adversarial images are wheeled out, . . . victimhood competitions are unleashed, parties and governments transmute resurging resentments into ‘policies for remembrance and reappraisal of the past.’” History is weaponized, and in extreme cases, such as the disintegration of Yugoslavia and the Soviet Union, the weapons have been lethal.

Carola Rudnick, who leads the redesign of the Euthanasia Memorial in Lüneburg, elucidates the effects of memorial policy in her essay on the GDR’s historical sites in the context of the reunited Federal Republic’s reappraisals of the Nazi era. Her findings come as a positive surprise. Only with the reappraisal of the Soviet Occupation Zone and the GDR in two Commissions of Inquiry set up by the Bundestag, and associated government subsidies for reappraisal initiatives—and with the former central commemorative monuments of the GDR—did support for concentration camp memorials as a whole become possible. Only then did Nazi memorials from the old FRG come to enjoy support from the federal government. The political crisis of legitimation for memorials in Germany, she writes, has been largely resolved, even if conflicts persist.

The causes and origins of ethnically based racist movements, which have shown renewed vigor everywhere, but especially in the five states of eastern Germany, is a particular source of controversy in the reunited Federal Republic. In her essay, Anetta Kahane, founder and chairperson of the Amadeu Antonio Foundation, shows that while the strength of these movements in the five new states of reunited Germany is by no means a mystery, scholars have yet to analyze conditions in the GDR with sufficient precision. As she explains,

In almost every reference cited nowadays in debates on the GDR, one thing above all is missing: the fact that it was itself a product of the war,

the Shoah, and postwar history. That the GDR would not have existed without Auschwitz and that without the war of extermination unleashed by Germans, Europe would have looked different and sixty million lives could have been saved seem to have lost their perceived relevance. As a reference point, the crimes committed by Germans have disappeared, just as the ethnic dimension gradually assumes the mantle of normalcy.

Historian Jeffrey Herf from the University of Maryland describes in a short essay how his books *Divided Memory* (1997) and *Undeclared Wars with Israel* (2016) were received in Germany. As a consequence of the Holocaust, research on Jewish issues in Germany is often written by authors who do not live in Germany. However, since the declaration of the GDR's first freely elected parliament on 12 April 1990, the subject of antisemitic domestic and foreign policy in the GDR has reached ever wider circles. It has not remained a topic only for academic researchers.

In a personal retrospective, Patrice G. Poutrus, a historian and research fellow of the University of Erfurt, deals with his own attempts and those of some of his colleagues to create a solid academic foundation for public debate on migration and xenophobia in the GDR. Poutrus also illuminates the early history of the Soviet Occupation Zone/GDR. Anti-fascists returning from exile were stigmatized as "misfits," as were "contract workers" who were subsequently recruited to the GDR from many socialist countries.

A somewhat different perspective on this issue emerges in the contribution from political scientist Raiko Hannemann. His research project at Berlin's Alice Salomon University of Applied Sciences is titled *Undemocratic Mindsets in Common: The Example of Marzahn-Hellersdorf*. It examines opposition and resistance in the GDR and its role in the development of democracy in the reunited Federal Republic. In his essay here, Hannemann first emphasizes the dearth of research on opposition to the system from the right. Second, he calls attention to shortcomings in the research on the origins of the GDR's pro-democracy movement. He attributes both failures to the totalitarianism paradigm that has guided much of the research on opposition. Questions regarding resistance activities within the framework of an industrial society, which emerged as part of GDR-related research in the pre-unification Federal Republic, he writes, have been taboo since the upheaval of 1989/90.

The book concludes with an essay by Daniela Blei, a historian, editor, and writer based in San Francisco, California. She visited Berlin for the first time as an undergraduate in the 1990s and has observed the city's commemorative culture ever since. Her essay explores the origins and evolution of the Freedom and Unification Monument. Blei establishes

that the monument in no way originated from a broad societal discussion, like the *Stolpersteine* (Stumbling Stones) and other memorials in Berlin. Instead, four men conceived the memorial, and, rather than seeking public support, they sought to persuade influential politicians and parliament. This was presumably why the public failed to perceive that parliament's crucial decision to greenlight the monument was by no means just about honoring the peaceful revolutionaries of 1989, says Blei. Instead, the monument offers a metaphysical view of history based on the notion that anti-democratic German traditions were "canceled out" by the upheaval of 1989. Blei's verdict: the initiators of the Freedom and Unification Monument "can be accused of advancing the old endeavors of conservatives to relativize the Nazi past." At the same time, she strikes a positive note. More impressive than the monument is the "silence that surrounds it." The monument will likely "fade into irrelevance" and unintentionally "serve as a lasting reminder that German history is a long way from being over and that unification can never be perfect."

Acknowledgments

Much of the research in this book was discussed during a workshop in Berlin in January 2017. Enrico Heitzer, Martin Jander, and Anetta Kahane shared additional research as part of the Annual Conference of the German Studies Association in Atlanta in the autumn of 2017, while Patrice G. Poutrus presented his findings in October 2014 at a forum of the Catholic University of America in Washington, DC. Jeffrey Herf presented work related to both of his essays during workshops of the Amadeu Antonio Foundation in Berlin—the first one in January 2017, the second one in January 2020. Some of the authors represented in this book were approached by the editors. All authors were requested to present a contribution of their choice that focused on how the GDR addressed National Socialism and how the reunited Federal Republic has wrestled with the GDR and its legacies. We thank all of the authors involved in this project, and hope that they find the book as successful as we do. Our special "thank you" for this publication goes to Daniela Blei, who edited all the articles for this publication. Without the help of Miriamne Fields, Alan Johnson, Martina Jones, Anthony Hood, Marian Koebner, and Daniela Blei, who translated some of the articles from German into English, this edition of our book would not have been possible. We are delighted that this book is published by Berghahn Books. The German version, *Nach Auschwitz: Schwieriges Erbe DDR*, was published in 2018 by Wochenschau Verlag.

Enrico Heitzer, born in 1977 in Altenburg in Thuringia, was with the Bundeswehr from 1996 to 1998. Beginning in 1998, he studied history and political science in Potsdam and Halle. From 2005 to 2007, he held a scholarship from the Graduate Program of the State of Saxony-Anhalt. In 2007, he received a doctoral scholarship from the German Historical Institute in Washington, DC. In 2007/8 he worked as a research assistant for the Chair of Modern History at the Martin Luther University Halle-Wittenberg. Since 2005, he has been an associate doctoral student at the Center for Contemporary Historical Research in Potsdam (ZZF) and, since 2010–12, has worked as a research assistant at the Berlin Wall Foundation. Today he is a research assistant at the Sachsenhausen Memorial and the Museum Sachsenhausen/Stiftung Brandenburgische Gedenkstätten. In addition to his exhibition activities, his research interests include the end of the World War II and the early Cold War, denazification, the history of opposition and resistance in the SBZ/GDR, and the politics and culture of remembrance. His publications include *Die Kampfgruppe gegen Unmenschlichkeit (KgU): Widerstand und Spionage im Kalten Krieg 1948–1959* (volume 53 in the series Zeithistorische Studien by Böhlau-Verlag, 2015); and with Günter Morsch, Robert Traba, and Katarzyna Woniak, *Im Schatten von Nürnberg: Transnationale Ahndung von NS-Verbrechen* (In the shadow of Nuremberg: Transnational persecution of Nazi crimes, volume 25 in the series Forschungsbeiträge und Materialien der Stiftung Brandenburgische Gedenkstätten by Metropol Verlag, 2019).

Martin Jander, born in 1955 in Freiburg, is a historian, lecturer, and journalist and teaches German and European history at Stanford University (Berlin), New York University (Berlin), and in the Freie Universität Berlin European Studies Program. He completed his dissertation in 1995 on “Formation and Crisis of the GDR Opposition” at the Otto Suhr Institute of the Freie Universität Berlin. Until 2017, he chronicled left-wing terrorism, a project sponsored by the Hamburg Foundation for the Advancement of Science and Culture, some of which has been published. In addition to his teaching and research, Jander works as an adult educator in the trade unions, produces teaching materials for school curricula, and offers guided tours of Berlin and Potsdam (www.unwrapping-history.de). His most recent publication, with Enrico Heitzer, Martin Jander, Anetta Kahane, and Patrice G. Poutrus (eds.), is *Nach Auschwitz: Schwieriges Erbe DDR* (Frankfurt, 2018).

Anetta Kahane, born in 1954 in East Berlin, is a German journalist and author. She holds a degree in Latin American Studies and has worked as a translator. In 1990, she was the first commissioner for foreigners of

the East Berlin Magistrate, and after reunification she helped establish the Regional Office for Foreigners (RAA) in Berlin and advocated intercultural education at schools in the new federal states. In late 1998, she co-founded the Amadeu Antonio Foundation, where she has been full-time chairperson since 2003. From 1974 to 1982, she was forced to work as an unofficial collaborator with GDR State Security. She ended this forced cooperation in 1982 because she no longer wanted to support racist practices of GDR functionaries. Since this collaboration became publicly known in 2002, right-wing extremists and right-wing populists have targeted her in campaigns against her and the foundation. In 1991, she was awarded the Theodor Heuss Medal, alongside Joachim Gauck, Christian Führer, David Gill, Ulrike Poppe, and Jens Reich. In 2002, she was awarded the Moses Mendelssohn Prize of the State of Berlin. For several years, she has worked as a columnist for *Berliner Zeitung* and has written for *Zeit*, *Tageszeitung*, *Stern*, *Tagesspiegel*, and other publications. She is the author of the book *Ich sehe was, was du nicht siehst* (I see what you don't see) (Berlin 2004).

Patrice G. Poutrus, born in 1961 in East Berlin, is a historian and migration researcher. He is currently a research assistant at the University of Erfurt. He received his doctorate in 2001 from the European University Viadrina, Frankfurt/Oder, and subsequently conducted research at the German Historical Institute in Washington, DC, the Center for Contemporary Historical Research in Potsdam, the Simon Wiesenthal Institute for Holocaust Studies in Vienna, and the Institute for Contemporary History at the University of Vienna. He is a member of the DFG research network Grundlagen der Flüchtlingsforschung. His book *Unkämpftes Asyl. Vom Nachkriegsdeutschland bis in die Gegenwart* was published in spring 2019.

Notes

1. See one work that adopts a similar approach: Herz 1997.
2. See the term in "Press Release from the Central Council of Jews in Germany," 21 January 2004 (Bibliothek der Jüdischen Gemeinde zu Berlin, Berlin).

References

- Amadeu Antonio Foundation, ed. 2010. *"Das hat es bei uns nicht gegeben" – Antisemitismus in der DDR*. Berlin.
- Behrends, Jan C., Dennis Kuck, and Patrice G. Poutrus. 2003. "Historische Ursachen der Fremdenfeindlichkeit in den Neuen Bundesländern." In *Fremde und Fremd-Sein in der DDR*, edited by Jan C. Behrends, 301–307. Berlin.

Introduction

- Berg, Nikolaus. 2003. *Der Holocaust und die westdeutschen Historiker. Erforschung und Erinnerung*. Göttingen.
- Bergmann, Werner, Rainer Erb, and Albert Lichtblau, eds. 1995. *Schwieriges Erbe. Der Umgang mit Nationalsozialismus und Antisemitismus in Österreich, der DDR und der Bundesrepublik Deutschland*. Frankfurt.
- Herf, Jeffrey. 1997. *Divided Memory*. Cambridge.
- Herz, Thomas A. 1997. "NS-Vergangenheit contra SED-Vergangenheit." In *Umkämpfte Vergangenheit: Diskurse über den Nationalsozialismus seit 1945*, edited by Michael Schwab-Trapp and Thomas A. Herz, 264–286. Opladen.
- Mlynar, Zdenek, eds. 1982–1989. *Krisen in den Systemen sowjetischen Typs*. Vienna.