
German Studies Association

Newsletter

**Volume XXXVI
Number 2
Winter 2011-12**

German Studies Association
Main Office:
1200 Academy Street
Kalamazoo, MI 49006-3295
USA
Tel.: (269) 337-7056
Fax: (269) 337-7251
www.thegsa.org
e-mail: director@thegsa.org
Technical Support: helpdesk@thegsa.org

President

Stephen Brockmann (2011-2012)
Carnegie Mellon University

Vice President

Suzanne Marchand (2011-2012)
Louisiana State University

Secretary-Treasurer

Gerald A. Fetz
University of Montana

Executive Director

David E. Barclay
Kalamazoo College

GSA Board:

Kathleen Canning, *University of Michigan, Ann Arbor* (2012)
Louise K. Davidson-Schmich, *University of Miami* (2013)
Gerd Gemünden, *Dartmouth College* (2012)
Pieter Moulton Judson, *Swarthmore College* (2011)
Lutz Koepnick, *Washington University in St. Louis* (2012)
Mary Lindemann, *University of Miami* (2012)
Johannes von Moltke, *University of Michigan, Ann Arbor* (2013)
Joyce M. Mushaben, *University of Missouri St. Louis* (2011)
Jacqueline Vansant, *University of Michigan—Dearborn* (2011)
Celia Applegate, *University of Rochester*, ex officio non-voting (2012)
Diethelm Prowe, *Carleton College*, ex officio non-voting

German Studies Association

Newsletter

Volume XXXVI

Number 2

Winter 2011-12

Table of Contents

Letter from the President3

Letter from the Executive Director6

Reports and Announcements:

Planning for the Next GSA Conference, Milwaukee, Wisconsin,
October 4-7, 20128

Call for Papers: German Studies Association,
Thirty-Sixth Annual Conference8

Dues Increases Approved.....10

Redesigned Website To Be Introduced.....11

2011 GSA/DAAD Prize Winners Announced.....11

2011 Sybil Halpern Milton Prize Winner Announced.....12

2011 Graduate Student Prize Winner Announced.....13

2012 Prize Competitions.....14

GSA Committee Appointments for 2012.....14

David Warren Sabean:

Report on Interdisciplinary Committee and Networks.....16

Patricia Herminhouse: Report on the 2011 Meeting of the
American Council of Learned Societies.....21

Rainer Hering: Aus deutschen Archiven:
GSA Archives Committee Report 2011.....23

Grants and Awards.....30

Issues and Discussions in German Studies:

Mary Lindemann: Werther in Hamburg, Lotte in Jail: History, Literature, and the Pleasures of the Imagination (GSA Luncheon Address).....	31
Manfred Wilke: Der Weg zur Mauer (GSA Banquet Address).....	43
In eigener Sache: The Early Years of the Western Association for German Studies (Special Roundtable on the 35th Anniversary of WAGS/GSA)...	70
Ronald Smelser.....	70
Christopher Browning.....	74
Marion F. Deshmukh.....	75
Gerald A. Fetz.....	78
Berlin Program Celebrates Its 25th Anniversary: Alumni Conference, June-July 2011.....	81
David E. Barclay: Bridges and Barriers: Reflections on Transatlantic Academic Exchanges.....	82
Results of the New York Conference on the Promotion of German.....	95
Eva Marquardt: Conclusions: 2011 New York Language Conference “Strategies for Sustainable Promotion of German in the USA”.....	95

In Memoriam

Bernhard Heisig (1925-2011) (<i>April A. Eisman</i>).....	97
Steve Jobs (1955-2011) and WAGS/GSA (<i>Gerald R. Kleinfeld</i>).....	100
Reece Kelly (1938-2011) (<i>David E. Barclay</i>).....	102
Peter Krüger (1935-2011) (<i>Wolf D. Gruner</i>).....	102

Letter from the President

The thirty-fifth annual conference of the German Studies Association occurred September 22-25 in Louisville, Kentucky, and I found this to be a particularly exciting and successful conference—one of our largest, with about 1200 participants and 296 sessions. One highlight for me was the special session on the “Crisis in the Humanities,” with stimulating talks by former GSA President Celia Applegate; Anthony Grafton, President of the American Historical Association; Russell Berman, President of the Modern Language Association; and John McCarthy of Vanderbilt University. Celia Applegate in a sense picked up where she had left off in her eloquent presidential address a year ago in Oakland, California and made the pragmatic suggestion that all of us, in dealing with the crisis in the humanities, should put even more emphasis on teaching—and thinking about teaching—than we already do. This was a theme that was picked up on by the other speakers, as well as in other sessions at this year’s conference. All of speakers at this special panel painted a realistic, sometimes grim, picture of the situation in the humanities in the United States, but all of them also suggested that the crisis needs to be addressed in pragmatic ways, not just with hand-wringing. And one of the most pragmatic, concrete things most of us do comes about in our day-to-day interactions with students, in both our teaching and in other contexts. As GSA president I took particular pride that it was the German Studies Association, an interdisciplinary organization devoted to the study of the German-speaking world, that made possible a kind of “summit meeting” between the leaders of two of the greatest American humanities organizations—the AHA and the MLA—at our annual conference. It would be hard to imagine a similar meeting happening in the same way anywhere else.

Since this was the thirty-fifth annual conference of the GSA, there were a number of sessions about the past and future of German Studies. The very first session was “A Multidisciplinary Look at the Future of German Studies,” which, as its title indicated, emphasized the increasing interdisciplinarity of German Studies as a field and of the German Studies Association as an organization. Joy Calico of Vanderbilt University gave a stimulating talk on “Musicology and the Future of German Studies,” with particular emphasis on the history of the discipline over the last few decades; while Gregory Williams addressed “Art History, German Studies, and Interdisciplinarity” with more of a focus on the present state of the discipline. Key questions raised during this session were: What is the status of the objects we study (whether artworks, works of music, or anything else), and what is the meaning of national categories like “the German” in the context of increasing globalization and “planetarity”. There was originally supposed to be a political scientist at this panel; the absence of such a scholar on the panel might have been taken by some participants to indicate that there may be a problem with the interconnection between German Studies and political science at the present time, a problem that needs to be addressed. Indeed, one thing that struck me throughout the conference is that, although this was a year of important political developments in the German-speaking world—for instance the Euro crisis, the Green election victory in Baden-Württemberg, and foreign policy debates surrounding Germany’s non-

involvement in the military action in Libya, to name just the most important—such political developments were rarely mentioned at the conference itself. It would be nice to figure out a way to integrate aspects like this more systematically and reliably into the conference.

Another important panel in honor of the thirty-fifth anniversary of the GSA was the special panel on the GSA's history organized by former GSA President Katherine Roper and featuring GSA veterans Ronald Smelser, Christopher Browning, Marion Deshmukh, and GSA Secretary-Treasurer Gerald Fetz. This was a particularly fascinating session for me as a GSA veteran since the 1983 conference in Madison, Wisconsin. I found it quite interesting to learn how a group of historians and Germanists got together in a few western states (particularly Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico, and Utah) in the second half of the 1970s to create a forum—then called the Western Association for German Studies, or WAGS—for interdisciplinary German Studies, at least in part motivated by a feeling that the key conferences tended to happen in the eastern part of the United States rather than in the west. None of them guessed or imagined at the time what a powerful impact their creation would have in the decades to come, and how it would affect younger scholars such as myself—I was still in high school when that first conference happened, and I didn't yet have an idea how interested I would soon become in German Studies! I found it extraordinary when, at this session, Christopher Browning noted that the GSA literally created a forum for his scholarly work on the history of the Holocaust—a forum that had not previously existed for Holocaust studies. Equally interesting to me were remarks made by former GSA President Sara Lennox about Women in German (WiG), feminism, and the history of the GSA, including the so-called “Wüstenkonferenzen” (so called because they took place in the Arizona desert), sponsored in large part by the German Academic Exchange Service, which helped to shape the discipline of German Studies in the late 1980s. This is a disciplinary history that has yet to be written, but the special session on GSA history was a welcome start in this direction. In many ways the discipline as we know it today is a result of all these efforts.

Another highlight of this year's conference for me was the celebration of Helene Zimmer-Loew, the long-term Executive Director of the American Association of Teachers of German (AATG), who is stepping down after twenty-seven years at the end of this year, to be replaced by Keith Cothrun (who was also present at the GSA conference). The GSA Board expressed its thanks to Helene for her championship of the German language over many decades and gave her a bouquet of flowers—a very small token of our affection and respect!—at the banquet; and the conference featured two special sessions that involved Helene's participation, both on the history and future—as well as present—of German and German Studies in the United States. These were fascinating, lively panels infused with Helene's typical, infectious optimism and high spirits. Keith Cothrun will have his work cut out for him as he takes over the Executive Directorship of the AATG from Helene, and we all wish him—and her!—all the best for the future. The GSA hopes to work even more closely in the future with the AATG to promote the study of German, and of the German-speaking world, in North America.

At the conference we also thanked Diethelm Prowe, the long-term editor of the *German Studies Review*, for his decade of extraordinary service to the GSA. Under his leadership the *German Studies Review* has become even more of a star in the German Studies firmament than it already was. Diet too will be a hard act to follow, but we are confident that the incoming editor, Sabine Hake, will be up to this challenge, and we look forward to working closely with Sabine in the future! We also expressed our thanks to the GSR's outgoing book review editor, Elizabeth Ametsbichler, who has done a remarkable job organizing, keeping track of, and publishing many dozens of book reviews every year for many years. Liz's service, too, is greatly appreciated.

At the Board meeting that occurred on Thursday, September 22, the Board, after careful consideration, voted to raise GSA dues for regular members from \$55 to \$70 for scholars residing in North America and from \$65 to \$80 for scholars residing elsewhere. Although no one, including the members of the Board, likes to raise membership dues, it was noted that there has been no dues increase in GSA membership fees for many years, and that, while the organization's expenses have gone up considerably over the past few years, our income, alas, has not! It was for this reason that the Board decided on a cautious, moderate increase in membership dues. We still believe that we continue to be one of the best bargains in the academic world, especially if one compares our dues to those of other major academic organizations!

As president I have put together a task force to look at the structure and organization of the annual conference, which has undergone a number of changes over the past few years, from increasing interdisciplinarity through the growing number of threaded strings of interrelated panels to the institution of Sunday afternoon sessions three years ago, to the sheer growth in the conference's size. This task force is co-chaired by former GSA President Celia Applegate and Rolf Goebel, who did extraordinary service on this year's Program Committee as Session Coordinator for Interdisciplinary and Diachronic topics. The mission of this task force will be to look at the current structure of the annual conference and examine whether there may be ways of making it even better, and even more exciting, than it already is. Task force members include Lutz Koepnick, Louise Davidson-Schmich, Pieter Judson, Amy Wlodarski, and, of course, Executive Director David Barclay, who knows more than anyone else about what it actually takes to put a conference together in pragmatic terms. I expect the task force to get a report to me, and to the Board, by late August of 2012, and I hope that the Board will be able to vote on any recommendations that the task force may make by its October, 2012 meeting in Milwaukee. If you have suggestions or ideas about the conference, you should communicate them to Celia, Rolf, or one of the other members of the task force.

Once again we thank the German Academic Exchange Service for its assistance in bringing a fascinating writer—Tzvetia Sofronieva—to the 2011 conference; and we wish to express our warm thanks to the Austrian Cultural Forum for its continuing cooperation and support of Austrian studies at the conference; and to the Swiss Embassy for its support of a special event on Saturday evening, September 24, in honor of the 100th anniversary of the birth of the great Swiss writer Max

Frisch—followed by a wonderful reception with excellent (what else?) fondue and delicious Swiss wine! It was a revelation to me how delicious Swiss white wine can be!

I look forward to seeing as many of you as possible at the thirty-sixth annual conference of the German Studies Association in Milwaukee, Wisconsin!

Stephen Brockmann
Carnegie Mellon University

Letter from the Executive Director

Dear members and friends of the GSA,

This may well be the last print issue of the newsletter, though obviously it is not the last issue of the newsletter itself. Many academic societies have gone over to an all-electronic format for their newsletters, which also allows them to be updated more frequently (e.g., with news of grants and awards). The GSA Executive Board has authorized us to go electronic; and, barring a clear statement from the majority of the membership that they prefer the old paper format, the first electronic issue will be the spring issue of volume 37. The electronic version will be e-mailed to all dues-paying members, and also will be available to members on the website, and will help us reduce burgeoning costs.

Speaking of the website, we're looking forward with great anticipation to the relaunch both of our newly redesigned website and of the newly redesigned *German Studies Review*. Both redesigns are products of our new publishing agreement with Johns Hopkins University Press. The new-look *GSR* in February 2012 will be the first to be edited by Sabine Hake. As Steve Brockmann notes in his letter, we welcome her to the editor's job, even as we all owe a huge debt of gratitude to Diet Prowe and Liz Ametsbichler for all their years of outstanding contributions to the *GSR*, the GSA, and the profession more generally. The new-look website should relaunch no later than the first of the year, in time for conference submissions to begin, as usual, on 5 January 2012.

And speaking of burgeoning costs, the GSA Executive Board has also authorized us to increase dues in some categories for the year 2012. By the time you receive this newsletter, we will have e-mailed details to you. Compared to other societies, our fee structure—dues, conference registration, exhibitor fees, and advertising fees—remains quite reasonable, and the GSA will continue to remain one of the best bargains in academia.

This year we have celebrated two special anniversaries in the German Studies Association: the thirty-fifth anniversary of the foundation of the Western Association for German Studies (WAGS), the predecessor of the GSA, in 1976; and the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Berlin Program for Advanced German and European Studies at the Free University of Berlin, which has been co-sponsored by the GSA for a number of years. This issue of the newsletter contains the texts of four presentations

by WAGS veterans—Ron Smelser, Chris Browning, Marion Deshmukh, and Jerry Fetz—that were part of a special roundtable on the early WAGS years that was organized and chaired by former GSA president Kathy Roper. The roundtable took place at the Thirty-Fifth Annual Conference in Louisville on 23 September. Earlier this year, in late June and early July, the GSA was represented at a special Berlin Program twenty-fifth anniversary alumni conference on “The Good Germans?”; my remarks on that occasion are reprinted in this issue.

The Thirty-Fifth Annual Conference, which took place at the Louisville Marriott Downtown from 22 to 25 September 2011, was one of the larger in our history. We had 1120 preregistrants, with another forty-eight registering on site, for a total of 1168 registrants, our second highest total in history. In all, the conference included 294 sessions, again our second highest total after last year’s Oakland conference. Participants from Germany numbered eighty-eight, or almost eight percent of conference attendees, down sharply from previous years. One cannot but suspect that drastic cuts in funding are at least partially responsible for this downturn.

While we’re on the subject of numbers, you may remember that, a few issues ago, we broke down the US membership of the GSA by regions. Now it might be useful to consider our membership internationally. Here is how the membership breaks down, based on 2011 dues paid by early October 2011:

Country	Number	Percent
Australia	8	0.46%
Austria	26	1.48%
Belgium	1	0.06%
Brazil	1	0.06%
Canada	63	3.59%
China	1	0.06%
Denmark	1	0.06%
France	3	0.17%
Germany	160	9.11%
Hong Kong SAR	1	0.06%
Hungary	1	0.06%
India	2	0.11%
Iran	1	0.06%
Israel	10	0.57%
Italy	6	0.34%
Japan	3	0.17%
Netherlands	3	0.17%
New Zealand	1	0.06%
Norway	2	0.11%
Poland	3	0.17%
Qatar	1	0.06%
Romania	1	0.06%

Slovenia	1	0.06%
Sweden	1	0.06%
Switzerland	9	0.51%
Taiwan	3	0.17%
United Arab Emirates	1	0.06%
United Kingdom	47	2.68%
USA	1395	79.44%
Total	1756	

This list is very interesting in terms both of which countries are represented, and which are not. German Studies are clearly being undertaken in Africa and Latin America, despite the fact the countries of those regions are barely represented in the GSA; and, in Europe, the Czech Republic is notable by its absence.

The GSA continues to play an active role, in these very difficult times, in support of the German language, German Studies, and of the humanities and social sciences more generally. We are active members of the ACLS and the National Humanities Alliance, among others. We work closely with the AATG, the Friends of the German Historical Institute, the DAAD, the Austrian Cultural Forum New York, the embassies and consulates of Austria, Germany, and Switzerland, and many other organizations as well. We are especially grateful to the Austrian Cultural Forum New York and to the DAAD for their continued support of our efforts. This issue of the newsletter contains updates on these collaborations, and on our efforts to advance German Studies nationally and internationally.

The Thirty-Sixth Annual Conference of the GSA will take place at the Hilton Milwaukee City Center in Milwaukee, Wisconsin, from 4 to 7 October 2012. The GSA has met twice before—in 1989 and 2005 -- in this historic hotel in the heart of downtown Milwaukee, not far from Lake Michigan. This issue contains early information on the Program Committee, conference submissions, and deadlines, as well as the official Call for Papers. We look forward to greeting as many of you as possible in Milwaukee! And, in the meantime, our very best wishes to you for a successful academic year 2011-12.

Best regards,

David E. Barclay
Executive Director, GSA

Reports and Announcements

Planning for the Next GSA Conference, Milwaukee, Wisconsin, October 4-7, 2012

The thirty-sixth annual conference of the GSA will take place October 4-7, at the Hilton Milwaukee City Center, 509 W. Wisconsin Avenue, Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53203.

This will be our third conference at the Hilton Milwaukee City Center, following our earlier meetings in 1989 and 2005. The hotel is a downtown landmark, with a history stretching back eighty-five years. Milwaukee itself is a vibrant community, with a famous German-American tradition, outstanding restaurants, and the superb Milwaukee Art Museum, designed by such noted architects as Eero Saarinen and Santiago Calatrava. The hotel is only a few blocks from the beautiful Lake Michigan lakefront.

As usual, the deadline for ALL submissions will be **FEBRUARY 15, 2012**.

Submissions will be accepted online (www.thegsa.org) after 5 January 2012. Only online submissions will be accepted. Paper proposals or proposals submitted by e-mail will not be accepted. Although the GSA encourages all types of submissions, including individual papers, members and non-member participants are urged, where practicable, to submit complete session proposals, **including the names of proposed moderators and commentators**. The latter is extremely important if sessions are to be complete. The GSA also encourages the submission of thematic series that might include up to six related sessions, and it also vigorously supports interdisciplinary sessions. (See the discussion of GSA "Networks" below.)

Although the Program Committee will certainly not reject four-paper session proposals, submitters are reminded that four-paper sessions tend to inhibit commentary and discussion. On the whole, three-paper sessions are vastly preferable. Please note that, in a session with three papers, individual presenters should speak no more than twenty minutes. In four-paper sessions, it is expected that individual presenters will speak for no more than fifteen minutes. In each case, the commentary should not exceed ten minutes in order to enable as much audience discussion as possible.

As in the past, all submissions will take place online at the GSA Web site (www.thegsa.org). Please do note that all presenters, including moderators, commentators, and roundtable participants, must be members of the German Studies Association at the time of submission. For information on membership, please go to the GSA website (www.thegsa.org).

Call for Papers

GERMAN STUDIES ASSOCIATION THIRTY-SIXTH ANNUAL CONFERENCE

The German Studies Association (GSA) will hold its Thirty-Sixth Annual Conference in Milwaukee, Wisconsin, October 4-7, 2012.

The Program Committee cordially invites proposals on any aspect of German, Austrian, or Swiss studies, including (but not limited to) history, Germanistik, film, art history, political science, anthropology, musicology, religious studies, sociology, and cultural studies. Proposals for entire sessions and for interdisciplinary presentations are strongly encouraged. Individual paper proposals and offers to serve as session moderators or commentators are also welcome. Programs of past GSA conferences may be viewed at the GSA website (www.thegsa.org).

Please see the GSA website for information about the submission process, which opens on January 5, 2012. ALL proposals must be submitted online; paper forms are not used. **The deadline for proposals is February 15, 2012.** Please note that presenters must be members of the German Studies Association. Information on membership is available on the GSA website (www.thegsa.org).

For more information, visit the GSA website or contact members of the 2012 Program Committee:

Jared Poley, Program Director, Georgia State University (jpoley@gsu.edu)

Rolf J. Goebel, Interdisciplinary, University of Alabama in Huntsville (goebelr@uah.edu)

Ray Canoy, Diachronic, University of Oklahoma (jcanoy@ou.edu)

Jesse Spohnholz, Medieval/Early Modern/Pre-1800 (all fields), Washington State University (spohnhoj@wsu.edu)

Margaret Eleanor Menninger, 19th Century (all fields), Texas State University-San Marcos (mm48@txstate.edu)

Randall Halle, 20th/21st-Century Germanistik/Cultural Studies, University of Pittsburgh (rhalle@pitt.edu)

Ingeborg Majer-O'Sickey, 20th-/21st Century Germanistik/Culture Studies, State University of New York, Binghamton (majer.osickey@gmail.com)

Dolores Augustine, 20th/21st-Century History, St. John's University, New York (augustid@stjohns.edu)

Jonathan Wiesen, 20th/21st-Century History, Southern Illinois University (jwiesen@siu.edu)

Jonathan R. Olsen, Political Science, University of Wisconsin—Parkside (olsenj@uwsp.edu)

Dues Increases Approved

At its September meeting, the GSA Board approved dues increases in certain membership categories. These are the first dues increases in seven years, and are necessitated by a variety of rising expenses, including hotel and audiovisual expenses. By the time you receive this newsletter, details of the dues changes will have been e-mailed to you. When one compares the costs of the GSA—membership, conference registration, exhibitor charges, and advertising—to other academic societies, one can see that we remain one of the best bargains in academia.

Redesigned Website to Be Introduced

In December 2011 the GSA will unveil a newly redesigned website. This redesign is being introduced as part of our new collaboration with Johns Hopkins University Press, and is being prepared by Brian Shea and his design team at the Press. They have been advised by a special GSA Web Redesign Task Force that includes Gerald A. Fetz (chair, University of Montana and GSA), David E. Barclay (Kalamazoo College and GSA), Deborah Ascher Barnstone (Washington State University), Kathleen Canning (University of Michigan—Ann Arbor), April A. Eisman (Iowa State University), and Johannes von Moltke (University of Michigan—Ann Arbor).

2011 GSA/DAAD Prize Winners Announced

The Deutsche Akademische Austauschdienst and the German Studies Association are pleased to announce this year's prize recipients, who were recognized at the GSA's thirty-fifth annual banquet in Louisville, Kentucky, on September 23, 2011.

The DAAD and the GSA are proud to announce that **Professor Ann Goldberg** (University of California, Riverside) is the winner of this year's DAAD Book Prize for the best book in history and the social sciences published during the years 2009 and 2010. Her book, *Honor, Politics, and the Law in Imperial Germany*, was published by Cambridge University Press in 2010. The prize committee consisted of Professors Peter Fritzsche (University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign) and Donna Harsch (Carnegie Mellon University). The GSA wishes to thank the committee for its hard and outstanding work, and congratulates Professor Goldberg for her excellent achievement.

Here is the text of the committee's *laudatio*:

We are pleased to bestow the DAAD Book Prize of the GSA for 2011 on Ann Goldberg's *Honor, Politics, and the Law in Imperial Germany* (Cambridge University Press, 2010). *Honor, Politics, and the Law in Imperial Germany* is a highly original study of "honor culture" and, in particular, the widespread use of defamation law to litigate alleged affronts to one's reputation. Ann Goldberg has culled evidence from court cases, the press, legal literature, and pamphlets and fashioned it into a compelling narrative that illuminates both public culture and the politics of the authoritarian state. Modernity, she argues, did not attenuate an older culture of honor but, rather, reinforced the importance of honor for people of all social classes. Goldberg's book is a classic monograph: it is tightly focused on an under-researched topic, while also illuminating broader cultural, legal, and political trends in Imperial Germany. Written in a lively and crisp style, the book is extremely informative, analytically sharp, and a pleasure to read.

The DAAD and the GSA are proud to announce that **Professor Jennifer M. Kapczynski** (Washington University in St. Louis) is the winner of this year's

DAAD Article Prize for the best book in *Germanistik* and culture studies published in the *German Studies Review* during the years 2009 and 2010. Her article, "Postwar Ghosts: *Heimatfilm* and the Specter of Male Violence. Returning to the Scene of the Crime?," appeared in the *GSR*, volume 33, no. 2, in May 2010. The prize committee consisted of Professors John Lyon (University of Pittsburgh, chair), Daniel Gilfillan (Arizona State University), and Carol Poore (Brown University). The GSA wishes to thank the committee for its hard and outstanding work, and congratulates Professor Kapczynski for her excellent achievement.

Here is the text of the committee's *laudatio*:

Jennifer Kapczynski's article provides a critical re-exploration of two 1950s West German *Heimatfilme* through the lens of masculine violence and demonstrates that the supposedly idyllic world of the *Heimatfilm* is instead inhabited by a range of movements between sanctioned and unsanctioned violence, that more exists within its frames than stereotyped serenity and communal happiness. The approach is original: it focuses in general on how sanctioned, wartime violence transitions to a postwar violence that exists outside the law, and in particular on the presence of the formerly militarized man as a character in these films and also on the significance of hunting scenes that graphically show dead animals as symbolic bodies. Kapczynski demonstrates that wartime violence is barely contained and is simmering just below the surface in the supposedly idyllic world that these films create. The article is a successful blend of film studies, masculinity studies, and cultural studies, and is an important contribution not only in offering new readings of each film, but also in reassessing our understanding of this quintessentially German film genre and notions of masculinity in postwar Germany.

2011 Sybil Halpern Milton Prize Winner Announced

The GSA is pleased to announce that **Professor Jeffrey Herf** (University of Maryland, College Park) is the recipient of the 2011 Sybil Halpern Milton Prize, awarded for the best book in Holocaust Studies published in 2009 or 2010. His book, *Nazi Propaganda for the Arab World*, was published by Yale University Press in 2009. The selection committee included Professors Doris Bergen (University of Toronto, chair), Amir Eshel (Stanford University), and Gavriel Rosenfeld (Fairfield University). The GSA thanks the committee for its outstanding work, and congratulates Professor Herf for his excellent achievement.

Here is the text of the committee's *laudation*:

This original and provocative book reveals how much can still be learned about National Socialism, the Holocaust, and World War II. Jeffrey Herf uses a wealth of previously untapped sources from archives in Germany and the United States to explore the massive print and radio campaign that Nazi propaganda experts directed at the Arab and Muslim populations of North Africa and Central Asia. By demonstrating empirically how Nazi antisemitism found an audience among Middle Eastern militants and meshed with their views

during World War II, Herf effectively underscores the pivotal role of ideology in the perpetration of the Holocaust. His focus on the interplay between Nazi ideology and politics and non-European political agents helps us recognize the Holocaust as not only European but global in its dimensions.

2011 Graduate Student Prize Winner Announced

The GSA is proud to announce that the winner of this year's Graduate Student Paper Prize for the best paper in German Studies written in 2010-11 is awarded to **Kira Thurman** (University of Rochester), for her paper on "Black Venus, White Bayreuth: Race, Sexuality, and the De-Politicization of Wagner in Post-War West Germany." The prize selection committee was chaired by Professor Joy Calico (Vanderbilt University) and included Professors Kevin Amidon (Iowa State University) and Eli Rubin (Western Michigan University). Ms. Thurman's paper will be published in a future issue of the *German Studies Review*. The GSA congratulates her for her excellent achievement and thanks the selection committee for its outstanding work.

Here is the text of the committee's *laudatio*:

Using a nuanced yet clear and succinct argument, Kira Thurman demonstrates that race played a charged and multivalent role in postwar high culture as part of West German *Vergangenheitsbewältigung*. Ranging across the tangled reception and production history of Richard Wagner's operas in Bayreuth and elsewhere, the paper focuses on productions staged by the composer's grandson Wieland Wagner after Bayreuth's postwar reopening, and in particular on Wieland's choice in 1961 to engage an African-American singer, Grace Bumbry, to play the major role of Venus in *Tannhäuser*. The paper concludes convincingly, with impressive command of sources from across the fields of history, musicology, political science, and sociology, that:

"The early 1960s shows Germany in the process of an important musical and political transformation that emphasized the importance of a universalizing experience over divisive ideologies. Not only were Germans learning to embrace the music of jazz (and its strong connotations of a black Other) and see it as an opportunity to break from Germany's racist tradition, but they also began to respond to new influences in concert halls and opera stages as well. But above all, Grace Bumbry's appearance in July of 1961 illuminates the difficulties and complexities involved in de-politicizing Wagner and his contentious legacy, a legacy that lay at the heart of Germany's troubled identity. To Wieland Wagner, Bumbry's presence was absolutely necessary to accomplish his goal of distancing Bayreuth from its Nazi past, even if that meant, ironically enough, engaging in discourses of race and racism to break from Bayreuth's racially problematic tradition."

The paper therefore embodies the ways in which the German Studies Association seeks to motivate and enable scholarship that is at once disciplinarily rigorous and cross-disciplinarily convincing. It further points toward a rich

and rewarding sphere of research that will expand the field of understanding about postwar German cultural developments. The committee congratulates Ms. Thurman on her fine work, and believes that it provides a strong basis for the development of her scholarship and career.

2012 Prize Competitions

In 2012 the GSA will again make a number of awards. We hope that as many members as possible will make nominations and submissions. For the membership of the various prize committees for 2012, please see the committee appointments listed below.

In 2012 the **DAAD/GSA Book Prize** will be awarded for the best book in Germanics or culture studies that has been published in 2010 or 2011. Inquiries, nominations, and submissions should be sent to the committee chair, Professor Katrin Sieg, Georgetown University (ks253[at]georgetown.edu), by **15 February 2012**.

The **DAAD Article Prize** will be awarded for the best article in history or social sciences that appeared in the *German Studies Review* in 2010 or 2011. Inquiries, nominations, and submissions should be sent to the committee chair, Professor Elizabeth Heineman, University of Iowa (Elizabeth-heineman[at]uiowa.edu), by **15 February 2012**.

The prize for the **Best Essay in German Studies by a Graduate Student** will again be awarded in 2012. The deadline for nominations and submissions is **15 February 2012**. They should be sent to the committee chair, Professor Kathrin Bower, University of Richmond (kbower[at]richmond.edu).

The **Sybil Halpern Milton Book Prize** will not be awarded in 2012. It is awarded every other year, and will again be awarded in 2013 for the best book in Holocaust Studies published in 2011 or 2012.

GSA Committee Appointments for 2012

2012 Program Committee (Milwaukee)

Program Director: Jared Poley, Georgia State University

Rolf J. Goebel, Interdisciplinary, University of Alabama in Huntsville

Ray Canoy, Diachronic, University of Oklahoma

Jesse Spohnholz, Medieval/Early Modern/Pre-1800 (all fields), Washington State University

Margaret Eleanor Menninger, 19th Century (all fields), Texas State University--San Marcos

Randall Halle, 20th/21st-Century Germanistik/Culture Studies, University of Pittsburgh

Ingeborg Majer-O'Sickey, 20th-/21st Century Germanistik/Culture Studies, State University of New York, Binghamton

Dolores Augustine, 20th/21st-Century History, St. John's University, New York

Jonathan Wiesen, 20th/21st-Century History, Southern Illinois University
Jonathan R. Olsen, Political Science, University of Wisconsin--Parkside

Archives Committee

Chair: Rainer Hering, Schleswig-Holstein State Archives
Astrid Eckert, Emory University
Norman Goda, University of Florida
Will Gray, Purdue University
Hal Rennert, University of Florida
Jennifer Rodgers, University of Pennsylvania
Gerhard Weinberg, University of North Carolina (emeritus)

Nominating Committee

Chair: Geoffrey J. Giles, University of Florida
Kevin Amidon, Iowa State University
Sara Lennox, University of Massachusetts, Amherst
David Patton, Connecticut College

Prize Committees:

DAAD book prize (for Germanics/culture studies) History/Social Science):

Chair: Katrin Sieg, Georgetown University
Katharina Gerstenberger, University of Cincinnati
Stuart Taberner, University of Leeds

DAAD article prize (for history/social science)

Chair: Elizabeth Heineman, University of Iowa
Mark Clark, University of Virginia, College at Wise
Devin Pendas, Boston College

Graduate Student Prize

Chair: Kathrin Bower, University of Richmond
Jennifer Miller, Southern Illinois University, Edwardsville
Zoe Lang, University of South Florida

Interdisciplinary Committee

Marc Silberman (University of Wisconsin—Madison) and Janet Ward (University of Oklahoma) have been reappointed to the committee and will co-chair the committee for the three-year term 2011-2014. Appointments to fill current vacancies on the committee will be announced soon.

Berlin Program Committee

Walter Frisch, Columbia University, 2010-12 (Musicology)

Sabine Hake, University of Texas, Austin, 2010-12 (Germanics)

Barbara McCloskey, University of Pittsburgh, 2012-14 (Art History)

Joyce M. Mushaben, Univ. of Missouri, St. Louis, 2012-14 (Political Science)

Helmut Walser Smith, Vanderbilt University, 2011-13 (History)

Jonathan Sperber, University of Missouri, Columbia, 2011-13 (History)

GSA Representatives to Friends of the German Historical Institute

Celia Applegate, University of Rochester, 2010-11

Suzanne Marchand, Louisiana State University, 2011-12

ACLS/GSA Delegate

Patricia Herminhouse, University of Rochester, 2012-15

GSA Investment Committee

Chair: Gerald Fetz, University of Montana (statutory)

Celia Applegate, University of Rochester (statutory)

David E. Barclay, Kalamazoo College (statutory)

Steven Brockmann, Carnegie Mellon University (statutory)

Patricia Herminhouse, University of Rochester

Katherine Roper, Saint Mary's College of California

Special GSA Conference Task Force

Co-chair: Celia Applegate, University of Rochester

Co-chair: Rolf J. Goebel, University of Alabama in Huntsville

Louise Davidson-Schmich, University of Miami

Pieter Moulton Judson, Swarthmore College

Lutz Koepnick, Washington University in St. Louis

Amy Wlodarski, Dickinson College

David E. Barclay, Kalamazoo College, *ex officio*

Report on Interdisciplinary Committee and Networks

David Warren Sabean

University of California, Los Angeles

[The establishment of interdisciplinary Networks has been one of the most important developments in the GSA in recent years, and one which is having a noticeable, and salutary, effect on the annual conference. Accordingly, we are publishing David Sabean's annual report to the Executive Board in order to apprise members of current developments.]

I. Members of the Committee (dates of appointment)

Nancy Collins (Columbia) (2008-11)
 Rolf Goebel (Alabama Huntsville) (2010-13)
 Timothy Guinnane (Yale) (2008-11)
 Roe-Min Kok (McGill) (2008-11)
 Maria Makela (Cal College of the Arts) (2010-13)
 Gavriel Rosenfeld (Fairfield) (2010-13)
 David Sabean (UCLA), Coordinator (2008-11)
 Marc Silberman (Wisconsin-Madison) (2008-11)
 Janet Ward (UNLV) (2008-11)
 Christopher Wild (Chicago) (2010-13)

II. The terms of service for the following end with the 2011 meeting:

Nancy Collins
 Timothy Guinnane
 Roe-Min Kok
 David Sabean
 Marc Silberman
 Janet Ward

III. Rolf Goebel is coordinator for Interdisciplinary panels for the 2011-12 programs

IV. Marc Silberman and Janet Ward have been reappointed to the committee and will co-chair the committee for the three-year term 2011-2014. They will make suggestions for new appointments to fill the current vacancies.

V. Development of Interdisciplinary panels 2008-11

- a) The point of organizing interdisciplinary panels and especially themed panel series by means of CFPs (organized by this committee, or by any other individuals or groups for GSA conferences) is to bring in brand new members (especially scholars from across the disciplines); to cross temporal lines of research enquiry when assembling the actual panels; and to blend the representation of disciplines within the panels themselves.
- b) We have seen that international participation goes up as a result of the CFPs announced on a variety of list-servs reaching non-member scholars abroad who are working on the topic at hand, and/or these international scholars receiving an invitation from a US-based GSA member to attend the conference.
- c) The committee has reflected the existing increase in themed panel series proposals that can be seen in the general panel proposal submissions to GSA. Valid concerns about a “conference within the conference” can nonetheless be allayed given the sheer number and variety of panels at GSA conferences—there is clearly still enough room for themed panel series to co-exist with individual panels and not dominate the program. Several panel series can help lend identity and coherence to what can otherwise appear to be a scattered “pot-pourri” of a conference program.

d) We had hoped that closer cooperation (even sponsorship and future symposia) could evolve between organizers of interdisciplinary panel series and relevant international institutes and archives. The point is to link the GSA more formally to centers of learning worldwide as an indirect result of the outreach performed by organizers of panel series. This remains as a desideratum for future development

e) Janet Ward served as the coordinator for Interdisciplinary/Diachronic panels from 2008-11. She reported on the 2010 program: For the 2010 GSA conference, the interdisciplinary/diachronic category was again flooded with so many proposals for series and papers (even after removing it from the fallback category position on the GSA website's drop-down menu!) that I was asked to do more than just winnow out those proposals not fully within our category -- but to "donate" many of the proposals that were bona fide interdisciplinary/diachronic to the other GSA program categories, so as to keep within the original allotments per category.

1) We are witnessing a "bottom-up" trend toward interdisciplinarity at the conference: scholars sending in their panel/paper proposals are not just increasingly defining their work as interdisciplinary; it is clearly now the case that more and more scholarship is being produced that is no longer containable within the traditional definitions of range/topic and temporality. Most people proposing interdisciplinary presentations are very well organized (a great bonus to this program coordinator!): they send in entire panels or even panel series; in other words they invited their preferred co-presenters or sent out CfPs well in advance of the February 15 deadline.

2) Several of these panels and panel series were put together by scholars with whom I was in communication during the fall of 2009 in order to assist them in organizing such panels and series. Interdisciplinary series for the 2010 conference include: "Asian-German Studies"; "Cosmopolitical and Transnational Interventions"; "Jews and the Transnational Public Sphere"; "New Approaches to Weimar Cinema"; "Space as a Keyword in German Studies"; "The Total Work of Art"; and "Money in the German Speaking Lands." I personally co-organized one of the interdisciplinary panel series called "(Trans)Nationalism and the German City." Jonathan Sheehan on our committee co-organized a series as well: "Law, Society, and Culture in Germany."

f) Rolf Goebel acted as coordinator for Interdisciplinary/Diachronic panels for the 2011 program.

1) Janet Ward noted in her report this year that the interdisciplinary/diachronic panels have gone from 25 in 2007 to 76 in 2011, with a steady increase. She comments: "The rise in Interdisciplinary/Diachronic panels has much to do with the emergence of the new interdisciplinary networks, the organizers of which created various panel series. Many of these panel series that fall under Interdisciplinary/Diachronic contain 20th-/21st-century historians, which goes some way to explain their apparent disappearance from the regular 20th-/21st-century category. At the same time, the Interdisciplinary/Diachronic panels tend to reflect a broadening of fields becoming more firmly represented at the GSA: musicology, anthropology, architecture, etc." Further: "The emergence of the

new interdisciplinary networks and other likeminded individuals/groups/organizations submitting various extended collections of panels has tended to create intellectually impressive and thematically cohesive “units” for the conference program. It should be noted that the greater the number of such panel series per category, the less grunt work a PC member has to do.”

2) Rolf Goebel reports: The interdisciplinary/diachronic panel section seems to continue to grow, as more and more scholars define their work in terms of disciplinary border-crossings, intermediality, and multicultural settings. Even panels/papers centered on literary topics often do so in an interdisciplinary context. With very few exceptions, all topics appeared to be legitimate and sound; some seemed a bit far-fetched or arcane, but not sufficiently so to warrant rejection. I was especially pleased to receive a large number of music-themed panels and individual paper proposals; this direction provides a welcome balance to the large number of panels/papers focussing on visuality. As was the case last year, many panels arrived in completely organized form, even though I frequently had to find an commentator/moderator. From a practical perspective, that task proved to be the most time-consuming and often frustrating (even though this challenge probably applies to other sections as well). This section has grown so large by now that I think we should consider dividing it into two--one for diachronic and another for interdisciplinary/intermedial panels/papers, with different coordinators for each. I am receiving some drop-outs from scholars due to lack of funding, health problems, and other reasons, some of which endanger panels where there are only two speakers left. In some cases, it has helped to move a speaker from another panel in the same series to that panel, but this is not always possible. Last but not least, I'd like to thank Janet Ward who has been exceptionally helpful and knowledgeable as program director and as a constantly available source of practical advice as I learned my job as section coordinator.

VI. During the past two years, the committee has experimented with developing a series of networks, which are intended to bring in new members to the GSA and new participants in the annual conference.

a) The first networks (together with their coordinators):

1) Law, Culture and Society

Jonathan Sheehan (Sheehan@berkeley.edu)

Timothey Guinnane (timothy.guinnane@yale.edu)

2) Religious Culture

Christopher Wild (wild@uchicago.edu)

John Smith (jhsmith@uci.edu)

3) Trans-regionalism and Transnationalism

Thomas Adam (Adam@uta.edu)

Deniz Göktürk (dgokturk@berkeley.edu)

4) Family and Kinship

Thomas Max Safley (tsafley@upenn.edu)

Silke-Maria Weineck (smwei@umich.edu)

5) Urban Society and Culture

Tanya Kevorkian (tanya.kevorkian@millersville.edu)

Chad Ross (Rossch@ecu.edu)

6) Visual Culture

Deborah Ascher Barnstone (dascher@acm.wsu.edu)

Thomas Haakenson (thaakenson@mcad.edu)

7) Memory Studies

Carol Anne Costabile-Heming (costabilec1@nku.edu)

Irene Kacandes (irene.kacandes@dartmouth.edu)

Gavriel Rosenfeld (grosefeld@mail.fairfield.edu)

b) Networks established or under construction during the past year:

1) Alltag

Andrew S. Bergerson (BergersonA@umkc.edu)

Craig Koslofsky (koslof@illinois.edu)

Brigitta Schmidt-Lauber (brigitta.schmidt-lauber@univie.ac.at)

2) Literature/Science/Technology

Jocelyn Holland (holland@gss.ucsb.edu)

Elisabeth Strowick (strowick@jhu.edu)

Rüdiger Campe (rudiger.campe@yale.edu)

3) War and Warfare

There was considerable correspondence about this. Developing it will be a task for the coming year.

c) Guidelines for the establishment of a network:

1) A network should be in the spirit of interdisciplinarity and/or encourage breaking with traditional periodization.

2) Each network will have two (or perhaps 3) coordinators, representing different disciplines or time periods, appointed for an initial period of 3 years. The networks will act as “subcommittees” of the Interdisciplinary Initiatives Committee.

3) The chief task of the coordinators is to develop a list of people from different disciplines relevant to the general topic. They can advertise through various list serves, H-Net sites, the GSA list serve, cull names from university and other websites, and ask relevant people for suggestions.

4) About six months before the deadline for the GSA program (around August), coordinators should canvass their lists for suggestions of topics, panels, and series of panels. They can use the list for following up suggestions and finding volunteers for papers. They should pay attention to continuity of discussion from meeting to meeting. The key thing is to bring different disciplines to bear on a problem and to develop new themes and subjects for the annual GSA meetings.

5) The network coordinators do not substitute for the established program coordinators but will send along suggestions to the relevant members of the program committee, with particular focus on the Interdisciplinary coordinator.

6) Network coordinators may wish to develop a dedicated forum on the GSA website to encourage discussion throughout the year. They may also wish to encourage workshops and conferences beyond the GSA annual meeting.

Report on the 2011 Meeting of the American Council of Learned Societies

Patricia Herminghouse
University of Rochester

At a time when phrases such as “crisis of the humanities” and “threats to the liberal arts” seem to dominate discussions of our humanistic endeavors, it was bracing to participate as GSA’s delegate in the somewhat more upbeat sessions of this year’s ACLS Annual Meeting in Washington, D.C.

The meeting opened with parallel evening sessions devoted to “The Consequences of Financial Turbulence in the Academy” and “The Humanities in Washington: Report of the National Humanities Alliance.” Given the threats to institutions such as NEH, Title VI, and the Fulbright programs in the current budgetary struggle, there is all the more reason to appreciate the work on behalf of the humanities carried out with efficiency and dignity by the Humanities Alliance. Nonetheless, the understated title of the first session and the diversity of its panelists drew my attention. I was rewarded with substantive discussion of the possibilities, indeed obligation for academics to take constructive, unified, energetic, and principled stands rather than engage in the usual blame game or rely on tired clichés about the value of the humanities. The session set a tone for the conference that was maintained in the next day’s reports from Nicole A. Stahlmann, Director of Fellowship Programs and ACLS President Pauline Yu .

Again this year, Stahlmann was able to report increased numbers of awards or improved stipends in some of the fellowship programs as well as new programs which attempt to create an alternate job market in the current difficult situation. The newest of these, the Public Fellows Program, funded by the Mellon Foundation, places eight recent Ph.D.s in two-year-long staff positions in government and non-profit agencies. In another program, now in its second year, sixty-five New Faculty Fellows took up two-year appointments in various colleges and universities. This program will not continue next year while ACLS evaluates what sort of program is most effective in the current “jobless job market,” but other recent initiatives such as the Digital Innovation Fellowships and Collaborative Research Fellowships are continuing. Information on all 2011-2012 fellowship competitions is now available on the ACLS website. Potential applicants should note that many deadlines for these programs occur in early fall.

In her report, President Yu pointed out, as others would subsequently do, the alarming threats, up to and including elimination of the NEH, faced by humanistic enterprises in the current budgetary crunch. A large measure of their disadvantaged position, she indicated, is because the humanities are not perceived as research enterprises that produce new knowledge useful to the human world. To address this damaging perception, Yu and ACLS Board Chair Anthony Appiah now serve on the new Commission on the Humanities and Social Sciences organized by the American Academy of Arts and Sciences. The commission has been established in response to a charge from Congress to identify the top ten actions that should be taken to assure “our intellectual and economic well-being; . . . a stronger, more

vibrant civil society; and . . . the success of cultural diplomacy in the twenty-first century.”

In concluding her report, Yu remarked on the ascendance of what she termed “market memes” in discussions of higher education. Asserting that higher education—including the humanities—is not just a private good in the sense of mere workforce preparation or an investment in personal career advancement, but rather a public good, “an investment in human capital” for the benefit of all society, she suggested that we need not “choose between arguing for the utility of humanistic study and making the case for its intrinsic value.” (The entirety of President Yu’s report and Chairman Leach’s speech, as well as an MP3 file of the session on “Global Perspectives on U.S. Higher Education,” can be found at http://www.acls.org/about/annual_meeting/2011/)

A similar note was struck in the luncheon address by NEH Chairman Jim Leach, who also remarked on the increasing tendency to focus on teaching job skills while giving short shrift to the humanities. To the pressure for training in “readin’, ‘ritin, and ‘rithmetic,” Leach would add a fourth “R” for reality, understood as “not only relevant knowledge of the world near and far but the imaginative capacity to put oneself in the shoes of others and creative apply knowledge to discrete endeavors.” While asserting the continuing determination of NEH to increase “knowledge development and dissemination” despite diminished resources, he also pointed to the discouraging state of federal support for the humanities, which -- in comparison to the sciences, where support has tripled since the mid-1990s—receive at best 1% of funding allocated to the sciences, indeed less than 1% of the Federal R&D budget.

A stimulating afternoon panel on “Global Perspectives on U.S. Higher Education” featured Lisa Anderson, President of the American University in Cairo; John Sexton, President of New York University; and Peter Lange, Provost of Duke University. While Sexton and Lange offered somewhat different accounts of the challenges and benefits of establishing branch campuses of their respective institutions abroad, Lisa Anderson (who had just been appointed President of AUC in January 2011) included interesting insights on the number of AUC students, faculty, and board members—some of them ministers in the Egyptian government—who had been actively involved in the events on Tahrir Square.

The entire ACLS Council moved to the Library of Congress for the final events of the meeting: the 2011 Haskins Lecture, delivered by Professor Henry Glassie of Indiana University, and a reception and dinner in his honor in the stunning Great Hall of the Library.

Aus deutschen Archiven GSA Archives Committee Report 2011¹

Rainer Hering
Landesarchiv Schleswig-Holstein

1.) In den Medien ist der nahezu vollständige Einsturz des Historischen Archivs der Stadt Köln am 3. März 2009 nach wie vor präsent, wenn es um das deutschsprachige Archivwesen geht.² Dieses Archiv ist das bedeutendste kommunale Archiv nördlich der Alpen, dessen Bestände inhaltlich weit über die Stadt und die Region hinausreichen, z.B. zur Hanse.

Seit August 2011 ist die Bergung der Dokumente nun abgeschlossen und ein erste Bilanz kann gezogen werden: Etwa 95 Prozent der Bestände sind derzeit geborgen, davon 35 Prozent schwerst beschädigt, 50 Prozent mit schweren und mittleren Schäden, 15 Prozent leicht beschädigt. Fünf Prozent der Bestände gelten als verloren. Die letzten fünf Prozent befanden sich im Grundwasserbereich und sind seit Ende 2010 in einer aufwändigen Aktion geborgen worden. Die Bohrungen zur Errichtung des Bergungsbauwerks hatten bereits erste Archivalien ans Licht gebracht, wie das Archiv berichtet. Hierbei handelt es sich vor allem um städtische Akten aus der zweiten Hälfte des 20. Jahrhunderts, darunter sogenannte "Ausländerakten" aus den 1960er und 1970er Jahren. Die Archivalien waren zwar durchnässt aber in einem relativ guten Zustand, da sie luftdicht abgeschlossen waren. Beim Herausholen an die Oberfläche kommen sie jedoch in Kontakt mit dem Luftsauerstoff, der den Schimmelbefall und die Zersetzung beschleunigt. Deshalb wird noch direkt an der Einsatzstelle mit der "Erstversorgung" begonnen. Dabei werden die Archivalien in sogenannten "Waschstationen" mit Frischwasser abgebraust, um Dreck und Steine zu entfernen. Anschließend folgt das Einschlagen in Stretch Folie sowie die Ablage in Gitterboxen, die rasch in die Gefriertrocknung nach Troisdorf gebracht werden. Im Kühlhaus werden die Fundstücke dann sehr schnell auf minus 28 Grad heruntergekühlt ("Schockfrostung") und später im Vakuum wieder aufgetaut. Dabei sublimiert das Wasser, das heißt, es verwandelt sich im Vakuum sofort in Wasserdampf und kann so abgesaugt werden, ohne das Archivgut erneut zu durchnässen.

Darüber hinaus werden die oftmals in viele Teile auseinander gerissenen und jetzt auf unterschiedliche Magazinstandorte verstreuten Akten weiterhin mühsam registriert, um sie wieder zusammenzuführen. Die einzelnen Stücke an den jeweiligen Lagerungsorten werden erfasst und identifiziert, damit man einen Überblick erhält. Für diese Aufgabe werden mehrere Jahre veranschlagt. Anschließend müssen die auseinandergerissenen Akten und Bestände zusammengeführt werden. Bis auch alle restauratorischen Maßnahmen abgeschlossen sind, werden vermutlich noch viele Jahre, wenn nicht Jahrzehnte, vergehen. Die Kosten dafür werden auf 350 bis 400 Millionen Euro geschätzt—allein mit der Restaurierung wären 200 Restauratoren und Hilfskräfte 30 bis 50 Jahre beschäftigt. Erst am Ende dieses Prozesses wird man genau wissen, was unwiederbringlich verloren gegangen ist.

Trotz dieser Situation können bereits digitalisierte Unterlagen nach Voranmeldung wieder genutzt werden. Der Digitale Lesesaal im Gebäude des Historischen Archivs

am Heumarkt 14 umfasst zehn Arbeitsplätze. Als zentrale Anlaufstelle bietet er allen Nutzerinnen und Nutzern Recherchemöglichkeiten über den PC. Mittlerweile hat das Historische Archiv fünf Millionen Digitalisate erstellt und auf einen städtischen Langzeitspeicher importiert. Diese verknüpfen die Mitarbeiterinnen und Mitarbeiter des Archivs in einem technisch und zeitlich sehr aufwendigen zweiten Schritt mit ebenfalls digitalisierten Findmitteln, die die Archivalien beschreiben, und stellen sie ins Netz. Zusätzlich kann man alle bereits sicherungsverfilmten und digitalisierten Bestände, meist aus der Zeit vor 1815, einsehen. Die wichtigsten Nachschlagewerke sowie gängige Standardliteratur zur Kölner Geschichte stehen für eine Einsichtnahme vor Ort (Handbibliothek) ebenfalls zur Verfügung. Die Planungen für einen Archivneubau in Köln schreiten voran. Im Jahr 2012 soll der Deutsche Archivtag in Köln stattfinden und sich Zukunftskonzepten für Archive widmen.

2.) Nicht vergessen werden darf über diesen spektakulären Einzelfall hinaus, dass gerade durch das säurehaltige Papier tagtäglich konservatorischer Handlungsbedarf in den Archiven (und Bibliotheken) gegeben ist. Schadensprävention ist die wirtschaftlichste Methode der Bestandserhaltung, aber sie ist unspektakulär und findet daher in der Öffentlichkeit nur wenig Aufmerksamkeit. Doch sie ist notwendig, wenn wir unser Kulturgut, unser historisches und juristisches Gedächtnis bewahren wollen.

Neu eingerichtet wurde in diesem Jahr die nationale Koordinierungsstelle für die Erhaltung des schriftlichen Kulturguts mit Mitteln des Bundesbeauftragten für Kultur und Medien und der Kulturstiftung der Länder. Sie fördert Modellprojekte, die innovativ, modellhaft und öffentlichkeitswirksam zum Erhalt des schriftlichen Kulturerbes in Bibliotheken und Archiven beitragen. Die Unterstützung vornehmlich kleinerer und regionaler Einrichtungen soll Trägern von Archiven und Bibliotheken Anreize geben, Maßnahmen zum Erhalt ihrer wertvollen Bestände zu ergreifen und auf diese Weise auch für andere Einrichtungen mit Vorbildfunktion wirken. Erwartet wird daher ein substantieller Eigenanteil des Trägers an der Vorbereitung, Finanzierung und Umsetzung der Maßnahme. Ob diese Mittel vor Ort zur Verfügung stehen, wird sich zeigen. Bislang reichten die dafür bereit gestellten öffentlichen Mittel nicht aus. Wenn sich das nicht nachdrücklich ändert, droht bereits mittel-, erst recht aber langfristig ein Verlust einer einmaligen Überlieferung.

3.) Nach wie vor wirken sich die knappen Haushaltsmittel gerade in einzelnen Bundesländern negativ auf die Lage der Archive in Staat, Kirchen und Kommunen aus. Dabei bereiten vor allem die Kürzungen im Personalhaushalt den Archiven große Probleme. Archive sind durch den permanenten Zuwachs an Unterlagen Wachstumsverwaltungen, die jährlich mehr Aufgaben erhalten, auch durch die gestiegenen Benutzerzahlen. Zugleich wachsen die Anforderungen, die die Kunden an die Archive stellen. Dem stehen die sinkenden Finanzmittel gegenüber. Als Konsequenz wird vereinzelt sogar erwogen, die bestehende gesetzliche Grundlage der archivischen Arbeit zu ändern, was die Sicherung der Überlieferung massiv gefährden würde. Insbesondere die kommunale Archivarbeit wird offenbar aus finanziellen Gründen als entbehrlich angesehen. Eine Umsetzung dieser Überlegungen würde für die historische Identität der Bevölkerung wie für die wissenschaftliche

Forschung fatale Konsequenzen haben. Im Bereich der Sicherung kirchlicher Unterlagen verhindern sinkende Kirchensteuereinnahmen einen adäquaten Ausbau des kirchlichen Archivwesens.

4.) An der Spitze des Bundesarchivs hat ein personeller Wechsel stattgefunden: Nach dem altersbedingten Ausscheiden von Prof. Dr. Hartmut Weber Ende März 2011 ist seit Mai 2011 Dr. Michael Hollmann, zuvor Abteilungspräsident Bundesrepublik, zum Präsidenten ernannt worden.

5.) Im Aufbau begriffen ist ein Europaweites Archivportal: <http://www.archivesportaleurope.eu/index.action>. Es bietet derzeit Zugang zu archivischen Erschließungsinformationen aus 17 europäischen Ländern sowie zu Informationen über Archive aus ganz Europa mit 38 Beständeübersichten und mehr als sieben Millionen Einheiten.

6.) Das Archiv des Internationalen Suchdienstes in Arolsen (IST) ist das weltweit größte Archiv über zivile Opfer des „Dritten Reiches“ und enthält 26.000 laufende Meter Unterlagen über Konzentrationslager, Inhaftierungen und Zwangsarbeit, die über 17,5 Millionen Menschen Auskunft geben. Digitale Kopie der Daten befinden sich derzeit im US Holocaust Memorial Museum in Washington sowie in Israel (Yad Vashem in Jerusalem), Polen (Nationales Institut des Gedenkens in Warschau), Belgien (Archives Générales du Royaume), Luxemburg (Centre de Documentation et de Recherche sur la Résistance) und nunmehr auch in Frankreich (Archives Nationales)—darunter auch Unterlagen über die Deportation französischer Widerstandskämpfer, die Ausbeutung französischer Zwangsarbeiter sowie die Verfolgung der Juden nach der Besetzung Frankreichs durch die Deutschen. Bislang wurden etwa 88 Millionen Abbildungen und über sechs Terabyte an Daten an diese Einrichtungen überreicht, darunter Dokumente zu Konzentrationslagern, Ghettos und Gefängnissen (ca. 18 Millionen Abbildungen), die Zentrale Namenkartei des ITS (ca. 42 Millionen Abbildungen), Registrierungskarten von Displaced Persons (ca. 7 Millionen Abbildungen) sowie Unterlagen zum Thema Zwangsarbeit (ca. 13 Millionen Abbildungen), zu DP Camps und zur Emigration (4,5 Millionen Abbildungen).

Neu übergeben wurden Teilbestände des Kindersuchdienstes und der so genannten Sachdokumente, also nicht personenbezogener Unterlagen, z.B. über die Logistik der Konzentrationslager, medizinische Experimente, den Verein „Lebensborn“ und Gerichtsprozesse der Nachkriegszeit (bisher ca. 2 Millionen Abbildungen). Zusätzlich wurden die ersten 76.000 von drei Millionen Korrespondenzfällen an die sechs Partnerorganisationen ausgehändigt. Die Digitalisierung der Korrespondenzfälle des ITS mit Überlebenden und Familienangehörigen und Behörden wird noch einige Jahre in Anspruch nehmen, da es sich um ca. 60 Millionen Blatt handelt.

Darüber hinaus sind nunmehr die ersten vier Findbücher zu Archivbeständen des ITS im Internet zugänglich und umfassen Teilbereiche, die bislang nicht für die Forschung zugänglich waren. Thematisch geht es um Zwangsarbeit, Todesmärsche aus Konzentrationslagern, den Generalbauinspektor für die Reichshauptstadt und das Verwaltungsamt für innere Restitutionsen, das u.a. für die Rückerstattung von persönlichem Eigentum der Häftlinge aus ehemaligen Konzentrationslagern zuständig war. Diese knapp 3000 Einheiten sind nach ihrer Herkunft und nach ihrem

Inhalt erschlossen.

Im Internet ist auch die Effektenliste zugänglich. Diese ca. 2.900 persönlichen Gegenstände, wie Brieftaschen, Fotos, Ausweispapiere und Briefe, waren den Häftlingen damals abgenommen worden. Sie stammen aus Konzentrationslagern (vornehmlich Neuengamme und Dachau sowie der Gestapo Hamburg) und sollen an Überlebende bzw. an Familienangehörige zurückgegeben werden. Im Rahmen eines eigenen Forschungsprojektes konnten 476 Effekten den Namen von ehemaligen Häftlingen zugeordnet werden. Mit der Publikation der Liste sollen der Kontaktaufnahme und die Rückgabe erleichtert werden.

Das ITS wird seit der Öffnung seiner Bestände in steigendem Maße genutzt. Im Jahr 2010 wurden 12.981 Anfragen (2009: 11.768, 2008: 10.251) gestellt. Etwa 80 Prozent kamen von Überlebenden der nationalsozialistischen Herrschaft und Familienangehörigen der Opfer, die übrigen stammen von Wissenschaftlern oder Journalisten. Das ITS wird oft von Gruppen besucht. Dafür hat es pädagogische Grundlinien entwickelt, die aufzeigen, was dort pädagogisch angeboten werden kann. Materialien für verschiedenen Jahrgangsstufen und Schulformen sowie für die außerschulische Bildung werden auf dieser Basis erarbeitet. Für alle Interessenkreise sind spezielle Rundgänge, Workshops und Vorträge erarbeitet worden; geplant ist die Publikation eigener pädagogischer Materialien.

Der Internationale Suchdienst in Bad Arolsen untersteht den elf Staaten des Internationalen Ausschusses für den Internationalen Suchdienst (Belgien, Frankreich, Deutschland, Griechenland, Israel, Italien, Luxemburg, Niederlande, Polen, Großbritannien, USA). Grundlage sind die Bonner Verträge von 1955 und das Änderungsprotokoll von 2006. Im Auftrag des Ausschusses wird der ITS vom Internationalen Komitee vom Roten Kreuz (IKRK) geleitet und verwaltet. Finanziert wird die Einrichtung aus dem Haushalt des Bundesinnenministeriums. Vorgesehen ist, die Zuständigkeit für diese Unterlagen ab 2013 auf das Bundesarchiv zu übertragen.

Nähere Informationen sind im Internet zu finden: www.its-arolsen.org.

7) Jennifer L. Rodgers (University of Pennsylvania) berichtet über eine aktuelle Kontroverse und ihre Erfahrungen mit der Arbeit beim ITS in Bad Arolsen

Recent Controversy over the Policies of the International Tracing Service

In recent months, controversy over access to and copies of material from the collections of the International Tracing Service (ITS) has played out in the German press and Bundestag. One researcher claims that the Red Cross has reverted to earlier policies of withholding and hindering access to documentation on the Holocaust and forced labor. He has raised further concerns regarding a policy that prohibits researchers from copying entire inventory entries (*Bestände*). This individual engaged the German party Die Linke, who subsequently filed a *Kleine Anfrage* with the Bundestag regarding the research conditions in Bad Arolsen.³ The Bundestag investigated the matter and responded that, of the hundreds of researchers who have conducted work at the tracing service, only this person mounted any concerns about the policies.⁴

In August of 2011, the *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung* published an article further addressing this researcher's ostensible difficulties with the ITS.⁵ It did not solicit any comment from either ITS Director Dr. Jean-Luc Blondel or the Research Director,

Dr. Susanne Urban. Moreover, the piece did not account for the Bundestag investigation and continued statements by both Blondel and Urban assuring historical researchers unfettered access to the documents.⁶ My own August research trip to review non-digitized institutional records for my dissertation underscored their position. Moreover, I spoke with another researcher who had the same experience during her review of the digitized *Lebensborn* collection. The ITS provided each of us individual support personnel who answered any requests we had and assured that every copy we requested was available on the day we departed. As the Red Cross begins to prepare for its departure from the Arolsen at the end of 2012, the ITS and its Research Division have given every indication of their intention to provide access to and copies of records relating to the period after 1933.

8.) Über die französische Besatzung in Deutschland und Österreich ist vergleichsweise wenig publiziert worden. Dabei bot das 1952 eingerichtete frühere französische Archiv in Colmar (Archives de l'occupation française en Allemagne et en Autriche) reichhaltiges Quellenmaterial, daher soll es hier näher vorgestellt werden. Seine Bestände umfassen ca. sechs laufende Kilometer Archivgut der französischen Besatzungsbehörden in Deutschland und Österreich (1945-1955) sowie der französischen Militärverwaltungen in Wien (1945-1955) und in Berlin (1945-1990). Dabei kann man drei Provenienzbereiche unterscheiden:

a. Die Zivilverwaltung der französischen Besatzung in Deutschland und Österreich (1945-1955)

Diese Unterlagen stammen aus den französischen Dienststellen in der französischen Besatzungszone in Deutschland und Österreich und aus der französischen Verwaltung im Saargebiet (Französische Gruppe des Kontrollrats in Berlin, Französische Militärregierung in Berlin, Französische Oberkommandantur in Deutschland [CCFA], Hohes Kommissariat der Französischen Republik in Deutschland [HCRF], Kommissariat für das Land Rheinland-Pfalz und Dienststellen in den Bezirken und Kreisen des Landes, Kommissariat für das Land Baden und Dienststellen in den Bezirken und Kreisen des Landes, Kommissariat für das Land Württemberg-Hohenzollern und Abordnungen der Bezirke und Kreise des Landes, Hohes Kommissariat der Französischen Republik in Österreich, Dienststellen in Wien und in den Provinzen Tirol und Vorarlberg, Generalkommissariat für deutsche und österreichische Angelegenheiten).

b. Archive der alliierten Dreiparteien-Organisationen in Deutschland, die Frankreich anvertraut wurden: Hohe Alliierte Kommission in Deutschland und das Gemeinsame Büro für Import und Export.

Darunter fallen: Die Hohe Kommission der Alliierten (1949-1955) (Generalsekretariat der Alliierten, Kontrollgruppe Stahl, Kontrollgruppe Kohle, Kontrollgruppe IG Farben, Büro für zivile Luftfahrt) und das Gemeinsames Büro für Import und Export oder Joint Export Import Agency (J.E.I.A.).

c. Bestände der französischen Präsenz in Berlin (Laufzeit bis 1990)

Im Jahr 2010 zog das Archiv mit seinen Beständen in das Zentrum der französischen diplomatischen Archive in La Courneuve, einem Vorort nördlich von Paris, um. Die Adresse lautet: Centre des archives diplomatiques, 3, rue Suzanne Masson, 93126 La Courneuve. In La Courneuve liegen die Bestände der Zentralen Verwaltungen

seit den Anfängen des Ministeriums für Auswärtige (und europäische) Angelegenheiten. Dazu kommen außerordentliche Erwerbungen sowie Nachlässe von Diplomaten und Staatsmännern. Jedes Jahr kommt etwa ein Kilometer Akten hinzu. Die Bestände gehen bis ins Mittelalter zurück und enthalten auch etwa 25.000 von Frankreich abgeschlossene Verträge.

Diese Unterlagen sind nunmehr in einem Zweckbau mit guten konservatorischen Bedingung aufbewahrt und an einem Ort zusammengefasst; sie umfassen insgesamt etwa 80 laufende Kilometer, von denen vorher ein großer Teil für Benutzer kaum zugänglich war. Dieses neue Zentralarchiv hat insgesamt 200 Beschäftigte und einen Lesesaal mit 160 Plätzen. Die Bibliothek des Außenministeriums mit etwa 450.000 Büchern, der bisher nur für die Beschäftigten des Ministeriums reserviert war, ist dort ebenfalls für die Öffentlichkeit zugänglich. Es handelt sich v.a. um Altbestände und Werke zu internationalen Beziehungen und zur Geschichte der Diplomatie.⁷

8.) Literaturarchive bieten nicht nur für die Germanistik, sondern gerade auch für die Geschichtswissenschaft wichtige Quellen. Herausragend ist das 1955 gegründete Deutsche Literaturarchiv in Marbach am Neckar. Finanziert wird es von der Bundesregierung und dem Land Baden-Württemberg sowie von den Städten Stuttgart, Ludwigsburg und Marbach sowie dem Landkreis Ludwigsburg. Mit rund 1.200 Nach- und *Vorlässen* von namhaften Schriftstellern, Schriftstellerinnen und Gelehrten gehört die Marbacher Handschriftensammlung international zu den führenden Sammlungen ihrer Art. Sie erwirbt, erschließt und archiviert Manuskripte, Briefe und Lebensdokumente vom 18. Jahrhundert bis in die Gegenwart. Der Zugang zu den Sammlungen steht allen offen, die Quellen für ihre Arbeit brauchen. Darüber hinaus finden sich hier auch *Redaktionsarchive literarischer Zeitschriften*, wie Merkur, Neue Deutsche Hefte, Text + Kritik, Texte und Zeichen, Die Wandlung, und Verlagsarchive, wie z.B. Cotta, Insel, Luchterhand, MÄRZ, R. Piper, S. Fischer. Die Bestände sind bis 1998 in Zettelkatalogen und Bestandslisten nachgewiesen, seit 1999 in der Datenbank. Im Museum finden regelmäßige Ausstellungen statt.

Als jüngste Neuzugänge sind die Briefe Franz Kafkas an seine Schwester Ottla zu nennen, die gemeinsam mit der Bodleian Library in Oxford erworben werden konnten. Beiden Institutionen, dem Deutschen Literaturarchiv Marbach und der Bodleian Library in Oxford, ist es in der Vergangenheit gelungen, die weltweit größten Kafka-Sammlungen zusammenzutragen: Die Bestände des Deutschen Literaturarchivs umfassen u. a. neben dem 1988 ersteigerten Manuskript des Romans *Der Prozess* Briefe von Franz Kafka an seine Geliebte Milena Jesenská aus den Jahren 1920 bis 1923 und Kafkas berühmten Brief an den Vater. Die Bibliothek des Literaturarchivs führt derzeit über 860 Nachweise der Primärliteratur und mehr als 4300 Nachweise der Sekundärliteratur zu Franz Kafka in ihrem Online-Katalog. Daneben betreut das Deutsche Literaturarchiv einen großen, laufend gepflegten Bestand von Zeitungsausschnitten, literarischen Dokumenten, Theaterprogrammen sowie die kostbare Sammlung der Hélène Zylberberg mit Zeitungsausschnitten (teilw. französisch) zu Kafka aus dem Zeitraum 1913-1972; die frühen Ausschnitte stammen teilweise aus dem Nachlass von Kafka. Die Bodleian Library der Universität Oxford bewahrt die größte Sammlung der

zum heutigen Zeitpunkt bekannten Handschriften Franz Kafkas. Die Sammlung umfasst Tagebücher, Reisetagebücher, Aphorismen, Briefe und Postkarten, Deutsch-Hebräische Vokabellisten und eine kleine Anzahl von Fotografien sowie literarische Notizbücher. Zu den Beständen gehören ferner die Romane *Der Verschollene* (Amerika), *Das Schloss* und die Erzählungen *Die Verwandlung*, *Das Urteil* sowie (in alphabetischer Reihenfolge) *Ein altes Blatt*, *Der Bau*, *Beim Bau der chinesischen Mauer*, *Ein Bericht für eine Akademie*, *Das Ehepaar*, *Elf Söhne*, *Ein Hungerkünstler*, *Der Jäger Gracchus*, *Eine kaiserliche Botschaft*, *Josefine die Sängerin*, *Eine kleine Frau*, *Schakale* und *Araber*.

Regelmäßig werden Ausstellungen und Veranstaltungen sowie Publikationen angeboten. Für Forschungen im Literaturarchiv gibt es ein Stipendienprogramm. Gefördert werden anspruchsvolle Forschungsarbeiten, die sich auf Sammlungen des Deutschen Literaturarchivs stützen.

Adresse: Deutsches Literaturarchiv Marbach, Schillerhöhe 8-10, 71672 Marbach am Neckar, Telefon +49 7144 848-0, Telefax +49 7144 848-299, <http://www.dla-marbach.de/startseite/index.html>.

9.) Grundsätzlich steht das Archives Committee für Fragen, Probleme und Hinweise zum Archivwesen im deutschsprachigen Bereich zur Verfügung. Auch Anregungen und Vorschläge für Veranstaltungen auf GSA-Konferenzen werden gern entgegengenommen. Sofern Mitglieder Erfahrungen mit der Anwendung der Informationsfreiheitsgesetze in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland haben, wird um Rückmeldung gebeten.

Rainer Hering, Landesarchiv Schleswig-Holstein, Prinzenpalais, 24837 Schleswig, Germany (rainer.hering@la.landsh.de).

¹ The Archives Committee consists of Astrid M. Eckert, Norman Goda, William Gray, Hal Rennert, Jennifer Rodgers, Gerhard Weinberg, and Rainer Hering (chair).

² Vgl. Rainer Hering: Anmerkungen zur Situation des Kölner Stadtarchivs nach dem Einsturz. In: German Studies Association Newsletter Vol. 34 No. 1 (Spring 2009), 39-42; James M. Brophy: Cologne's Catastrophe. In: German Studies Association Newsletter Vol. 34 No. 1 (Spring 2009), 43-46; Gedächtnisort. Das Historische Archiv der Stadt Köln. Hg. Von Bettina Schmidt-Czaia und Ulrich S. Soénius. Köln-Weimar-Wien 2010. .

³ Deutscher Bundestag Drucksache 17/ 5826 (May 13, 2011), "Forschungsbedingungen beim Internationalen Suchdienst des Internationalen Komitees vom Roten Kreuz," <http://dipbt.bundestag.de/dip21/btd/17/058/1705826.pdf> (last accessed August 29, 2011)

⁴ Deutscher Bundestag Drucksache 17/ 6023 (May 27, 2011), "Antwort der Bundesregierung auf die Kleine Anfrage „Forschungsbedingungen beim Internationalen Suchdienst des Internationalen Komitees vom Roten Kreuz,"" <http://dipbt.bundestag.de/dip21/btd/17/060/1706023.pdf> (last accessed August 29, 2011); and press release dated June 20, 2011 from the German Bundestag „Kaum Beschwerden über Arbeitsbedingungen beim Internationalen Suchdienst des Roten Kreuzes in Bad Arolsen," http://www.bundestag.de/presse/hib/2011_06/2011_254/04.html (accessed August 29, 2011)

⁵ Martin Otto, "Das Auswärtige Amt kann nichts ausrichten," *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, August 9, 2011, 29.

⁶ ITS Annual Report 2010, available at http://www.its-arolsen.org/fileadmin/user_upload/Dateien/jahresberichte/ITS_AnnualReport2010.pdf (last accessed August 29, 2011). See in particular pages 18-29, "Schwerpunktthema Forschung." Also see attached report "Inventing Research: The Department of Research within the ITS -- Aims and Challenges."

⁷ Für diese vielfältigen Informationen danke ich meiner Schleswiger Kollegin Bettina Dioum sehr herzlich.

Grants and Awards

The Botstiber Institute for Austrian-American Studies Grant and Fellowship Programs 2012

The Botstiber Institute for Austrian-American Studies (BIAAS) offers grants and a fellowship to promote an understanding of the historic relationship between Austria and the United States. The 2012 application guidelines are now available. Please see our website at www.botstiber.org/austrian for further details.

BIAAS seeks grant proposals for projects aimed at promoting an understanding of the historic relationship between the United States and Austria in the fields of history, politics, economics and law. Grant proposals that further the Institute's mission will also be accepted in the fields of literature, poetry, music and translations. Grant proposals may include support for related lectures, seminars, workshops, conferences and documentaries. Grant proposals for salary replacement will not be considered. Grants will not exceed \$25,000 unless a compelling case is made for a larger grant.

Grant proposals must be submitted by March 31, 2012. Applicants will be notified of the result of their application in July 2012. Grants will be distributed on or before September 1, 2012. A final report will be due within ninety days after the completion date of the award period.

BIAAS is accepting applications for the Botstiber Fellowship in Austrian-American Studies. The fellowship will be awarded to a scholar or professional who seeks funds for a project that promotes an understanding of the historic relationship between Austria and the United States. A grant of up to \$30,000 will be considered for support for salary, travel, or other necessary expenses. Applications from (i) graduate students, (ii) early-career professionals and (iii) mid-career professionals will be accepted. Grant applications must be submitted by March 31, 2012. Applicants will be notified of the result of their applications in June 2012. Distribution of the grant may occur within a two-year period thereafter.

Guidelines and More Information

For grant and fellowship application guidelines, and for more information about BIAAS, please visit our website at www.botstiber.org/austrian or contact:

Carlie Numi

Deputy Administrator

The Dietrich W. Botstiber Foundation

200 E. State Street, Suite 306-A

P.O. Box 1819

Media, Pennsylvania 19063

Email: cnumi@botstiber.org

Telephone: 610-566-3375

Fax: 610-566-3376

Issues and Discussions in German Studies

[The Thirty-Fifth Annual Conference of the GSA featured many memorable highlights. Among them were a memorable luncheon address by professor Mary Lindemann of the University of Miami and a remarkable banquet address by Professor Manfred Wilke of the Institut für Zeitgeschichte München/Berlin. We are pleased to publish both addresses in their entirety.]

Mary Lindemann is Professor of History at the University of Miami, Florida. She has written four books. Choice named her first monograph, Patriots and Paupers: Hamburg, 1712-1830 (Oxford University Press, 1990), "An Outstanding Academic Book for 1990." Health and Healing in Eighteenth-Century Germany (Johns Hopkins University Press, 1996) received the 1998 American Association of the History of Medicine William H. Welch Medal book prize. Cambridge University Press published the first edition of her survey, Medicine and Society in Early Modern Europe, in 1999. It has since been translated into Spanish (2001) and Portuguese (2003); a second edition followed in 2010. In 2006, she published Liaisons dangereuses: Sex, Law, and Diplomacy in the Age of Frederick the Great with Johns Hopkins University Press. Professor Lindemann is currently finishing a comparative study of political culture in three early modern "merchant republics": Amsterdam, Antwerp, and Hamburg. She has recently embarked on a new project entitled "Charlotte's Web: The Guyard Incest Case as History and Literature." Professor Lindemann has received many major scholarly awards including an NEH Fellowship; a John Simon Guggenheim Fellowship; a Davis Center Fellowship; a Fellowship from the Netherlands Institute for Advanced Study in the Humanities and Social Sciences; and, during spring 2011, is Fellow-In-Residence at the Flemish Academic Center for Science and the Arts in Brussels. She is a member of the Executive Board of the GSA and serves on several editorial boards including that of Central European History and Studies in Central European Histories (Brill Academic Press).]

Werther in Hamburg, Lotte in Jail: History, Literature, and the Pleasures of the Imagination

Mary Lindemann
Department of History, University of Miami

Everyone here knows the story of Werther and Lotte. But just in case it has been some time since you last read it, or taught it, let me refresh your memory. "Werther," a young pastor in Hamburg is appointed spiritual advisor to the city's Zuchthaus, where he meets Lotte, a seductively attractive women, incarcerated there since 1766. Love blossoms, a child is conceived, a scandal breaks, and—finally—Werther flees the city. A few years later, in a house adjacent to that same Zuchthaus, he blows his brains out. Okay, so that is not *quite* the Werther/Lotte story with which most of you are familiar but it is *a* Werther/Lotte tale that many eighteenth-century contemporaries would have immediately recognized.

The Werther story most of us know is both very different and very similar. Johann Goethe's youthful novel presented a part autobiographical romance that fired

the imagination of a whole generation of readers. It also triggered a widespread debate about morality, suicide, manliness, and love, and induced a huge number of authors to produce imitations, shifting the place and setting, changing the times and outcomes, following the romantic lines or satirizing them. Indeed, studies of the *Wertheriaden*, the “Werther-Krankheit” or the “Werther-Fieber” have sustained veritable cottage industries.¹ I have no intention of replowing these well-turned furrows and my subject is, after all, not *Die Leiden des jungen Werthers* but rather “Werther in Hamburg.”

The protagonists of my “Werther” story were Charlotte Guyard and Dietrich Scriba. This “Lotte,” soon after marrying a French merchant named Guyard, accused her father, Denys Martin, of forcing her to commit incest with him. For six months Charlotte held steadfastly to her story, embroidering it with further details of where and when the alleged crime took place (in the ice-cellar, in the kitchen, in an arbor) and further shocking her audience with lasciviously detailed descriptions of greater depravities with nine other lovers. Then, suddenly, unexpectedly, she recanted. Flipping the story on its head, Charlotte charged her husband with cooking up the sordid tale to ruin her father. Both men defended themselves in print and the scandal smoldered for years. For “making mischief,” the judges confined Charlotte in the city’s Zuchthaus indefinitely, where she met and seduced, or was seduced by, her “Werther.”

What is striking about this incident of true crime is how quickly it became literature; it was “literaturized.” Excuse the term; it is indeed an ugly one and breaks one of the Ten Commandments of good writing: “Thou shalt not create neologisms.” Nonetheless, it describes a phenomenon that I wish to address here: how various incidents (often crimes, but not invariably so) rapidly evolved into hardy literary perennials, blooming repeatedly over generations and even centuries and affecting writing far afield from *belles lettres*. Very often, the forms were trivial or the writing just plain bad, but just as frequently these stories laid down the foundations for greater fictional works.

The literaturization, however, went beyond the mere adaptation of incidents, and the introduction of tropes and phrases that created a literary or even novelistic “jargon.”² They became part of the European imagination and they evinced, as well as wrought, a profound transformation in how people not only wrote lives but also lived them. I am reluctant to go as far as Lynn Hunt, who postulated a sea-change in attitudes that arose from “reading accounts of torture or epistolary novels” and that actually “translated into brain changes” thus nurturing a modern sense of empathy and birthing the concept of “human rights.” But I will argue that people came to story life and events in certain ways as a result of the reading and composing of particular kinds of fiction and non-fiction in the late eighteenth century.³

The eighteenth century was a pivotal moment for so much, not least of all changes in the writing of history and literature when, scholars seem to agree, the two disciplines divided and merrily went their separate ways. Lionel Gossman, for example, noted that by the end of the eighteenth century, “history came to appear as something distinct from literature” and had begun its long slow march toward the

illusory pole of objectivity.⁴ Yet something quite different happened at the same time. The eighteenth century was also the crucible where genres fused to produce a strong and stable literary alloy that time has only slightly worn away. As Gossman also observes, at the very moment when literature and history were supposedly drifting apart, “the novel was giving itself an air of history and offering itself to the reader as reportage.”⁵

If, as Roy Porter has asserted, “pleasure came into its own in the eighteenth century,” one of its most pleasurable forms was the literature woven by the imagination. Romances, sentimental novels, melodramatic plays, and operas spread with astonishing speed⁶ Exceedingly popular were the “romances of real life” that became the *not*-forbidden best-sellers of the eighteenth century. I suspect that few will immediately recognize the name of Charlotte Turner Smith. In 1787, she published a three-volume work entitled *The Romance of Real Life* that proved a publishing sensation and whose title encapsulates my argument. In her preface she expressed the hope that these “few little volumes” would “prove as attractive as the most romantic fiction, and yet convey all the solid instruction of genuine history.”⁷ For her and her contemporaries, little tension existed between fiction and history and it is that easy movement between the “imaginary” and the “factual” that characterized a great deal of writing in the eighteenth century and since.

Smith’s subject was the *cause célèbres* of pre-revolutionary France; she drew her material from the multi-volume compilation of “true-crime” stories penned by the French lawyer François Gayot de Pitaval.⁸ From Pitaval, she selected just those incidents that would “lead us to form awful ideas about the force and danger of human passions” and sought to craft each “in my own way, render it as much as possible an interesting lesson of morality.” In other words, she reworked Pitaval’s legal tales for more popular consumption; she was by no means the first, or the last, to do so.⁹

Such true-crime proved an immensely engaging genre and newer “Pitavals,” as well as similar collections, quickly proliferated. Pitaval was neither *sui generis* nor a pioneer nor even a bellwether. What set him apart from his predecessors, however, was that he “allowed the human conflicts within each of the actors or involved persons to emerge dramatically and vividly.” While some of his villains and villainesses are indeed monstrous, even the most hardened and deadly act as human beings and possess redeeming human qualities. The early *Aufklärung*, with its “rational interest in human beings, also in their abnormalities and flaws,” nurtured such criminal histories and reportage. This tendency and this type of writing also appear elsewhere, for example, in moral weeklies, but crop up, as we shall soon see, in far less expected places as well.¹⁰

What distinguished Pitaval, therefore, was the pronounced imaginative quality his work exhibited. His “history of individual cases [that illustrated] . . . the rules of jurisprudence” and also simultaneously “perfectly satisfied curiosity.” Although he separated his accounts from “works of the imagination,” by which he meant “strange and supernatural events,” he believed his own stories gave “our spirit and heart a pleasure pure [and] exquisite.”¹¹ Pitaval’s true-crime tales found a large audience keen for what we might today call “creative non-fiction.”¹²

To give some idea of the pervasive influence of the eighteenth-century fusion of true-crime and literature, we need only follow the publishing history of Pitaval into the nineteenth and even twentieth centuries and across the Rhine. Julius Eduard Hitzig and Wilhelm Häring began publishing *Der neue Pitaval* in 1842; it ran to sixty volumes by 1890.¹³ This “new” Pitaval was both like, and unlike, its eighteenth-century model. Much true crime literature of the nineteenth century, and an even higher percentage of the eighteenth century’s, flowed from the pens of lawyers. Hitzig’s biography also began with law; he sat on the Criminal Council and Berlin Supreme Court. Hitzig, and even more, his collaborator, Häring, however, were deeply involved in the literary world. Hitzig frequented Rahel Varnhagen’s Berlin salon and struck up friendships with E. T. A. Hoffman and August von Kotzebue. Häring offers even clearer evidence for the ways in which law and literature entwined in these decades. He was a novelist who authored a series of *Väterlandische Romane* (such as *Der Werwolf* and *Der Roland von Berlin*) as well as “translations” such as *Walladmor*, originally attributed to Sir Walter Scott but which were actually his. Literary scholars probably know him better under his *nom de plume*: Willibald Alexis, one of the early practitioners of novelistic realism in Germany. He, too, had studied law.¹⁴

If one seeks to discern an evolution from the “old” to the “new” Pitaval, the divergence lies perhaps more in emphasis and audience than type.¹⁵ While the original Pitaval never solely addressed ongoing lawyers, such was its principal intended readership. Nonetheless, Pitaval’s stories, like cloned cells, extended their lives into the written, read, and imagined world of later centuries, down to today of course. They persisted possibly because they were so easily transposed in time and space and modified to convey differing morals as the remaking of Martin Guerre in the 1993 movie, *Sommersby*, set in post-Civil War America shows. It was Martin Guerre in Confederate gray fitted to an agenda of race, slavery, war-time love and loss.

The wider narrative appeal was always inherent in the original Pitaval, if never fully developed there. The mid nineteenth-century Pitavals and similar collections enhanced these qualities as they proliferated elsewhere in Europe. Although by no means unique to Germany, they certainly flourished luxuriantly there as, for example, in what was a virtual reprint of Friedrich Schiller’s 1790s selection and a translation of the original as *Geschichten aus dem alten Pitaval* that Insel brought out in 1910; Paul Schweder’s *Die grossen Kriminalprozesse des Jahrhunderts: Ein deutscher Pitaval* in 1961; or Karl Friedrich Kaul’s 1988 *Prozesse, die Geschichte machten* that covered the period 1887 through 1933.¹⁶ Authors composed Pitavals capturing specific urban environments. There was a *Prager Pitaval*, others for Berlin, Leipzig, Dresden, Freiburg, Bonn, Wiesbaden, and Vienna, to name just some of the almost limitless number that appeared in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. They multiplied in the German Democratic Republic and the Federal Republic; indeed, those published in the German Democratic Republic proved as popular, or perhaps even *more* popular a publishing phenomenon (to judge by the numbers of titles) as in the Federal Republic; they often bore an anti-fascist or anti-capitalist theme. The Brandenburg-Prussian Pitaval that appeared in 1979 with the

pregnant title *Das Richtschwert traf den falschen Hals* or that of 1953 about the Weimar Republic, *Justiz wird zum Verbrechen*, offer good examples.¹⁷ It was the persistence of themes, but also their rewriting, that explain the longevity of these genres. Many narratives, for example, crystallized around the Hamburg “Lotte” and “Werther” in the 1760s and 1770s and subsequently. Each reveals deeper historical trends, of course. And this is one reason, perhaps the most obvious, for studying them; not as transparent reflections of what “really happened” but as a way to explore, or even identify, historical issues of greater moment. One significant narrative in this case, for example, was religious. All three principals in the drama were Catholic; it was Charlotte’s expressed desire to convert to Lutheranism that eventually shipwrecked her “Werther” on the rocks of lust. The 1760s witnessed the last stand of the orthodox Lutheran pastors, led by Johann Melchior Goeze, against rational religion. Goeze was, of course, Lessing’s opponent in the *Fragmentenstreit*. He had also written an anti-Werther pamphlet and was adamantly opposed to the original appointment of “such a weak reed” as Scriba to any pastoral post.¹⁸

Such is a fairly standard way historians would use the “Werther in Hamburg” story. Yet even more interesting was the way in which Lotte’s husband and father couched their defenses; how each settled on certain rhetorical and narrative strategies to make their cases.¹⁹ Martin disingenuously represented his *Vollständige Acten* published in 1767 as a completely transparent assemblage of the pertinent legal documents. He was saying in effect “Here are the facts; they are clear; make up your own mind.” The very openness of the document and its feigned innocence of position were intended to generate credibility and verisimilitude.

Martin’s narrative strategy also reflected how legal writings themselves had developed by the eighteenth century.²⁷ Scholars in several disciplines have observed and analyzed the seepage of literary languages, styles, and tropes into legal culture. Indeed, the eighteenth century evolved a form of “sentimental legal reasoning” that relied on “a highly melodramatic presentation of facts.” French historians, such as David Bell and Sarah Maza, have noted that the *mémoires judiciaires* that frequently appeared in the form of pamphlets seeking to sway an emergent public opinion borrowed stylistic elements from the melodramatic *drame bourgeois*.²¹

The influence was transformative. Eighteenth-century legal culture depended increasingly on the techniques of “story-telling” and lawyers learned to construct their briefs as historical narratives that replicated true-crime reportage. Johann Stephan Pütter, professor of law in Göttingen, explained how legal documents could best convey “truth” and effect favorable decisions. While the formalities of titles and proper address continued to constitute significant parts of his tutelage, instructions on how to craft literary or narrative constructions were also central; baroque flourishes gave way to a “juristic poetics.”²²

This shift in legal writing also affected those who investigated crimes; they, too, composed “historical narratives”—*Geschichts-Erzählungen*—that detailed events but which also attributed motives and suggested possible courses of action that only the imagination could supply. These, too, were often highly melodramatic or sentimental in tone. For example, when the Hamburg syndic Garlieb Sillem reported on the death of the adventurer and *faux-count*, Joseph Visconti, slain in a

fight with an erstwhile Prussian lieutenant over the mistress of the Spanish consul in Hamburg, he produced a lively document combining history and dramaturgy. It replicated the speech and gestures common to contemporary drama and the physical layout of the report conveyed the stage directions. On the right-hand side of the folio sheets, Sillem swirled together a rich mixture of psychological motivations and character assessments while preserving a more formal legal framework of precisely numbered paragraphs. On the left, in the margins, appeared the stage directions and the actors' cues; "Arrival of victim," "First scene between the lovers," "The Discovery," "Appearance of the other players," and so on. Like all good novelists of the day, Sillem probed the psyches of his protagonists, highlighting "Circumstances and characters of the persons involved" and "What the consul really wanted." In another way as well, Sillem created. The "action" on the night of the murder proceeded by no means as seamlessly as his account presented it. Rather, he *imagined* what happened and produced a homogenous narrative by selecting, excising, accentuating, and then stitching remnants together into a whole-cloth story. There is, of course, a dose of legalese here, but overall the document makes for quite gripping reading.²³

Imaginings and reimaginings laid down different strata of literary sediment, but a hard structural core endured. True-crime stories and their literary *Doppelgänger*s insinuated themselves into other accounts, such as those of adventurers. These, too, cannot be dismissed as ephemeral, trivial, or escapist. The stories were retold, often years later, with different ends in mind but stylistically, they preserved—and further elaborated—the true-crime sentimentalism they had first acquired in the eighteenth century.

The real-life experiences of eighteenth-century adventurers followed similar plottings and stylistic lines and evidenced the same longevity and demonstrated the same dual identity as literature and life. The older picaresque novels, by "break[ing] down the traditional separation of styles and establish[ing] the legitimacy of considering vulgar characters as appropriate subjects for morally serious literature,"²⁴ made it easier for ordinary people to envision their lives and the lives of fictional, semi-fictional, or quite real adventurers, rogues, and criminals as similar and similarly plotted or even to pattern life in a literary mode.²⁵ One also wonders about the "brain-wave" effect that such literary narrative constructions had on how people described their lives in words penned or spoken as they shaped memory "flashes" into more coherent forms.

One of the best known eighteenth-century German adventurers was Theodor von Neuhoff, the erstwhile king of Corsica, whose often exotic exploits attracted many later literary and non-fictional treatments. Interest in him continues today, perhaps stimulated by the movement within the European Union to recognize regional autonomy. In April 2011, Schloß Neuenhof in Westphalia staged an exhibition to commemorate the 275th anniversary of his coronation.²⁶ He was involved with other major figures on the European diplomatic and economic stage, whose own larger-than-life reputations and activities bore the marks of a picaresque, or at least peripatetic, life: Freiherr Georg Heinrich von Görtz (the chancellor of the Swedish king, Karl XII), the Baron Ripperda, and John Law.³⁴

The number of books on Neuhoff is astonishingly large and spans the centuries from the 1700s to today; these explicitly acknowledge that “his life was made for fiction.”²⁸ In the late nineteenth century, Percy Fitzgerald included Neuhoff among his *Kings and Queens of An Hour*, the sole non-English figure to appear in this two-volume work. In a list of outscaled figures such as Casanova, St. Germain, Ripperda, Law, and D’Eon, Fitzgerald ranked that “yet more remarkable adventurer, whose story has all the colors and brilliancy of a romance—THEODORE OF NEUHOFF, who played for a throne, won, and even kept it for a time.” Had a novelist like Alexander Dumas the elder written the tale, he opined, it would have “taken the shape of an absorbing and even chivalrous romance.”²⁹

Fitzgerald was but one of Neuhoff’s admirers. The mid nineteenth-century French historian, André Le Glay, recognized in Neuhoff the mentality of all Rococho adventurers “whose brains boiled over with ideas and schemes” but who were “poorly balanced.”³⁰ The first president of the Federal Republic, Theodor Heuss, found literary inspiration in several “Randfiguren der Geschichte” and, in a book published in 1950 (that went through many subsequent editions, appearing most recently in 2009), dedicated a chapter to “Der König von Korsika.” He, too, located Neuhoff among “the remarkable figures of the eighteenth century” whose lives were more wonderful than all “make-believe.”³¹

But you did not have to be a king (even an ephemeral one), or a financial high-roller like John Law, to have a life that echoed through literature as a sentimental literary narrative. Charlotte Guyard’s story produced an equally rich crop of writings that crossed literature and life. While, as we have seen, her father’s version took on the form of a sober, almost legalistic collection of documents, her husband produced a far more literary defense; his *Schreiben* drew directly on the literature of true-crime. The confusion over fictive and real events and authors in this case can be seen even today: the University of Minnesota library system refers to the author, Guyard, as a “fictitious character.”³² Guyard’s own account reimaged Charlotte as the nefarious Madame Lescombat, who, in Paris in 1753, plotted with her lover to murder her husband. The multiple retellings of her tale provided the “stuff” for fictive accounts, including several *Lettres amoureuses*. Madame Lescombat thus lived on for centuries to be executed again and again as entertainment in novels, stage plays, and operas. Guyard, however, fictionalized the true-crime aspects of her life for another purpose: to project the truth of his own position.

Nineteenth-century writers then reformulated Charlotte’s story incorporating it into a new literary genre: that of the “urban mystery.” The “mysteries literature” reproduced the sentimental and melodramatic style but added a realism drawn from the very fabric of the nineteenth-century city. Eugène Sue’s *Les Mystères de Paris* set the pace and Sue’s imitators, like Pitaval’s, were legion: Francesco Mastiani’s *Mystères de Naples*, George W.M. Reynolds, the *Mysteries of London*, and last but hardly least, Émile Zola’s *Les Mystères de Marseille*. In all these, fiction and melodrama mixed with social consciousness and social criticism to whip up a blend that drew heavily on the eighteenth-century sentimental novel and contemporaneous true-crime writings.³³ If Zola, Mayhew, and Sue dominated the genre, they were surrounded by thousands of others who fed—and fed on—a public’s seemingly

insatiable hunger for such material.

One of these epigones was Bernhard Heßlein, doctor of philosophy and erstwhile tutor, who, beginning in the mid nineteenth century, turned his hand to the writing of literary descriptions of cities and historical fiction. From the late 1840s until his death in 1882, he published over forty volumes of travel literature, historical novels, true-crime, and the ever popular “moral panoramas.” One was *Hamburgs berühmte und berüchtigte Häuser in historischer, criminalistischer und socialer Beziehung* in which Heßlein combined fiction, travelogue, and topography to craft captivating vignettes, of which perhaps the raciest lay concealed under the prosaic title of “Der Kaiserhof.”³⁴ Here he recast Lotte and Scriba. In this mid nineteenth-century version, however, incest, perjury, and imprisonment played no role. Rather, we find a story of “Werther’s” unrequited love for Charlotte, herself here reimaged as a femme-fatale who toyed cruelly with his affections. After being spurned for another lover, the “little pastor,” that is, Scriba, returns on Lotte’s wedding night. He begs her to elope with him and threatens her with a poisoned dagger— “the slightest scratch,” he warns her, “will mean your instant death.” Charlotte flees successfully; the “little pastor” is captured and hauled off to prison where he hangs himself.

Heßlein was by no means a great writer. He successfully drew, however, on several genres and fabricated a new Charlotte for his time. His Charlotte is a bad woman, a practiced flirt, and a manipulative female. Unlike her eighteenth-century counterpart who was, or presented herself, as either the helpless pawn of her husband or the hapless victim of her father, here she is strong and independent, if also a bit frightening. Incest has disappeared along with all explicit sexual themes. Heßlein has taken up other strands of the bourgeois family drama and woven out of them a nineteenth-century “Charlotte” possessing some traits of the heartless Madame Lescombat yet in a more domesticated form: that of a coquette.

Murder and mayhem, scandal and adventure were the narrative skeins many used to describe lives (their own or others), knitting them up as dramas and romances. Such interlacing could serve many purposes, to defend their makers in a court of law, to earn a living, or even to construct a coherent account of their own actions. Similar narrative characteristics thus existed in what may seem odd places, such as in the seemingly sober world of business. Bankruptcy and speculation became literary tropes in the eighteenth century and “tales of insolvency” proliferated, likewise assuming sentimental and melodramatic forms. The contemporary discussion of bankruptcy was literaturized, as can be seen in its treatment in the moral weeklies whose significant impact derived from their presentations of “real” people who were, of course, almost inevitably fictional creations. In laying out the road to economic perdition, that is, to bankruptcy, *Der Patriot* fabricated the tale of two brothers whose life-stories were parablized as the grasshopper and the ant.³⁵

But the frivolous bankrupt as trope did not only appear in the pages of spectatorial publications like *Der Patriot* or in literary productions like Johann Jacob Dusch’s 1763 play, *Der Bankerot, ein bürgerliches Trauerspiel*; it existed in very similar terms in contemporary legal documents—as a sentimental tale and a romance of real life. One finds it embedded in Hamburg’s new Bankruptcy Ordinance of

1753, for example. Memoirs, too, reveal how deeply sentimental and melodramatic styles had struck root in everyday life. One of the wealthiest men in Hamburg, John Parish, filled his journal with descriptions of mental tortures that accompanied his many business dealings and that he portrayed in words that could have easily been found in the sentimental novels of the day. When reflecting on the nail-biting experiences of the 1783 economic crisis, that left him holding huge numbers of virtually worthless bills, he moaned “[it was] my hardest stand.” “O! . . . what I suffer’d in that fortnight! . . . I can still recollect it, as yesterday, I shudder when I think of it. . . it shook the very marrow in my bones.”³⁶

The study of literary styles, motifs, and manner of presentation may appear a strange topic for a historian, even one brazen enough to brave literary tides without her water-wings. My brief, however, is not to trace forms or specific storylines through centuries, at least not alone. Rather, the developments I discuss here—the growth and persistence of a certain way of relating events, either “real” or “fictional” ones, the heavy reliance on a sentimental, melodramatic mode that developed in the eighteenth century, the overlap of styles whether in law, literature, or even business—have historical and methodological relevance. The story of “Werther in Hamburg and Lotte in Jail,” or rather the *stories* told around those quite real events, often used literature and fictional characters and associations to project truth. Likewise, the sentimental mode influenced not only how legal briefs were constructed but actually how cases were argued and decided, in formal courts and in the court of public opinion.³⁷ In the nineteenth century, for example, the melodrama of life would become increasingly central in the development of the insanity defense where detailed biographies, attentive to moods, emotions, and passions became critical in the discussions for and against. If one wants to go further, and I think it merits some speculation here, one could argue that as life was literaturized in the ways I have described the effect did not rest only in the realm of the imagination, however much pleasure it gave there, but also affected how people acted. We need, therefore, to turn our attention to styles in literature not in any hope (probably vain) of separating literature and history or fact from fiction, but to understand the literary core of late eighteenth- and post-eighteenth-century life.

¹See, for instance, Bruce Duncan, *Goethe's "Werther" and the Critics* (London: Camden House, 2005); on the Wertheriana in particular, Ingrid Engel, *Werther und die Wertheriaden: Ein Beitrag zur Wirkungsgeschichte* (St. Ingbert: Röhrig, 1986) and Karin Vorderstemann, “*Ausgelitten hast du - ausgerungen . . .*”: *Lyrische Wertheriaden im 18. und 19. Jahrhundert* (diss., Freiburg im Breisgau, 2006).

²See the column “The Mechanic Muse” by Ben Zimmer titled “The Jargon of the Novel: Computer Analysis Reveals the Stylistic Tics Unique to Fiction Writing,” *New York Times Book Review* (31 July 2011).

³Lynn Hunt, *Inventing Human Rights: A History* (New York: W.W. Norton, 2007), 33-34.

⁴Lionel Gossman, *Between History and Literature* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1990), 227; Peter Novick, *That Noble Dream: The “Objectivity Question” and the American Historical Profession* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1988).

⁵Gossman, *Between Literature and History*, 236, 239.

⁶Roy Porter, “Enlightenment and Pleasure,” in idem and Marie Mulvey Roberts, eds., *Pleasure in the Eighteenth Century* (New York: New York University Press, 1996), 1, plus several essays in that

volume; John Richetti, *The English Novel in History 1700-1780* (London: Routledge, 1999).

⁷ Charlotte Turner Smith, *The Romance of Real Life* (3 vols.; London: Cadell, 1787).

⁸ François Gayot de Pitaval, *Causes célèbres et intéressantes, avec les jugemens qui les ont décidées* (22 vols.; The Hague: Jean Neaulme, 1748-65). The publishing history of Pitaval also testifies to its popularity. The original was apparently twenty volumes, published in Paris with Guillaume Cavelier between 1734-43. The twenty-two volume edition I used, and which seems to be the most common one available, may have been a pirated edition. The first German edition, by an anonymous compiler/translator, appeared in Leipzig: *Erzählung sonderbarer Rechtshandel sammt deren gerichtlichen Entscheidung* (9 vols.; Leipzig: Kiesewetter, 1747-68). There were numerous other continuations, additions, translations, selections, and compilations, including many in the nineteenth and twentieth century. One of the most recent, albeit actually a re-issuing of Schiller's collection, is: Oliver Tekolf, ed., *Schillers "Pitaval": Merkwürdige Rechtsfälle als ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Menschheit* (Frankfurt am Main: Eichborn, 2005).

⁹ Smith, *Romance*, v. A modern analysis of Pitaval that appeared in the introduction to a new collection and edition of his *Unerhörte Kriminalfälle* (Cologne: Parkland Verlag, 1998) noted that Pitaval was not always successful, indeed only limitedly so, in turning criminal and legal cases into a "spannende Handlung." (11)

¹⁰ Similar works included: August Gottlieb Meißner, *Kriminalgeschichten* (Vienna: Doll, 1796); Christian Heinrich Spieß, *Biographie der Selbstmörder* (4 vols.; Leipzig: Schönfeld, 1785-89); Friedrich Schiller, *Der Verbrecher aus verlorener Ehre: Eine wahre Geschichte* (1786). Meißner's work was re-issued several times, including most recently in 2004 with a "Nachwort" by Alexander Kosenina as *Ausgewählte Kriminalgeschichten* (2nd. ed.; St. Ingbert, Röhrig, 2004); Kosenina also selected and edited Spieß's *Biographie* (Göttingen: Wallstein, 2005); and, of course, there are many editions of Schiller's *Verbrecher*.

¹¹ *Causes célèbres* (24 vols.; 1739-1770), 1: xiiij.

¹² Creative nonfiction is also called literary or narrative nonfiction. The genre uses literary styles and techniques to create factually accurate narratives. Chris Anderson, *Literary Nonfiction: Theory, Criticism, Pedagogy* (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1989); Lee Gutkind, *The Art of Creative Nonfiction: Writing and Selling the Literature of Reality* (New York: Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1997). There is also a journal devoted to creative nonfiction: *Creative Nonfiction* (Pittsburgh, PA, 1994-).

¹³ Julius Eduard Hitzig and Wilhelm Häring [later Anton Vollert], eds., *Der neue Pitaval: Eine Sammlung der interessantesten Criminalgeschichten aller Länder aus älterer und neuerer Zeit* (60 vols.; Leipzig: Brockhaus, 1842-90). A recent dissertation on *Der neue Pitaval* discusses the work in literary, historical, political, and social terms and offers a reading that reinterprets *Der neue Pitaval* as not a mere copy of the eighteenth-century model but an original contribution to the crime literature of the nineteenth century: Michael J. Divine, "The Crime of the Century: The Psychology and Politics of Deviance in *Der neue Pitaval*, 1842-50" (Ph.d. diss., Washington University, 2004).

¹⁴ S.v. Hitzig, Julius Eberhard in ADB and NDB; Nikolaus Dorsch, *Julius Eberhard Hitzig: Literarisches Patriarchat und bürgerliche Karriere, Eine dokumentarische Biographie zwischen Literatur, Buchhandel und Gericht der Jahre 1780-1815* (Frankfurt a. Main: Lang, 1994); s.v. Alexis, Willibald in ADB and NDB; Wolfgang Beutin, ed., *Willibald Alexis (1798-1871): Ein Autor des Vor- und Nachmärz* (Bielefeld: Aisthesis-Verlag, 2000).

¹⁵ Divine, "Crime," argues differently.

¹⁶ Friedrich Schiller, ed., *Merkwürdige Rechtsfälle als ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Menschheit: Nach dem Französischen Werk des Pitaval durch mehrere Verfasser ausgearbeitet und mit einer Vorrede begleitet* (Jena: Christian Heinrich Cuno's Erben, 1792-96); Paul Ernst, comp., *Geschichte aus dem alten Pitaval* (3 vols.; Leipzig: Insel, 1910); Paul Schweder, *Die grossen Kriminalprozesse des Jahrhunderts: Ein deutscher Pitaval* (Hamburg: Kriminalistik, 1961); Friedrich Karl Kaul, *Prozesse, die Geschichte machten: Deutscher Pitaval von 1887-1933* (Berlin: Verlag Neue Berlin, 1988).

¹⁷ Egon Erwin Kisch, *Prager Pitaval* (Berlin: E. Reiss, 1931); Karl Friedrich Kaul, *Von der Stadtvogtei bis Moabit: Ein Berliner Pitaval* (Berlin: Das neue Berlin, 1965); idem, *Vornehme Leute: Der Bonner Pitaval* (Berlin: Das neue Berlin, 1964); Klaus Hermann and Andrea Lefevre, *Neuköllner Pitaval: Wahre Kriminalgeschichte aus Berlin* ([Hamburg]: Rotbuch, 1994); Walter Fellmann, *Leipziger Pitaval* (Berlin: Militärverlag der DDR, 1980); Willy Forner, *Dresdener Pitaval: Kriminalfälle aus 4 Jh.* (Berlin: Militärverlag der DDR, 1979); Wolf Middendorff, *Freiburger kleiner Pitaval:*

Kriminalfälle aus unserer Stadt (Freiburg im Breisgau: Kehrer, 1984); Hans-Jürgen Fuchs, *Verbrechen und Schicksale: Ein Wiesbadener Pitaval, spektakuläre Kriminalfälle aus vier Jahrhunderten* (Wiesbaden: Edition 6065, 2005); Max Edelbacher and Harald Seyri, *Tatort Wien, der neue Wiener Pitaval: Dokumentation der bedeutendsten Kriminalfälle Wiens des 20. Jahrhunderts* (Vienna: Edition Seyri, 2004-); Peter Kaiser, Norbert Moc, and Heinz-Peter Zierholz, *Das Richtschwert traf den falschen Hals: Ein brandenburgisch-preussische Pitaval* (Berlin: Militärverlag der DDR, 1979). While cities were generally the sites of Pitavals, there were also ones treating regions, for instance: Lemke Dietrich, *Mord und Totschlag in der Rhön: Höher Pitaval, Vergehen und Verbrechen und ihre Ahndung in der Thüringischen Rhön vom 16. bis zum 20. Jahrhundert* (Zeuthen: Lemke, 2007).

¹⁸ Franklin Kopitzsch, “Lessing und seine Zeitgenossen im Spannungsfeld von Toleranz und Intoleranz,” in *Deutsche Aufklärung und Judenemancipation* (Special issue of *Jahrbuch des Instituts für Deutsche Geschichte*; Tel Aviv: Institute für Deutsche Geschichte, 1980), 29-85; William Boehart, *Politik und Religion: Studien zur Fragmentenstret (Reimarus, Lessing, Goeze)* (Schwarzenbeck: Martienss, 1988); Hugh Barr Nisbet, *Lessing: Eine Biographie* (Munich: Beck, 2008), 701-44. Archival material on Goeze and Scriba in Staatsarchiv Hamburg [hereafter StAHbg], Ministerium (511-1), III A, vol. 5: 807-12, 837-47; *ibid.* III B13, vol. 2: 883-85, 887-96, 913-14; *ibid.*, vol. 3: 921-28, 1047-52;

¹⁹ Denys Martin, *Vollständige Acten in der selten und überaus wichtigen Sache, Denis Martin wider seinen unwürdigen Schweigersohn und unwürdige Tochter, Jean François Guyard und Carlotta Guyard gebhrne Martin, in Hamburg, Criminel-Verläumder; insonderheit itzo wider die Herren Bürgermeister und Rathmänner der Stadt Hamburg wegen übel verwalteter Justiz, . . .* (n.p. [Hamburg]: n.p., 1767); Johann Franz Guyard, *Schreiben des Kaufmanns Guyard in Hamburg an seine Mitbürger: Als eine Einleitung zu seinen herauszugebenden Mémoires* (n.p. [Hamburg]: n.p., 1767).

²⁰ When Natalie Davis investigated the pardon tales of sixteenth-century France, she analyzed how these “fictions” were constructed and the purposes to which the “tellers” turned them. In examining prerevolutionary *causes célèbres*, Sarah Maza deftly unraveled the fictions and political agendas embedded in the *mémoires législatives*. More recently, James Farr in relating *A Tale of Two Murders* in seventeenth-century Burgundy observed how often legal documents approximate fictional ones (the various *histoires* he discusses). I, too, have treated one such affair that played out in Hamburg in the 1770s as a way to study the overlap of sexuality and eighteenth-century diplomacy. Certainly all of this is quite well-known today and part of the stock and store of how historians write about crime and legal culture as, for instance, David Myers’s new book, *Death and a Maiden* abundantly demonstrates. Natalie Zemon Davis, *Fiction in the Archives: Pardon Tales and their Tellers in Sixteenth-Century France* (Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1987); Sarah Maza, *Private Lives and Public Affairs: The Causes célèbres of Prerevolutionary France* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1993); James R. Farr, *A Tale of Two Murders: Passion and Power in Seventeenth-Century France* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2005), 198; Mary Lindemann, *Liaisons dangereuses: Sex, Law, and Diplomacy in the Age of Frederick the Great* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2006); William David Myers, *Death and a Maiden: Infanticide and the Tragic History of Grethe Schmidt* (DeKalb, IL: Northern Illinois University Press, 2011).

²¹ Amalia D. Kessler, *A Revolution in Commerce: The Parisian Merchant Court and the Rise of Commercial Society in Eighteenth-Century France* (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 2007), 91-95.

²² Wolfgang Schild and Eckhardt Meyer-Krentler have argued, for example, that we can discern here the development of a “juristic poetics,” tied to “sobriety, objectivity, brevity, clarity, [and] discipline,” the formed part of an ongoing bureaucratization of society.” Wolfgang Schild, “Relationen und Referierkunst: Zur Juristenbildung und zum Strafverfahren um 1790,” in Jörg Schönert, eds., *Erzählte Kriminalität: Zur Typologie und Funktionen von narrativen Darstellungen in Strafrechtspflege, Publizistik und Literatur zwischen 1770 und 1920* (Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1991), 159-76; Eckhardt Meyer-Krentler, “Geschichtserzählungen,” in *ibid.*, 117-57.

²³ “Actenmäßige Geschichts-Erzählung, wegen der Entleibung des sogenannten Visconti,” presented to the Senat on 4 December 1775, StAHbg, Senat Cl. VII Lit. Me no. 8 vol. 6 fasc. 2. The written defense submitted on Kesslitz’s behalf was constructed in a similarly narrative manner, but the “facts” here led to quite different conclusions. See [Andreas Wilhelm Uhendorff], “Libellus ex Officio Inquirentis und Pein. Anklagers, entgegen und weiter [wieder?] Herrn Joseph, Baron von Kesslitz, Gefangenen, p. p.,” (n.d. [probably December 1775] in *ibid.* Senat Cl. VII Lit. Me no. 8 vol. 6 fasc. 3.

Historians who use court records in their more undigested form, that is, one that contain

“statements by suspects, witness accounts, detailed torture proceedings, legal opinions by the city’s advocates, private pleas, and summaries of the various judicial meetings,” also make “interpretative choices . . . about what to take from which document” to construct their own narratives. But as those very prolix documents are *themselves* constructed as narratives, we find ourselves often faced with a historian’s reimagining of a contemporary’s reimagining and with a manner of writing, thinking, and perceiving that became common in the eighteenth century. Maria Boes, “On Trial for Sodomy in Early Modern Germany,” in Tom Betteridge, ed., *Sodomy in Early Modern Europe* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2000), 27 and Stephen Robertson, “What’s Law Got to Do with It? Legal Records and Sexual Histories,” *Journal of the History of Sexuality* 14 (2005): 165.

²⁴ Richard Bjornson, “The Picaresque Novel in France, England, and Germany,” *Comparative Literature* 29 (1977): 125. Obviously, the genre found a home in the German-speaking lands as well. One need only think of Grimmelshausen’s *Simplissimus* (1668) or Christian Reuter’s *Schelmuffsky* (1696). Gerhart Hoffmeister, ed., *Der deutsche Schelmenroman im Europäischen Kontext* (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1987); Ulf-Heiner Marckwort, *Der deutsche Schelmenroman der Gegenwart: Betrachtungen zur sozialistischen Rezeption pikaresker Topoi und Motive* (Cologne: Pahl-Rugenstein, 1984); Matthias Bauer, *Der Schelmenroman* (Stuttgart: Metzler, 1994). For a long, if not comprehensive list, of works influenced by the *Schelmenroman* but not generally considered such, see <http://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Schelmenroman>.²⁵ The typical picaresque novel and its offspring, usually depicted “travel through space and/or time, interactions with representatives of different social classes, frequent ups and downs in the life of the protagonist, and costume changes and disguises, including cross-dressing, petty criminality, varied sexual encounters, initiation rites, and numerous changes in employment.” *Feminist Encyclopedia of German Literature*, ed. by Friederike Eigler and Susanne Kord (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1997), 397.

²⁶ <http://www.koenig-theodor.de/eng/>

²⁷ The literature on John Law and his financial schemes is enormous. Perhaps the best work is that of Lawrence Lande, *The Rise and Fall of John Law, 1716-1720* (Montreal: Lawrence Lande Foundation for Canadian Historical Research, 1982). There is also a quite recent popular work by Janet Gleeson, *Millionaire: The philanderer, Gambler, and Duelist Who Invented Modern Finance* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 2000).

²⁸ Hans Dietrich Mittorp, *Theodor von Neuhoff: König von Koriska, Ein Taktiker ohne Fortune* (Altena: Heimatbund Märkischer Kreis, 1990).

²⁹ Percy Fitzgerald, *Kings and Queens of An Hour: Records of Love, Romance, Oddity, and Adventure* (2 vols.; London: Tinsley Brothers, 1883), 1: 2, 6, 9.

³⁰ André Joseph Le Glay, *Théodore de Neuhoff: Roi de Corse* (Monaco: Imprimerie de Monaco, 1907), v-vi. The book was published posthumously; Le Glay lived from 1785-1863.

³¹ Theodor Heuss, *Schattenbeschwörung: Randfiguren der Geschichte* (Tübingen and Stuttgart: Rainer Wundlich Verlag Herman Leins, 1950; Tübingen: Klöpfer & Meyer, 2009), 29.

³² Johann Franz Guyard, *Schreiben des Kaufmanns Guyard an seine Mitbürger* (n.p. [Hamburg]: n.p., 1767); [http://prime2.oit.umn.edu/primo_library/libweb/action/display.do?tabs=detailsTab&ct=display&fn=search&doc=umn_aleph000282880&indx=10&recIds=umn_aleph000282880&recIdxs=9&elementId=9&renderMode=poppedOut&displayMode=full&frbrVersion=2&dscnt=0&dum=true&frbg=&tab=default_tab&dstmp=1310737854039&vl\(13244018UI0\)=creator&srt=rank&vl\(fr eeText0\)=guyard&vid=TWINCITIES&mode=Basic](http://prime2.oit.umn.edu/primo_library/libweb/action/display.do?tabs=detailsTab&ct=display&fn=search&doc=umn_aleph000282880&indx=10&recIds=umn_aleph000282880&recIdxs=9&elementId=9&renderMode=poppedOut&displayMode=full&frbrVersion=2&dscnt=0&dum=true&frbg=&tab=default_tab&dstmp=1310737854039&vl(13244018UI0)=creator&srt=rank&vl(fr eeText0)=guyard&vid=TWINCITIES&mode=Basic) (Accessed 7/15/2011)

³³ Ann and Michael Jay Watts, eds., *Literature and the Urban Experience: Essays on the City and Literature* (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1981); Richard Maxwell, *The Mysteries of Paris and London* (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 1992).

³⁴ (2 vols.; Hamburg: Heßlein, 1850). “Der Kaiserhof,” that is, the Charlotte/Scriba story is told in 2: 72-87.

³⁵ *Der Patriot* [Hamburg], 31 (3 August 1724).

³⁶ Jacob Dusch, *Der Bankrot, ein bürgerliches Trauerspiel* (Hamburg: Dieterich Anton Harmsen, 1763); *Der Stadt Hamburg Neue Falliten-Ordnung: Auf Befehl Hochedlen Raths publicirt d. 31. Aug. 1753* (Hamburg: Conrad König, 1753); John Parish, “Journal from 1797,” in StAHbg, 622-1/138 (Familie Parish), B1, vols. 1-2. On Parish, see also Richard Ehrenberg, *Das Haus Parish in Hamburg* (2nd. ed.; Jena: Gustav Fischer, 1925).

³⁷ Amalia D. Kessler, *A Revolution in Commerce: The Parisian Merchant Court and the Rise of Commercial Society in Eighteenth-Century France* (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 2007), 91-95.

[Professor Manfred Wilke's banquet address, "Der Weg zur Mauer," derived its title from his recently published book of the same name. Manfred Wilke studied at the Hochschule für Wirtschaft und Politik and the University of Hamburg before receiving his doctorate in political science at the University of Bremen in 1981; a Habilitation in sociology followed at the Free University of Berlin. He served as a professor at the Fachschule für Wirtschaft Berlin and was one of the co-founders of the Forschungsverbund SED-Staat at the Free University of Berlin. He was a member of the Bundestag Enquete Commissions "Aufarbeitung von Geschichte und Folgen der SED-Diktatur in Deutschland" (1992-1994) and "Überwindung der Folgen der SED-Diktatur im Prozess der deutschen Einheit" (1995-1998). He is the author of many publications, among them Der SED-Staat (2006) and Der Weg zur Mauer: Stationen der Teilungsgeschichte (2011). Recently he has served as an external project director for the Institut für Zeitgeschichte, Munich/Berlin.]

Der Weg zur Mauer¹

Manfred Wilke

Institut für Zeitgeschichte München/Berlin

Sehr geehrter Herr Präsident Stephen Brockmann,
 Sehr geehrter Herr Exekutivdirektor David Barclay und
 sehr geehrte Mitglieder des GSA Board,
 mein Dank gilt zunächst ihrer Entscheidung, auf dieser Jahrestagung an den 50. Jahrestag des Berliner Mauerbaus 1961 zu erinnern. Das Ereignis selbst war eine wichtige Zäsur in der Geschichte Deutschlands und der Vereinigten Staaten von Amerika.
 Ich empfinde es als Ehre, dass Sie mich eingeladen haben, zu Ihnen über dieses Thema zu sprechen.

Das geteilte Berlin und die Berliner Mauer

Der Weg zur Berliner Mauer begann 1945. Nach der totalen Niederlage in Hitlers Krieg verlor Deutschland seine Souveränität und die vier Siegermächte übernahmen die oberste Regierungsgewalt. Das von der nationalsozialistischen Diktatur befreite und besetzte Land wurde in vier Besatzungszonen eingeteilt. Berlin wurde als Sitz des Alliierten Kontrollrates aus dieser Zoneneinteilung herausgenommen und sollte von den Vier Mächten gemeinsam verwaltet werden. Die alliierte Kriegscoalition zerbrach endgültig 1947/48 und die Demarkationslinie zwischen der sowjetischen Besatzungszone und denen der Westmächte wurde zur Grenze zwischen dem sowjetischen Imperium und den westlichen Demokratien. Deutschland und Berlin wurden gespalten. Die innerdeutsche Grenze, die auf Befehl von Stalin 1952 auf einer Länge von knapp 1400 km von der DDR befestigt wurde, war die Frontlinie im kalten Krieg in Europa. Die beiden Berlin-Krisen 1948/49 und 1958-1962 gehören zu seinen europäischen Höhepunkten.

Das Fundament der Berliner Mauer entstand 1948, als die Kommunisten die einheitliche Berliner Verwaltung spalteten und die Westmächte die DM in den Westsektoren einführten. Danach gab es in Berlin zwei Stadtverwaltungen und

Währungen. Trotz der politischen und ökonomischen Spaltung der Stadt blieb die Sektorengrenze zwischen Ost- und West-Berlin auch noch nach der Schließung der innerdeutschen Grenze durch die DDR weiterhin offen. Berlin wurde zum Tor nach Westen für viele Deutsche aus der DDR; bis zum Mauerbau 1961 flohen 2,9 Millionen vor dem „Aufbau des Sozialismus“ in der DDR.

Vorab einige Bemerkungen zur Berliner Mauer selbst. Das Bauwerk, das Ost- von West-Berlin trennte, war 44 km lang, ein 112 km langer Zaun riegelte die Teilstadt von ihrem Umland ab. West-Berlin wurde zur Insel der Freiheit mitten in der DDR. Die Bezeichnung Mauer für das Bauwerk ist begrifflich irreführend und verharmlost ihren Charakter. Sie war eine militärisch gesicherte Grenzbefestigung, die von zwei Mauern eingegrenzt war.² Als Bildikone wurde nur ihre westliche Außenseite millionenfach weltweit verbreitet. Der eigentliche Grenzwall, die „Hinterlandmauer“, die den Ostberlinern den Weg nach Westen versperrte, blieb im Dunkeln—sie durfte auch nicht fotografiert werden.

Die ambivalente Symbolik der Berliner Mauer

Aus dem Stadtbild Berlins ist dieses Bauwerk weitgehend verschwunden, nach 1990 wurde sie schnell beseitigt. Bis heute ist sie aber das weltweit wahrgenommene zentrale Symbol der deutschen Teilung und ihrer Überwindung in der Nacht vom 9. zum 10. November 1989 geblieben. Die Deutschen verbinden mit dieser Mauer sehr gegensätzliche Gefühle: die Ohnmacht, diesen Gewaltakt des SED-Regimes gegen das eigene Volk hinnehmen zu müssen, den Zorn über das persönliche Leid ungezählte getrennter Familien in Berlin, die Trauer über die Toten, die an ihr gestorben sind, den Schmerz über die Teilung Deutschlands und an ihrem Ende 1989 die Freude über ihren Fall.

Seit dem 13. August 1961 war diese „Grenzbefestigung“ 28 Jahre lang das augenfällige Zeugnis für die Realität der Teilung der Stadt, des Landes und Europas. Die Mauer war nicht nur eine innerdeutsche Grenze, sondern auch eine Außengrenze des sowjetischen Imperiums, ihr Fall sollte sein Ende und das der Sowjetunion beschleunigen.

Die Nacht vom 9. zum 10. November als Augenblick der Befreiung veränderte die symbolische Bedeutung des nun zerfallenden Bauwerks. Die weltweit verbreiteten Bilder der Freude über die Öffnung der Mauer 1989—der Befreiung durch ein Volksfest der Berliner—haften im kollektiven Gedächtnis der Welt. Die Mauer symbolisierte nun das Ende des kalten Krieges und den Untergang der sowjetischen Kommunismus. Ihr Fall leitete das Ende des SED-Staates und der 44-jährigen deutschen Teilungsgeschichte ein. Damit verkehrte sich ihre Symbolik für die Deutschen grundlegend. Ihr Fall überstrahlte nun die dunkle Seite der Geschichte der Stadt und symbolisierte nun ihre Wiedervereinigung, die Deutschlands und Europas.

Die Bilder der Freude von 1989 standen im krassen Kontrast zu den erschütternden Szenen der Realität dieser Grenzbefestigung, die ebenfalls um die Welt gegangen waren. Unvergessen sind die Fotos vom öffentlichen Sterben Peter Fechters 1962 an dieser tödlichen Grenze. Sieht man nur auf das Ende der Mauer, überstrahlt heute die Symbolik der Befreiung jene der Repression, des Schreckens,

die die Wahrnehmung einer ganzen Generation beherrscht hatte. Historisch bleibt ihre symbolische Bedeutung ambivalent. Sie ist untrennbar verbunden mit zwei Zäsuren in der deutschen und europäischen Politik: 1961 befestigte der Mauerbau weltpolitisch den Status Quo der deutschen Zweistaatlichkeit und trug so zur „Entspannungspolitik“ zwischen Ost und West bei. 1989 dagegen bedeutete ihr Fall das Ende der DDR und die Wiedervereinigung Deutschlands.

Der Auftakt der Krise 1958

Der öffentliche Auftakt der Berlin-Krise fand im Juli 1958 auf dem V. Parteitag der SED in Ost-Berlin statt. Walter Ulbricht, Erster Sekretär des ZK der SED, war damals der unbestrittene Herrscher über seine Partei und ihren Staat. Er und der sowjetische Partei- und Staatschef Nikita S. Chruschtschow propagierten hier offen ihre politischen Ziele zur Veränderung der Lage in Berlin.³ Ulbricht griff erneut den sowjetischen Entwurf eines Friedensvertrags mit und über Deutschland von 1952 auf („Stalin-Note“). Er betonte, der sozialistische Kernstaat DDR werde aus historischen und völkerrechtlichen Gründen eine aktive Rolle bei der Wiedervereinigung Deutschlands spielen, in dem sie den Systemwettbewerb zu Gunsten des Sozialismus entscheiden werde. Die politische Konsequenz hieß: Die gesellschaftlichen Verhältnisse in der Bundesrepublik müssen sich ändern, und die DDR könne mit „friedlichen Mitteln“ dafür sorgen. Die SED beanspruchte somit ein Interventionsrecht gegenüber der Bundesrepublik. In Deutschland gebe es keine friedliche Koexistenz zwischen DDR und Bundesrepublik, die DDR sei „der rechtmäßige souveräne deutsche Staat.“⁴ Somit setze eine Politik der Wiedervereinigung der SED die Beseitigung des „deutschen Imperialismus“ in der Bundesrepublik voraus. Um dieses Ziel zu erreichen, bedurfte es der inneren Festigung und der internationalen Anerkennung der DDR—als wichtigen Beitrag zum europäischen Frieden.

Ulbricht entwickelte auch die „ökonomische Hauptaufgabe“ für die DDR, die im engen Zusammenhang mit dem geforderten Friedensvertrag stand. Rhetorisch orientierte er sich an der Kampagne der chinesischen Kommunisten, die zeitgleich mit einem „Großen Sprung nach vorn“, nur gestützt auf die mobilisierten „Volksmassen“ und ohne die notwendigen Stahlwerke, England in der Stahlproduktion überholen wollten.⁵

Ulbricht auf seinem Parteitag: „Die Volkswirtschaft der Deutschen Demokratischen Republik ist innerhalb weniger Jahre so zu entwickeln, dass die Überlegenheit der sozialistischen Gesellschaftsordnung der DDR gegenüber der Herrschaft der imperialistischen Kräfte im Bonner Staat eindeutig bewiesen wird und infolgedessen der Pro-Kopf-Verbrauch unserer werktätigen Bevölkerung mit allen wichtigen Lebensmitteln und Konsumgütern den Pro-Kopf-Verbrauch der Gesamtbevölkerung in Westdeutschland erreicht und übertrifft. (Lebhafter Beifall)“⁶. Das Überholkonzept war Ausdruck der Hoffnung, dass die Systemfragen in Deutschland zu Gunsten des Sozialismus entschieden werden können.

Aber das Vorhaben war unrealistisch, die ökonomische Basis der DDR war für diesen Plan viel zu schmal. Die SED-Führung wusste das, hoffte aber auf sowjetische Hilfe und darauf, dass die Wirtschaft der Bundesrepublik auf eine Krise zusteuer-

te—aber das Gegenteil trat ein. Der Arbeitskräftemangel in der Hochkonjunktur der Bundesrepublik hatte eine magnetische Anziehungskraft auf gut ausgebildete Fachkräfte aus der DDR und verstärkte die Flüchtlingszahlen.

An der „Festigung“ der DDR wurde die SED nicht zuletzt durch die Existenz von West-Berlin gehindert. Ulbricht unterstrich diese Bedeutung in der Sprache der kommunistischen Propaganda:

„Die Hauptstadt der Deutschen Demokratischen Republik ist Berlin. Ein Teil der Hauptstadt, Westberlin, wird gegenwärtig noch als Stützpunkt des kalten Krieges, der Spionage und Sabotage gegen die DDR und die anderen Länder des sozialistischen Lagers missbraucht. Die Aufgabe ist, diesen unnatürlichen, auch gegen die Interessen der Einwohner Westberlins herbeigeführten Zustand zu ändern, die Verhältnisse in Berlin zu normalisieren und die ganze Stadt zur Stadt des Friedens und des Fortschritts zu machen. In Berlin ist ein entschiedener Kampf zu führen gegen die amerikanische Lebensweise und Dekadenz, die in bestimmten Kreisen Westberlins Platz gegriffen haben.“⁷

Diese Forderung, die Verhältnisse in West-Berlin grundlegend zu verändern, bildete auch den Kern des sowjetischen Berlin-Ultimeatums vom November 1958. Chruschtschow hat seine Kernforderungen bereits auf dem SED-Parteitag vorformuliert. Er forderte einen Friedensvertrag mit Deutschland. West-Berlin sollte in eine „Freie Stadt“ umgewandelt werden. Er sprach von der Stärke des sozialistischen Lagers und stellte sich demonstrativ hinter die Deutschlandpolitik der SED. Die Frage der Wiedervereinigung sei eine innere Angelegenheit der Deutschen. Schuld an der entstandenen Lage sei die Politik der Westintegration der Bundesrepublik, sie habe eine „Mauer“ in Deutschland entstehen lassen. „Niemand kann leugnen, dass der Eintritt Westdeutschlands in die NATO, die Einführung der allgemeinen Wehrpflicht und der Beschluss über die Ausrüstung der Bundeswehr mit Atom- und Raketenwaffen die internationalen Beziehungen und insbesondere die Beziehungen zwischen den beiden deutschen Staaten noch weiter verschärft haben. Die Bonner Regierung selbst errichtet somit Stein für Stein die Mauer zwischen den beiden Teilen Deutschlands.“⁸ Das Wort Mauer im Zusammenhang mit der deutschen Teilung war ausgesprochen. Chruschtschow trug aus seiner Perspektive ein in sich stimmiges Bild der Teilung Deutschlands vor, in dem allerdings die Maßnahmen der sowjetischen Besatzungsmacht zur Etablierung der SED-Diktatur auffällig fehlten.

Massiv griff Chruschtschow die Wiedervereinigungsforderung der Bundesregierung auf Grundlage freier Wahlen in beiden deutschen Staaten an. Diese glaube offenbar, dass die Sowjetunion „ihr Einverständnis dazu geben und sich auf die Liquidierung der Deutschen Demokratischen Republik einlassen könnte.“⁹ Nach dieser Klarstellung fragte er unter dem Beifall der SED-Funktionäre: „Aber können denn Kommunisten zur Beseitigung einer sozialistischen Ordnung beitragen? Können wir denn dazu beitragen, dass das ganze deutsche Volk zu Kanonenfutter für die amerikanischen Generale gemacht wird?“¹⁰ Er wiederholte dann Ulbrichts Forderung, Berlin zu einer „Stadt des Friedens“ zu machen und die „Frontstadtpolitik“ in Westberlin zu beseitigen. Dies sei die Voraussetzung für die Normalisierung des Verhältnisses von Westberlin zur Deutschen Demokratischen Republik.¹¹

Das sowjetische Ultimatum

Die Forderungen von Ulbricht und Chruschtschow auf den SED-Parteitag fanden weltpolitisch keine Resonanz. Der SED-Staat war international nicht anerkannt und für die Westmächte kein Verhandlungspartner. Ulbricht war gezwungen, die Interessen seiner DDR auf internationaler Ebene durch die Sowjetunion vertreten zu lassen. Ein gewichtiger qualitativer Unterschied zwischen der Bundesrepublik und der DDR zu dieser Zeit.

In West-Berlin suchte die SED im Wahlkampf zum Abgeordnetenhaus 1958 die offene Auseinandersetzung, um ihre Forderung nach Umwandlung in eine „Freie Stadt“ voranzutreiben. In der Endphase dieses Wahlkampfes griff Ulbricht ein und nahm grundsätzlich Stellung zum Status von Berlin. In der mit Moskau abgestimmten Rede¹² wiederholte er seine Behauptung, Berlin sei Hauptstadt der DDR und die ganze Stadt liege auf ihrem Territorium. Die „Besatzungsgewalt der Westmächte“ in West-Berlin habe zwar keine gültige Rechtsgrundlage mehr, aber „sie ist doch gegenwärtig noch eine Tatsache.“¹³ Die Westmächte hätten das Potsdamer Abkommen gebrochen und damit „haben sie die Rechtsgrundlage ihres Aufenthalts in Berlin untergraben und jeden Rechtsanspruch sowie jeden moralisch-politischen Anspruch auf die Fortführung der Besatzung Westberlins verwirkt.“¹⁴ Ulbrichts Ankündigung der notwendigen Veränderungen in Berlin fand wenige Tage vor dem 10. November statt, an dem Chruschtschow in Moskau die Bühne des Sport-Palastes betrat und den Westmächten diese Forderungen ultimativ als sowjetische Außenpolitik präsentierte. Die erste Antwort auf die Moskauer Drohungen gaben die Wähler von West-Berlin am 7. Dezember 1958, sie ließen sich nicht einschüchtern. Die Wahlbeteiligung von 93 % glich einer Volksabstimmung gegen dieses Ultimatum und die SED bekam nur 1,9 % der Wählerstimmen. Die Partei war sich der Bedeutung dieses Wahlergebnisses wohl bewusst: Die Lage in West-Berlin werde sich für die SED erst dann ändern, wenn die Westmächte abziehen würden. Das war der zentrale Streitpunkt zwischen der Sowjetunion und den Westmächten in der Berlin-Krise.

Mit der Note der Sowjetunion an die drei Westmächte vom 27. November 1958 wurde die zweite Berlin-Krise zur weltpolitischen Realität. Darin forderte Moskau den Abschluss eines Friedensvertrages mit Deutschland und den Abzug der Westmächte aus Berlin. West-Berlin solle in eine selbständige und entmilitarisierte „Freie Stadt“ umgewandelt werden. Die Note war als Ultimatum formuliert: Falls die Westmächte dem sowjetischen Vorschlag nicht innerhalb von sechs Monaten zustimmen würden, werde die Sowjetunion einen separaten Friedensvertrag mit der DDR abschließen und dieser die sowjetischen Rechte in Berlin übertragen—und damit die Kontrolle der Transitwege von Westdeutschland nach West-Berlin zu Lande, zu Wasser und in der Luft.

Sowohl die drei Westmächte als auch die Mitgliedstaaten der NATO lehnten das Moskauer Ultimatum noch im Dezember 1958 ab, sie waren aber zu Verhandlungen bereit. Die Bundesregierung lehnte im Januar 1959 alle sowjetischen Forderungen ab. Sie wollte keine Anerkennung der DDR, keine Konföderation mit dem SED-Staaten und keine Umwandlung West-Berlins in ein selbständiges politisches Gebilde. In den daraufhin einsetzenden Verhandlungen gab die Sowjetunion ihr

grundlegendes Ziel nicht auf, wohl aber das damit verbundene Ultimatum: Die Frist von sechs Monaten ließ sie fallen. In einer von Mai bis August 1959 tagenden Außenministerkonferenz in Genf, bei der die beiden deutschen Staaten als Zuhörer zugelassen waren, konnte keine Einigung erzielt werden.

Die zwei Phasen der Berlin Krise von 1958 bis 1962

Als Chruschtschow durch sein Ultimatum 1958 die Krise auslöste, dachten weder er noch Ulbricht daran, dass sie am Ende diese Mauer durch Berlin ziehen würden. Ein Motiv des sowjetischen Vorstoßes von 1958 war bereits zu Beginn der Krise offensichtlich: die völkerrechtliche Stabilisierung der DDR als sozialistischer Staat in Deutschland. Das Gefühl der nationalen Zusammengehörigkeit der Deutschen war noch stark, das hatte der 17. Juni 1953 in der DDR—der erste große Volksaufstand gegen eine kommunistische Diktatur im sowjetischen Imperium—bewiesen.

Der Ablauf der Krise verlief uneinheitlich, Phasen der Konfrontation wechselten mit denen relativer Ruhe; aber zwei Phasen lassen sich in ihrer Geschichte deutlich unterscheiden. Von 1958 bis 1961 dominierten Verhandlungen unter den Vier Mächten und dem abschließenden Gipfeltreffen des amerikanischen Präsidenten John F. Kennedy mit Chruschtschow in Wien ihren Verlauf.

Diese Verhandlungen hatten für Chruschtschow in dieser ersten Phase absolute Priorität. Er wollte das West-Berlin-Problem im Rahmen eines mit den Westmächten abgestimmten deutschen Friedensvertrages lösen, der auf eine dauerhafte Dreiteilung Deutschlands hinaus gelaufen wäre: Bundesrepublik, DDR und die „Freie entmilitarisierte Stadt Westberlin“.

Für Chruschtschow war West-Berlin kein eigenständiges Ziel, es war der Hebel, um den Einfluss der Amerikaner in Europa zu schwächen, und der geforderte deutsche Friedensvertrag ein Mittel, um die NATO zu „zerreißen“, wie es Chruschtschow gegenüber Ulbricht im März 1961 ausdrückte.¹⁵ SED und KPdSU hatten ein gemeinsames Interesse daran, die Präsenz der Westmächte in Berlin zu beseitigen, und West-Berlin in eine „entmilitarisierte Freie Stadt“ umzuwandeln, die auf dem Territorium der DDR lag. In dieser Hinsicht wahrte Chruschtschow Kontinuität zu den Zielen, die Stalin 1948 in der ersten Berlin-Krise verfolgt hatte. Die Planungen für diesen sowjetischen Vorstoß begannen 1947, vor der Londoner Außenministerkonferenz über die deutsche Fragen der vier Mächte. Ihr Scheitern war absehbar, da die Weichen für die Entstehung zweier deutscher Staaten bereits gestellt waren. Aus dieser Konstellation zog der stellvertretende sowjetische Außenminister Fedor T. Gusew in einer Expertise für Stalin und seinen Außenminister Wjatscheslaw M. Molotow die Konsequenz für Berlin. Sollten Amerikaner und Engländer nicht auf die „legitimen“ deutschlandpolitischen Forderungen der Sowjetunion in London eingehen, so könnte sie „gezwungen sein, die Beseitigung der Zone von Groß-Berlin und die Eingliederung des gesamten Berliner Territoriums in die sowjetischen Zone zur Diskussion zu stellen.“¹⁶ Die Londoner Konferenz scheiterte und die Sowjetunion verließ den Alliierten Kontrollrat, die alliierte Kommandantur in Berlin, und nahm die Einführung der D-Mark in West-Berlin zum Anlass, um die geplante Blockade der Transitwege von der amerikanischen und britischen Zone nach West-Berlin durchzuführen. Diese erste Berlin-Offensive

der Sowjetunion scheiterte vor allem an zwei Männern, an dem amerikanischen Militärgouverneur Lucius D. Clay, der eine Luftbrücke zur Versorgung der West-Berliner Bevölkerung organisierte, und dem Regierenden Bürgermeister von Berlin Ernst Reuter, der den Selbstbehauptungswillen der West-Berliner mobilisierte. Über Reuter hat David Barclay eine bemerkenswerte Biografie geschrieben, auf die an dieser Stelle hingewiesen werden muss.

Die zweite Phase der Krise begann im Herbst 1960 und wurde immer stärker bestimmt durch die wachsende Instabilität der DDR durch die Fluchtbewegung nach Westen.

Ulbricht verlangt die Grenzschließung

Die Diskussionen zwischen Ost-Berlin und Moskau über die vordringliche Lösung der „Westberlinfrage“ begannen im Herbst 1960—zu einem Zeitpunkt, als die DDR in eine ökonomische Krise geriet. Durch die Kollektivierung der Landwirtschaft sank 1960 die Produktion von Lebensmitteln in der DDR und es kam zu einer Versorgungskrise bei Grundnahrungsmitteln. Viele Bauern flohen über Berlin in den Westen. Ulbricht berichtete Chruschtschow im November 1960 über die krisenhafte Situation in der DDR und bat um Kredite sowie Wirtschaftshilfe. Die Schließung der Sektorengrenze in Berlin war laut dem russischen Protokoll kein Thema dieses Gesprächs. Der sowjetische Parteichef legte aber den Fahrplan für das weitere Vorgehen fest. Vor dem geplanten Treffen mit dem neuen gewählten amerikanischen Präsidenten John F. Kennedy sollte es in der Berlin-Frage keine Entscheidungen geben.

Im Januar 1961 beriet das SED-Politbüro die entstandene Lage und beschloss den verstärkten Kampf gegen die „Republikflucht“—das Codewort, unter dem auch die Grenzschließung in Berlin vorbereitet wurde. Ulbricht informierte Chruschtschow über diese Sitzung, nannte die Zahlen der Abwanderung und die Altersstruktur der Flüchtenden: 75 Prozent von ihnen waren unter 25 Jahren alt. Die soziale Zusammensetzung war besonders alarmierend, Angehörige der Intelligenz und qualifizierte Facharbeiter verließen das Land. Mit ihrer Flucht verschärfen sie die wirtschaftlichen Probleme der DDR. Der konjunkturelle Aufschwung in der Bundesrepublik, der „für jeden Einwohner in der DDR sichtbar war, ist der Hauptgrund dafür, dass im Verlauf von zehn Jahren rund zwei Millionen Menschen unsere Republik verlassen haben.“¹⁷ Die entscheidende Voraussetzung für diese Abwanderung erwähnte Ulbricht nicht direkt: die offene Sektorengrenze in Berlin; doch gerade sie war der Kern des West-Berlinproblems der SED. Ulbricht drängte nachdrücklich auf seine Lösung noch im Jahr 1961.

Dieser Brief kam einem Offenbarungseid der SED gleich. Die Existenzsicherung der DDR durch die Schließung der Sektorengrenze in Berlin rückte unabweisbar in den Vordergrund der durchsetzbaren sowjetischen Konfliktlösung. Chruschtschow hielt gegenüber Ulbricht an der Reihenfolge des Vorgehens in der West-Berlin-Frage fest: „Wir wissen, dass auch Sie der Meinung sind, dass es in der heutigen Lage nach dem Amtsantritt des neuen amerikanischen Präsidenten notwendig und wichtig ist, zu versuchen, die Frage eines Friedensvertrages mit Deutschland und der Normalisierung der Lage in West-Berlin aufgrund einer Verständigung mit den

USA sowie mit den anderen Westmächten zu regeln. Zurzeit beginnen wir, eine sachliche Erörterung dieser Fragen mit Kennedy einzuleiten. Die vorgenommene Abstimmung zeigt, dass es einiger Zeit bedarf, bis Kennedy seine Position in der Deutschlandfrage deutlicher abgesteckt haben und es klar wird, ob die Regierung der USA gewillt sein wird, gegenseitig annehmbare Beschlüsse zu erzielen.¹⁸ Erst wenn diese Frage geklärt sei und man zu keiner Einigung gelange, sei der Zeitpunkt gekommen, um weitere Maßnahmen mit der DDR zu vereinbaren.

Zwei Monate später forderte Chruschtschow von Ulbricht, er möge mit Maßnahmen in Berlin warten, bis er selbst mit Kennedy zusammengetroffen sei. Er wollte den Friedensvertrag über Deutschland mit den Amerikanern aushandeln. Sein politisches Kalkül dabei sprach er offen aus: „In den Gesprächen mit Kennedy wird der Friedensvertrag eine zentrale Frage sein. Wenn wir ihm den Friedensvertrag abringen, reißen wir die NATO in Stücke, denn die deutsche Frage zementiert die NATO.“¹⁹ Mit Blick auf das bevorstehende Treffen versicherte Chruschtschow, er wisse sehr wohl, dass die Amerikaner auf Zeit spielten und sich mit ihren Verbündeten berieten, er sei aber nicht gewillt, länger zu warten. Im Frühjahr 1961 traten auch die Differenzen in den Prioritäten zwischen der Großmacht und ihren Satelliten offen zutage. Wollte die SED mit dem Friedensvertrag vordringlich ihr West-Berlin-Problem lösen, so verfolgte Chruschtschow mit diesem Vertrag nichts weniger als eine weltpolitische Verschiebung des Kräfteverhältnisses in Europa. Aus den unterschiedlichen Zielprojektionen ergab sich auch eine Differenz in der Einschätzung der Bedeutung der „Republikflucht“ über Berlin. Der sowjetische Parteichef spielte die Fluchtbewegungen in ihrer Bedeutung für die Stabilität des SED-Staates herunter. Noch im März dachte der sowjetische Parteichef nicht daran, in Berlin die offenen Türen zu schließen, obwohl ihm Ulbricht eindringlich versicherte: „Gegenwärtig stört uns das mehr als je zuvor, die Flucht hat jetzt einen größeren Umfang als vor zwei Jahren.“ Ulbricht übertrieb nicht, 1959 verließen 143.917 Flüchtlinge die DDR und Ost-Berlin, 48,3 Prozent von ihnen waren Jugendliche unter 25 Jahren. 1960 stieg diese Zahl auf 199.188, davon drei Viertel Jugendliche. Bis zum 13. August 1961 kamen weitere 207.026 Menschen nach West-Berlin, knapp die Hälfte war erneut unter 25 Jahren. Die dramatische Zuspitzung dieser Fluchtwelle kam allerdings erst noch: im Juni gingen 19.198, im Juli schon 30.415, und bis Mitte August 1961 noch einmal 47.433. In drei Monaten stimmten somit die Einwohner einer Großstadt mit ihren Füßen ab.

Der Wiener Gipfel

Auf auf neutralem Boden in Wien trafen sich Anfang Juni der amerikanische Präsident und das sowjetische Staatsoberhaupt zu ihren Gipfeltreffen. In ihrer letzten Gesprächsrunde behandelten sie die Frage eines deutschen Friedensvertrages und die Lösung der Berlinfrage.²⁰ Das Gespräch verlief konfrontativ, und Chruschtschow übergab Kennedy ein auf sechs Monate befristetes Ultimatum, um die Berlin-Fragen zu lösen. Im Gespräch betonte Chruschtschow gegenüber Kennedy sein Interesse, mit ihm einen Friedensvertrag zu abschließen. Dieses Angebot verband er sofort mit einer Drohung: „Wenn Sie jedoch nicht die Bereitschaft dazu zeigen, werden wir allein auf einseitiger Grundlage den Friedensvertrag mit Deutschland

schließen und dabei vor nichts haltmachen.“²¹ Die erste Kontroverse über Berlin schien geografischer Natur zu sein. Kennedy: „Aber West-Berlin befindet sich nicht auf dem Territorium der Ostdeutschen Republik.“ Chruschtschow widersprach: „Das ganze Territorium Ostdeutschlands einschließlich West-Berlins bildet das Territorium der DDR.“ Darauf entgegnete Kennedy mit der völkerrechtlichen Position der Amerikaner: „Das ist Ihr Standpunkt. Wir meinen jedoch, dass wir in West-Berlin bestimmte Rechte gemäß den Vereinbarungen mit Ihnen erhalten haben. Und jetzt wollen Sie diese Rechte Ostdeutschland übertragen. Auf einseitige Weise können Sie niemandem unsere Rechte übertragen.“ Chruschtschow fragte: „Aber wozu brauchen Sie West-Berlin, warum halten Sie es für einen wichtigen Punkt?“²² Kennedy ging auf diese Frage ein und unterstellte dem sowjetischen Staatschef, dass er versuche, die USA in die weltpolitische „Isolation“ zu treiben. „Wenn wir diese Bedingung akzeptieren, dann wird das, ich wiederhole, zur völligen politischen Isolierung der USA führen, aber ich bin nicht deshalb Präsident der USA geworden, um bei einem solchen Prozess der Isolierung meines Landes zu präsidieren, ebenso wie auch Sie, dessen bin ich sicher, dem niemals bezüglich Ihres Landes zustimmen würden.“ Chruschtschow: „Heißt das, dass sie den Friedensvertrag nicht unterzeichnen wollen?“ Kennedy: „Wir sind daran interessiert, unser Zugangsrecht und unsere Rechte in West-Berlin insgesamt aufrechtzuerhalten.“ Er wollte den Standpunkt der sowjetischen Seite nicht verändern, appellierte aber angesichts der gegenwärtigen Weltlage an ihn, das „Gleichgewicht der Kräfte nicht zu verändern.“ Dieser Wortwechsel war vielleicht von großer Bedeutung für Chruschtschows Entscheidung sechs Wochen später, Ulbricht die Sektorengrenze in Berlin schließen zu lassen. Allerdings kam Chruschtschow in Wien noch einmal auf seine ultimative Drohung zurück, am Ende des Jahres einen separaten Friedensvertrag mit der DDR zu unterzeichnen. Kennedy stellte klar, dass nicht der Abschluss eines Friedensvertrages mit der DDR an sich das Problem sei, sondern: Ein Vertrag, „der uns unsere Rechte nimmt, ist ein Akt des Krieges.“ Eine formale Übertragung der Berliner Statusrechte der Sowjetunion an die DDR würde das Problem also keinesfalls lösen, denn der Versuch der DDR, diese Rechte gegenüber den Westmächten durchzusetzen, würde einen militärischen Konflikt heraufbeschwören. Kennedy hatte die Schwachstelle in der Drohung mit dem separaten Friedensvertrag gefunden und gegenüber Chruschtschow markiert.

Kennedy fuhr fort, West-Berlin sei für ihn kein Aufmarschgebiet gegen die Sowjetunion, aber die USA hätten vertragliche Verpflichtungen übernommen, „von denen die ganze Welt weiß. Würden wir dem Vorschlag der Sowjetunion zustimmen, würde daraus die ganze Welt den Schluss ziehen, die USA seien ein Land, das seine Verpflichtungen nicht ernst nimmt. Und ich versichere Ihnen, dass wir unsere Verpflichtungen sehr ernst nehmen, die unsere strategischen Interessen berühren.“ Chruschtschow entgegnete mit Blick auf einen separaten Friedensvertrag mit der DDR: „Ich schätze Ihre Offenheit, Herr Präsident, erkläre aber meinerseits, dass, falls Sie nach Unterzeichnung des Friedensvertrages auf Ihrem Recht auf Zugang nach Berlin bestehen, auch eine direkte Konfrontation zwischen uns diese Frage nicht zu Ihren Gunsten entscheiden wird. Wir werden uns gegen die Aggressionen verteidigen, falls Ihre Truppen die Grenzen der DDR überschreiten.“ Kennedy:

„Aber Sie wollen doch die bestehende Lage verändern.“ Chruschtschow entgegnete ihm, er wolle den Frieden, „Harvard-Drohungen von Ihrer Seite werden uns nicht aufhalten, wir wollen keinen Krieg, wenn Sie ihn uns aber aufnötigen, wird es ihn geben. Das können Sie auch Macmillan, de Gaulle und Adenauer sagen, und behalten Sie, Herr Präsident, aber im Auge, dass dies unser unabänderlicher Entschluss ist und dass wir den Friedensvertrag im Dezember dieses Jahres unterzeichnen werden.“ Kennedy: „Ja, wie es scheint, wird es einen kalten Winter geben in diesem Jahr.“

Kennedy wehrte sich gegen das zweite sowjetische Ultimatum, war aber nicht prinzipiell gegen Verhandlungen über den Status quo in Deutschland. So vertrat er die Ansicht: „Ich glaube, es wäre gut, wenn Westdeutschland und Ostdeutschland einen Weg zur Normalisierung ihrer Beziehungen finden und die UdSSR und die USA ihre Beziehungen in eine positive Richtung entwickeln könnten.“

Chruschtschow befand sich nach dem Wiener Gipfel in einem Dilemma: Den von ihm angestrebten Friedensvertrag mit den Westmächten zur Veränderung des Status quo in Berlin konnte er auf dem Verhandlungsweg nicht durchsetzen, und die Krise der DDR, die sich in der Massenflucht über West-Berlin immer mehr verschärfte, ließ ein weiteres Abwarten nicht zu. Der Wiener Gipfel stellte einen Wendepunkt im Verlauf der zweiten Berlinkrise dar und leitete den Rückzug der Sowjetunion aus einer politischen Offensive ein. Erst nach dem Gipfeltreffen wurde für Chruschtschow die Schließung der Sektorengrenzen zwischen Ost- und West-Berlin durch Ulbricht spruchreif.

Der militärische Aufmarsch

Im Zusammenhang mit dem „Wiener Ultimatum“ hatte am 1. Juli das Präsidium der KPdSU den von den Militärs ausgearbeiteten Einsatzplan „Maßnahmen zur Durchführung einer verstärkten Kontrolle und Bewachung an den Außen- und Sektorengrenzen Groß-Berlins“ bestätigt.²³ Zwischen Mai und August wurden die sowjetischen Truppen in der DDR um 37.500 Soldaten auf insgesamt 380.000 Mann verstärkt. An der polnischen Westgrenze wurden weitere 70.000 Soldaten stationiert und die Truppen in Ungarn um 10.000 Mann aufgestockt. „Damit war die Mannschaftsstärke der sowjetischen Truppen in Mitteleuropa im Vorfeld des Mauerbaus um etwa 25 Prozent auf mehr als 545.000 Mann erhöht worden. Die Sowjetunion hatte fast ein Drittel der gesamten Landstreitkräfte für die militärische Absicherung der Grenzschießung in Berlin in der DDR, Polen und Ungarn konzentriert.“ Auch die Luftstreitkräfte wurden in der DDR verstärkt, und sie verfügten erstmals über „Spezialmunition“. „Hinter diesem Begriff verbargen sich in der sowjetischen Militärsprache Atomwaffen.“²⁴ Ein qualitativer Unterschied zwischen den beiden Berlin-Krisen bestand darin, dass in der zweiten Krise die Militärs und Politiker beider Seiten wussten: käme es zum militärischen Konflikt; so bedeutete dies einen mit Atomwaffen geführten Krieg in Europa. Weder Moskau noch Washington wollten dieses Risiko eingehen.

Das sowjetische Vorgehen in Berlin berücksichtigte die Interessen der Westmächte schon in der Planungsphase der Grenzschießung. Besonders sensibel waren die Flugverbindungen von und nach West-Berlin. Die Luftkorridore waren

für die Westmächte, aber auch für die DDR von herausragender Bedeutung. Die „Republikflüchtlinge“ wurden aus West-Berlin ausgeflogen. Ulbricht strebte seit Chruschtschows Ultimatum die Kontrolle über den Flugverkehr von und nach West-Berlin an, er forderte beharrlich die Auflösung des internationalen Flugsicherungszentrums Berlin und die Übernahme seiner Funktionen durch die DDR-Luftsicherung. Den mit West-Berlin abgewickelten zivilen Luftverkehr wollte er nach dem Ost-Berliner Flughafen Schönefeld verlagern.

Eine solche Regelung hätte der DDR, unabhängig vom Abschluss eines Friedensvertrages, sofort die vollständige Kontrolle des zivilen Verkehrs auf allen Transitwegen von und nach West-Berlin verschafft. Ein Ausfliegen von DDR-Flüchtlingen wäre nicht mehr möglich gewesen, damit hätte sich eine Mauer durch Berlin erübrigt.

Die Entscheidung

Ende Juni/Anfang Juli ließ Ulbricht Chruschtschow mitteilen, dass er bei offener Grenze in Berlin für die Existenz der DDR nicht länger garantieren könne. Aber bevor Chruschtschow am 20. Juli endgültig entschied, die Berliner Sektorengrenze abzuriegeln, zog er Erkenntnisse und Berichte des militärischen Geheimdienstes (GRU) und des KGB über die amerikanische Politik zu Rate. Sie waren offenbar von zentraler Bedeutung für seine Entscheidungsfindung, zumal die drei Westmächte in ihren Noten vom 17. Juli die Forderungen des Wiener Memorandums vom 4. Juni zurückwiesen, einschließlich der Behauptungen West-Berlin liege auf dem Territorium der DDR. Die drei Mächte bekräftigten ihr Recht auf ihren Aufenthalt in Berlin aufgrund der alliierten Vereinbarungen von 1945.

Die GRU widersprach der propagandistischen Vorstellung von der Überlegenheit der sowjetischen Armee und betonte die Risiken eines militärischen Vorgehens gegen die Westmächte. „Die Sowjetunion würde auf einen gerüsteten und gut vorbereiteten Gegner treffen.“ Die GRU berichtete zudem über die Stärke der amerikanischen Luftstreitkräfte in Europa und ihre Pläne gegen eine Luftblockade West-Berlins. Nach dieser Information verwarf Chruschtschow sein ursprüngliches Vorhaben einer Luftblockade, für die in der Sowjetunion bereits „Spezialtruppen aufgestellt wurden“, und ließ die entsprechenden Planungen der Nationalen Volksarmee der DDR stoppen.²⁵

Der KGB informieren über die Einschätzung der Lage in Washington. „Das amerikanische Außenministerium ging in seinen Überlegungen davon aus, dass die Politik der UdSSR hinsichtlich der Berlin-Frage ein bedeutendes Bluff-Element enthalte und die Sowjetunion kaum das Risiko des Ausbruchs eines Atomkrieges um West-Berlin eingehen werde.“ Das amerikanische Außenministerium empfahl, die Politik des Westens müsse „hart sein und die Sowjetunion auf allen Kanälen über die möglichen Folgen eines bewaffneten Konfliktes um Berlin gewarnt werden.“²⁶ Genau das tat der Präsident beim Gipfeltreffen in Wien und auch der NATO-Rat erklärte, „die Sperrung des freien Zugangs nach West-Berlin mit Maßnahmen zu beantworten, in deren Ergebnis eine reale Gefahr für die Sicherheit der Sowjetunion entstehen“ könne. Der Westen verlieh dieser Drohung durch Truppenverstärkungen Nachdruck.“²⁷ All diese Informationen lagen Chruschtschow am 20. Juli vor und

ließen für ihn nur eine Schlussfolgerung zu: Die NATO würde die Bedrohung des freien Zugangs nach West-Berlin als militärischen Ernstfall ansehen. Chruschtschows Ja zur Grenzschießung in Berlin stand am Ende eines langen politischen Entscheidungsprozesses und bedeutete den Rückzug aus einer politischen Offensive, auf den vom Westen geforderten Status Quo in Berlin.

Julij A. Kvicinskij, der damalige Attaché des sowjetischen Botschafters, war Augenzeuge, als der sowjetische Botschafter Perwuchin Ulbricht die Moskauer Anweisung überbrachte, „die Grenze Westberlins zu schließen und mit der praktischen Vorbereitung dieser Maßnahme unter größter Geheimhaltung zu beginnen.“²⁸ Ulbricht nahm die Mitteilung ungerührt zur Kenntnis und ließ Chruschtschow seinen Dank ausdrücken, bevor er detailliert über die Durchführung der Aktion sprach. Um die Grenze zu West-Berlin in ihrer ganzen Länge abzuriegeln, benötigte man in ausreichender Menge Stacheldraht, ebenso „Pfähle, und alles müsse insgeheim nach Berlin gebracht werden. Auch die U- und S-Bahn-Verbindungen nach Westberlin müssten unterbrochen werden.“ Mit seinen Detailkenntnissen soll er den sowjetischen Botschafter verblüfft haben. Die SED dachte offenbar schon länger über diese Aktion nach. Ulbricht wusste auch bereits, wann man handeln sollte: an einem Sonntag—der 13. August war ein solcher. Geheimhaltung war die Voraussetzung für die Vorbereitung und das Gelingen der Operation „Rose“.²⁹ Die konspirative Kommunikation zwischen Chruschtschow und Ulbricht während der Operation „Rose“³⁰ beschrieb Kvicinskij ebenso wie die personelle Verantwortung in der SED. „Ulbricht legte fest, dass der Chef seiner Leibgarde, Wagler, zu uns Verbindung hielt, und er brachte die Dokumente seines Chefs in die Botschaft und gab sie nur mir persönlich in die Hand. Später löste Otto, der Oberst der Staatssicherheit aus der Abteilung für Sicherheitsfragen des ZK der SED, Wagler ab. Wir übersetzten die Dokumente und übermittelten sie nach Moskau.“³¹ Das geschah nicht durch Funk, da man fürchtete, der Code sei nicht sicher genug, sondern per Kurier. Perwuchin persönlich schrieb die Briefe für Chruschtschow und war im Zweifel, ob er seinen Außenminister Andrej Gromyko in die Sache einweihen durfte, was er dann aber doch tat.

Der SED-Chef entschied, „nur Erich Mielke, den Minister für Staatssicherheit, Innenminister Karl Maron, Verteidigungsminister Erich Hoffmann und Verkehrsminister Erwin Kramer einzuweihen.“ Bis auf Hoffmann gehörten die Genannten zu der Arbeitsgruppe, die im Januar 1961 vom SED-Politbüro eingesetzt wurde, um die „Republikflucht“ einzudämmen. Alle Verantwortlichen für diese Operation waren Moskau-Kader, die 1945 mit Ulbricht aus dem sowjetischen Exil in die sowjetische Besatzungszone zurückkehrten oder wie Mielke in Moskau ausgebildet wurden, um Schlüsselfunktion in der kommunistischen Partei und der neuen deutschen Verwaltung zu übernehmen. Der Verkehrsminister trug die Verantwortung für die Unterbrechung der S- und U-Bahn-Netze in Berlin.³² „Sie alle hatten Befehl, das Material nur persönlich vorzubereiten, mit der Hand zu schreiben und im eigenen Safe aufzubewahren. Die Ausarbeitung des Gesamtkonzepts übernahm Ulbricht selbst, und erst einige Tage später teilte er mit, dass er beschlossen habe, Erich Honecker als Stabschef einzusetzen.“³³ Das formal höchste Führungsgremium der Partei, das Politbüro des ZK, wurde mit der Operation erst befasst, als

alle Entscheidungen bereits gefallen waren und es nur noch um die Durchführung der Operation „Rose“ ging. „Ulbricht sprach in der Regel immer über vollendete Tatsachen und wartete erst einmal ab, was in Moskau herauskam, um dann das Politbüro und das Sekretariat zu informieren.“³⁴

Chruschtschow traf zwei Entscheidungen, sie betraf die militärische Planungen ihrer Durchführung. Der damalige stellvertretende Chef der operativen Abteilung des Stabes der Gruppe der sowjetischen Streitkräfte in Deutschland (GSSD), Oberst Anatolij G. Mereschko wurde beauftragt, den Plan zur Absicherung der Grenzkontrollsperrre zwischen Ost- und Westberlin mit Hilfe der DDR-Streitkräfte auszuarbeiten. Der Oberkommandierenden der GSSD Armeegeneral Iwan I. Jakubowskij wurde zum Botschafter Michail G. Perwuchin einbestellt und er sollte die Karten der DDR mit der genauen Grenze zwischen der Bundesrepublik und Westberlin mitbringen. Perwuchin erklärte „Iwan Ignatjewitsch, wir haben über ein Staatsgeheimnis zu sprechen. Nikita Sergeewitsch [Chruschtschow—Anmerkung der Übersetzerin] hat mich beauftragt, Sie über den Plan zur Einführung der Grenzordnung zwischen den beiden Teilen Berlins zu informieren, den sie auszuarbeiten haben«. [...]

Er hat gefragt: «Wie viel Zeit brauchen Sie für die Ausarbeitung dieses Planes? Beachten Sie, dass nur drei Personen aus der Regierung der DDR daran teilnehmen werden: nach unseren Vorstellungen, Verteidigungsminister Hoffmann, Innenminister Maron und der Minister für Staatssicherheit Mielke. Jakubowskij hat mich angeschaut, und ich sage: „Genosse Botschafter, wenn die Lage so kompliziert ist (und wir wussten natürlich darüber Bescheid) und er in kürzester Frist vorliegen muss, so bereiten wir den Plan in einer Woche vor.“³⁵ Ja, vor unserem Abschied sagte der Botschafter noch: „Ich fahre jetzt zum Genossen Ulbricht und wir werden verabreden, dass diese drei Minister an der Ausarbeitung des Planes teilnehmen, und unsererseits wird der Oberst diesen Plan technisch bearbeiten.“ Jakubowskij antwortete: „Ich bitte, dass diese Minister um 15 Uhr nach Wünsdorf“³⁶ kommen, und wir werden mit ihnen die Kontakte und die gemeinsame Arbeit verabreden.“ Und wirklich: Um 15 Uhr—wir waren früher zurückgekehrt—waren diese drei Minister bei uns. Wir haben verabredet, wie wir zusammenarbeiten, wie wir Verbindung halten werden; das Hauptproblem war die Sprachbarriere.[...]Aber die Vorbereitungsarbeiten in den Organen der DDR waren deutlich im vollen Gang.[...] Die Minister konnten praktisch auf jede Frage schon fertige Auskünfte geben.“³⁷

Die Gebote der Konspiration und der Geheimhaltung galten auch für Mereschko: Vor der Ausarbeitung des Planes hat Jakubowskij mir befohlen: „Weder Deinem Vorgesetzten, noch dem Stabschef, niemandem sollst Du über Deine Arbeit was sagen. Wer was wissen soll, das werde ich selbst bestimmen. Du selbst wirst schweigend arbeiten.“³⁸

In 7 bis 10 Tagen war der Plan in doppelter Ausführung auf Stadtplänen eingezeichnet. „Den Plan hat Jakubowskij unterschrieben, und so weit ich mich erinnere, stehen aus irgendeinem Grunde auch die drei Unterschriften der Minister der DDR auf dem Plan. Ich erinnere mich nicht an Kramer. Rechts oben auf der Karte—„Bestätigt. Ulbricht“, links—„Bestätigt. Chruschtschow“. Dieser unterzeichnete den Plan nach Angaben von Mereschko am 8. August. „Es war so,

dass die linke Seite wichtiger war. Ein Exemplar des Planes wurde mit Extraboten sofort an unseren Generalstab abgesandt, ein Exemplar blieb in der GSSD.“³⁹

Moskau August 1961

Nach Fertigstellung des Plans zur Abriegelung der Sektorengrenze, gab es eine Zusammenkunft mit Ulbricht, ihm wurde der Plan vorgelegt und erläutert, bevor er nach Moskau abreiste.

Ulbricht und Chruschtschow trafen am 1. August 1961 in Moskau zusammen, um neben den wirtschaftlichen Problemen der DDR, der bevorstehenden Tagung des Politischen Beratenden Ausschuss des Warschauer Paktes, auch Einzelheiten der Sperrung der Sektorengrenze in Berlin zu besprechen. Das Protokoll dieses Gesprächs gehört zweifellos zu den Schlüsseldokumenten des Mauerbaus.⁴⁰ Die hier dokumentierten Passagen zeigen: Für beide Parteiführer war die Grenzschließung eine Frage, die über das Schicksal so vieler Menschen entschied, nur ein lösbares, technisches Problem ihrer Machtsicherung.

Chruschtschow: „Ich habe eine technische Frage: Wie wird die Kontrolle an den Straßen verwirklicht, deren eine Seite sich in der DDR befindet und die andere in West-Berlin?“

Ulbricht: „Wir haben einen bestimmten Plan. In den Häusern, die einen Ausgang nach West-Berlin haben, werden wir diesen Ausgang zumauern. An den anderen Orten werden wir Sperren aus Stacheldraht errichten. Der Draht ist schon herangeschafft worden. Das alles kann man sehr schnell machen. Schwieriger ist es mit dem Transportwesen. Wir bauen die Bahnsteige der S- und U-Bahn um für das Umsteigen nach West-Berlin.“

Chruschtschow: „Aber wer wird dann denn umsteigen?“

Ulbricht: „Jener Teil der Bevölkerung, der die Genehmigung zum Überschreiten [der Grenze] erhält. Beispielsweise wohnen etwa 14 Tausend Leute, unter ihnen viele Vertreter der Intelligenz, in West-Berlin, arbeiten aber bei uns.“

Chruschtschow: „Ich habe noch eine Frage. Wenn Sie Ihren Leuten erlauben, in West-Berlin zu wohnen, werden dann dort Personen, die bei Ihnen wohnen, arbeiten können?“

Ulbricht: „Nein, das wird nicht erlaubt, das ist etwas anderes. Jedoch gibt es bei uns einige Tausend Kinder, vor allem aus kleinbürgerlichen Familien, die in Ost-Berlin wohnen und in West-Berliner Schulen lernen.“

Chruschtschow: „Das ist zu unterbinden.“

Ulbricht: „Ja, wir werden sie nicht mehr lassen.“

Ein weiteres Thema zwischen beiden war die Frage: Wie ernst war die Gefahr innerer Unruhen in der DDR? Dieser Teil des Gesprächs gewährt einen einzigartigen, bislang unbekanntem Einblick in die Wahrnehmung der Krise des SED-Staates durch die beiden kommunistischen Machthaber. Ulbricht hatte Angst um die eigene Macht, und diese motivierte ihn, auf die Sperrung der Sektorengrenzen in Berlin zu drängen.

Chruschtschow: „Ich habe noch eine Frage. Ich lese vertrauenswürdige Geheimberichte aus dem Westen, und sie schätzen die Lage so ein, dass in der DDR die Bedingungen für einen Aufstand herangereift sind. Gemäß ihrer politischen

Linie geben sie die Anweisung, die Sache nicht bis zu einem Aufstand kommen zu lassen, weil dies zu nichts Gutem führe. Sie sagen: Wir werden nicht helfen können, und die Russen werden alles mit Panzern niederschlagen“. Darum rufen sie zum Abwarten auf, bis die Bedingungen herangereift seien. Ist es dem wirklich so? Ich weiß das nicht genau und berufe mich lediglich auf westliche Berichte.“ Das war die Gegenwart der 17. Juni 1953 im Gedächtnis der sowjetischen Staatschefs.

Ulbricht wiegelte ab: „Wir haben Informationen darüber, dass die Bonner Regierung durch Anwerbungen und die Organisation von Widerstand Schritt für Schritt Bedingungen für die Organisation eines Aufstandes vorbereitet, damit der Aufstand im Herbst 1961 stattfinden kann. Wir sehen die Arbeitsmethoden des Gegners: Die Kirche organisiert den Austritt der Bauern aus den Genossenschaften, obwohl die Resultate auch nicht groß sind. Es gibt auch Sabotageakte. Ist dies alles real? Ein Aufstand ist nicht realistisch. Aber es sind Aktionen möglich, die uns großen internationalen Schaden zufügen könnten.“ Das Gespräch diente auch der Vorbereitungen der Tagung des Politischen Beratenden Ausschuss des Warschauer Paktes, die vom 3. bis 5. August in Moskau stattfand. Ulbricht trug auf ihr seinen Plan zur Schließung der Sektorengrenzen für DDR-Bürger in Berlin vor und sprach offen aus, gegen wen diese Maßnahme gerichtet war, gegen die eigene Bevölkerung.

„Diese Lage macht es notwendig, dass zur gegebenen Zeit die Staatsgrenze der Deutschen Demokratischen Republik (die mitten durch Berlin geht) für Bürger der Deutschen Demokratischen Republik nur mit besonderer Ausreisegenehmigungen passiert werden darf, oder, soweit das einen Besuch von Bürgern der Hauptstadt der DDR in Westberlin betrifft, mit besonderer Bescheinigung erlaubt wird.“⁴¹ Dabei blieb es bis zum 9.11.1989

Öffentlich galt die These von der äußeren Bedrohung der DDR durch die Bundesrepublik und die NATO. Der Warschauer Pakt forderte in seiner Erklärung mit dieser Behauptung die Regierung der DDR auf, die Grenze in Berlin zu schließen.

Stacheldraht durch Berlin—der 13. August 1961

Politisch wurde die Erklärung der Staaten des Warschauer Paktes zum Basistext für die am 7. August vom SED-Politbüro gefassten Beschlüsse zur Grenzschießung, die dann von der Volkskammer und dem Ministerrat einstimmig und damit „demokratisch“ in Regierungshandeln überführt wurden. Der Beschluss des DDR-Ministerrates und die Erklärung der Staaten des Warschauer Paktes hatten eines gemeinsam: Sie dienen der Legitimation der endgültigen Teilung Berlins.

In Bezug auf den Ministerrat legte das Politbüro fest: „Der Beginn der vorgesehenen Maßnahmen zur Kontrolle erfolgt in der Nacht vom Sonnabend zum Sonntag aufgrund eines Beschlusses des Ministerrates. Genosse Ulbricht wird den Ministerrat am Wochenende zu einem Beisammensein einladen.“⁴² Am Abend des 12. August beendete Ulbricht in seiner Funktion als Staatsratsvorsitzender gegenüber dem Ministerrat die konspirative Vorbereitung der Grenzsperrung. Es galt, den Beschluss des Politbüros in staatliches Handeln zu überführen, sollte doch die Grenzschießung auf Grundlage eines Regierungsbeschlusses erfolgen. Diese

Sitzung begann als Sommerfest in Ulbrichts Landhaus am Döllnsee.

Werner Eberlein⁴³ erinnerte sich: „Ich glaube nicht, dass jemand auch nur ahnte, worum es sich eigentlich handelte. [...] Nach dem Essen wurde gegen 21:00 oder 21:30 Uhr abgeräumt und Ulbricht sagte: ‘Wir machen jetzt noch eine kleine Sitzung.’ [...] Dann trug Ulbricht vor, dass die Maßnahmen am 13. August durchzuführen waren. Ins Detail ging er nicht, sondern er las nur die zu fassende Entschliebung vor, der allgemein zugestimmt wurde. Nur wenige sagten ein paar Worte dazu. Nachts gegen 22:30 oder 23:00 Uhr wurde der Beschluss angenommen. Als die Gesellschaft ungefähr gegen 23:30 Uhr oder etwas später aufgehoben wurde und nach Hause fuhr, war die Chaussee nach Berlin bereits mit sowjetischen Panzern voll. Die Entscheidung war also bereits vorher gefallen.“⁴⁴

Ulbricht hatte in Moskau eindeutig klargestellt: Die Schließung des Tors zum Westen richtete sich gegen die DDR-Bevölkerung. Das Verlassen des SED-Staates ohne staatliche Genehmigung war als „Republikflucht“ bereits kriminalisiert, und nun sollte denen, die die Flucht trotzdem wagten, in Berlin der Weg nach Westen endgültig versperrt werden. Diese politische Zielsetzung gab der Sperrung der Sektorengrenzen ihre Form. Sicherheitspolitisch war sie eine komplexe Aufgabe, bei der den sowjetischen Streitkräften und der Nationalen Volksarmee (NVA) der DDR die militärische Sicherung der Operation oblag. Sie standen für den Fall in Bereitschaft, dass sich über die Kontrolle der Transitwege nach West-Berlin ein militärischer Konflikt mit der NATO entwickelte.

Die Grenzabriegelung in Berlin selbst war eine Aufgabe des Ministeriums des Inneren, dem die Grenzpolizei und die „Kampfgruppen der Arbeiterklasse“, die Parteiarmee der SED, unterstanden. Nur sie sollten zusammen mit der Volkspolizei in Berlin eingesetzt werden, um der ganzen Aktion den Charakter eines „Polizei-einsatzes“ zu geben. Trotzdem war dies Teil der militärischen Operation—das zeigt sich an der Tatsache, dass die sowjetische Armee die Planungsunterlagen für diese Aktion koordinierte. Auch die Durchführung der Grenzsperrung als Polizeiaktion hatte mit dem Viermächtestatus von Berlin zu tun; Aktionen des deutschen Militärs hätten gegen den entmilitarisierten Status der Stadt verstoßen.

Der reaktivierte Marschall der Sowjetunion Iwan S. Konjew übernahm am 10. August sein Kommando als Oberkommandierender der GSSD. An diesem Tag erfolgte auch die Befehlsausgabe an die drei DDR-Minister zur Durchführung der Grenzsperrung.⁴⁵ Die Ernennung Konjews war ein symbolischer Schritt, der die sowjetische Entschlossenheit, ihre Siegerrechte in Deutschland zu behaupten, personalisierte: Konjew hatte zusammen mit Marschall Konstantin G. Schukow auch jene sowjetischen Truppen kommandiert, die 1945 unter ihm Berlin eroberten. Die Arbeitsteilung zwischen der Gruppe der GSSD und der NVA während der Sperrung der Sektorengrenzen wurde so festgelegt, dass die Volksarmee die Aktion außer Sichtweite der Grenze sicherte und die sowjetischen Truppen „sich in voller Kampfbereitschaft in der zweiten Reihe“⁴⁶ bereithielten.

Die Aktion selbst schlug ein wie einen Blitz, die Berliner und die Welt wurden überrascht. Am Morgen des 13. August standen sie vor den vollendeten Tatsachen der gesperrten Sektorengrenze in Berlin.

Vom Stacheldraht zur Mauer

Ulbricht hielt Stacheldraht für ein geeignetes Material zur raschen Absperrung der Sektorengrenze. Um den 20. August, erinnerte sich Kwizinskij, fand eine Besprechung zwischen ihm, Botschafter Perwuchin und Marschall Konjew statt. Ulbricht erklärte seinen sowjetischen Gästen, „die heiße Phase der Operationen sei vorüber; jetzt müsse man die Lage konsolidieren und die Grenze befestigen. Der Stacheldraht könne nicht ewig in der Stadt bleiben, er reize die Menschen und provoziere sie zu immer neuen Versuchen, die Grenze zu durchbrechen. ‘Wir werden anstelle des Stacheldrahtes eine Betonmauer bauen,‘ sagte Ulbricht.“⁴⁷

Der weitere Ausbau der Grenzsicherung in Form der Ersetzung des Stacheldrahtes durch eine Mauer folgte dieser Vorgabe. Die Berliner Grenzziehung hatte auch Auswirkungen auf die Bewohner an der innerdeutschen Grenze. Mit der „Aktion Festigung“ setzte am 1. September eine zweite Umsiedlungswelle nach der von 1952 ein, „bei der 3000 „unzuverlässige Elemente“ entlang der Grenzen zwangsweise ins Binnenland umgesiedelt wurden.“ Das geschah auf Befehl des Innenministers, der die Bewohner klassifizierte, die aus dem Bereich der „5-km-Sperrzone und des 500-m-Schutzstreifens“ zu deportieren waren.⁴⁸

<http://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/SchelmenromanUlbricht> informierte vier Tage vor der Sitzung des Zentralen Stabes Chruschtschow über seine Pläne: „Jetzt wird an der weiteren Befestigung der Grenze gebaut. Die Taktik, schrittweise die Maßnahmen durchzuführen, hat es dem Gegner erschwert, sich über das Ausmaß unserer Maßnahmen zu orientieren, und es uns erleichtert, die schwachen Stellen an der Grenze zu finden.“⁴⁹

Der Zentrale Stab, der die Grenzabspernung am 13. August koordinierte, trat auf Beschluss des SED-Politbüros am 20. September noch einmal zusammen, um eine erste Zwischenbilanz der Grenzsperrung zu ziehen. Der Auftrag lautete außerdem: „Alle Durchbruchversuche müssen unmöglich gemacht werden.“⁵⁰ Generalmajor Willi Seifert vom Ministerium des Innern erläuterte die zu treffenden Maßnahmen, um die Grenzsicherung zu stabilisieren.

Für die innerstädtische Grenze plante das Ministerium des Innern, „18 bis 20 km Grenzmauer zu errichten. Bis zur Fertigstellung sind Gräben zu errichten.“ In der „Kanalisation“ seien Sperren zu errichten. „Entschiedene Maßnahmen“ seien u. a. in der Bernauer Straße erforderlich, „wo die Grenzlinie entlang der Hausgrundstücke verläuft“. Hier müsse eine „vollständige Räumung oder schnellere Räumung unzuverlässiger Elemente erfolgen“. Auf Nachfragen erklärte er, dass die Mauer zwei Meter hoch gebaut werden sollte. Als sich die Delegationen von SED und KPdSU am 2. November 1961 in Moskau trafen, hatte Ulbricht noch „eine kleine Frage“ an Chruschtschow ob es jetzt der richtige Zeitpunkt sei, um die Grenze zu befestigen. Seine Antwort war lapidar: „Aber warum sollte man das nicht tun?“⁵¹

Die Bundesregierung und der Senat von Berlin bekennen sich zum Selbstbestimmungsrecht der Deutschen

Der Stacheldraht durch Berlin demonstrierte bildhaft die Teilung des Landes. Diese Bilder warfen schon am 13. August die Frage auf: Mussten die Deutschen nun ihre Hoffnung auf Wiedervereinigung endgültig begraben und was bedeutete das

Ereignis für die künftige Deutschlandpolitik der Bundesrepublik?

Bundeskanzler Adenauer benannte noch am 13. August die eigentliche Ursache für diesen Gewaltakt: „Diese Maßnahme ist getroffen worden, weil das der mitteldeutschen Bevölkerung von einer auswärtigen Macht aufgezwungene Regime der inneren Schwierigkeiten in seinem Machtbereich nicht mehr Herr wurde.“⁵² Dieser Gewaltakt ändere aber nichts an dem Verfassungsauftrag der Bundesrepublik, die deutsche Einheit mit friedlichen Mitteln herbeizuführen. „Mit den Deutschen in der Sowjetzone und in Ost-Berlin fühlen wir uns nach wie vor aufs engste verbunden; sie sind und bleiben unsere deutschen Brüder und Schwestern. Die Bundesregierung hält an dem Ziel der deutschen Einheit in Freiheit unverrückbar fest.“⁵³ Die Erklärung war ein Versprechen vor allem gegenüber der Bevölkerung der DDR. Die Bundesregierung beharrte weiter auf dem Selbstbestimmungsrecht der Deutschen und damit auf dem Ziel der Wiedervereinigung Deutschlands.

Der Brennpunkt der Proteste gegen den Stacheldraht durch die Stadt war das abgeriegelte West-Berlin. Der Schock für die West-Berliner war ein doppelter: einmal die Brutalität, mit der die SED die Sektorengrenze schloss, und dann die Hinnahme der Grenzsperrungen durch die Westmächte. Angst vor der eigenen Zukunft und eine Vertrauenskrise in die Bündnisgarantien der Vereinigten Staaten breiteten sich aus. Mussten nun die Möbelwagen bestellt werden, um diese im Stich gelassene Stadt zu verlassen? Das war die Frage.

In gewisser Weise wiederholte sich das Szenario von 1948, als die Sowjetunion mit einer Blockade der Transitwege von Westdeutschland nach West-Berlin die drei Westmächte zum Abzug aus der Stadt zwingen wollte. Der Regierende Bürgermeister Willy Brandt trat in die Fußstapfen seines Vorgängers Ernst Reuter, der 1948 den Widerstandswillen der Berliner gegen die Blockade mobilisiert hatte und damit die Voraussetzung für die Luftbrücke der Amerikaner schuf. Wie dieser sprach Brandt für die Stadt. Am 16. August wurde das Schöneberger Rathaus zur Tribüne, vor dem sich 250.000 Berliner versammelten. Mit seiner Rede verwandelte Brandt die ohnmächtige Empörung vieler Berliner über die gewaltsame Teilung ihrer Stadt durch die kommunistischen Machthaber zu einer entschlossenen Haltung der Selbstbehauptung von West-Berlin. Er erinnerte seine Zuhörer daran, dass „unsere Mitbürger“ in Ost-Berlin und in „der Zone“- so nannte er damals DDR- „die schwerste Last trügen, die man ihnen in diesen Tagen nicht abnehmen könne, „und das ist heute das Bitterste für uns! Wir können sie ihnen nur mittragen helfen, in dem wir ihnen zeigen, dass wir uns der Stunde gewachsen zeigen! Sie fragen, ob wir sie jetzt abschreiben. Darauf gibt es nur die Antwort: Nein, niemals! Sie fragen uns, ob wir sie jetzt verraten werden, und auch darauf gibt es nur die Antwort: Nein, niemals!“⁵⁴ Er forderte die öffentliche Ächtung des SED-Staates. Zwei Tage später sprach er als SPD-Spitzenkandidat bei der bevorstehenden Bundestagswahl im Deutschen Bundestag über die eingetretene Zäsur für die deutsche Politik, auch im Hinblick auf ihre Verbündeten:

„Ein Wurm krümmt sich noch, wenn er getreten wird. Für die westlichen Schutzmächte bedeutet der vergangene Sonntag, dass sie aus jener Viermächtevereinbarung heraus gedrängt worden sind, die sich auf Berlin als Ganzes beziehen. Die Erklärung der Warschauer-Pakt-Staaten und das, was

die Zonenregierung darauf gestützt verkündet hat, bedeutet in Wirklichkeit auch, dass den Westmächten die Mitverantwortung für Deutschland als Ganzes streitig gemacht wird.“⁵⁵ Nüchtern konstatierte er die Konsequenz die sich aus dieser Analyse für die Bundesrepublik ergab. Sie konnte sich nicht weiter darauf verlassen, dass die drei Westmächte in Verhandlungen mit der Sowjetunion eine deutsche Wiedervereinigung 16 Jahre nach Kriegsende versuchen würden durchzusetzen. Der 13. August hatte diese Tatsache den Deutschen schmerzhaft vor Augen geführt, diese Mauer durch Berlin konnte nicht mehr ignoriert werden. Die Schuld an der eingetretenen Verschärfung der internationalen Lage gab Brandt der Regierung der Sowjetunion, „die nicht davon ablassen will, das aus Brutalität und Unfähigkeit zusammengesetzte Ulbricht-Regime zu stützen“. Er beharrte, wie Adenauer, auf der Einheit der Deutschen: „Die Preisgabe unserer Landsleute wird nicht stattfinden. Wir sind ein Volk [...] nur Recht und Moral verpflichten uns zu diesem Standpunkt.“⁵⁶

Nicht die Grenzschießung am 13. August war für Brandt rückblickend der Wendepunkt in seinem politischen Denken, sondern die Reaktion der Westmächte auf diesen Gewaltakt. Er verlor Illusionen und gewann Realitätssinn: „Es wurde Ulbricht erlaubt, der Vormacht des Westens einen bösen Tritt vors Schienbein zu versetzen—und die Vereinigten Staaten verzogen nur verstimmt das Gesicht. Meine politischen Überlegungen sind in den folgenden Jahren durch die Erfahrungen dieses Tages wesentlich mitbestimmt worden. Was man meine Ostpolitik genannt hat, wurde vor diesem Hintergrund geformt.“⁵⁷

International war die bundesdeutsche Politik gezwungen, sich den neuen welt-politischen Realitäten anzupassen; das wusste auch Adenauer. Seine Überlegungen kreisten um einen Modus Vivendi mit der Sowjetunion in der deutschen Frage und die Einsicht, dass wir „die SBZ hinnehmen [müssen], auch als staatsrechtliches Gebilde, wenn die Menschen dort freier und menschenwürdiger leben können.“⁵⁸ Kurz vor dem Ende seiner Kanzlerschaft konnte er aus dieser Einsicht selbst keine politischen Konsequenzen mehr ziehen.

Das demonstrative Nein von Brandt auf die stummen Fragen der Deutschen hinter dem Stacheldraht, ob man sie nun „abschreibe“ oder gar „verrate“, war von grundsätzlicher Natur. Es war zugleich die Anfrage an die Westdeutschen, ob sie gewillt waren, an der nationalen Perspektive der deutschen Einheit angesichts der mit der Mauer endgültig vollzogenen Spaltung Deutschlands festzuhalten. Der Realität deutscher Zweistaatlichkeit mussten die Bundesregierung und der Berliner Senat aber ihren Tribut zollen; sie mussten eine Politik des Nicht-Loslassens entwickeln, die der Logik der Mauer und der Abgrenzungspolitik des SED-Staates entgegenwirkte.

Der nationale Zusammenhalt der Deutschen über Zonengrenzen hinweg beruhte seit 1945 in erster Linie auf den familiären Bindungen und auf der gemeinsamen Sprache und Kultur. Die SED-Führung zog die Grenze durch Berlin nicht nur, um die Flucht aus der DDR zu verhindern, sie tat es auch, um die „nationalen Illusionen“ in der DDR absterben zu lassen. Der einheitlichen Sprache wollte die SED durch Zensur und Sprachlenkung beikommen. In ihrer Kulturpolitik betonte sie die Eigenständigkeit der sozialistischen Kultur der DDR in Abgrenzung zu der der

Bundesrepublik. Dieser Prozess der erzwungenen Abgrenzung der Bevölkerung der DDR von den Deutschen in der Bundesrepublik bedrohte langfristig die politische Option, einen deutschen Nationalstaat zu rekonstruieren.

In Berlin hatte die Mauer viele menschliche Beziehungen zerrissen. West-Berlinern war danach ein Besuch ihrer Angehörigen im Ostteil der Stadt verwehrt. Es dauerte zweieinhalb Jahre bis zur ersten Passierscheinregelung zwischen dem Berliner Senat und der DDR im Dezember 1963. Es war der sichtbare Beginn der Politik der menschlichen Erleichterungen in der Spaltung seitens des Berliner Senats und der Bundesrepublik. Ihr Preis war bekannt, die faktische Anerkennung der DDR als zweiten deutschen Staat. Den Anspruch auf nationale Einheit und Selbstbestimmung gab keine Bundesregierung völkerrechtlich auf. Auch in den 28 Jahren, in denen die Mauer stand, bewährte sich Berlin als Drehscheibe für Kontakte sowie Informationen und als Brücke zwischen den Menschen in beiden deutschen Staaten.

Ulbricht der Stacheldraht in Berlin und die deutsche Einheit

Gegenüber seinem Staatsvolk trat Ulbricht nach dem 13. August als Sieger auf. Am 18. August erklärte er der DDR-Bevölkerung im Fernsehen die Grenzsperrung als Rettung des europäischen Friedens vor einer drohenden Aggression der Bundesrepublik gegen die DDR. Das bedeutete für die SED aber keine grundsätzliche Absage an die deutsche Einheit, im Gegenteil, er nannte den genauen Zeitpunkt einer deutschen Wiedervereinigung. Er wiederholte die obligatorische Schuldzuweisung an den Westen, der für die Teilung verantwortlich sei und versicherte:

„Niemand aber soll etwa denken, die strenge Sicherung unserer Grenzen hätte zu bedeuten, dass wir etwa die Arbeiter und die friedliebenden Menschen in Westdeutschland abgeschrieben hätten. Nein, niemand ist abgeschrieben.“⁵⁸ Der letzte Satz war eine Replik auf Brandts Rede am 16. August. Ulbricht verschob den Tag der Wiedervereinigung auf den Sieg des Sozialismus in Deutschland, der zur Voraussetzung die sozialistische Umwälzung in der Bundesrepublik hätte.

Entgegen der Betonung der Gemeinsamkeiten mit Teilen der westdeutschen Bevölkerung war die Konsequenz der SED für die DDR eine der grundsätzlichen Abgrenzung von der Bundesrepublik. Ulbricht hatte über ihre Notwendigkeit auch keine Illusionen. Im September 1961 erstattete er einen Lagebericht an das Präsidium der KPdSU. Die Schlüsselworte waren die „Stabilität der Lage“ und das „Umdenken“ in der DDR, in West-Berlin und der Bundesrepublik. Die Voraussetzungen für die Stabilität der DDR sei die Grenzschließung. Ulbricht schrieb: „Die Erfahrungen der letzten Jahre haben bewiesen, dass es nicht möglich ist, dass ein sozialistisches Land wie die DDR einen friedlichen Wettbewerb mit einem imperialistischen Land wie Westdeutschland bei offener Grenze durchführen kann.“⁵⁹ Ein solcher Wettbewerb sei nur möglich, „wenn das sozialistische Weltsystem in der Pro-Kopf-Produktion die kapitalistischen Länder übertroffen hat“. Das war das Eingeständnis, dass der Sozialismus in der DDR den Systemwettbewerb gegenüber der Marktwirtschaft der Bundesrepublik verloren hatte. Es blieb die geschlossene Grenze und die repressive Machtstruktur der Diktatur inklusive der Existenzgarantie durch die Sowjetunion, die das Regime aufrechterhielt. Angesichts dieser Realität glaubte Ulbricht damals, die Menschen in der DDR, die immer noch auf

eine Wiedervereinigung im westlichen Sinn gehofft hatten, „waren jetzt gezwungen, die Fragen bis zu Ende zu denken, d. h., dass die Lösung der nationalen Frage des deutschen Volkes da fehlt ein Verb finden? [...]den Sieg des Sozialismus in der DDR voraussetzt“. Die Intelligenz habe die Situation relativ schnell verstanden, „respektierte“ die Maßnahmen, und „es gab mit ihnen weniger Schwierigkeiten als früher.“⁶⁰

Ulbricht forderte nun von Chruschtschow den Abschluss eines separaten Friedensvertrages mit der DDR und die Übertragung der sowjetischen Statusrechte in Berlin an den SED-Staat. Chruschtschow entschied sich aber für erneute Verhandlungen mit den Vereinigten Staaten und die Sowjetunion behielt ihre Statusrechte in Berlin. Die SED konnte eine Mauer errichten, aber sie bekam nicht die uneingeschränkte Souveränität über ihr Staatsgebiet.

Perspektiven amerikanischer und sowjetischer Deutschlandpolitik

Nach dem 13. August hing die weitere Zukunft West-Berlins von der Reaktion des amerikanischen Präsidenten John F. Kennedy auf den Mauerbau ab. Der ließ sich am 14. August über die Lage in Berlin informieren und seine Reaktion soll gelassen gewesen sein: „Die anderen sind in Panik geraten—nicht wir. Wir werden jetzt nichts tun, weil es keine Alternative gibt außer Krieg. Es ist vorbei, sie werden Berlin nicht überrollen.“⁶¹ Für Brandt dagegen war es nicht vorbei, sondern eine neue Entwicklung hatte begonnen. Er entschloss sich zu einem Brief an Kennedy, um ihm seine Sicht der Lage in Berlin und die Pflichten der Westmächte darzulegen: „Die Entwicklung hat den Widerstandswillen der West-Berliner Bevölkerung nicht verändert, aber sie war geeignet, Zweifel in die Reaktionsfähigkeit und Entschlossenheit der drei Mächte zu wecken. Dabei ist ausschlaggebend, dass der Westen sich stets gerade auf den existierenden Vier-Mächte-Status berufen hat.“

Er wisse wohl, dass sich diese Garantien für die Freiheit der Berliner immer nur auf die Westsektoren bezogen hätten. Die politisch-psychologische Gefahr in Berlin sei aber eine doppelte:

„1. Untätigkeit und reine Defensive könnten eine Vertrauenskrise zu den Westmächten hervorrufen.

2. Untätigkeit und reine Defensive könnten zu einem übersteigerten Selbstbewusstsein des Ostberliner Regimes führen, das heute bereits in seinen Zeitungen mit dem Erfolg seiner militärischen Machtdemonstration prahlt.“⁶²

Kennedy sah die Grenzsperrung auch als „Beweis dafür, wie sehr das Thema ‘Freie Stadt’ ‘leeres’ Gerede und wie verachtenswert das DDR-Regime war, das die Sowjetunion ‘respektabel’ zu machen versuchen.“⁶³ Dem widersprach Brandt ebenfalls:

„Der zweite Akt ist eine Frage der Zeit. Nach dem zweiten Akt würde es ein Berlin geben, das einem Ghetto gleicht, das nicht nur seine Funktionen als Zufluchtsort der Freiheit und als Symbol der Hoffnung auf Wiedervereinigung verloren hat, sondern das auch vom freien Teil Deutschlands abgeschnitten wäre. Dann können wir statt der Fluchtbewegung nach Berlin den Beginn einer Flucht aus Berlin erleben.“

Brandt verlangte nach der Zerstörung des Vier-Mächte-Status für Berlin einen Drei-Mächte-Status für West-Berlin, die Wiederholung der Garantie der Westmächte, bis zur Wiedervereinigung Deutschlands in Berlin präsent zu bleiben, und

eine Erklärung, dass für die Westmächte die deutsche Frage keineswegs erledigt sei.“⁶⁴ Die östliche Grenzschießung hatte die Rechte der Westmächte in der Stadt respektiert, trotzdem war die Krise nicht vorbei, Chruschtschow hatte sein Wiener Ultimatum noch nicht zurückgenommen. Während man in Washington in den ersten Tagen nach dem 13. August glaubte, „mit müden Protestschreiben die Krise, die aus Washingtoner Sicht gar keine war, im Griff zu haben, schrillten bei den Amerikanern [...] in Berlin und Bonn die Alarmglocken. Entsprechend sahen die Telegramme aus, die sie am 16. und 17. August nach Washington schickten.“⁶⁵ Für eine realistische Meinungsbildung über die Lage in Berlin sorgten in Washington auch amerikanische Journalisten, wie Robert H. Lochner, der vom amerikanischen Außenministerium bestellte Direktor des Rundfunks im amerikanischen Sektor (RIAS).⁶⁶

Am 17. August hatte Kennedy den Brief von Brandt in Händen, „der damals in Washington für Irritationen sorgte.“ Kennedy selbst war „außerordentlich verärgert. Er verbat sich solche Ratschläge und entsprechend fiel auch sein Antwortschreiben aus—und zeigte Brandt gleichzeitig die Grenzen der deutschen Politik und des amerikanischen Engagements auf. Kein Wort von Wiedervereinigung, es ging nur um West-Berlin.“ Der Präsident schrieb: „Die Bindung Westberlins zur freien Welt ist keine Sache schöner Reden. So wichtig auch die Verbindungen zum Osten gewesen sind, so schmerzlich ihr Abbruch auch ist, so läuft das Leben der Stadt, so wie ich es verstehe, doch in erster Linie zum Westen hin—ihr Wirtschaftsleben, ihre moralische Basis und ihre militärische Sicherheit.“⁶⁷

Der Protest aus West-Berlin zeigte jedoch in Washington Wirkung und die USA ergriffen die Maßnahmen, auf die in Berlin viele warteten. Rolf Steininger kommt zu dem Schluss:

„Alles zusammen sorgte für eine graduelle Änderung der amerikanischen Politik—wenn auch nur im Atmosphärischen. Kennedy entschied, die US-Garnison in Berlin um eine Kampfgruppe (1.500 bis 1.800 Mann) zu verstärken [...] sowie Vizepräsident Lyndon B. Johnson auf Kurzbesuch, und den „Helden“ der Luftbrücke 1948/49 General Lucius. D. Clay als seinen persönlichen Vertreter nach Berlin zu schicken; gleichzeitig wollten die USA ihre militärische Aufrüstung beschleunigt vorantreiben—ohne dies allerdings öffentlich zu machen. Der Mauerbau, so kritisierte der Präsident, hätte vorhergesehen werden müssen.“⁶⁸

Über die propagandistische Ausnutzung der Berliner Grenzschießung dachte Kennedy schon am 14. August nach. Die Reise von Johnson nach Berlin bot ihm die Gelegenheit, Grundmuster dieser Propaganda in dieser Geste der Solidarität medial zu verbreiten. Johnson betonte, dass sich die Amerikaner für die Lebensfähigkeit dieser Stadt verbürgt hätten. Die „Schranke aus Stacheldraht“ habe „menschliche Bande zerrissen“ und die im Osten würden „einen Sieg für sich in Anspruch [nehmen] und haben ihre Niederlage bewiesen. Die Kommunisten haben sich zu früh beglückwünscht.“ Die Ursache für die Teilung Berlins sah er darin, dass sie den Systemwettbewerb in Deutschland nach 1945 verloren hätten. Während die Deutschen in der Bundesrepublik „ein lebenswertes Leben aufgebaut“ hätten, sei dagegen in Ostdeutschland „ein schrecklicher und tragischer Fehlschlag zu zeichnen.

“Nun würden „diese Leute“ versuchen, sich mit Stacheldraht, Bajonetten und Tanks den Kräften der Geschichte entgegenzustellen. Auf kurze Sicht ist der Stacheldraht da und wird nicht durch eine Handbewegung verschwinden. Auf lange Sicht wird aber dieses unkluge Bemühen scheitern. Wendet Eure Augen von diesen Schranken ab und fragt Euch selbst: Wer kann wirklich glauben, dass die Geschichte Deutschland und Berlin ihre natürliche Einheit verweigern wird? Dies ist somit eine Zeit für Vertrauen, Haltung und Glauben an Euch selbst. Dies ist auch eine Zeit für Glauben an eure Alliierten allüberall in der Welt und diese Insel steht nicht allein. Ihr seid ein lebenswichtiger Teil der gesamten Gemeinschaft freier Menschen.”⁶⁹

Mit anderen Worten, die Teilung der Stadt bleibt, auch die Vereinigten Staaten können sie nicht mit einer „Handbewegung“ beseitigen, aber die „Insel“ selbst ist Teil der westlichen Gemeinschaft. Es bleibt die Gewissheit einer kommunistischen Niederlage, die sie als Sieg propagieren, und die Hoffnung auf die Geschichte und ihre Gesetze, die die unnatürliche Teilung Deutschlands und Berlins beenden werden. Die Botschaft „vertraut euch selbst und euren Alliierten“ war auch eine indirekte Antwort auf Brandts Warnung vor einer Vertrauenskrise.

Die sowjetische Seite fürchtete genau diese Propaganda mit ihrer Dualität von Freiheit und Gewalt, denn sie wirkte. Gleichzeitig startete der amerikanische Präsident eine Verhandlungsinitiative gegenüber Moskau, um den Konfliktherd Berlin zu befrieden. Paul-Henri Spaak, der belgische Außenminister, sondierte in Moskau im September 1961, ob Chruschtschow zu solchen Verhandlungen überhaupt bereit sei. Er war es, forderte aber „Realismus in der deutschen Frage“. Was er darunter verstand, verdeutlichte er dem belgischen Außenminister mit einer Anekdote aus der Frühzeit der Sowjetunion:

„Damals gab es viele Fragebögen zur Befragung von [Partei- und Staats-] Bediensteten.“ Eine der Fragen betraf den Glauben an Gott. „Ein Feuilletonist hat das genutzt und eine Glosse geschrieben. Man fragt einen sowjetischen Bediensteten: Glauben Sie an Gott? Er sagt: im Dienst nein, aber zu Hause—ja. So befassen Sie sich mit den Deutschland-Fragen. Zu Hause, da sagt er nein, im Dienst—ja, denn de Gaulle hat sich nie dafür erklärt, dass es zwei Deutschlands gibt, nirgends hat er sich öffentlich dafür ausgesprochen, aber im Gespräch scheut er sich nicht und sagt offen, man dürfe keinesfalls zulassen, dass es ein Deutschland gibt, es sei nötig, dass es zwei Deutschlands gibt. Die Engländer, die sind diplomatischer. Sie sagen das nicht im Gespräch, sondern man muss in ihren Augen lesen, dass sie nie damit einverstanden sein werden, dass ein Deutschland entsteht. Der Standpunkt zu Deutschland ist hier nicht durchdacht, unreal. Wir glauben, dass es zwei Deutschlands gibt. Und das ist die Realität. Sie, der Westen, wollen ein einziges Deutschland, wie Sie jedenfalls verkünden, aber unaufrichtig.“

Nach diesen Ausführungen umriss Chruschtschow die sowjetische Position zu Deutschland, die er als Verhandlungsgrundlage ansah: „Um ein einiges Deutschland mit Ulbricht an der Spitze zu haben, ist ein Krieg erforderlich. Um ein Deutschland mit Kanzler Adenauer an der Spitze zu haben, ist ein Krieg erforderlich. Wir sind gegen Krieg. Wir sind für das, wie jetzt die Lage entstanden

ist.”⁷⁰ Die Verhandlungen zwischen den amerikanischen und sowjetischen Außenminister über die Transitwege nach Berlin wurden aufgenommen und Chruschtschow zog im Oktober sein Wiener Ultimatum zurück.

Henry Kissinger: Die deutsche Wiedervereinigung in der Perspektive der amerikanischen Deutschlandpolitik

Gegen den sowjetischen Realismus und ihrer Forderung nach der völkerrechtlich abgesicherten endgültigen Teilung Deutschlands, setzte Henry Kissinger in Washington zeitgleich die amerikanische Interessenlage in der deutschen Frage. In seiner Analyse der deutschen Politik nach dem Bau der Mauer für die amerikanische Administration kam er zum Schluss, diese müsse nach dem 13. August in der Frage der Wiedervereinigung Konsequenzen ziehen. Stacheldraht und Mauer seien international eine deutliche Absage an alle deutschen Hoffnungen auf eine Wiedervereinigung. Trotzdem würden diese weiter existieren und als Potenzial auf die Politik der Bundesregierung wirken. Der Historiker Kissinger dachte Politik in längeren Zeiträumen, und er wusste vor allem, welche Bedeutung die öffentliche Meinung für das Selbstverständnis von Gesellschaften hat. Er befürwortete daher trotz der Bilder aus Berlin, dass die amerikanische Regierung weiterhin für die deutsche Wiedervereinigung eintrete. Für ihn war diese Position keine „politische Träumerei“, sondern eine „absolute Notwendigkeit, um den Aspirationen der deutschen Bevölkerung gerecht zu werden“. Dabei hatte er vorrangig die amerikanische Deutschlandpolitik im Blick, deren oberste Priorität es damals war, die Bundesrepublik im westlichen Bündnis zu halten und ihr kein erneutes „Rapallo“ zu ermöglichen. In den westlichen Regierungen war die Furcht vor einer Wiederholung eines neutralistischen Ausgleichs der Bundesrepublik mit der Sowjetunion immer virulent. Kissinger wollte aber diese Möglichkeit dauerhaft ausschließen, in dem sich die USA in dieser Frage klar positionierten: „Der beste Weg hierfür sei es, die Schuld an der fortdauernden Trennung weiterhin der UdSSR anzulasten.“⁷¹

An dieser Stelle ist eine Anmerkung notwendig. Der in Fürth geborene Kiesinger musste seiner deutsche Heimat vor 1939 entfliehen, ebenso wie Gerhard Weinberg oder der Berliner Gerhard H. Weiss, der Historiker und der Germanist hatten entscheidenden Anteil am Aufbau der GSA. Ihr Schicksal ist Teil der deutschen Tragödie, die die Diktatur der Nationalsozialisten über unser Land heraufbeschwor. Ich persönlich schäme mich immer noch dafür, dass mein Volk diese Verbrechen gegen seine jüdischen Mitbürger und die Juden Europas zugelassen hat, die mit den Vertreibungen ins Exil begann. Trotzdem ließen viele von ihnen als Amerikaner die deutschen Probleme, sei es als Wissenschaftler oder Politiker nicht los und sie unterstützten den demokratischen Neuanfang nach 1945; dafür gebührt ihnen Dank. Diese Anmerkungen ist keine Fußnote.

Bonn war nicht Weimar und eine Berlinpolitik außerhalb der Abstimmung im westlichen Bündnis kam für die Bundesrepublik nicht in Betracht. Alle Bundesregierungen wussten, dass die Vereinigten Staaten die Freiheit West-Berlins garantieren.

Die Bedeutung des 13. August für die deutsche Teilungsgeschichte

Die Grenzschießung in Berlin führte allen Deutschen die unerbittliche Realität der Teilung ihres Landes vor Augen. Die Grenze zwischen den beiden deutschen Staaten und in Berlin war auch die der bipolaren Weltordnung. 16 Jahre nach Kriegsende musste eine ganze Generation Deutscher ihre Hoffnungen auf die Wiedervereinigung in Frieden und Freiheit beerdigen. Die nächste Generation wuchs in ihrem Schatten auf. Die Mauer wurde zum Symbol der scheinbar unabänderlichen Teilung Deutschlands als Folge von Hitlers Krieg.

Die kollektiven Erinnerungen an den Mauerbau sind deshalb bis heute vielschichtig, interessengeleitet und generationsspezifisch. Für die Erlebnisgeneration war 1961 alles klar: Um die totalitäre Macht der SED in der DDR angesichts der Flüchtlingszahlen aus dem „Arbeiter- und Bauern-Staat“ zu behaupten, musste das Tor zum Westen in Berlin geschlossen werden. Umgekehrt war für die Aktivisten der DDR die Grenzschießung zur Sicherung des Sozialismus in Deutschland eine unbedingte Notwendigkeit.

Nach dem 13. August in Berlin mussten sich die Deutschen in der DDR mit den Verhältnissen abfinden und sich mit den Kommunisten arrangieren ohne ihre Herrschaft mehrheitlich zu billigen. Der Entzug der Freizügigkeit durch die SED schuf ein Gefühl einer Freiheitsberaubung, das schließlich eruptiv 1989 in der friedlichen Revolution in der DDR mündete und zum Fall der Mauer führte.

In der Bundesrepublik wurde die Berliner Mauer in den innenpolitischen Debatten um die Deutschlandpolitik zunehmend als Beweis für das Scheitern der Deutschlandpolitik der Regierungen von Konrad Adenauer gewertet, die unbeirrt gegenüber den vier Siegermächten auf eine Lösung der deutschen Frage im Sinne der Wiederherstellung der deutschen Einheit beharrte.

Die Mauer wurde in der Bundesrepublik zum Katalysator für eine neue Ostpolitik. Sie musste von den Realitäten der deutschen Zweistaatlichkeit ausgehen. Die politischen Differenzen lagen in der Antwort auf die Frage: Hält die westdeutsche Politik die Perspektive der Wiedervereinigung offen oder akzeptiert sie die Teilung als letztes Wort der Geschichte? In der veröffentlichten Meinung und der akademischen Diskussionen wurde die DDR immer mehr zu einem „zweiten Österreich“. Die Hoffnung auf die Einheit der Nation schwand unzweifelhaft im demokratischen Kernstaat Bundesrepublik. Der kommunistische Gewaltakt gegen das eigene Volk, der sich in dieser Mauer manifestierte, wurde außerhalb von Berlin immer mehr zur Normalität und schon damals die Mauer zu einem touristischen Event.

Erst die friedliche Revolution in der DDR und der Mauerfall 1989 bewiesen die Gegenwart der Geschichte. Nun entschieden die Deutschen die seit 1949 eingefrorene Systemauseinandersetzung um die Zukunft Deutschlands zu Gunsten einer Wiedervereinigung in Frieden und Freiheit.

¹ Dieser Text basiert auf den Notizen zu meinem in Louisville gehaltenen Vortrag

² vgl. Jochen Maurer: Dienst an der Mauer. Der Alltag der Grenztruppen rund um Berlin, Berlin 2011

³ Ulbricht hatte seinen Staatsgast Chruschtschow vom Flughafen abgeholt und damals kursierte ein Witz in der DDR: Als beide durch ein Spalier jubelnder Menschen führen, fragte der Gast aus Moskau erstaunt: „Genosse Ulbricht, wie haben sie das organisiert?“ Ulbricht antwortete: „Ganz einfach

Genosse Chruschtschow, ich habe ein Schild an unseren Wagen anbringen lassen, wir hauen ab!“ Auf die Erfüllung dieses Wunsches mussten die Deutschen noch Jahrzehnte warten.

⁴ Protokoll des V. Parteitags der Sozialistischen Einheitspartei Deutschlands, 10.–16.7.1958 in Berlin, 2 Bände, Berlin (Ost) 1959, Bd. 2, S. 1347.

⁵ vgl. Jean—Louis Margoline: Chinas: Ein Langer Marsch in die Nacht, in: Stephan Courtois, Nicolas Werth, u.a. (Hrsg.): Das Schwarzbuch des Kommunismus, München 1998, S. 539-557

⁶ Walter Ulbricht: Über den Kampf um den Frieden, für den Sieg des Sozialismus, für die nationale Wiedergeburt Deutschlands als friedliebender, demokratischer Staat, Referat auf dem V Parteitag der SED, in: derselbe: Zur Geschichte der deutschen Arbeiterbewegung, Band VII, Berlin (aus) 1964, S. 319.

⁷ Walter Ulbricht: „Der Sozialismus siegt“! Schlusswort, in: Protokoll des V. Parteitags der Sozialistischen Einheitspartei Deutschlands, 10.–16.7.1958 in Berlin, 2 Bände, Berlin (Ost) 1959, Bd. 2, S. 1348.

⁸ Rede Chruschtschow, in: Protokoll des V. Parteitags der Sozialistischen Einheitspartei Deutschlands, 10.–16.7.1958 in Berlin, zwei Bände, Berlin (Ost) 1959, Bd. 1, S. 279.

⁹ Ebd., S. 278.

¹⁰ Ebd.

¹¹ vgl. Ebd., S. 1336.

¹² Vgl. Gerhard Wettig, Chruschtschows Berlin-Krise 1958-1963, München 2006, S. 24.

¹³ Walter Ulbricht: An die Arbeiterschaft und an alle friedliebenden Bürger Westberlins!, in: derselbe, Zur Geschichte der deutschen Arbeiterbewegung, Bd. III, Berlin (Ost) 1964, S. 649.

¹⁴ Ebd., S. 649.

¹⁵ zitiert nach: Manfred Wilke: Der Weg zur Mauer, Berlin 2011, S. 278

¹⁶ zitiert nach: der Weg zur Mauer, S. 164

¹⁷ vgl. Manfred Wilke: der Weg zur Mauer, Berlin 2011, S. 269-273

¹⁸ SAPMO-Barch, DY 30/3508, Chruschtschow an Ulbricht, 30.1.1961, zitiert nach: Manfred Wilke, ebenda, S. 273.

¹⁹ RGANI, F. 52, op. 1, d. 557, S. 113-123, Gespräch Chruščevs mit Ulbricht, 31.3.1961, abgedruckt in: Gerhard Wettig in Zusammenarbeit mit Stefan Karner – Horst Möller – Michail Prosumenschschikow – Peter Ruggenthaler – Barbara Stelzl-Marx – Natalja Tomilina – Aleksandr Tschubarjan – Matthias Uhl – Hermann Wentker (Hg.), Dokumentation Chruschtschows Westpolitik 1955–1964. Gespräche, Aufzeichnungen und Stellungnahmen. Band 3: Kulmination der Berlin-Krise (Herbst 1960 bis Herbst 1962). München 2011. (Dokument 4). Berlin 2011, S. 106-114. Diesem Protokoll entstammen alle weiteren Zitate.

²⁰ Zum Wiener Gipfel vgl. Stefan Karner, Barbara Stelzl-Marx, Natalja Tomilina, Alexander Tschubarjan, Günter Bischof, Victor Iscenko, Michail Prozumenschikov, Peter Ruggenthaler, Gerhard Wettig, Manfred Wilke: Der Wiener Gipfel 1961 Kennedy-Chruschtschow, Innsbruck 2011, 1056 Seiten

²¹ Protokoll der Gespräche Chruščevs mit Kennedy in Wien, 3. 7. 1961, abgedruckt in: Wettig u. a. (Hg.), Dokumentation Chruschtschows Westpolitik, ebenda, S. 220-250., daraus alle folgenden Zitate

²² Uhl, Krieg um Berlin?, S. 126f. Dieser Plan ist bis heute für die historische Forschung noch immer gesperrt, betonte Uhl.

²³ Ebd., S. 128f.

²⁴ Matthias Uhl, Krieg um Berlin?, München 2008, S. 223–5.

²⁵ Uhl, ebenda, S. 226.

²⁶ Gerhard Wettig: Chruschtschows Berlin-Krise 1958 bis 1963, ebenda, S. 169.

²⁷ Julij A. Kwizinskij, Vor dem Sturm, Berlin 1995, S. 180, alle folgenden Zitate entstammen dieser Quelle.

²⁸ Ebd., S. 178.

²⁹ Das war der Deckname für die Sperrung der Sektorengrenze in Berlin.

³⁰ Kwizinskij, Vor dem Sturm, S. 181.

³¹ Verkehrsminister Kramer emigrierte 1932 in die Sowjetunion, arbeitete im sowjetischen Verkehrswesen, 1937 Lehrgang Taktik der Pioniertruppen an einer sowjetischen Militärschule; Teilnahme am Spanischen Bürgerkrieg, Instrukteur für das Pionierwesen eines Armeekorps.

³² Kwizinskij, Vor dem Sturm, S. 180.

- 33 Gespräch von Wilfriede Otto mit Werner Eberlein am 5.9.1996 über die Beratung der Ersten Sekretäre der kommunistischen und Arbeiterparteien der Staaten des Warschauer Paktes vom 3. bis 5. August 1961 in Moskau, in: Beiträge zur Geschichte der Arbeiterbewegung 2/1997, S. 40-97, hier S. 85. Eberlein war zu der fraglichen Zeit der Chefdolmetscher von Ulbricht.
- 34 Manfred Wilke, Alexander J. Vatlin: Interview mit Generaloberst Anatolij Grigorjewitsch Mereschko, Wolgograd, 11.9.2010, übersetzt von: Dr. Tatiana Timofeew; "Arbeiten Sie einen Plan zur Grenzordnung zwischen beiden Teilen Berlins aus!", Manfred Wilke / Alexander J. Vatlin, Deutschland Archiv 1/2011 – Dokumentation, <http://preview-update.bpb.de/themen/NAWPSE.html>
vgl. Manfred Wilke: Der Weg zur Mauer, ebenda, S. 306- 308.
- 35 Sitz des Oberkommandos der GSSD, südlich von Berlin.
- 36 Interview mit Generaloberst Anatolij Grigorjewitsch Mereschko, vgl. auch: Manfred Wilke: Der Weg zur Mauer, ebenda, S. 306- 308
- 37 Interview mit Generaloberst Anatolij Grigorjewitsch Mereschko, ebda
- 38 Interview mit Generaloberst Anatolij Grigorjewitsch Mereschko, ebda.
- 39 Gespräch Chruschtschow mit Ulbricht, 1.8.1961, in: Wettig u. a. (Hg.), Dokumentation Chruschtschows Westpolitik, ebenda, S. 295-313, daraus alle Zitate
- 40 zitiert nach Wilke: Der Weg zur Mauer, ebenda, S.324
- 41 Protokoll 39/61 der außerordentlichen Sitzung des Politbüros des ZKs am Montag, 7. August 1961, zitiert nach: Matthias Uhl/Armin Wagner (Hg.): Ulbricht, Chruschtschow und die Mauer, Band 86 der Schriftenreihe der Vierteljahrshefte für Zeitgeschichte, München 2003, S. 97.
- 42 Werner Eberlein (1919–2002), Sohn des KPD-Mitbegründers Hugo Eberlein, der 1937 in der Sowjetunion ermordet wurde. Sein Sohn wuchs in der Sowjetunion auf und war 1961 Dolmetscher von Ulbricht. 1986 Mitglied des Politbüros des ZK der SED bis 1989.
- 43 Wilfriede Otto, 13.8.1961 – eine Zäsur in der europäischen Nachkriegsgeschichte, Dokumente und Materialien, Gespräch der Autorin mit Werner Eberlein am 1.10.1996, in: Beiträge zur Geschichte der Arbeiterbewegung 2/1997, S. 85-89, hier S. 88.
- 44 vgl. Interview mit Generaloberst Anatolij Grigorjewitsch Mereschko, eben der
- 45 Uhl, Krieg um Berlin?, S. 127.
- 46 Kwizinskij, Vor dem Sturm, S. 187.
- 47 Jürgen Ritter – Peter Joachim Lapp, Die Grenze. Ein deutsches Bauwerk. Berlin 2007, S. 28–30.
- 48 SAPMO-BArch, DY 30/3509, Ulbricht an Chruščev, 16.9.1961.
- 49 Protokoll über die Lagebesprechung des zentralen Standes am 20.9.1961, zit. nach: Werner Filmer – Heribert Schwan, Opfer der Mauer. München 1991, S. 374. Diesem Protokoll entstammen auch die folgenden Zitate.
- 50 Gespräch Chruščevs mit Ulbricht, 2. 11. 1961, abgedruckt in: Wettig u. a. (Hg.), Dokumentation Chruschtschows Westpolitik, ebenda, S.519-536
- 51 zitiert nach: Wilke: Der Weg zur Mauer, ebenda, S.351
- 52 ebenda
- 53 zitiert nach: Wilke: Der Weg zur Mauer, ebenda, S.352-353
- 54 ebenda, S.352
- 55 zitiert nach: Wilke: Der Weg zur Mauer, ebenda, S.352
- 56 zitiert nach: Wilke: Der Weg zur Mauer, ebenda, S.356
- 57 Hans-Peter Schwarz: Adenauer. Der Staatsmann; 1952-1967, Stuttgart 1991, S.748
- 58 ebenda, S.359-360
- 59 zitiert nach: Manfred Wilke: der Weg zur Mauer, ebenda, S.383-384.
- 60 zitiert nach: Wilke: Der Weg zur Mauer, ebenda, S.384
- 61 Zitiert nach: Peter Wyden: Die Mauer war unser Schicksal, Berlin 1995, S. 95.
- 62 Schreiben des Regierenden Bürgermeisters von Berlin, Willy Brandt, an Präsident John F. Kennedy, 16.8.1961, zitiert nach: Dokumente zur Deutschlandpolitik, hg. vom Bundesministerium für innerdeutsche Beziehungen, Reihe IV, Bd. 7/1, Frankfurt am Main 1976, S. 48–49.
- 63 Rolf Steininger, Berlinkrise und Mauerbau 1958 bis 1963, München 2009, S. 255.
- 64 Brandt an Kennedy, 16.8.1961, ebenda
- 65 Steininger, Berlinkrise, S. 260.
- 66 Siehe Frederick Taylor: Die Mauer, Berlin 2009, S. 207–228.

67 Steininger, Berlinkrise, S. 262.

68 Steininger, ebenda., S. 267.

69 Rede des amerikanischen Vizepräsidenten Johnson auf der gemeinsamen Sitzung des Berliner Senats und des Berliner Abgeordnetenhauses, 19.8.1961, in: Jürgen Rühle/Günter Holzweißig, 13. August 1961. Die Mauer von Berlin, Köln 1981 S. 104–105.

70 zitiert nach: Manfred Wilke: Der Weg zur Mauer, S.361-362

71 Harald Biermann, John F. Kennedy und der Kalte Krieg, Paderborn 1997, S. 136–137.

In eigener Sache:

The Early Years of the Western Association for German Studies (Special Roundtable on the 35th Anniversary of WAGS/GSA)

[At the Louisville conference the GSA commemorated the thirty-fifth anniversary of its founding as the Western Association for German Studies (WAGS) with a special roundtable in which WAGS members described their own recollections of the Association's earliest years. Chaired by Professor Katherine Roper (Saint Mary's College of California), herself a former president of the GSA, the roundtable included presentations by Professors Ronald Smelser (University of Utah), Christopher Browning (University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill), Marion F. Deshmukh (George Mason University), and Gerald A. Fetz (University of Montana). Their contributions are reprinted below. The roundtable concluded with a rousing discussion in which many other WAGS "veterans" participated. The entire discussion was recorded, and will be stored in the GSA archives.]

Ronald Smelser University of Utah

My assignment is to examine the beginnings of the WAGS/GSA organization, analyze the early annual conferences, the second of which I helped to organize, and to offer a tribute to a man who might be called "Mr. GSA," Gerry Kleinfeld. In doing so I tried to contact the original founders and officers in the organization: David Kitterman (Northern Arizona University), Gerry Kleinfeld (Arizona State University), Douglas Tobler (Brigham Young University), and Reece Kelly (Fort Lewis College). Sadly, Reece just passed away this July and his wife asked me to mention this to the conference, because many of you knew him.

The founders decided to form an organization called the Western Association for German Studies for several reasons. One had to do with the fact that the primary organization for German scholars then was the Conference Group for Central European History, which many felt, legitimately or not, to be an old boy organization that discriminated against younger scholars. It was also felt that an organization was needed which was more multidisciplinary in its approach. In addition, it was felt that most conferences were being held in the eastern part of the country, which meant expensive travel. A decision to found a new organization was taken during the Rocky Mountain Social Studies Conference in Tempe, Arizona, in April 1976. In August of that year, Kitterman, Kelly, Kleinfeld, and Tobler gathered for a pre-conference planning session. They drew straws to assign themselves positions as officers in the new organization: Kitterman as president, Kelly as V.P., Kleinfeld as secretary-treasurer. They called it the Western Association for German Studies.

The first meeting was scheduled for Tempe, site of the Arizona State University, on October 21-22, 1977. A co-sponsor was the American Graduate School of International Management in Glendale. At this point the leadership and membership were clustered geographically in Arizona and Utah. There were five institutional members—all of them in the southwest. The number of sessions was small by today's standards: six on Friday, at one of which was Christopher Browning who read a paper on "Ribbentrop and the Final Solution"; five on Saturday, including Gottlieb Schneebeili, consul for Switzerland, who presented a talk on a "Holiday in Switzerland," really more a travelogue than anything else. A modest beginning to be sure, but one already sees here the potential for a much larger organization, on a national and international level. German guests were already involved. In addition to the Swiss consul, there was Hans Buchheim (Mainz) who read a paper on "Nationality and the Politics of Reunification since 1945." Also present was Hans Schauer from the West German Embassy who presented a talk on "The Changing Role of the Federal Republic of Germany Since World War Two." Schauer's presence at the meeting also reminds one of the intimacy and informality of the organization in the early days. Schauer was invited to dinner at Gerry Kleinfeld's home and took part in the preparation of the meal, creating a delicious soup. He was rewarded when Gerry presented him with the apron he wore during the cooking process. The next evening he joined some members on a trip to North Scottsdale, to a restaurant called "Pinnacle Peak," which staged a reenactment of a western gunfight as on a movie set. The restaurant was grass roots enough that it forbade the wearing of ties; if you appeared in one, you risked having it cut in two. Both experiences fascinated this German diplomat and I am sure the story went around Washington. We also see in the program of this first conference the intention to offer a multidisciplinary conference, with papers on history, culture, literature, political science, critical theory, and women's history, with attention also paid to other German-speaking countries like Austria and Switzerland. And, already there were five institutional members—all of them in the southwest.

The second annual conference was held at the mountain ski resort at Snowbird, twenty-nine miles outside of Salt Lake City (fifty minutes driving time from the airport). I was in charge of local arrangements for this conference and it was quite a challenge, since I had never done this before. Program directors were Douglas Tobler and Ehrhard Bahr (UCLA). There were two local university sponsors: the University of Utah and Brigham Young University. My own dean was quite generous, offering to pay for one cocktail party and provide a subsidy for a guest speaker. The university also provided university buses to transport guests from the airport to Snowbird and back. Needless to say, there were long negotiations with the Snowbird conference office on registration, lodging, conference packets, catering, etc., but in the end it all worked out well. As I put it in a letter to Kleinfeld: "It should be a tremendous conference. Snowbird is a breathtaking location; and, perhaps most importantly, the guests are trapped here in isolated splendor and cannot escape into other pursuits during the two days." Not that there were not problems. A number of guests worried about transportation over a long distance from the airport. One wrote to me: "I will be attending the WAGS conference next week

and would like to confirm that there will be transport to Snowbird when I arrive at 8:30 pm on Thursday. The thought occurred to me that the WAGS information desk at the airport might have closed by that hour.” I assured Katherine Roper that the desk would remain open. I also made the mistake of engaging Horst Fiedel and his Bavarian oompah band to play between sessions. His group was there to play for Oktoberfest. But Fiedel’s music was so loud that most of the colleagues went elsewhere in order to talk. Finally a group of volunteers (my wife included) who were manning the desks for registration were approached to take on the extra burden of babysitting the children of guests. They revolted against this suggestion and a graduate student (who else) was eventually found to take on this responsibility. I should also note that several guests came up to me with shortness of breath; they were worried until I reminded them that we were at a very high altitude. The guests were also confused by Utah’s strange liquor laws-- that they had to spend an extra dollar to join a club in order to buy a drink.

As for the conference itself, there were eight Friday and nine Saturday sessions. Again the tradition continued of a wide range of disciplines in the panels. On one panel on History and Drama, Gerald Fetz presented a paper entitled “The Tradition of the German History Play” and on another dedicated to “Art and Literature in Imperial Germany,” Marion Deschmukh presented on the theme of “Rinnsteinkunst: German Writers and Artists, 1880-1900” Our keynote speaker was Gordon Craig who spoke on “The Condition of Contemporary German Democracy: An Evaluation.” Foreign guests from the German-speaking world were also present; Gabriele Wohmann (Darmstadt) who read from her own work; Wolfgang Jacobmeyer (Münster) who lectured on “Deutsch-Polnische Beziehungen,” and Norbert Leser (Austria) who presented on the theme “Austria’s Marxism as a Nutshell of the Problems of International Socialism.” The number of institutional members had doubled since the year before to ten. (This year there are forty-eight institutional supporters). One could also observe that the ratio of panelists from east and west of the Mississippi was changing gradually in the direction of the east: nineteen of fifty-one panelists were from east of the Mississippi.

These trends continue at the third annual meeting at Stanford University (1979) and the fourth at Wichita State University (1980) At Stanford there were twenty sessions, plus the German connection continued with several sessions sponsored by the DAAD as well as faculty seminars on psychoanalysis and history carried out by Winfried Kudszus and Peter Loewenberg. Now there were thirteen institutional members (all from the Southwest or California) and thirty-four panelists of sixty-seven are from east of the Mississippi. At the Wichita meeting in 1980 there were sixteen institutional members (still all from the Southwest or California). The sessions had increased to twenty-three, and forty-four of seventy-five panelists are from the east. One should also mention—in the context of foreign guests—the presence of a man who would always be a friend of the WAGS/GSA: Hans-Adolf Jacobsen (Bonn). He helped to set up the DAAD sessions at Stanford and spoke at Wichita on the theme of “The German Question: History and Perspectives.”

I won’t get into the debate over going national and renaming the organization German Studies Association, just to note that this debate was going on several years

before the change occurred in 1983. It was driven by the fact that more and more panelists, especially the younger ones, saw the organization as one where they wanted to present and desired for it to be a national one. It had from the beginning been an international one thanks to the presence every year of scholars from the German-speaking world. Institutions from the Southwest and California continued to dominate, but scholars from all over the country came to present. It would be a fierce debate.

Note that at the beginning membership was \$10.00; registration was \$8.00, the banquet \$10.00, and lunch \$5.00. Over the years we rarely sought to raise these numbers unless we had to. The WAGS/GSA fees have been modest to say the least compared with other organizations, given what the members have received.

Now, to Gerry Kleinfeld, who unfortunately is not able to be here today. I tried to come up with some words that characterize Gerry. I came upon “*einzigartig*,” “*aussergewöhnlich*,” “*unnachahmlich*.” These three terms are on the back of a Bierdeckel and are supposed to apply to Warsteiner Beer. But I think they also characterize Gerry Kleinfeld, who is indeed unique, remarkable, and inimitable. I have worked with Gerry for many years in various offices I held in our organization. I remember as secretary/treasurer flying down to Phoenix where we would go over the books every year just before our conference. Gerry was there from the very beginning as founder. Our organization became his passion, the members his family. He was absolutely dedicated to it. For many years he was editor of the Newsletter and the *German Studies Review*, which he handled in a very professional manner. From the beginning he solicited “blind reviews” of manuscripts; no officers of the association were allowed to publish while in office; I have heard from many members how professional he was in explaining acceptance or rejection of manuscripts. Early on he did the typesetting of the journal himself because we didn’t have the money to have it done professionally. (Tobler) He had great connections to Germany. He went there at his own expense to get organizations to fund German scholars who wanted to give papers. David Kitterman called him a “networker par excellence.” I should note here that other officers and members in the association also deserve credit for making the German connection. Kitterman himself on two trips to Europe early on recruited scholars in West Germany, Austria, and Switzerland, including Erich Pohl, who became a good friend to the association. But Gerry played the leading role. He also got us involved with a number of organizations over the years, including the ACLU, the DAAD, the Forschungsgemeinschaft, Fulbright, and the Marshall Fund. He secured for us tax exempt status. He saw to it that our bylaws were gender neutral, so that women from the beginning could serve on the editorial board, then the executive committee, then occupy the presidency. He protested when the Forschungsgemeinschaft refused to support women. I could continue this list, but you see why one could call him “Mr. GSA.” You might want to add to the list from your own experiences.

Christopher Browning University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

Born in the south, raised and educated in the midwest, I took up my first tenure-track job at Pacific Lutheran University in Tacoma, Washington, in the fall of 1974. Thus I was not among and indeed did not yet even know the core of young scholars already located in the west who laid plans for the Western Association for German Studies and its first meeting at Tempe, Arizona, in the fall of 1977. But I was precisely the kind of person for whose needs WAGS was designed to meet. Teaching at a regional university of modest size and reputation, and with a modest annual salary and an even more modest budget to support faculty travel for conferences, I had little chance of getting on the program of the national meeting of the AHA and even less chance of being able to afford travel to it, except perhaps in the occasional year in which it was held in a major west coast city. Indeed, in the first thirteen years of my career, I attended the AHA only once, when it met in San Francisco, and I was not on the AHA program until 1987, a full decade after the first meeting of WAGS in Tempe.

Thus responding to the notice of the first WAGS conference was a “no-brainer.” It offered the possibility of a conference that I could afford to attend and where I could hope to be accepted on the program and present to and interact with interested colleagues. And indeed, all of those expectations were realized. We were a small group, there were by current standards a shockingly small number of panels, and almost all the participants were young junior faculty in the first stages of their careers. The prominent exceptions as attending senior scholars—at least in history—were Charles Burdick of San Jose State and Joachim Remak of UC Santa Barbara, who held court on the patio in the late afternoon and generously bought drinks for their fledgling colleagues. From the very first conference, collegiality and informal interaction among participants became a consistent hallmark of WAGS gatherings.

Over the next several years a small number of luminaries graced the annual meetings with their presence; most prominent in my memory were Richard Rubenstein—the author of *The Cunning of History*, a series of provocative essays about the Holocaust—-at Snow Bird and Hans Adolf Jacobsen—Karl Dietrich Bracher’s colleague at the University of Bonn—at Stanford. After I had returned from my first sabbatical, I found that the character of WAGS was changing rapidly in the early 1980s. At El Paso in 1982 there were major contingents of German scholars, in history most prominently Hans Mommsen and Manfred Messerschmidt, the head of the Militärgeschichtliches Forschungsamt, then in Freiburg. Having an exceptionally supportive Messerschmidt as the commentator on my paper (on “Wehrmacht Reprisal Policy and the Mass Murder of Jews in Serbia”) was especially beneficial to me. The following year in Madison—the most eastern venue to date and first time east of the Mississippi—witnessed a significant leap in size and an especially large influx of “easterners.” For the first time, at least in my memory of the conferences, a large hall was needed to accommodate not just the splashy roundtable on the Sonderweg featuring Geoff Eley, Theodore Hamerow,

and other prominent scholars of German history attending WAGS for the first time but also the panel I was on, chaired by the renowned George Mosse. It was this “double influx” of both “easterners” and Germans from overseas, now attending in ever larger numbers, that tipped the scales in favor of transforming WAGS into the GSA. To assure the founding generation of “westerners” that one of the original purposes of the organization—geographical proximity—was not lost and that the organization would not be hijacked to the east coast, geographical equality was constitutionally mandated, namely that no less than every three years the GSA conference must be held west of the Mississippi. Though the small-scale intimacy of WAGS was no more, fortunately the collegiality has endured.

There is one other aspect of the WAGS years that I would be remiss not to address, namely that it was the chief venue at that time for Holocaust specialists to present their work to and interact with a wider audience of scholars of German studies. Sir Ian Kershaw, in the foreword to his recent book of collected essays, reminds us that when he attended the famous and fiery confrontation between historians of the Third Reich at Cumberland Lodge in 1979, the Holocaust was not even mentioned. It was at that conference that Tim Mason coined the terms “intentionalist” and “functionalist” to designate the warring historiographical factions, but those terms were not applied to the debates over Hitler and the shaping of Nazi Jewish policy until a 1982 conference in Paris, organized by Saul Friedländer and François Furet. Starting in the ‘70s there was an annual Scholars Conference on the Church Struggle and the Holocaust, mostly focused in fact on church history, and the occasional ad hoc conference on the Holocaust, such as the two in San Jose organized by Henry Friedlander and Sybil Milton. But the “Lessons and Legacies” conferences of the Holocaust Education Foundation did not begin until 1989, and the USHMM—now a major sponsor of Holocaust scholarship—did not open until 1993. Quite simply, the basic infrastructure legitimizing Holocaust Studies as an academic field did not yet exist.

For myself, working at the juncture of German and Holocaust history in the 1970s and ‘80s, first WAGS and then the GSA was the venue where I could be assured that my proposals would be welcomed and my papers respectively received. Between 1977 in Tempe and 1987 in St. Louis, I presented six times. There was no other place where I could have done this, and that body of work was formative in my development as a scholar. For younger scholars today, who in the past two decades have witnessed the explosion of Holocaust scholarship and even experienced what some have termed “Holocaust fatigue” (or others, even more derogatorily, “Shoah business” or “the Holocaust industry”), the notion of needing a venue for Holocaust studies may seem very quaint, indeed almost unfathomable. If that is the case, it is in no small measure thanks to a transformation that WAGS helped bring about.

Marion F. Deshmukh
George Mason University

I shudder to think that this venerable association has been in existence thirty-five years. There must be current participants—recent PhDs or graduate students -- who were not even alive or, at most, toddlers, when the organization was founded. Its

establishment and its first conference in 1977 (the one conference I did not attend) marks the fact that the GSA is now well over a generation old.

Being the pack rat that I am, I have actually found copies of volumes 2, 3, and 4, (1977 through 1979) of the WAGS *Newsletters*. Volume 2 states that the first annual conference was held at Arizona State University in Tempe, the academic home of the editor of the *German Studies Review*, Gerry Kleinfeld. Reading the newsletter's first paragraph brought a smile to me. Let me quote it for you: "Over 175 persons attended, far exceeding our calculations. The chef could not accommodate all of the late registrants, and only 135 could be seated at the banquet. Included in the registration fee, the dinner featured prime rib and cabernet sauvignon. There was space for the late-comers, however, at the Association cocktail party on Saturday night." I fondly recall participating in the second conference in the lovely resort of Snowbird, Utah, near Salt Lake City. What struck me then and now are several features of WAGS that have continued as the association grew, and became national and international, as the German Studies Association.

First, there was an early and ongoing attempt to make the organization interdisciplinary. Papers were encouraged from Germanisten, historians, political scientists, art historians, economists, musicologists, and philosophers. The idea, rather avant-garde for its time, was to truly integrate disciplines by having sessions which examined issues from multiple perspectives. Taking a topic and analyzing it historically, economically, culturally, would be a value-added approach to German Studies. At the larger discipline-based conferences -- such as the Modern Language Association for Germanisten, the American Historical Association for historians, or the College Art Association for art historians -- those of us toiling in interdisciplinary fields could, on occasion, present papers. But many central European art historians felt somewhat marginalized at these large gatherings because other fields of art history, such as the Renaissance or nineteenth-century France, took center stage.

At the early WAGS meetings, the sincere attempt to integrate disciplines connected with German-speaking Europe was its primary mission. And while this lofty goal has been harder to realize in the concrete than in theory, there have been many truly interdisciplinary sessions, despite perennial grumblings about the high hotel costs of AV equipment! There has also been the fruitful interchange, often at cocktail hours or lunch banquets, between historians, Germanisten and others who would not normally interact, especially at discipline-based conferences, or even at one's own colleges and universities.

Secondly, because there has never been a job market attached to the association, and the association has been rather non-hierarchical, WAGS from the first allowed advanced graduate students as well as professors to participate in its sessions. While some have criticized this openness, I believe that it has allowed the organization to repeatedly renew itself and keep its "youth," even after thirty-five years. To be sure, there were those who decried this openness, suggesting that quality may have been sacrificed for quantity. But as many of you know, even at the more traditional and venerable scholarly associations, such as the AHA, MLA or CAA, the quality of offerings can vary considerably. We all must have stories where we were

profoundly disappointed after hearing a dismal paper by a well-known academic. Or conversely, very pleasantly surprised and gratified after hearing a terrific paper by a novice. A related early feature of WAGS, and one strongly endorsed by its Executive Director, Gerry Kleinfeld, was the inclusion of women in all areas of the organization—from participating in sessions, to serving on the Executive Committee and becoming officers, to serving on the Editorial Board of the *German Studies Review*. In today's academic organizations, the role of women has been firmly established. That was not the case a generation ago. Again, WAGS was in the vanguard of an inclusive representation that was gender-blind. And not having a job market attached to the conference allowed WAGS and later GSA members to actually enjoy conferences because there was not the depressing aspect of job hunting in a job market that has, unfortunately, remained problematic after thirty-five years and sees no particularly rosy future.

Thirdly, because the founders of WAGS felt somewhat slighted by most conferences taking place on the east coast, the idea of a specifically western conference venue meant that young professors would actually be able to afford to attend and participate. While I teach and have always taught on the east coast, I am a born and bred Californian and thus felt a sentimental affinity to this idea. Another bonus of the early meetings was sightseeing. How many of us would have been able to visit a range of western cities, from Seattle to Denver, from Palo Alto to El Paso, from the heights of mountainous Snowbird to the flatlands of Wichita, Kansas?!

Frankly, there is nothing like word of mouth, now known as “buzz,” to spread the news of an exciting new association and make it tick. Most of its early members were young, eager professors, wanting to share their research with others. We are still theoretically young, or at least young at heart! Encouraging fellow academics in German Studies to participate led to the association's continuous growth. It is quite fascinating to learn that despite the ups and downs of the global economy, WAGS, then the GSA, has seen a steady uptick in membership and conference participation: ten fold over the years. More importantly, the association has contributed to a sense of family among those of us teaching and researching German Studies. Yes, we know the old adage that families can be dysfunctional as well as happy. But in the case of WAGS and, later, the GSA, the family has contributed to the health and welfare of German Studies, a field certainly needing advocacy in academe. Furthermore, from its beginnings in Tempe, Arizona, it has reached out beyond academe to include organizations and institutions, including governmental organizations such as the German-speaking embassies, the DAAD, the Austrian Cultural Forum, Fulbright, Humboldt, NEH and others who participate at our conferences. These groups actively enlarge the presence and profile of German studies.

Now if we could revert to the dues structure of 1977-78 and only have to pay \$10.00 annually, which would include copies of the *German Studies Review* and the *Newsletter* together with association membership. Now that was a deal!

Gerald A. Fetz
University of Montana

It was my exceptionally good fortune to become involved with the Western Association of German Studies very early, both in my own academic career and in the early years of WAGS. I can't recall how I heard about WAGS initially -- perhaps from a colleague in Montana's history department who had participated in the first "real" WAGS conference (1977) or perhaps from colleagues in the southwest whom I had met in Santa Fe at a Rocky Mountain Modern Language Association conference in 1976. In any case, once I heard about the idea behind WAGS, it was one that excited me and seemed like a breath of fresh academic air. I organized a session for the second WAGS conference in 1978 at Snow Bird and have been coming to and participating in WAGS/GSA ever since. It's clearly been "my" number one scholarly organization. Here's a summary of why.

As an undergraduate at Pacific Lutheran University I had pursued a double-major in German and History. I spent one year at the University of Heidelberg, where I attended lecture courses and participated in inspiring seminars in both fields, encountering such luminaries as Professors Löwith, Gadamer, Conze and Wapnewski. When it came time to select a graduate school, my problem was deciding whether to pursue advanced studies in German literature or in European history. For reasons no longer totally clear to me, especially since I anticipated being able to combine the two in some way, I applied in German Literature, received a generous fellowship from the University of Oregon, and started my graduate studies there. The mid-1960s were still the days of "New Criticism" in most literature programs, or as we called it "All text and no context"). The kindred school of literary study in Germany, *Werkimmanente Literaturtheorie*, (reflected in the canonical guides written by Wolfgang Kayser, Emil Staiger, and a few others. The result was that some literature departments, such as the German program I was in at Oregon, were not all too eager to encourage students to explore the connections between literary studies and other fields such as history. As a result, my professors and advisors were not keen on having me enroll in history courses, even German history courses taught by a trio of young German historians (Bob Berdahl, Tom Brady, and Roger Chickering), but in my second year of graduate school, despite the discouraging words, I sat in courses by both Berdahl and Chickering, much to my benefit. As I neared the end of my graduate studies, and as I searched for a dissertation topic that would allow me to stray from "Werkimmanenz," and despite some grumbling on the part of several of my professors, I was able to convince one of them to become my "Doktorvater" for a project that involved German Literature and History (and a few other areas): "The Political Chanson in German Literature from Wedekind to Brecht." It was a topic that allowed and challenged me to combine and probe issues and texts and contents and methodologies that involved poetics, literary journalism, literary history, cultural institutions, history, political and social questions, one that allowed me to roam broadly, yet at the same time forced me to focus in an interdisciplinary fashion. And in all fairness, I had learned a lot about close reading of texts from the "New Critical" approaches that benefitted me

greatly then and still do. I suspect it may even have been partially responsible for keeping me from becoming overly enamored with the “*literary* theory” obsessions that struck our discipline in the 1980s and 1990s, although there, too, I learned a good deal that has been instructive and useful in reading and studying literary texts *and* their contexts.

At the University of Montana, where I was offered and assumed a faculty position in 1970, I was not only allowed, but actually encouraged, to teach broadly: from the start, my teaching assignment included not only core courses in German literature, language, and culture, but I was “invited” (that is, assigned by the chair and dean) to teach a section of the Introduction to Humanities course that had been created sometime earlier by the famous and infamous literary critic Leslie Fiedler. Although I had to fill in lots of gaps to teach the course, I had significant help from faculty colleagues across the campus who also taught sections of the course, and I taught in that program for over twenty years. I had found at the University of Montana an academic home that fit me and my broad interests well, and any notion of working exclusively in a disciplinary “silo” were gone forever. As I began to look around for off-campus opportunities to become involved in scholarly work though, through conferences and journal publications, I found very few, at least in the west, where interdisciplinary work appeared readily encouraged and where colleagues were to be found from disciplines outside literature programs. And even when I did encounter colleagues at conferences from other national literatures, except perhaps in comparative literature, the silos of German literature, French literature, Slavic literature, British literature, etc. appeared pretty much the order of the day and such conferences were, in fact, “conferences within conferences,” isolated by an exclusive focus and by language. And then along came WAGS!

Just as other colleagues on this roundtable have mentioned, Gerry Kleinfeld’s brilliant vision of starting a scholarly organization focused on German-speaking Europe across the disciplines and in the American West was attractive to many of us “out there” not only because we found few if any homes for our work out of the current mainstream, whether in literature or history, but also because it was in the West. That meant, in an earlier day of relatively little access to travel funds, we didn’t have to travel, at great personal expense, to the East coast, where most of the larger, national conferences took place. Those of us who participated in the early WAGS conferences (in Phoenix in 1977, at Snow Bird in 1978, at Stanford in 1979 and so on) all had our own reasons for doing so, many of them similar to mine, and a large number of us kept on coming, and many of us are still here. Since I had also been nominated and elected to the Executive Board prior to the Snow Bird conference, I thought a good way to become involved was to organize a session. Since at the time I was working on a project on German historical drama, I invited two German literature acquaintances and two historians, including the “outside” member of my dissertation committee at Oregon, Roger Chickering, and a long-time WAGS/GSA historian member from the University of New Mexico, Charles McLelland, to join me on the panel on the German History Play. Even in retrospect, it was a session that was created in the spirit of WAGS and it illustrated, I think, at least one of the ways in which WAGS/GSA created important scholarly

space between and among scholars and all-too-separate disciplines. Why would one not want to have historians involved when discussing a mixed breed like the German History Play? Over the years (decades, even—yikes!), I have continued to be the beneficiary of hundreds of WAGS and GSA sessions (many I have participated in directly and many more as a member of the “audience”), as my colleagues from different disciplines and “inter-disciplines” have presented and discussed their intriguing, fresh, important, and often cutting-edge work and ideas. My own teaching and scholarship has been significantly influenced, informed, and enriched by presentations and discussions, both formal and informal, at these conferences as well as by the articles in the *German Studies Review*.

I have to admit that I have sometimes been a little disappointed over the years by the sense of an ever-present tendency, even at WAGS and GSA, for historians or political scientists or 18th century German literary scholars or medievalists to stay away from sessions and presentations that aren’t focused on their own disciplines or sub-disciplines. I wish that more GSA conference participants would attend more sessions outside their own narrower interests, and even serve as panelists in them, thus adding an often very useful “different” perspective, but I suppose that the abundance of sessions at our conferences that are focused on our specific interests actually makes that unrealistic. But I think it would make for a healthier conference if each of us tried to attend at least one session that wasn’t in our areas of expertise, and even to participate in one now and then. I do think that the recent development of the interdisciplinary threads, both in the conference program and in several online forums, has expanded significantly the “space” in the GSA for genuine and important interdisciplinary collaboration that, in turn, has led to important research and publishing projects. The GSA *SPEKTRUM* series of books clearly attests to that fact.

Before I conclude my reflections here on the early days of WAGS, I want to mention a few of the interesting things that I found when reading through the programs of the WAGS conferences, 1977 through 1983. One of the features of the early conferences that most of us “oldsters” reminisce about is the fact that they were smaller and therefore more conducive to important, informal encounters with colleagues outside our own fields. But the attractiveness of the WAGS idea, even far beyond the West, became already evident in those first few years: the conference grew in number of sessions, in number of participants, and in the number of participants who came from the East, even from abroad. A couple of details and trends perhaps worth noting from those first seven years are: although most sessions consisted of three or four participants presenting papers, introduced by a moderator and followed up by a commentator’s comments, there were some that were less formal roundtables or “discussions,” and there were a few “faculty seminars,” that expected some background reading and work on the part of the participants prior to the conference. The plenary lecture, such as the one given by Gordon Craig at Snow Bird in 1978, exemplified clearly and impressively the “interdisciplinary” nature of German Studies. Those first few years also reflected the beginning of participation in the GSA by the Federal Republic of Germany (first), and by the Austrian and Swiss governments gradually as well, in that they were

often represented by Embassy and Consulate speakers and attendees, and during those first few years a number of scholarly organizations and agencies began their long-term affiliation with and participation in WAGS/GSA: the DAAD, MALCA (now the Austrian Studies Association), AATG, Humboldt and several others.

Included on the program during the WAGS years were also Thursday evening readings by German-American authors from their own works, as well as literary readings by guest authors from Germany or Austria. At Snow Bird the author was the German writer Gabriele Wohmann, who also participated in a session about her literary work. Another important feature of WAGS/GSA conferences that became embedded and has continued to grow over the years was the presence of book exhibitors as well as other information exhibits of relevance to German Studies scholars. I suspect that not a few book projects and contracts were first discussed and then finalized at WAGS/GSA conferences. One thing that is obvious from the participant lists in the early years that has changed immensely in recent years is that there were very few graduate students who participated then. We now have a significant number of graduate student participants in GSA conferences, a good sign that our “Nachwuchs” in German Studies regard the GSA as a very important conference for them, even before they find their first academic positions.

In conclusion, I might just add that looking back at the early programs has reminded me of how much the GSA today is similar to WAGS thirty to thirty-five years ago, but also how much it has changed and grown. To the extent that anything has been lost, it is clearly because we are the “victims” of our own success. I guess I’m not so nostalgic, as I look back to those years when we were WAGS, to think that, although we have clearly lost some of the informality and intimacy that were only possible at smaller conferences, we have gained much more in terms of access, breadth of topics, issues discussed, disciplines of participants, and, I think it fair to say, importance in the world of German Studies internationally. Even though we grumble about having extended the conference into Sunday mornings and now, even, into Sunday afternoons, it’s a small price to pay, in my mind and even experience of having been in a few sparsely attended Sunday sessions, for all of that. Thanks for your interest in reading about WAGS, written by a few of us old “wags,” and for continuing to seek ways to keep the GSA robust, interesting, dynamic, and important. I plan to be an active member of this, my central scholarly organization and place to make important academic friends and be exposed to inspiring ideas, for as long as I can get on a plane.

Berlin Program Celebrates Its Twenty-Fifth Anniversary: Alumni Conference, June-July 2011

[In 2011 the Berlin Program for Advanced German and European Studies at the Free University of Berlin celebrated its twenty-fifth anniversary. The German Studies Association is proud of its many years of association with the Berlin Program, which, under the able leadership of Karin Goihl, has enabled dozens of North American graduate students and post-docs to spend a year in Berlin in connection with their dissertation or monograph projects. To celebrate its anniversary, in June

and July 2011 the Berlin Program hosted a conference on “The Good Germans? New Transatlantic Perspectives” that brought more than two dozen Berlin Program alumni back to the city. The themes of the conference were summarized by the organizers: “In their academic research, scholars in German and European studies constantly address the ambivalent nature of the German experience. Due to the two World Wars and the Holocaust, the problematic aspects have, however, tended to prevail in recent decades in the perception of much of the Anglo-American media and among many intellectuals. Instead of reinforcing such understandable stereotypes, the conference starts from the opposite perspective and asks, somewhat self-ironically of course, whether there are not also some appealing aspects of German history, society and culture. Without intending thereby to relativize Nazi crimes, such an approach seeks to contribute to a more nuanced understanding of the entire range of German experiences in North America and the English speaking world. The conference therefore aims to trace recent scholarship addressing the German model in politics, society and culture within a European context.”

The organizers plan to publish the conference contributions. GSA Executive Director David E. Barclay spoke on the history, present, and future of transatlantic academic exchanges. His remarks are included here.]

Bridges and Barriers: Reflections on Transatlantic Academic Exchanges

David E. Barclay
Kalamazoo College/German Studies Association

I'd like to preface my remarks with two important caveats. First, I am not speaking today on behalf of the German Studies Association, but in my own personal capacity. Second, I am by no means an expert on the issues I shall be addressing here. I am an historian, and would feel much more comfortable speaking here today on my current book project, a history of West Berlin from 1948 to 1994! But I do have about twenty years of experience administering organizations that directly benefit from transatlantic academic exchanges, including the German Studies Association since 2006, and it is in that role that I shall be speaking here.

Not long ago I had the opportunity to read the diary of a twenty-one-year-old Princeton undergraduate in which he describes his first-ever visit to Germany in the summer of 1935. He was here as a participant in what these days would be called a Study Abroad program. Among other things, he was hoping to gather information for his proposed senior thesis on the subject of Social Democracy during the Weimar Republic. He discusses his very first day in Germany, in July 1935, in terms that, at once naive and insightful, ought to resonate with all those Americans who have encountered this country for the first time:

So here I am alone in Köln and feeling very helpless. I have seen the cathedral and wish now that I knew architecture so that I could talk intelligently about it. The stained glass windows are beautiful, but the great Christopher and child leaves much to be desired. Christopher is obviously in pretty bad shape and the

child is enjoying it immensely.

This is my first glimpse of a German city, and it's very interesting. The streets are filled with Nazis. I came out of the cathedral to find a whole busload about to start off for somewhere or other. Most of them I've seen are young men, and some are not very soldierly, but they're all obviously having a good time. . . . I have just come in from the streets. Everybody is going home from work, and the narrow streets around the cathedral are crowded. I tried my luck in the stores and found my German much at fault. It will, however, improve—or so I hope.¹

If this young American's combination of fascination and frustration with a new overseas experience was rather typical, the results of his first stay in Germany turned out to be less so. His name was Gordon A. Craig; and, as I think most people in the audience know, in later years he became the doyen of American historians of Germany, president of the American Historical Association, *Honorary professor* at the Friedrich-Meinecke-Institut at the Freie Universität Berlin, and the author of innumerable books, virtually all of them appearing in both English and German. The last, published sixty-three years after his first trip to Germany, was a magisterial study of Theodor Fontane written very much in the interdisciplinary spirit of the German Studies Association.² Although Gordon Craig may be a particularly spectacular example of the long-term effects of study abroad programs and, ultimately, of international academic exchanges for the German-American relationship, he is one of many thousands of individuals whose lives have been transformed by these experiences.

It's appropriate that we should reflect on those transformative aspects of transatlantic exchanges as we commemorate a quarter century of the Berlin Program for Advanced German and European Studies here at the Free University of Berlin. Moreover, this year is an occasion for a dual commemoration, for it is also the thirty-fifth anniversary of the US co-sponsor of the Berlin Program, the German Studies Association. The history of the GSA, like the history of the Berlin Program, tells us a great deal about the post-1945 trajectories of transatlantic and transnational intellectual exchange. The GSA began in 1976 in Tempe, Arizona, as the Western Association for German Studies, or WAGS. It quite literally began in the back yard of my very esteemed predecessor, Gerald Kleinfeld. Its founders, mostly young scholars in the Southwest and the Rocky Mountain West of the United States, were dissatisfied both with their isolation from the east and west coasts of that country (not to mention Central Europe) and with the difficulty of establishing interdisciplinary contacts in German Studies within the large disciplinary associations themselves. By December 1976 WAGS had 120 members, and 170 participated in its first conference in 1977; there were eleven sessions.³ Currently the GSA—it was renamed in 1984—has over 1800 members, of whom about three hundred are in Europe. Last year's conference in Oakland attracted 1334 participants to 317 sessions; 184 participants came from Germany. So WAGS and the GSA, like the Berlin Program, clearly responded to real intellectual and professional needs, and have certainly contributed signally to transatlantic dialogue and intellectual

collaboration.

We have sometimes taken these things for granted, just as we have often tended to take the postwar and post-Cold War European orders for granted. It's salutary to remind ourselves that in many ways we have been luckier than someone like Gordon Craig, who for rather obvious reasons was unable to work or study in Germany from the late 1930s until the mid-1950s, during some of his most productive years. As one of Gordon Craig's students, I have been able to spend at least some time in Germany almost every year since I was in graduate school in 1972: sometimes several times a year, and often for extended sojourns of over a year. I take my annual transatlantic sojourns for granted. Like so many of my generation, I have been the beneficiary of numerous funding opportunities that have emerged in the context of postwar German-American academic exchanges, including the American Council of Learned Societies, the Social Science Research Council, the Goethe-Institut (technically speaking not involved, I suppose, directly in academic exchanges, but I'll mention it anyway), the Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst, the National Endowment for the Humanities, the Alexander von Humboldt-Stiftung, Title VI of the Higher Education Act, and the American Academy in Berlin. And we could go on to mention the Institute for International Education (IIE), the Council on International Educational Exchange (CIEE), NAFSA: Association of International Educators, the German Marshall Fund, the Robert-Bosch-Stiftung, the German Historical Institutes, and others, a list that hardly exhausts the possibilities for Americans to study in Germany, and vice-versa, as this week's Berlin Program commemoration obviously reminds us.

Nevertheless, it is hardly news to suggest that the halcyon days of the postwar German-American academic exchange may be coming to an end, even as—ironically— we are bound together more tightly than ever before by the worlds of electronic media and instant global communication. Thus, in the remarks that follow, I fear that I may not be able to strike quite the celebratory note that might seem most appropriate for an occasion like this. I fear that this will be more a jeremiad than a *Loblied*. A commemoration is an occasion for stock-taking; and, in trying to account both for where we have come and where we are likely to be heading in the world of German-American academic exchange, I cannot be terribly optimistic. Since 1945 we have built bridges over the Atlantic; but we have also erected barriers, usually unconsciously, and often against our best interests. And in recent years the barriers have gotten more formidable, for a variety of reasons that should arouse our concern and encourage us to take the kinds of action for which academics don't usually seem very well suited.

But before I begin my modest jeremiad, I'd like to provide some context by reviewing some of the history of transatlantic academic exchanges. This will mostly be a familiar story, but, especially on an occasion like this, a brief survey might be useful. We hear a great deal these days, of course, about transnationality and transnationalism; but the discovery of transnationalism has always reminded me a little bit of Molière's *bourgeois gentilhomme*, who is fascinated to learn that he has been speaking prose all his life without knowing it. As we all really know, the phenomenon of transnationalism isn't exactly new, especially when it comes to

the German-American relationship in general, and German-American academic interactions in particular. For example, in his admirable 1998 book *Atlantic Crossings: Social Politics in a Progressive Age*, Daniel Rodgers shows how, in the last decades of the nineteenth century, “transnational networks of debate and connection” tied together American and European social reformers: academics, activists, politicians, writers, and journalists alike. These networks persisted until the 1930s, and their effects on both continents were profound. In Rodgers’s words,

This was a new understanding of common histories and vulnerabilities. The new landscapes of fact and the intertwined landscapes of mind had equally indispensable parts to play in the Atlantic progressive connection. For social policies to be borrowable across political boundaries, there must be not only a foundation of common economic and social experience but also a recognition of underlying kinship. The policies in question must be seen to face similar needs and problems, to move within shared historic frames, and to strive toward a commonly imagined future. Relatedness is the core assumption. Where there is only comparison or culturally imagined difference there can be envy or pride in abundance, but there can be no sustained trade in social policy.⁴

Or indeed in much of anything else, as I shall argue later on.

Of course, as we all know, and as Rodgers emphasizes, Europe had occupied what he calls “a central, ineradicable place” in the political imaginations of Americans from the very beginnings of the American republic. Although at first Americans tended to emphasize their opposition to all things European, their sense of connectedness to the old continent never entirely disappeared, and in the nineteenth century it steadily increased. Americans early on admired the German research university, and Germans contributed signal impulses to the American university, especially after the founding of Johns Hopkins University in 1876. As early as 1826, Karl Follen, one of the so-called *Dämagogen* persecuted under the Karlsbad Decrees and thus a refugee from Germany, had become a professor of German at Harvard and created what became the physical education program at that university. And in the early 1830s a young New Englander, John Lothrop Motley, studied at Göttingen, where he became the lifelong closest friend of his German fellow student, Otto von Bismarck, as Jonathan Steinberg has underscored in his very recent Bismarck biography.⁵ One can point to plenty of other examples, especially to the large numbers of Americans who studied and earned degrees at German universities, above all in the 1870s and 1880s—but really all the way up to the First World War.⁶

More to the point of today’s topic, though, it is both interesting and important to note that several of the organizations that contribute to transatlantic academic exchanges, and specifically to German-American exchanges, can trace their history to the interwar years. Again, this is a history that is familiar to a number of you who are here today, like Rolf Hoffmann or Wedigo de Vivanco. But it is worth retelling anyway. The oldest is certainly the Alexander von Humboldt-Stiftung, which was originally founded in 1860, lost all its capital in the 1923 hyperinflation, was refounded in 1925, collapsed again in 1945, and, as I’ll note in greater detail

a few minutes, was successfully refounded yet again in Bonn in 1953.⁷

One of the first great academic-exchange organizations to be founded after World War I was the Institute for International Education, created in an outburst of internationalist enthusiasm in 1919 by Nicholas Murray Butler, the legendary president of Columbia University; Elihu Root, Secretary of War and Secretary of State in the Theodore Roosevelt administration; and Stephen Duggan, a political scientist who became the IIE's first president. In contrast to its German counterparts, the IIE has had an uninterrupted history for more than nine decades. As early as the 1920s it was organizing significant student exchanges with several countries, and in the 1930s its Emergency Committee to Aid Displaced German Scholars played a significant role in facilitating the process that brought so many German refugee scholars to the United States, a phenomenon that obviously had profound and enduring effects on the study of Germany in the United States.⁸

The DAAD has a particularly interesting history, having been originally established in 1925 as the Akademischer Austauschdienst e.V. (or AAD). Key to its foundation was a student from Heidelberg, Carl J. Friedrich (1901-1984), who as I think we all know later became a very prominent political theorist at both Harvard and Heidelberg. In 1922-23 Friedrich had studied in the United States, where, in conjunction with the IIE in New York, he arranged for thirteen more Heidelberg students to receive additional funds for study in the United States. By 1925 the AAD was officially established, with Alfred Weber as its first chair and Adolf Morsbach as its driving force. In 1931 it merged its stipend-awarding activities with those of the Humboldt-Stiftung and became the DAAD. After 1933 it became an instrument of National Socialist *auswärtige Kulturpolitik* until its formal dissolution in the spring of 1945.⁹

But my principal concern in these remarks is to assess transatlantic exchanges since 1945. And it is very obvious that, at the beginning, the terms of these exchanges were set by the victorious United States. It is hardly surprising or controversial, and will hardly be a revelation, to note that German-American academic exchanges were embedded in the context of emerging Cold War rivalries, in the context of a new and, quite frankly, idealistic American commitment to internationalism, and in the context of certain American views of a defeated Germany during and in the years just after the Second World War. Those views, as Konrad Jarausch has described them, were rooted in notions of German exceptionalism which "held up the Anglo-American pattern of democratic development as standard and viewed German history as disastrous deviance from it."¹⁰

What Walter Rüegg has recently labeled the "globalization of university relationships" after 1945 certainly reflected the cultural as well as political hegemony of the United States in the Western Europe of the early Cold War. Thus the development of postwar academic exchanges proceeded hand in glove with the rise of what Rebecca Lowen has described, in her case study of my own alma mater Stanford, as the "Cold War university" in the United States, and of what Rüegg calls the "Americanization of the European university" on this side of the Atlantic. That hegemony, according to Rüegg, was at least in part the ironic consequence of earlier transatlantic interactions: "The American hegemony derived from suc-

successful adoption and further development of the ideas of the European university, especially the combination of teaching and research that the German universities developed in the nineteenth century.”¹¹ At the same time, there can be no doubt that, in the Cold War competition with the Soviet Union, American leaders were interested after 1945 in promoting a certain political and ideological agenda that manifested itself in an increasingly confident and assertive *Kulturpolitik* overseas as a response to the behavior of the Soviets and their allies. The very institution in which we are now meeting is a prime example of what Andreas Daum has described as “America’s Berlin,” as were the Freiheitsglocke, the Airlift Memorial, the Amerika-Gedenkbibliothek, the Amerika-Haus, and the Kongresshalle.¹² From the very beginning, then, there was some degree of tension inherent in the two functions of postwar transatlantic exchanges, described by Christian Jansen as *Wissenschaftsförderung*, on the one hand, and *auswärtige Kulturpolitik* on the other.

This was certainly the case with two of the most rightly celebrated American achievements in international higher education in the 1940s and 1950s, the Fulbright program and Title VI. Both of these programs have been immense successes, of that there can be absolutely no doubt. In 1945 Senator J. William Fulbright of Arkansas—throughout his long career anything but a “traditional” Cold Warrior—introduced the legislation which bears his name; it passed the Senate unanimously in 1946. In that same year the Council for the International Exchange of Scholars was established to administer the Fulbright program on behalf of the US State Department. Since then some 250,000 individuals from over 140 countries have participated in the Fulbright program, with about forty percent coming from the US and sixty percent from other countries.¹³ The Fulbright program maintains about fifty Fulbright commissions abroad; the German Fulbright Commission is represented here today by its director, Rolf Hoffmann.¹⁴

When one is outside the US it’s sometimes a little easy to overlook Title VI, but it too is rooted in the context of the Cold War and has also had a spectacularly successful history. Created in 1958 as part of the National Defense Education Act, Title VI was originally a response to the Sputnik shock of 1958. But it has been modified continuously over the years, most notably by its incorporation into the subsequently much-amended Higher Education Act. Its original purpose was to train foreign language and area specialists, especially in Less Commonly Taught Languages (LCTLs) and in what were considered to be strategically vital parts of the world. Originally the Western European languages did not fall under its purview; they were added later. It remains the US government’s largest program in support of international higher education, and the more than 120 National Resource Centers located at university campuses around the country have long served as the sources of a continuing stream of international visitors. As Gilbert Merckx, one of the real veteran Title VI directors, writes, “The Title VI model of government-university collaboration in establishing university-based centers for the purpose of generating international expertise is unique to the United States. . . . Title VI produces experts who serve in the government, but who also populate higher education, businesses, and NGOs.”¹⁵

The West German counterparts of Fulbright and Title VI enjoyed similarly

spectacular postwar histories. The DAAD resumed its activities in 1950, and has been on a steady growth trajectory ever since. In 2009 alone it provided support for 66,953 individuals, of whom 25,264 were Germans and 41,689 were non-German. Compare those numbers to the fewer than two thousand in 1962.¹⁶ I am quite certain that many of us in this room are DAAD-Ehemalige; and I am especially pleased that the German Studies Association maintains an extremely close relationship with the DAAD, through its contributions to our book and article prizes and to the travel funds that make it possible for dozens of German colleagues to attend our annual meetings. Since 1971 the DAAD has had an office in New York, headed for many years by our friend Dr. Wedigo de Vivanco, who is also with us today.

The Alexander von Humboldt-Stiftung, refounded in 1953, can point to similar successes, as Christian Jansen emphasizes in his study of the foundation from that year to 2003. Over twenty-five thousand scholars from over 130 countries have received stipends from the Humboldt-Stiftung since its reestablishment, including over five thousand from North America. About two thousand scholars now receive Humboldt stipends annually. Recent years have witnessed a significant uptick in the Foundation's activities.¹⁷

Thus the Berlin Program for Advanced German and European Studies is part of a large network of academic exchange that can point to a proud and significant history, one that is truly worth commemorating and expanding in the future. The German Studies Association is proud to support the Berlin Program, which has played a demonstrable and important role in encouraging whole generations of gifted young American academics to do what Ernst Reuter asked the Western democracies to do back in September 1948: "*Schaut auf diese Stadt.*"

So if all seems well, if the numbers are healthy, indeed unprecedentedly healthy, where is my promised jeremiad? And how can I justify it? It does seem to me that, as we look at the present and future of transatlantic and specifically German-American academic exchange, we encounter a range of problems that are sobering, and indeed can lead to somber reflection. It seems that we have problems that stem from both sides of the exchange, from Germany and from the United States. And it also seems to me that some of our present and future problems stem from that persistent, unresolved, and probably insoluble tension between the two purposes of academic exchange, described by Jansen as *Wissenschaftsförderung*, or the global advancement of scholarship, and *auswärtige Kulturpolitik*, or what we might call cultural diplomacy and the advancement of mutual cultural understanding. These goals and purposes may not always be entirely compatible.

Other problems are, I think, the almost logical and perhaps unavoidable consequence of the post-Cold War times in which we have lived for more than two decades. Many if not most of the successful exchange programs that I've briefly described were products of a unique, non-replicable Cold War conjuncture, in which, at least until the time of the Vietnam War, it seemed that West Germans and Americans shared common interests and certain common outlooks and aspirations, especially given the particular form of democratization that West Germany experienced (and which historians like Konrad Jarausch, Heinrich August Winkler, Manfred Görtemaker, Volker Berghahn, Edgar Wolfrum, and the late Hermann

Rupieper, to mention only several, have so effectively described).

It is hardly a secret that times have changed, and that, especially in the past decade, the Atlantic has grown wider rather than narrower; and I believe that one can say this without necessarily adhering to everything that Robert Kagan said a few years ago in his well-known Venus and Mars analysis of the European-American relationship.¹⁸ To be sure, recent polling data from the Pew Global Attitudes Project suggests that the huge gap of distrust that marked the Bush-Schröder years immediately after 2003 has diminished considerably, especially since 2009. In 2010, sixty-three percent of Germans said they had a very or somewhat favorable view of the United States, up from thirty percent in 2007. (German views of Americans in general have remained fairly unchanged in the past decade, with about sixty-eight percent reporting very or somewhat favorable views of Americans in 2010.)¹⁹ These figures place Germany somewhere in the middle among the countries where Pew polling takes place, behind France and Poland, about the same level as the UK, but ahead of Spain in terms of positive attitudes toward the United States.²⁰ More important than volatile or evanescent polling data, though, is what many observers believe to be incontrovertible evidence that Germany is increasingly following its own interests and its own course in the world. Again, this is hardly news, and it is also logical and eminently understandable; but we do need to be reminded of it on occasions like this. The old Cold War relationship between the two sides of the Atlantic can never be restored. The outgoing American Secretary of Defense, Robert Gates, more or less said as much a few days ago when he questioned the future viability of NATO and wondered just what its purpose is supposed to be.²¹ All of these things are bound to have significant consequences for future transatlantic academic exchanges.

So let me at long last begin my jeremiad with what I perceive to some problems from the German side of the exchange, or, more specifically, the Germany-to-America side of the exchange. I may ruffle some feathers in what I'm about to say, especially in view of the fact that much of it is based on impressionistic and anecdotal rather than empirical evidence. There can be little doubt, I think, that from the *Wissenschaftsförderung* aspect, Germans and Americans alike have benefitted and will continue to benefit immensely from the presence of German scholars on our campuses and in our labs. I am reminded of this every year when the DAAD professors in North America hold their annual meeting at the same time as the German Studies Association. My concern is rather with that aspect of academic exchange that deals with cultural diplomacy and, if you will, mutual cultural understanding. As I look at this aspect of German-American academic exchanges since about 1950, and especially in recent years, I cannot help but think that Americans have learned more about Germany than the other way around.²²

To explain this argument, I am going to commit one of the worst but common sins of speakers on occasions like this. I'm going to paraphrase myself, because what I'm about to say is something that I have been saying for some years now. I remain distressed about the persistence in Germany, among people who have traveled to and lived in the United States, of older cultural stereotypes and clichés that in some cases date back to the early nineteenth century. When one hears these things,

one is often reminded of nineteenth-century works like Ferdinand Kürnberger's 1855 novel, *Die Amerikamüden*, based on the unhappy experiences of Nikolaus Lenau, the Romantic poet who went to America in the 1830s in search of Romantic wilderness but instead got fleeced there by scam artists. The disillusioned Lenau referred to the US as "die verschweinten Staaten" and complained that there were no nightingales in the United States—but they didn't deserve them anyway. But to get back to the present: I continue to be dismayed by the poor quality of German journalism from and about the United States (and at least there *is* reporting from the US, which is more than can be said about US newspapers reporting or not reporting from Europe these days). As I said several years ago, and my views haven't changed: ". . . [A]ll too often, or so it seems to this Florida native and Michigan resident, academic exchange programs from Germany to the United States often wind up with Germans—students, professors, journalists—landing in intellectual bubbles from which they all too rarely emerge. Nothing against the Kennedy School or the Wilson Center or the Center for Advanced Study or the National Humanities Center or the rest of them, or against the elite research universities. But I really wish that our German visitors would open themselves up more for other possibilities."²³ The DAAD professorships certainly help in this regard. But, still, as I observe phenomena like the Bologna reforms and *Exzellenzinitiativen* and the like, I wonder if our German colleagues and German politicians and German university administrators aren't sometimes confusing excellence with elitism, and assuming that excellence can only be found and encouraged at a handful of American institutions. I note as well that two of the most insightful German observers of the United States, the journalist Josef Joffe and Ambassador Klaus Scharioth (who retired in 2011), spent considerable amounts of time in Grand Rapids, Michigan, and in Idaho respectively, far away from elite university campuses.²⁴

Having said this, however, I am much more concerned about the present and the future of the American side of transatlantic academic exchanges. For one thing, there is the incontestable reality of demographic and cultural shifts in the United States, the cumulative effect of which is to reduce the visibility and the significance of Europe in general, and Germany in particular, in American life. This trend will continue. It is irreversible. As the United States becomes more oriented toward Asia and Latin America, Europe will of course continue to be important, but that sense of "relatedness" that Daniel Rodgers describes, and which I quoted earlier, will become more attenuated. We see this at my home institution in Michigan. Since 1962 we have sent between eighty-five and ninety percent of all our students on our Study Abroad programs. We used to have four exchange arrangements in Germany. We are now down to two. Ecuador has become a more popular Study Abroad destination for our students than Germany or France; and of course we have a growing presence and an expanding exchange relationship with China.

Thus the study of the German language, and of all things German, faces serious challenges; and this must inevitably have consequences for the present and future of transatlantic academic exchanges. To be sure, German remains the third most-studied foreign language at American universities and colleges. According to the most recent report of the Modern Language Association, in the fall of 2009

1,629,326 American students were enrolled in foreign language courses other than Latin and Ancient Greek. Of those, 864,986—or fifty-three percent—were enrolled in Spanish, and the other forty-seven percent in all the other languages combined. French still came in second at 216,419. And German was still in third place, with 96,349. In fact, German has registered slight gains since 1998, when it had slipped to 89,020. Still, the numbers for German are far down from their postwar high in 1968, when 216,263 American students were enrolled in German courses. Moreover, the post-1998 rate of growth in German courses is extremely slow compared to the rate of growth in Chinese and Arabic. Arabic enrollments increased by 46.3 percent between 2006 and 2009, and Chinese by 18.2 percent. (Here I should observe, parenthetically but I think significantly, that area and language studies in the US have always tended to be crisis-driven.) And it should also be noted that American students, never noted for their linguistic aptitude, have become significantly less oriented toward the study of foreign languages in recent years. In 1965, 16.5 percent of all US college course enrollments were in modern languages, by 2009 that had slipped to 8.6 percent, about half the levels of forty-five years earlier.²⁵ Various reasons can be adduced for this drop, including increases in non-liberal arts enrollments, the elimination of language requirements for undergraduates, and the like.

Mentioning course enrollments brings us to an important point of immediate relevance for those of us who are concerned about the present and future of transatlantic academic exchanges, and the identification and training of the *Nachwuchs* who will take part in those exchanges. We have all been hearing a great deal in recent years about the continuing crisis in the humanities—or, if you will, *die Krise der Geisteswissenschaften*—in the United States. The extent of this crisis has not been exaggerated. And programs in foreign languages—including and perhaps especially German—have been particularly vulnerable. One especially visible canary in the mine of this unhappy phenomenon has been the State University of New York at Albany, which eliminated its German major several years ago and then, in the fall of 2010, eliminated classics, French, Italian, Russian, and theater as well, though it has kept several of these programs as minors rather than as majors.²⁶ (And this despite the fact that SUNY Albany was the institutional home, for a number of years, of the Renaissance Society of America.) The University of Southern California, which claims to be an international research university, eliminated its German major a few years ago. The University of Nevada at Reno is doing likewise. Graduate programs in German are under threat in my home state of Florida, both at Florida State University and the University of Florida. One can go on and on. Scarcely a month passes in my office at the German Studies Association without word of yet another German program in danger; and the same is true at the offices of the American Association of Teachers of German. Indeed, both of our organizations regularly write letters to university administrators in defense of German programs; but one often has the feeling that one is putting fingers in the dike. Nor, it should be added, are the woes of the humanities unique to the US. Anyone familiar with British universities will know how much the humanities have been gutted at those institutions. (Try to take a course on medieval paleography at a UK university these

days.) And just the other day I had a long phone call about a Brazilian colleague whose research funding has collapsed because the new Brazilian administration, in contrast to the former President Lula, wants to concentrate all research spending on science, technology, and business.

So serious has the situation of the German language become in the United States—especially at the secondary level, which feeds into universities—that the German Embassy in Washington has itself stepped into the discussion, co-sponsoring a conference in July 2010 on “The Future of the German Language in America” as part of a larger series of discussions on the ways in which the German language might be revitalized in the United States. Among other things, the conference produced what is being called the “Waldsee Statement,” which observes that, “while German remains an important language in America, it is under assault from many different quarters.” Among other things, the Waldsee Statement calls for a series of steps to improve the position of the German language in the United States, including—and this is important—expanded people-to-people exchanges.²⁷

But the bad news continues for all the humanities: that is, not only for languages but also for many of the fields traditionally represented in German Studies-related academic exchanges, including, one might add, the social sciences as well. In May 2011 the US Department of Education sent out notices that competitions in Fiscal Year 2011 were being cancelled for a variety of stipend programs, including Fulbright-Hays Training Grants for Doctoral Dissertation Research Abroad and for Faculty Research Abroad. In addition, there will be no funding for American Overseas Research Centers, the International Research and Studies Program, and the Undergraduate International Studies and Language Program. Title VI and Fulbright-Hays programs, as authorized under the Higher Education Act and the Fulbright-Hays Act, were cut by \$50 million, or forty percent of their proposed budget, for Fiscal Year 2011. No one knows what will happen in Fiscal Year 2012.²⁸ On this side of the Atlantic, the DAAD is cutting its funding for scholars to attend overseas conferences. As of 1 May this year, recipients of such funding will not be able to reapply for funds in consecutive years. This will almost certainly have a negative effect upon the attendance of German colleagues at academic conferences in the United States.

And, of course, I have not even mentioned the continuing job crisis in American and German academia alike, a crisis that has been going on for more than four decades now but is only getting worse, and not better, with no signs of improvement.

So what is to be done? Should we surrender to counsels of despair, look nostalgically at the non-repeatable *Erfolgsgeschichte* of the post-1945 years, and assume that all is lost? Should we assume that, at the end of an unbroken history that reaches back to the schoolmen of the Middle Ages, we should allow higher education to be ruled by considerations of economic productivity, technical training, and short-term profit? Well, of course not. The crisis of the humanities has, predictably, spawned a cottage industry of publications about the crisis and how to address it. Martha Nussbaum in particular has written eloquently—as one would expect from one of the world’s leading scholars—of the consequences for democracy of the de-emphasis on the humanities and humane values.²⁹ But we also need to think

of practical responses. On both sides of the Atlantic, academics in the humanities need to become political, not in ideological but in *practical* and *pragmatic* ways: something that is not always easy for us to do. We need to organize and learn how to communicate *effectively* with the publics that constitute civil societies in democracies. We need to learn how to lobby. For those of you who are here today from the United States, I would urge you to return to your campuses and become active in the National Humanities Alliance, the most important lobbying organization in the country for the disciplines *and* the values that we espouse.³⁰

More specifically, those of us who have been the beneficiaries of transatlantic academic exchanges, in terms both of *Wissenschaftsförderung* and of cultural diplomacy, will have to engage in activities that might seem truly strange or alien to us. We will need to explain and justify a number of core values that we assume ought to be intuitive or self-evident. We will need to explain why Europe, and Germany in particular, and the United States continue to need each other. Americans will need *practically* and *pragmatically* to explain why, despite the shift toward Asia and Latin America, Europe and Germany will remain vitally important to the United States for decades to come. Similarly, Europeans who have increasingly been going their own way in recent decades will need to explain and understand why their links to the United States will remain vitally important to them for decades to come as well. Only then can we assure that the Gordon Craigs of the future will have their opportunities as well.

In the meantime, the Berlin Program for Advanced German and European Studies, as I know from my own experience, and as the papers at this conference so admirably demonstrate, remains an exemplar of transatlantic academic exchange at its very best. The effects of that exchange upon the larger academic enterprise are unquestionable. According to my count, twenty-one North American and European universities and colleges are represented among the Berlin Program alumni who are presenting at this conference. It plays an essential and critical role in maintaining a transatlantic dialogue that too often has become shrill or vague or both at the same time. Given all that I have said today, it seems to me that Berlin Program has become more, not less, important over the years. We need it. We need it now. We need it for our future, and for all our futures, beyond academia.

¹ Gordon A. Craig, diary entry for 4 July 1935, Stanford University Libraries, Department of Special Collections and University Archives, SC 467: Gordon Alexander Craig Papers, Series 6: Diaries and Occasional Verse, 1935-1992 (microfilm), Box 1, Reel 1.

² Gordon A. Craig, *Über Fontane* (Munich, 1998); English: *Theodor Fontane: Literature and History in the Bismarck Reich* (New York, 1999).

³ Katherine Roper, "Is There Life after Thirty? GSA Presidential Address, 29 September 2006, Pittsburgh," *German Studies Association Newsletter* 31, no. 2 (Winter 2006): 17-18.

⁴ Daniel T. Rodgers, *Atlantic Crossings: Social Politics in a Progressive Age* (Cambridge, Mass., 1998), 31, 33-34. See also James T. Kloppenberg, *Uncertain Victory: Social Democracy and Progressivism in European and American Thought, 1870-1920* (Oxford, 1988).

⁵ Jonathan Steinberg, *Bismarck: A Life* (Oxford, 2011), 39-42, 194, 218-19.

⁶ See the excellent summary in Jörg Nagler, "From Culture to *Kultur*: Changing American Perceptions of Imperial Germany, 1870-1914," in *Transatlantic Images and Perceptions: Germany and America since 1776*, ed. David E. Barclay and Elisabeth Glaser-Schmidt (New York, 1997), 131-54, esp. 136-39. — Earning a degree from a German university did not always work to one's advantage, as an

incident from the history of my own institution, Kalamazoo College, suggests. The first holder of a German doctorate there was Professor J. Perry Worden, a Columbia graduate and author of an 1899 Halle dissertation on Longfellow's relationship to German literature. However, in 1907 he was fired from Kalamazoo College for having mentioned to students that Germans like to drink in beer gardens and that the French like wine. The *Evening Press* of Grand Rapids described the College's president, Arthur Gaylord Slocum, as an "extremest [sic] on all matters pertaining to temperance." A rather distinguished scholar, Worden returned to Germany and became a correspondent for *The Nation*. *The Evening Press* (Grand Rapids), 1 June 1907; *Kalamazoo Gazette*, 2 June 1907, Kalamazoo College Archives, 74/Worden, J. Perry.

⁷ See, *inter alia*, *Alexander von Humboldt-Stiftung 1953-1993. 40 Jahre im Dienst von Wissenschaft und Forschung* (Bonn, 1993), 211-19. For the Foundation's postwar history, see especially Christian Jansen, *Exzellenz weltweit. Die Alexander von Humboldt-Stiftung zwischen Wissenschaftsförderung und auswärtiger Kulturpolitik (1953-2003)* (Cologne, 2004)

⁸ For a capsule history of the IIE, see www.iie.org/Who-We-Are/History.aspx (accessed 13 June 2011).

⁹ See the summary history in www.daad.de/portrait/wer-wir-sind/geschichte/08945.de.html (accessed 13 June 2011).

¹⁰ Konrad H. Jarausch and Michael Geyer, *Shattered Past: Reconstructing German Histories* (Princeton, 2003), 91.

¹¹ Rebecca S. Lowen, *Creating the Cold War University: The Transformation of Stanford* (Berkeley, 1997); Walter Rüegg, "Introduction," in *A History of the University in Europe*, vol. 4, *Universities since 1945*, ed. Walter Rüegg (Cambridge, 2011), 26.

¹² Andreas W. Daum, "America's Berlin, 1945-2000: Between Myths and Visions," in *Berlin: The New Capital in the East. A Transatlantic Appraisal*, ed. Frank Trommler (Washington, D. C., 2000), 49-73.

¹³ The original legislation was later replaced by the Fulbright-Hays Act of 1961.

¹⁴ On the history of the Fulbright program, see the summaries in <http://fulbright.state.gov/history/fulbright-the-early-years> (accessed 14 June 2011); www.cies.org/senator_fulbright.htm (accessed 14 June 2011); and Rüegg, "Introduction," 22. – The German Studies Association also maintains excellent with the Austrian Fulbright programs administered under the aegis of the Austrian-American Educational Commission, which in 2010 celebrated sixty years of Austrian-American Fulbright exchanges. See Georg Steinböck, *Fulbright at Sixty: The Austrian-American Fulbright Program, 1950-2010*, DVD (Vienna, 2010).

¹⁵ Gilbert W. Merx, "Gulliver's Travels: The History and Consequences of Title VI," in *International and Language Education for a Global Future: Fifty Years of U.S. Title VI and Fulbright-Hays Programs*, ed. David S. Wiley and Robert S. Glew (East Lansing, 2010), 29. See also Richard D. Lambert, "The Changing Form and Function of Title VI since Its Beginnings in the 1960s," in *ibid.*, 155-64.

¹⁶ www.daad.de/portrait/wer-wir-sind/geschichte/08945.de.html (accessed 14 June 2011).

¹⁷ www.humboldt-foundation.de/web/geschichte.html (accessed 14 June 2011); Jansen, *Exzellenz weltweit*.

¹⁸ Robert Kagan, *Of Paradise and Power: America and Europe in the New World Order* (New York, 2004).

¹⁹ <http://pewglobal.org/database/?indicator=1&country=81&response=Favorable> (accessed 14 June 2011).

²⁰ <http://pewglobal.org/database/?indicator=1&response=Favorable> (accessed 14 June 2011).

²¹ Robert M. Gates, "The Security and Defense Agenda (Future of NATO)," 10 June 2011, www.defense.gov/speeches/speech.aspx?speechid=1581 (accessed 17 June 2011).

²² It would be very interesting for me, as a non-expert on such matters, to learn about recent detailed, empirical studies on the responses of transatlantic exchange participants to their experiences and to their host countries. The study with which I most familiar is an analysis for the Alexander von Humboldt-Stiftung by Rolf Hoffmann, *Mit den Augen der anderen. Erfahrungen ausländischer Wissenschaftler in Deutschland* (Bonn, 1988).

²³ David E. Barclay, "Transatlantic Cooperation in an Age of Transnationalism: The Future of German Studies," *German Studies Association Newsletter* 32, no. 2 (Winter 2007-08): 27, 29-30.

²⁴ Secondary school exchanges, like those organized for decades by the American Field Service, are of course another exception.

²⁵ Nelly Furman, David Goldberg, and Natalia Lusin, *Enrollments in Languages Other Than English in United States Institutions of Higher Education, Fall 2009*, The Modern Language Association of America, Web Publication, December 2010, www.mla.org/pdf/2009_enrollment_survey.pdf (accessed 10 June 2011).

²⁶ Stanley Fish, "The Crisis of the Humanities Officially Arrives," *New York Times*, 11 October 2010; www.albany.edu/news/12607.php (accessed 12 June 2011).

²⁷ "The Waldsee Statement," *German Studies Association Newsletter* 36, no. 1 (Spring 2011): 13-17.

²⁸ "Dept. of Education Cancels Select Title VI/Fulbright-Hays Competitions for FY 2011," National Humanities Alliance website, 2 June 2011, www.nhalliance.org/news/dept-of-education-cancels-select-title-vi-fulbright.shtml (accessed 10 June 2011).

²⁹ Martha C. Nussbaum, *Not for Profit: Why Democracy Needs the Humanities* (Princeton, 2010). See also, *inter alia*, Stanley Fish, *Save the World on Your Own Time* (New York, 2008); Frank Donoghue, *The Last Professors: The Corporate University and the Fate of the Humanities* (New York, 2008); Mark Bauerlein, *The Dumbest Generation: How the Digital Age Stupefies Young Americans and Jeopardizes Our Futures (or, Don't Trust Anyone under 30)* (New York, 2009); Louis Menand, *The Marketplace of Ideas: Reform and Resistance in the American University* (New York, 2010); Mark C. Taylor, *Crisis on Campus: A Bold Plan for Reforming Our Colleges and Universities* (New York, 2010); Andrew Hacker and Claudia Dreifus, *Higher Education? How Colleges Are Wasting Our Money and Failing Our Kids – And What We Can Do about It* (New York, 2010); Richard Arum and Josipa Roksa, *Academically Adrift: Limited Learning on College Campuses* (Chicago, 2011)

³⁰ Website: www.nhalliance.org.

Results of the New York Conference on the Promotion of German

[After last year's conference on the future of the German language in the United States at Waldsee, part of the Concordia Language Villages near Bemidji, Minnesota (see the German Studies Association Newsletter, 36 no. 1 [Spring 2011]: 13-17), the Goethe Institute organized a follow-up conference on September 17, 2011, to make practical recommendations to the German government on steps to take for the promotion of German in the US. I attended the conference as a representative of the German Studies Association. Also present were Carol Anne Costabile-Heming, President of the AATG (American Association of Teachers of German), Helene Zimmer-Loew (outgoing Executive Director of the AATG), Keith Cothrun (incoming Executive Director of the AATG), Russell Berman (President of the Modern Language Association), and Barbara Kosta (President of Women in German), as well as representatives of German organizations like the Goethe Institute, the German Academic Exchange Service (DAAD), and the German Embassy. Detailed information on the conference, the participants, and the issues discussed, can be found at: <http://www.goethe.de/ins/us/ney/lrn/dlw/mys/deindex.htm> and also at http://www.theeuropean.de/eva-marquardt/7862-deutschlernen-in-den-usa?utm_source=THE+EUROPEAN+-+Newsletter&utm_campaign=abf15b80b5-The+European+Newsletter&utm_medium=email. What follows is the final statement that came out of the conference, presented by Eva Marquardt, director of language programs in North America for the Goethe Institute and the primary organizer of the New York conference, who distilled this statement on the basis of input from other conference participants. The German Studies Association would like to express its thanks to Dr. Marquardt specifically and to the Goethe Institute in general for hosting this important conference.

-Stephen Brockmann]

Conclusions
2011 New York Language Conference
“Strategies for Sustainable Promotion of German in the USA”

Eva Marquardt
 Goethe-Institut

On 17 September 2011, major representatives from American and German organizations, professional associations, and educational institutions, as well as representatives from the German Embassy and the German-American Chamber of Commerce, met at the Goethe-Institut New York to develop forward-looking ways to strengthen German programs in the United States.

With the difficult economic situation in the U.S. and the resulting nationwide budget cuts in education, more and more high school and college German programs are being discontinued. Although German remains the third most popular foreign language in the U.S. and is being learned by a slightly growing number of young Americans, German, measured against the number of other language programs as well as against population growth in the U.S., is on the decline. Participants at the conference agreed that an increased common effort was required to counter this trend. At the same time, it was pointed out that representatives of the American organizations have to make U.S. policymakers more aware of the importance of foreign language instruction, particularly in regard to German.

The conference worked up the following recommendations:

1. A focused ad campaign should promote both German and Germany.

Taking a practical approach to the promotion of German, a focused ad campaign—perhaps under the slogan “Just Add German”—should emphasize that supplementing a major in, say, engineering or computer technology with German studies is an unbeatable combination. The multicultural aspect of present-day Germany, which is relatively unknown to many Americans, should also be strongly emphasized. For young Americans, who themselves as a rule move in a multicultural society, knowing about this aspect of German culture can only have a positive effect, and can convey an extremely attractive image of Germany.

2. Course offerings for students should be practice-oriented and geared to specific needs.

Participants considered contemporary American students to be pragmatic and practice-oriented. Therefore German programs and promotional offers should have an increased focus on the practical benefits that can be derived by students choosing to study German as a foreign language. Included here are practice-oriented course formats and content, innovative combinations of majors and minors (“German Is Your Best Second Major“), as well as a wider range of internships for American students. Future specialists must be offered training programs that will help them view learning German as a career-enhancement tool.

3. Organizations, educational institutions, and professional associations should work in close association with each other.

Participants at the conference in New York considered the revitalization of synergy

and cooperation among the represented organizations to be very important, and called for its continuing development. Under the direction of the Goethe-Institut and the Consulate General, the already existing network “Sprachvergnügen“ will become more actively involved, as needed, on the local and regional levels to extend the network to honorary consuls and representatives of the German-American Chamber of Commerce. Synergistic results can be achieved at this level that could also benefit the larger context of learning German.

4. The development of teacher training continues to be of major importance. Participants agreed that, for the upcoming generation of scholars in German language and literature, interdisciplinary developments in research and teaching (“German Studies“) must be brought into closer alignment. A qualitatively first-class education should not focus only on language and literature, but on the full spectrum of cultural, social, historical, economic, and political phenomena associated with German-speaking Europe. In addition, all participants called for improving the quality of teacher training, above all in the areas of methodology and educational theory, and for a more focused development—and continuing development—of teachers-in-training.

New York, 25 October 2011

For the conference participants:

Dr. Eva Marquardt

Director of Language Programs, North America

Goethe-Institut New York

In Memoriam

Bernhard Heisig (1925-2011)

On June 10, 2011, the German painter and printmaker Bernhard Heisig passed away at the age of 86 in his home in Strodehne, near Berlin. One of former East Germany’s most successful artists, Heisig was also one of postwar Germany’s leading painters. Best known in Germany today for his many expressionist images of war and trauma, Heisig was a controversial figure in the Federal Republic after the Wall fell due to his connections to East Germany and his teenage years as a soldier for the Nazis. He remains virtually unknown in the Anglo-American West, a victim of lingering Cold War-era stereotypes about art under Communism.

Born in Breslau, Germany (now Wrocław, Poland) in 1925, Bernhard Heisig grew up the son of a painter, learning to draw at an early age. At sixteen, he enrolled at the *Meisterschule des Deutschen Handwerks* and volunteered for the military. The following year, he became a tank driver for the 12th SS Tank Division of the Hitler Youth. He fought in Normandy and the Ardennes (“Battle of the Bulge”) on the Western Front, and later returned to Breslau on the Eastern Front, which was under attack by the Russians. After the German surrender, he was a prisoner of the Soviets for several months and later a graphic artist in Wrocław before ultimately moving to Leipzig.

Heisig enrolled as a graphic arts student at the Leipzig Academy in 1949. Two

years later, he dropped out in the midst of the Formalism Debates and became a freelance artist. He returned in 1954—without a diploma—as a teacher and was awarded an honorary degree in 1959; he became rector in 1961. Throughout the 1950s, Heisig was primarily a graphic artist and created a number of portraits as well as cycles about the 1848 revolution and the Paris Commune; he would later illustrate a number of books, including Ludwig Renn's *War*, Bertolt Brecht's *Three Penny Opera* and *Mother Courage*, and Goethe's *Faust*. Black and white lithographs were his preferred graphics medium and remained so throughout his life. It was also in the 1950s that he began experimenting with painting, a highly prestigious medium in East Germany. His style in these early paintings, such as *Circle of Young Field Biologists* (1952) and *1848 in Leipzig* (1954-58), was realistic, recalling the Soviet style of Socialist Realism praised by cultural functionaries at the time. He also created a number of portraits in these years, especially of women. Some of these, such as *Portrait of Gertrude Skacel* (1958), hint at the looser brushwork that would later characterize his paintings. Portraits would remain an important part of his oeuvre throughout his life.

In the mid 1960s, Heisig turned away from his earlier realist style to embrace a more modern one, looking to Lovis Corinth, Max Beckmann and Otto Dix, among others, for inspiration. It was in these years that he was also at the center of a number of artistic controversies. In April 1964, he gave a speech at the national conference of the Association of Visual Artists (VBKD) in Berlin in which he called for greater freedom for artistic experimentation, and for artists—not politicians—to be the ones to decide what art was and should be in East Germany. His critical speech was one of several at the conference and resulted in a multi-week investigation into his loyalty to the Party that ended with his delivery of an official self-criticism on June 10 (the same day on which he passed away forty seven years later). The surviving document, although overtly contrite, subtly argues for many of the points he had made at the conference. (Rumors that he lost his position as rector of the Leipzig Academy because of his controversial speech are incorrect: archival documents confirm that his resignation predated the conference). That summer, he began work on a series of murals for the prestigious Hotel Deutschland, a new building being created as part of the celebrations for Leipzig's 800th anniversary. In January 1965, shortly after they were finished, Alfred Kurella, former head of the commission for cultural questions at the Politburo, lambasted the murals for their “intentional deformation” of reality and “pure formal effects.” This letter set off a multi-month debate between artists and art critics on the one side and cultural functionaries and politicians on the other about the appropriateness of the modern style employed. It was followed by a third conflict that fall: this time for Heisig's painting *The Paris Commune* (1965), which was exhibited at the controversial Seventh Regional Art Exhibition in Leipzig. Unlike the previous three exhibited versions of the work (*March Days in Paris I*, 1960; *March Days in Paris II*, 1961; and *The Communards*, 1962), this one combined multiple moments and events into one tumultuous, simultaneous narrative composition that emphasized the final bloody battle between the Communards and French troops. Largely overlooking the modern style of the painting, critics dismissed the work for its pessimism and

questioned his commitment to Communism.

It was also in 1965 that Heisig created one of his most famous print series, *The Fascist Nightmare*, the title image for which won the gold medal at that year's International Book Exhibition in Leipzig. It demonstrated an innovative technique of melting crayon on the surface of the printing stone, and was one of the earliest sustained engagements with the Nazi past to appear in Heisig's oeuvre. It was followed in 1968 by *Fortress Breslau*, the first painting to reflect explicitly upon his experiences in the war, and one he would paint several times over the course of the subsequent decade. It was also in 1968 that he resigned from his position as professor at the Leipzig Academy, becoming a freelance artist for the second time in his career. Shortly thereafter, he completed two murals and several of his best-known paintings in East Germany: *Lenin and the Unbelieving Timofej* (1968/70), *Portrait of Vaclav Neumann* (1969), *Brigadier II* (1970), and a four-part *Paris Commune* (1971/72).

When he came to power in 1971, Erich Honecker stated there would be "no more taboos in the realm of art and literature" for those who believed in socialism. During the cultural relaxation that ensued, Heisig rose to national prominence. In 1972, he received the National Prize of the GDR (2nd class) and was elected a member of the Academy of Arts in Berlin. In 1973, he had a major retrospective exhibition of his work in Leipzig and Dresden. In 1974, he became a vice president of the National Association of Visual Artists. In 1976, he became rector of the Leipzig Academy for the second time (until his retirement in 1987), and a candidate of the Leipzig branch of the SED. He also completed a large painting, *Icarus*, for the Palast der Republik in Berlin. It demonstrated the complex, simultaneous narrative style for which he had become known. In 1978, he received the National Prize of the GDR (1st class) and became second in command of the Association of Visual Artists.

In 1977, the West German curator Manfred Schneckenberger invited Heisig, together with Wolfgang Mattheuer, Willi Sitte and Werner Tübke, to exhibit at the international art exhibition "documenta 6" in Kassel, West Germany. This exhibition marked the emergence of East German art *en masse* onto the Western art scene and was followed by exhibitions of East German art in France, Italy, England and the United States in addition to several in West Germany in the final decade of the Cold War. All of these included works by Heisig. Throughout the 1980s, Heisig also had several solo exhibitions in West Germany, in addition to solo exhibitions and regular participation in exhibitions in East Germany and the eastern bloc. In 1986, he painted the official portrait for the West German chancellor Helmut Schmidt (Schmidt published a remembrance in *Die Zeit* shortly after Heisig's death and sent flowers to the funeral.) It was in these years of increasing recognition in the West that Heisig created many of the images of traumatized soldiers for which he is best known today (series such as *Encounter with Images*, *Christ Travels with Us* and *The Christmas Dream of the Unteachable Soldier*).

In 1989, a major retrospective exhibition of Heisig's work opened at the Martin Gropius Bau in West Berlin less than a month before the Wall fell. At the age of sixty-four, Heisig had made it as a "German" artist, highly praised in both East and West. This exhibition and its catalog, written by both East and West German

scholars, marks the height of Heisig scholarship to date. It presented him as an intellectual artist with a diverse range of media and topics, including history, still lifes, portraiture, and book illustrations.

In the new Germany, Heisig became a center of controversy, along with Mattheuer, Sitte and Tübke, the so-called “Band of Four” who had been East Germany’s most successful artists. Each time their work was included in a major exhibition in the 1990s and early 2000s, it was met with controversy in the press, and they were dismissed as *Staatskünstler*. In Heisig’s case this German-German *Bilderstreit* crescendoed in 1998 when he was invited, as one of only two East Germans, to contribute work to the Reichstag’s permanent collection. Critics saw Heisig’s “cooperation with the GDR regime” as standing “in crass opposition to a democratic horizon of values.” Others criticized Heisig’s inclusion because of his past as a teenage soldier for the Nazis. In both cases, the emphasis was on biography rather than artistic quality. The impact of the *Bilderstreit* continues to affect current scholarship, as can be seen in the catalog for the 2005 exhibition of his work that traveled to several cities in Germany and to Wrocław, Poland, for his eightieth birthday.

Heisig’s memorial service took place on July 2 in Havelberg. Christoph Hein, Wolfgang Thierse and art historian Armin Zweite, among others, spoke to several hundred guests gathered in the cathedral to pay their last respects. Heisig leaves behind his wife, Gudrun Brüne, and sons Johannes Heisig (b. 1953) and Walter Eisler (b. 1954), all painters, together with numerous prominent artists who were once his students, including Hartwig Ebersbach, Arno Rink, Sighard Gille and Neo Rauch. He will be greatly missed.

April A. Eisman

Iowa State University

Steve Jobs (1955-2011) and WAGS/GSA

WAGS/GSA started out on a shoestring budget. We began with \$24, and planned immediately to have a Newsletter, a Conference with a professionally printed Program, and—of course—a scholarly journal. At that time, most journals were still done with hot lead, and there were some primitive photocopy machines. We could not afford anything like that, and I jumped immediately for the early Macintosh. It was an odd-looking machine, and my Department sniffed at it, and pronounced it unworthy. I was not allowed to have one. One of the first of many fights with my Department at Arizona State University that cost me dearly, and why they still do not talk to me in Tempe. But, Steve Jobs had an idea that worked for us, and I would not give it up. Without Jobs and his Macintosh, we would have had a hard time indeed.

We did not do our typesetting originally on the Mac. We started off with an old tabletop typesetter that cost \$250, and then cut and pasted the typeset characters on to a mockup that was displayed over a light table. Later, we moved to a photostat machine that produced better copy, which could even be pasted in sheets. But, all the

time, the records, the manuscripts, and our data were kept on Macintoshes, where it was crucial to have umlauts and special German characters if our organization was to be truly bilingual and deal with Germans without the substituted English characters. It fitted our needs so much better than the early PCs. When calling a company to ask about word processing software for the PC, a technician asked me “Do the French use our alphabet, too?” Jobs knew what needed to be in the OS.

Many Germanists discovered the Macintosh before historians and political scientists, and were wedded to it right away, but as the many campuses where we all worked were totally enamored of the PC, there was often a lack of backup support. People did not know how to connect printers, which printers to get, and how to set up new programs. The whole world of computers that opened in the 1980s and after did not find WAGS or later, GSA members, as technically trained as counterparts in other disciplines. That was why I introduced the Computers and Software section of our Newsletter. It was widely read, and although it also encompassed PCs, the hard core were Mac users.

Macs were built, we felt, for the humanities. Jobs was talking to US, and his ideas made many of us a devoted band who sallied forth with our article and book manuscripts produced without all of that heavy training and that heavy dose of jargon. They were intuitive. You could grasp it right away. Everything fit, and worked.

Then, came the day that new software was developed that made the Mac not only the publishing engine for magazines with graphics, but for text people. The first software that we used was Pagemaker. I remember how I marveled at it at an expo. It had kerning! It knew leading! Thank you, Steve, for planning your computer so that such software could be developed, and could really work with it. And, effortlessly, like all other Mac programs, it used the umlauts just as all the other programs did! Good grief, was it good! And, when new phototypesetting machines were getting to the \$24,000 each level, a few hundred dollars could turn an ordinary Mac into an engine for our journal. We could do it! This was the first time anyone could have used what later became the standard for a Mac product. There really was an app for it.

What could we have done without the Macintosh? The whole history of WAGS/GSA would have been different. We would have had to have access to much more money. Later, this software also helped PC users, who then had to work harder for German language products, but ours was all integrated, and so easy to train students in our own office. Our production schedule beat many older, established journals. Our pricing kept dues low. More than a thousand pages a year could be turned out.

Later, of course, more electronic genius enabled manuscripts to be sent electronically, and people began to accept as commonplace that which then was revolutionary. But, in grasping the revolutionary as soon as it came out, WAGS/GSA was able to emerge earlier, to develop more quickly, and to help more people establish professional careers sooner, than might ever have been the case if we had waited until what we did was acceptable everywhere.

Steve Jobs was a kind of idol of mine, and I went a few times to the Las Vegas

show to see new stuff. He helped found WAGS/GSA and helped so many colleagues with his easier Macs, that so fitted our bilingual profession. All of us who used Macs, and who could do things faster and easier than their colleagues who struggled with PCs or sought specialized education before they could get past the dot prompt, really felt that Jobs was talking to US.

Thank you, Steve Jobs. From all of us.

Gerald R. Kleinfeld

Reece Kelly (1938-2011)

The GSA is saddened to learn of the death on 15 July 2011 of Dr. Reece Kelly, professor emeritus of history at Fort Lewis College in Durango, Colorado, shortly before his seventy-third birthday. Professor Kelly was one of the founding members of the Western Association of German Studies (WAGS), the predecessor of the German Studies Association. He participated in its very first meetings, and served as the organization's first vice-president and in 1979-80 as its second president. After graduating from Eastern Washington State College, Professor Kelly received his PhD from the University of Washington before embarking on a thirty-two-year teaching career at Fort Lewis College, where he served as chair of the History Department. A more detailed obituary will follow in the next newsletter. (Source: *The Durango Herald*, 17 July 2011)

David E. Barclay

Kalamazoo College/GSA

Peter Krüger (1935-2011)

Am 16. September 2011, wenige Tage vor Beginn der 35. GSA-Jahreskonferenz in Louisville / Kentucky, verstarb in Marburg a.d. Lahn unser langjähriges Mitglied und aktive Teilnehmer an den Konferenzen der German Studies Association Peter Krüger nach einer sehr kurzen und schweren Krankheit. Er wird uns mit seinem Humor, seiner menschlichen Wärme, seiner freundlichen Zuwendung, seiner Fähigkeit zuzuhören und seiner fachlichen und nüchternen Kritik und großen Kompetenz sehr fehlen.

Peter Krüger wurde am 17. 12.1935 in Eisenach geboren. Nach dem Abitur in Goslar im Harz studierte er in Marburg und München Geschichte, Politik, Germanistik und Kunstgeschichte. Er wurde von Franz Schnabel in München 1962 mit einer Arbeit über die Politik der Rheinischen Pfalz zu Westeuropa 1576-1582 promoviert und habilitierte sich 1972 an der Universität zu Köln bei Erich Angermann, ebenfalls ein Schüler des bis heute eine Generation von führenden deutschen Historikern prägenden Münchner Historikers Franz Schnabel. Thema seiner Habilitationsschrift war "Deutschland und die Reparationen 1918/19". Peter Krüger wurde 1973 zum Außerplanmäßigen Professor an der Universität zu Köln ernannt und nahm 1975 einen Ruf auf einen Lehrstuhl für Neuere Geschichte an der Philipps-Universität Marburg an, wo er bis zu seiner Emeritierung 2002 und

darüber hinaus lehrte und forschte und Schülergenerationen prägte. Sein Engagement für die Geschichte der Internationalen Beziehungen und für Europastudien wurde Profil prägend für seine Universität.

Nach seiner Promotion war er zunächst Wissenschaftlicher Mitarbeiter der von Ernst Deuerlein betreuten Herausgabe der Dokumente zur Deutschlandpolitik, 1962-1965, ehe er 1966 als Mitarbeiter in das Auswärtige Amt wechselte und bis 1974 und darüber hinaus Mitherausgeber der Akten zur deutschen auswärtigen Politik 1918-1945 wurde. In diesen Jahren erschienen von ihm betreut und ediert die Bände der Serie B III-XXI (1925-1933) und der Band XIII (1937-1941) der Serie D.

Seine Dissertation und seine Habilitationsschrift befassten sich beide mit Fragen der äußeren Politik, sind aber ihrem Charakter nach von Anbeginn internationale Beziehungen, die über die Außenbeziehungen hinausgreifende Einflussgrößen in die Analyse einbeziehen. Internationale Beziehungen verstand er stets in einem globalen und europäischen historischen Rahmen. Einer seiner Forschungsschwerpunkte war die Weimarer Republik. Seine Studie über die Außenpolitik der Republik von Weimar ist bis heute ein Standardwerk und Klassiker der Geschichtswissenschaft. In der GSR 22/1999 erschien sein Aufsatz "Das doppelte Dilemma. Die Außenpolitik der Republik von Weimar zwischen Staatensystem und Innenpolitik". Die Außenpolitik der ersten deutschen Demokratie sah er eingebunden in das Spannungsfeld von Revisionismus, Friedenssicherung und europäischer Politik. Neben Studien zu Stresemann und Briand äußerte er sich verschiedentlich auch zu Locarno, zu den deutsch-französischen Beziehungen, zu europäischen Grenzräumen und zur Rolle und Stellung Osteuropas im europäischen Staatensystem und in den internationalen Beziehungen der Zwischenkriegszeit.

Ein weiteres Interessengebiet von Peter Krüger waren die internationalen Beziehungen von der frühen Neuzeit bis in das 20. Jahrhundert. Hierzu leistete er wichtige anregende inhaltliche und methodische Beiträge. Es erschienen mehrere Sammelbände, die sich mit dem europäischen Staatensystem und den internationalen Beziehungen im Wandel beschäftigten, seien es die Beiträge einer Tagung des Münchner Historischen Kollegs und verschiedener Veranstaltungen an der Philipps Universität Marburg. Sehr anregend und zahlreiche Forschungsimpulse vermittelnd war eine von Peter Krüger zusammen mit dem DHI in Washington organisierte Konferenz an der Universität von Illinois in Urbana-Champaign über Paul W. Schroeders Studie "The Transformation of European Politics 1763-1848". Kritisch diskutierten die Teilnehmer diese Arbeit und erörterten die Frage, ob diese inhaltlich und methodisch als Episode oder Model für moderne internationale Beziehungen angesehen werden könne. Diplomatiegeschichte und Adaption von Methoden der Politikwissenschaft greifen zu kurz und müssen durch strukturge-schichtliche Einflussgrößen ergänzt werden, die wirtschaftliche, gesellschaftliche, kulturelle und mentale Prozesse in die Analyse einbeziehen. Mit seinen Studien zu den internationalen Beziehungen hat Peter Krüger wichtige Beiträge geleistet, die aufgegriffen und fortgeführt wurden.

Ein weiterer Forschungsschwerpunkt bildeten für Peter Krüger Europa, die Europäische Integration und die Ausbildung einer europäischen Identität. In zahlrei-

chen Aufsätzen und auf internationalen Tagungen hat er sich diesen Themen immer wieder gewidmet und sich mit dem Integrationsthema kritisch auseinander gesetzt. Wichtig war ihm dabei auch als Historiker, dass die Geschichte der europäischen Integration nicht auf die Zeit nach dem Zweiten Weltkrieg reduziert wurde, sondern, dass viele Fragen, Problem und Ideen bereits lange vorher da waren und diskutiert wurden. Wichtig war seine Beitrag über die wirtschaftlichen Einigungsbestrebungen und die Europapolitik im 20. Jahrhundert, der leider nur auf Französisch vorliegt. Seine positiv-kritische Sicht zum europäischen Einigungsprozess hat er 2006 in einem gewichtigen Buch mit dem Titel "das unberechenbare Europa. Epochen des Integrationsprozesses vom späten 18. Jahrhundert bis zur Europäischen Union" niedergeschrieben und als Historiker aufgezeigt, dass die europäischen Einigungsbestrebungen der Gegenwart nur im gesamthistorischen Kontext verständlich sind und den Menschen Orientierung geben können.

Peter Krüger war Mitglied in zahlreichen gelehrten wissenschaftlichen Vereinigungen, so im Collegium Carolinum, der GSA, der Gesellschaft für Geistesgeschichte, der Rankegesellschaft und der Gesellschaft für Verfassungsgeschichte, um nur einige zu benennen. Als Gastwissenschaftler war er 1984 Fellow des Woodrow Wilson Centers in Washington D.C. und 1993/94 Stipendiat des Münchner Historischen Kollegs und lehrte nach seiner Emeritierung auf Einladung eines Freundes Kollegen für ein Semester an einem amerikanischen College.

Peter Krüger war in seiner ruhigen, kritischen, unaufdringlichen und unaufgeregten Art immer zu Gesprächen mit jüngeren Kolleginnen und Kollegen bereit. Er hörte zu und richtete in schwierigen Zeiten seine Schüler und jüngeren Kollegen immer wieder auf und motivierte sie weiter zu machen, nicht aufzugeben. Er erteilte auch Ratschläge und regte an, doch nur wenn dieses auch erwünscht war.

Der Verfasser dieses Nachrufes profitierte über viele Jahre von intensiven Gesprächen und gemeinsamen Projektüberlegungen mit Peter Krüger, der als Historiker in der gesamten Geschichte der Neuzeit, in der Zeitgeschichte, in der Geschichte Europas und in der Geschichte moderner internationaler Beziehungen zu Hause war. Neben seinen zahlreichen Verpflichtungen war er auch stets bereit an meiner Universität, der Universität Rostock, als auswärtiger Gutachter an zahlreichen Promotionen und Habilitationen zum großen Nutzen meiner Schüler mitzuwirken.

Peter Krüger suchte nicht den großen öffentlichen Auftritt. Das hatte er nicht nötig. Die Qualität seiner breit gefächerten Arbeiten zwischen dem 16. Und dem 21. Jahrhundert sprachen für sich. Wir haben einen großen Historiker verloren, der das Fach in vielen Bereichen befruchtet und geprägt hat. Er hinterlässt eine schwer zu schließende Lücke.

Wolf D. Gruner
Universität Rostock

Institutional Members

American Friends of the Alexander von Humboldt Foundation
American Friends of the Documentation Center of Austrian Resistance
American Institute of Contemporary German Studies
Austrian Cultural Institute
Austrian Fulbright Commission
The Canadian Centre for German and European Studies/Le Centre canadien d'études
allemandes et européennes at York University & Université de Montréal
Center for Holocaust Studies of the University of Vermont
Cornell University
Freie Universität Berlin
Friedrich Ebert Stiftung-Bonn
Georgetown University/Center for German and European Studies
German Historical Institute
Gesellschaft für Deutschlandforschung
Grinnell College
Hannah-Arendt-Institut, TU Dresden
Harvard University/Center for European Studies
Hoover Institution, Stanford University
Illinois College
Indiana University, Institute of German Studies
Konrad Adenauer Foundation
Landesarchiv Schleswig-Holstein
Leo Baeck Institute, New York
McGill University
Max Planck Institut für Geschichte
Militärgeschichtliches Forschungsinstitut Potsdam
Nanovic Institute for European Studies at the University of Notre Dame
Northern Arizona University
The Salzburg Institute of Gordon College
University at Buffalo, State University of New York
United States Holocaust Memorial Museum
University of Arkansas, Fulbright College
University of California–Berkeley/Institute for European Studies
University of Colorado
University of Florida/Center for European Studies Program
University of Minnesota/Center for Austrian Studies
University of Minnesota/Center for German, Scandinavian, and Dutch
University of Montana
University of North Carolina–Chapel Hill
University of Pennsylvania
University of Richmond
University of South Carolina
University of Wisconsin/Center for European Studies
Vanderbilt University
Western Washington University
Zentrum für Zeithistorische Forschung (ZZF) Potsdam

German Studies Association
David E. Barclay, Executive Director
1200 Academy Street
Kalamazoo, MI 49006-3295 USA