

Introduction

Memory Boom or Memory Fatigue in 21st Century Germany?

Eric Langenbacher

Government, Georgetown University

Friederike Eigler

German, Georgetown University

Memory Still Matters

Is “memory fatigue” setting in? One often hears this question in regards to Germans whenever another Holocaust-centered or Nazi era memory event erupts. But, one also increasingly hears this question about intellectuals and scholars in the humanities. Political scientists, lamentably, never really got into the study of memory in the first place. As an overly qualitative phenomenon the study of collective memory was impervious to dominant quantitative or rationalist methodologies in the discipline. Like culture more generally, it was considered either a default category or an irrelevant factor for the core of political analysis—interests and institutions—and was best left to the humanities or sociology. Others have argued that memory never really mattered at all for the vast majority of Germans who are interested in the consumerist present or for a proper understanding of the political system. At the most, it concerned only a small circle of the German elite and media such as the feuilleton section of the *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung* and *Der Spiegel*, and, certain German studies centers and journals in the USA.

Contrary to these attempts to downplay the importance and the study of memory, even a casual observer of Germany will recognize that memory issues continue to bubble up, at times permeating the German political and cultural scene. This is not to say that collective memory is the only thing that matters, or that Germans are obsessed and irrevocably haunted by the past. The point is merely that

memory continues to matter in contemporary Germany—perhaps just a little bit more than in other countries.

A brief list of major memory events over the last few years reveals this continued importance. The sustained debate over the memory of German suffering has been on-going since 2002, unleashed by the publication of the novel *Im Krebsgang* (*Crabwalk*) by Günter Grass about the deaths of German refugees in 1945 and a history of the Allied bombing campaign in World War II, *Der Brand* (*The Fire*) by Jörg Friedrich. Although the crest of attention has passed, the discussion is still a political factor insofar as vigorous reactions continue to flow from neighboring countries, while, domestically, right radical politicians have seized and attempted to appropriate the memory. Debates in the Saxon provincial parliament in early 2005 (discussed by Eric Langenbacher in this issue), pushed by rightwing extremists, various right-radical demonstrations in Dresden and Berlin, and serious counter-mobilizations dominated the press—high and low. Before that, there was the sustained Walsler-Bubis controversy about the role of Auschwitz in the Berlin Republic, and, in 2003, the Hohmann Affair, when a CDU backbencher gave an inappropriate speech that emphasized the role of Jews in the Bolshevik Revolution.¹ These events and others have contributed to ongoing discussions about antisemitism in German society and its relationship to memory of the Holocaust.

Beyond these high profile events, memory continues to influence both popular and high-brow culture, as the authors of this volume document. Two of the most popular German films in recent years were *Rosenstrasse* and, especially, *Der Untergang* (*Downfall*). The former features a story of Gentiles saving their Jewish spouses from certain death at the hands of the Nazis; the latter is an account of the last days of Hitler and his inner circle in the Berlin bunker. Public and private television have aired countless documentaries, mini-series, and docudramas about Holocaust and Nazi-era themes—including numerous programs by Guido Knopp for German public television (Zweites Deutsches Fernsehen, ZDF). Examples are *Hitlers Kinder* (Hitler's Children), *Hitlers Helfer* (Hitler's Helpers) and *Die Grosse Flucht* (The Great Flight), as well as programs produced by others such as *Speer und Er* (Speer and He), and *Stauffenberg*—the latter of which garnered a market share of 23% when it was first broadcast in

February 2004.² Considering this broad media coverage, it should not come as a surprise that, according to public opinion surveys, the vast majority of average Germans has a high degree of historical knowledge, has thought about memory of the Holocaust and has internalized many of the concerns of this memory into their political values and worldviews.³ For example, 96% of Germans in a 2000 survey knew what Auschwitz was. In 2001, 57% of respondents believed that children learn too little about the events of the Nazi period in school, versus only 4% thinking it was too much. A 2002 poll found that only 1% thought that a Jewish neighbor would be undesirable versus 20% who answered desirable and 79% indifferent.⁴

One also must look back farther—to the great debates of the late 1970s surrounding the Bundestag vote over revoking the statute of limitations for Nazi era murders and the television miniseries *Holocaust*; those of the mid-1980s such as the *Historikerstreit* (Historians' Debate) and Edgar Reitz's popular TV series *Heimat* (*Homeland*); controversies about Unification (e.g., Günter Grass stating that Auschwitz made a unified German state unthinkable); the more recent memory events of the mid and late 1990s including *Schindler's List*, the *Wehrmachtausstellung*, 50th anniversary commemorations, Daniel Goldhagen's *Hitler's Willing Executioners*, Viktor Klemperer's Diaries, and the slave labor compensation negotiations. One should also mention memories other than those based on the Nazi period, such as Eastern-specific memories of the German Democratic Republic (GDR), discussed at length by Katherina Gerstenberger in this volume, expressed in popular films such as *Sonnenallee*, *Helden wie wir* and *Good Bye Lenin!*, or the burgeoning memories of the student rebel generation and domestic discontent including RAF (Rote Armee Fraktion) terrorism in the 1970s. One could fill a library with these texts and the commentaries they have generated. All of this taken together suggests not memory fatigue, as some critics and academics observe, but rather a sustained and unabated memory boom.

Why Study Memory Now?

2005 is an important year to take stock of developments in German culture, memory and politics for several reasons. It marks the 60th

anniversary of the end of World War II and the Holocaust, still the most important historical touchstones for contemporary Germany. It is the first major commemorative year of the so-called Berlin Republic, now half a decade old—as well as the first (and last) for the Red-Green government, in power from 1998-2005.⁵ It is also fifteen years since unification in 1990. According to sociologists, this is already half of a political generation, long enough to begin assessing the creation of an all-German memory culture, or the persistence of significant regional differences.

Indeed, 2005, like 1995, was a “super” memory year, particularly the first half. The winter and spring witnessed a dense series of commemorations. Each one gained substantial attention in the German and international press; each one revealed the political importance and controversy that collective memory, representations of the past and commemoration still entail. The highest profile memory events were the ceremonies surrounding the anniversaries of the liberation of Auschwitz on January 27, the bombing of Dresden on February 13 & 14, and the anniversary of the end of World War II on May 8, followed closely by the inauguration of the Memorial to the Murdered Jews of Europe (Holocaust Memorial) two days later. The autumn witnessed the 15th anniversary of German unification on 3 October. In addition to these national events, there are thousands more local and regional anniversaries, marking the liberation of various concentration camps or the de facto end of the war for towns and cities occupied by Allied troops before 8 May.

Looking back at trends in collective memory over the last ten to fifteen years, several points are obvious. Increasing distance and mediation are setting in as the “witness generation” passes away. As Friederike Eigler discusses, this changing environment results in generational shifts, necessary changes in representational forms from collective and personal to cultural memory⁶ and increasing medialization of memory. There is also pressure to bear witness among the aging “first generation” (e.g., the documentary about Hitler’s secretary, *Blind Spot*). Surely, 2005 was one of the last occasions for generations with first-hand experience of the Nazi era to participate in commemorations and to affect discourses about how to commemorate the past.

Moreover, collective memory, like many other cultural and political phenomena, has faced substantial internationalization; examples

include the Stockholm International Forum on the Holocaust in 2000, on-going conferences and research at venues like Yad Vashem in Jerusalem, the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum in Washington, DC and the bi-yearly Lessons and Legacies conference in the United States. Such trends have been heightened since the end of the Cold War and the opening of Eastern European archives, leading to concomitant interest in the recollections and the traumas of its peoples, a theme Joanna Stimmel addresses in her contribution to this issue.

Perhaps more controversially, there is increasing “normalization” of 20th century German history as the constraints of post war semi-sovereignty fade away, as Germany continues to reconcile with its neighbors through the construction of “Europe,” and as a vibrant Jewish community (re) establishes itself in Federal Republic.⁷ In the political and legal realms, many of the issues lingering from the Nazi era have been dealt with in recent years. Examples include the slave labor fund and the recent Wertheim compensation case (along with a host of other cases spurred by the fall of communism in the East). There are also attempts to rectify previously flawed responses to Nazi persecution, dealing with what some authors call the re-traumatizing “second guilt.” Examples include efforts to provide proper support to Jewish forced laborers, denied pensions on technicalities in the 1950s, 1960s, and 1970s and the revocation of honors and sometimes even pensions in Joseph Fischer’s Foreign Office for retiring officials who also served the Nazis.⁸

Yet despite the resolution of these political and legal matters, tensions and controversies abound in the symbolic and discursive realms of commemoration. Since the unification of Germany, the commemorative landscape has expanded greatly throughout the country, especially in the new capital—exemplified by the new Holocaust Memorial and, after early 2006, the revamped German Historical Museum. The planning phase of the Holocaust memorial took more than a decade, due to endless debates and disagreements about location, dedication (to Jewish victims and/or other victimized groups) and appropriate representational forms. Its realization has led to demands for additional memorials for other groups persecuted by the Nazis (e.g., homosexuals, Sinti and Roma, the mentally handicapped). More recently, there has been the controversial initiative to

set up a Zentrum gegen Vertreibung (Center against Expulsion) whose primary purpose, thematizing the memory of German suffering, continues to be a divisive issue. Finally, there are ongoing discussions about appropriate official and unofficial ways to remember East Germany and the period of disunity. In Berlin, controversy has surrounded the remnant of the Wall at the East Side Gallery, the Bernauer Strasse Memorial, the Checkpoint Charlie Museum, and the memorial to the Soviet army in Treptow Park, among others.

Other significant controversies concern the roles of perpetrators and victims in accounts of Nazi Germany. On the one hand, there is a focus on the perpetrators and ensuing debates about individual and collective actors, most notably the formerly white-washed German army (*Wehrmachtaustellung*) and discussions regarding the guilt or complicity of average Germans (Goldhagen).⁹ On the other hand, the focus on Jewish victims of the Holocaust that dominated in the old Federal Republic has been augmented with more attention to other victim groups, especially East European civilians. Moreover, discussions are burgeoning in many of these former East block countries about the complicity of some of their citizens in the Holocaust and other wartime crimes, exemplified by the discussion of the wartime massacre of the Jewish population of Jewabne, Poland. The most noticeable discursive shift in recent years has been a focus on the memory of German suffering—on the victims of Allied aerial bombing or the mass rape of German women as the Red Army and East European partisans invaded the Third Reich.¹⁰ Demands that these memories also become part of public memory are legitimate, but some political groups have quickly instrumentalized the attention to German suffering, resulting in the impression that victims of German atrocities are downplayed or displaced.

Innovative conceptual frameworks for the study of memory are emerging as Holocaust studies move beyond the intentionalist-functionalist paradigm, the predominant use of psychoanalytic theories, and focus on narratives and narrativity.¹¹ In what Confino and Fritzsche deem the second and third generations of memory studies,¹² new theoretical advances are being developed through the introduction and application of perspectives from other disciplines. Karen Remmler, for example, uses insights from archeological and disaster studies in her contribution to this volume. In political science

there have been some attempts to utilize behaviorist and rational choice methods for studying the Holocaust and collective memory more generally. On the one hand, the proliferation of different memories has created a comprehensive and deep historical consciousness. On the other, research in the social sciences, neuroscience, and the humanities has created a dense corpus of academic knowledge concerning the diverse roles and the complex functioning of memory. It is hard to imagine many other topics that have been studied and discussed from such a rich multitude of (inter-)disciplinary perspectives.

Towards a New Interdisciplinary Study of Memory

Nevertheless, there is still much work to be done. Since too often memory studies in specific disciplines remain isolated from each other, there is a need for more productive dialogue among disciplinary perspectives. Contributors to this special issue endeavor to reopen this dialogue by adopting a professedly interdisciplinary approach. The articles examine, interpret and analyze memory events and trends, focusing especially on the political and social implications of developments in historical, visual and literary representations.

Why this focus on literature, film, and political culture? In the most general terms, culture can be defined as the inherited sets of beliefs, values, narratives, practices and traditions of a given group that provides a sense of identity and subjective anti-mechanistic “order,” which, in turn, can generate meaningful action.¹³ Political culture is a subset of the more general culture. Lucien Pye has emphasized the historical dimension and the intersection of private and public: “A political culture is the product of both the collective history of a political system and the life histories of the members of that system, and thus is rooted equally in public events and private experiences.”¹⁴ Collective and cultural memories, usefully defined as intersubjectively shared interpretations of a common past with a high degree of affect, comprise a vital ideational component of political culture. Several types of shared memories (in contrast to focused personal memories) have been identified. Most useful is Aleida and Jan Assmann’s differentiation between communicative, collective

and cultural memories, which move from less to more societal breadth and institutionalized depth.¹⁵ There is also an implicit chronological and dynamic dimension, given that memories often interact with or evolve from personal to communicative and cultural memories across several generations. As the contributions to this special issue demonstrate, cultural products like movies and literature provide a rich object of study as they conjoin aspects of personal memory, collective, and national memory.

Cultural texts, understood broadly as products of literature, the media (print and visual), films and monuments, are a constitutive part of any culture. Typical and hegemonic values, as well as contested heterodox understandings, are embedded in these narratives, greatly affecting the values, behaviors and worldviews of individuals who confront and internalize them. Confino and Fritzsche summarize the link between memory and political culture, in addition to foregrounding the dynamics of competition and hegemony they entail:

If the impulse to organize the past is the basis for the construction of identity, then this impulse achieves intelligibility as a compelling story or narrative. ... Without this management of the past, the coherence that connects individuals with collectivities and makes social action in a public setting possible would be unimaginable. Narratives establish authority by telling a plausible story, and by providing social meaning to otherwise scattered individual experiences. ... Collective memories are a weak form in that they are potentially integrated into any number of narratives, but once embedded in a narrative stream they turn out to be remarkably strong and they thus deflect counternarratives and counterarguments.¹⁶

Indeed, cultural texts with their embedded representational forms are one of the prime means of socialization in any community. At both the elite and mass levels, texts allow the crucial inter-generational transmission of values, identities, memories, and norms, as well as the means for change,—a central concern for all of the contributors here. Consider the impact that Alexis de Tocqueville, Ralph Waldo Emerson and Frank Capra have had on American consciousness and political culture. A similar impact derived in Germany from classical writers like Herder, Goethe and Schiller, to 20th century authors like Thomas Mann, Grass, and Christa Wolf, among many others. While the dominant position of intellectuals and writers in German society has been seriously challenged in

recent years, cultural products still influence significantly an “old” European high culture like Germany, where a *gebildete* elite has always had disproportional influence on the hegemonic values and narratives of the culture as a whole.

In other words, cultural texts (including visual representations) and their narratives greatly shape the construction and content of both the general political culture of a country, as well as the specific memories that partially constitute it. Texts are the most visible public face of a culture, a core component and object of contestation in the public realm. As much as texts color memories and political values, so too, do current trends and events in politics and society affect the content, narratives and representational forms of any text. As Stimmel’s article illustrates, globalization and internationalization are also increasingly salient forces, so national cultures are beholden to ideas and influences not just from within their (often arbitrarily defined) borders, but from a multitude of others from the outside.

Finally, the concerns of memory have permeated many of the great works of postwar German art and literature, and continue to do so. As Eigler shows in her article, prior to German unification, this attention was shaped by the division of Germany and by Cold War ideologies. By contrast, literature written since unification often broadens the scope and critically reflects on competing memories such as the memory of German suffering *and* of atrocities committed by Germans. Furthermore, many of these recent texts insist on keeping memories of sites and lives in the “other,” Socialist Germany alive, a topic analyzed by Gerstenberger in this volume. This prominence is sufficient reason to explore the current representations of memory in German literature and film, as well as the intellectual influences helping to construct these narrative representations.

The Contributions of this Volume

Opening with “Writing in the New Germany: Cultural Memory and Family Narratives at the Turn of the 21st Century,” Friederike Eigler explores the intersections between individual and collective memories of 20th century German history. Contextualizing the discussion of this literary genre, she first surveys dominant trends regarding

cultural memory in contemporary Germany and beyond: the immense influence of the visual media and information technology; the deterritorialization of memory discourses, specifically concerning the Holocaust; the flattening out of GDR history; and the ritualization of public commemoration in contemporary Germany. Eigler then discusses different disciplinary approaches to the study of memory, arguing that sociological perspectives—while most helpful for placing literary texts into larger societal contexts—cannot account for the specific possibilities of literature (e.g., regarding the representation of traumatic or repressed memories). The second part of her article looks at how the genre of family narratives has changed since unification compared to literature written in divided Germany. She concludes with a discussion of two novels that exemplify the limitations and the possibilities of the genre: the international bestseller *The Reader* by the West German author Bernhard Schlink and the *Gunnar-Lennefsen-Expedition* by the East German author Kathrin Schmidt. In Schlink's novel, the adoption of a highly subjective perspective risks displacing other voices and glossing over uncomfortable aspects of the German past. By contrast, Schmidt's novel invites readers to work through Germany's discontinuous and often violent history. Overall Eigler maintains that family novels are in a unique position to counteract the ritualization of memory in the public realm by creating mediated forms of historical witnessing for readers in the 21st century.

Karen Remmler's contribution, "'On the Natural History of Destruction' and Cultural Memory: W.G. Sebald," also focuses on recent literary texts. Her analysis draws on current approaches to cultural memory in archeological and disaster studies. These fields, themselves in flux and subject to different practices embedded in national and methodological claims, are seemingly tangential to current debates within German studies on the formation and meaning of cultural memory. Yet, like Holocaust studies and other areas of cultural studies, trauma studies struggle to come to terms with the meaning of atrocity and its afterlife, exploring particular sites of memory in which the dead are buried, commemorated, or transformed into objects of material culture. By attending to shifting approaches to cultural memory across disciplines, and their usefulness for identifying different modes of cultural memory in contemporary literary texts,

this article raises questions about the primacy of the Shoah as the touchstone for Germany's ongoing formation of national identity. Without diminishing the centrality of the Shoah in German studies or its role in shaping concepts of memory in other fields, Remmler suggests that we look to the material aspects of cultural memory that capture the significance of place and the placement of objects in space in relation to the dead. The emerging theoretical approaches from outside the realm of German studies may help us to differentiate more clearly the forms and claims of cultural memory, itself both bound and unbound by interdisciplinary exchange.

Physical place and material culture also play a central role in Katharina Gerstenberger's article "Reading the Writings on the Walls—Remembering East Berlin." Rendered in great visual and linguistic detail in literature as well as film, "place" serves to preserve and authenticate memory of life in East Berlin, which, many authors agree, was to a large degree shaped by the city's physical appearance. Specifically, writers have looked to East Berlin's crumbling facades with their fading inscriptions, both to capture the experience of living in the GDR and to exemplify its termination as the 1990s building boom quickly made life in East Germany "unimaginable." Moreover, the facades inspire reflections on the censorship of memory under Socialism and the transfiguration of the GDR into memory. The East German-Jewish writer Irina Liebmann is one of the few who connects memories of East Berlin with the history of Jews in Berlin. Gerstenberger argues that memories of Jewish life in East Berlin ties in with the major public debates after unification, namely East Germans' assertion of a memory of their own, the globalization of Holocaust memory, and the unification of Germans' collective memory around their victim status. Through her nuanced engagement with East Berlin facades, Liebmann offers ways of contextualizing these memory discourses without losing sight (and site) of their distinctiveness.

The larger question Gerstenberger addresses is how writers convert the GDR, including the memory politics of Easterners, into literary texts. By insisting on distinct East German memories these writers challenge the comparability of East/West experiences, as well as the applicability of West German memory traditions to East Germany. While younger Eastern writers seem less critical of the GDR

than those who have memories of the Nazi period as well, even those older writers are not willing to approach GDR memory through West German paradigms.

In “Screen Images of the Holocaust: ‘Cosmopolitan’ Memories in Germany and Poland,” Johanna Kedzierska Stimmel moves beyond an exclusive focus on German issues by looking at cinematic representations of the Holocaust, an integral part of the “memory boom.” Because films not only represent the past verbally but also render it visually, cinema employs a medium of memory that transcends linguistic boundaries and national contexts. However, the current internationalization of Holocaust memory, including cinematic representations, does not mean that the past is screened in the same way across national borders. Her essay examines the interplay of two trends within cultural memories of the Holocaust in Germany and Poland: the globalization of memory, on the one hand, and the re-territorialization of memory, on the other. Two “Holocaust films” are subjected to in-depth study: the West German feature *Bittere Ernte* (Angry Harvest, 1986) and the Polish documentary *Fotoamator* (Photographer, 1998). Both films represent not only diverging ways of representing the Holocaust; they also foster distinctly different depictions of the wartime relationship between Germans, Jews, and Poles. Even as they draw on certain “cosmopolitan” tropes and icons of the Holocaust, both films evince local sensibilities, pertinent to the time and place of each one’s production and release. In the last part of the article, she examines a more recent example of the cinematic Holocaust memory: Roman Polanski’s *The Pianist* (2002). Concentrating on varied responses among German, Polish, and Jewish individuals instead of portraying them as a mass or a type, this film provides a comprehensive view of the triangular relationship between the involved national and religious groups. This differentiated view of the German-Polish-Jewish triad might suggest the emergence of a transnational memory striving to undercut national biases in remembering the Holocaust.

Finally, Eric Langenbacher’s “*Moralpolitik* versus *Moralpolitik*: Recent Struggles over the Construction of Cultural Memory in Germany” uses many of the concepts, dynamics, and texts outlined by the other authors, yet shifts away from close readings of literature and film to focus on the (partisan) politics of memory. He posits that com-

petition and the pursuit of cultural hegemony amongst various kinds of memories (generational, cultural), different content and embedded interpretations are always central analytical concerns, given the pluralism inherent in postmodern societies and diverse historical experiences. Individual agency is also key, especially among elites, who respond to memories from below and certify the narratives and values that become hegemonic and constitutive of a collectivity's identity and culture. Hegemonic memories are a form of power and imply certain normative behaviors and values in the present, a *Moralpolitik*, as well as the creation of a set of constraints and taboos.

Langenbacher examines competitive discourses in response to the return of the memory of German suffering after 2002. After an unexpected sympathetic response initially, older partisan positions of conservative support and left-wing denunciation re-emerged. The controversy surrounding a planned *Zentrum gegen Vertreibung* led to a vigorous competition among proponents of the memory of German suffering and backers of the previously hegemonic memory of the Holocaust, with the latter largely prevailing by 2005. Explanations for the shifting attitudes among leftists, originally expressing support for the new memories and later reverting to older criticism, come down to a fear that a rehabilitated memory sours fragile relations with East European countries like Poland and the Czech Republic. Most important is the fear that memories of German suffering aid the surging radical right. This *moralpolitische* position prematurely cuts off discourses needed for coming to terms with the past and for constructing cultural memory. This allows right radicals once again, Langenbacher argues, to monopolize and pervert the memory, and overlooks the legitimate *Moralpolitik* associated with the memory by its mainstream representatives.

Into the Future

To conclude, we return to the sentiments expressed at the outset. First, we hope to convince the reader that memory still matters in contemporary Germany—or at least to persuade the reader to be open to the perspectives, findings, and interpretations discussed by the contributors to this special issue. One large questions remains:

what about the future of memory of the “short 20th century,” as Eric Hobsbawm memorably deemed it, in German society and beyond? Perhaps the pace and intensity of the “memory boom” will settle down as the events recede in time and as cultural memories from the previous century with its turbulent and often catastrophic history become firmly implanted. This possibility seems unlikely. The concerns and influence of memory are well-institutionalized in Germany today: physically in the memorial landscape of the capital and almost every other urban center; in the school curricula; in a dense infrastructure of institutes inside and outside of academia, non-governmental organizations and foundations. This influence is also mental and ideational—in the historical consciousness of individuals, in the path-dependent norms of policy makers, certainly as major themes in the artistic, literary and cultural life of the country. This supporting infrastructure is even stronger when one looks at the influences emanating from the international arena.

Even if the long-proclaimed end of the memory boom in Germany does soon come to pass, the concerns addressed in this volume will continue to matter. This special issue can then be regarded as a document, interpretation, and analysis of a particular era in Germany, for which future generations may need a guide—and as explication of the boom itself. However, the extent to which this continued examination of the past and the lessons of the violent and discontinuous course of 20th century German and European history can assist us in facing the novel ideological challenges of the 21st century remains debatable. Yet, cultural and political discourses that are unaware of the legacies of the 20th century—including, for instance, the historical contexts out of which international treaties on human rights emerged—are not viable alternatives. Literature and film are among the most accessible media that can foster differentiated and personally engaging memories of this still-crucial 20th century history. Critical studies and discussions of these representations—both within and outside of academia—are an integral and important part of this engagement.

Notes

The contributions to this special issue are based on an interdisciplinary symposium entitled “Trans/Formations of the Past in Contemporary German Literature and Culture” organized by Friederike Eigler from the Department of German at Georgetown University, May 2004. The editors would like to thank all of the participants in the symposium for their contributions and feedback, as well as the two anonymous reviewers of this special issue.

1. On Dresden see “Misusing the Memory,” *The Economist*, 12 February 2005; “Rightists Mar Remembrance in Dresden,” *The New York Times*, 14 February 2005; Craig Whitlock, “As Dresden Recalls Days of Ruin, Neo-Nazis Issue a Rallying Cry,” *The Washington Post*, 14 February 2005; On the Hohmann affair see “Griff in die unterste Schublade des Antisemitismus,” *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, online, 31 October 2003.
2. See http://www.swr.de/stauffenberg/index_sat.html
3. See the review of quantitative data as well as an original survey in Eric Langenbacher, *Memory Regimes in Contemporary Germany*, Dissertation, (Washington, 2002).
4. Alphons Silbermann and Manfred Stoffers. *Auschwitz: Nie davon gehört? Erinnern und Vergessen in Deutschland* (Berlin, 2000); *Der Spiegel* (19) 2001; *Der Spiegel* (24) 2002.
5. Despite the change in power in Fall 2005 with the new CDU-SPD Grand Coalition under the chancellorship of Angela Merkel, all of the aforementioned commemorations took place under the Red-Green coalition’s auspices.
6. See Aleida Assmann, *Erinnerungsräume: Formen und Wandlungen des kulturellen Gedächtnisse* (Munich, 1999).
7. See Jeffrey Peck, *Being Jewish in the New Germany* (Piscataway, 2006).
8. See Ralf Giordano, *Die zweite Schuld oder von der Last Deutscher zu sein*. (Hamburg 1987); “Freiwilliger Zwang,” *Der Spiegel*, (22) 2005; “Aufstand der Mumien,” *Der Spiegel*, (7) 2005.
9. See “Atoning for Germany’s Nazi past: A shift in the landscape,” *The Economist*, 16 December 2004.
10. See Jan T. Gross, *Neighbors: The Destruction of the Jewish Community in Jewabne Poland* (Princeton, 2001).
11. See Omer Bartov, *Germany’s War and the Holocaust: Disputed Histories* (Ithaca, 2003); Yehuda Bauer, *Rethinking the Holocaust* (New Haven, 2001).
12. Alon Confino and Peter Fritzsche, eds., *The Work of Memory: New Directions in the Study of German Society and Culture* (Urbana, 2002).
13. Jeffrey Alexander and Steven Seidman, eds., *Culture and Society: Contemporary Debates* (Cambridge, 1990).
14. Lucien Pye and Sidney Verba, eds., *Political Culture and Political Development* (Princeton, 1965): 218.
15. Aleida Assman and Ute Frevert. *Geschichtsvergessenheit - Geschichtsversessenheit: vom Umgang mit deutschen Vergangenheiten nach 1945* (Stuttgart, 1999).
16. Confino and Fritzsche (see note 12), 8.