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1. Introduction

Dealing with the recent past was a significant initiative of the newly established political structures in Germany after 1990. In this sense one can argue that a massive, state-supported industry emerged for dealing with the past. At first, an increased attention was dedicated to issues such as the Berlin Wall, the Ministry for State Security (informally known as the Stasi) and the repressive character of the SED regime. As the authors argue, such initiatives aimed at the consolidation of an official history of the SED, its repression and of the GDR regime.¹

However, the role of the state in addressing the legacy of the recent past has changed over time. While during the 1990s state institutions, such as the Bundestag (German Parliament), were actively involved in officially addressing the recent past, this eventually shifted towards facilitating wider societal participation in the process of engaging with the GDR legacies.² State support manifested in numerous ways. Among the most significant initiatives were either the funding or establishing of institutions with the purpose of addressing the recent past, including the Federal Foundation for the Reappraisal of SED Dictatorship in East Germany (GDR) (Bundesstiftung zur Aufarbeitung der SED-Diktatur) in 1998, and the Federal Agency for Civic Education (Bundeszentrale für politische Bildung), at present extant in 15 of the 16 federal states. The Federal Commissioner for the Records of the State Security Service of the former German Democratic Republic (BStU) was created in order to facilitate the preservation of Stasi documentation and provide wider public access to its holdings. A further significant contribution in addressing the GDR’s legacy was made by financially supporting grassroots organisations and foundations, such as the Robert-Havemann Society (Robert-Havemann Gesellschaft e.V.) in Berlin and the Civic Movement Archive in Leipzig (Archiv Bürgerbewegung Leipzig). Additional non-academic research institutions, history museums, and memorials emerged as a consequence of public and private engagement with the past.³

Soon after reunification, two parliamentary enquiries (1990s) and expert committees (2005-2006) made significant contributions in these pursuits. These were created to discuss the future of GDR remembrance culture and its institutions. The special parliamentary enquiry commissions from 1992 to 1994, “The Reappraisal of the History and Consequences of the SED Dictatorship in Germany (Aufarbeitung von Geschichte und Folgen der SED-Diktatur in Deutschland); and from 1995 to 1998: “Overcoming the Consequences of the SED Dictatorship in the Process of German Reunification (Überwindung der Folgen der SED-Diktatur im Prozeß der deutschen Einheit) aimed at addressing the ‘totalitarian nature of the GDR’.

However, these parliamentary commissions did not claim ultimate authority in addressing the past. Rather, they aimed to further encourage and complement academic, judicial, public and

¹ Hogwood, Patricia. “Selective memory”, 37.
² Beattie, “The politics of remembering the GDR,” 33.
³ East Side Gallery, GDR Museum and Check Point Charlie Museum in Berlin; Museum of the Lies in Radebeul also discussed by COURAGE, Memorial of the Berlin Wall.
private debates. Their contribution was ultimately the emergences of ‘state-mandated memory’ debates.

Hence, following the first enquiry commission a series of considerations came to the fore supporting institutional mechanisms for promoting ‘critical memory work’ and encouraging ‘didactic public history’ initiatives. The first parliamentary commission highlighted that opposition and resistance were expressed in various ways during the GDR. A volume was dedicated to this issue and contains numerous expert analyses and testimonies of contemporary witnesses.⁴

As a consequence, the second commission further elaborated on the idea of memorialisation of the past, ‘Erinnerungspolitik’, contributing significantly to addressing how the GDR was to be remembered in the future by museums and memorials, coining the term ‘Gedenkstättenkonzeption’ (Memorial Concept).⁵ A significant role in developing, funding, researching and promoting in this direction was attributed to the newly established Federal Foundation for the Reappraisal of the SED Dictatorship.⁶

Nevertheless, most initiatives from the 1990s (histories, museums, memorials, etc.) focused on the illegitimacy of the GDR and its repressive power structures, often comparing it with Nazi Germany, imposing a state-promoted ‘Diktaturgedächtnis’ (memory of the dictatorship) as defined by the historian Martin Sabrow.

State involvement in the politics of addressing the legacy of the past resulted in a further expert commission led by the historian Martin Sabrow, Director of the Centre for Contemporary History in Potsdam. This was organised in 2005 and 2006 as the History Alliance for Coming to Terms with the SED Dictatorship, to address the SED regime and its relationship to society and the opposition. This commission sought to undertake a reconsideration of the institutionalised memory landscape in Germany. One of its major contributions was a recommendation to emphasise everyday life under the regime and opposition, which eventually did not find much support. This proposal was rejected on the basis that it downplayed the dictatorial nature of the regime and failed to adequately draw parallels between the GDR and Nazi Germany.

In that spirit, this chapter within the framework of the COURAGE project is not limited to only addressing the extent to which the recent past was dealt with in Germany from 1990 on, but rather, aims to expand debates concerning the legacies of the recent past, by highlighting the significance of cultural opposition. Consequently, the GDR chapter briefly introduces first the context and conditions that facilitated the preservation of the legacies of the socialist regime, thereafter focusing specifically on the aspects of cultural opposition as a subject for preservation before and after 1989.

After a short introduction to the state of the arts concerning research on cultural opposition under state socialism, the general conditions of institutions and normative frameworks for preservation in the context of regime change will be briefly discussed. The extent to which legacies from the socialist past became the subject of debate to ensure its further preservation, legal protection and

⁵ Beattie, “The politics of remembering the GDR,” 27.
⁶ Ibidem.
institutionalisation will be highlighted. The report will focus on more specific issues, by briefly summarising the significance of the collections identified as cultural opposition in the GDR by the COURAGE project. Finally, it will conclude by summarising a series of recommendations for the EU Commission.

2. Context

2.1 Researching Cultural Opposition under State Socialism

In Germany, research after 1990 concerning opposition in the GDR and Eastern Europe most often related to the terms opposition, resistance and dissidence, and their comparison to the Nazi regime, or the analysis of various forms of opposition and resistance. These received a great deal of attention among academics, political parties and former opposition members. Thus, numerous academic publications, reports and statements followed, and it is not the aim of the report to provide a comprehensive summary thereof.

Publications were issued with the support of various federal institutions, foremost among which the Federal Foundation for the Reappraisal of the SED Dictatorship, and concerned specific topics related to cultural opposition, such as: the civic, human and environmental rights movements, alternative forms of education and lifestyle, or personalities. Another institution thoroughly involved in similar pursuits is the BStU. Such publications have detailed documentation created by former Stasi officers and informants, and the institution throughout the life of the regime.

Another example is the collaboration of these institutions with additional organisations holding archival documentation on opposition in the GDR and on various personalities, such as the Robert-Havemann Society. Further institutions published documentation on opposition in the GDR or were based on the holdings of the archives, such as the Civic Movement Archive in Leipzig.

A detailed publication including all archives preserving documentation on the opposition was issued by the Robert-Havemann Society, under the supervision of Bernd Florath. This publication offers a comprehensive overview of all institutions that currently hold documentation on opposition in the GDR. These include independent archives, those of parties and organisations,
local, regional and state archives, church repositories, university archives, libraries, museums, memorials, and media archives.\textsuperscript{13}

However, one notices a great attention paid by research to themes focusing on political opposition and various personalities. Among the first contributions with state support to research cultural opposition have been already mentioned, meaning the reports issued by the two parliamentary enquiries (during the 1990s) and later the expert committee (2005, 2006).

Topics such as alternative lifestyles, social, environmental, human and civic movements, youth, religious, subversive and alternative art scenes, have recently become a subject of attention.\textsuperscript{14} Research focusing on such themes, or holdings\textsuperscript{15} contributed to enlarging the discourse concerning opposition, dissidence and resistance during the GDR, by moving beyond the realm of politics and instead highlighting alternative and subversive ways of criticising, opposing or disengaging from the regime. These draw attention to groups of artists on the periphery, Boehmiennes, and youth and civic movements among others, who expressed their disengagement or dissatisfaction with the socialist regime through their activities. Such networks and critical communication channels emerged among artists, poets, writers, musicians, youth, religious groups, and environmental groups, among others.

Recent publications addressing cultural opposition have focused on specific topics related to disidence and opposition, in the fine and performing arts, theatre, literature, political and artistic samizdat, cinema, photography and music.\textsuperscript{16} These addressed the phenomenon as such, discussed various artists and their contribution to the arts and opposition in the GDR, or compared them to the greater Eastern European context\textsuperscript{17} forming subjects of analysis for various disciplines from art-history to history, or political science, either centrally, or within the wider context of opposition.\textsuperscript{18}

Additionally, catalogues have been issued following exhibitions which displayed GDR artists, disidence and subversive artistic creations.\textsuperscript{19}

\textit{2.2. Institutions and Normative Frameworks for Preservation and Dealing with the Recent Past}

In order to better understand the preservation and interpretation of the socialist regime’s legacies, one has to adopt a longue duree approach. This means that the multitude of institutions and normative frameworks responsible for the preservation of the socialist regimes’ legacies must be addressed in the context of continuities and change.

\textsuperscript{13} Florath, Selbstzeugnisse.
\textsuperscript{15} Such as those described by COURAGE
\textsuperscript{17} Hamersky, \textit{Gegenansichten}.
\textsuperscript{18} Kuhrt, \textit{Opposition in der DDR}. Weisheit-Zenz, \textit{Öffentliche Meinung}.
\textsuperscript{19} Kaiser, \textit{Boheme in der DDR}.
Following German reunification in 1990, dealing with the legacy of the GDR became a major subject of debate. Yet the conditions for the preservation of the GDR’s legacies, in certain cases, predated the fall of the SED regime, such as the environmental movements libraries in Berlin and Großhennesdorf (1987), or the collections of artists books preserved in the Saxon Library demonstrate.

Consequently, this report is not limited to addressing institutions and actors involved in the historical interpretation of the GDR regime after 1989 generally, but rather, more specifically those concerning cultural opposition. Moreover, this subchapter aims to highlight to what extent the institutional and normative reforms starting with 1989-1990 created the conditions for the legacies of the recent past, in general, to be addressed or not. Within the wider framework of preserving the legacies of GDR regime, this report highlights that not only socialist realism and propaganda belong to the GDR’s legacy, but also dissent and opposition which manifested in various ways in East German cultural life.

Therefore, providing a general overview of the conditions and eventually on what became (or did not become) heritage within the context of regime change in Germany is significant in order to better understand the contribution of the COURAGE project to expanding debates concerning the GDR’s legacies and its relevance for heritage preservation.

Consequently, this subchapter introduces conditions and actors that facilitated the preservation of cultural heritage associated with the GDR in general, from a longue duree perspective. Subsequently, within this framework, it will question the significance of cultural opposition and the conditions which facilitated its preservation.

The institutional framework and the normative conditions for preservation were set and revised by the socialist regime throughout its existence (1949-1990). Conditioned by geo-political, economic, administrative and cultural changes following the Second World War and the division of Berlin (1961), the SED regime engaged in processes of developing an administrative mechanism, as well as the institutionalisation and regulation of heritage preservation and its protection. This meant that a centralised state apparatus was created under the Ministries of Culture (1954) and the Interior (e.g. for the central archives administration). Cultural heritage became a matter of state, divided between local, regional and central authorities in Berlin, facilitating bureaucratisation of the preservation and protection of cultural heritage. This model was consolidated until the end of the regime.

In addition to the various local and regional levels of heritage administration and expert bodies, cultural heritage preservation became a field of interest among the public through various civic organisations or volunteers, among which were the Association for Culture (Deutsches Kulturbund) and the Society for Monument Preservation (1977) among others.

Hence one can identify that after the Second World War a complex institutional and administrative network was established, connecting state interest, experts and society at the local, central and regional levels, in order to ensure a comprehensive and uniform approach to heritage
preservation in the GDR. Nevertheless, a series of debates emerged regarding development of overarching approach to ensure the preservation of valuable museal and archival assets as well as those of libraries, together with built monuments, and movable assets such as works of art, museum collections, and documentary heritage. These eventually became subject to separate administrative and legislative priorities, and only during the 1980s were reconsidered.

As legislation became more comprehensive, the GDR regime contributed to the further elaboration and consolidation of such structures by adapting to the social, political and economic conditions in the country. The understanding of cultural heritage (Kulturelles Erbe) as a concept, evolved throughout the regime with the normative framework providing an overview on this matter (the Law of 1952\textsuperscript{20}, Decree of 1961\textsuperscript{21}, Law of 1975\textsuperscript{22}, Law of 1980\textsuperscript{23}).

All decrees and laws issued by the GDR (1952, 1961, 1975, and 1980) coined the conceptual understanding of heritage for possessing an historic, artistic, historic, and scientific value. These decrees and laws have contributed to the creation and and framing of a unitary and systematic approach towards heritage preservation in the GDR. Furthermore, the concept of cultural heritage (kulturelle Denkmale) possessed an overarching meaning by relating equally to both categories of movable and immovable objects. Denkmale were also considered movable assets preserved by national and local museums, collections, archives and libraries. These included works of arts, paintings, graphics and sculptures of exceptional significance, among others, and were protected by the regulations governing institutions that preserved them, such as the decree of 22.2.1951 concerning the reorganisation of the education system, and the implementing rule on scientific museums from 10.4.1953 (Ges. Bl.S.607). Additionally, the decree concerning the protection of ownership of arts and of scientific documents and materials, issued on the second of April 1953, introduced regulations concerning the export of protected cultural objects.\textsuperscript{24}

In comparison to the preservation norms governing built monuments, coherent laws concerning the preservation of museum artefacts as national heritage were elaborated relatively late starting only near the end of the 1970s, continuing throughout the 1980s. In April 1978, the regulation concerning the state museum’s fund was issued.\textsuperscript{25} Its main contribution was to guarantee the ‘registration, preservation, conservation, development, protection and use’ of all objects and collections held in trust by museums in the GDR.

The lack of a legal framework to encompass the preservation of both built monuments and movable assets was highlighted throughout the course of the regime, raising questions concerning the necessity for a comprehensive law to address the preservation and protection of material

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{20} Verordnung zur Erhaltung und Pflege der nationalen Kulturdenkmale vom 26. Juni 1952. In Gesetzblatt der DDR, nr. 84/1952.
\item \textsuperscript{21} Verordnung über die Pflege und den Schutz der Denkmale, Gbl. II, 23.Oct.1961, Nr.72, S.475.
\item \textsuperscript{22} Gbl.I/75, Nr.16, S.453.
\item \textsuperscript{23} Gesetz zum Schutz des Kulturgutes der Deutschen Demokratischen Republik vom 3. Juli 1980, GBL.I Nr.20
\item \textsuperscript{24} Hammer, Verordnung zum Schutze, 351.
\item \textsuperscript{25} Verordnung über den staatlichen Museumsfonds der Deutschen Demokratischen Republik- Museumsforschungsverordnung, GBL.I 1978, Nr.14, S.165.
\end{itemize}
cultural heritage in the GDR. This was proposed to include: monuments, museums, archives, libraries, and cultural artefacts in private ownership, as well as archeological remains.

It was only during the 1980s that the common law introduced the concept of ‘cultural goods’. This was aimed at both movable and immovable assets under a single legal framework.\textsuperscript{26} The main contribution of this law was referring to the intervention of the state concerning valuable assets independent of ownership, including state-owned, religious assets in addition to privately-owned cultural history or its achievements from being officially included in the GDR’s national heritage.

In summation, the normative framework introduced in the GDR did not only prioritise the centralisation of the administrative mechanisms to deal with heritage, but also elaborated the hierarchisation of the heritage, such as those items of national and international significance, to which also contemporary assets from the GDR period were considered for protection. Furthermore, comprehensive normative frameworks evolved towards addressing the preservation of contemporary GDR achievements including movable and immovable assets.

Heritage-making in the context of regime change in Central and Eastern Europe in 1989 was conditioned by a series of continuities and breaks with normative and institutional frameworks. In the case of Germany these added to the discourse on the significance of the regime’s legacy for processes of democratisation and reuniﬁcation.

Following the unity agreement between the GDR and the Federal Republic (31.08. 1990), the legislation and institutions of the former regime became obsolete. Eventually, these were transferred, transformed or discarded in the process of reuniﬁcation (03.10.1990). Thus, the centralised structures of the GDR were dismissed, and reformed institutions submitted to the Western German legislation, preventing an institutional and legal vacuum in the field of preservation, as experienced in Romania, for example. As a consequence, the basis for the functioning of the institutions contending with cultural heritage protection was laid, centred on the re-instated federal administrative system in (now) Eastern Germany.

Consequently, after German reuniﬁcation, new federal administrative structures adopted their own cultural heritage preservation laws which clearly addressed the built environment and movable assets separately. These developments ushered in major changes relating to the GDR’s conception of movable and immovable heritage. Here, one must make a distinction between what was already acknowledged as part of the GDR’s national heritage, and new processes set forth in the context of regime change, which led to a re-evaluation of the GDR’s legacies and the legitimisation of a ‘new heritage’.

The process of reuniﬁcation led to a revision and recontextualisation of the material legacy of the regime, however, the procedure encompassing the evaluation and selection of assets from the GDR and the identiﬁcation of a new heritage associated with the regime reﬂected predominantly the politics of discussing the GDR in the frame of an authoritarian regime.

\textsuperscript{26} Gesetz zum Schutz des Kulturgutes der Deutschen Demokratischen Republik vom 3. Juli 1980, GBL.I Nr.20
Besides the consolidation of institutional and normative frameworks at federal and state levels, the premises of heritage-making manifests itself in the active process of engaging with the past legacy so that one identifies and legitimises what is or is not necessary for conservation and preservation. However, this is conditioned by the context within which the significance of certain values and assets is legitimised. In addition to the institutional and normative transformations, as Boesler argues, the transformation of societal values is relevant in heritage preservation. As such, Boesler suggests that one can speak of an altered, albeit not necessarily wholesale change of certain values. The regime change in the GDR and Central and Eastern Europe after 1989 exposed societies to a re-assessing of the values from the past, as much as to a re-orientation towards new ‘democratic’ principles and values. Along with the new institutional and legal frameworks came a new heritage reflecting the values of the society, within which memorial politics attracted considerable attention, and strongly influenced the politics of preservation.

Therefore, one must question to what extent, in the context of regime change, a paradigm shift occurred extending the understanding of cultural heritage, and of the politics of preservation. In respect to the GDR’s past, after 1990, the focus was set on consolidating a discourse which predominantly depicted the GDR as a dictatorship. Thus the emergence of the ‘dissonant heritage’ (Tunbridge, Ashworth, 1996), ‘unbequeme Denkmale’ (Schmidt, 2008), ‘unerwünschtes Erbe’ (Steinkamp, 2008) associated with painful past events, trauma, and underlining negative characteristics from the past, have marked the manner in which one engaged with the legacy of the GDR regime from the 1990s on, to a certain extent, becoming the predominant frameworks within which the legacy of communism in CEE was addressed.

The regime change of 1989 and addressing the legacy of the past shared similarities with the processes encountered in societies in post-revolutionary times. In those contexts, important initiatives were taken, such as: reinstating commissions to evaluate what determines artistic and historic value, or even questioning the financial burden to retain or remove objects, and pursuit of their musealisation and archiving. As such, various assets from built monuments to museum artefacts, documentary material, and arts were subject to debate concerning their retention or dismissal. The newly constructed legal frameworks for the preservation of cultural heritage provided new provisions ensuring a clear division between movable and immovable heritage and its protection without any prioritisation, between national and local heritage. In place of hierarchical ordering and listing, inventories were introduced. A similar appreciation and procedure came about for movable assets which were registered in inventories of the respective institutions to which they have been entrusted, such as museums, collections, archives, libraries etc.

Germany’s reunification also meant overcoming cultural differences between East and West. As such the first parliamentary commissions (1992, 1996) made the preservation of cultural heritage

29 For more details see Demeter, Picking up the Pieces.
a matter of debate and interest for the state. Following the first parliamentary commission meetings, a report was issued addressing cultural heritage in a broader way. The report delivered an analysis on the role and contribution of cultural heritage in employing and promoting party ideology in the GDR.

It was only in 1996 that the second parliamentary commission addressed the condition of the arts in the transformation process after 1990. Particular attention was paid to state-commissioned art (Auftragskunst) and state agency. In addition, this commission extensively elaborated on the role of memorials and memorial culture in addressing abuses of the past regime. Despite the fact that it was only briefly addressed in the report, archiving the legacy of state-commissioned art was deemed worthy of pursuit, similar to monuments, graphic art, and commemorative plaques which undoubt- edly had a strong ‘political character’. The purpose was to prevent their destruction while at the same time also ensuring their accessibility as ‘historical testimonies’ to the GDR (historische Zeugnisse).  

According to the report, works of art produced during the GDR and state-commissioned art should be collected and preserved, as they are ‘significant testimonies for the contemporary history and for the artistic developments in divided Germany over the past 40 years.’ Also, the commission suggested that GDR state-commissioned art should be researched and evaluated for its particularities, and not limited only to appreciation as kitsch or political propaganda.

A further contribution of this commission was to address transformation processes affecting the arts in Eastern Germany after 1989, specifically, the impact reunification had upon the cultural policies of the former GDR, such as repealing all state-run cultural organisations, agencies, and galleries where ideological intervention in the production of culture was significant. The difficulties encountered by artists from the former GDR in establishing themselves in a liberal market defined system was highlighted. However, according to the report, a re-modernisation of GDR cultural structures was not foreseen.

Criticism raised by members of the former socialist party regarding the assessment of cultural production in the GDR delivered by the report was linked to the fact that it limited and focused on its ideological and political aspects by discussing commissioned art, state art and artists, without taking into account positive developments such as its dissident character or international orientation.

The substantial initiative of this commission was to develop and elaborate an overarching memorialisation programme (Gedenkstättekonzeption) supported by the federal government. Further, it set the conditions for a memory politics for dealing with the ‘two dictatorial pasts’, the Nazi and the Communist regimes.

31 Ibidem.
33 Ibid. 189.
34 Ibid. 226.
A further goal pursued by the parliamentary commission was the internationalisation of the memorialisation practices. Consequently, the commission engaged in promoting exchange and international networking. In particular, countries in Central and Eastern Europe were addressed that aspired to join European structures and pursued reform and democratisation. More precisely, it suggested a series of exchanges with foreign institutions, responsible for addressing the abuses of dictatorial regimes, such as the memorial Sighet in Romania.\textsuperscript{35} The international collaboration among memorial sites and museums in particular, and the development of educational projects have been considered essential steps in the process of addressing past abuses and coming to terms with the past.\textsuperscript{36}

Although the parliamentary commission addressed the GDR’s cultural heritage generally, there were a series of expert commissions which treated the fate of various categories of material culture associated with the GDR questioning their retention or dismissal. The expert commission called by the Senate for Urban Development in East Berlin in February 1992 provides one such example concerning its debates on the future preservation of the so-called ‘politische Denkmälern der Nachkriegszeit im ehemaligen Ost-Berlin’ (Post-war political monuments in former East Berlin) in Berlin’s public space.\textsuperscript{37} The expert’s commission was initiated alongside the parliamentary commission, while each of the eastern federal states was given autonomy to deal with such issues on their own terms and within the legal framework.

However, the built environment was not considered by the Berlin commissions. The preservation of the built environment was addressed nationally and internationally by numerous conferences, symposia, and expert meetings throughout the 1990s. The modification of the built heritage legislation of 1995 in Berlin, for example, created the legal condition for protection of contemporary modern architecture, despite political-ideological and aesthetic criticism that was initially voiced concerning the GDR’s architectural legacy.

The diversity of the legacy associated with the GDR regime that made the subject for preservation cannot be limited only to state-commissioned arts, public monuments and architecture. The complexity of the regime and its legacies must also be discussed in terms of opposition and dissent as they manifested variously in all cultural spheres.

In the aftermath of regime change, museums and their collections experienced the same fate as built monuments, namely: some were closed and replaced by new institutions committed to new legitimisation processes, or new private initiatives emerged. The handling of the museums and their collections, in addition to the acquisition policies of items from the GDR must be individually addressed. Some museums such as the German Historical Museum in Berlin for example not only inherited the collections of the defunct GDR Museum for German History, but also numerous works of art from GDR artists who either stood in opposition to the regime, or supported it. In addition, the museum acquired new artefacts associated with the GDR. In some cases, the

\textsuperscript{35} Ibid. 256.
\textsuperscript{36} Ibid. 257.
\textsuperscript{37} Staroste, “Politische Denkmäler in Ost-Berlin,” 7.
museum was approached by artists themselves, offering to purchase their art, such as the photography documentation by Jürgen Nagel and discussed by COURAGE. State museums which depicted the GDR under various themes from history to arts and everyday life, have predominantly adopted the same narrative, namely being committed to highlighting the criminal nature of the past regime. Nevertheless, themes of dissidence and cultural opposition emerged in various contexts. In addition, one must also note private initiatives that aimed at capturing either the history of the GDR, or adopted a critical stance towards museal developments in Eastern Germany, such as the Museum of Lies discussed by COURAGE.

In terms of normative frameworks that guarantee heritage protection for movable assets, including museum funds, an overarching law concerning the protection of cultural goods only entered into power in 2017. This introduced the concept of national cultural goods and aimed at governing the transfer of cultural goods abroad, which nevertheless met with strong criticism. Thus, a specifically tailored legal framework that addressed the handling of items in museums linked to the GDR and specifically to opposition and dissent was not adopted, as the legal provisions foresee that all museum objects enjoy the same protection status.

At the same time as the cultural goods law from 2017 was issued, a general governing legal framework for archives also came into being, seeking to deal with archives at the Bund level in terms of use and safeguarding, in addition to the respective Länder archival laws. By law, public access to state archival documentation is restricted for 30 years following its creation, except in the Länder of the former GDR, where archival records created before October 2, 1990, can be accessed without restrictions. The Länder laws task archives to manage governmental documentation and have a consultative role for public institutions on managing and keeping their records.

One of the major questions addressed by COURAGE is how and what records have been preserved not only in state institutions, but also which initiatives could be identified that go beyond state interests and testify to opposition and dissent in the GDR. More precisely, how and where can we trace records on the social, freedom, humanitarian and ecological movements, dissent, subversive arts scene in the GDR, among others?

State archives that preserved records on opposition and dissent were initially organised in order to preserve written documentation for the authorities, and individuals linked to various institutions or personalities that acquired public recognition or had scientific relevance. Among the most significant initiatives at the federal level that facilitated the preservation of cultural opposition documentation one has to note the holdings of the former Stasi currently in possession of the BStU. The law concerning Stasi documentation was passed by the German Bundestag in November

38 Gesetz zum Schutz von Kulturgut, KGSG, BGBl. I S. 872, 890. 13 April 2017
41 Ibid. 337.
42 Florath, “Wo liegen die Selbstzeugnisse der Opposition?.“
1991 and enabled wide access to archival documentation issued by the state’s surveillance mechanisms. This had the consequence of increasing public and private initiatives to trace and collect material that demonstrated not only the repression of the state and its surveillance, but also its monitoring of opposition and dissent.

However, according to the report issued by the Union of German Archivists from 2016⁴³, there was no state-mandated strategy to encourage and support archiving records, for instance, documenting social movements. Under such conditions the so-called ‘Freie Archive’ which aimed at preserving the documentation of opposition and dissident groups, in a manner apart from the classical understanding and functioning of state archives, assume a critical role.⁴⁴ According to the report, as of 2016, there are nearly 90 ‘free archives’ in Germany dedicated to the opposition, protest, and civic rights movements in the GDR. The diversity and size of the material preserved varies and is impressive, considering the amount of assets dedicated to social movements on hold by state-managed archives. These range from artwork, films, photos, posters, grey literature, samizdat, interviews, pressfiles, etc. The aim of these institutions is not to establish a new type of archive, but rather to record specific civil movements, regions, or subject areas. The status of such archives has been detailed by Bacia and Wenzel and will not be detailed here. However, according to the authors in comparison to the ‘free archives’ dedicated to social and political movements that likewise emerged in the West starting the 1960s, the Eastern German archives seem to be better positioned. The so-called ‘Aufarbeitung’ archives were set up after 1989 and received state funding which allowed them to engage in professional archival work. Among the most prominent archives dedicated to documenting civic movements in the GDR is the Archives of the GDR Opposition curated by the Robert Havemann Society in Berlin which has in the interim added various other collections applying to the heading of ‘opposition archives’ under its structure; the Civic Movement Archive in Leipzig and the Thuringian Archive for Contemporary History ‘Matthias Domashk’ in Jena. The history and development of such archives has been thoroughly studied and published.

However, not all free archives sought state support or aimed at carrying on archival work regulated according to normative frameworks of the state. These entities did not submit to state regulations, and instead follow their own practice of documenting, systematisation, and defining what is, or is not relevant for preservation. Some of these operate under constraints given the precarity of the working conditions, human capacities to sustain such archives, and inadequate financial resources. Moreover, the lack of a long-term strategy raises questions concerning the accessibility of their records, their sustainability and that of the records on hold.

Discussing the legacy of the GDR means also addressing the debate surrounding the complexity of relationships with the socialist regime and their shifts, by focusing particularly on the opposition and subversive forms of creation during the regime as part of a common heritage in Central and

---

⁴⁴ Bacia, Bewegung Bewahren.
Eastern Europe. Tracing and preserving such records is challenging and will be discussed based on the COURAGE collections in the following section.

3. Analysis of the Collections in the COURAGE Registry

3.1. Typology, Themes and Actors

The GDR collections included in COURAGE should not to be understood as the most significant manifestations of cultural opposition in the GDR, but rather a selection aimed at highlighting as much diversity within the phenomenon as possible, specifically as these represent initiatives which emerged owing to a desire to safeguard such collections, and are the result of positive collaboration with institutions which showed interest in sharing information with us.

We aimed at tracing the origins, processes, and actors who contributed to raising awareness concerning the significance of the included collections and took measures to ensure their safeguarding. This allowed us to address and highlight various and changing social, political and cultural contexts in which such collections emerged, operated and how their meaning and function developed over time. In addition, we sought to cover a great diversity of manifestations of cultural opposition from fine arts to music, literature, cinema, theatre, and social movements, among others. These highlight the complex relationship with the state, and the dynamics of cultural life, its shifting borders and the often-blurred lines between official and non-official engagement, refusal, co-option and opposition to the socialist regime. Ultimately, the selection of the collections for the GDR was motivated by the main objectives of the COURAGE project, namely, to document the diversity and wealth of cultural opposition in state socialist countries and to present their significance following the events of 1989.

The GDR chapter includes 24 collections, among which only one is an ad-hoc collection, meaning it is not preserved as a collection, but described as such owing to its characteristics. This is the photography collection of Jürgen Nagel, held by the German Historical Museum images’ archive. The themes most represented by the GDR section highlight the rich and diverse forms cultural opposition and its manifestation. These span from avant-garde arts, to alternative education, critical science, emigration, ethnic movements, film, music, human rights, independent journalism, minority movements, national movements, peace movements, philosophical movements, religious, samizdat, surveillance, visual and media arts, underground and popular culture, party dissidents, censorship, and student movements.

Given the rich manifestation and diversity of the material associated with the cultural opposition, we wanted our presentation of the initiatives which safeguard it to be equally manifold, spanning from private to public, from small state institutions to major institutions, from the local and regional levels to the federal, and those which are not only state archives. Moreover, we identified that cultural opposition manifested geographically and temporally across the GDR, and had various degrees of intensity and forms of manifestation. Thus, our geographical selection did
overemphasize Berlin, but aimed at covering various places from Dresden to Leipzig, Meißen, or Radebeul.

Apart from the diversity of regional and thematic representation, another key aspect which we identified is the generational context. For example, artistic means of production embraced during the 1970s were challenged by artists from the 1980s who had their own local specificities. Here, the collection of artist books preserved by the Saxon Regional-, State- and University Library Dresden (SLUB) which reflect a series of local conditions are key to mention. Changes in the conditions of the artists and their own reaction towards the cultural policies of the regime must likewise be taken into account from a longue durée perspective. Such an example has been provided to us by analysing the art collection of Roger Loewig, currently held by the Federal Foundation for the Reappraisal of the SED Dictatorship.

We laboured to identify best practice solutions for managing significant collections for the cultural opposition. In this respect, we addressed initiatives that benefit from sizable state support such the Federal Foundation for the Reappraisal of the SED Dictatorship, or BStU, which in addition to managing the documentation of the Stasi archives also operates a museum. These actively contribute to providing support to smaller initiatives and to organisations that emerged at first privately, yet also evolved towards institutionalisation of their collections, such as those on hold by the Archives of the GDR Opposition at the Robert Havemann Society and Civic Movement Archive in Leipzig. Even more, the example set by the BStU became a model for the safekeeping and securing of the archival holdings of the former secret police adopted by other post-socialist countries. One notices that despite the structure of the institutions, the revised cultural goods legislation of 2016 (updated in 2017) provided the basis upon which the collections of the Archives of the GDR Opposition have been included in 2017 on the national lists of cultural goods. Likewise, we shed light on private initiatives that hold collections, which nevertheless showcase difficulties in managing and preserving holdings that address cultural opposition, such as the Museum of Lies in Radebeul.

According to our data, most institutions holding collections for cultural opposition described in COURAGE were founded in the beginning of the 1990s. As mentioned earlier, we addressed the issue of continuity and change, aspects which impacted the outcome of many of these collections after 1989. By presenting the collection of artist books acquired by the Saxon Library already prior to 1989, we highlight the need to address the historical provenance and impact of institutional and normative changes not only after 1989, to better understand how these collections have been subsequently dealt with. This shows great potential for further research and highlights the rich variety of sources available for identifying the provenance of collections. Some collections were created already prior to 1989, although given different significance. In this particular case, we can
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better understand the complexity of the state institutions in handling cultural opposition prior to 1989, but also the change of their significance in the context of political developments.

Given the different typology and legal organisation of the institutions involved in addressing, preserving, and documenting cultural opposition in the GDR, the capacities for caring for such collections differ substantially. Over the course of the project, we addressed a wide variety of actors that currently maintain such collections. The most predominant covered by COURAGE were museums and educational institutions, followed by archives and foundations, libraries and unfortunately only few by private persons and communities. The collections identified by COURAGE are predominantly operated by institutions that receive government support and have been organised as associations, or public foundations. A limited number of collections are currently held in private hands, public trust or corporations. What we could identify nevertheless, in our specific cases, is the limited public and private collaboration in this direction, or the involvement of non-profit organisations. With a note on gender, according to our data, within institutions addressing cultural opposition we noticed a predominant female representation of over 70%.

These statistics are not representative for the entire phenomenon of cultural opposition in the GDR, but cover only a small sample discussed by COURAGE opening the potential for further research. Also, in terms of budget allocated to supporting such initiatives in CEE, Germany stands out as one of the countries which invests the largest amount of financial resources in supporting initiatives and institutions which address cultural opposition, in comparison to its CEE partners. Nevertheless, great differences have been noted in terms of funding and preservation capacities within Germany as well.
4. Conclusions and Recommendations

This report aimed at highlighting the contribution of COURAGE in addressing the legacy of the socialist regime in Germany and in particular, the topic of cultural opposition. By identifying various collections in private or public trust this report sought to highlight the significance to preserve the material and immaterial heritage of cultural opposition and dissent in Germany. By framing the debates concerning the relevance of the recent past in Germany and highlighting the normative and institutional setting, the significance of the preservation of legacies of the regime from a long duree perspective has been treated.

Alongside discourses on addressing the past, normative and institutional settings were influential in creating the conditions for preservation. Furthermore, public and private initiatives contributed to supporting initiatives in the research, communication, preservation, and conservation of legacies of the recent past. However, how various regions and institutions in the former GDR managed to address and preserve varies greatly, specifically concerning the legacy of cultural opposition.

Given the particular political situation encountered after 1989, the state played a central role in promoting and supporting policies to address the preservation of the regime’s legacies by pursuing the reunification of Germany and reinstating the federal system.

If these aimed, at the outset, to legitimise the reunification of Germany and democratisation processes, over the past thirty years, we have subsequently identified a greater diversity of initiatives in this direction involving public and private stakeholders seeking to address the complexity of the recent past. Furthermore, not only grassroots initiatives emerged, international cooperation was also further developed.

Therefore, several pillars should be considered when addressing a series of recommendations at national, European and stakeholder levels in order to overcome deficits and to improve the decision-making mechanism when dealing with the legacy of cultural opposition in Europe. Furthermore, these will highlight also best-practices in Germany which successfully contributed to ensuring the safeguarding of such legacies.

After a consultation with various stakeholders who manage holdings and records that testify to cultural opposition and dissent in Germany, we draw our final conclusions and recommendations, focusing on challenges and opportunities. These recommendations address issues including the sustainability of collections (funding, role of digitalisation), networking, carrying capacities (professionalisation), and audience development (youth involvement).

**Sustainability of Collections and Institutions: Funding**

Given the diversity and volume of assets associated with the legacy of the socialist regime, the financial responsibility for its preservation, conservation, interpretation, and communication is daunting. The new federal administrative structure in Germany sought to divide responsibility regionally among the Länder, yet given the weak economy in the (eastern) region(s) after 1989, at
first, state support was unavoidable in overcoming the massive institutional and normative reforms in the region. This ensured that no legal and institutional vacuum was generated and created central structures to address and deal with the legacies of the GDR, such as the BstU, and the Federal Foundation for the Study of Communist Dictatorship in East Germany (GDR). The latter eventually provided further support to grassroots initiatives which lacked substantial financial means to preserve various collections, such as the Civic Movement Archive in Leipzig, the Archives to the Opposition of the GDR, or the Thuringian Archive for Contemporary History “Matthias Domaschk”.

Although there are many more funding structures available in Germany in comparison to CEE countries, one notices the precarious and fragile financial stability of grassroots initiatives which often rely on project funding, sponsorship or donations in order to ensure their functioning. Furthermore, initiatives which do not perpetuate the state narrative concerning the meaning and significance of the regime in the current political landscape of Germany, tend to fail to ensure their long-term financial stability (i.e. the Museum of Lies in Radebeul).

Also, as COURAGE has demonstrated, the legacy of cultural opposition is encountered in various forms, from archival documentation to art objects, to installations, film and photography, music, etc. Thus, the preservation of such diverse material falls under the legislation and competences governed by various institutions or initiatives, public and private, with different funding structures. Funding for such assets often faces the same impediment, namely the lack of long-term strategies for ensuring the necessary resources for their preservation and facilitating accessibility. Also, one notices that distinguishing between the funding support provided to institutions per se, and for the collections itself is often not defined clearly. Given the fact that project-based funding schemes have grown to become the most common means to ensure financial support for various initiatives, these are unfortunately time constrained.

In this respect, a consistent and long-term financial plan which complements state support (or its absence) for grassroots initiatives is welcome, in order to overcome establishment of a dominant narrative but also to encourage a plurality and diversity of initiatives for the preservation of the legacies from the recent past.

Here too, promoting and encouraging the funding of projects that promote cultural opposition is another means which could support various issues linked to the topic, such as education, preservation, conservation, interpretation or dissemination. Assistance in elaborating such projects and training could enable institutions that lack the capacities to manage projects or complete applications to secure additional funding.

*Sustainability of Collections: The role of digitalisation*

Linked to the issue of funding, the sustainability of such collections is a key aspect to be taken into consideration. This is connected not only to the institutional and financial sustainability of a collection, but also the items themselves. Digitalisation has received a great amount of attention and numerous projects have been carried out to facilitate the digitalisation of collections or
various items. These allow instant and remote access, even though their use can be limited due to copyright and user fees. Indeed, digitalisation seeks to ensure greater public access to the collections, yet beyond the emerging opportunities, major challenges exist given the rapid technological shift and costs linked to its maintenance, skills (software complexities), and support.

Therefore, digitalisation has proven to be a major financial investment, but nevertheless, it provides a series of solutions to increase the accessibility to information and items. However, digitalisation cannot be considered an alternative to preservation, but a supplemental one which further increases financial pressures. Also, copyright issues present greater challenges and restrictions following the adoption of the new EU regulation limiting wider accessibility of information.

**Networking**

Cultural opposition cannot be studied only locally and our research has highlighted numerous connections between its proponents. Given the transnational significance of the topic, the exchange between various actors internationally is encouraged. Major state-funded institutions actively engage in such exchanges, however, at the local level one notices that smaller institutions or individuals have benefited less. This is conditioned partly on the lack of capacities and funding. These often tend to address local phenomenon, linked to local histories. Therefore, encouraging and supporting local communities and individuals to share their knowledge, and encouraging public and private cooperation, can prove a solution. This can ensure a more encompassing and diverse approach to the recent past. Also, facilitating extensive exchange between the initiatives emergent not reliant on state support should be encouraged and supported.

**Carrying Capacities: Professionalisation**

Preservation of the past is a matter of concern not only for the present but raises challenges for the future. The rapid technological changes, unstable political climate, high diversity and the state of the conservation of assets associated with the topic of cultural opposition raise a series of challenges for their adequate safeguarding. Moreover, additional difficulties have arisen in the context of private initiatives which lack the means and knowledge to handle such collections. These often require expert knowledge and are subject to interdisciplinary approaches. We have noticed that throughout the past significant collections set up by various private initiatives emerged or evolved towards institutionalisation. This necessitated a professionalisation of the individuals involved in these initiatives and of the tasks necessary to ensure the safeguarding of such legacies. Nevertheless, promoting interdisciplinarity can unlock innovative approaches to better enhance the significance of the collections dealing with cultural opposition.

**Audience development: Youth involvement**

Preservation of the legacies of the recent past is to be addressed not only in the present, but long-term. For this, reaching out and ensuring a more active involvement of young generations and facilitating the generational exchange of knowledge, must be addressed. Thus, digitalisation is not
the only means of raising awareness among youth. Moreover, facilitating the acquisition of knowledge in the thematic area and promoting critical thinking, in addition to acquiring new technological skills, are essential to better understand the nuances of authoritarian forms of governance and the means of expressing opposition.
Summary

This report begins by providing the reader with an introduction to the context and state of the arts concerning research on cultural opposition and dissent in Germany. By framing the debates concerning the relevance of the recent past in Germany and highlighting the normative and institutional setting, the significance of the collections in addressing the preservation of the legacies of the regime from a long durée perspective is discussed.

Moreover, the report aims to provide a more thorough and broader understanding of the conditions which facilitated the preservation of the legacies associated with the GDR. Consequently, by also including dissent and opposition, the need to expand debates concerning heritage preservation and the legacies of the GDR is revealed. Moreover, the report identifies that, in addition to the discourses which addressed the significance of the past, the normative framework and institutions are to thank for creating the conditions which allowed assets testifying to dissent and opposition in the GDR to be safeguarded and preserved.

The significance for the preservation of heritage associated with opposition and dissent during the GDR is discussed based on the collections identified by COURAGE. By delivering an overview of the actors, themes, and typologies of assets, the potential of the topic to expand discourses on the material legacy of the GDR and its significance for preservation is highlighted.

Finally, this text concludes by offering recommendations on how to further proceed with such assets at local, national and European levels, focusing on both challenges and opportunities. Various solutions to improve decision-making mechanisms by focusing on the sustainability of the collections and institutions (funding, digitalisation), network and carrying capacities, and audience development with a focus on youth involvement are suggested.

With an outlook on the future, ensuring the financial sustainability of a plurality of institutions and collections ranks highest among the recommendations which this research has produced. Furthermore, supporting and promoting international exchange is a must given the transnational significance of the topic. In this sense grassroots initiatives require greater backing. Digitalisation is likewise discussed as an important tool to facilitate access to information and items, but also as a challenge proving that its implementation alone cannot be understood as a silver bullet, but that additional means to secure and access information are also required. Knowledge transfer and supporting interdisciplinarity are essential to further ensure youth involvement as a guarantee of long term preservation for the material legacy of the GDR.
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List of Collections
Archive Citizens Movement of Environmental Library Grosshennersdorf
Archive of the GDR-Opposition at the Robert Havemann Society
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Federal Commissioner for the Records of the State Security Service of the former German Democratic Republic (BStU)
Federal Government Commissioner for Culture and the Media
Foundation Poster EAST
The Foundation for Culture and Environment Leipzig
German Federal Cultural Foundation
German Lottery Foundation Berlin
German Historical Museum
Humboldt-University Berlin
Institute for German Literature at the Humboldt-University Berlin
Kooperative Berlin
Museum of Lies
Neubrandenburg Literary Center
OSTKREUZ Agency of Photographers
Regional Commissioner for the Documents of the State Security of the former GDR
Roger Loewig Association
Union for the Theatre Producers in the GDR
The Saxon Regional, State and University Library Dresden
Robert-Havemann-Society
Song and Social Movements Association
Substitut Agency
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Geipel, Ines
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Jahn, Roland
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Krolkiewicz, Ralf-Günter
Krone, Tina
Loest, Erich
Loewig, Roger
Lokatis, Siegfried
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Müller, Heiner
Nagel, Jürgen
Paul, Saskia
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