

Introduction

German Division as Shared Experience

Erica Carter, Jan Palmowski and Katrin Schreiter

In 1988, the Stasi clandestinely recorded a conversation between two loyal socialists, Fred Müller, Director of East Berlin's International Press Centre, and Heinz Felfe, arguably the KGB's most famous spy in 1950s Bonn.

Felfe: I was in Lusitania and couldn't get hold of sauerkraut. They say that deliveries go to Berlin first, then to the district capitals. We get the leftovers. But try shopping in West Berlin: all the shops are full! oranges, bananas, peaches

Müller: Just what I've always said! I've been crossing the border for twenty years now. If you go to the market in any small or medium-sized town, they have everything.

Felfe: My wife has seen fruit that she had never even heard of: nectarines, avocatoes [sic] ... And the traffic on the *Kurfürstendamm*, heavy traffic: it runs, it hums, no noise, no two-stroke engines, no broken exhaust pipes, Then back to the lousy border: ... nothing but greyness, drabness.¹

This brief exchange from the late 1980s speaks volumes about the dissatisfaction of many East Germans with the conditions of everyday life. It also reproduces narrative tropes that became pervasive after 1989 in accounts of life across the German-German divide. The conversation contrasts the turgid grey of the GDR with the bright colours of the *Kurfürstendamm*. It juxtaposes the tastes and smells of the West with the 'leftover' sensations of Germany's eastern half; and it makes of West Berlin a throbbing soundscape that drowns the stuttering put-put of the GDR two-stroke.

The West, then, is plenitude, abundance, fullness, the East a place of scarcity and sensory lack. This divided image of the sensory pleasures and unpleasures of life across the German-German border fuelled, as is well known, a post-1989 'Ostalgia' wave in German popular culture.² In post-*Wende* German heritage culture, consumer objects and practices became sites for an idealized memorialization of divided sociopolitical identities. East German consumer goods and cultural artifacts – food brands, TV shows, cars, traffic light insignia (the GDR *Ampelmann*) clothing, films – became the retrostyle avatars for a GDR way of life that was both repudiated, and somehow also nostalgically missed.³ Controversies over the meaning of GDR heritage came to one kind of head in 2006. That year saw the publication of the Sabrow report, a public commission headed by the historian Martin Sabrow, whose recommendation that the public memory of the GDR focus, amongst others, on the everyday triggered public controversy amidst claims that it would constitute a memory of the GDR 'lite'.⁴ Beneath the noise caused by this debate, 2006 also saw the opening of the private Berlin GDR Museum, criticized in its early years for preserving the GDR in its status as the 'other' Germany: an irredeemably foreign rump state whose idiosyncracies might be charming, but whose history was at best a museum attraction, and one radically divorced from the political realities of the postwar FRG.⁵

Historical scholarship also emphasized for many years the 'peculiarities' of GDR 'life', seeing it as set apart from the processes of democratization and consumerization, or the social and political tensions of the 1960s and 1970s that so affected the FRG. This view of the GDR as *sui generis* in the context of German history gained plausibility from the GDR specificity of state machinations via the Stasi, of mass organizations like the Free German Youth, or of consumer goods shortages, none of which had parallels in West Germany. Attempts to understand each German state in its distinctiveness seemed of particular significance for the GDR, which in 1990 presented itself as a *terra incognita* to historians (notwithstanding the quality of GDR scholarship in the political sciences up until that point).⁶ Social historians used such notions as the 'bounded dictatorship' (Jessen and Bessel) or the 'welfare dictatorship' (Jarausch) to capture the specificity of GDR society, and the conjoining of an authoritarian political system with varying levels of social and civic participation.

Yet more recently, historians have also posed questions about the many interconnections between the histories of the two Germanies.⁷ Even scholars working within the relatively distinctive historiographies of East and West Germany have recognized an East-West commonality in the key postwar challenges confronting all Germans. Both states struggled to reintegrate displaced populations, to mend the ruptures of exile, to rebuild

flattened cities, to mend family and kinship relations while meeting new demands for gender equality, or to come to terms with a substantial Cold War foreign military presence.⁸ Cross-border relationships amongst families, friends, political allies, or later, subcultural communities and cross-border social movements – environmentalism, feminism, third world politics, the peace movement – also cut across the German-German border, building on older links, or forging new connections across Cold War divides.

Though the scholarship on this entangled binational history remains in its infancy, historians have certainly made headway with new approaches to what Christoph Kleßmann has called the ‘asymmetrical parallel history’ of the two postwar Germanies.⁹ The proposal that historians explore the ‘divided’ but ‘not disconnected’ history (Lindenberger) of the two postwar German states finds resonance across a broad field of current historical research, including, as Frank Bösch has noted, ‘energy and environmental history ... the history of consumption, sports history, the history of medicine ... media history [or] global history’.¹⁰ Fruitful studies by Eli Rubin, Katherine Pence, Judd Stitzel and others have shown how consumption functioned as a site where both asymmetry and connectivity between the two Germanies played out. Without denying that GDR consumers, within the socialist planned economy, shared many experiences with citizens in other socialist states,¹¹ this work has shown how GDR consumer desires were shaped in close reference to West Germany.¹² Other historians have suggested that the failure to fulfill these desires chipped away at the foundations of the legitimacy of socialism in the GDR state.¹³ The Federal Republic, from this perspective, functioned as a society of reference for GDR citizens, who at the same time developed their own strategies to achieve happiness within their means.

West Germany, of course, mattered for consumer behaviours in the GDR in ways that was simply not the case in reverse. It is no accident that the West German historiography of consumption has been less concerned with German-German relations, focussing instead on the transatlantic and transnational forces that shaped the FRG’s postwar consumer economy. As early as the early 1990s, studies were emerging that explored the embedding of the Federal Republic, through consumption, in western liberalism. West Germany’s economic success inspired histories of the ‘German Model’ of ordoliberalism, with its distinctive social market approach to state, industry and consumer relations, as well as its attention to gendered consumption as a structuring force for economic development.¹⁴ This emphasis on ‘westernized’ or ‘Americanized’ economic and consumer models deflected attention from the GDR as West Germany’s significant other, and highlighted instead West Germany’s relations with

its western European neighbours and transatlantic partners, especially, though not exclusively, the USA.¹⁵

The picture in social, cultural or political history is arguably less clearly divided. Social historians have highlighted the need to ‘break out of the strait-jacket of parallel stories’, and to emphasize instead the similar problems faced by both Germanies, even while each found different solutions in line with their ideological bent and geopolitical dependencies.¹⁶ Studies of history and memory have also explored similarities in Germans’ dealings with the Nazi past, even if the two populations addressed that shared history in very different environments.¹⁷ Political historians have shown increasing interest in cross-border relations within a politics of national division. There is for instance a growing body of work on Willy Brandt’s *Ostpolitik*, the NATO double-track decision in the 1980s, and Stasi infiltration into the political and economic institutions of the FRG.¹⁸ Further important scholarship explores the interconnectedness of the two Germanies in the realm of culture. Uta Poiger’s early research on jazz culture in East and West set an important standard, showing how both parts of Germany were influenced, albeit differently, by American jazz.¹⁹ Even here, however, the ‘West’ remained the society of reference for the East, in contrast to sport, which was a rare field of genuine exchange, competition and mutual reference. As Uta Balbier has shown, the GDR’s athletic prowess made of competitive sports one arena where West Germans were as eager to learn from the GDR as vice versa.²⁰

Yet such perspectives still remain the exception. The necessary distinction between a GDR society shaped by authoritarian state structures, and an FRG counterpart deeply entangled with western capitalism and a liberal international order, continues to present problems for historians seeking to identify commonalities across the German-German border. It is to these problems that the present volume is addressed. *German Division as Shared Experience* draws on, and seeks to supplement with a German-German perspective, a body of historical work that suggests lived experience as a route to understanding the relation between politics and power. That relation, this volume proposes, was one that was in part negotiated in the postwar period, both internally within each German state, and across the boundaries between them, at the level of everyday social relations and aesthetic practice. The volume takes its cue in the first instance from GDR history, which has been pioneering in a field that explores from an everyday perspective the broad range of human emotions, behaviours and sensibilities that colour the relation of individuals and communities to structures of power.²¹ As the East German author Kerstin Hensel puts it: ‘Every individual had a life-story, not a preliminary one, but one lived over decades ... history can neither be reconstructed nor come to terms

with. It can only be grasped through the everyday'.²² Hensel's insight is confirmed by histories whose exploration of the everyday offers a rich understanding of how socialism shaped individual assumptions of the private;²³ how state planning affected individual experience and identity;²⁴ how the tenacity of the GDR state system might be explained by studying its citizens' 'subjectivities, values, beliefs and mentalities';²⁵ and how the Party's desire for control affected personal attitudes towards sexuality and the body.²⁶

There have, admittedly, been concerns that an emphasis on individual everyday experience may deliver a rose-tinted view of GDR-history that glosses over the state's repressive instruments,²⁷ even while fulfilling popular desires to remember the past.²⁸ In an effort to counter the danger of history as nostalgia, GDR history has turned for one conceptual anchor to the historian Alf Lüdtke, as well as to other histories that Lüdtke's writing has inspired. There are important affinities between Lüdtke's approach and the work of fellow oral historians including Dorothee Wierling, Alexander von Platho and Lutz Niethammer, whose 1980s studies focused on working-class histories of East and West.²⁹ Nonetheless, it is Lüdtke's work that has been especially influential in GDR historiography, and indeed for historians exploring other authoritarian regimes, including the Soviet Union and Nazi Germany.³⁰ Central to Lüdtke's approach is his notion of *Eigensinn*, which explores the relationship between political domination and social action through a close-up look at individual action, signals and meanings. For Lüdtke, there is a 'disjunction' between formal politics, and acts of negotiating and appropriating socio-political structures and relations. In the social gestures of *Eigensinn* – which translates literally as obduracy or obstinacy – that disjunction is articulated through acts of recalcitrance, 'spontaneous self-will', or 'prankish, stylized, misanthropic distancing from ... constraints'.³¹ Lüdtke's historical-anthropological approach shares with early subcultural studies in the Anglophone tradition, as well as with Chicago School urban sociology, the anthropological 'thick description' of Clifford Geertz, or the phenomenology of Georg Simmel or Michel de Certeau, a focus on the everyday as a locus of human agency. But his work also privileges, and has inspired a number of further studies that trace, both the deep contours of power within everyday life, and the 'obstinate' behaviours that signal a 'reappropriation' by individuals and groups of a 'world' or a 'society' which otherwise presents itself in the form of external interest or constraint.³²

By examining closely the meanderings of the individual away from the lofty summits of political history, everyday history has made it possible to understand how power is transmitted, transformed and evaded, and thus – crucially for the present volume – to reveal the gap between structural

histories of state socialism or liberal democracy, and the ambiguous realities of politics as they are lived on the ground.³³ To be sure, for the GDR context, marked by stark power imbalances that could not be articulated and negotiated openly, Lüdtke's work has offered particularly powerful ways of reading between the lines of official GDR documents, examining carefully the social practices beneath citizens' public acts, and uncovering the contrast between lived experience and memory. This approach poses important questions, however, regarding heuristic value, the specific question being how *Eigensinn* and everyday history can be fruitfully applied to West Germany, or to cross-border flows between East and West. A key issue here is how to conceptualize the ground of the everyday as a field of social action. For Lüdtke, the practice of *Eigensinn* relates to an individual experience (*Erfahrung*) of social agency. Andrew Bergerson, Leonard Schmieding and others have used that insight to offer perspectives on German history that approach the shifting relations between centre and periphery through stories of everyday lives from the ground up. The lives of Germans, they have argued, have been determined by rupture, and by a concomitant process of making sense and meaning within life worlds determined by extrinsic structure and agency.³⁴ These authors' emphasis on power that becomes effective through individuals' self-authorization, dissociates power's exercise from a particular ideological or political context and shows how everyday history might in principle provide an important lens for the study of German history across East and West.

Lüdtke himself, while his work has focused on unsettling easy binaries between domination and the apparently powerless, has also noted that everyday history can be applied in any context to alert historians to the physicality of their human subjects' existence, their subjective experiences, their sociabilities, their anxieties and aspirations, and their 'shifting involvements' (Hirschman).³⁵ Studies of the 'situational', the (literally) concrete settings of individuals, are already producing fruitful new perspectives, as shown by Eli Rubin's examination of the impact of the built environment of the Berlin suburb of Marzahn on the memories and sensibilities (through sight, sound and smell) of their residents.³⁶ A focus on the situatedness of human subjects within the time and space of the everyday requires, however, a careful awareness of the social and political structures within which their actions unfold, and the cultural meanings of contexts and actions. A key challenge, then, is to develop an analysis of 'historically formed and historically shaping actions, insights and perceptions in their culturally specific entanglements, differences, ruptures and commonalities'.³⁷ Such a perspective cannot focus solely on human action in systems characterized by great imbalances of power, but it has to ask

precisely how actions, symbols and ideas are transmitted across different social, political and cultural divides.

This question, which has become of growing interest to historians of postwar Europe, also fuels this volume's search for a rearticulated focus on the everyday that might offer a better understanding of German history across the East-West divide. Some cultural histories have already offered potential frameworks for comparative or transnational studies. Rana Mitter and Patrick Major's 2004 comparative sociocultural history of the Cold War allots to popular cultural industries and forms 'across the blocs' an important role in shaping both shared and divided modes of 'mass experience'. Mitter and Major coin the oxymoronic, but heuristically rich term 'mirror opposite' for the relations of simultaneous affinity and difference that shaped Cold War sociocultural relations.³⁸ They also argue persuasively for the value of cultural history in mapping East-West interrelations. But if culture is an important starting point, there is a need also for careful scrutiny of questions of method. Mitter and Major identify social histories, alongside anthropologies of everyday culture, as the dual methodological pillars on which their 'home front' Cold War history rests. Clifford Geertz is cited as one of many possible sources for an understanding of culture as 'interworked systems of construable signs'.³⁹ Culture, then, is located here in the field of symbolic representations and practices, which are seen in turn to be productive of individual and social subjectivities, as well as structures of feeling and experience across and between nations or supranational blocs.

Our book aims to take further this exploration of culture and the everyday within and across the inner German border. The volume seeks to energize cross-disciplinary debate, further probing Major and Mitter's history of 'mirror opposites' by bringing together scholars working not only in history and anthropology, but also in art history, cultural, literary, media and visual culture studies. The shared aim of the volume's contributors is to examine how approaches from the perspective of the everyday might further illuminate the history of shared but divided belonging that shaped the two postwar German states. The common perception of chapters in the collection is that individuals and communities are actively involved, through their own idiosyncratic (or 'obstinate' – *eigensinnig*) modes of linguistic, narrative, poetic or performative cultural production, in shaping their relation to larger political and social formations – in this case, the two postwar Germanies. This will come as no surprise either to historians of *Alltagsgeschichte*, or to practitioners of cultural studies. But the focus of all the volume's contributors on questions of cross-border belonging will, we hope, contribute a new perspective on the place of cultural practice – which we understand in the broadest sense, as the production of oral and

written language, image, sound, or performance, as well as practices of reading, viewing, tasting, touching, smelling – in shaping shared experiences of socio-political community in a divided Germany.

Volume Overview: Methods and Approaches

This methodological concern with capturing in a new way the idea of *Eigensinn* and moving beyond it for a cross-disciplinary exploration of experience in postwar Germany was the subject of intense discussions that began with a departmental seminar series at King's College London in 2012, and continued with a conference at King's College London in 2014, as well as the US German Studies Association Conference in Washington DC in 2015. Those events were the starting point for the interdisciplinary dialogue that threads its way through the book. Emerging from these cross-disciplinary conversations is no single methodology or theory. To generate such a unified approach was neither heuristically desirable nor feasible in our view. Instead, our discussions on research and method (including the consideration of key framing texts) yielded multiperspectival approaches articulated from multiple disciplinary standpoints. This perspective has guided our approach to this volume and its contributions, and we believe – and set out to show in the overview of those approaches presented below – that our approach to postwar German experience in the everyday is all the richer for that heterogeneity. It allows historical methods that develop in specific relation to objects, artifacts, events, collective and individual cultural practices, and thus reflect the ontological complexity of the historical ensembles that shape everyday experience.

At the same time, the volume's eleven chapters, generated as they are in part in response to shared readings and collective debate, converge in their methods and approaches around a series of distinct concerns. The first relates to questions of narrative. In numerous contributions to this volume, narrative form figures as a site of intersection between macro-histories of political division, and the experiences of social actors negotiating those histories within quotidian life. Historians across a range of fields have regularly explored the role of narrative – whether as oral narration, prose fiction, life-writing, or indeed historical scholarship⁴⁰ – in shaping both social experience and its recorded, remembered, fictional or fantasized histories. Narrative 'grammar', as well as the 'larger conventions of discourse'⁴¹ to which storytelling adheres, make of narrative a communicative mode that is at once ineffably individual (no two stories are ever quite the same), and necessarily collective. Even avant-garde literary narration, or in everyday speech, the fantastical or nonsensical stories

of children and eccentrics, either adhere to the conventions of what the Russian formalists termed *fabula* (the basic story material) and *syuzhet* (the story's organization in space and time), or retain those conventions as a common point of reference against which to pitch more playful or experimental forms.⁴² That narrative form has a normative status not only in cultural production, but in broader social relations, is confirmed by the long-standing equation of narrative disorder with social marginality or outsider status. Thus in mental illness for instance, 'narrative disruption' – the inability to tell coherent stories – is one diagnostic marker for a mental state seen to place patients beyond the bounds of ordinary social life. In psychosis particularly, a loss of narrative frameworks produces a collapse of that sense of progressive time, bounded space, or coherent self-other relations, which is the stuff both of cohesive life stories and of effective communication amongst individuals or larger social groups.⁴³

Conversely, as Jan Palmowski shows in his chapter below on GDR television, fictional narrative enters the daily life of so-called ordinary people – here, GDR TV viewers – as a means both of individual and collective meaning-making, and of a spatio-temporal and affective ordering of social reality. In the GDR, Palmowski contends, television was a 'central reference point of social and cultural communication', and played a key role therefore in forging 'socialist ways of living and ... feeling'. In his account, narrative form features as a means of regulating everyday contingencies, giving form and meaning to experienced events, but also managing everyday life's unforeseen or uncanny elements by locating them in the time and space of familiar stories. Palmowski's focus in particular is on the temporality of television narratives, and on the subjunctive mood ('what might have been, or what might yet transpire if ...') as a means of containing both the melancholy of lost utopias (which might include the utopia of a grass-roots democratic socialism), and the subjective as well as social instability induced by imagined alternative futures.

While Palmowski's chapter, then, explores institutionally generated narrative as a means of organizing and containing an unruly popular imaginary (an ultimately failed project in GDR television, as Palmowski also shows), Heidi Armbruster considers autobiographical narration in oral testimony as a means of self-positioning within social and historical discourses of belonging. The assumption by the everyday historians of the 1970s and 1980s that history was made in 'microhistorical moments of interaction' produced what Sarah Maza has termed a return 'with a vengeance' of storytelling, both as source and method, to the historical disciplines.⁴⁴ Armbruster shows the value of the pluralist method for evaluating storytelling in everyday history. The first of several chapters focusing on migrant groups – here, white German post-1945 immigrants to the

former German settler colony of Namibia – Armbruster’s contribution draws on socio-linguistic accounts of ‘positioning’ as a form of ‘relational work’ performed by storytelling to show how stories of being ‘German’ amongst this white minority expatriate group function as ‘ambiguous narrative act[s] of racial and historical self-positioning’ in the postcolonial context of post-independence Namibia.

While Armbruster’s anthropological and sociolinguistic approach reveals storytelling as a mode through which social actors (including herself as researcher) locate themselves in historical relations of space, time and micropolitical power, Katharina Karcher’s reading of autobiographical writings produced by Red Army Faction (RAF) member Inge Viett during a five-year prison sojourn from 1992 to 1997 shows Viett using similar narrative acts of self-positioning to locate herself within German history as the story of ‘an ongoing revolutionary struggle against fascism and for a socialist society’. Without defending Viett’s commitment to revolutionary violence, Karcher explores her life-writing as an interventionist communicative act that ‘stubbornly’ (*eigensinnig*) resists absorption into established postwar historical narratives. Particularly significant for Karcher is Viett’s dual life as a revolutionary activist on both sides of the German-German border, as Karcher shows how Viett created spaces of *Eigensinn* that defied conformity or resistance, through practices better described as footdragging to maximize her own desires. Charting Viett’s account of a life lived underground between the two Germanies, Karcher shows how, despite its political ‘peculiarities’, her case illustrates the part played by self-narration in generating or refiguring Cold War subjectivities.

Karcher’s argument that autobiographical narratives from Cold War Germany involve the narrator in a necessary positioning ‘towards the other [Germany] and the relationship between both’ has purchase, moreover, not only on such radically politicized subjects as Viett. In subsequent chapters on, respectively, oral histories from villagers living at some distance from the border, in Saxony and Baden-Württemberg, and German-language short prose by migrant writers, Marcel Thomas and Áine McMurtry show how national belonging was shaped after 1949 by a cross-border or transnational imaginary, whether in the West German imagination of the GDR as a structural absence (Thomas), or in migrant imaginings of the inner German border as a symbolic cipher for other forms of spatial fracture between *Heimat* and *Fremde* (McMurtry).

That the inner German border shaped German imaginations and everyday experiences is hardly surprising, nor is a recognition that Germany’s division was created through social practices on both sides of the border, beyond the physical separation that it most tangibly produced. There is

now a rich literature on inner German border communities that demonstrates how social practices on both sides of the border gave it meaning and effect.⁴⁵ Yet, curiously, historians still have only a partial understanding of how the division affected cultural meanings and sensitivities beyond these communities, in the contexts of the everyday. Here again, this volume's cross-disciplinary investigations yield helpful insights. Thomas follows Michael de Certeau in searching within his interviews for evidence of the 'spatial practices' that defined his subjects' relation to German division. Unlike Inge Viett, who uses written narrative to insert herself temporally as the active agent of a (failed) history of revolutionary progression, Thomas's interviewees use spatial markers in oral narration to locate their personal stories within the political history of the German Cold War. While his West German respondents thus obliterate the GDR as a quotidian presence by locating it narratively in a distant elsewhere, his GDR villagers tell stories that are haunted by the Federal Republic as an ever-present site of longing. Here too, however, narrative constructions of the FRG as a distant and unattainable space help Thomas's GDR subjects to manage the melancholy of spatial division, either through the stress they place on their geographical distance from the East-West border (rural Saxon Neukirch is described by one interviewee with a degree of approbation as 'far away from it all [*weit ab vom Schuss*]'), or by repudiation: 'a rather forced narrative of lacking knowledge about the West'.

Thomas's oral history of Germans living at some distance from the border shows, then, how the absence of the frontier's physical presence intensifies the capacity of narrative form to shape an imagined affective geography of divided Germany. His chapter also highlights a second common thread uniting contributions to this volume, namely their shared understanding of form (in Thomas's case, forms of narrative) as a material force within both everyday and macro-political history. In recent media, cultural and literary theory, cultural form figures not simply as a vector of symbolic meaning and value, but as a vehicle for what the literary historian and theorist Caroline Levine terms 'the ordering of bodies and spaces, hierarchies and narratives, containments and exclusions'.⁴⁶ Developing insights from Foucault on the 'organisations and arrangements' through which power works at the micro-level of lived culture, Levine extends Foucault's linguistically-influenced understanding of form as discourse, presenting form instead as a larger category of 'shapes and configurations ... ordering principles, patterns of repetition and difference' that are simultaneously aesthetic and social, and that thus shape social perceptions of the material world.

Levine's political aesthetics of social form is distinguished both from Foucauldian accounts of discourse, and from classical narratology in

its emphasis on what are termed the 'affordances' of form. Deriving from design and material culture theory, Levine's notion of affordance describes the 'potential uses or actions latent in materials or designs': thus glass 'affords' transparency and brittleness, steel 'affords' strength, smoothness and durability, straw by contrast 'affords' a desiccated warmth coupled with bristle and fragility, and so on.⁴⁷ This account of form begins to move cultural analysis towards an understanding of form as productive of specific modes of embodied historical experience.⁴⁸ The affordances of narrative, for instance, include, as Palmowski, Armbruster and Thomas show, its capacity for spatio-temporal positioning. Narrative locates not only its stories' protagonists, but also speakers, writers, readers and audiences within specific historical temporalities and spaces: in Palmowski's case, the subjunctive temporality of West German television, in Armbruster's and Thomas's, the stretched space of cross-border belonging experienced by German expatriates in Namibia, and, albeit differently, by Thomas's hinterland citizens of a divided postwar state. But narrative also has affordances that are significant in other ways for storytelling across borders. Narrative form is structured by the tension between what narratology calls 'disruption' – the experience of conflict between opposing forces that triggers new storylines; sequentiality – the ordering of events through time; and equilibrium – the opening state of expectant inertia that precedes the story's unfolding, or the closure that remains part of narrative convention, however much it may have been challenged by modernist or postmodern modes of narrative fragmentation and textual bricolage.

The tension between narrative disruption and closure, or stasis, reveals within narrative – as indeed in any form – affordances that are potentially in a state of mutual conflict. That these conflicting affordances can generate contestation of social and political arrangements is evident below in three chapters on dissident forms that contest the border narratives of a divided Germany. In Levine's understanding of form, narrative, by virtue of its drive towards closure, becomes a subset of what she terms 'bounded wholes': aesthetic but also social totalities whose contradictory 'affordances' include, first, the containment or, at worst, imprisonment within their borders of imagined and actual social actors; second, the drive to exclude those who do not belong; and third, more alluringly, the appeal of inclusion, alongside the certainty of a world whose contours are familiar, secure, and invested with senses of belonging.

Levine's work offers interesting perspectives on the FRG-GDR border, a frontier that might figure in a version of her socially embedded formalism not solely as ideological or physical boundary, but as a line of demarcation between 'contending wholes'.⁴⁹ In Levine's account then,

the border comes under pressure as a site of collision between the competing affordances of bounded wholes. That it is in what Ernest Renan famously termed the 'plebiscite of the everyday' that the felt implications of those formal collisions are registered is demonstrated below in Áine McMurtry's account of short written prose by two postwar migrant writers, Herta Müller and Emine Sevgi Özdamar.

McMurtry's chapter focuses on two key works that span the transition from divided to reunified Germany: Müller's 1989 *Reisende auf einem Bein* (Traveling on One Leg), and Özdamar's *Mein Berlin* (My Berlin), a text written during the years following unification, and first published in the short story collection *Der Hof im Spiegel* (The Courtyard in the Mirror, 2001). As exiles finding refuge in divided Berlin from authoritarian regimes (Müller fled to West Berlin following political persecution in Ceaușescu's Romania, Özdamar escaped Turkish military repression to pursue an acting career in 1970s East Berlin), Müller and Özdamar share common experiences of migrant flight. The two writers also have recourse to prose strategies that are identified in McMurtry's analysis as significant for this volume's discussion of the interplay between aesthetic form and divided everyday experience. The first such is a use of staccato textual constructions that block fluid narration, favouring instead a montage or collage structure that reinvents through poetic narration the fractured experience of a divided Cold War Berlin. For both Müller and Özdamar, Berlin, as McMurtry shows, is at once a place of 'resettlement and new beginnings' and a site of division that captures the migrant, refugee or exile's 'sensed experience of everyday strangeness'. To recast this in Caroline Levine's terms: the 'temporal, spatial and perspectival play' identified by McMurtry as a shared feature of Müller and Özdamar's experimental prose foregrounds precisely those ambivalent 'affordances' – the simultaneous presence of disruption or fracture, and a containment that fosters senses of space, place and belonging – which Levine might identify in the Berlin urban milieu as 'bounded whole'.

McMurtry's analysis secondly casts light on a spatial practice that differs markedly from the cross-border imaginings of Thomas's East-West villagers. As McMurtry stresses, *Reisende* and *Mein Berlin* derive from a historical moment of 'structural transformation' in which both the 'former East-West coordinates of Cold War division' and the 'binaries of Orient and Occident' are in a state of transition to a new post-Cold War order of globally dispersed community and multipolar power. That experience of precarious spatio-political transition is captured by Müller and Özdamar through an emphasis in their prose on modes of transnational and local mobility, from the migrant journey into exile, to walking as a practice that 'establish[es] connections and contrasts without

providing explicit commentary'. McMurtry's account of the journey recalls Lüdtke's observations on 'meandering', a practice for which he uses a nautical parallel, of boats tacking in the wind. Tacking is a manoeuvre that appears random at first sight, but that in fact establishes a trajectory through space and time through multidirectional movements that avoid confronting head-winds straight on.⁵⁰ The strategy is identified by Lüdtke as a means by which social actors negotiate the 'commando heights' of history, developing their own meanings, and frustrating, evading or amending identifications or behaviours constructed from 'above'. An analogous mode of what Lüdtke might identify as 'obstinate' subjective reinvention can be observed in McMurtry's prose narratives in a dislocated and imagistic writing style that 'reduplicate[s]' their protagonists' 'state of disconnectedness', while also forging new understandings of mobile belonging in the similarly fractured city of pre- and post-unification Berlin.

A third insight from McMurtry connects her discussion with the numerous contributions to this volume that explore multiple belongings in geopolitical spaces beyond the nation state. In McMurtry's reading, both Müller and Özdamar are seen to associate everyday repressive acts encountered in daily life in Berlin with 'forms of coercion and exclusion' experienced back home. For Müller's protagonist Irene, familiar types of 'wardrobe, demeanour and speech patterns' encountered in interviews with the *Bundesnachrichtendienst* (Federal Intelligence Service) recall the 'formulaic turns of phrase and contrived gestures' of her former Romanian interrogators. The links Irene makes between these cognate modes of 'coercion and exclusion' (McMurtry) are replicated in Özdamar's account of memories of the Turkish military regime conjured by small signals of everyday constraint on East Berlin streets (the conspicuous absence of graffiti for instance). Özdamar's simultaneous delight in passing reminders of socialist utopias – streets and squares named after Marx, Engels, and Rosa Luxemburg, or dreams of social equality rekindled by fixed prices for cucumbers (40 Pfennig 'no matter where you bought them') – demonstrates meanwhile, as McMurtry also shows, the potential of migrant movement both to facilitate insight into the transnational character of political repression, and to point up 'possibilities for solidarity' that may generate 'as yet unthought and unimagined ... forms of perceptible community'.

McMurtry's ultimately optimistic account of transnational belonging as an experience facilitated (or in Levine's terms, 'afforded') by open aesthetic form and fluid movement is echoed by the volume's two subsequent chapters on, respectively, East German experimental film, and East-West subcultural style. Franziska Nössig's contribution

on the DEFA filmmaker Jürgen Böttcher examines the relation between experimental form and spatial imaginings in the ‘only experimental film ever produced’ by the GDR studio, Böttcher’s short film trilogy *Verwandlungen* (Transformations, 1981). In McMurtry’s chapter, experimental literary technique in Özdamar is compared to cinematic montage as a means of drawing together distinct spaces (Turkey/Germany, Istanbul/Berlin) within a single narrative frame. Nössig’s chapter shows Böttcher using film montage proper, but also more painterly collage forms deriving from his own practice as a visual artist, to produce similar forms of simultaneous collision and linkage across disparate spaces of quotidian experience and artistic practice. Perhaps the most significant ‘transformation’ of Böttcher’s film is thus the metamorphosis of his own private apartment – where the entire film is shot – into an experimental playground for avant-garde film art. Contextualizing Böttcher’s oeuvre within a GDR film industry constrained by censorship as well as socialist realist artistic norms, Nössig presents his ‘sensuous [cinematic] experiments’, performed as they are within the confines of domestic space, as signaling something more than homage to the underground filmmaking of artists such as Andy Warhol, Stan Brakhage or Kenneth Anger. Nössig instead reads Böttcher’s practice spatially, exploring how it ‘imaginatively extends his everyday boundaries’ (the four walls of his flat) into the ‘cultural space of the international film avant-garde’.

Nössig thus follows historian Paul Betts in understanding private space in the GDR as a site of ‘alternative identity formation’ as well as a ‘semipermeable refuge from public life’.⁵¹ But her chapter also emphasizes the capacity of artistic practice to remodel quotidian experience by calling forth a transnational presence within private space. Böttcher does this, admittedly, from a relatively privileged position as ‘the most significant GDR documentarist, and one of its most influential visual artists’ (Nössig). Alissa Bellotti’s contribution, by contrast, pursues visual evidence of similar transnational borrowings in the street-level modernism of West and East German 1980s youth subcultures. Drawing on contemporary interviews as well as oral history, memoirs, fanzines, photographs and other popular ephemera, Bellotti highlights how subcultural practices of self-fashioning (dress, hairstyle, music, dance and other elements of subcultural style) situated 1980s punks within a cross-border community of dissident youth. Bellotti is not unusual in reading punk’s nihilistic aesthetic as the signal of a breakdown in social consensus: a resistant response then, as Birmingham cultural studies scholar Dick Hebdige famously suggested, to the ‘continued subordination’ of groups that find no place in the prevailing social order – in Bellotti’s case, disaffected German youth.⁵²

But Bellotti's work also yields novel insight into punk's role in what her co-contributor McMurtry terms 'new kinds of subject formation at historical moments of structural transformation'. The subject emerging here is the post-socialist individual formed in the wake of the collapse of GDR state socialism in 1989; and Bellotti's chapter charts the emergence of punk as an early signal of that subjective transformation. She discovers in the archive as well as oral history interviews a set of shared stylistic elements amongst East and West German punks, including 'irreverent, aggressive postures; clothing transformed through ripping/tearing, the addition of handwritten slogans or by mismatching pieces of an outfit; and short, spikey hair, especially on young men'. As Bellotti notes, shared modes of self-construction through such 'signifiers of chaos' did not however locate punk as a new universal language of East-West dissent. 1980s social scientists concurred in their identification of punk style as a resistant stylistic mode that funnelled youthful protest towards locally specific objects of discontent. In the West, rising youth unemployment, environmental destruction and the nuclear threat fed punk's anarchic 'no-future' attitude. GDR punk, by contrast, directed its inchoate ire at the deadening conformity of a sclerotic authoritarian regime.

Bellotti is especially interesting on vibrant colour as an aesthetic element in GDR punk that disrupted the ambient drabness to which we point in our opening quote. But she also identifies a tendency in East German punk that locates it as more than an empty signifier of youthful discontent. Naming the spread of youth subcultural style as part of a 'broader turn towards lifestyles as a mode of identity construction', Bellotti pinpoints a historical development that is of signal interest for this volume. Historians of the last years of Cold War have shown how the GDR's turn to a consumer economy from the late 1960s set in motion struggles over the individualism seen to derive from the country's adoption of economic models from the capitalist West.⁵³ Bellotti's chapter shows a different cross-border dynamic at work in the demand for individualized lifestyles. For her, it is not only mainstream consumerism, but also underground transnational traffic in dissident cultural forms that fuels a longing for the expressive possibilities contained in dress, music, visual culture, literature, and everyday performance. The sonic, visual and performative styling of the self appears in this context as a practice fuelled not by consumer desires for commodity acquisition, but by demands for an individual stake in the process of production of social forms and institutional arrangements.

Bellotti's analysis resonates once again with Lüdtké's account of *Eigensinn* in terms of acts of stubborn awkwardness that highlight the 'frictions, malfunctions, disturbances and attritions' inherent in social

orders.⁵⁴ Punk style, or indeed any dissident cultural expression, appears in this light no longer in the mode of 1980s cultural studies analysts, who read subcultural styles as semiotic ensembles expressing ‘resistance through rituals’, but as an ‘obstinate’ embodied intervention into the ordered social arrangements that Levine associates with closed form.⁵⁵

At the same time, an understanding of stylistic self-fashioning as an embodied challenge to established arrangements of power reveals some potential limits to Levine’s avowedly formalist approach. That cultural practice not only engages ‘form’, but also bodies, spaces, temporalities, sensibilities and subjectivities, is demonstrated by four final contributions to this volume from Katrin Schreiter, April Eisman, Michael Schmidt and Alice Weinreb. Schreiter enters the fray first with a contribution on the urban allotment garden (*Schrebergarten*). Considering the allotment as a physical space whose specifically German history she traces to origins in nineteenth-century health and urban reform movements, Schreiter also addresses this volume’s interdisciplinary concerns by placing the ‘experienced history’ of gardens in dialogue with the allotment as a postwar literary *topos*. She draws on Pierre Nora’s notion of *lieu de mémoire*, as well as Henri Lefèbvre’s account of what he terms ‘social spatial production’, to explore the role of literature in producing the garden as a phenomenological entity (a concrete space possessing material substance) and thus a place of embodied experience and either affective belonging, or alienation from social norms.

In Lefèbvre’s resonant formulation, space ‘takes on body’ through representational practices (in this case, literary narration) as well as spatial practices (‘behaviours triggered and defined by space’: Schreiter) that produce within larger social spaces determinate places of embodied experience and feeling.⁵⁶ Schreiter’s approach to Lefèbvre distinguishes his work from more formalist accounts of spatial production by emphasizing the capacity he identifies in space to produce feeling, affective attachment, and concrete spatio-temporal location in history. Analysing two Berlin novels by Paul Gurk and the East German Ulrich Plenzdorf, which she counterposes to post-unification texts set by authors Jost Baum and Michael Kleeberg respectively in the Ruhr region, and on the former German-German border, Schreiter presents the garden as more than an imagined space of seclusion or privatized belonging. The allotment garden is instead produced within literary representation as both the material repository (or ‘palimpsest’) of traces of collectively shared troubled pasts (and it is in this sense that the garden is a social, not an individual ‘place of memory’), and a space of imaginative production in which both literary and actual social subjects negotiate new relationships to sociopolitical orders in present time.

Even the most reclusive everyday space, the allotment garden, is not able, then, to defy questions of politics and power. Schreiter also echoes other contributors when she stresses the political importance of belonging in everyday social practice: an importance clearly recognized by postwar political regimes, as is evident for instance in Palmowski's exploration of how the Socialist Unity Party, through GDR television, encouraged both distinctive quotidian viewing practices, and socialist communities and behaviours. In the volume's penultimate chapter, April Eisman follows both Palmowski and Schreiter when, in a study of painting in East Germany, she presents fine art practice as a form of socialist 'work' that strives to 'connect individuals to larger narratives'.

Eisman's approach is distinguished from Palmowski's however by her critique of historiographical maps that locate the GDR uniquely in a topographical and ideological relationship to the German West. The asymmetry of a relationship that places the GDR at several steps behind more 'advanced' forms of Western modernism is countered by Eisman when she draws on writers including Dipesh Chakrabarty and Piotr Piotrowski to argue for an East German art history located more centrally in relation to the global East and South.⁵⁷ What links East German art to non-Western cultural domains is, for Eisman, its eschewing of high modernism, and its embedding of art production and consumption within the realm of the socialist everyday. Ranging historically across forty years of GDR policy and practice, Eisman shows how East German artists, museums, galleries, curators, critics and policy makers strove to make of painting a 'public medium' enjoyed not solely by specialist, elite or connoisseur audiences, but by the socialist collective, or simply, the 'people'.

Especially notable in Eisman's contribution is an attentive use of quantitative method to explore the reach of GDR painting into popular culture and daily life. As she shows, GDR policies designed to extend public encounters with contemporary art practice were shaped by audience surveys and representative polls that probed reasons for exhibition and museum attendance. Data from those quantitative surveys are set in Eisman's account alongside visual analyses of paintings by artists Heidrun Hegewald and Doris Ziegler, as well as considerations of the extensive paratextual framework of popular magazine articles, exhibition reviews and other critical responses that contextualized artists' work for popular audiences. Her pluralist method affords multi-perspectival insight into the actualization in art and museum practice of a socialist critique of Western models of fine art as elite intellectual and economic capital. It shows too how the consumption of painting did indeed become a key component of everyday leisure culture in the GDR. But Eisman's work also points towards a final field of enquiry

shaping contributions to this volume. Her chapter ends with a suggestive reference to the 'alternative structures of feeling' revealed by GDR art history as framing East German quotidian life. Her reference here is to Raymond Williams 1961 *The Long Revolution*, the *locus classicus* of accounts of 'structures of feeling' as the constitutive framework for historical relationships between subjectivity, collective experience, and the formal or institutional structures of nation, economy and state.⁵⁸ Of the various shared readings on method discussed in the workshops which inspired this volume's approach, Williams' text was amongst the most productive in generating shared approaches to the postwar German everyday; and it is most comprehensively examined in the chapter that follows Eisman's, Michael Schmidt's analysis of the place of jazz and pop within the 'perceptual fabric and everyday practices' of East and West Germany after 1945.

As Schmidt explains, structures of feeling are 'forms of present-oriented thinking and sensing that do not fit into established institutions or received cultural tendencies and movements'. Schmidt's summary shows Williams sharing with Alf Lüdtke a commitment to exploring the frictions between lived cultures and the structures of domination within which they are constrained. But Williams reorients everyday history as practised by Lüdtke when he further defines structures of feeling as 'meanings and values as they are actively ... felt'.⁵⁹ His approach, then, is one that decisively foregrounds questions of social affect: an emphasis mirrored in Schmidt's study of West and East German post-1945 jazz and pop culture, which similarly accentuates the affective entanglements of bodies and subjectivities in everyday cultural practice. His chapter charts a postwar history first of hot jazz and its differential embedding in the musical cultures of East and West Germany, and second, of pop songs or *Schlager*, seen specifically in their intermedial relation to film, television and celebrity culture. Importantly, Schmidt also adds to Williams' account a spatial dimension that refigures 'structures of feeling' as 'perceptual-medial zones' traversing the inner German border as well as the external frontiers of German nation. Against regime efforts on both sides of the border to contain popular experience within Cold War bounds, Schmidt thus identifies in popular music a historical attachment to transnational black music cultures, as well as to North American and trans-European popular music modes.

Such affective attachment depends for Schmidt on engagements of the body, primarily through dance: engagements that in turn demand conceptual frameworks which move beyond Williams' ideas of structure to capture the mobility and fluidity of the embodied self (Schmidt's suggested starting point is Roland Barthes' notion of *musica practica*). What

Schmidt further identifies as a lacuna in William's approach is a sensitivity to processes of transnational circulation and distribution which, in his musical case studies, 'reorient ... daily practices and experiences ... away from racial insularity and towards a sense of community and subjectivity beyond the nation'. Schmidt turns here therefore, albeit briefly, to a second key text in our workshop discussions, Jacques Rancière's *The Politics of Aesthetic*.⁶⁰ Rancière explores in that study what he terms a 'distribution of the sensible' that disperses sensed experience across hierarchically organized sociopolitical domains, forging popular affiliations as well as opposition to institutional structures, and becoming therefore profoundly implicated in practices of domination as well as of contestation and dissent.

Schmidt makes use of this circulatory model to trace within postwar music history the transnational distribution of popular music practices and sensitivities. His focus is on patterns of perceptual and sensory organization that drew communities together around common reference points (a shared musical past, the cultural pull of the US, similar generational conflicts), but that also divided musical culture between industries and publics that subsisted under the different material conditions and contrasting political agendas of the two postwar German states.

The final chapter in this volume, Alice Weinreb's study of 'gustatory tastes' in West and East Germany, replicates Schmidt's focus on sensory experience and the body, but amplifies it with a detailed history of the two countries' postwar food cultures. Indebted less centrally to Rancière or Williams, Weinreb turns instead initially to Bourdieu's account of social taste as a factor in 'social ordering and hierarchy', as well as to Foucault's understanding of biopolitics as a 'politics that operates on the body to determine the organisation, distribution and limitation of powers in a society'.⁶¹ Those writers are used by Weinreb to determine how GDR and FRG food policy and practice forged links between 'bodies, taste and economic development'. Central here is her account of 1970s nutritional education in both Germanies, which she sees as creating a common pathologization of fatness across the inner German divide. Although pathologies of obesity intersect differently in the two Germanies with the hierarchical ordering of bodies around divisions of class, 'race', gender and other social identities, there remains nonetheless a shared 'pathologization of popular tastes' that Weinreb shows to have persisted well beyond unification in 1990. At the same time, divisions in culinary, food-industrial and agricultural practice, as well as divergent 'moral economies' of gustatory taste in the GDR and FRG, generated frameworks for everyday eating that shifted through time and diverged across social groups and national boundaries.

Weinreb's exhaustive history of fluctuating German food economies charts the transition for instance from a celebration of overeating in the *Fresswelle* (eating frenzy) of an increasingly prosperous 1950s West Germany, to differently contoured moral panics over class and obesity in both Germanies from the 1970s on. Weinreb's conclusion that obesity became in both Germanies 'a useful expression of the troubled relationship between state economies and individual bodies' returns this introduction finally to questions of the everyday. As Weinreb also indicates, neither Foucault nor Bourdieu offer ways of fully accounting for the part played by everyday practices – which in her chapter take the most mundane possible form, as cooking and eating – in determining the specific relation of social subjects to larger relations of domination. Her solution is to interweave a discursive history of German-German obesity with an examination of taste as embodied experience within everyday food cultures. Other contributors to this volume explore from other perspectives the relation of everyday to larger political histories, drawing on historical anthropology, sociolinguistic, narratological and politico-aesthetic accounts of form, as well as social theories of space, place, affect and the body, to explore the commonalities and distinctions that patterned German experience across Cold War divides. In thus rearticulating the complex relationship between the cultural, the social and the political, we hope to have begun to meet suggestions by Thomas Mergel at the beginning of the millennium for an intersecting history of the cultural and the political. In considering how culture might enrich our understanding of political history, Mergel suggested that the cultural perspective enabled historians to look at the political with a new sense of distance, as an 'Amazonian' terra incognita that was there to be discovered afresh.⁶² Our volume proposes that the same is true for the social praxis of Germans, informed as it was by the political, the cultural, the social – but also by emotions and sensibilities, memories and affect. This has required us to take the commitment of everyday history, and the wider field of historical anthropology, into the realm of transdisciplinary scholarship and dialogue: a dialogue that we hope will continue as readers now engage with the eleven chapters below.⁶³

Erica Carter is Professor of German and Film Studies at King's College London, and Chair of the UK German Screen Studies Network. She has published extensively on German cinema and cultural history; her publications include *How German Is She? Postwar West German Reconstruction and the Consuming Woman* (University of Michigan Press, 1997), *Dietrich's Ghosts: The Sublime and the Beautiful in Third Reich Film* (2004), *The German Cinema Book*, 2nd edition (Bergfelder, Carter & Göktürk, 2019) and *Béla*

Balázs: Early Film Theory (Berghahn, 2010). She is currently writing a monograph on cinema and late colonial sensibilities in the European ‘white Atlantic’ after the Second World War.

Jan Palmowski joined King’s College London in 1999, and became a professor in 2009. In 2013, he was appointed Professor of Modern History at the University of Warwick. He is a specialist on the history of the GDR and of contemporary Germany, and his books include *At the Crossroads of Past and Present: Contemporary History and the Historical Discipline* (ed. with Kristina Spohr-Readman, special issue of the *Journal of Contemporary History* 3/2011), *Inventing a Socialist Nation: Heimat and the Politics of Everyday Life in the GDR* (Cambridge University Press, 2009, translated into German in 2016), and *Citizenship and National Identity in Twentieth-Century Germany* (ed. with Geoff Eley, Stanford University Press, 2008).

Katrin Schreiter is Lecturer in German and European Studies at King’s College London. Her research focuses on the interplay of economics and culture of the Cold War era, and how these areas are connected to the politics of German diplomacy and ideas about nationhood. Her monograph *Designing One Nation: The Politics of Economic Culture and Trade in Divided Germany, 1949–1990* is forthcoming with Oxford University Press. She has published on related topics in *Business History Review* and *Europeanisation in the 20th Century: The Historical Lens* (Peter Lang, 2012). Her work on the gendered experience of Second World War trauma was published in *Central European History*.

Notes

1. Knabe, *Der Diskrete Charme der DDR*, 85–86.
2. For one of the best discussions of Ostalgie, see Leeder, *From Stasiland to Ostalgie*.
3. Berdahl, ‘(N)Ostalgie for the Present’.
4. Sabrow et al., *Wohin treibt die Erinnerung?*.
5. Paver, ‘Colour and Time in Museums of East German Everyday Life’; Penny, ‘The Museum für Deutsche Geschichte and German National Identity’; Arnold-de Simone, ‘Ostalgie – Nostalgia for GDR Everyday Culture?’.
6. For an overview of the breadth of GDR scholarship in the political sciences up to 1989, see Glaeßner, *Die DDR in der Ära Honecker*.
7. See, for instance, the enlightening reflections of a number of some of Germany’s most prominent contemporary historians in Möller and Mählert, *Abgrenzung und Verflechtung*.

8. With a focus on West Germany, see for instance Biess, *Homecomings*; Demshuk, *The Lost German East*. For the GDR, see Jacobson, 'Integration of East German Resettlers into the Cultures and Societies of the GDR'. For insights into shared challenges around gender and sexual equality, see Brühöfener, Hagemann and Harsch, *Gendering Post-1945 German History*.
9. Kleßmann, 'Verflechtung und Abgrenzung'; Kleßmann, 'Spaltung und Verflechtung'.
10. Lindenberger, 'Divided, but not Disconnected'; Bösch, *A History Shared and Divided*, 5. This introduction addresses in particular entangled histories of culture, politics and consumption. For further scholarship on media history, see also Fengler, 'Westdeutsche Korrespondenten in der DDR'; Beutelschmidt and Oehmig, 'Connected Enemies?'; Badenoch, Fickers and Heinrich-Franke, *Airy Curtains in the European Ether*; Carter, 'Contact Zones and Boundary Objects'; Allen and Heiduschke, *Re-Imagining DEFA*. On environmental histories, see (on the German-German nuclear industry), Radkau and Hahn, *Aufstieg und Fall der deutschen Atomwirtschaft*; Eckert, 'Geteilt, aber nicht unverbunden'.
11. Bren and Neuburger, *Communism Unwrapped*.
12. Crew, *Consuming Germany in the Cold War*; Stitzel, *Fashioning Socialism*; Rubin, *Synthetic Socialism*.
13. See also Hertle, *Der Fall der Mauer*.
14. Moeller, *Protecting Motherhood*; Carter, *How German Is She?*; Heineman, *What Difference Does a Husband Make?*
15. Lüdtkke, MarBolek and von Saldern, *Amerikanisierung*. For an approach that looks more closely at German-German connections, see Swett, Wiesen and Zatlín, *Selling Modernity*.
16. Kleßmann, *The Divided Past*; Jarausch, 'Divided, Yet Reunited'. See also Lindenberger, 'Ist die DDR ausgeforscht?'.
17. Jarausch, *After Hitler*.
18. See, for instance, Rödder and Elz, *Deutschland in der Welt*; Sarotte, *Dealing with the Devil*; Gray, *Germany's Cold War*.
19. Poiger, *Jazz, Rock and Rebels*.
20. Balbier, *Kalter Krieg auf der Aschenbahn*.
21. This is the starting point of Fulbrook, *The People's State*, 1–2.
22. Billardt and Hensel, *Alles war so. Alles war anders*, 6–7.
23. Betts, *Within Walls*.
24. Rubin, *Amnesiopolis*.
25. Fulbrook and Port, *Becoming East German*, 24.
26. McLellan, *Love in the Time of Communism*.
27. 'DDR-Alltag – das war nicht nur die private Idylle', interview with Culture Minister Bernd Neumann, *Berliner Zeitung*, 25 May 2006.
28. Hodgkin and Pearce, *The GDR Remembered*, especially part 2 on museums and the everyday.
29. Niethammer and von Platho, 'Die Jahre weiss man nicht, wo man die heute hinsetzen soll'.
30. Two of the most important examples include Fitzpatrick, *Everyday Stalinism* and Wildt, *Generation des Unbedingten*.
31. Eley, 'Glossary'.
32. Lindenberger, *Volkspolizei*; Palmowski, *Inventing a Socialist Nation*; Lüdtkke, 'Introduction', 16. R. Hürtgen, *Der lange Weg nach drüben: Eine Studie über Herrschaft und Alltag in der DDR-Provinz* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 2014).
33. Lüdtkke, 'Alltagsgeschichte'.
34. Bergerson and Schmieding, *Ruptures in the Everyday*.
35. Lüdtkke, 'Introductory Notes', 4–7.

36. See Rubin, *Amnesiopolis*, esp. chapter 3 on 'Material, Sensory, and Mnemonic Ruptures'.
37. Medick, "'Quo Vadis historische Anthropologie?'" , 92.
38. Mitter and Major, *Across the Blocs*, 11.
39. *Ibid.*, 3; Geertz, *The Interpretation of Cultures*, 3.
40. See Koselleck, *Futures Past*, esp. Part II, 'Theory and Method of the Historical Determination of Time', 75–154.
41. Tonkin, *Narrating our Pasts*, 2, c.f. Chamberlain and Thompson, *Narrative and Genre*, 10.
42. On *fabula* and *syuzhet* in Russian formalism, see for instance Cobley, *Narrative*, 15–16 and 243.
43. See France and Uhlin, 'Narrative as an Outcome Domain in Psychosis', 53. France and Uhlin in fact challenge notions of the psychotic's lack of narrative capacity, and explore developments in talking therapy that allow psychotics to renarrate their lives in ways that 'deconstruct oppressive narratives and generate alternative stories' (54).
44. Maza, 'Stories in History'.
45. Sheffer, *Burned Bridge*; Shaefer, *States of Division*; Johnson, *Divided Village*.
46. Levine, *Forms*, xii.
47. *Ibid.*, 6. 'Affordances' is also a key term in the study of multimodal communication (communication in multiple and simultaneous semiotic form, as for instance in film, which may include speech, writing, music, image, etc.). In multimodal analysis, each semiotic mode is examined for its specific affordances, and meaning and aesthetic pleasure or unpleasure are seen as derived from the experience of these multiple modes in space and time: see Kress, *Multimodality*.
48. Examples of these disciplinary shifts include the recent rise of the history of emotions and the body, whose prominent exponents include the Berlin-based Centre for the History of the Emotions, <https://www.mpib-berlin.mpg.de/en/research/history-of-emotions>. See also Kalof and Bynon, *A Cultural History of the Body*; Porter, 'History of the Body Reconsidered'.
49. Levine, *Forms*, 37.
50. Lütke, "'Fehlgreifen in der Wahl der Mittel'" .
51. Betts, 'Building Socialism at Home', 114.
52. Hebdige, *Subculture*, 14.
53. Merkel, *Utopie und Bedürfnis*.
54. C.f. T. Lindenberger, 'Eigen-Sinn, Herrschaft und kein Widerstand', Version: 1.0, *Docupedia-Zeitgeschichte*, 2 September 2014. http://docupedia.de/zg/lindenberger_eigen-sinn_v1_de_2014. Retrieved 20 September 2018.
55. The reference is to one of the classical texts of 1970s and 1980s subculture studies, Hall and Jefferson, *Resistance through Rituals*.
56. Lefèbvre, *The Production of Space*, 220.
57. See Chakrabarty, *Provincializing Europe*; Piotrowski and Mickiewicz, 'Towards Horizontal Art History'.
58. Williams, *The Long Revolution*.
59. Williams, *Marxism and Literature*, 132.
60. Rancière, *The Politics of Aesthetics*.
61. Bourdieu, *Distinction*; Foucault, *The Birth of Biopolitics*, 13.
62. Mergel, 'Überlegungen zu einer Kulturgeschichte der Politik', 588–89.
63. Medick, "'Quo Vadis'", 84–87.

Bibliography

- Allen, S. and S. Heiduschke (eds). *Re-Imagining DEFA: East German Cinema in its National and Transnational Contexts*. Oxford and New York: Berghahn, 2016.
- Arnold-de Simone, S. 'Ostalgie – Nostalgia for GDR Everyday Culture? The GDR in the Museum', in S. Arnold-de Simone, *Mediating Memory in the Museum: Trauma, Empathy, Nostalgia* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013), 160–86.
- Badenoch, A., A. Fickers and Chr. Heinrich-Franke (eds). *Airy Curtains in the European Ether: Broadcasting and the Cold War*. Baden-Baden: Nomos, 2013.
- Balbier, U. *Kalter Krieg auf der Aschenbahn: Deutsch-deutscher Sport 1950–72, eine politische Geschichte*. Paderborn: Schöningh, 2007.
- Bauerkämper, A., M. Sabrow and B. Stöver (eds). *Doppelte Zeitgeschichte: Deutsch-deutsche Beziehungen 1945–1990*. Bonn: J.H.W. Dietz Nachfolger, 1998.
- Berdahl, D. '(N)Ostalgie for the Present: Memory, Belonging, and East German Things'. *Ethnos* 64(2) (1999), 192–211.
- Bergerson, A.S., and L. Schmieding (eds). *Ruptures in the Everyday: Views of Modern Germany from the Ground*. New York and Oxford: Berghahn, 2017.
- Betts, P. 'Building Socialism at Home: The Case of East German Interiors', in K. Pence and P. Betts (eds), *Socialist Modern: East German Everyday Culture and Politics, Social History, Popular Culture, and Politics in Germany* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2008), 96–132.
- . *Within Walls: Private Life in the German Democratic Republic*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.
- Beutelschmidt, T. and R. Oehmig. 'Connected Enemies? Programming Transfer between East and West during the Cold War and the Example of East German Television'. *VIEW Journal of European Television History and Culture* 3(5) (2015), 60–67.
- Biess, F. *Homecomings: Returning POWs and the Legacies of Defeat in Postwar Germany*. Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2006.
- Billardt, T. and K. Hensel. *Alles war so. Alles war anders: Bilder aus der DDR*. Leipzig: Kiepenheuer, 1999.
- Bösch, F. (ed.). *A History Shared and Divided: East and West Germany since the 1970s*. Translated by J. Walcoff Neuheiser. Oxford and New York: Berghahn, 2018.
- Bourdieu, P. *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1984.
- Bren, P. and M. Neuburger. *Communism Unwrapped: Consumption in Cold War Eastern Europe*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012.
- Broszat, M. and E. Fröhlich. *Alltag und Widerstand: Bayern im Nationalsozialismus*. Munich: Piper, 1987.
- Brühöfener, F., K. Hagemann and D. Harsch (eds). *Gendering Post-1945 German History: Entanglements*. Oxford and New York: Berghahn, forthcoming 2019.
- Brunner, D., U. Grashoff and A. Kötzing (eds). *Asymmetrisch verflochten? Neue Forschungen zur gesamtdeutschen Nachkriegsgeschichte*. Berlin: Ch. Links, 2013.
- Carter, E. 'Contact Zones and Boundary Objects: The Media and Entangled Representations of Gender', in F. Brühöfener, K. Hagemann and D. Harsch (eds), *Gendering Post-1945 German History: Entanglements*. Oxford and New York: Berghahn, forthcoming 2019.

- _____. *How German Is She? Postwar West German Reconstruction and the Consuming Woman*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1997.
- Chakrabarty, D. *Provincializing Europe: Postcolonial Thought and Historical Difference*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000.
- Chamberlain, M. and P. Thompson (eds). *Narrative and Genre: Contexts and Types of Communication*. London and New York: Routledge, 1998.
- Cobley, J. *Narrative*. Hove: Psychology Press, 2001.
- Crew, D.F. (ed.). *Consuming Germany in the Cold War*. Oxford and New York: Berg, 2003.
- 'DDR-Alltag – das war nicht nur die private Idylle'. *Berliner Zeitung*, 25 May 2006.
- Demshuk, A. *The Lost German East: Forced Migration and the Politics of Memory, 1945–1970*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012.
- Dillon, M.C. *The Ontology of Becoming and the Ethics of Particularity*. Athens: Ohio University Press, 2012.
- Eckert, A.M. 'Geteilt, aber nicht unverbunden: Grenzgewässer als deutsch-deutsches Umweltproblem'. *Vierteljahreshefte für Zeitgeschichte* 62 (2014), 69–100.
- Eley, G. 'Glossary', in A. Lüdtkke (ed.), *The History of Everyday Life: Reconstructing Historical Experiences and Ways of Life*, translated by W. Templar (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1989), 313–14.
- Enzensberger, H.M. *Hammerstein oder Der Eigensinn: Eine deutsche Geschichte*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 2008.
- Felski, R. and S. Fraiman (eds). *In the Mood*, special issue of *New Literary History* 43(3) (2012).
- Fengler, D. 'Westdeutsche Korrespondenten in der DDR', in J. Wilke (ed.), *Journalisten und Journalismus in der DDR* (Cologne, Weimar and Vienna: Böhlau, 2007), 79–216.
- Fitzpatrick, S. *Everyday Stalinism: Ordinary Life in Extraordinary Times: Soviet Russia in the 1930s*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Foucault, M. *The Birth of Biopolitics: Lectures at the Collège de France, 1978–79*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008.
- France, C.M. and B.D. Uhlin. 'Narrative as an Outcome Domain in Psychosis'. *Psychology and Psychotherapy: Theory, Research and Practice* 79(1) (2006), 53–67.
- Fulbrook, M. *The People's State: East German Society from Hitler to Honecker*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2005.
- Fulbrook, M. and A.I. Port (eds). *Becoming East German: Socialist Structures and Sensibilities after Hitler*. New York and Oxford: Berghahn, 2013.
- Geertz, C. *The Interpretation of Cultures*. New York: Basic Books, 1973.
- Glaeßner, G.-J. (ed.). *Die DDR in der Ära Honecker: Politik – Kultur – Gesellschaft*. Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag, 1988.
- Gray, W.G. *Germany's Cold War: The Global Campaign to Isolate East Germany, 1949–1969*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2003.
- Hall, S. and T. Jefferson (eds). *Resistance through Rituals: Youth Subcultures in Postwar Britain*. London and New York: Routledge, 2006 [1976].
- Hebdige, D. *Subculture: The Meaning of Style*. London and New York: Routledge, 1988 [1979].
- Heineman, E.D. *What Difference Does a Husband Make? Women and Marital Status in Nazi and Postwar Germany*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999.

- Hertle, H.-H. *Der Fall der Mauer: Die Unbeabsichtigte Selbstaflösung des SED-Staates*. Wiesbaden: Westdeutscher Verlag, 1999.
- Highmore, B. and J.B. Taylor (eds). 'Introduction'. *Mood Work, New Formations* 82 (2014), 5–12.
- Hodgkin, N. and C. Pearce (eds). *The GDR Remembered: Representations of the East German State since 1989*. Rochester, NY: Random House, 2011.
- Hürtgen, R. *Der lange Weg nach drüben: Eine Studie über Herrschaft und Alltag in der DDR-Provinz*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 2014.
- Jacobson, A. 'Integration of East German Resettlers into the Cultures and Societies of the GDR'. PhD thesis, University College London, 2015.
- Jarausch, K. *After Hitler: Recivilizing Germans, 1949–1995*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006.
- . 'Divided, Yet Reunited – The Challenge of Integrating German Post-War Histories'. H-German Forum, 1 February 2011. Retrieved 13 October 2015 from <http://h-net.msu.edu/cgi-bin/logbrowse.pl?trx=vx&list=H-German&month=1102&week=a&msg=lnK7XIEc2qqANKFyP6tmew>.
- Johnson, J.B. *Divided Village: The Cold War in the German Borderlands*. Abingdon: Routledge, 2017.
- Kalof, L. and W. Bynon (eds). *A Cultural History of the Body*, 6 vols. London: Berg, 2010.
- Kleßmann, C. 'Spaltung und Verflechtung: Ein Konzept zur integrierten Nachkriegsgeschichte 1945–1990', in C. Kleßmann and P. Lautzas (eds), *Teilung und Integration: Die doppelte deutsche Nachkriegsgeschichte als wissenschaftliches und didaktisches Problem* (Bonn: Wochenschau, 2005), 20–37.
- . 'Verflechtung und Abgrenzung: Aspekte der geteilten und zusammengehörigen deutschen Nachkriegsgeschichte'. *Aus Politik und Zeitgeschichte* 29–30 (1993), 30–41.
- (ed.). *The Divided Past: Rewriting Post-War German History*. Oxford and New York: Berg, 2001.
- Knabe, H. *Der Diskrete Charme der DDR*. Berlin: Ullstein, 2001.
- Koselleck, R. *Futures Past: On the Semantics of Historical Time*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2004.
- Kress, G. *Multimodality: A Social Semiotic Approach to Contemporary Communication*. London: Routledge, 2010.
- Leeder, K. (ed.). *From Stasiland to Ostalgie: the GDR 20 Years After*, *Oxford German Studies* 38(3) (2009), special issue, 234–344.
- Lefèbvre, H. *The Production of Space*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1991.
- Levine, C. *Forms: Whole, Rhythm, Hierarchy, Network*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2015.
- Lindenberger, T. 'Divided, but not Disconnected: Germany as a Border Region of the Cold War', in T. Hochscherf, C. Laucht and A. Plowman (eds), *Divided, but not Disconnected: German Experiences of the Cold War* (London and New York: Berghahn, 2010), 11–33.
- . 'Ist die DDR ausgeforscht? Phasen, Trends und ein optimistischer Ausblick'. *Aus Politik und Zeitgeschichte* 24–26 (2014), 27–32.
- . *Volkspolizei: Herrschaftspraxis und öffentliche Ordnung im SED Staat 1952–68*. Cologne, Weimar and Vienna: Böhlau, 2003.

- Lüdtke, A. 'Alltagsgeschichte – ein Bericht von Unterwegs'. *Historische Anthropologie* 11(2) (2003), 278–95.
- . "'Fehlgreifen in der Wahl der Mittel': Optionen im Alltag militärischen Handelns'. *Mittelweg* 36 (2003), 61–75.
- . 'Introductory Notes', in A. Lüdtke (ed.), *Everyday Life in Mass Dictatorship: Collusion and Evasion* (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2016), 3–12.
- Lüdtke, A. (ed.). 'Introduction: What Is the History of Everyday Life and Who Are its Practitioners?', in *The History of Everyday Life: Reconstructing Historical Experiences and Ways of Life* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1995), 3–40.
- Lüdtke, A., I. Marßolek and A. von Saldern (eds). *Amerikanisierung: Traum und Alptraum im Deutschland des 20. Jahrhunderts*. Stuttgart: Steiner, 1996.
- Maza, S. 'Stories in History: Cultural Narratives in Recent Works in European History'. *American Historical Review* 101(5) (1996), 1493–515.
- McLellan, J. *Love in the Time of Communism: Intimacy and Sexuality in the GDR*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.
- Medick, H. "'Quo Vadis historische Anthropologie?" Geschichtsforschung zwischen Historischer Kulturwissenschaft und Mikro-Historie'. *Historische Anthropologie* 9(1) (2001), 78–92.
- Mergel, T. 'Überlegungen zu einer Kulturgeschichte der Politik'. *Geschichte und Gesellschaft* 28(4) (2002), 574–606.
- Merkel, I. *Utopie und Bedürfnis: Die Geschichte der Konsumkultur in der DDR*. Cologne: Böhlau, 1999.
- Mitchell, W.J.T. *Picture Theory: Essays on Verbal and Visual Representation*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1994.
- Mitter, R. and P. Major. *Across the Blocs: Cold War Cultural and Social History*. London and Portland: Frank Cass, 2004.
- Moeller, R.G. *Protecting Motherhood: Women and the Family in the Politics of Postwar West Germany*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993.
- Möller, F. and U. Mähler (eds). *Abgrenzung und Verflechtung: Das geteilte Deutschland in der zeithistorischen Debatte*. Berlin: Metropol, 2008.
- Negt, O. and A. Kluge. *Geschichte und Eigensinn*, 2 vols. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1981.
- Niethammer, L. and A. von Platho (eds). 'Die Jahre weiss man nicht, wo man die heute hinsetzen soll': *Lebensgeschichte und Sozialkultur im Ruhrgebiet 1930 bis 1960*, 3 vols. Berlin: Dietz, 1983–1986.
- Palmowski, J. *Inventing a Socialist Nation: Heimat and the Politics of Everyday Life in the GDR 1945–1990*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009.
- Paver, C. 'Colour and Time in Museums of East German Everyday Life', in A. Saunders and D. Pinfold (eds), *Remembering and Rethinking the GDR: Multiple Perspectives and Plural Authenticities* (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2012), 132–48.
- Penny, H.G. 'The Museum für Deutsche Geschichte and German National Identity'. *Central European History* 28(3) (1995), 343–72.
- Piotrowski, P. and A. Mickiewicz. 'Towards Horizontal Art History', in J. Anderson (ed.), *Crossing Cultures: Conflict, Migration, Convergence* (Melbourne: Melbourne University Publishing, 2009), 82–85.
- Poiger, U.C. *Jazz, Rock and Rebels: Cold War Politics and American Culture in a Divided Germany*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2000.

- Porter, R. 'History of the Body Reconsidered', in P. Burke (ed.), *New Perspectives on Historical Writing* (Cambridge and Malden: Polity Press, 2001), 233–60.
- Radkau, J. and L. Hahn. *Aufstieg und Fall der deutschen Atomwirtschaft*. Munich: oekom, 2013.
- Rancière, J. *The Politics of Aesthetics: The Distribution of the Sensible*. Translated and with an introduction by Gabriel Rockhill. London: Continuum, 2004.
- Rödger, A. and W. Elz (eds). *Deutschland in der Welt: Weichenstellungen in der Geschichte der Bundesrepublik*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 2010.
- Rubin, E. *Amnesiopolis: Modernity, Space and Memory in East Germany*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2016.
- . *Synthetic Socialism: Plastics and Dictatorship in the German Democratic Republic*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2008.
- Sabrow, M. et al. (eds). *Wohin treibt die Erinnerung? Dokumentation einer Debatte*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2007.
- Sarotte, M.E. *Dealing with the Devil: East Germany, Détente & Ostpolitik, 1969–1973*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2001.
- Shaefer, S. *States of Division: Border and Boundary Formation in Cold War Rural Germany*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014.
- Sheffer, E. *Burned Bridge: How East and West Germans made the Iron Curtain*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012.
- Steege, P., A.S. Bergerson, M. Healy and P.E. Swett. 'The History of Everyday Life: A Second Chapter'. *Journal of Modern History* 80 (June 2008), 358–78.
- Stitzel, J. *Fashioning Socialism: Clothing, Politics and Consumer Culture in East Germany*. Oxford and New York: Berg, 2005.
- Swett, P., J. Wiesen and J. Zatlin (eds). *Selling Modernity: Advertising in Twentieth-Century Germany*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2007.
- Tonkin, E. *Narrating our Pasts: The Social Construction of Oral History*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.
- Wildt, M. *Generation des Unbedingten: Das Führungskorps des Reichssicherheitshauptamtes*. Hamburg: Hamburger Edition, 2002.
- Williams, R. *The Long Revolution*. Peterborough and Ontario: Broadview Press, 2001 [1961].
- . *Marxism and Literature*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1977.