

Introduction

Constantin Goschler

In June 2007 the Foundation 'Remembrance, Responsibility and Future' announced the completion of its payment programme to former Nazi forced labourers, begun at the turn of the millennium. In cooperation with seven partner organizations, the foundation had distributed a total of DM 8.7 billion among 1.66 million forced labourers in eighty-nine countries of the world, mostly in eastern and east central Europe. While the turbulent international negotiations preceding the programme had received in-depth media coverage, the programme's completion was noted only in the margins. Yet as the authors of the present book have found, it was the actual practice and effects of implementing the programme, with its mission to compensate for historical injustice, which made the deepest impact.

From Politics to Practice of Compensation

What does this study concern? In 1998 the first ever coalition government made up of Social Democrats and Greens came to power in Germany. One of its primary goals on entering government was to find solutions to the enduring conflict over compensation for forced labour and other unresolved issues of compensation for Nazi persecution. The ground had been prepared by a unique combination of German civil activism and US civil law: gaining compensation for 'forgotten victims' of Nazism was one of the moral and political goals that the Social Democrats and the Greens shared, leading them to form a Red-Green political camp in the 1980s. In addition, a series of class actions had

been placing export-oriented German businesses under considerable pressure since the mid 1990s. Publicly accused of having profited from forced labour as well as the expropriation of Jewish property in the Third Reich, a number of German companies faced the threat of damaged reputations and considerable financial losses.

Following years of legal struggles over compensation for Nazi injustice, the new German government finally brought the issue back into the political arena. It formed an alliance with a Foundation Initiative made up of German companies, and negotiations were opened. Participants included the Conference on Jewish Material Claims against Germany (JCC) and a number of US lawyers, as well as government representatives from eastern and east central Europe, the United States and Israel. Stuart Eizenstat presided over the negotiations as Special Representative of the US President. After much hard bargaining, the various parties agreed on a total endowment of DM 10 billion (€5.1 billion) that was to be provided jointly by the German economy and the German government. Essentially, this was the price of gaining the US government's backing to put an end to the class actions against German companies and safeguard against future actions.

The impression conveyed to the public of the negotiations, during which the fund was shared out according to the individual parties' requirements, was of a fierce battle between victims' groups for each one's share of the money. The 'Future Fund', set up with half the endowment at the request of German industry to support humanitarian and future-oriented activities after completion of the compensation programme, was reduced to DM 700 million (€358 million). Further portions were set aside for asset losses, 'other personal injuries', special humanitarian programmes, claimant lawyers and administrative costs. But the bulk of the fund – eventually totalling some DM 8.7 billion (€4.4 billion) including interest – was earmarked for payments to forced labourers.

The German side measured each party's requirements by two crucial yardsticks: firstly, all aspects of Nazi persecution that might be a cause of action were to be covered. Secondly, each party's estimated number of forced labourers was multiplied by the political influence of their respective lobbyists. The principal target groups were forced labourers from former Eastern bloc countries, who had previously received virtually no compensation from Germany, and Jewish 'slave labourers' – a definition advanced by the JCC to highlight the exceptional fate they had suffered. This semantic distinction was also reflected in the different payment rates: slave labourers were to receive the highest rate of DM 15,000 (€7,670), while forced labourers were entitled to DM

5,000 (€2,556). Other groups could be included in the programme, and receive smaller payments, by means of so-called option clauses.

Western European forced labourers and prisoners of war, however, were not eligible for payments if they had no proof of being confined in concentration camps or other places of imprisonment recognized by the foundation. By making such exclusions, Germany hoped to reduce the number of potential claims and thus ensure that the individual payments did not shrink disproportionately. The agreed sum of DM 10 billion marked a compromise between the maximum burden the German side was prepared to shoulder and the minimum amount the claimant parties were prepared to accept. It was clear from the outset that it would not be enough to compensate all those who had suffered damages. The payment programme in aid of forced labourers faced the conundrum of achieving a result that was acceptable to all sides with a fund that was too small from the start.

A law enacted in July 2000 by the German Bundestag regulating the Foundation 'Remembrance, Responsibility and Future' and implementing the outcome of the negotiations (Foundation Law) was built around the mutual condition of a limited fund for payments to forced labourers and legal security for German economy.¹ The Foundation Law was, then, based on an asymmetrical package deal: claimants were required to sign a legally binding waiver renouncing all future claims to compensation while the payments they received were made explicitly not in recognition of any legal obligation. A comparison with the results of collective bargaining between trade unions and employers, as is part of the foundation's own narrative,² might be misleading. At least in free societies, the idea that such an agreement should come at the price of a formal renouncement of any future negotiations might not be conceivable.

A complex transnational network of institutions was formed to implement the Foundation Law. The Berlin-based Foundation 'Remembrance, Responsibility and Future' was at the centre and took a supervisory role. It in turn was answerable to the Federal Ministry of Finance and a board of trustees on which members of the partner organizations – themselves subject to the foundation's supervision – played a key role. Where possible, institutions that already worked in the field of compensation were engaged as partner organizations. These included the reconciliation foundations set up in the 1990s in the Soviet successor states and Poland to distribute DM 1.5 billion (€767 million) provided following German reunification to benefit former Nazi victims, and the German-Czech Future Fund, set up in 1997, in the Czech Republic. The JCC had several decades' experience of dealing with compensation for

Jewish Nazi persecutes, but in contrast to the above-mentioned institutions was a transnational organization. Finding a suitable organization to represent the forced labourers from the 'rest of the world' was more difficult. Eventually, the International Organization for Migration (IOM) in Geneva was chosen, though entirely new to this field.

The institutional conglomerate thus created brought together several different historical, legal and cultural viewpoints as well as political and social backgrounds, with an uncertain outcome. The former forced labourers encountered this both as individuals and in organized groups: as applicants, lobbyists and critics of the payment programme. The asymmetrical package deal anchored in the Foundation Law also governed the triangular relationship between the Foundation 'Remembrance, Responsibility and Future', the partner organizations and the applicants.

Ultimately, the payment programme created a complex moral economy, which in contrast to Edward P. Thompson's well-established use of the term did not refer to the morals of the market, but rather to the market of morals, which is determined by competition and where suffering is converted into benefits.³ The 'compensation in exchange for legal security' deal provided for by the Foundation Law triggered a complex administrative process that addressed such pivotal matters as the rehabilitation and recognition of victims and the need for reconciliation and understanding. The programme contained an inherent tension, balancing as it did sober legal and economic considerations with moral pathos, which should not be regarded in simplistic or cynical terms as merely the workings of politics with rhetorical accompaniment.

The history of the negotiations has been described in depth by eyewitnesses, journalists, lawyers and some historians.⁴ But as so often in the history of compensation, the really interesting part of the process, i.e. the actual practice and its consequences, was largely ignored. Perhaps the process by which the outcome of negotiations is turned into a transnational bureaucratic payment practice does not seem immediately fascinating. But it is in fact enlightening: the payment practice was no law enforcement machine but a complex process of continuous negotiation, not only between the triangle made up of the Foundation 'Remembrance, Responsibility and Future', the partner organizations and the applicants but also between the various national and transnational publics involved – both on a personal level and on a discursive level. While the preceding diplomatic negotiations had essentially been propelled by the power logic of international relations, over the course of the payment process, the individual persecutees came to the fore with their diverse and hitherto largely unknown biographies, which so

often challenged the previously determined categories and criteria for distributing the funds. Importantly, the process marked the translation of material benefits into symbolic acts of recognizing past histories of persecution.

Can any general conclusions for dealing with the victims of collective violence after the removal of the perpetrator regime be drawn from the studies contained in the present book? This is where the opinions of practitioners and historians tend to diverge. In overstated terms, the former are interested in successful actions and what facilitates them, while the latter focus on the difficulties and problems that arise.⁵ The chapters contained here seek to portray the programme's prospects of success in historical contexts, exploring questions such as: What expectations did the various parties have of the payment process? How did the various parties perceive each other? What results did the payment process achieve for each of them – as individuals and as groups? How did they assess their experience of the process in the end? It was not the authors' aim, then, to adjudicate on the payment programme from the historian's safe vantage point or announce the names of winners and losers.

The Semantic Fields of 'Forced Labour' and 'Compensation'

The project occupied a difficult semantic field. The central concepts, contained in the very title of the book, are problematic as they blend elements of the source language with analytical factors. To start with, the term 'forced labour':⁶ the international military tribunal in Nuremberg identified and condemned the Nazi 'slave labour programme' as a central aspect of the crimes committed during the Third Reich. The term 'slave labour' thus primarily denoted all those who had been forcibly taken to the German Reich during the Second World War as 'foreign workers' (*Fremdarbeiter*), as they were generally referred to before and for some time after 1945 in Germany. When the debate on the 'forgotten victims' of compensation arose in West Germany in the 1980s, the term 'forced labourer' (*Zwangsarbeiter*) came into wider use. During the negotiations over the Foundation Law in the late 1990s, the JCC insisted on distinguishing between slave labour and forced labour. In this way, the fate of those who had performed work intended to induce death was to be distinguished from those who had by and large performed work for a rational, economic purpose that was not expressly intended as a means of physical destruction. The use of the term 'slave labour' had, then, narrowed since the Nuremberg trials from the general to

the specific: the category ‘slave labour’ encompassed mostly but not exclusively Jews, whereas the category ‘forced labour’ referred in the main to the much larger group of non-Jewish former ‘foreign workers’. In view of this, the present book generally refers to ‘forced labourers’ with respect to potential or actual applicants, while also distinguishing between ‘forced labourers’ and ‘slave labourers’ when addressing the distinction made during the payment programme.

Similarly, the financial transaction at the core of the payment process defies precise definition. In the language of the Foundation Law, the programme was concerned with providing ‘humanitarian benefits’ (*humanitäre Leistungen*), ‘payments’ (*Zahlungen*) or ‘deficiency payments’ (*Ausgleichszahlungen*). By consciously avoiding references to compensation in the sense of reimbursement (*Entschädigung*), the legislators hoped to circumvent the programme’s central dilemma: while functioning as a legal device to deflect compensation claims in the United States, it was not intended to acknowledge any legal claims. The language used in the discourse was, then, always a reflection of the material, symbolic and not least legal expectations implicitly attached to the programme. But in contrast to the efforts of the Foundation ‘Remembrance, Responsibility and Future’, to emphasize the novelty of this kind of benefit, the researchers’ primary aim was to view the programme in the context of the ongoing debate on compensation for forced labourers. Hence the authors of the present book, which explicitly seeks to explore the moral economy of the ‘humanitarian gesture’ thus made, use the term ‘compensation’ while factoring in the political dimensions of the terms in the various contexts explored.

Expectations, Interactions and Success: Levels of Investigation and Hypotheses

Each of the eight chapters contained in the present book investigates the triangular relationship between the Foundation ‘Remembrance, Responsibility and Future’, its partner organizations and the applicants in a different social and political context and from a different perspective. The first countries to cooperate with Germany on the programme were the successor states of the Soviet Union – especially Russia, Belarus and Ukraine – and former Eastern bloc countries Poland and the Czech Republic. In all these countries, the payment programme in aid of former forced labourers took place in the context of post-Soviet transformation, though there were differences in practice. The JCC and the IOM, in contrast, were both founded in 1951 and signalled the

emergence of new actors in international politics. These transnational organizations did not operate within nationally defined social contexts; the forced labourers they represented came from a number of different countries. The JCC was responsible for Jews and the IOM for Roma, among others. Their clienteles were, then, categorized by ethnicity but not, or only to a lesser extent, by nationality. This typological distinction between national and transnational partner organizations runs through the entire study: firstly, with respect to levels of expectation, secondly to interaction and communication between the various parties and, thirdly, to the results and effects of the payment programme and the various actors' responses to them.

(1) *Expectations*: the wide range of institutional and private actors involved from very different contexts attached a range of expectations to the programme. This gave rise to a number of different conflict situations. The participating institutions increasingly perceived themselves as champions of the interests of forced labourers. They all cited principles of justice to legitimize their divergent positions, basing their arguments on different concepts of justice, each of which was justified by its own inherent rationale.

In typological terms, it is possible to distinguish between three main concepts of justice that were brought to bear on the payment programme in various constellations: restorative justice, redistributive justice and procedural justice. Restorative (i.e. historical) justice was seen to relate to the extent of suffering endured; this replaced tangible loss as a benchmark, shifting the focus from the material to the psychological and personal. Redistributive (i.e. social) justice, in contrast, was sought in the light of the former forced labourers' contemporary situations and needs. Procedural justice, a key aspect of liberal social ethics, is not concerned with just outcomes, but, as Friedrich August von Hayek has described, with the just application of rules.⁷

The character of the Foundation 'Remembrance, Responsibility and Future' was shaped by political requirements designed to ensure legal security against future compensation claims. It was, then, built around the attempt to safeguard procedural justice for the benefit of the German economy, i.e. the model of a fair deal – from the German point of view – comprising financial payments in exchange for security against lawsuits from the United States. So in parallel with recognizing the claims by former forced labourers in the context of the payment programme, the Foundation 'Remembrance, Responsibility and Future' insisted on written disclaimers from the applicants to ensure that they renounced all future legal claims in exchange for their compensation payments.

The act of submitting the disclaimer along with the completed application form thus marked the crux of the asymmetrical deal defining the programme. It also deterred an unknown number of potential applicants from participating – this, too, is an aspect of its history. As the programme progressed and the actors involved gained more experience of it, the Foundation ‘Remembrance, Responsibility and Future’ grew increasingly concerned with guaranteeing the fair and uniform application of the programme’s rules, not only for the sake of the applicants but also to consolidate its relations with its partner organizations.

The partner organizations thus found themselves ‘fighting’ on two fronts. *Vis-à-vis* the Foundation ‘Remembrance, Responsibility and Future’ they and various supporters fought to achieve either restorative or redistributive justice, acting as the true champions of the forced labourers’ cause. Deciding how to distribute their respective ceiling funds often placed them in a dilemma. For example, they faced the choice between limiting the number of approvals for the sake of raising the amount of each individual payment or, conversely, issuing smaller sums to a larger number of applicants. In their regular, personal encounters with the applicants, however, the partner organizations often pointed out their duty to ensure procedural justice, in keeping with their role as institutions. But the rules that they sought to uphold had been largely made independently of them.

The former forced labourers, who had suffered deportation, confinement and racial persecution, were predominantly concerned with redistributive justice. Yet they also raised the issue of material losses, which had been largely abandoned by political discourse on compensation, and claimed the wages and social benefits they had been denied. The main obstacle to this kind of compensation was the lump-sum arrangement written into the Foundation Law. While distinguishing between slave labour and forced labour, the law did not make any provisions for adjusting payments according to the duration of forced labour, despite the fact that assessing individual fates is considered to be crucial to achieving restorative justice. The lump-sum arrangement can be interpreted as a reaction to the rise of trauma discourse since the 1970s.⁸ The individualized approach to legal action requiring the extensive hearing of evidence, which had become standard in German compensation jurisdiction, was increasingly felt to be a source of renewed trauma for Nazi persecutees. Secondly, the lump-sum payments were symptomatic of a shift in focus from quantifiable damages towards non-quantifiable suffering that had attended the rise of victim discourse. And lastly, the lump-sum arrangement was chosen in order to simplify the procedure’s administration and to enable payments to be

issued as swiftly as possible. Many applicants criticized the lump-sum arrangement as it did not make allowances for different levels of suffering. Many forced labourers, especially in eastern Europe, wanted to see their fates recognized on a hierarchical scale. Fierce rivalries broke out between victim groups as they struggled to seize the opportunity to improve their social standing as well as their material circumstances. Ultimately, former forced labourers hoped to have their own histories of suffering regarded on equal terms as that of the Jews, continuing a conflict that had sparked during the preliminary negotiations.

The clash of different forms of justice was only the most obvious conflict arising from the various parties' divergent hopes for the outcome of the programme. Former forced labourers hoped that compensation payments would bring symbolic recognition of their suffering. To some extent, the partner organizations also sought recognition, primarily of the exceptional losses that each nation perceived itself to have suffered during the Second World War. This was the case in Poland, the Czech Republic and Ukraine.⁹ Hence the payment programme was harnessed to these countries' efforts to design a new post-communist self-image. On the German side, it was hoped that the compensation process would contribute to international reconciliation.

(2) *Interaction and communication*: while the first level of investigation is primarily concerned with discourse, the second analyses compensation as a social practice. Here, the focus is placed on the interaction and communication between the various actors on all sides of a programme that was bureaucratically organized and realized within the frame of a complex 'network of compensation'.¹⁰ What relations developed between them and which positions did they hold as a result of their interaction and communication? What influence did they have on the course and outcome of the payment programme? And how did they deal with the intense media coverage of the process?

First of all, the payment programme formed a normative sphere under the Foundation Law, which defined a binding legal framework for everyone involved in the bureaucratic process and initially also structured their relations with the forced labourers – now in the role of applicants. However, a number of bilateral negotiations and agreements between the Foundation 'Remembrance, Responsibility and Future' and the partner organizations changed the legal rules of the game. Many were made in a bid to reconcile the individual countries' national legal systems with the German Foundation Law. The points negotiated included inheritance provisions for dependents of forced labourers who passed away while their claims were still being

processed. Another influential factor was the staff's direct encounter with the applicants and their histories, not least because it brought the many difficulties, hardships, shortcomings and dilemmas inherent in the application process palpably to light.¹¹ Thus the normative sphere created by the Foundation Law was a fundamental but not determining aspect of the social practice of the payment process. Each of the respective social, cultural and architectonic spheres within which the process took place also played a significant role, not to mention the virtual sphere, since the internet was as vital for conducting outreach as it was for processing the claims.¹²

Communication between the staff in the institutions administering the programme and the applicants was influenced and informed by their family backgrounds, levels of education and behavioural patterns as well as by bureaucratic traditions, institutional and spatial parameters and not least the means of communication used. The persistence of administrative traditions, tending to outlive even the collapse of political systems, is a well-known phenomenon. Here, the relationship between applicants and authorities was grounded on long-standing traditions via, for example, the forms of address used on the application forms.¹³ Because of the broad range of participating institutions in various parts of the world, the programme was carried out in the context of disparate bureaucratic cultures, despite being regulated in principle by the – German – Foundation Law. The differences cannot be overstated: the spectrum ranged from post-Soviet bureaucracies in eastern Europe and administrations explicitly striving to adjust to the standards of Western NGOs in east central Europe to the New York-, Frankfurt- and Jerusalem-based JCC with its own range of national bureaucratic contexts, and the electronically operating IOM in Geneva, serving a clientele that tended to live without electricity. Wavering between German bureaucratic efficiency and NGO culture, the Foundation 'Remembrance, Responsibility and Future' was not able to enforce a uniform approach but made many attempts to assert German standards of 'orderly administration' in all the participating countries. To some extent, the foundation's approach echoed the liberal mission to promote civil society, a successor of the old colonial mission to promote civilization.¹⁴ The significance of each partner organization's cultural context is, then, far from marginal, as the chapters here show in detail.

Gauging the relationship between the Foundation 'Remembrance, Responsibility and Future' and its partner organizations is complicated by the fact that it was only partially regulated by the Foundation Law. A number of other factors also played an influential role. In the 1990s, large sums had disappeared into unknown channels from programmes

affording lump-sum payments to former Nazi victims in the Soviet Union's successor states. Due to this negative previous experience, the Foundation 'Remembrance, Responsibility and Future' was particularly eager to maintain a controlling influence, both in the interest of the former forced labourers – to ensure that they received the entire sum earmarked for them – as well as in the interest of gaining legal security for the German economy – the condition seen to ensure justice. A peculiar role reversal took place as a result, with the national partner organizations that saw themselves as defenders of the former forced labourers against the Germans facing a German institution that now vied with them for this role. An inversion of history politics thus persisted that had first become apparent during the negotiations over the Foundation Law, when, in view of the growing rivalry between victim groups, the German state had taken the role of mediator between persecutee interests and the German economy.¹⁵ The law regulating the relationship between the Foundation 'Remembrance, Responsibility and Future' and its partner organizations provided for the former to act as supervisor of the procedure, thus performing a control function. In practice, it did so by regularly dispatching German supervisory teams to conduct on-site inspections of the partner organizations' work. These transpired to be formative experiences for both sides. Austria was also carrying out a forced labour compensation programme in the former Eastern bloc countries at the time,¹⁶ and they inevitably compared their experiences of the two donor countries' conduct. The outcome often echoed the stereotypical view of pedantic Prussian bureaucracy versus Austrian cordiality.¹⁷ The authors of the present book, however, found that the relationship between the Foundation 'Remembrance, Responsibility and Future' and its partner organizations vacillated between a clearly hierarchical relationship and a cooperative one, based on negotiation, in which mutual trust developed over the course of the payment process. Overall, the Foundation 'Remembrance, Responsibility and Future' fluctuated between presenting itself as the custodian or the master of the procedure.

Adding the former forced labourers to the equation, the picture becomes even more complex. The spectrum ranged from applicants who had already established a routine for dealing with compensation procedures – and hence did not necessarily distinguish between them – right up to applicants who had never before been able to speak or write about their past suffering in public or even in private. The first type was found mostly among Jewish Holocaust survivors living in the West; the latter primarily among eastern European forced labourers, who after the war had been discriminated against as Nazi collaborators

in their home countries. Some applicants were versed in dealing with benefit administration and compensation bureaucracy and presented their claims confidently; others perceived the experience of dealing with bureaucracy as a form of continued discrimination, such as the Roma. And lastly, there were applicants whose claims were processed by national partner organizations, which they viewed with extreme scepticism. One example is the forced labourers from the Baltic States, who were required to apply to partner organizations in post-Soviet successor states from which they had only recently gained their independence.

The authors of the present book were, then, not only concerned with describing the inherent bureaucratic logic of the payment process but also with analysing the conflicts that arose from the applicants' perspective. The staff in each partner organization dealt with the former forced labourers differently, eliciting a variety of responses. On one end of the spectrum was the JCC, which was able to help prepare the bulk of applications on the basis of data it had collected during previous compensation programmes. On the other end, the procedure in the post-Soviet countries was often perceived to be an arduous struggle through a bureaucratic jungle. Moreover, in eastern and east central Europe, conflicts arose from the fact that certain Nazi persecutees, who had been entitled to payments under the compensation programmes of the 1990s, were not eligible for payments under the present payment programme. Sometimes the sense of struggle was even inverted, such as when the IOM found itself painstakingly trying to reach potential beneficiaries. But there were many applicants who were practised at dealing with the authorities on a local level and not intimidated by the payment programme's complex bureaucratic structure. If they were dissatisfied with their national partner organization's handling of their applications, they sent appeals not only to the political leaders of their own countries but also directly to Berlin and representatives of the Foundation 'Remembrance, Responsibility and Future'. Most such appeals arrived from countries with a background of socialist administration, where the right of petition had been an important instrument and appeals were often 'directed straight to the top' in order to give the subordinate bodies a push.¹⁸ Such modes of behaviour among the applicants were, then, an indication of their social education and evidence that they perceived the bureaucracy of the payment programme as a strict hierarchy.

(3) *Results and criteria for success*: finally, the question of the programme's results and consequences and how the individual actors interpreted

them, as well as the yardsticks of success on which they based their assessments, must be considered. This third level of investigation weaves strands of social history and cultural history together with ethnological and psychological aspects in order to analyse both the intentional and the unintentional effects of the compensation payments on the various individuals and groups affected. An analysis of this kind must consider the 'objective' effects of the programme in light of its 'subjective' reception and vice versa. It is especially difficult to make general observations here, as all information is crucially coloured by the provider: whether it be the former forced labourers, the institutions participating in the payment process or the societies in which they were embedded. And people's perceptions diverged considerably even within these discrete groups.

Nevertheless, any investigation of the history of the compensation programme, as this book attempts, cannot avoid the question of its 'success'. It is interpreted here in historical rather than normative terms; the criteria for success on which the actors' varying, sometimes conflicting, opinions were based are analysed in the individual chapters. In view of the basically ambivalent nature of this undertaking, it was not surprising to find that they spanned the range from 'the glass is half full' to 'the glass is half empty'.

From the perspective of members of the participating institutions, the payment programme appears to have been a success – a view which informed the institutions' self-perception.¹⁹ The payment programme was carried out largely untroubled by scandal and with great precision, in positive contrast to the predecessor programmes of the 1990s. The Foundation 'Remembrance, Responsibility and Future' not only gained legal security for Germany against further claims but also considerable symbolic capital, which together with the DM 700 million of financial capital 'retrieved' from the total endowment of DM 10 billion formed a solid foundation for the Future Fund that became the foundation's main mission after completion of the payment programme. Similarly, the partner organizations looked back on their work with satisfaction, the only drop of bitterness being the disappointment of the IOM, especially, that its clientele – the 'rest of the world' – had been at such a financial disadvantage. Nevertheless, all the participating institutions had achieved their central goal: They had issued the payments correctly to the eligible claimants and simultaneously collected the required notices of disclaimer. However, not all the partner organizations were able to fulfil a second, 'institutional' criterion of success that all would have welcomed: their continued existence after completion of the payment programme. To some extent, the partner organizations contributed to

the development of civil society in their countries. Among the unintentional side effects of the payment programme were, for example, the consolidation of the Lukashenka regime's power basis in Belarus, not least on account of the popularity of the country's provision of basic social security for the elderly.²⁰ This example also points to the ambiguous nature of a policy that treats compensation as an instrument for propagating the organization of civil society.

Among the former forced labourers, however, opinions on the results and success of the payment programme diverged greatly. From the start, they were divided between those who were found eligible and those who were not. The former Italian Military Internees, for example, were excluded from the scheme on the basis of expertise by specialists in international law, commissioned by the Federal Ministry of Finance, despite or perhaps precisely because of the fact that the specialists arrived at their conclusion by applying outlandish historical logic.²¹ In this way, the German government hoped to prevent the IOM's insufficient ceiling fund from collapsing under the burden of too many claims as well as setting a precedent to deter former German prisoners of war from claiming compensation from the victors of the Second World War.²² At the same time, alongside cases of persecution that entitled the victims to payments, there were many more cases of damages for which the victims were not afforded any compensation under the scheme. In this way, the payment programme – like all compensation programmes to benefit Nazi persecutees – left a large number of people frustrated and embittered. This included those who decided not to apply, despite their entitlement, as they were not prepared to sign the required notice of disclaimer.

Among those who were afforded payments, opinions of the programme and its outcome diverged greatly, according to the amount received, the recipients' social circumstances and other factors. While all recipients were presumably old-age pensioners, their standards of living differed from country to country. In general terms, a distinct East–West divide could be discerned: the payments had far more perceptible effects in the post-Soviet countries.²³ However, the sums paid – varying between DM 5,000 and DM 15,000, or distinctly less if applicants had been included in the programme by means of an option clause – were not usually sufficient to permanently improve the recipients' standard of living, even in the eastern countries. Nevertheless, a superficial relation was found to exist between the significance of the payments to the recipients and their income levels: the lower the latter, the greater the former. And even to those who were not financially dependent on the payments, the amount received was not immaterial but seen as a

measure of the recognition gained. The procedure of issuing payments in two instalments rather than one larger lump sum reduced their symbolic effect somewhat. Moreover, some of the very elderly applicants did not live to see the payment of the second instalment; it was paid to their heirs instead. In Ukraine this was true of almost seventy per cent of applicants.²⁴ Mostly, then, the material effects were limited to short-term consumer opportunities, or the chance to pay for medication or medical treatment, or to put some money aside for the recipient's own funeral. As a rule, the payments did not allow recipients to fundamentally and lastingly improve their level of material comfort. The donors were in fact aware that this would be the case, and always stressed the symbolic character of the payments for this reason.

The recipients' opinions of the programme varied between appreciation that anything had happened at all and embitterment that too little had occurred or been given, and far too late at that. Explanations for why some responded in a certain way and others in a different way cannot be proposed with any certainty. But in general terms, it was found that recipients' post-war experiences, as well as those of the war years, had a crucial impact on their perception of the programme. For many of them it was not the first and only experience of a compensation programme. Indeed, the 1990s had seen a boom in compensation initiatives, resulting in a number of programmes being carried out in parallel in countries including Austria and Switzerland. As a consequence, many applicants were not able to distinguish between the various programmes and hence did not attribute certain effects to specific schemes.²⁵

In one major respect, however, the present programme stood out from other compensation programmes, at least in the post-Soviet countries: many beneficiaries were eager for their neighbours to know about their compensation as it was a sign that their previous suffering had been officially recognized. It allowed the former forced labourers to put an end to the decades of discrimination they had suffered for being regarded as 'Nazi collaborators'.²⁶ Conversely, some of the recipients' unexpected, though modest, new wealth made them targets of fraud, theft and even murder²⁷ – and sometimes of renewed discrimination, such as when guards prevented Romanian Roma from entering banks where they intended to cash their compensation cheques.²⁸

As well as the effects on recipients' financial situations, then, the programme had a range of social consequences. Many non-Jewish applicants now retold their own histories in the light of the forced labour issue. Jewish persecutees did so to a lesser extent as their histories were mostly dominated by the murder of family members; they tended

to regard forced labour as a peripheral aspect of their experiences. But many non-Jewish forced labourers from eastern and east central Europe were enabled by the prospect of compensation to speak about their experiences during the war years for the first time, even to their families. As a consequence, a group identity as former forced labourers also began to develop. Public awareness of the Holocaust had existed for several decades, at least in Western countries, and although some Jewish persecutees were reluctant to label themselves 'slave labourers' in the context of the present programme, most had long since overcome any difficulties they might have had with being regarded as victims. The same was not true of non-Jewish forced labourers. For this reason, one particular group of forced labourers now came to the fore: those who had lived in forced labour contexts as children. They assumed a prominent role, not only because of their relatively young age, but also because they were not seen to be burdened with any joint guilt. In the light of their suffering as innocent children, a new view of history was promoted in their home countries that aimed to rehabilitate not only all other former forced labourers but also, in some cases, the nation as a whole.²⁹

On a macro social level, moreover, it emerges that there were basic differences in the impact of the payment programme in the West and the East. While the payments issued to applicants in western countries were distributed in a trickle-down manner across a large number of countries, in eastern countries they remained within national parameters. Consequently, far greater significance was attached to them in the latter countries, though some individuals here, too, developed comparative views via family ties beyond their national borders. The public debate that attended the payment programme in the Eastern countries not only concerned the collaboration issue but also victim rivalry with survivors of the Holocaust. To some extent, the payment programme permanently altered the status of former forced labourers in their countries' national canons of recognized victims of the Second World War. In the former Eastern bloc countries, this change was linked with a tension-filled shift from a heroic narrative to a new, Western-style victim narrative.³⁰ Thus the programme had an impact not only on the personal lives of former forced labourers but also – to varying extents – on the memorial landscapes of the individual countries. Furthermore, the issue of forced labour was taken as a point of departure for promoting a joint European approach to remembering the Second World War when the Foundation 'Remembrance, Responsibility and Future' funded a touring exhibition on the topic to this end.³¹ On the other hand, some of the partner organizations mounted their own exhibitions that took

a distinctly national approach to commemorating 'their' forced labourers.³² An unintentional side effect of the programme's impact on memorial policy and culture could be observed in Germany when the debate over forced labour compensation became a catalyst for the discussion sparked at the start of the twenty-first century concerning 'German victims' of the Second World War.

The Contributions of the Volume

This book presents the key findings of an extensive research project, begun in late 2007, by a team of twenty scholars from seven countries, on the payment programme implemented by the Foundation 'Remembrance, Responsibility and Future'. It was an explicit concern of the project participants not to surrender to the sheer weight of institutional documentation but also to do justice to the applicants' perspectives – those of both successful and unsuccessful applicants (such as those who refused to participate and those who were not found eligible). The authors aimed to represent the applicants not merely as objects of bureaucratic activity but as autonomous agents. It must be left to the readers to judge whether this has been achieved. During four years of research in Germany, Poland, the Czech Republic, Belarus, Ukraine, Russia, Romania, Switzerland and the United States, the authors viewed material that no other researchers had seen before: databases, correspondence, protocols, forms and other administrative documents from the respective institutions, applications and letters from claimants; in short, all the aspects of the payment programme recorded on paper or in electronic documents, including the preceding developments and post-history. The material was often still in its original administrative condition or had recently been entered into the archives without being previously sorted or ordered. Only a small number of documents had already been destroyed due to a lack of means to pay for storage. In addition to viewing documents, the project participants conducted many interviews with applicants, representatives of forced labour associations, political agents and staff of the relevant institutions in all the above-mentioned countries. Lastly, they researched media coverage of the programme intensively in most of the countries involved.

Contemporary history researchers usually have to wait at least thirty years to be given access to institutional sources such as these. If an exception occurs and they are granted earlier access, it is usually in the wake of a regime's collapse, with the express intention

of delegitimizing the regime by publishing all its secret documents. Examples are tsarist Russia, Nazi Germany and the GDR, which are all, of course, quite different entities from the present object of investigation. They differ not only in a moral sense, but also because the present object of investigation includes institutions and individuals who continue to work in similar fields and could therefore be directly or indirectly affected by the findings of our research. They deserve our respect for agreeing to an uncomfortably close scientific examination, akin to vivisection in the contemporary history domain. It marked an extraordinary step for the institutions participating in the payment programme to disclose their documents immediately after completing their operations, especially in view of the fact that they risked damaging their reputations like those involved in the compensation programmes of the 1990s, which attracted harsh public criticism. Moreover, they also faced the possibility of applicants taking legal action, using our findings as evidence. The researchers participating in the project were forced to accept that their work might have far greater practical implications than is usually the case. Under these circumstances, we can only praise the openness that we mostly encountered when conducting our research. Even with access to all the relevant material, many aspects such as internal arrangements, agreements and conflicts remained obscure, and additional information was essential to attempt to make rounded analyses.

The unusual framework of the project posed a special challenge not only for the participating institutions and their personnel but also for the researchers. Interacting with the objects of their contemporary history research, who to some extent were still conducting the activities under investigation, they were involuntarily placed in the position of 'participatory observers'. This demands a particularly sensitive handling of familiarity and distance and has an unpredictable influence on research methods. For this reason, we chose not to broaden the project's national base but to extend it in interdisciplinary terms to include members with knowledge of sociology, ethnology and psychology as well as historical expertise on the research team. We approached the special challenge of investigating an object from very recent history as an opportunity to broaden contemporary history methods for the twenty-first century. We very much hope that the result has justified the effort.

Of the sixteen studies filling four volumes that were the outcome of the project,³³ eight have been selected and abridged for this edition, making the key findings accessible to an English-speaking readership. In the

first chapter, Henning Borggräfe describes the developments leading to the establishment of the Foundation ‘Remembrance, Responsibility and Future’ in the context of the long history of legal and political struggles over forced labour compensation. Subsequently, Benno Nietzel considers the role of the Foundation ‘Remembrance, Responsibility and Future’ in the forced labourer payment programme in the light of administrative traditions in the field of compensation for Nazi persecutees, focusing especially on the ambiguities arising from its institutional structure. In a second article, Benno Nietzel also examines the JCC’s role representing Jewish slave labourers in the payment programme and how this affected, and was affected by, the organization’s other, far more comprehensive, activities in the field of compensation for Holocaust survivors. Paul Erker investigates the role of the IOM and how it coped – like the JCC – with serving an initially unfamiliar, extremely heterogeneous and underfunded group of applicants, and traces its trajectory from efficiency to empathy.

Further studies investigate the payment programme within the field of tension created by the interplay of national identities, victim discourses and administrative conduct in east central Europe after the fall of the Iron Curtain. Focusing on the Czech partner organization, Stephanie Zloch examines how attempts were made to classify Czech forced labourers as Slavic victims of racial persecution in the context of the payment programme while the country demonstrated its political affiliation with the West. Michael Esch analyses the Polish partner organization in the context of efforts to ensure Poland’s recognition as a victim nation and at the same time carry out a major social relief scheme under the banner of historical justice.

Subsequently, two studies discuss the payment programme in the countries of the former Soviet Union, where Western victim discourse was not only challenged by the Soviet tradition of honouring ‘heroes’ but also by the former forced labourers’ self-perception as *Ostarbeiter* (workers forcibly recruited by the Nazis specifically from the East). Julia Landau analyses the compensation in aid of former forced labourers and Nazi victims in Ukraine and shows how it became a means of restructuring the traditional pension system. Tanja Penter compares the special circumstances of the payment programme in the shadow of Lukashenka’s rule in Belarus with the programme’s context in Russia, where the programme highlighted a particularly strong conflict between national awareness and attempts to adopt Western standards of civil society.

The present book is neither a handbook on the payment programme implemented by the Foundation ‘Remembrance, Responsibility and

Future'.³⁴ The chapters comprising the book must remain in many respects mere case studies. We hope, however, that through our selection of aspects and perspectives to consider we have been able to convey an understanding of the significance of the payment programme and by extension provide indications of the basic effects of such compensation programmes. In this sense, we aimed not only to shed light on a historical process but also to provide intellectual stimuli that might be important for current or future projects in the field of compensation for victims of collective violence. And lastly, we also hope to offer basic insights into the practice of transnational cooperation among government and non-governmental institutions, the importance of which is growing, not only in the compensation field.

Acknowledgements

I and my cooperation partners Professor José Brunner (Tel Aviv), Professor Krzysztof Ruchniewicz (Wrocław) and Professor Philipp Ther (Vienna) would like to thank the Foundation 'Remembrance, Responsibility and Future' for providing a generous grant to fund our research project in the years 2007 to 2012 while also respecting the independent nature of our research. Indeed, throughout the entire period, the Foundation 'Remembrance, Responsibility and Future' and its partner organizations tolerated our authors' demands to look in every filing cabinet and drawer, despite the fact that this often stood in the way of their work. We are also very grateful to all those who we interviewed and who took the time to answer our (many) questions. The English edition of our study was made possible by the financial support of the Foundation 'Remembrance, Responsibility and Future', for which we are also very grateful. Last but not least, we want to warmly thank Charlotte Kreutzmüller for translating the chapters into English.

Constantin Goschler is Professor of Contemporary History and Dean of the Faculty of History at Ruhr University Bochum, Germany. His numerous books on the topic of compensation for Nazi victims include *Robbery and Restitution: The Conflict over Jewish Property in Europe*, edited with Martin Dean and Philipp Ther (New York: Berghahn, 2007); *Schuld und Schulden: Die Politik der Wiedergutmachung für NS-Verfolgte seit 1945*, 2nd ed. (Göttingen: Wallstein, 2008); *Die Globalisierung der Wiedergutmachung: Politik, Moral, Moralpolitik*, edited with José Brunner and Norbert Frei (Göttingen: Wallstein, 2013).

Notes

1. The Law on the Creation of a Foundation 'Remembrance, Responsibility and Future', printed in Michael Jansen and Günter Saathoff (eds) on behalf of the Foundation Remembrance, Responsibility and Future 'A Mutual Responsibility and a Moral Obligation': *The Final Report on Germany's Compensation Programs for Forced Labor and other Personal Injuries* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009), 174–84.
2. See the foreword by Günter Saathoff in the present book.
3. See Friedrich Wilhelm Graf 'Loyalität für 'nen Euro', *SZ-Magazin* 25, 20 June 2008: 18–23.
4. See Henning Borggräfe in the present book; Michael Jeismann, *Auf Wiedersehen Gestern: Die deutsche Vergangenheit und die Politik von morgen* (Munich: DVA, 2001); Matthias Arning, *Späte Abrechnung: Über Zwangsarbeiter, Schlußstriche und Berliner Verständigungen* (Frankfurt am Main: Fischer, 2001); John Authers and Richard Wolffe, *The Victim's Fortune: Inside the Epic Battle over the Debts of the Holocaust* (New York: Harper Collins 2002); Stuart Eizenstat, *Imperfect Justice: Looted Assets, Slave Labor, and the Unfinished Business of World War II* (New York: Public Affairs, 2003); Susanne-Sophia Spiliotis, *Verantwortung und Rechtsfrieden: Die Stiftungsinitiative der deutschen Wirtschaft* (Frankfurt am Main: Fischer, 2003); Ulrich Adamheit, 'Jetzt wird die deutsche Wirtschaft von ihrer Geschichte eingeholt': *Die Diskussion um die Entschädigung ehemaliger Zwangsarbeiter am Ende des 20. Jahrhunderts* (Berlin: Berliner Wissenschafts-Verlag, 2004); Claudia S. Weisser, 'Erinnerung, Verantwortung und Zukunft': *Eine Betrachtung der NS-Zwangsarbeiter-Entschädigungsverhandlungen unter Berücksichtigung der außenpolitischen und rechtlichen Faktoren* (Berlin: Logos, 2004); Constantin Goschler, *Schuld und Schulden: Die Politik der Wiedergutmachung für NS-Verfolgte seit 1945*, 2nd ed. (Göttingen: Wallstein, 2005); Lutz Niethammer, 'From Forced Labor in Nazi Germany to the Foundation "Remembrance, Responsibility and Future": A Tentative History', in Jansen and Saathoff, *Mutual Responsibility*, 15–85; Anja Hense, *Verhinderte Entschädigung: Die Entstehung der Stiftung 'Erinnerung, Verantwortung und Zukunft' für die Opfer von Zwangsarbeit und 'Arisierung'* (Münster: Westfälisches Dampfboot: 2008); Michael Marrus, *Some Measure of Justice: The Holocaust Era Restitution Campaign of the 1990s* (Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press, 2009); Benno Nietzel, 'Business finished? Transnationale Wiedergutmachung historischen Unrechts in Europa seit 1989', *Zeitschrift für Geschichtswissenschaft* 57(1) (2009): 26–50; on the preceding history, see Hans Günter Hockerts, Claudia Moisel and Tobias Winstel (eds), *Grenzen der Wiedergutmachung, 1945–2000: Die Entschädigung für NS-Verfolgte in West- und Osteuropa* (Göttingen: Wallstein, 2006).
5. Elazar Barkan expressed this view in a personal conversation with the author.
6. On the development of the political semantics of the term 'forced labour' see Constantin Goschler, 'Sklaven, Opfer und Agenten: Tendenzen

- der Zwangsarbeiterforschung', in Norbert Frei and Tim Schanetzky (eds), *Unternehmen im Nationalsozialismus: Zur Historisierung einer Forschungskonjunktur* (Göttingen: Wallstein, 2010), 116–32.
7. See Friedrich August von Hayek, *Law, Legislation and Liberty: A New Statement of the Liberal Principles of Justice and Political Economy* (London: Routledge, 2012) Previously, a similar point was made by John Rawls, *A Theory of Justice* (Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1971).
 8. See José Brunner *Die Politik des Traumas: Gewalterfahrungen und psychisches Leid in den USA, in Deutschland und im Israel/Palästina-Konflikt* (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 2014).
 9. See the chapters in the present book by Michael Esch, Stephanie Zloch and Julia Landau.
 10. To paraphrase the term 'networks of Nazi persecution' coined by Gerald D. Feldman and Wolfgang Seibel (eds), *Networks of Nazi Persecution: Bureaucracy, Business, and the Organization of the Holocaust* (New York/Oxford: Berghahn, 2005)
 11. See the chapter on the Foundation Remembrance, Responsibility and Future by Benno Nietzel in the present book.
 12. Peter Becker, 'Sprachvollzug: Kommunikation und Verwaltung', in Peter Becker (ed.) *Sprachvollzug im Amt: Kommunikation und Verwaltung im Europa des 19. und 20. Jahrhunderts* (Bielefeld: transcript, 2001), 9–42.
 13. See Julia Landau in the present book.
 14. Mark Mazower, 'The End of Civilization and the Rise of Human Rights: The Mid-Twentieth-Century Disjuncture', in Stefan-Ludwig Hoffmann (ed.), *Human Rights in the Twentieth Century* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), 29–44.
 15. Jeismann, *Auf Wiedersehen Gestern*, 179.
 16. Cf. Hubert Feichtlbauer, *Zwangsarbeit in Österreich 1938–1945. Fonds für Versöhnung, Frieden und Zusammenarbeit: Späte Anerkennung, Geschichte, Schicksale* (Vienna: Braintrust, 2005); Stefan Karner and Walter M. Iber (eds) *Schweres Erbe und 'Wiedergutmachung' Restitution und Entschädigung in Österreich: Die Bilanz der Regierung Schüssel* (Innsbruck: Studien Verlag, 2015).
 17. Mentioned by Dariusz Pawłowski (Warsaw) in a conversation on 6 March 2009.
 18. See Tanja Pentter in the present book.
 19. Cf. for example Jansen and Saathoff, *Mutual Responsibility*.
 20. See Tanja Pentter in the present book.
 21. See the critique by Ulrich Herbert, 'Wie das Gesetz es befahl: Italienische Zwangsarbeiter sollen keine Entschädigung erhalten', in *Süddeutsche Zeitung*, 16 October 2001.
 22. See Paul Erker in the present book.
 23. See Tanja Pentter in the present book.
 24. See Julia Landau in the present book.
 25. See Paul Erker in the present book.
 26. See Julia Landau and Tanja Pentter in the present book.

27. See Tanja Pentter in the present book.
28. See Paul Erker in the present book.
29. See Tanja Pentter in the present book.
30. See Michael Esch and Julia Landau in the present book.
31. The foundation behind the Buchenwald and Mittelbau-Dora memorial site organized the international travelling exhibition 'Forced Labor under National Socialism', which opened in Berlin in 2010 and went on to be shown in several European countries and the United States.
32. See, for example, the travelling exhibition 'Preserving Memory: Slave and Forced Workers of the Third Reich from Poland 1939–1945', organized by the Polish-German reconciliation foundation and opened in 2007, or the travelling exhibition 'Total Deployment: Czech Forced Labourers in the Third Reich', opened in Berlin in 2008 by the German-Czech Future Fund in cooperation with the Nazi Forced Labour Documentation Center Schöneweide of the Foundation Topography of Terror.
33. Constantin Goschler (ed.), in cooperation with José Brunner, Krzysztof Ruchniewicz and Philipp Ther *Die Entschädigung von NS-Zwangsarbeit am Anfang des 21. Jahrhunderts*, 4 vols, (Göttingen: Wallstein, 2012).
34. To this end, see Jansen and Saathoff, *Mutual Responsibility*.

Bibliography

- Adamheit, Ulrich. 'Jetzt wird die deutsche Wirtschaft von ihrer Geschichte eingeholt': *Die Diskussion um die Entschädigung ehemaliger Zwangsarbeiter am Ende des 20. Jahrhunderts*, Berlin: Berliner Wissenschafts-Verlag, 2004.
- Arning, Matthias. *Späte Abrechnung: Über Zwangsarbeiter, Schlußstriche und Berliner Verständigungen*, Frankfurt am Main: Fischer, 2001.
- Authers, John, and Richard Wolffe. *The Victim's Fortune: Inside the Epic Battle over the Debts of the Holocaust*, New York: Harper Collins, 2002.
- Becker, Peter. 'Sprachvollzug: Kommunikation und Verwaltung', in Peter Becker (ed.), *Sprachvollzug im Amt: Kommunikation und Verwaltung im Europa des 19. und 20. Jahrhunderts*, Bielefeld: transcript, 2001, 9–42.
- Brunner, José. *Die Politik des Traumas: Gewalterfahrungen und psychisches Leid in den USA, in Deutschland und im Israel/Palästina-Konflikt*, Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 2014.
- Eizenstat, Stuart. *Imperfect Justice: Looted Assets, Slave Labor, and the Unfinished Business of World War II*, New York: Public Affairs, 2003.
- Feichtlbauer, Hubert. *Zwangsarbeit in Österreich 1938–1945. Fonds für Versöhnung, Frieden und Zusammenarbeit: Späte Anerkennung, Geschichte, Schicksale*, Vienna: Braintrust, 2005.
- Feldman, Gerald D., and Wolfgang Seibel (eds). *Networks of Nazi Persecution: Bureaucracy, Business, and the Organization of the Holocaust*, New York/Oxford: Berghahn, 2005.
- Goschler, Constantin. *Schuld und Schulden: Die Politik der Wiedergutmachung für NS-Verfolgte seit 1945*, 2nd ed., Göttingen: Wallstein, 2008.

- . 'Skaven, Opfer und Agenten: Tendenzen der Zwangsarbeiterforschung', in Norbert Frei and Tim Schanetzky (eds), *Unternehmen im Nationalsozialismus: Zur Historisierung einer Forschungskonjunktur*, Göttingen: Wallstein, 2010, 116–32.
- Goschler, Constantin (ed.), in cooperation with Jose Brunner, Krzysztof Ruchniewicz and Philipp Ther. *Die Entschädigung von NS-Zwangsarbeit am Anfang des 21. Jahrhunderts*, 4 vols., Göttingen: Wallstein, 2012.
- Graf, Friedrich Wilhelm. 'Loyalität für 'nen Euro', *SZ-Magazin* 25, 20 June 2008: 18–23.
- Herbert, Ulrich. 'Wie das Gesetz es befahl: Italienische Zwangsarbeiter sollen keine Entschädigung erhalten', in *Süddeutsche Zeitung*, 16 October 2001.
- Hayek, Friedrich August von. *Law, Legislation and Liberty: A New Statement of the Liberal Principles of Justice and Political Economy*, London: Routledge, 2012.
- Hense, Anja. *Verhinderte Entschädigung: Die Entstehung der Stiftung 'Erinnerung, Verantwortung und Zukunft' für die Opfer von Zwangsarbeit und 'Arisierung'*, Münster: Westfälisches Dampfboot, 2008.
- Hockerts, Hans Günter, Claudia Moisel and Tobias Winstel (eds). *Grenzen der Wiedergutmachung, 1945–2000: Die Entschädigung für NS-Verfolgte in West- und Osteuropa*, Göttingen: Wallstein, 2006.
- Jansen, Michael and Günter Saathoff (eds) on behalf of the Foundation 'Remembrance, Responsibility and Future'. 'A Mutual Responsibility and a Moral Obligation': *The Final Report on Germany's Compensation Programs for Forced Labor and Other Personal Injuries*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009.
- Jeismann, Michael. *Auf Wiedersehen Gestern: Die deutsche Vergangenheit und die Politik von morgen*, Munich: DVA, 2001.
- Karner, Stefan and Walter M. Iber (eds). *Schweres Erbe und 'Wiedergutmachung'. Restitution und Entschädigung in Österreich: Die Bilanz der Regierung Schüssel*, Innsbruck: Studien Verlag, 2015.
- Marrus, Michael R. *Some Measure of Justice: The Holocaust Era Restitution Campaign of the 1990s*, Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press, 2009.
- Mazower, Mark. 'The End of Civilization and the Rise of Human Rights: The Mid-Twentieth-Century Disjuncture', in Stefan-Ludwig Hoffmann (ed.), *Human Rights in the Twentieth Century*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011, 29–44.
- Niethammer, Lutz. 'From Forced Labor in Nazi Germany to the Foundation "Remembrance, Responsibility and Future": A Tentative History', in Michael Jansen and Günter Saathoff (eds), 'A Mutual Responsibility and a Moral Obligation': *The Final Report on Germany's Compensation Programs for Forced Labor and Other Personal Injuries*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009, 15–85.
- Nietzel, Benno. 'Business finished? Transnationale Wiedergutmachung historischen Unrechts in Europa seit 1989'. *Zeitschrift für Geschichtswissenschaft* 57(1) (2009): 26–50.
- Rawls, John. *A Theory of Justice*, Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1971.

Spiliotis, Susanne-Sophia. *Verantwortung und Rechtsfrieden: Die Stiftungsinitiative der deutschen Wirtschaft*, Frankfurt am Main: Fischer, 2003.

Weisser, Claudia S. *'Erinnerung, Verantwortung und Zukunft': Eine Betrachtung der NS-Zwangsarbeiter-Entschädigungsverhandlungen unter Berücksichtigung der außenpolitischen und rechtlichen Faktoren*, Berlin: Logos, 2004.