

INTRODUCTION



May 1, 1987 began with gorgeous spring weather. It was “sunny and warm, resplendent with fresh green. On festively decorated Karl-Marx-Allee a sea of radiant red carnations, banners in working-class red and the colors of our Republic. The mood was just as magnificent in the mighty procession of more than 650,000.”¹ This was how *Neues Deutschland*, the Party newspaper, described the traditional May Day demonstration in East Berlin. Like every year, hundreds of thousands of people from Berlin gathered in the streets of the district of Friedrichshain and threaded their way in three marching columns onto Karl-Marx-Allee. They carried countless flags and banners as they headed towards Alexanderplatz, where they marched past the grand VIP stand decked out in red, from which Erich Honecker (1912–94) reviewed and saluted them. Next to the head of state and the Party stood members and candidates of the SED Politbüro, ranking Soviet officers, guests of state from Ethiopia and Chile, as well as distinguished workers and veterans of the labor movement. This “combat demonstration,” as the May Day parade on Karl-Marx-Allee was called, took no less than four and a half hours and ended with a mighty thunderstorm. As a finale, factory militias from East Berlin marched past the platform of dignitaries in the pouring rain while “The Internationale” blared from the loudspeakers.²

The May Day demonstration in the capital underlined, as it had for decades, the SED’s claim to power as well as serving as a form of popular acclamation. But May 1, 1987 was also the prelude to festivities marking the 750th anniversary of Berlin. The SED looked with pride at the Nikolai Quarter and other buildings in the center of the “Capital of the GDR” specially reconstructed for these events, a three-day public festival held throughout the whole of East Berlin. Sixty-four event stages had been set up between Strausberger Platz and Alexanderplatz, with cycling races

Notes for this chapter begin on page 22.

and fireman shows taking place on Karl-Marx-Allee. In a nearby public park, Friedrichshain Volkspark, each region of the GDR presented itself to the public. Finally, at 10 p.m., there was a spectacular fireworks display in Friedrichshain to mark the end of this Labor Day holiday in East Berlin.³

A very different kind of fireworks was going on at the same time less than four kilometers (2.5 miles) away in the western part of the city, on the other side of the Berlin Wall. Here there was a state of emergency. At Görlitzer Bahnhof in Kreuzberg, an entire Bolle supermarket went up in flames. Numerous stores were destroyed, firemen were seriously thwarted in their efforts to put out the fires, and traditional May Day festivities on Lausitzer Platz escalated into street fighting.⁴ The district of Kreuzberg was experiencing its worst conflict since the West Berlin squatters' movement of the early 1980s. The mood had been tense all day after West Berlin police stormed the MehringHof alternative center without a search warrant and confiscated numerous boycott leaflets from the offices of census opponents.⁵ Added to this was widespread protest against the declared intention to abolish rent control in West Berlin, not to mention a sense of annoyance at all the pomp and circumstance accompanying the opening event of the 750th anniversary of Berlin held the night before at the International Congress Center (ICC).⁶ To make matters worse, U.S. president Ronald Reagan (1911–2004) was scheduled to visit Berlin on June 12,⁷ heating the atmosphere even more on an already rather sultry May afternoon.⁸

West Berlin police were unprepared and wholly outnumbered at first by demonstrators who were willing to resort to violence. After being pelted by rocks, they withdrew from Kreuzberg for a couple of hours, leaving the field to the autonomists. As the evening wore on, more and more locals joined the stone-throwers.⁹ But not everyone was sympathetic to their cause. Massive plundering by ordinary citizens irritated countless observers of the Kreuzberg riots.¹⁰ All in all, the evening's events took a disastrous toll.¹¹ May 1, 1987 in Kreuzberg witnessed the hitherto greatest street riots in the history of West Berlin.

The events in Friedrichshain and Kreuzberg taking place simultaneously on this particular May Day could not have been more different. The one side exhibited a well-orchestrated self-performance staged by a dictatorial state power; the other an eruptive challenge to a democratically legitimized state's monopoly on power. The May Day celebrations in Friedrichshain were part of a state-sponsored mega event that spanned the entire GDR. The May Day riots in Kreuzberg, by contrast, were a local event that nonetheless sent shock waves across the nation. What both demonstrations had in common was their reference to May Day traditions. But how did it come to pass that Labor Day in these two neighboring dis-

tricts transpired in such distinctly different ways, that claims on the public sphere were asserted so differently?

Friedrichshain and Kreuzberg, at one time very similar, had apparently grown apart. Prior to 1945, both had belonged to the old proletarian eastern half of Berlin, forming the poorhouse of a starkly socially segregated Reich capital.¹² Before the war more than three hundred thousand people were crowded into each of these two districts, living in ten square kilometers each.¹³ The two neighborhoods were paradigmatic of a “Berlin made of stone” during the high phase of urbanization.¹⁴ Yet ever since the city’s political division very different social conditions prevailed in Friedrichshain and Kreuzberg. The districts henceforth belonged to different sides of a system conflict playing out at the municipal, national and global levels. Friedrichshain was located in the Soviet sector close to downtown East Berlin, the capital of the GDR. Kreuzberg belonged to the American sector and found itself in a peculiarly peripheral position, bordering as it did as of 1961 two sides of the Berlin Wall. This effectively cut Kreuzberg off from its old economic environment and led to a social situation that was vastly different than in Friedrichshain. May 1, 1987 marked the dramatic culmination of this developmental divide.

Even more surprising, and in need of explanation, is how quickly Friedrichshain and Kreuzberg grew back together again following the events of 1989–90. Nowadays the two traditionally working-class districts are both characterized by an alternative scene that constitutes the better part of their image. The challenges they currently face are also rather similar. These include the extensive modernization of existing structures and the attendant gentrification of these neighborhoods. Both banks of the Spree have witnessed widespread resistance to privatization and to the structural development of public spaces by private large-scale investors. This can be seen most prominently in the “Sink the Mediaspree!” initiative boycotting the plans of huge media concerns to develop both banks of the Spree River, or in the pushback against the removal of original segments of the Berlin Wall next to the East Side Gallery to allow the construction of a private luxury high-rise.

In political and administrative terms as well, Friedrichshain and Kreuzberg have converged in recent years. In the wake of a 2001 reform they were merged into a common administrative district (see map on page xiii). The two neighborhoods now form the 84th election district, whose representative, Hans-Christian Ströbele (b. 1939) of the Green Party, has won a direct mandate to the German Bundestag four times in a row since 2002, the electoral behavior of these once-divided boroughs now showing remarkably little disagreement.¹⁵ The fusion of East and West in the form of the Friedrichshain-Kreuzberg district is thus a kind of microcosm for the overall process of healing the city’s Cold War divisions.

As in all of Berlin, the process of reunification is far from complete. There are still plenty of cultural differences and mental animosities between Friedrichshain and Kreuzberg, especially between long-established locals. The original occupants of Karl-Marx-Allee have little in common with the left-wing alternative scene or the Turkish community of Kreuzberg. But young residents too, most of whom hail from other parts of Germany and elsewhere, likewise do their part to preserve—in a wholly different way—the contrast between these two neighborhoods. Perhaps the most striking example are the water and vegetable fights between Friedrichshain and Kreuzberg, in which residents of each half-district duke it out with squirt guns, paint bombs and rotten tomatoes. Oberbaum Bridge—the only road link between Friedrichshain and Kreuzberg, and hence a symbol of unity serving as the fused district’s coat of arms—has been the theater of these occasional skirmishes. The mostly youthful participants, who try to drive back their opponents from the bridge, view the fusion of these two municipal districts as a “forced merger.” Outwardly the event seems rather warlike, and it is always accompanied by a considerable police and media presence. But it’s no comparison to the violence and riots on May Day witnessed since 1990 in both parts of the city. The water and vegetable fights are neither an expression of any real conflict between Friedrichshain and Kreuzberg nor an indication of the often-invoked “wall in people’s heads.” It is simply a playful way of dealing with local urban identities that are no longer all that different from each other. The two working-class neighborhoods have since become a common, alternative-oriented district.

The present volume is devoted to the question of how Friedrichshain and Kreuzberg grew apart during the period of Cold War division, developing in opposite directions. But it will also ask what continued to link these two parts of the city, and why the period of division meanwhile almost seems like a brief interlude. Examining the separate yet intertwined paths of these two boroughs requires a comparative method that inquires into commonalities, differences and entanglements. This integrated approach will be briefly outlined in the following before the guiding questions are developed and concrete areas of investigation defined. This will be followed by an introduction to the sources used, to the current state of scholarship, and by an outline of this study.

A Divided History

Like temporarily separated twins, Friedrichshain and Kreuzberg form a kind of historical experiment, being almost ideally suited for a histori-

cal comparison inquiring into similarities and differences. The differences seem plain enough. Whereas dictatorship was the order of the day in Friedrichshain, fundamental democratic freedoms existed in Kreuzberg. This contrast of political systems forms the historical basis of the following investigation. As opposed to a conventional contrastive history of the two German states, however, the present study endeavors to go beyond a simple juxtaposition of two politically contrary districts so as not to merely perpetuate long-established facts and normative historical interpretations.¹⁶ The postwar history of Friedrichshain and Kreuzberg is much more than the contrast between democracy and dictatorship. The repressive system of rule in the East met with partial acceptance, whereas the democratically elected state authorities in West Berlin sometimes proved incapable of entering a fruitful, peaceful dialogue with the citizens of Kreuzberg. May 1, 1987 is one example.

A comparative investigation of Friedrichshain and Kreuzberg also has to inquire into the commonalities between these two districts. As old working-class neighborhoods in eastern Berlin they shared a similar historical starting point. Their social structure, their dilapidated housing stock, and a comparable degree of wartime destruction led to similar problems after 1945. The present study therefore follows a problem-history approach spanning the Cold War divide.¹⁷ It is as much about commonalities as it is about division, the postwar history of two politically divided districts, both of which nonetheless faced many of the same social challenges.¹⁸

The answers each society found to existing problems were not entirely independent of each other and did not go unnoticed by the other side. Even after Berlin was divided, Friedrichshain and Kreuzberg remained interconnected—for example, by low-level cross-border traffic prior to 1961, or by the transborder consumption of media after the Wall was built. In the following I will thus inquire into selected entanglements between Friedrichshain and Kreuzberg, taking care though not to force autonomous developments into the corset of connected history. Comparative analysis and transfer history will not be understood as antagonistic and mutually exclusive approaches.¹⁹ Instead, I will seek to add an entangled-history perspective to the historical comparison of these two municipal districts.²⁰

The specific situation in Berlin as a window on Cold War confrontation²¹ offers the possibility of examining entanglements in the divided metropolis with a specifically urbanistic perspective. This is why I have chosen to compare and contrast the directly adjacent neighborhoods of Friedrichshain and Kreuzberg, though not necessarily focusing on the “inherent urban logic”²² of self-perception and the perception of others. In this respect the district of Prenzlauer Berg would have perhaps been a better match for comparative purposes.²³ The similarities between

Prenzlauer Berg and Kreuzberg, however, are largely the result of a myth ascribed retrospectively, one which overestimates the actually rather limited opposition scene in Prenzlauer Berg.²⁴ The fact that such ascriptions can nonetheless be powerful is demonstrated by the massive gentrification of Prenzlauer Berg that followed in 1990, due not least of all to the neighborhood's enhanced symbolic status as the home of dissident bohemian artists.²⁵ But this book does not concern itself with the myth of these two well-known neighborhoods; its focus is on social developments, parallel challenges and the tangible entanglement of these two neighboring districts.

The local perspective of this investigation using the concrete examples of Friedrichshain and Kreuzberg offers the advantage that certain issues of German postwar history can be examined here in more detail than from the grand perspective of two competing German states. This applies in particular to specific protagonists, local attempts to dissociate oneself from those on the other side of the Wall, and isolated transfers. And yet Friedrichshain and Kreuzberg are hardly small units of investigation. Each resembles a mid-sized German town in terms of their number of inhabitants.²⁶ For the sake of a detailed investigation, the districts will not be described here in their entirety. I will sometimes focus on individual buildings, streets and neighborhoods (*Kieze*), adopting a microhistorical perspective.

This neighborhood history or *Kiezesgeschichte*—the original title of this book in German—follows a narrative approach which, instead of offering a strictly systematic comparative overview, tells the story of individual case studies and representative examples from both districts, ultimately linking them to each other. But it is more than a purely local history of these two districts, however justified that approach would be given the lack of any such comparative study to date. Rather, the book works on several levels. It not only describes the history of two Berlin *Kieze*—two essentially self-contained neighborhoods with a unique identity and sense of belonging—but also shows how the term *Kiez* was reinvented in the 1970s and 1980s in East and West alike, becoming the historicizing expression of a new urbanity and making its own history, as it were: as a new, powerful and appealing label for the rediscovery of historic buildings which in turn helped lead to their preservation.

The neighborhood history also directs attention to the inner diversity of Friedrichshain and Kreuzberg, neither of which formed a homogeneous, self-contained district. The large swaths of intact older buildings in the eastern parts of each borough exhibit a different development pattern and social structure than the western parts, which were largely destroyed in the war and subsequently rebuilt. Moreover, Friedrichshain and Kreuz-

berg each have to be recontextualized in terms of urban space. Modern urbanism inquires into the locality of a concrete urban space in the topographic framework of an overall city.²⁷ This means that Friedrichshain and Kreuzberg not only have to be put in relation to each other, but also to the other districts in their respective urban halves. Friedrichshain, for instance, cannot be properly understood without its fluid boundaries with the district of Mitte in the center of East Berlin. Kreuzberg, on the other hand, has to be seen in connection with the adjacent district of Neukölln, whose Gropiusstadt, a large-scale housing project erected in the 1960s and 1970s, absorbed large parts of Kreuzberg's population. Only city-wide relationships reveal patterns of socio-spatial segregation and offer an explanation for certain local characteristics in Friedrichshain and Kreuzberg.

A look at the particular in turn gives rise to overarching questions of German contemporary history after 1945. The present *Kiezgeschichte* of Friedrichshain and Kreuzberg would like to make a contribution to an integrated German postwar history in the form of an "asymmetrically entangled parallel history" as conceived by Christoph Kleßmann.²⁸ Using the example of these two Berlin boroughs divided by the Wall, I will inquire into how these two German subcommunities developed, which answers they found to parallel problems, and to what extent East and West remained entwined with each other. I will hence pose larger questions by way of small-scale investigations.

The primary period of investigation—the era of divided Berlin, from 1961 to 1989–90—is also geared towards these questions. Since it is the shared prehistory of Friedrichshain and Kreuzberg that forms the historical basis of comparison here and that likewise results in many shared challenges, the timeframe of this study will occasionally go back as far as the late nineteenth century. In this manner I aim to show, furthermore, that Berlin was divided even before the Cold War, especially with regard to the longstanding socio-spatial division between the bourgeois (middle-class) West and the predominantly petty-bourgeois (lower-middle-class) and proletarian (working-class) eastern part of the city, which Friedrichshain and Kreuzberg both belonged to. But also the two-class society within the Wilhelmine-era "rental barracks," the tenement houses in these two working-class neighborhoods, is in many ways part of the "divided Berlin" in the title of this book.

Remarkably, in the years since 1989–90, it is not only the political division of the Cold War that has ceased to exist but also the aforementioned socio-spatial division that marked the city for long periods of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. The final chapter of this book is therefore entitled "Perspectives" and deals with more recent contemporary history, describing how Friedrichshain and Kreuzberg have grown back together

as well as how the old socio-spatial patterns have tended to be reversed in the wake of increasing gentrification in areas with older, prewar buildings. This long-term historical transformation can only be grasped if the period of investigation goes beyond the traditional historico-political watersheds. Thus, the present study sometimes focuses on the entire twentieth century without, however, laying claim to being a comprehensive account of it. The Nazi period, for example, only plays a role here when it is relevant to the historical development of these neighborhoods.

The Public and Private Spheres

A comparative investigation of Friedrichshain and Kreuzberg has to be based on the right questions. A particularly fruitful perspective can be gained by focusing on historical transformation and the interrelationship between the public and private spheres. For one thing, the question of the public and private spheres offers a new and largely untapped perspective on postwar German-German history.²⁹ For another, it allows a genuine urban-history approach to the history of Berlin. Friedrichshain and Kreuzberg are then viewed as urban spaces and examined with regard to their urban character. The historiographical approach of this study will thus be expanded through the addition of an urban-sociology perspective, to be introduced in the following.

The fundamental terminology on the dichotomy of the public and private spheres in the modern city was established by Göttingen sociologist Hans Paul Bahrtdt (1918–94), who refers to the public and private spheres as the basic principles of urban association.³⁰ Bahrtdt in this case follows Max Weber’s (1864–1920) economic definition of the city as a market settlement.³¹ The contacts at markets, fleeting and yet always following strict rules, between individuals who are almost complete strangers to each other while at the same time potentially excluding the respective social fabric are for Bahrtdt the earliest form of a public sphere.³² Bahrtdt builds on this to develop a basic formula for urban life. He defines the city as such:

a settlement in which the whole of life, everyday life included, shows a tendency towards polarization, i.e., to take place either in the social aggregate of the public sphere or in the private sphere. A public and a private sphere are formed that are closely interrelated without losing their polarity. The areas of life that can neither be characterized as “public” nor “private” ultimately lose their significance. The stronger the polarity and interrelationship between the public and private sphere, the more “urban,” sociologically speaking, the life of a settlement becomes.³³

By focusing on the duality and interrelationship of the public and private spheres, Bahrtdt defines the city independently of its legal status and size. He views the imperfect social integration of city dwellers as the decisive prerequisite for the development of a public sphere. In contrast to the perfect and prestructured social constitution of the village, the city, in his opinion, offered the necessary freedom for the development of a public sphere. Imperfect urban integration, however, is for Bahrtdt merely a negative precondition for the development of a public sphere. The latter only develops when specific stylized behaviors emerge that help bridge the gap between inhabitants, thus allowing communication and contact to occur. These stylized behaviors, for Bahrtdt, include representation as a form of self-presentation in which the subject makes himself visible, enabling communication and integration, for example through certain social behaviors, clothing styles and architecture. The public game of representations has led, accordingly, to a consciousness of various social behaviors and hence to an awareness of the possibility of social change. Thus, all progress, in Bahrtdt's opinion, stems from the city.³⁴

This public sphere is complemented by the private one. For Bahrtdt, the private sphere forms the necessary refuge in an imperfectly integrated society. The city, in other words, awakens the need for privacy but is also the prerequisite for a certain form of the private sphere that does not exist in village society with its strict social controls. Only a developed private sphere can create opportunities for individual development, cultivate personalities and lead to a complex emotional life, though this interpersonal remove is always a matter of contention in need of constant reassertion. Much like Georg Simmel (1858–1918), Bahrtdt describes the inhabitants of cities as being both individualistic and impersonal or aloof.³⁵ Analogous to a developed public sphere, society draws its dynamism from a developed private sphere as well. The public and private spheres are predicated on each other. But for Bahrtdt this also means that when the one deteriorates the other follows suit.³⁶ He thus expounds on the problem of modern cities becoming “unsightly” and life becoming ever more technology-dependent. Streets and squares could no longer serve the public, he claimed, because they had degenerated into mere traffic pipelines.³⁷

Bahrtdt's book, published in 1961, aimed to sensitize his audience to the difficulties of a functionally organized modern city in the context of a postwar Germany undergoing reconstruction,³⁸ and was warmly received by urban planners and architects.³⁹ He was one of the first to articulate the discomfort people felt about the growing “inhospitality” of cities, an idea that would take off in the 1960s.⁴⁰ A wide range of scholarly debates on the idea of the public and private sphere appeared at around the same

time,⁴¹ responding not only to urban transformations but especially to the widespread mediatization of society.⁴² The most important and influential treatment of the subject was undoubtedly Jürgen Habermas's (b. 1929) postdoctoral thesis *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere*.⁴³ The book remains the standard work and baseline for any discussion of the public and private spheres.⁴⁴ Habermas describes the formation of a bourgeois public sphere in the eighteenth century confronting the transformed public authority of the state. The modern public sphere, for Habermas, is part of bourgeois society, which is divided into the private sphere of the nuclear family and the public sphere of private, bourgeois individuals. The latter form the public that, by way of reason, questions the public authority of the state. Habermas develops his concept historically, describing the conceptual history of the public and private spheres—*Öffentlichkeit* and *Privatheit*, respectively.⁴⁵

In contrast to Hans Paul Bahrtdt, the city figures only marginally in Habermas's deliberations. For him it is mainly the place where the literary public of early-modern salons and coffeehouses gathered, which later developed into the bourgeois political public sphere.⁴⁶ The two studies differ in their reference to space and their avowed aims.⁴⁷ And yet there are some striking parallels between Bahrtdt and Habermas. Both sociologists argue historically and start from the assumption that the public and private spheres existed in an ideal state in the past. Bahrtdt locates the ideal type in the medieval "burgher town,"⁴⁸ whereas Habermas's model is the public sphere of bourgeois society in the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries.⁴⁹ Both identified clear symptoms of a declining public sphere in the present. Bahrtdt counts among these the emergence of large corporations that are neither private nor public as well as the mediatization of the public sphere as a result of the modern nation-state becoming more bureaucratic.⁵⁰ Habermas, for his part, warns about the mediatization of the public sphere caused by the increasing dissolution of boundaries: "Tendencies pointing to the collapse of the public sphere are unmistakable, for while its scope is expanding impressively, its function has become progressively insignificant."⁵¹ Habermas mostly blames the modern "culture industry" for this. There are similarities here between Habermas's leftist cultural critique influenced by the Frankfurt School and conservative cultural pessimism,⁵² although Habermas clearly rejects the antiliberal school of Carl Schmitt (1888–1985)⁵³ just as Bahrtdt vehemently argues against traditional critiques of the city.⁵⁴ Both books are fundamental and still very thought-provoking investigations of the public sphere. But they also reflect a specific discourse prevalent during the 1960s and therefore have to be historicized as critical interventions based on a period-specific diagnosis of decline.

The twentieth century was marked by an unparalleled expansion of the private sphere. This was accompanied on the one hand by the novel idea of a right to privacy, the protection of which was understood as a public responsibility. On the other hand, the state's encroachment on the private sphere was one of the century's most salient characteristics—sometimes even culminating in the total destruction of personal privacy.⁵⁵ In the second half of the twentieth century a number of prominent sociologists identified a tendency among people in Germany to retreat into the private sphere, not least as a reaction to these radical encroachments upon private life experienced under the Nazis. In the 1950s Helmut Schelsky (1912–84) described a “skeptical generation” that consciously withdrew from the public sphere.⁵⁶ Hans Paul Bahrdt viewed this “bliss in a quiet corner” as a denaturation of the private sphere and a danger to the public sphere.⁵⁷ But perhaps the most prominent warning came from American sociologist Richard Sennett (b. 1943), who talked about a “tyranny of intimacy,” diagnosing a radicalization of the private and a complementary decline of the public sphere.⁵⁸ Here, too, a cultural critique was clearly evident.

The shortcomings and omissions in the work of many social scientists analyzing the public and private spheres have been widely discussed in the literature, leading to numerous advances. Habermas, for instance, notably ignored the urban lower classes, prompting Oskar Negt (b. 1934) and Alexander Kluge (b. 1932) to develop the concept of a proletarian (counter-) public sphere.⁵⁹ Feminist theory of the 1960s and 1970s questioned the traditional understanding of separate public and private spheres altogether, asserting instead that the private and the personal were eminently political.⁶⁰ Nancy Fraser (b. 1947) discussed the problem of women being left out of classic interpretations of the bourgeois public sphere, advocating an alternative concept of “multiple, competing publics.”⁶¹ Despite the explosion of literature on the topic ever since the translation of Habermas's seminal work into English,⁶² there has yet to be an investigation into how the public and private spheres continued to develop in the twentieth century.⁶³

A more fundamental question is whether there was a public and private sphere at all in the dictatorships of the twentieth century. Were they merely staged pseudo-public spheres?⁶⁴ Did the public sphere not forfeit its independent creativity in the face of overpowering political constructions of society?⁶⁵ And did the totalitarian creative will of a dictatorial regime not largely destroy the private sphere?⁶⁶ With regard to the GDR, more specifically the East Berlin district of Friedrichshain under investigation here, the question is to what extent this concept of public and private spheres is applicable at all. In their deliberations on public spheres in societies of the Soviet type, Gábor T. Rittersporn, Jan C. Behrends and

Malte Rolf make the case for “productively harnessing the concept [of the public sphere] developed for research on Western societies by detaching it from its normative context and cautiously opening it to a broader semantics. This perspective would enable new investigative approaches to the historical analysis of state socialism.”⁶⁷ The authors conclude that even in state-socialist dictatorships a variety of different public spaces and spheres existed. They are interested not only in an investigation of the residual (counter-)public spheres of a small oppositional minority,⁶⁸ but especially in the question of a fragmented public sphere within the boundaries set by the regime. “In principle, every organization, structure or association created by the state was a kind of public sphere . . . Every place the regime allowed its citizens to congregate can ultimately be understood as a public one: streets and squares, cinemas and stadiums, swimming pools and stores.”⁶⁹ In centralized dictatorships it is precisely the regional and local public spheres that gain importance as spaces for social experimentation.⁷⁰

The present study has chosen this local level to investigate the relationship between public and private spheres in East-West comparison. This means abandoning any normative concept of the public sphere.⁷¹ Instead, I propose understanding the public sphere as a spatial category and pluralizing it, as suggested by Jörg Requate,⁷² thus allowing for various layers of meaning. The public sphere is variously understood in the following to mean a) an *inclusive* space that is open to all, b) a *communal or public (state)* sphere subject to public law, and c) a *communicative* space, ranging from small sub-public spheres to public mass media. Similarly, private spheres are understood as a) spaces with *exclusive* access, b) spaces that are *private property* in the legal sense, and c) spaces that allow personal development, intimacy and a withdrawal from the public sphere.⁷³ These are all instances of contested spaces whose limits were a matter of contention between historical protagonists.

The pluralization and spatialization of the public and private spheres necessarily leads to a more pragmatic understanding of the term, because “only a sufficiently flexible concept of the public sphere can remain operational over time and in comparative perspective between different states.”⁷⁴ The present study neither endeavors to be a conceptual history⁷⁵ nor does it attempt to historicize theories taken from the social sciences⁷⁶ or to form its own theory of the public and private spheres.⁷⁷ The two categories of public and private serve rather as a hermeneutic key to the postwar history of Friedrichshain and Kreuzberg. For analytical purposes, this investigation opts for the broadest possible understanding of the public and private sphere.

At the same time, it is necessary to distinguish between related concepts that are sometimes used synonymously with the public and private

sphere. The Roman term “republic,” for example, originally meant “public thing” or “public affair.” And yet public sphere in the modern sense is neither equivalent to the “state” nor “democracy,” since the origins of the modern public sphere are more to be found in its fraught relationship to politics.⁷⁸ In everyday language the public sphere is often confused with “society.” The latter is a comprehensive communal system, an umbrella under which the entire spectrum of community relations is organized,⁷⁹ and not so much an actual space in the way public sphere is understood here.⁸⁰ Competing concepts exist with respect to the private sphere as well. Historians have shown a heightened interest recently in the history of “subjectivity.” But the focus here is on historical protagonists and how they construct meaning. Richard Sennett tends to use the term “intimacy” as a synonym for “privacy,” but mostly only with reference to the modern obsession with the self and the desire to retreat into the private sphere.⁸¹ The term “individuality” is closely linked to this.⁸² It overlaps in many respects with “privacy” but lacks the spatial dimension so decisive here for the urban-history approach of this book.

The binary construction of the public and private sphere has often been criticized.⁸³ It does, however, offer the advantage that both spheres need to be taken into consideration when applying these categories to historical analysis. That said, the limits of the approach should be kept in mind. *First*, the dichotomy of public and private spheres suggests a totality that makes it tempting for historians to assign all of lived reality to one or the other. Areas of overlap tend to be overlooked, along with those areas that are neither public nor private in character. This is the case, for instance, with the border facilities at the Berlin Wall, which divided Friedrichshain and Kreuzberg from 1961 to 1989. *Second*, the sociological twin terms of the public and private sphere are relatively static. It is therefore all the more important to inquire in the present study into the historical transformation and entanglements of the public and private spheres. *Third*, despite a decidedly pluralist and spatial understanding of the public and private spheres, it is hard to avoid the inherent normativity of the two terms, tending as they do to describe an ideal social state which is pointless to compare with historical reality and is not the aim of this study. Normative pitfalls are likewise lurking in notions of an “expanding” or “declining” public and private sphere, though process concepts like these are indispensable for analyses of historical change. This points, *fourth*, to the dual character of the public and private spheres as source and analytical terms that cannot always be clearly distinguished from each other. It is important, for example, to always bear in mind that the term “counter-public sphere” was a battle cry used by contemporaries even though it is just as indispensable for historical analysis. *Fifth*, the analytical twin terms of

public and private sphere exhibit an inherent and fundamental asymmetry. Whereas the public sphere literally found public expression and is traceable in countless sources, the private sphere is almost by definition an invisible category that often eludes historical analysis. This is why the term public sphere is much easier to operationalize than its counterpart, the private sphere. And yet only the two terms taken together account for the analytical potential of the approach chosen here.

The public and private spheres are key terms, essential to an understanding of urban history.⁸⁴ They offer a multiperspective approach to the contemporary history of Friedrichshain and Kreuzberg. In this respect, the following questions are crucial to this investigation. What forms of the public and private sphere existed in Friedrichshain and Kreuzberg, and what did they mean to the residents of these two boroughs? What role did the public and private spheres play in the transformation from a working-class to an alternative culture, and how did the relationship between the public and private spheres change in a concrete urban context? Have the public and private spheres in Friedrichshain and Kreuzberg tended to decline or expand over time? Where did the dynamics of the public and private spheres have a causal effect on urban development and where did they tend to result from such developments? What reciprocal relationships between the public and private spheres existed in Friedrichshain and Kreuzberg, and to what extent did these tend to result from the overall social framework or from specific urbanistic conditions and developments? Were the public and private spheres in Friedrichshain and Kreuzberg more a historical exception or were they representative of more general tendencies?

This book investigates these questions through case studies of three different aspects of postwar life in Friedrichshain and Kreuzberg. The first of these, tenement *housing*, will examine the core urban sphere of private lifestyles and public intervention. A second aspect is the Protestant *Church* as the driving force and protective umbrella of new counter-public spheres. Third, the example of *entertainment* in Friedrichshain and Kreuzberg will open up a new area of research in contemporary history, incorporating mass consumption as a key concept of the twentieth century. All three aspects concern constitutive areas of the public and private spheres, in which the interrelationship between the two spheres was negotiated in a particular way.

The housing question formed a crucial area of conflict between private lifestyles and individual demands on the one hand and between public offerings and intervention on the other. Using the example of two streets and their histories—Sorauer Strasse in Kreuzberg and Strasse der Pariser Kommune (formerly Fruchtstrasse) in Friedrichshain—I will examine the

historical interrelationship between the public and private spheres on a concrete urbanistic level. I will subsequently look at alternative forms of living and alternative public spheres in both districts. Given that these developed in old Wilhelmine rental barracks, my focus will be on these older, historic tenement buildings of Friedrichshain and Kreuzberg.

In the second section I will investigate the relationship between the public and private spheres with regard to church intervention in social affairs. The two case studies in this instance are St. Martha's parish in Kreuzberg and the Samaritan parish in Friedrichshain, their pastors having become formative figures in new public spheres originating in the church in the 1970s and 1980s. St. Martha's Church (Marthakirche) became a center of debate on urban-planning policy in Kreuzberg, whereas the Samaritan Church (Samariterkirche) in Friedrichshain served as the venue for the famed "blues masses," a gathering point for opposition members. The present investigation focuses on the transformation of religious spaces originally intended for collective worship and private religious practice into a local, secular and politicized public sphere.

My third focus, urban entertainment culture, became an important interface for public supply and private demand. Public and private spheres were constituted and addressed at places of urban entertainment. This is where urbanites picked up the mannerisms of both spheres, entertainment culture thus making a key contribution to "inner" urbanization. Using the example of taverns, I will first examine traditional places of urban entertainment and the historical transformation of their character and function before inquiring into the transformation of public entertainment in the second half of the twentieth century using the example of street and other public festivals in Friedrichshain and Kreuzberg.

My focus is necessarily limited. Other aspects of the public and private spheres apart from the three case studies mentioned above could have been addressed as well. Labor, for example, would have lent itself to an investigation of the socio-cultural transformation of these two working-class neighborhoods into alternative hot spots, but less so to the interaction between public and private spheres which forms the chief concern of this study. The welfare state as an institution would have been another worthy point of inquiry, given the incomparably strong influence it exerted on the relationship between the public and the private spheres during the twentieth century.⁸⁵ But such an investigation would have required a larger framework than the urban-history perspective of this study could offer, since the relevant social legislation was the work of state authorities despite the communal organization of poor-relief and social-welfare institutions. Given the significant history of migration in Kreuzberg, a view to migrant-related public and private spheres would have been of inter-

est too, though admittedly the asymmetry here between Kreuzberg and Friedrichshain would have been too big to lend itself to a comparative investigation. The same applies to journalistic and parliamentary public spheres at the communal level, which are likewise barely discussed in this study, the state-socialist Eastern district and the liberal-democratic Western one being constituted too differently in political terms, whereas a historical comparison focused solely on self-evident differences in political opinion- and decision-making seemed pointless.

Sources

The historical sources this book is based on are extremely heterogeneous. The present work is not based on any specific body of sources as is the case with other studies devoted to the public sphere. Instead, I consult a large variety of different sources for the purpose of a broad investigation of the postwar history of Friedrichshain and Kreuzberg, inquiring into various aspects of the public and private spheres. Access to these sources was admittedly uneven. Whereas most of the files from the municipal authorities of East Berlin and the district council of Friedrichshain are accessible in the Berlin State Archive up to the years 1989–90 thanks to the extensive opening of state files from the GDR, the corresponding files from Kreuzberg are generally frozen for a period of thirty years due to the Federal Archives Act, effectively limiting access to more recent files on Senate planning, squatting and so on. The opposite is true of the Kreuzberg Museum, which acquired a range of archival materials from the Friedrichshain Regional Museum and Archive in 2004 in the wake of their fusion. Unlike the Kreuzberg files, the Friedrichshain documents are only partly accessible. Added to this is Kreuzberg's more liberal political constitution, which results in more sources being preserved and archived, particularly those of non-state actors.⁸⁶

An important source alongside contemporary address books and social surveys are Berlin dailies and local papers. The fact that *Neues Deutschland*, the *Berliner Zeitung* and *Neue Zeit* have meanwhile all been fully digitalized and are available online at the GDR Press Portal of the Berlin State Library turned out to be a real boon.⁸⁷ This enables quantifiable inquiries into historical semantics, meaning I not only investigated the changes in meaning of certain terms in classic hermeneutic fashion but was able to use new computational-linguistics tools for the analysis of word frequency and tenses. Apart from descriptions of the city, the way it is visualized is just as important, since it forms a significant aspect of urban-development processes and practices of appropriation. The photos in this book—of

building facades, furnished apartments, and scenes from daily life in Friedrichshain and Kreuzberg—are not just for illustrative purposes but serve as historical sources and are critically analyzed here with the methods of visual history.⁸⁸ I will also look at feature films, examining issues of artistic construction and historical reconstruction. *The Legend of Paul and Paula* (1973) and *Berlin Chamissoplatz* (1980) are not merely taken as fictional portrayals of Berlin but as public interventions in urban-planning discourses and artistic manifestations of individual lifestyle choices.

The built city itself is also used as a source in this study. Architectural ensembles are a key component of material culture comprising numerous levels of meaning and serving as an important historical resource.⁸⁹ This includes representations in the form of maps, which served as a visual aid and helped contemporaries form an image of their city.⁹⁰ The sources used in this study likewise include citizens' petitions to the Communal Housing Administration (KMV) of the Friedrichshain district, which are now kept at the Berlin State Archive in the form of petition analyses. A final key source are interviews with contemporary witnesses, conducted specifically for this book with historical protagonists from Friedrichshain and Kreuzberg. While most of these interviews served the purpose of collecting background information, some were incorporated into the narrative.

Before moving on to a brief outline of the current state of scholarship, it is worth noting that the boundary between sources and research literature is often a fluid one.⁹¹ Older social surveys, local histories and so on sometimes proved to be fundamental works on the history of these two districts. On the other hand, many recent accounts of the history of Friedrichshain and Kreuzberg were written by the historical protagonists themselves, thus lending them the character of firsthand sources. In many cases these self-portrayals form an indispensable basis for this study given the lack of other sources or recent research on the history of these districts.

The State of Scholarship

The aim of this monograph is to present a small-scale integrated German postwar history. From an all-German perspective this is still a desideratum. While there may be survey works on postwar German-German history,⁹² none of these fulfills the demand programmatically formulated by Christoph Kleßmann and Konrad H. Jarausch for a social and entangled history.⁹³ Numerous edited volumes have appeared, however, in recent years that develop social-historical perspectives on the “divided history”⁹⁴ of East and West Germany in a systematically comparative way or that employ case studies to inquire into asymmetric entanglements⁹⁵ between

the GDR and the Federal Republic. Even erstwhile skeptics have meanwhile underlined the relevance of comparative and entangled perspectives on German-German postwar history.⁹⁶

A comprehensive overview of the postwar history of Berlin giving equal consideration to East and West Berlin and their relationship to each other has likewise yet to materialize. The two-volume standard work on the history of Berlin, published in 1987 by the Berlin Historical Commission under the stewardship of Wolfgang Ribbe, contains comprehensive accounts of individual historical periods from political- and social-history perspectives but lacks sufficient coverage of the postwar period, not to mention the fact that the work was published before the watershed events of 1989.⁹⁷ Ribbe, Bernd Stöver and Arnt Cobbers have all written concise historical surveys of Berlin, but each of these suffers from the same problem of having to cover the national and world-historical significance of the German capital in the twentieth century on a limited number of pages, thus tending towards a political-history approach that sometimes entirely loses track of the urban history of Berlin.⁹⁸

There are, however, a number of comparative studies addressing individual intervals and aspects of the postwar period. Michael Lemke describes divided Berlin in the period “before the Wall” as an “entangled society determined by culture and day-to-day politics” that developed a remarkable resilience, stability and flexibility in the face of various political influences and moments of heightened conflict during the heyday of the Cold War.⁹⁹ The 750-year anniversary of Berlin near the end of the Cold War is described by Krijn Thijs, who compares the celebrations of 1937 and 1987 in East and West Berlin, making numerous cross-references.¹⁰⁰ A number of publications on “dual” and intertwined urban development in divided Berlin have also appeared of late.¹⁰¹ Hartmut Häußermann and Andreas Kapphan have compared the two halves of the city from an urban-sociology perspective, foregrounding questions of continuity vs. transformation of socio-spatial orders, with in-depth descriptions of historical foundations mostly serving as a backdrop to the analysis of segregation processes after 1990.¹⁰²

An increasing number of more recent accounts focus on just one half of the city.¹⁰³ Wilfried Rott offers a very well-informed history of the “island” of West Berlin, profiting enormously from his own personal experience as a resident there.¹⁰⁴ Rott focuses in particular on the governing mayors and their character traits, West Berlin corruption (“*Filz*”) and its structural causes, the city’s (high-)cultural landscape and its creative individuals, as well as on problems and status issues with respect to the Allied powers, the Federal Republic and the GDR. A special issue of *Zeithistorische Forschungen / Studies in Contemporary History* developed social-history perspectives

on West Berlin, inquiring into the particular locus of this half-city as a historical exception, a magnifying glass and laboratory, but also into the impressive “boom” of recent exhibits and photo volumes on West Berlin.¹⁰⁵ The history of everyday life in West Berlin has also become the subject of a sometimes rather nostalgic literature of remembrance appearing in the decades since the city’s reunification and often written by those who lived it.¹⁰⁶ There is no comparable overview to date for the eastern half of the city, but there are numerous studies examining individual aspects of East German history using East Berlin as an example.¹⁰⁷ These works tend to address much more general questions about the history of the GDR than the local history of Berlin, however.

In contrast to other border areas along the German-German frontier¹⁰⁸ and/or the Berlin Wall¹⁰⁹ there are no in-depth comparative studies of Friedrichshain and Kreuzberg. The newly fused district does, however, boast a joint *Bezirkslexikon*, an alphabetical reference work on the district’s streets and squares, its buildings and institutions, presenting the basics of its urban development in a detailed historical introduction.¹¹⁰ Also worth noting is Jens Dobler’s thoroughly researched history of homosexuality in Kreuzberg and Friedrichshain, which developed out of an exhibition at the Kreuzberg Museum.¹¹¹ The museum’s director, Martin Düspohl, has published a popular historical survey of Kreuzberg with a special focus on the neighborhood’s long history of migration.¹¹² Barbara Lang investigates the myth of Kreuzberg from an ethnological perspective, describing in particular the symbolic underpinnings of present-day gentrification.¹¹³ There are numerous publications dealing with the redevelopment history of individual streets and squares.¹¹⁴ These were often written by people directly involved in the process and who hoped to use their historical depictions to lend authority to their own arguments in the debates on urban development.¹¹⁵

In contrast to Kreuzberg, there are considerably fewer accounts of the history of Friedrichshain.¹¹⁶ Prior to 1989 these were mostly working-class stories and autobiographies, describing the simple day-to-day lives of proletarian East Berlin.¹¹⁷ After German reunification a number of detailed local histories were published, some of them addressing the entire district,¹¹⁸ others individual parts of it.¹¹⁹ Other studies focus on individual streets, such as Annett Gröschner’s remarkably thick description of Friedrichshain’s Fruchtstrasse.¹²⁰ Other locales are depicted in the context of certain historical events that took place in Friedrichshain. Also worth mentioning here are works by Dirk Moldt on the blues masses at Samaritan Church as well as the literature on the clearance of occupied buildings on Mainzer Strasse in 1990, both of which were fundamental for the present study.¹²¹

There are hardly any comparative histories on the subject of the public and private spheres in postwar German-German history. This is most likely due to the fact that a public sphere in the normative sense did not exist in the GDR, thus rendering comparison pointless. Jörg Requate, on the other hand, has proven the contrary, that it is indeed possible to inquire into the notion of a public sphere in the GDR.¹²² Using the example of the East German television show *Prisma*, Requate showed how viewers aired a variety of problems through their letters to the editor, thus giving rise to an unintended surrogate public sphere in the GDR.¹²³ Michael Meyen has investigated media public spheres in the GDR and published an empirical study on German-German media history with its asymmetric entanglements.¹²⁴ The literature on the public sphere in the Federal Republic is extensive, albeit with a focus on the media.¹²⁵ The private sphere, on the other hand, has seldom been the focus of historical studies on postwar Germany.¹²⁶ A noteworthy exception here is Paul Betts' groundbreaking history of private life in the GDR, ranging from Stasi surveillance in everyday life to private photographs.¹²⁷

Adelheid von Saldern published several seminal works on the history of housing in the twentieth century.¹²⁸ Johann Friedrich Geist and Klaus Kürvers edited three richly documented volumes on the history of Berlin tenement houses which are still standard works in the field, spanning the period from the eighteenth century into the 1980s.¹²⁹ Sven Reichardt, in his highly regarded study of the left-wing alternative scene, looked at alternative forms of living and squatting in West Berlin,¹³⁰ which Bart van der Steen, for his part, examined from a transnational comparative perspective.¹³¹ Reinhild Kreis recently published a study on the so-called *Instandbesetzung* or "rehab squatting" of houses in West Berlin.¹³² An even more recent volume edited by Barbara and Kai Sichtermann, both of whom took part in the West Berlin squatters' movement, contains testimonies by contemporary witnesses from the squatting scene in West Germany but also addresses the phenomenon of *Schwarzwohnen*, or squatting in the GDR.¹³³ Udo Grashoff, in particular, has dealt extensively with the latter topic, conducting fundamental research on the history of semi-legal forms of housing in East Germany which the present study has been able to build on.¹³⁴

The literature on the history of churches in the German postwar era has long been focused on the process of secularization after 1945. More recent interpretations, however, point to the persistence of religious beliefs and communities as well as to the reorientation of churches in the spirit of civil society.¹³⁵ Frank Bösch and Lucian Hölscher have addressed the transformation of the church in the postwar era and the expanding spheres of activity adopted by Christian churches.¹³⁶ They follow a topological ap-

proach, inquiring into new spaces occupied or offered by churches. The history of churches in Friedrichshain and Kreuzberg has been written for the most part by the priests and pastors of individual parishes, who were often important protagonists themselves in the historical events they depict.¹³⁷ There are also survey works on the congregations and church buildings of Friedrichshain and Kreuzberg.¹³⁸

Unlike urban entertainment culture in Germany at the turn of the twentieth century, which has been the subject of much scholarly research,¹³⁹ the history of entertainment in more recent German history has only been explored in a rudimentary fashion. The works of Kaspar Maase, which take an in-depth look at the history of popular culture in Europe, deserve particular mention.¹⁴⁰ Uta G. Poiger has explored the pop-culture entanglements of the postwar era in German-German comparison, showing that both sides initially exhibited forms of resentment towards American pop culture rooted in their respective cultural critiques, which soon diminished in the West, however, as youthful consumers became an ever more important market segment.¹⁴¹ Ulrike Häußner and Marcus Merkel published an explorative edited volume on entertainment in the GDR, opening a new field of investigation on the history of everyday life in East Germany.¹⁴² For Kreuzberg, the works of Lothar Uebel deserve particular mention, though focusing mainly on entertainment culture in the first half of the twentieth century.¹⁴³ Some corresponding studies for the district of Friedrichshain have recently been published as well.¹⁴⁴

On the Structure of this Book

Writing an integrated German urban history is an ambitious task to say the least. A comparative and entangled history of two city districts would necessitate constantly jumping back and forth. Hence, for narrative reasons it makes more sense to tell parallel histories of Friedrichshain and Kreuzberg using exemplary case studies rather than organizing the study in a strictly comparative way. To begin with, however, I will depict the general historical foundations of urban development in Friedrichshain and Kreuzberg, which are crucial for an understanding of recent history. The first part of this book will offer an in-depth discussion of the urbanization of eastern Berlin beginning in the second half of the nineteenth century, a process which lent these two historic neighborhoods their present-day urban structure. This will be followed by an account of the founding of these districts in 1920, the Weimar and Nazi periods, and their subsequent destruction in World War II. The main focus of this introductory chapter is the immediate postwar period and the reconstruction of these two neigh-

borhoods henceforth under opposing political systems. Finally, I will discuss the erection of the Berlin Wall in 1961 and its specific ramifications for Friedrichshain and Kreuzberg, with a special focus on the social transformations occurring in East and West.

The bulk of this book is divided into three major parts, each with a different focus: housing, churches, and entertainment in Friedrichshain and Kreuzberg after 1961. All three of these aspects are constitutive areas of the public and private spheres, in which the interrelationship between the two spheres is negotiated in a special way. Each of these three sections is structured identically, beginning with a general overview of the respective interrelationship between public and private spheres in the overarching historical context of German history before and after World War II. This is followed by a number of local case studies focused either on Friedrichshain or Kreuzberg.

The final part, on transformation, ventures a look at the period after the fall of the Wall. The main focus here is on the shift from transfer to transformation processes between Friedrichshain and Kreuzberg. Using the example of squatting on Mainzer Strasse, I will look at radical catch-up processes in the eastern district before briefly sketching demographic development and structural transformation since 1990. Finally, I will describe a number of current challenges facing the Friedrichshain-Kreuzberg district after the fusion in 2001, with a particular emphasis on gentrification and the privatization of public space. The book thus hopes to make a contribution to understanding the historical roots of conflict situations that largely revolve around the fraught relationship between the public and private spheres in urban spaces.

Notes

1. *Neues Deutschland*, May 2, 1987, 3.
2. *Ibid.*, 1–3.
3. *Berliner Zeitung*, April 25, 1987, 14 f.; *Berliner Zeitung*, May 2, 1987, 7 f.
4. *Die Zeit*, May 8, 1987, 12.
5. *taz*, May 4, 1987, 1 f.
6. *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, May 2, 1987, 1 f.
7. *Der Spiegel*, May 11, 1987, 57–64, here 57.
8. The newspaper *taz* even partially blamed the weather for the riots in Kreuzberg: “May 1st was the first muggy day of the year, slightly overcast and cloudy, but already warm at 8 in the morning, with thunderstorms at noon. The first little downpour of the season came at 2 p.m. Haze. There was something in the air.” *taz*, May 4, 1987, 3.

9. *Spiegel* magazine described “an alliance on a scale never seen before between black bloc and bourgeois discontent. Germans and Turks fraternized in divvying up looted goods.” *Der Spiegel*, May 11, 1987, 57–64, here 64.
10. Many newspapers described widespread unemployment and a lack of perspective as reasons for the destruction and looting. On the social causes and context, see *ibid.*; *taz*, May 5, 1987, 1 f.; as well as the *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, May 5, 1987, 6, and the *Berliner Zeitung*, June 25, 1987, 3. The *Berliner Morgenpost* of May 5, 1987 argued the opposite, claiming it was getting things backwards to try and explain “criminal acts of violence, arson and looting with recourse to supposedly ‘unresolved social issues.’”
11. A total of 36 businesses were looted and destroyed, 35 fires were started, 193 policemen and 60 other individuals were injured, 77 police vehicles, 16 fire trucks and an ambulance were damaged, and about 20 cars went up in flames. See *Die Zeit*, May 8, 1987, 12.
12. W. Gensch, H. Liesigk, and H. Michaelis, *Der Berliner Osten*, Berlin 1930.
13. Hans-Jürgen Mende and Kurt Wernicke (eds), *Berliner Bezirkslexikon Friedrichshain-Kreuzberg*, Berlin 2003, 53.
14. The term goes back to German-American urban planner and architectural critic Werner Hegemann (1881–1936) and his 1930 book by the same name, *Das steinerne Berlin. Geschichte der größten Mietskasernenstadt der Welt*, Braunschweig 1992⁴ [1930].
15. Election district 84 also includes the eastern part of Prenzlauer Berg. On the election results of district 84, see <https://www.bundeswahlleiter.de/bundestagswahlen/2017/ergebnisse.html> (accessed April 29, 2020). On Hans-Christian Ströbele, see most recently Stefan Reinecke, *Ströbele. Die Biographie*, Berlin 2016.
16. On the concept of German-German contrastive history, see Horst Möller, “Demokratie und Diktatur,” *Aus Politik und Zeitgeschichte* 57 (2007) no. 3, 3–7.
17. See the various contributions in Christoph Kleßmann and Peter Lautzas (eds), *Teilung und Integration. Die doppelte deutsche Nachkriegsgeschichte als wissenschaftliches und didaktisches Problem*, Schwalbach 2006.
18. The divided-history approach traces back to the global-historical deliberations of Sebastian Conrad and Shalini Randeria, “Einleitung. Geteilte Geschichte. Europa in einer postkolonialen Welt,” in *idem* (eds), *Jenseits des Eurozentrismus. Postkoloniale Perspektiven in den Geschichts- und Kulturwissenschaften*, Frankfurt am Main 2002, 7–49, here 17. Frank Bösch applied the divided-history approach to East and West Germany: Frank Bösch (ed.), *Geteilte Geschichte. Ost- und Westdeutschland 1970–2000*, Göttingen 2015.
19. The strident debates of the 1990s between comparativists and transfer researchers are hopefully a thing of the past. See Matthias Middell, “Kulturtransfer und Historische Komparatistik. Thesen zu ihrem Verhältnis,” *Comparatio* 10 (2000) no. 1, 7–41; Hartmut Kaelble, “Die Debatte über Vergleich und Transfer und was jetzt?” *H-Soz-u-Kult*, February 8, 2005, <http://hsozkult.geschichte.hu-berlin.de/forum/2005-02-002>.
20. Michael Werner and Bénédicte Zimmermann, “Vergleich, Transfer, Verflechtung. Der Ansatz der Histoire croisée und die Herausforderung des Transnationalen,” *Geschichte und Gesellschaft* 28 (2002), 607–636.
21. Michael Lemke (ed.), *Schaufenster der Systemkonkurrenz. Die Region Berlin-Brandenburg im Kalten Krieg*, Cologne 2006.
22. Helmuth Berking and Martina Löw (eds), *Die Eigenlogik der Städte*, Frankfurt am Main 2008.
23. See, e.g., Thomas Mergel, “Zweifach am Rande. Die Dissidenten vom Prenzlauer Berg,” in Martin Sabrow (ed.), *ZeitRäume. Potsdamer Almanach des Zentrums für Zeithistorische Forschung 2009*, Potsdam 2010, 107–117. On Prenzlauer Berg, see also the more recent study by Dirk Moldt, *Kleine Prenzlauer Berg-Geschichte*, Berlin 2015.

24. See, e.g., Krista Tebbe, *Kreuzberg—Prenzlauer Berg. Annähernd alles über Kultur*, Berlin 1990.
25. On the gentrification of Prenzlauer Berg, see Hartmut Häußermann, André Holm, and Daniela Zunzer, *Stadterneuerung in der Berliner Republik. Modernisierung in Berlin-Prenzlauer Berg*, Opladen 2002.
26. In 1987, Friedrichshain had 116,955 and Kreuzberg 140,938 inhabitants.
27. Rolf Lindner, "Urban Anthropology," in Helmut Berking and Martina Löw (eds), *Die Wirklichkeit der Städte*, Baden-Baden 2005, 55–66, here 58 f.
28. The conceptual history of an "asymmetrically entangled parallel history" is hard to reconstruct. Bernd Faulenbach notes that he first heard the term coined by Christoph Kleßmann at a conference in the early 1990s. See Bernd Faulenbach (ed.), *Asymmetrisch verflochtene Parallelgeschichte? Die Geschichte der Bundesrepublik und der DDR in Ausstellungen, Museen und Gedenkstätten*, Essen 2005. The first documented use of the term appeared in the introduction of a multiauthor volume co-edited by Christoph Kleßmann et al., *Deutsche Vergangenheiten—eine gemeinsame Herausforderung. Der schwierige Umgang mit der doppelten Nachkriegsgeschichte*, Berlin 1999. Kleßmann develops the term programmatically in Christoph Kleßmann, "Konturen einer integrierten Nachkriegsgeschichte," *Aus Politik und Zeitgeschichte* 55 (2005) nos. 18–19, 3–11. Konrad H. Jarausch follows a similar approach with his concept of a plural sequence analysis: Konrad H. Jarausch, "'Die Teile als Ganzes erkennen'. Zur Integration der beiden deutschen Nachkriegsgeschichten," *Zeithistorische Forschungen/Studies in Contemporary History* 1 (2004) no. 1, 10–30, <http://www.zeithistorische-forschungen.de/1-2004/id=4538>.
29. Paul Nolte, "Öffentlichkeit und Privatheit. Deutschland im 20. Jahrhundert," *Merkur* 60 (2006), 499–512.
30. Hans Paul Bahrtdt, *Die moderne Großstadt. Soziologische Überlegungen zum Städtebau* [The Modern City: Sociological Deliberations on Urban Planning], Opladen 1998 [1961], 106. An English essay on this concept was published as "Public Activity and Private Activity as Basic Forms of City Association," in Roland Warren (ed.), *Perspectives on the American Community: A Book of Readings*, Chicago 1966, 78–85.
31. Weber writes: "Accordingly, we shall speak of a 'city' in the economic sense of the word only if the local population satisfies an economically significant part of its everyday requirements in the local market, and if a significant part of the products bought there were acquired or produced specifically for sale on the market by the local population or that of the immediate hinterland. A city, then, is always a market center." Max Weber, *Economy and Society: An Outline of Interpretive Sociology*, edited by Guenther Roth and Claus Wittich, trans. by various hands, Berkeley 1978 [1921–22], 1213. German original: Max Weber, *Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft*, 2nd half-volume, Tübingen 1956 [1921–22], 732.
32. Bahrtdt, *Die moderne Großstadt*, 83.
33. *Ibid.*, 83 f.
34. *Ibid.*, 86–95.
35. Georg Simmel, "Die Gross-Städte und das Geistesleben," in idem, *Das Individuum und die Freiheit*, Frankfurt am Main 1993 [1903], 192–204. See also Louis Wirth, "Urbanism as a Way of Life," *American Journal of Sociology* 44 (1938), 1–24.
36. Bahrtdt, *Die moderne Großstadt*, 99–105.
37. *Ibid.*, 160.
38. Hans Paul Bahrtdt was by no means trying to idealize premodern ways of life. He argued quite the opposite, in fact: "One of the main objectives in writing this book was to counter the utterly thought-restraining predominance of traditional critiques of city life. . . ." The grand planning concepts of functional separation and the fantasy of own-

- ing one's own home were for Bahrtdt a result of these critiques, which he sought to debunk in his book. See Bahrtdt, *Die moderne Großstadt*, 28.
39. Though Hans Paul Bahrtdt openly claimed to not be prescribing any particular urban-planning agenda, his subsequent book *Humaner Städtebau. Überlegungen zur Wohnungspolitik und Stadtplanung für eine nahe Zukunft* [Humane Urban Planning: Deliberations on Housing Policy for the Near Future], Hamburg 1968, did make some concrete policy suggestions. See Ulfert Herlyn, "Vorwort zur Neuauflage von Hans Paul Bahrtdt," *Die moderne Großstadt. Soziologische Überlegungen zum Städtebau*, Opladen 1998, 7–26, here 13 f.
 40. A pioneering critique of the functionally differentiated modern city was a book published at the same time as Bahrtdt's and which stridently attacked this division of urban functions: Jane Jacobs, *The Death and Life of Great American Cities*, New York 1961. Just as important in the German context was Alexander Mitscherlich's provocative pamphlet on the "Inhospitability of Our Cities," which argued from a psychoanalytical standpoint for a rethinking of the compartmentalized, disjointed and scattered nature of modern cities in favor of a new urbanity characterized by a more dense settlement pattern: Alexander Mitscherlich, *Die Unwirklichkeit unserer Städte. Anstiftung zum Unfrieden*, Frankfurt am Main 1965. Berlin publisher Wolf Jobst Siedler was a prominent advocate for the rehabilitation of inner-city areas: Wolf Jobst Siedler and Elisabeth Niggemeyer, *Die gemordete Stadt. Abgesang auf Putte und Straße, Platz und Baum*, Berlin 1964.
 41. Suffice it to mention Theodor Geiger's analysis of the postwar period, in which he characterizes mass society by the modern division of public and private spheres of existence: Theodor Geiger, *Demokratie ohne Dogma. Die Gesellschaft zwischen Pathos und Nüchternheit*, Munich 1963.
 42. Christina von Hodenberg links the growing discussion of the public and private spheres with the triumph of television and the huge popularity of the tabloid newspaper *Bild* in West Germany. See Christina von Hodenberg, *Konsens und Krise. Eine Geschichte der westdeutschen Medienöffentlichkeit 1945–1973*, Göttingen 2006, 31.
 43. Jürgen Habermas, *Strukturwandel der Öffentlichkeit. Untersuchungen zu einer Kategorie der bürgerlichen Gesellschaft*, Frankfurt am Main 1992 [1962]; English translation: *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere. An Inquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society*, trans. Thomas Burger and Frederick Lawrence, Cambridge 1989 [1962].
 44. Manuel Wendelin, *Medialisierung der Öffentlichkeit. Kontinuität einer normativen Kategorie der Moderne*, Cologne 2011, 204.
 45. Habermas, *Strukturwandel der Öffentlichkeit*, 54–90.
 46. *Ibid.*, 88 f.
 47. Thus, Hans Paul Bahrtdt writes in the introduction to the new edition of his book from 1969 that his concept of the public sphere is "more unhistorical" and "more unphilosophical" than the concept of the public sphere put forth by Jürgen Habermas. Bahrtdt was mainly concerned with a phenomenological description and analysis of the possibilities of individual human behavior under certain conditions: "'The Modern City' never had a great epistemological interest in the relationship between the public and private spheres. My only concern was in seeing a correspondence between typical architectural designs from various historical periods and typical human behaviors." Bahrtdt, *Die moderne Großstadt*, 31–33.
 48. *Ibid.*, 106.
 49. Habermas, *Strukturwandel der Öffentlichkeit*, 269 ff.
 50. Bahrtdt, *Die moderne Großstadt*, 132–164. In his introduction to the new edition of Bahrtdt's work, Ulfert Herlyn discusses the symptoms of a declining public sphere. In his view, "new developments have arisen that raise doubts as to whether the urban society of

our day and age can be adequately understood with these categories. One need only think of the diffusion of cities resulting from the many obvious signs of urban disintegration, the eroding of the classic function of the inner city as a traditional field of urban communication, socio-structural shifts and atrophied skills in interpersonal discourse, tendencies towards delocalization of the public sphere through processes of economic globalization, and the increasing spatial independence of modern communications and information technologies whose full spatial and structural ramifications are yet to be determined." Herlyn, Introduction to Bahrdr, 25 f.

51. Habermas, *Strukturwandel der Öffentlichkeit*, 57; idem, *Structural Transformation*, 4.
52. Axel Schildt, *Moderne Zeiten. Freizeit, Massenmedien und "Zeitgeist" in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland der 50er Jahre*, Hamburg 1995, 330; Nolte, "Öffentlichkeit und Privatheit," 505.
53. Wendelin, *Medialisierung der Öffentlichkeit*, 205.
54. Bahrdr, *Die moderne Großstadt*, 55–80.
55. Nolte, "Öffentlichkeit und Privatheit," 510–512.
56. Helmut Schelsky, *Die skeptische Generation. Eine Soziologie der deutschen Jugend*, Düsseldorf 1957.
57. Bahrdr, *Die moderne Großstadt*, 105, 140.
58. Richard Sennett, *The Fall of Public Man*, New York 1977.
59. Oskar Negt and Alexander Kluge, *Öffentlichkeit und Erfahrung. Zur Organisationsanalyse von bürgerlicher und proletarischer Öffentlichkeit*, Frankfurt am Main 1972; Habermas's only reference to the historical lower classes was when he explained the decline in the bourgeois public sphere as a consequence of its being co-opted by the have-nots. The occupation of the political public sphere by the masses of the unpropertied supposedly led to the entanglement of state and society, depriving the public sphere of its old base without giving it a new one. See Habermas, *Strukturwandel der Öffentlichkeit*, 269 f., in English: *Structural Transformation*, 181 f., as well as Wendelin, *Medialisierung der Öffentlichkeit*, 217 f.
60. Ilse Lenz, *Die Geschichte der Frauenbewegung in Deutschland*, Wiesbaden 2010².
61. Nancy Fraser, "Rethinking the Public Sphere. A Contribution to the Critique of Actually Existing Democracy," in Craig Calhoun (ed.), *Habermas and the Public Sphere*, Cambridge 1992, 109–142.
62. John Michael Roberts and Nick Crossley, "Introduction," in idem (eds), *After Habermas: New Perspectives on the Public Sphere*, Oxford 2004, 1–27, here 2; Matthew G. Specter, *Habermas: An Intellectual Biography*, Cambridge 2010, 1–26.
63. Nolte, "Öffentlichkeit und Privatheit," 500.
64. This is Bahrdr's argument: "in a social system in which no private sphere is tolerated, e.g., in a totalitarian regime, there is a denaturation of the public sphere if the ruling group succeeds in asserting its will. The public sphere is transformed into a pseudo-public sphere." Bahrdr, *Die moderne Großstadt*, 102.
65. Arnd Bauerkämper, *Die Sozialgeschichte der DDR*, Munich 2005, 3.
66. This question is currently being investigated by a research project on the history of the private sphere in Nazi Germany carried out by the Institute of Contemporary History, Munich-Berlin.
67. Gábor T. Rittersporn, Jan C. Behrends, and Malte Rolf, "Von Sphären, Räumen und Schichten. Gab es eine sowjetische Ordnung von Öffentlichkeit? Einige Überlegungen aus komparativer Perspektive," in Gábor T. Rittersporn et al. (eds), *Sphären von Öffentlichkeit in Gesellschaften sowjetischen Typs. Zwischen partei-staatlicher Selbstinszenierung und kirchlichen Gegenwelten/The Public Sphere in Societies of the Soviet Type. Between the Great Show of the Party-State and Religious Countercultures*, Frankfurt am Main 2003, 389–421, here 390.

68. In this regard, Rittersporn, Behrends and Rolf have discovered that the range of counter-public spheres under state socialism has often been overestimated, whereas their extreme fixation on the state has frequently been underestimated: "They were filled with the symbols, themes and dreams of the official canon." *Ibid.*, 409–411.
69. Gábor T. Rittersporn, Jan C. Behrends, and Malte Rolf, "Öffentliche Räume und Öffentlichkeit in Gesellschaften sowjetischen Typs. Ein erster Blick aus komparativer Perspektive," in Rittersporn et al., *Sphären von Öffentlichkeit in Gesellschaften sowjetischen Typs*, 7–21, here 9.
70. Adelheid von Saldern, "Öffentlichkeiten in Diktaturen. Zu den Herrschaftspraktiken im Deutschland des 20. Jahrhunderts," in Günther Heydemann and Heinrich Oberreuter (eds), *Diktaturen in Deutschland. Vergleichsaspekte, Strukturen, Institutionen und Verhaltensweisen*, Bonn 2003, 442–475, here 444.
71. Habermas himself writes that the (Hellenic) model of the public sphere still retains a curiously normative hold on our thinking. Habermas, *Strukturwandel der Öffentlichkeit*, 57. Nolte, on the other hand, suggests that the semantics of the adjective "public" have shifted away in recent years from the notion of an emphatic public sphere towards a mere synonym for "state." Nolte, "Öffentlichkeit und Privatheit," 504.
72. Pathbreaking in this respect: Jörg Requate, "Öffentlichkeit und Medien als Gegenstand historischer Analyse," *Geschichte und Gesellschaft* 25 (1999), 5–32. Incidentally, there has been some confusion in the German debate due to the multiple meanings of the term *Öffentlichkeit*, which alternately translates as "public," "public sphere" and "publicity."
73. Habermas points out the diversity of competing meanings contained in the German words *öffentlich* and *Öffentlichkeit*. Instead of trying to clearly define them, however, he advocates putting them in their historical context. He makes this clear, for example, with the contrast in Roman law between *publicus* and *privatus*, which did not exist in the Middle Ages. Habermas, *Strukturwandel der Öffentlichkeit*, 54–57; English translation: *Structural Transformation*, 1–5. Bahrtdt, too, interprets the distinction between public and private law as resulting from the formation of a public and private sphere. Bahrtdt, *Die moderne Großstadt*, 105.
74. Rittersporn, Behrends, and Rolf, "Von Sphären, Räumen und Schichten," 392.
75. Still authoritative for the concept of the public sphere, albeit only until the nineteenth century: Lucian Hölscher, "Öffentlichkeit," in Otto Brunner, Werner Conze, and Reinhart Koselleck (eds), *Geschichtliche Grundbegriffe. Historisches Lexikon zur politisch-sozialen Sprache in Deutschland*, vol. 4, Stuttgart 1978, 413–467.
76. See, e.g., Wendelin, *Medialisierung der Öffentlichkeit*.
77. Friedhelm Neidhardt, "Öffentlichkeit, öffentliche Bewegungen, soziale Bewegungen," in idem (ed.), *Öffentlichkeit, öffentliche Bewegungen, soziale Bewegungen*, Opladen 1994, 7–41; Volker Gerhardt, *Öffentlichkeit. Die politische Form des Bewusstseins*, Munich 2012.
78. Paul Nolte, *Was ist Demokratie? Geschichte und Gegenwart*, Munich 2012, 163.
79. Paul Nolte, *Die Ordnung der deutschen Gesellschaft. Selbstentwurf und Selbstbeschreibung im 20. Jahrhundert*, Munich 2000, 14.
80. As ideal types, however, the two terms were both understood as antipodes of the "state." This distinction has largely vanished nowadays.
81. Sennett, *The Fall of Public Man*.
82. Moritz Föllmer, *Individuality and Modernity in Berlin: Self and Society from Weimar to the Wall*, Cambridge 2013.
83. E.g., by Ingrid Oswald and Viktor Voronkov, "Licht an, Licht aus! 'Öffentlichkeit' in der (post-)sowjetischen Gesellschaft," in Rittersporn et al., *Sphären von Öffentlichkeit in Gesellschaften sowjetischen Typs*, 37–61, here 55.

84. Hartmut Häußermann and Walter Siebel, *Stadtsoziologie. Eine Einführung*, Frankfurt am Main 2004, 55–66.
85. Nolte, “Öffentlichkeit und Privatheit,” 502.
86. These include a large number of posters, redevelopment documents, house albums, etc. from the archive of the Kreuzberg Museum, which was renamed the FHXB Friedrichshain-Kreuzberg Museum in April 2013. See the homepage of the Regional Museum and Archive of Friedrichshain-Kreuzberg: <http://www.fhxb-museum.de> (accessed April 14, 2016).
87. See the homepage of the GDR Press Portal of the Berlin State Library: <http://zefys.staatsbibliothek-berlin.de/ddr-presse/> (accessed April 13, 2016) as well as the website of the associated research project at the Center for Contemporary History in Potsdam: <https://pressegeschichte.docupedia.de/wiki> (accessed April 29, 2020).
88. Gerhard Paul, “Visual History,” Version: 3.0, *Docupedia-Zeitgeschichte*, March 13, 2014, http://docupedia.de/zg/Visual_History_Version_3.0_Gerhard_Paul?oldid=108511; e.g.: Sonja Häder, *Schülerkindheit in Ost-Berlin. Sozialisation unter den Bedingungen der Diktatur (1945–1958)*, Cologne 1998.
89. Andreas Ludwig, “Materielle Kultur,” Version: 1.0, *Docupedia-Zeitgeschichte*, May 30, 2011, http://docupedia.de/zg/Materielle_Kultur?oldid=84634.
90. Andreas Matschenz (ed.), *Stadtpläne von Berlin. Geschichte vermessen*, Berlin 2006; Jan-Henrik Friedrichs, “Mapping Kreuzberg. Karten als Quelle der Bewegungsgeschichte,” *WerkstattGeschichte* 24 (2015) no. 70, 89–102.
91. The distinction in the bibliography between published sources and secondary literature is therefore somewhat artificial but is meant to serve as a handy guide.
92. E.g., Peter Bender, *Episode oder Epoche? Zur Geschichte des geteilten Deutschland*, Munich 1996; Peter Graf Kielmansegg, *Nach der Katastrophe. Eine Geschichte des geteilten Deutschland*, Berlin 2000.
93. Kleßmann, “Konturen einer integrierten Nachkriegsgeschichte”; Jarausch, “Die Teile als Ganzes erkennen.”
94. Bösch, *Geteilte Geschichte*.
95. Detlev Brunner, Udo Grashoff, and Andreas Koetzing (eds), *Asymmetrisch verflochten? Neue Forschungen zur gesamtdeutschen Nachkriegsgeschichte*, Berlin 2013.
96. Dierk Hoffmann, Michael Schwartz, and Hermann Wentker, “Die DDR als Chance. Desiderate und Perspektiven künftiger Forschung,” in Ulrich Mählert (ed.), *Die DDR als Chance. Neue Perspektiven auf ein altes Thema*, Berlin 2016, 23–70.
97. Wolfgang Ribbe (ed.), *Geschichte Berlins*, 2 vols, Berlin 1987–1988; and its East Berlin counterpart: Laurenz Demps and Ingo Materna, *Geschichte Berlins von den Anfängen bis 1945*, Berlin (East) 1987.
98. Wolfgang Ribbe and Jürgen Schmädke, *Kleine Berlin-Geschichte*, Berlin 1994; Arnt Cobbers, *Kleine Berlin-Geschichte. Vom Mittelalter bis zur Gegenwart*, Berlin 2005; Bernd Stöver, *Geschichte Berlins*, Munich 2010.
99. Michael Lemke, *Vor der Mauer. Berlin in der Ost-West-Konkurrenz 1948 bis 1961*, Cologne 2011, 20. On the role of Berlin in the Cold War, see also a number of contributions in Katharina Hochmuth (ed.), *Krieg der Welten. Zur Geschichte des Kalten Krieges*, Berlin 2017.
100. Krijn Thijs, *Drei Geschichten, eine Stadt. Die Berliner Stadtjubiläen von 1937 und 1987*, Cologne 2008. Also worth mentioning are the following comparative works: Melanie Arndt, *Gesundheitspolitik im geteilten Berlin 1948–1961*, Cologne 2009; Frank Roggenbuch, *Das Berliner Grenzgängerproblem. Verflechtung und Systemkonkurrenz vor dem Mauerbau*, Berlin 2008; Burghard Ciesla, *Als der Osten durch den Westen fuhr. Die Geschichte*

- der Deutschen Reichsbahn in Westberlin, Cologne 2006; Heiner Stahl, *Jugendradio im Kalten Ätherkrieg. Berlin als eine Klanglandschaft des Pop (1962–1973)*, Berlin 2010.
101. See esp. Stephanie Warnke, *Stein gegen Stein. Architektur und Medien im geteilten Berlin 1950–1970*, Frankfurt am Main 2009; Günter Schlusche et al. (eds), *Stadtentwicklung im doppelten Berlin. Zeitgenossenschaften und Erinnerungsorte*, Berlin 2014.
 102. Hartmut Häußermann and Andreas Kapphan, *Berlin. Von der geteilten zur gespaltenen Stadt? Sozialräumlicher Wandel seit 1990*, Opladen 2000.
 103. An overview of these is provided by David E. Barclay, “Kein neuer Mythos. Das letzte Jahrzehnt West-Berlins,” *Aus Politik und Zeitgeschichte* 65 (2015) no. 46, 37–42.
 104. Wilfried Rott, *Die Insel. Eine Geschichte West-Berlins 1948–1990*, Munich 2009. The same goes for Hermann Rudolph’s history of Berlin since 1900: Hermann Rudolph, *Berlin – Wiedergeburt einer Stadt. Mauerfall, Ringen um die Hauptstadt, Aufstieg zur Metropole*, Berlin 2014.
 105. Stefanie Eisenhuth, Hanno Hochmuth, and Martin Sabrow (eds), *Zeithistorische Forschungen/Studies in Contemporary History* 11 (2014) no. 2: *West-Berlin*, <http://www.zeithistorische-forschungen.de/2-2014>.
 106. E.g., Jenny Schon (ed.), *Wo sich Gott und die Welt traf. West-Berlin. Zeiteugen erinnern sich an die ersten Jahre nach dem Mauerbau*, Vechta 2011; Ulrike Sterblich, *Die halbe Stadt, die es nicht mehr gibt. Eine Kindheit in Berlin (West)*, Reinbek bei Hamburg 2012; Wolfgang Müller, *Subkultur Westberlin 1979–1989. Freizeit*, Hamburg 2013; Barbara Sichtermann and Kai Sichtermann, *Das ist unser Haus. Eine Geschichte der Hausbesetzung*, Berlin 2017.
 107. See, e.g., Häder, *Schülerkindheit in Ost-Berlin*; Thomas Klein, “Frieden und Gerechtigkeit!” *Die Politisierung der Unabhängigen Friedensbewegung in Ost-Berlin während der 80er Jahre*, Cologne 2007; Danuta Kneip, *Berufliche Diskriminierung und politische Dissidenz in der Honecker-DDR*, Cologne 2009.
 108. Edith Scheffer’s local study of the two neighboring small towns of Sonneberg (East) and Neustadt bei Coburg (West) is noteworthy as an example of a microhistory of a German-German border area. Edith Scheffer, *Burned Bridge: How East and West Germans Made the Iron Curtain*, Oxford 2011.
 109. From an ethnological perspective: Falk Blask (ed.), *Geteilte Nachbarschaft. Erkundungen im ehemaligen Grenzgebiet Treptow und Neukölln*, Berlin 1999. Annett Gröschner investigated Gleimstrasse, which was divided between Prenzlauer Berg and Wedding from 1961 to 1989. See Annett Gröschner (ed.), *Grenzgänger, Wunderheiler, Pflastersteine. Die Geschichte der Gleimstraße in Berlin*, Berlin 1998.
 110. Mende and Wernicke, *Berliner Bezirkslexikon Friedrichshain-Kreuzberg*.
 111. Jens Dobler, *Von anderen Ufern. Geschichte der Berliner Lesben und Schwulen in Kreuzberg und Friedrichshain*, Berlin 2003.
 112. Martin Düsphohl, *Kleine Kreuzberggeschichte*, Berlin 2009, esp. 108–148.
 113. Barbara Lang, *Mythos Kreuzberg. Ethnographie eines Stadtteils (1961–1995)*, Frankfurt am Main 1998. Urban transformation and the protest culture of Kreuzberg are also investigated by Carla MacDougall, “In the Shadow of the Wall. Urban Space and Everyday Life in Berlin Kreuzberg,” in Timothy Brown and Lorena Anton (eds), *Between the Avant-Garde and the Everyday. Subversive Politics in Europe from 1957 to the Present*, New York 2011, 154–173; Belinda Davis, “The City as Theater of Protest: West Berlin and West Germany, 1962–1983,” in Gyan Prakash and Kevin M. Kruse (eds), *The Spaces of the Modern City: Imaginaries, Politics and Everyday Life*, Princeton 2008, 247–274.
 114. E.g., Alf Bremer et al., *Kreuzberg Chamissoplatz. Geschichte eines Berliner Sanierungsgebietes*, Berlin 2007; Andrea Gerischer and Kerstin Jablonka, *Geschichte von Orten im Wrangelkiez. Eine Ausstellung in Schaufenstern*, Berlin 2008.

115. Paradigmatically: Dieter Hoffmann-Axthelm, *Straßenschlachtung. Geschichte, Abriss und gebrochenes Weiterleben der Admiralstraße*, Berlin 1984. Other publications on the history of Kreuzberg emerged in the context of the Berliner Geschichtswerkstatt (Berlin History Workshop) in West Berlin, concentrating for the most part on the history of Nazism in the district. See, e.g., Berliner Geschichtswerkstatt (ed.), *Juden in Kreuzberg. Fundstücke, Fragmente, Erinnerungen*, Berlin 1991.
116. There is, however, a recent counterpart to the abovementioned *Kleine Kreuzberggeschichte*: Martin Düspohl and Dirk Moldt (eds), *Kleine Friedrichshaingeschichte*, Berlin 2013. The district mayor, Monika Herrmann, refers explicitly to the Friedrichshain *Heimatbuch* (local history) of 1930 in the preface. See Gensch, Liesigk, and Michaelis, *Der Berliner Osten*.
117. See, e.g., John Stave, *Stube und Küche. Erlebtes und Erlesenes*, Berlin (East) 1987; Waldemar Brust, *Koppenstraße 60. Eine Berliner Kindheit in der Weimarer Zeit. Episoden aus dem Berlin der 20er und 30er Jahre*, Berlin (East) 1987.
118. Jan Feustel, *Verschwundenes Friedrichshain. Bauten und Denkmale im Berliner Osten*, Berlin 2001; Wanja Abramowski, *Siedlungsgeschichte des Bezirks Friedrichshain von Berlin bis 1920*, Berlin 2000; Kerima Bouali and Maren Schulze, *Bewegte Zeiten. Friedrichshain zwischen 1920 und heute*, Berlin 2000.
119. E.g., Wanja Abramowski, *Boxhagen—zwischen Aufruhr und Langeweile. Eine Stadtteilgeschichte*, Berlin 2003; Martin Wiebel, *East Side Story. Biographie eines Berliner Stadtteils*, Berlin 2004.
120. Annett Gröschner and Arwed Messmer, *Berlin, Fruchtstraße am 27. März 1952*, Ostfildern 2012. Lothar Uebel also looks at one particular street: Lothar Uebel, *Spreewasser, Fabrikschlote und Dampflok. Die Mühlenstraße am Friedrichshainer Spreeufer*, Berlin 2009. Also worth mentioning here is the extensive literature on the history of Stalinallee (as of 1961 Karl-Marx-Allee), e.g., Herbert Nicolaus and Alexander Obeth, *Die Stalinallee. Geschichte einer deutschen Straße*, Berlin 1997.
121. Dirk Moldt, *Zwischen Haß und Hoffnung. Die Blues-Messen 1979–1986. Eine Jugendveranstaltung der Evangelischen Kirche Berlin-Brandenburg in ihrer Zeit*, Berlin 2008; Susan Arndt et al. (eds), *Berlin Mainzer Straße. Wohnen ist wichtiger als das Gesetz*, Berlin 1992.
122. Requate, “Öffentlichkeit und Medien als Gegenstand historischer Analyse.”
123. Similar conclusions were reached by Ina Merkel, *Wir sind doch nicht die Meckerecke der Nation. Briefe an das DDR-Fernsehen*, Cologne 1998.
124. Michael Meyen, *Denver Clan und Neues Deutschland. Mediennutzung in der DDR*, Berlin 2003; idem, “Kollektive Ausreise? Zur Reichweite ost- und westdeutscher Fernsehprogramme in der DDR,” *Publizistik* 47 (2002) no. 2, 200–230. Cf. more recently Franziska Kuschel, *Schwarzhörner, Schwarzseher und heimliche Leser. Die DDR und die Westmedien*, Göttingen 2016.
125. See, e.g., von Hodenberg, *Konsens und Krise*.
126. An exception here is the explorative volume by Daniel Fulda et al. (eds), *Demokratie im Schatten der Gewalt. Geschichten des Privaten im deutschen Nachkrieg*, Göttingen 2010.
127. Paul Betts, *Within Walls: Private Life in the German Democratic Republic*, Oxford 2010.
128. Still the most comprehensive study, extending well beyond the housing conditions of the working class: Adelheid von Saldern, *Häuserleben. Zur Geschichte städtischen Arbeiterwohnens vom Kaiserreich bis heute*, Bonn 1995.
129. Johann Friedrich Geist and Klaus Kürvers, *Das Berliner Mietshaus*, 3 vols., Munich 1980/1984/1989.
130. Sven Reichardt, *Authentizität und Gemeinschaft. Linksalternatives Leben in den siebziger und frühen achtziger Jahren*, Berlin 2014, here esp. 498–572.

131. Bart van der Steen, "Die internationalen Verbindungen der Hausbesetzerbewegung in den 70er und 80er Jahren," in Alexander Gallus, Axel Schildt, and Detlef Siegfried (eds), *Deutsche Zeitgeschichte—transnational*, Göttingen 2015, 203–220.
132. Reinhild Kreis, "Heimwerken als Protest. Instandbesetzer und Wohnungsbaupolitik in West-Berlin während der 1980er-Jahre," *Zeithistorische Forschungen/Studies in Contemporary History* 14 (2017) no. 1, 41–67, <http://www.zeithistorische-forschungen.de/1-2017/id=5449>.
133. Sichtermann and Sichtermann, *Das ist unser Haus*.
134. Udo Grashoff, *Schwarzwohnen. Die Unterwanderung der staatlichen Wohnraumlenkung in der DDR*, Göttingen 2011. Life in East German prefab panelized housing—the other extreme of housing in the GDR—was investigated by Christine Hannemann, but only plays a minor role in the present study. See Christine Hannemann, *Die Platte. Industrialisierter Wohnungsbau in der DDR*, Wiesbaden 1995.
135. On the general history of churches in Germany after 1945, see esp. Thomas Großbölting, *Der verlorene Himmel. Glaube in Deutschland seit 1945*, Göttingen 2013. On the GDR, see also Detlef Pollack, *Kirche in der Organisationsgesellschaft. Zum Wandel der gesellschaftlichen Lage der evangelischen Kirchen in der DDR*, Stuttgart 1994.
136. Frank Bösch and Lucian Hölscher (eds), *Jenseits der Kirche. Die Öffnung religiöser Räume seit den 1950er Jahren*, Göttingen 2013.
137. Of importance to the present study, esp. Klaus Duntze, *Die Verantwortung der Kirche für das großstädtische Gemeinwesen. Eine Untersuchung zum Verhältnis von kirchlicher Arbeit und Stadtentwicklung in Berlin (West) von 1968 bis 1985 unter besonderer Berücksichtigung des Bezirks Kreuzberg*, Frankfurt am Main 1992.
138. Jan Feustel, *Turmkreuze über Hinterhäusern. Kirchen im Bezirk Friedrichshain*, Berlin 1999; Marina Wesner, *Kreuzberg und seine Gotteshäuser. Kirchen, Moscheen, Synagogen, Tempel*, Berlin 2007.
139. See more recently Tobias Becker, Anna Littmann, and Johanna Niedbalski (eds), *Die tausend Freuden der Metropole. Vergnügungskultur um 1900*, Bielefeld 2011; Paul Nolte (ed.), *Die Vergnügungskultur der Großstadt. Orte, Inszenierungen, Netzwerke (1880–1930)*, Cologne 2016; Daniel Morat et al., *Weltstadtvergnügen. Berlin 1880–1930*, Göttingen 2016.
140. Kaspar Maase, *Grenzenloses Vergnügen. Der Aufstieg der Massenkultur 1850–1970*, Frankfurt am Main 1997.
141. Uta G. Poiger, *Jazz, Rock, and Rebels: Cold War Politics and American Culture in a Divided Germany*, Berkeley 2000.
142. Ulrike Häußer and Marcus Merkel (eds), *Vergnügen in der DDR*, Berlin 2009.
143. Lothar Uebel, *Viel Vergnügen. Die Geschichte der Vergnügungsstätten rund um den Kreuzberg und die Hasenheide*, Berlin 1985.
144. Hanno Hochmuth and Johanna Niedbalski, "Kiezvergnügen in der Metropole. Zur sozialen Topographie des Vergnügens im Berliner Osten," in Becker, Littmann, and Niedbalski, *Die tausend Freuden der Metropole*, 105–136.