Why Three Stories on *Through the Night*?

❧

On 5 September 1955, Hoffmann und Campe publishing house first published Hans Scholz's novel *Am grünen Strand der Spree* (On the green banks of the Spree) which was later translated into English as *Through the Night*. Only one year after its initial release, *Through the Night* appeared both as a feature novel in the *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung* newspaper and as a five-part radio play directed by Gert Westphal on SWF public radio. In 1960, NWRV public television produced a television miniseries, again in five parts, directed by Fritz Umgelter. The book, and the radio and television adaptations all contain a detailed account of the Orsha massacre; the production and the reception of each version mirror the processes of negotiating the 'sayable' concerning German war crimes at each specific point in West German postwar history. In order to understand those processes, my focus shifts on the depiction of the Nazi crimes in *Through the Night*—or, more precisely, on eleven pages of the book, three episodes of the feature novel, eleven minutes of the radio play, and twenty-two minutes of the television miniseries. Although the individual episodes of each media production also have their individual titles, for reasons of readability I will stick with the common English translation of the main title *Through the Night*.

In Scholz's novel, the fictional character of infantryman Jürgen Wilms hears from his comrades about the planned execution. He applies for a two-hour leave, and—like the writer himself had done fourteen years earlier—walks up to the railroad embankment facing the Jewish cemetery where he witnesses the mass execution right before his eyes. Infantryman Wilms writes

down his detailed impressions in a diary—in part, they coincide with the historical facts. In Wilms's notes, the massacre happens on a cold autumn day at the Jewish cemetery in Orsha, the victims are 1,800 Jewish men, women, and children, and once the corpses no longer fit into the prepared execution pits, the perpetrators dispose of them in "concrete conduit pipes" (*Through the Night* [TN] 59). In one decisive point, however, Wilms's account in the book decisively deviates from the historical facts at Orsha: the executioners Wilms observes are not members of the German *Einsatzkommando*, but Latvian soldiers. This fictional account by Wilms, subsequently adapted for radio and television, is at the core of my interest. Technically speaking, I focus on one short passage of a much broader opus. However, the fictional diary also bears characteristics of a stand-alone narrative in itself, which is ultimately supported by the fact that Scholz originally framed it that way. SWF public radio broadcast this passage both as the first episode of the series and as a separate radio feature, and NWRV even planned to adapt the respective episode for a feature film.

In addition to Wilms's account, the novel contains six more episodes, of which all but one are set between 1934 and 1954. The episodes are linked by a frame narrative: in April 1954, four friends meet in West Berlin's famous Jockey Bar to celebrate the release of one of them from a POW camp. The evening passes with telling stories and anecdotes—hence the English title *Through the Night*—while the strict division between the frame story and the stories within the story dissolves several times, creating a dense "*Geschichtengewebe* (story web)" (Heck and Lang 2018, 241).[1] The overarching theme emerges as "human behavior in war and postwar times" (Heck 2020, 228). In the first story, the recent *Heimkehrer* (returning POW) Joachim Lepsius reads from the Wilms diary, which he received from Wilms himself; the two soldiers had met shortly before Lepsius's release from the POW camp. The other episodes deal with the acquaintance between a German soldier and a Russian partisan, a German wardroom in Norway, a family saga dating back to the eighteenth century, an actor who fled from the former eastern territories of Germany and now resides southeast of Berlin, a US-American POW camp, and finally a fictional love story in Italy.[2] From today's perspective, the description of the massacre in the first story is one of the novel's stylistic highlights—Scholz's contemporaries, in turn, praised it for its accurate rendering of the jargon at the time. Similarly, the first episodes of the radio and television adaptations (set in the occupied Soviet Union) still appear convincing today, while the remainders of both are firmly anchored in contemporary discourses and so are more difficult to understand.

Recently, academic interest in *Through the Night* has increased noticeably. In their anthology, Heck, Lang, and Scherer (2020) discuss a broad spectrum of topics from all episodes. Because of the different media productions,

all created in a relatively short period, the authors call *Through the Night* a 'media complex,' a productive term that is used here as well. In contrast to Heck, Lang, and Scherer, however, it is not my concern to bring the entire media complex back to memory; illustrated by the example, I am rather interested in the sociosystemic structures concerning the presence (or absence) of the Holocaust in West Germany's memory culture of the 1950s and 1960s. I aim to complement the numerous publications on the early attempts at *Vergangenheitsbewältigung* (overcoming the past),[3] employing an in-depth focus on the micro dimension of the media's handling of the difficult past. What I wish to achieve is a precise understanding of the media representation of the executions in Orsha—no more, but also no less.

The Exceptionality of the Execution Scene

In the context of the general silence about the Holocaust in West German culture in the 1950s, the detailed and 'plurimedial' (Erll and Wodianka 2008, 2) description of the mass execution of the Orsha Jews is, without a doubt, a significant exception. However, that is also true for German memory culture today: in comparison to the atrocities in the concentration and extermination camps, the mass executions of approximately 1.5 million[4] East European Jews are still considerably less present. The no doubt extensive historiographical research on this so-called 'Holocaust by bullets' resulted in only very few novels, films, or television productions that could have contributed to cultural memory (Vice 2019). It is now thirty years ago that Omer Bartov pointed out that historical knowledge about German war crimes in Central and Eastern Europe had only had a minor impact on the German perception of World War II (Bartov 1991, 182–83); and despite numerous publications, exhibitions, and documentaries produced since then, Bartov's claim remains valid. German memory of the Eastern Front is still dominated by heroic Wehrmacht soldiers and honorable war victims; in this narrative, the German mass executions, which account for approximately 25 percent of all Jewish victims of the Holocaust, continue to have little space. From the German perspective, the execution sites are still just "somewhere in the east" (Klei and Stoll 2019, 10). While in almost every German city, memorials or plaques commemorate deported Jews, East European Jews murdered on the spot close to their homes are largely absent from German memory. This 'dual forgetting' discussed in this study—that is, the lack of debate around German war crimes in Eastern Europe on the one hand, and the significant absence of *Through the Night* in German media history on the other—vividly illustrates the dynamics of German memory culture.

Notably, the first story of *Through the Night* focuses on the memory of German war crimes, even if the fictional and plurimedial diary of Jürgen Wilms is far from today's conventions concerning Holocaust remembrance. From this perspective, all media productions—the novel, the radio play, and the television miniseries—can be considered as being far ahead of their times; the depiction of Nazi crimes in *Through the Night* was "probably even unique" (Scherer 2020, 111). Indeed, narratives that specifically addressed German perpetration did not gain popularity until the twenty-first century (McGlothlin 2016b, 34). By contrast, Scholz was already able to claim more than sixty years ago that he deliberately emphasized the issue (Scholz 1969).

As much as Scholz may have tried to make his readership aware of the 'German guilt,' however, his strategy to adapt the execution passage to contemporary expectations is obvious. For example, protagonist Jürgen Wilms does not participate in the execution, but is only a witness. Similar adaptation strategies are used in the radio and television versions of *Through the Night*. In contrast to the book, producer Gert Westphal slightly shortened the description of the massacre for the radio adaptation; and director Fritz Umgelter, in turn, considerably expanded the scene on television by showing an arrival of Jews by train, adding scenes of Wilms trying to save a Jewish girl, and even introducing an apparently psychopathic SS officer in charge of the execution. In the companion published for the revised Wehrmacht Exhibition in the early 2000s, the authors addressed the Wehrmacht's involvement in the Holocaust, as shown in *Through the Night*: "An SS officer exercises command, while members of the *Feldgendarmerie* [military police] cordon off the execution site, and Latvian collaborators carry out the mass execution. A Wehrmacht soldier watches the killings helplessly" (Hamburger Institut für Sozialforschung 2002, 675). According to the authors, the film scene emphasizes the soldier's consternation, portraying him as another victim rather than as a downright perpetrator and/or collaborator.

Despite the morally dubious attitude of the fictional character Wilms, the authors of the Wehrmacht Exhibition described the television adaptation of *Through the Night* as a "provocation" (Hamburger Institut für Sozialforschung 2002, 675). Literature scholar Norman Ächtler calls the passage of the massacre in the book a "risk" (Ächtler 2014, 79); media historian Knut Hickethier, in turn, speaks of a "caesura" (Hickethier 2000, 94), and historian Peter Seibert of a "rupture in the collective silence" (Seibert 2001, 74). However, these interpretations of *Through the Night* were ascribed subsequently. After all, 'ruptures' and 'caesuras' rarely occur in the history of memory, especially as changes usually occur gradually and as a result of highly complex processes. Accordingly, not every new motif that appears in memory culture for the first time is necessarily a 'rupture.' Eventually, *Through the Night*, includ-

ing the execution scene, disappeared from the public sphere just as quickly as it had entered it.

Today, the media complex of *Through the Night* is only, if at all, known to specialists. Furthermore, the editors of the above-mentioned anthology devoted to *Through the Night* claim that even the few existing references are directly related to the depictions of the massacre (Heck, Lang, and Scherer 2020). According to Christoph Hißnauer, however, this does not do justice to the media complex, "even though it [the depiction of the massacre] is certainly one of its greatest achievements" (Hißnauer 2020, 216). For my approach, the plurimedial depiction of the massacre is of fundamental relevance, including the history of its creation and impact. My experience with *Through the Night* also shows that the execution scene is hardly known. Over the last couple of years, I have repeatedly presented *Through the Night* to professional audiences in Germany and abroad; in almost all instances, it caused great astonishment, especially the fact that those depictions were possible in the 1950s and early 1960s.

Ernestine Schlant's monograph on the Holocaust in West German literature is probably the most prominent example of the novel's absence in academic research—although the execution scene undoubtedly contributed to her argument (Schlant 1999). Other accounts on the (West) German history of literature also entirely ignore *Through the Night*, or only mention it in passing. The first study on the radio play did not appear until 2020. There are, however, some isolated publications concerning the Orsha massacre in the television miniseries.[5] Antiquarian editions of the book are still easily available, the feature novel of the *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung* can be read in any major library in Germany, and the radio play and television miniseries are accessible on the Internet. The execution scene is thus within everyone's immediate reach—and yet hardly present. This apparent paradox is an opportunity to reflect on the complex mechanisms of memory culture in more detail.

A foreseeable objection to my method is its grounding in fragments taken out of context. That is, however, a widespread cultural technique. Scene excerpts and longer quotations are regularly used in teaching; a quick glance at textbooks, for instance, reveals only excerpts of literary texts. At least in German schools, students are rarely required to read a work in its entirety, and interpretations are usually based on short passages. Until the early 2000s, even students of film knew the classics of movie history mainly from descriptions and short sequences shown during lectures; the departments usually had a limited number of VHS or (later) DVD copies, which were difficult to distribute among dozens of students. While it is now easier to make copies, the influence of online platforms such as YouTube, providing only short clips due to copyrights, has spread the practice of watching isolated scenes. In this

context, microhistory and microsociology are especially suitable for the analysis of fragmented reception practices.

History of Memory as Microhistory

As the present study is based on a single scene, it requires a corresponding methodological approach. My focus on the 'plurimedial' depiction of the Orsha massacre aims at an extreme 'magnification' of the research object: like under a historical microscope (Medick 1994, 44; Schlumbohm 1998, 22; Levi 2012, 95), I look at those extremely brief moments in West German media history. Consequently, I propose a detailed analysis within the framework of micro- if not nanohistory that "is based on real historical events and requires genuine archival research, yet it leads us not to microhistory but to histories that rely on patterns, trends and regularities" (de Vries 2019, 34). The microhistorical approach allows me to identify memory culture as being 'made' at the micro level—a fact that has received little attention. Memory is produced, received, and processed by individual actors under certain sociocultural conditions. Therefore, the mechanisms of these complex processes are now at the center of my study, using the example of the execution scene in *Through the Night*.

Microhistorians often refer to Clifford Geertz's famous claim that ethnologists do not research *about* villages, but *in* villages (Medick 1994, 44; Hiebl and Langthaler 2012, 11; Levi 2012, 93). By analogy, microhistory is an approach to study not small events, but *in* small events. To take up this metaphor, my thick description of the history of *Through the Night* provides insight about the micro mechanisms and structures of West German memory culture. "At the center of microhistory are . . . not isolated individuals, but social relations," writes Jürgen Schlumbohm (1998, 22). In this sense, my book is less about individual authors, producers, editors, or recipients, but about the entire network of people, institutions, technologies, and aesthetics of memory culture. This method is not new to academic disciplines contributing to memory studies: in historiography, microhistorical approaches have been well established, much like microsociological studies in sociology; in ethnology, thick description is one of the basic methods, and literary scholars often apply close reading. Even in art, film, and music studies, detail-focused research is not considered new. In memory studies, however, these methodological approaches have hardly been applied to date. In the following chapters, I therefore present three case studies, which I regard as a kind of microhistorical and interdisciplinary thought experiment.

The challenges of microhistory are threefold. The first two difficulties have been elaborated by the cofounder of microhistory, Giovanni Levi

(2012, 95 and 109). According to Levi, microhistory consists, first, of thick descriptions of source-saturated research objects, and second of sociostructural interpretations of case studies. In other words, we must stay close to the sources but also draw conclusions beyond the microlevel. The focus on actions of individual actors also allows scholarly narratives with identifiable protagonists and clear conflicts. This way, potentially readable yet scientifically precise stories emerge, such as Carlo Ginzburg's microhistorical classic and bestseller *The Cheese and the Worms* (Ginzburg 1980). German historian Hans Medick (1994, 12) formulates the third challenge by pointing at the diversity of perspectives: practicing microhistory "means engaging in complexity, not trusting simple and generalizing explanations, but elaborating social and cultural practice from the source material" (Lanziger 2012, 49). Following those calls, I propose not one but three microhistories of the execution scene in *Through the Night*, all resting on a broad base of sources, all identifying structural patterns of West German memory culture, and all told from different perspectives.

Writing a history of memory from a microhistorical perspective means looking 'behind the scenes' of memory culture in order to identify the mechanisms of its production and use. In the case of *Through the Night*, questions concern negotiations between authors, publishers, and broadcasters, their respective interests and decision-making processes, and the reactions of readers, listeners, and viewers. These are long-term processes, hardly visible from afar, and (for the most part) happening beyond the public sphere. Even if a historical event has eventually reached the status of a piece of art, often after lengthy negotiations, it still says nothing about its relevance in terms of memory culture. Only on the basis of other authors' references and the artifact's presence in public debates can it be considered relevant for the mnemonic field. In other words: the decisive factor is the impact it has on the public, as Christoph Cornelißen emphasizes in his definition of memory culture. It implies all "modes of representation of history . . . as far as they leave traces in the public sphere" (Cornelißen 2012). According to Cornelißen, memory culture is, above all, about the use of history; in this context, the Holocaust reserves a particular place in German memory culture. The broad range of Cornelißen's approach is its greatest weakness and, at the same time, its greatest strength; 'memory culture' becomes an umbrella term referring to diverse manifestations of public interaction with the past. In my opinion, however, this productive term still requires a structured reflection on its social and media dimensions.

Memory culture does not emerge out of nowhere. It is shaped by social actors such as authors, editors, and directors, who act in certain social, political, economic, and cultural environments. Under equally complex circumstances, narratives of memory culture are (or are not) read, heard, seen,

commented on, kept silent, praised, or despised. This process, however, cannot be understood based on the cultural texts and images themselves. Its reconstruction first requires painstaking (archival) research, and a degree of luck, to find the proper sources. When I first worked through the estate of director Fritz Umgelter in the Archives of the Academy of Arts in Berlin, I realized the potential of a historiographical study on *Through the Night*. However, the estate of Hans Scholz was missing, without which the project would have been unfeasible. That changed when the Academy of Arts made the Scholz collection accessible in 2018.

In general, and beyond this particular case, however, the postwar cultural history of West Germany is fertile ground for source-based research. Since 1945, no archives in Western Europe have been destroyed by a war; in the 1950s, writing letters was still a widespread practice, as the telephone was not available in every household, and its cost was high. At the same time, the use of typewriters was common, even in private correspondence. As deciphering manuscripts is time-consuming, the use of the typewriter not only increased the efficiency of the scribes and readers of the time, but also of today's researchers. The materiality of the typescripts, including deletions, corrections, and marginal notes, provide additional clues. Using carbon paper for copies used to be common practice as well, meaning that if today a letter is not included in the addressee's estate, it is very likely that it can be found in the sender's. The exchange of opinions about books and films, crucial in the context of this study, usually happened by mail; while today we write and read comments and opinions on the Internet, readers and viewers of the 1950s picked up a pen or pulled out the typewriter. The overall number of letters, notes, and drafts was certainly much smaller than the vast amounts of emails and messages of today; more effort was required then, and the cost of paper and postage as well as the distances to and from the post office and mailboxes simply made such communications less commonplace. Last but not least, analog media was easily manageable, and many people had a greater urge to archive. Public figures commissioned press services to regularly collect and send newspaper clippings with reports about themselves and their work; Hans Scholz had the habit of adding his own handwritten comments. Future historians can only dream of such a substantial and at the same time manageable number of sources when studying the correspondence of the digital age.

The incredible wealth of personal sources neatly stored in German archives makes it remarkable that the history of West German *Vergangenheitsbewältigung* is dominated by research on political institutions, public figures, and widely published cultural texts. Research on Nazi trials, on personal and institutional continuities from Nazi- to West Germany, and on public debates and representations of violence is increasingly hard to grasp. However, research on the construction of memory 'from below'

is available, albeit less common: for example, by Lutz Niethammer (1999), who analyzed *Vergangenheitsbewältigung* based on oral history. Other accounts include Konrad Jarausch's *Broken Lives* (2018) and Hanne Leßau's *Entnazifizierungsgeschichten* (Stories of denazification, 2020): while Jarausch reconstructs various perspectives on twentieth-century German history based on private diaries, Leßau examines individual interpretations of denazification based on questionnaires and private correspondence. Overall, these rare analyses of collective memory at a microlevel usually make use of biographical methods. My approach, in turn, is to tell the microhistory of memory based on a single representation of history; in this sense, I write the biography of a cultural text.

The social and media practices accompanying the production and reception of collective memory are largely invisible to the public. For example, the majority of the investigations against Nazi perpetrators happened behind closed doors and went largely unnoticed. Whether and how employees of the public prosecutor's offices, police departments, and courts spoke about the mass murder of Jews and other groups can hardly be reconstructed. Looking at the internal communication of publishers and broadcasters, the situation is similar. Although we can easily refer to published books and screened films about the Holocaust, it is much harder to reconstruct the processes and discussions on manuscripts and film proposals which in the end were not produced. Consequently, many sources on *Through the Night* provide a unique insight into the otherwise mostly hidden world of negotiations 'behind the scenes' of memory culture. Although the fictional diary of Jürgen Wilms does not seem to refute the theory of silencing Nazi crimes in postwar West Germany—an 'uninvolved' German soldier, expressing his dismay, observes a massacre perpetrated mainly by non-Germans—the story of *Through the Night* reveals numerous cracks in this picture. In this sense, the discussions in the publishing house and in the broadcasting stations, as well as the very diverse reactions of readers, listeners, and viewers, are probably the most telling material. They provide insight into those areas of memory culture that I call 'subcutaneous memory'—they hardly appear on the surface of the public sphere.

In his seminal study on collective memory, Maurice Halbwachs states that memory emerges in 'social frameworks' (1992, orig. 1925). In which 'framework' did the authors of *Through the Night* create the account of a cruel mass murder committed by individuals of their own society? In which 'framework' was the representation perceived? While for Halbwachs it was mainly class, religion, and family that contributed to the 'framing' of memory, today the term needs some amendment. Certainly, the family or social background still plays a significant role in the perception of the past—both on an individual and a collective level. However, 'discursive frameworks' are also relevant for

dealing with the depictions of the Orsha massacre: what topics were discussed in public at the time? How were the German war crimes in Eastern Europe talked about? How did the discourse on the Nazi past change between manuscript submission and television premiere? We should further consider the 'media frameworks' (Erll 2011a, 128): what status did individual publishers have on the book market? What kind of mnemonic function was attributed to the older medium of radio or the younger medium of television? In addition to capturing those social, discursive, and media frameworks concerning the depiction of the Orsha massacre, I am also interested in their historical contextualization. As early as the 1970s, literary scholar Hans Robert Jauss (1982) suggested that the respective perspective of individual readers should also be taken into account, and this claim has lost none of its topicality.

I conceptualize the microhistory of memory culture as a response to four desiderata in memory studies. First, scholars in the field are often concerned with hermeneutic analyses of cultural representations of history, following the account of Aleida Assmann (2006, 54), among others, according to which cultural memory is mediated by symbols and signs. This approach has been implemented in countless analyses of literature, film, art, museums, and rituals. Despite numerous voices criticizing the notion of representation when researching the Holocaust (Friedländer 1992; Ehrenreich and Spargo 2010), especially in relation to traumatic memories (Golańska 2017), it is likely to dominate memory studies for a long time to come. Even if we wanted to move away from 'representational' thinking, it is still the starting point of criticism. "But rather than leading us to some authentic origin or giving us access to the real," Andreas Huyssen states, "memory . . . is itself based on representation" (Huyssen 1995, 2–3). The present study deviates slightly from this paradigm; it is conceptualized as an intervention in order to expand the prevailing hermeneutic approach by aspects of the production and reception of 'representation' relevant to memory culture.

Second, global and transcultural aspects entered memory studies in the twenty-first century (e.g., Assmann and Conrad 2010; Inglis 2016; Young, N. 2019). Memory scholars follow the discussion about the globalization of Holocaust memory, first initiated by Daniel Levy and Natan Sznaider (2005), and later continued by Michael Rothberg (2009). I do not want to contradict those accounts; however, the more we are concerned with global aspects of memory cultures the less we focus on their practices and historical dimensions at the local and individual level. In this context, global- and microhistory are not necessarily to be understood as opposites (Epple 2012; de Vries 2019). What both approaches have in common is their challenge of national narratives: while global history seeks transcultural patterns of explanation, microhistory focuses on individual and local processes that cut across national categories.

Third, I would like to address a desideratum frequently mentioned in memory studies. With the microhistorical examination of *Through the Night*, I intend—following Wulf Kansteiner—to "illuminate the sociological basis of historical representation" (Kansteiner 2002, 180). Many scholars call for a stronger consideration of reception, as "no mediation of memory can have an impact on memory culture if it is not 'received'" (Törnquist-Plewa, Andersen, and Erll 2017, 3). The claim does not necessarily refer to the direct 'impact' of cultural texts on collective memory. This one-sided relationship has recently been called into doubt because recipients also project *their* ideas onto cultural artifacts (Moller 2018; Rauch 2018; Garncarz 2021).

Fourth, *Through the Night* is not a sophisticated work, but rather a piece of popular culture aimed at a mass audience. This is significant insofar as cultural memory studies often deal with ambitious art. In contrast, this case study is about an example of 'popular memory.' According to Alison Landsberg, it is precisely those images of the past that allow their viewer to "suture himself or herself into a large history. . . to take on a more personal, deeply felt memory of a past event through which he or she did not live" (Landsberg 2004, 2). Without contradicting this approach, however, I want to focus on the opposite relationship: in early West Germany, almost all adult citizens had individual memories of World War II; millions of former soldiers knew very well what had happened in the occupied territories. Thus, the function of war literature or films was to provide narratives offering meaningful interpretations of uncomfortable memories.[6]

This study is difficult to fit into a specific academic field. According to Christina von Hodenberg, media history is equally part of historiography and media studies, both often misinterpreting each other due to different research questions, approaches, and methods (Hodenberg 2012, 26–27). Following von Hodenberg, I consider discussions about academic classifications rather unhelpful. I start with my object of research, which is the description of the Orsha massacre in the different versions of *Through the Night*, and examine it with all methods and techniques available to memory studies. After all, it is a premise of microhistory to combine historical and social science methods.

Movements in Memory Culture

As Ann Rigney points out, memory studies have currently experienced a shift from 'product' to 'process' (Rigney 2015, 68). Cultural memory does not exist, but happens—it occurs and passes. Memory 'travels' and 'moves.' More than twenty years ago, Annette Kuhn (2000) expressed this idea in relation to cultural memory, but only in the wake of intensifying migration patterns did it gain greater significance. The idea fits into the successful notions of

traveling concepts by Mieke Bal, traveling theory by Edward Said, and traveling cultures by James Clifford (Neumann and Nünning 2012). In the context of the latter concept, Astrid Erll emphasizes that "*all* cultural memory *must* 'travel,' be kept in motion in order to 'stay alive,' to have impact on individual minds and social formations" (Erll 2011b, 12), and Rigney adds that only those memories that "travel across media and are appropriated by different actors" (Rigney 2012, 51–53) can be productive for cultural memory. Both scholars take a very thorough and 'high resolution' look at their research subjects, albeit through a wide-angle lens: Rigney explores the long afterlife of Walter Scott's literature, and Erll examines the 'traveling memory' of the Odyssey in its global scope. By contrast, I capture the changing popularity of *Through the Night*'s account of the Orsha massacre in a detailed close-up. Compared to the 'travels' of memory that are the focus of transcultural memory studies, this project deals with almost molecular oscillations that are tangible at the lowest level of memory culture.

Small movements of memory are already visible at the individual level: Hans Scholz presented his biography during a number of ceremonies; for example, when he received the Heinrich Stahl Prize of the Jewish Community, and when he was admitted to the Academy for Language and Poetry. However, each time he presented it differently. He adapted his narrative to his audience—in discourse analysis we speak of 'framing,' which corresponds to Halbwachs's concept of 'frameworks of memory.' Scholz repeatedly emphasized certain episodes from his biography, such as his refusal to join the *Reichskulturkammer* (Reich Chamber of Culture), while others, including his voluntary enlistment in the Wehrmacht, were mentioned only on certain occasions, and commented on in different ways. Depending on who formed his audience, he sometimes presented himself as a painter, sometimes as a writer, sometimes as an intellectual, and sometimes as a barfly. We can value such strategies in different moral ways, but the fact that people—Scholz is certainly not the only one—communicate divergent elements of their past testifies to the flexibility of individual memory, which adapts to collective expectations.

Scholz incorporated his experiences into the manuscript of the novel. The editors at the publishing house forced him to make some changes, and further revisions followed during work on the radio and the television adaptations. What viewers finally got to see on television was only partly based on what Scholz had seen in Orsha. And yet, after the broadcast, he sounded as if it was a film based on his recollections (Scholz 1960c). The depiction of the Orsha massacre moved—or rather, was moved—between texts and images, and then returned. Of course, we do not know exactly what Scholz thought while watching it on television, or whether he actually equated the scene or its fragments with his memories. But social psychologists have long demon-

strated that media images of history can indeed shape individual memories (Welzer 2017, 185–207).

Looking at *Through the Night* from a broader perspective, it quickly becomes clear that it is an 'exceptionally normal case' (Hiebl and Langthaler 2012, 12). The media complex represents the overwhelming part of cultural production, which did not provoke political debates, impacted few—if any—subsequent authors, and was rarely studied. In this sense, it is a fairly average artifact of West German cultural history. Furthermore, Scholz was by no means the first to address German war crimes; other authors also highlighted the murders of East European Jews. One of them was Heinrich Böll in *The Train was On Time* (orig. 1949), describing Galician towns as "smelling of pogroms" (Böll 1994, 18). On the way east, his protagonist Andreas thinks several times "of Cernauti, and he said a special prayer for the Jews of Cernauti and for the Jews of Lvov, and no doubt there were Jews in Stanislav too, and in Kolomyya" (ibid., 28). He says nothing more, but these thoughts emerge in context with his reflections on death. He therefore expresses what, strictly speaking, he does not: that the Jews from Galicia are now dead.

Another example is Paul Verhoeven's barely known film *Ich weiß wofür ich lebe* (1955) about a woman raising two Jewish children from Eastern Europe. In 'unpopular flashbacks,' as it was called at the time, the viewer learns that the children's parents had been killed, but in the end "once again everything is wrapped in cotton wool, repressed, and . . . found in a friendly ending" ("Neu in Deutschland" 1955; "Probleme verspielt" 1955). In contrast to such subliminal or subcutaneous, as I call it, fragments of the cultural memory of the Holocaust, which had only somewhat seeped into public awareness, *Through the Night* contained by far the most detailed description, up to that time, of the massacres during World War II. To this day, hardly any comparable passages can be found in German literature; in world literature, Jonathan Littel filled this 'gap' with his monumental novel *The Kindly Ones* (2009, orig. 2006).

The ambivalent character of *Through the Night* does not seem unusual for the West German approach to the (then) recent past. Research on *Vergangenheitsbewältigung* in West Germany proves that a homogenic memory culture has never existed. Many political and social processes ran in parallel, and the decisive turns probably occurred somewhere in the interstices. Konrad Adenauer's conservative government programmatically blocked any attempt of *Vergangenheitsbewältigung*;[7] it was not without reason that Theodor W. Adorno, in his famous lecture *The Meaning of Working through the Past*, spoke of "forgetting" and of "repression of what is known or half-known" (Adorno 2005, 90–91). The theory of 'repression' was pushed even further by Alexander and Margarethe Mitscherlich in their psychoanalytically

underpinned essay *Inability to Mourn* (1975, orig. 1967). Later, Hermann Lübbe coined the term *kommunikatives Beschweigen* (communicative silence) for the West German postwar society's silent yet constructive approach to war crimes (Lübbe 1983).

However, 'repression' and 'silence' do not illustrate the whole picture of West Germany's handling of its Nazi history; numerous criminal prosecutions should be mentioned as well. Between 1950 and 1960, West German prosecutors initiated more than seven thousand investigations against Nazi perpetrators (Eichmüller 2008, 626). In 1958, probably the most famous of the court trials from this period—against the *Einsatzkommando Tilsit* who had murdered Lithuanian Jews—took place at the Ulm Regional Court (Fröhlich 2011). Partly in response to this trial, the Central Office of the State Justice Administrations for the Investigation of National Socialist Crimes was subsequently founded in Ludwigsburg (Krösche 2008).

The downside of these efforts, however, was the fact that the vast majority of Nazi perpetrators were never investigated, and only a fraction of the investigations ended in convictions (Fulbrook 2018, 355). Moreover, most of those convicted could hope for early discharges from prison (Eichmüller 2008). In any case, a conclusive judgment about the handling of war crimes in the West German postwar period is hardly possible. Repression of the past and attempts of *Vergangeneitsbewältigung* existed simultaneously, always depending on what we take into consideration (Berghoff 1998, 97).[8] The extensive research on postwar West Germany and its dealings with the Nazi past makes clear that the legal, political, media, and even family ways of coping with the past were highly diverse: examining individual areas leads to varying judgments, case by case.

This notwithstanding, major changes did not occur until the 1960s. The "centerpiece of Germany's *Vergangenheitsbewältigung*" (Reichel 2010, 10) were the major Nazi trials, above all the Frankfurt Auschwitz trials which started in 1963. They quickly triggered artistic reactions, as evidenced by Peter Weiss's drama *The Investigation* (orig. 1965), among others. In contrast to other media events related to *Vergangenheitsbewältigung*—such as the television broadcast of the Eichmann trial (1961), and the broadcast of the US television miniseries *Holocaust* (1978/79)—only very few scholars recognize *Through the Night* as relevant. How could a representation of German war crimes, disseminated through mass media, not have any long-term consequences on memory culture? The memory of the murder of Soviet Jews conveyed by the novel, the radio play, and the television miniseries quickly ceased to 'travel' or even to 'oscillate;' it seems as if the depiction of the Orsha massacre, as well as the entire media complex *Through the Night*, reached a mnemonic cul-de-sac. Instead of moving forward on the path of memory culture, it suddenly stopped. Why? And could *Through the Night* possibly be

moving out of the cul-de-sac again in the future, pushed by further transformations of memory and media cultures?

The Remediation of Memory Culture

The presence of the past in the present requires a mediation of history, as collective memory is depending on media and is inconceivable without them. Halbwachs already argued that memory only emerges in the act of communication; the relationship between media and collective memory has since been elaborated multiple times, often with reference to Benedict Anderson, who famously pointed at the connection between collectively shared images of history and the development of mass media.

Following Richard Grusin (2004), Astrid Erll sees history not only remediated, but also premediated (Erll 2011a, 139). Certain motifs are often *re*mediated precisely *because* they have already been *pre*mediated. It resembles a circular or spiral movement in which images and concepts are shaped and subsequently reactivated by pre-existing 'pre-images' and 'pre-concepts.' This model allows us to consider the media complex *Through the Night* as a process of pre- and re-mediation. By contrast, the concept of adaptation—even in its processual view (Hutcheon 2013)—assumes a generally linear process in which a work emerges in response to a previous one. Cultural memory, however, is not linear; it is entangled, branched, and it circulates.

The idea of a genuine connection between media and cultural memory is at the core of Aleida and Jan Assmann's theory (Assmann 2004). Inspired by technological determinism, they propose a model of the history of memory that is based on innovations in media technology, such as writing, printing, and photography. With the rise of television, *Through the Night* came out in a crucial epoch, even though the 'media revolution' at the end of the 1950s was less obvious than it appears in hindsight. While the arrival of television in West Germany primarily impacted movie theaters, its initial effect on book and newspaper sales, as well as on radio use, was insignificant (Meyen 2001, 79–82). The decisive question therefore is how contemporary technological changes also affected memory culture.

According to Andrew Hoskins, every new medium influences existing modes of memory (Hoskins 2001). As an example, Hoskins mentions the transition from electronic to digital media, from television to the Internet. While in the electronic phase a few large media institutions controlled the mass audience, in the digital phase the control is distributed among multiple competing institutions and globally dispersed users. Explaining the difference, Hoskins uses the example of wars and media. In the electronic phase, questions about making war visible and communicating it to the public were

central; in the digital phase, the war is shaped for the media and the media for the war. In this process, users form "affective networks" instead of mass audiences (Hoskins 2014, 669).

Most of today's media studies focus on the technological developments in the media during recent years and decades. Early television, however, when the mediated image of history became an everyday experience in Western societies, is less often taken into account. Stewart Anderson and Wulf Kansteiner even claim that, until 1967, West German television "never visualized the 'war crimes' nor, for that matter, the criminals themselves" (Anderson and Kansteiner 2014, 446). That is not true, as the miniseries *Through the Night* proves. As early as at the turn of the 1960s, West German television was slowly developing into a medium of social debate, and it contributed to the establishment of new discourses on history (Classen 1999; Keilbach 2003; Bösch 2006). Thanks to serial formats, it was possible to draw the attention of the audience over several days and weeks: the broadcast of *Through the Night* in the spring of 1960, for instance, was followed by the documentary *Das Dritte Reich* (1960/61) and the coverage of the Eichmann trial in 1961 (Bösch 1999; Keilbach 2019).

From this perspective, *Through the Night* reflects not only the rapid rise of television but also of popular literature in the postwar period, as well as the slow demise of the feature novel and the radio play. The transformation of West German memory culture coincided with these developments. Following Science and Technology Studies, it is also worth considering to what extent media technologies determine memory culture. This means that we should pay more attention to the technological aspects of the media of memory: if the circulation is too small, the reception too poor, or the image too blurred, the mediated images of history will hardly impact memory cultures, regardless of their content.

Concerning the discussion about remediation as the basis of memory culture, 'plurimediality' should be emphasized. *Through the Night* has great potential for a historical investigation of the same content 'traveling' between different media. Heck, Lang, and Scherer emphasize the uniqueness of the media complex, which in their view can only be compared to Alfred Döblin's *Berlin Alexanderplatz* (1929) and its contemporary radio and film adaptations. However, repeated adaptations of the same literary material for radio and cinema were common in the early postwar period. Gerhard Hauptmann's *The Rats* (1911) gained significant popularity after the end of World War II, with three radio and four film adaptations, including two in the United States (Schauding 1992). Another example is Theodor Plievier's bestseller *Stalingrad*, published as a book immediately after the war (1945) and adapted three times for radio (twice in 1948, and in 1953) and later for television (1963). According to Heck, Lang, and Scherer, the uniqueness of

Through the Night is primarily the relatively short time between the novel's publication and the adaptations, but even that was nothing too unusual at the time. Wolfgang Borchert's drama *The Man Outside* was adapted as a radio production (1947), shortly after as a theater play (1947), and two years later as a movie called *Love '47*. The novel *So weit die Füße tragen* (As far as my feet will carry me) by Joseph Martin Bauer, published in 1955 (like *Through the Night*), was first used as a script for a radio play of the same title (1956), and later for a television miniseries (1959). Both novels competed for the Fontane Prize, which Scholz eventually won; and both film adaptations were shot by Fritz Umgelter.

In addition to the novels and their adaptations, the audience also received reviews, program booklets, posters, and the like. 'Plurimediality' therefore was—and remains—an essential component of reception. For Janet Staiger and Sabine Hake (2009), research should always consider several types of media simultaneously, not only one. For historian Axel Schildt, the twentieth century was the age of "mass media ensembles" (Schildt 2001, 188); Andreas Fickers added that media history cannot be understood as a linear process, and that the appearance of 'new' media, especially television, always retroactively influences already existing media techniques (Fickers 2012, 51). In addition, mediated artifacts have a long 'afterlife,' often overlooked in common narratives about media history. Accordingly, basic research on the history of literature, film, or theater usually follows a certain chronological pattern: first the idea, then the product, then the reception immediately after premiere. This type of narrative, however, does not correspond with the views of the producers or the audiences. Books appear in several editions—first hardcover, then as paperbacks, then as audio books or as e-books. Movies run for months, until they are released on DVD, broadcast on television, or offered through streaming services. Theater plays are usually performed over and over again, works of art repeatedly exhibited, or even digitized. According to Ann Rigney, this 'afterlife' of cultural artifacts is characteristic of cultural memory, with the disappearance in turn being the absence of rewriting, reissues, or restaging (Rigney 2012, 51). *Through the Night* illustrates all those phenomena on a microlevel.

As people almost always use several types of media simultaneously, the fact that reception studies usually focus on only one medium (Moller 2018; Rauch 2018; Biltereys and Meers 2018) has more to do with the structure of academia. Put simply, literary scholars are primarily interested in readers, and film scholars in viewers; however, as Christina von Hodenberg puts it, it should be about "explaining the impact of different media on each other and, in their interplay, on the society" (Hodenberg 2012, 36). For example, radio listeners commenting on the radio version of *Through the Night* used to compare it to the book; television critics, on the other hand, did so less

frequently. It is highly probable, however, that they were familiar with the Ulm trials only a year earlier; a few weeks before the screening of the first episode of the television miniseries, they might have heard Adorno's lecture on *Vergangenheitsbewältigung* on public radio. As difficult as it may seem to trace these connections in detail, they might have shaped or altered the reception of the execution scene in all versions of *Through the Night*.

About This Book: Telling the Same Story, Three Times

The idea for this book first appeared in 2014. After seeing the Orsha massacre in the television version of *Through the Night*, then hearing the radio adaptation, and finally reading the book, I wanted to learn more. However, literature on *Through the Night* turned out to be very sparse and additional archival research essential, but even the available sources did not look promising at first. With the acquisition of the Scholz estate by the Academy of Arts in Berlin, the tide turned; I was then able to consult the archives of the Hoffmann und Campe publishing house in Hamburg as well as the archives of the public broadcasters SWR and WDR, which hold material on the radio and television productions. I also found supplementary material in the State Archives of Berlin, the Military Archives of the Federal Archives in Freiburg, and the German Literature Archives in Marbach. Finally, thanks to the help of the staff at the Central Office of the State Justice Administrations for the Investigation of National Socialist Crimes and the Bavarian State Archives in Munich, I succeeded in locating files on the Orsha massacre.

At the same time, I read Sylvie Lindeperg's book *Night and Fog: A Film in History* (2014), a forceful and captivating example of a source-saturated analysis of a seemingly straightforward event in media history. Lindeperg impressed me with her precise approach and the numerous cross-sections through the history of Alain Resnais's famous Auschwitz film. Taking a microhistorical approach, Lindeperg perceives the individual performances and versions as distinct layers, carefully uncovering them one by one. She calls her approach "a micro-history in movement" (Lindeperg 2014, XXIV) and a "palimpsest of perspectives" (ibid., XXV). She unfolds the individual narratives of each layer in full detail and complexity, so that in the end a multidimensional narrative of *Night and Fog* emerges. I recognized in Lindeperg's method as a possible way to approach the media complex *Through the Night*; however, the abundance of sources clouded attempts to discern a clear narrative. I tried to formulate different (partly even opposing) questions instead of one central research question. On the one hand, the account of the Orsha massacre might have created a mnemonic 'rupture'; at a time when the massacres of the Jews were rarely (or even hardly) discussed, the respective sequence in the

book as well as in the radio and television adaptations confronted millions of recipients with fictional images of the murder of East European Jews. On the other hand, the way it was portrayed contained numerous motifs to justify the act, such as Scholz's Latvian gunmen and Umgelter's psychopathic SS officer. In multiple conversations with colleagues, I considered what the individual versions of *Through the Night*, as well as the sources concerning its production and reception, could 'tell.' Depending on the particular perspective from which I read, heard, or saw the material, it always resulted in a different narrative: about negotiating the rules of 'sayability' concerning the Holocaust at the time, about the development of the West German media landscape in the late 1950s and early 1960s, and finally about the voids in the memory of the Holocaust. I discussed *Through the Night* at numerous talks and conferences, until, one day, a commentator requested: 'Make a point.' I replied, 'There is no *one* point,' to which she replied: 'Well, then this is your point.' This brief exchange later reminded me of Thomas Bauer's essay *Die Vereindeutigung der Welt* (The univocalization of the world, 2018), in which he criticizes modern cultures for their preferences for unambiguous narratives. Similar processes can be observed in academia, particularly how the Anglo-American writing culture demands clearly formulated theories and plausible arguments. It was no coincidence that the conference language was English.

I do not want to completely oppose that notion of unambiguity, but I also do not want to fall into total ambiguity. *Through the Night* certainly does not evoke a highly relevant research question that urgently needs to be answered. There are good reasons why scholars have preferred other books, radio plays, and television productions so far. The need of 'stuffing research gaps'—to use an ironic remark by Annette Vowinckel (2013)—does not necessarily lead to good results. My aim is rather to 'understand' the account of the Orsha massacre in all its historical, social, and cultural aspects. I could perhaps be accused of splitting hairs here, but how often do we have the opportunity to scrutinize a book passage or a film sequence so closely? As this book is not intended to be an academic qualification of any sort, I decided to take the risk.

The eventual decision to tell the same story three times from three different perspectives goes back to two conversations: one with my colleague Sabine Stach, who—seeing my dilemma with *Through the Night*—was reminded of Tom Tykwer's film *Run Lola Run* (1998) and its leitmotif that one and the same story can always have different outcomes. The second conversation I had was with some of my students at the University of Lodz. It started with them questioning why they had to learn so many different cultural theories; for the next session, I then developed an exercise in which we interpreted two artifacts—first a photograph and then a short film—using different theories. As a result, we discovered that the use of different theories led to different

meanings. I achieved my didactic goal with this exercise, but I also ran into trouble when trying to answer the students' next question: why do most scholars use only one theoretical approach, or at most two? I had no convincing answer, other than that the unwritten rules of academic convention demand it. The following chapters, however, contain three stories of *Through the Night*; more precisely, they contain three stories of the fictional diary of Jürgen Wilms, written from three perspectives. To give a preview: the result turned out to be less surprising than I had hoped. Instead of illuminating contrasts, the chapters ended up complementing each other.

The first perspective focuses on the actors involved in the circulation of the media complex. Although I stick to the rather old-fashioned terms of 'production' and 'reception,' I refer to multiple actions related to the 'use' of the novel, radio play, and television miniseries, centered around the strategies of adapting the execution scene to the contemporary norms of *Vergangenheitsbewältigung*. The analytical description is based on Anthony Giddens' theory of structuration; Giddens opposes a strict separation between micro- and macrosociological approaches, and with them the understanding of society either as a result of individual interactions or fixed structures. Giddens wants to combine both ideas: every interaction contributes to the emergence of social structures, which in turn shape individual interactions. Negotiations about the rules of 'sayability' follow a similar pattern: while the account of the Orsha massacre undoubtedly pushed the boundaries of what 'could' be said, it also had to be defined by those very boundaries. All actors involved negotiated those rules. I examine this process from the first version of the novel manuscript, all the way to the rerun of the television miniseries.

The second story is dedicated to the text of the novel, the sound of the radio play, and the images of the miniseries. Considering research on 'authenticity' and the 'affective turn,' I examine the strategies of 'authenticity' characteristic of the execution scene: what kinds of war images were considered 'genuine' and 'authentic' at the time? Another focus of my investigation is the affective impact of the massacre's depiction: what did the scene 'do' to its producers and its recipients? These considerations are seen through a close reading of the corresponding passages in the book, as well as the scenes in the radio and television adaptations. In contrast to the hermeneutic approach of classical reception aesthetics (Jauss 1982), I not only reflect on how contemporary recipients *could* have perceived the texts and images, but I confront the account with the *actual* reactions. Hundreds of reviews, letters, and surveys provide insight into the emotional makeup of West Germans toward *Vergangenheitsbewältigung*.

The third story is about media from two different perspectives. It first deals with the mediality of *Through the Night*; taking this perspective, I fol-

low Bruno Latour's account, centering around the connections between human and non-human actors, particularly technology: according to Latour, humans and technology mutually interact (Latour 2006, 17); whereby it is less a matter of *how* they act, but rather what circumstances *make* them act how they do (ibid., 18). Inspired by Latour, I ask how the material properties of the media influenced the mediation of the execution scene: what did the media 'demand' from the material? Furthermore, media also took an important role concerning the intradiegetic level of *Through the Night*: the male characters in the frame story earn their money in the cinema industry, the diary is *the* medium of memory par excellence, and Jürgen Wilms also records his impressions with a camera; the protagonists thus reflect on the contemporary changes of media usage.

My three stories are connected by the main focus of my study, namely the first episode of *Through the Night*. The above-mentioned research questions, the methods of analysis, and the theoretical approaches distinguish each of the three stories, however. The first story emphasizes media as institutions, including publishers or broadcasters; in the second story, media are mediators of past images; and in the third they are technical apparatuses affecting the construction of cultural memory. In fact, the first and third stories are closely intertwined, as they deal with the social and technological conditions of the circulation of *Through the Night*. I want to present them separately, however, especially as the chapters on actors and institutions have a sociological focus, whereas the chapter on media and technologies derives from media and cultural studies. Both frame the second story—not to be placed last, as it specifically addresses the 'plurimedial' representation of a previously unrepresentable event.

Finally, I discuss why *Through the Night* has remained outside the (West) German cultural memory. After a brief and intense popularity, the public's interest declined just as rapidly as it had started, and the media complex entered a mnemonic cul-de-sac. Admittedly, this metaphor harbors numerous pitfalls, as it transcends the sheer microhistorical perspective. However, I take the lack of interest in *Through the Night* as an opportunity to reflect on the mechanisms of staying outside of memory culture. A significant majority of the literary, radio, and television history is not part of the academic canon and has never crossed the threshold of 'functional memory,' a notion by Aleida Assmann (2011) referring to memories that are not only 'stored' in culture, but also 'used.' The fact that the canon is an exception rather than the rule "is part of the normality in literary history, too," Assmann writes. "Only few ultimately make it into the pantheon of great artists whose works are sainted and given the cachet of enduring durability" (Assmann 2016, 40). While we focus on few exceptional works that 'traveled' toward the present memory culture without much resistance, numerous other texts fall by the

wayside or drift into cul-de-sacs; in any case, they remain 'outside' of cultural memory, and must be, if necessary, 'recalled' with considerable effort.

The multiperspective narration at the execution scene in *Through the Night* forces the readers of this book to compromise, however. Redundancies are particularly difficult or even impossible to avoid. Whoever intends to read the book from beginning to end, I have to ask for some understanding about the repeated encounter of factual statements. Yet, academic books are rarely read from the first to the last page; hardly anyone can afford to purchase all relevant titles. German university libraries, for instance, increasingly rely on collections that can be used only on the spot, with the result that books are leafed through, scanned in fragments, but hardly ever read in their entirety. This trend has progressed to the point where thousands of e-books can only be downloaded in parts, as libraries buy licenses by the chapter. The policy of large publishing houses and the pressure to increase efficiency shapes the reading behavior of academics, who—at least in Europe—already practice fragmentary reading during their college years, mostly selecting only excerpts relevant for the assignment or study at hand. In order to address the requirements of fragmented reading in this book, the most important background information is given in all three chapters—albeit in a different perspective and corresponding to the respective thematic focus.

As can be gathered from this Introduction, I would like to write from a first-person perspective, as long as the remarks are not of a general nature. The reason is my academic socialization: the academic form of Polish—my native language, in which I formulate most of my thoughts—barely tolerates passive voice, and knows no indefinite pronouns. I also avoid aesthetic judgments; several times, after lectures and talks on *Through the Night*, people asked me: 'Are the book, radio, and the television adaptations actually good?' In my opinion, aesthetic judgments should be left to literary, radio, and television critics, especially as current expectations often differ substantially from judgments made at the time the respective works first appeared. While I consumed *Through the Night* with some difficulty, readers and viewers in the 1950s and 1960s mostly expressed enthusiasm. In the end, to conclude with Hans Robert Jauss, aesthetic judgment depends on the horizon of expectations of the respective present (Jauss 1982).

Notes

1. Stephanie Heck and Simon Lang present a more detailed analysis of the structure of the novel, and also consider the anecdotes from the frame story; they identify eight stories within the story and six metadiegetic narratives (Heck and Lang 2018, 239–40).

2. Complete summaries of the book and the film is provided by Hans Schmid (2011) in his witty DVD review; he addresses numerous aspects of the contemporary context, and explains the meaning of individual symbols and figures (retrieved 13 January 2023 from https://www.heise.de/tp/features/Scheener-Herr-aus-Daitschland-3390037.html).

3. See Brochhagen (1994); Frei (2002); Herf (1997); Kittel (1993); Moeller (2001); Niven (2006); Reichel (2010).

4. Estimates on the number of victims of the Holocaust by bullets differ. Mary Fulbrook, for example, suggests 1.8 million (Fulbrook 2018, 105); I follow the data provided by Paul A. Shapiro (2008).

5. Detailed references to current research on *Through the Night* can be found throughout the book.

6. See Norman Ächtler (2013) or Christoph Classen (1999).

7. A notorious example in the Adenauer government is Hans Globke, then head of the Federal Chancellery, who was accused of complicity in the Holocaust due to his role as a ministerial councilor in Nazi Germany (Bästlein 2018).

8. In addition to FN 5, the books by Niethammer (1999), Reifenberger (2019), or Rürup (2019) should be mentioned here.