LUND UNIVERSITY

EUHR18 - Master Thesis

Master of Arts in European Studies

Spring 2022

Lund University

Integrating the Other

Narrative Constructions of GDR memory in *Berlin Global*

Jette Strohschneider

Supervisor: Tomas Sniegon

Abstract

The following paper examines the production of memory in *Berlin Global*, an exhibition housed at the Humboldt Forum in Berlin, through employing methods of discourse and narrative analysis. The analysis aims to deconstruct memories of the German Democratic Republic present in the exhibition and how these are integrated into greater national and international historical narratives through the use of the exhibition design, concept and the objects present there. To produce a sufficient analysis concepts such as the discursive object as theorized by Mieke Bal, memory, as well as nostalgia, ostalgia and hegemonic narratives need to be understood.

The paper comes to the conclusion that although reinforcing certain narratives and, in consequence, re-producing certain memories of the GDR, Berlin Global offers an innovative way of integrating the divided past of Germany into a common national and international context. Through the juxtaposition of objects, East and West Germany remain divided but directly compared in several socio-cultural aspects that have previously often been disregarded or sentimentalized.

Keywords: memory, German Democratic Republic, museum studies, discourse, narrative, othering

Contents

1. Introduction

With its conceptual roots in the enlightenment period and colonialism, museums have been assigned and constructed the widely perceived notion as authorities on historical knowledge.[1] Yet, just as modernity has been contested in the past years, museums cannot simply be described as neutral agents in the quest for said knowledge in a postmodern world. The demand towards a contemporary museum calls for it to be a mediator of plurality - a space where different voices of history can be heard and diverse narratives explored.

This is also reflected in the controversies surrounding the recently established Humboldt Forum in Berlin, which opened its doors in 2021. Critics interpret its existence as a beginning of consolidation of history and with it, the process of forgetting about the plurality of German history.[2] Meanwhile, the actors behind the Humboldt Forum proclaim their dedication to represent the history of the German Democratic Republic (GDR), which should include the use of objects paired with active engagement.[3] Both make claims for the authenticity of GDR history and its wider meaning for German memory culture.

The aim of this thesis is to examine discourses and narratives of the GDR in one of the main exhibitions of the Humboldt Forum: *Berlin Global*. Which narratives are constructed in the exhibition? Which discourses thus reveal themselves and how do they situate the GDR as part of local, national and world history? What is the role of objects and their arrangement in the narratives constructed?

Hence, these questions pertain to matters of narrativity and postmodernist understandings of the mediation of history and the role of museums as spaces of discursive objects following theories

[1] Irit Rogoff and Daniel J. Sherman, *Museum Culture: History, Discourses, Spectacle* (London: Routledge, 1994), xvi-xvii.
[2] Förderverin Palast der Republik e.V, accessed June 18, 2022, https://palast.jetzt/.
[3] Maritta Tkalec, "„Wir müssen Schloss und Palast erklären“," Humboldt Forum Magazin, Humboldt Forum, accessed May 19, 2022, https://www.humboldtforum.org/de/magazin/artikel/wir-mussen-schloss-und-palast-erklaren.

of Mieke Bal.[4] *Berlin Global* specifically has been chosen as an exhibition as its theme is tangible already in its title in how it aims to connect the local to the global. It is actively attempting to convey a connection between different levels of government as well as the connection between the "yesterday, today [and] tomorrow".[5]

The thesis will begin with presenting theories relevant to the analysis from the field of museum studies, memory studies as well as discussions of postmodern criticism on history writing, hegemony and dominant narratives before presenting the methods of discourse and narrative analysis in more depth. As mentioned beforehand, the analysis itself is restricted to one exhibition and its objects which are to be interpreted as mediators of discourse not only for the fact they have been chosen to be displayed in the first place, but also for their arrangement in the exhibition. An in-depth analysis of the objects will be presented in which the narratives that reveal themselves will be problematized.

1.1. Relevance

This thesis is written as part of the Master of Arts program in European Studies at Lund University. As a nation state that existed on the European continent and in the European context, the existence and fall of the GDR offers an object of study that positions socialism and communism within a European narrative.

With its interdisciplinary approach, the thesis includes multiple research fields relevant to the study of Europe, European values and European identities. Furthermore, this thesis aims to contribute to a plurality of narrative and discourse when it comes to the GDR, its memory and representation as many citizens of the vanished state, today also equally Germans and Europeans, live with their unique memory and understanding of the past.

With its concept, the exhibition *Berlin Global* situates the GDR in the international, which also includes the European. With cooperation between several actors and visitors from across the globe, the memory of the GDR is not only limited to Germans but transmitted beyond national borders and integrated into a European history.

---

[4] Mieke Bal, *Double Exposures: The Subject of Cultural Analysis* (New York: Routledge, 1996)

[5] "Berlin - City of Stories", Berlin Global, accessed June 20, 2022. https://berlin-global-ausstellung.de/.

2. Background

"We hope that the debates about the Humboldt Forum can, in the future, take place inside the Humboldt Forum, because we do want to be a place of debate and discussion [...] I wish for visitors who learn of something they did not know was even relevant to them."[6]

- Hartmut Dogerloh, Director of the Humboldt Forum

On 20 July 2021, the Humboldt Forum opened as the latest addition to Berlin's museum quarter following years of construction delays and discussion. The Forum combines several permanent and temporary exhibitions in collaboration with four partners, the *Stiftung Humboldt Forum im Berliner Schloss, Kulturprojekte Berlin und Stadtmuseum Berlin, Staatliche Museen zu Berlin* and the Humboldt-University of Berlin.[7] These partners oversee different exhibitions within the Forum, with focuses in their fields of expertise as well as collaborations between each other. The controversies surrounding the Humboldt Forum stem from mainly two points of contention: the exhibition of looted colonial objects as a means to discuss colonialism itself and the historical architectural project of reconstructing the Berlin Palace and, as a consequence, the demolition of the Palace of the Republic. The latter serves as a background as to why this thesis is of relevance to the current ongoing discussions on the Forum as well as GDR and Unified German history.

The "Schlossdebatte" ("Palace Debate") largely entered the political, intellectual and public discourse in the early 1990s when publicists Joachim Fest and Wolf Jobst Siedler published their essays advocating for a reconstruction of the Berlin Palace.[8] Roth (2019) evaluates the debate and the discourses of different parties as a symptom of the search for identity of a new Berlin Republic, in which Berlin, as a most nationally and internationally visible place of division and

---

[6] Jochen Erdmenger, "Das Humboldt-Forum als Diskussionsraum", SR 2 Kulturradio, July 20, 2021 (my translation), accessed May 18 2022, audio, 05:58. https://www.sr.de/sr/sr2/themen/kultur/20210720_dogerloh_hartmut_ueber_humboldt_forum_eroeffnung_interview_100.html.

[7] "Partners," Humboldt Forum, accessed June 20, 2022, https://www.humboldtforum.org/en/about/.

[8] Tim Birkholz, *"Schloss mit der Debatte!"?: Die Zwischennutzung im palast der Republik im Kontext der Schlossplatzdebatte* (Berlin: Forum Stadt- und Regionalplanung E.V., 2008): 18. https://depositonce.tu-berlin.de/bitstream/11303/2303/1/Dokument_10.pdf.

the fall of the wall was discursively assigned a representative symbol of the nation.[9] This was reflected in the debate that emerged in which many East German citizens as well as politicians of the left spectrum advocated instead for the renovation of the Palace of the Republic or, more progressive voices, for an original building to be built in the area entirely. With the decision on the reconstruction settled in 2002 through a parliamentary vote, the discussion did, however, not subside.[10]

2.1. Current Responses to the Berlin Palace and the Humboldt Forum

As becomes apparent, the debate surrounding the reconstruction is not simply just one of preserving and reconstructing materiality but history and ideology with a disagreement on which history is worth to be conserved. While it is less the building itself that is important, it is the act of reconstructing the Berlin Palace which stands as a symbol of unification, democracy; in comparison, the Palace of the Republic earns its symbolism in its materiality as a building itself, as a construct of an illegitimate state.[11]

Both sides of the debate, however, remain far from homogenous. Advocate groups of the Berlin Palace, while in agreement of its reconstruction, differed slightly in their means of PR and external communication as well as what form the interior architecture should take on. Advocates of the Palace of the Republic exhibited several commonalities as well but differed slightly in their focus on narrative, which among others included the argument that the closing of the Palace was done with too much haste or criticism of political motivations of the reconstruction of the Berlin Palace.[12] They instead highlight the role of the Palace of the Republic as a cultural place

[9] Hannelore Roth, "Das Berliner Schloss: mythologisches Relikt in einer mythenarmen Zeit," *arcadia* 54, no. 2 (2019): 259. https://doi.org/10.1515/arcadia-2019-0021.
[10] Deutscher Bundestag, "Beschlussempfehlung und Bericht des Ausschusses für Kultur und Medien (23. Ausschuss), July 2, 2002, accessed May 5, 2022, https://dserver.bundestag.de/btd/14/096/1409660.pdf.
[11] Anna Inés Hennet, "Die Berliner Schlossplatzdebatte: Die Geschichte einer Identitätssuche," in *Palast der Republik: Diskurs und private Erinnerung*, ed. Alexander Schug (Berlin: Berliner Wissenschaftsverlag, 2007), 58.
[12] Reinbold, Fabian and Miriam Novak, "Leidenschaftliche Kämpfer: Die Abrissdebatte und ihre Akteure", in *Palast der Republik: Politischer Diskurs und Private Erinnerung*, ed. Alexander Schug (Berlin: Berliner Wissenschafts-Verlag, 2007), 70-71.

and house of the people. In addition, narratives of victimhood emerged later on as the demolition was seen not just as a symptom but also an act of violence against East German memory. [13]

While these narratives also partly include nostalgia, modern movements for a recognition of the Palace of the Republic hope to juxtapose it against the Berlin Palace, so as to work against the forgetting of GDR architecture, history and the existence of the two Germanies in equal relevance to the history of unification.[14] However, most activist movements focus on postcolonial criticism in regards to the architecture of the reconstruction and looted objects of the Humboldt Forum. The place of East German history on the Spree island as part of Berlin's Historischer Mitte ("Historical Middle") is therefore still contested, in flux and unstable.

Despite many critics and former staff members of the Forum vocalizing their dissatisfaction with the process, as well as the fact that their opinions were not heard during the reconstruction process and establishment of the different exhibitions, the Humboldt Forum has undertaken a shift in the recent years, and has since its opening made the GDR, the Palace of the Republic and the debate surrounding the Forum itself part of its repertoire. Not only, as this thesis will argue, is GDR history part of the exhibition *Berlin Global*, but historical objects relating to the GDR are found in various parts of the exhibition as part of *Spuren* ("Tracks") while the video panorama also mentions the use of the space during the GDR. In addition, the Forum offers guided tours and discussions concerning the topic as for example during a themed day on the Palace of the Republic on April 30, 2022.[15]

The debate surrounding the Humboldt Forum does not concern a contestation of history itself; rather, it is a debate of what is to be remembered and how - of memory, national identity and cultural influence. In accordance, most vocal activists and critics have a background in politics, architecture, history or cultural critique. While most Germans have come in contact with the debate through private engagement or media coverage, it can very much be considered an intellectual and academic debate, which often happens out of reach of the general public.

---

[13] Ibid., 71.
[14] Förderverin Palast der Republik e.V, accessed June 18, 2022, https://palast.jetzt.
[15] "Programme 30/04," Humboldt Forum, accessed May 15, 2022, https://www.humboldtforum.org/en/programme-2/?start=20220430&end=20220430.

The decision of the staff of the Humboldt Forum to address East German history through exhibitions, historical objects and dedicated theme weeks, offers an opportunity to take up the discussion and mediate it to the visitor. Yet, depending on the methods and tools, the result of such mediation, and in turn education, can vary and produce discourses that can potentially benefit either party in the discussion.

3. Theoretical Background

To understand the significance of the topic and the debate, it is necessary to establish the work that has previously been done in the field of museum and memory studies. This background will be supplemented with aspects of postcolonial and critical theory as they are of essence in understanding the dynamics that emerge through research in the narrative of museums and memories. The museum as a mediator and its discursive objects are discussed in their role of creating or reinforcing memory while, in specific, GDR history and memory are viewed from the perspective of an often commodified or estranged other in the aftermath of German unification.

3.1. Memory Studies

To the modern person, memory exists everywhere; it is in the graves of relatives we visit, the national holidays we practice, the historical films we watch and the traditions we nurture. The capacity to not only memorize but verbalize and transform this knowledge of the past while possessing awareness of our knowledge of memory is uniquely human and a building block of human cultural existence and society.[16] As the study of memory finds its place in a variety of research fields e.g. psychology, social science and the humanitites, memory studies as a discipline is ever-evolving and different focuses of memory studies are often regulated and isolated within the specific field they are used in.[17]

---

[16] David W. Blight, "The Memory Boom: Why and Why Now?," in *Memory in Mind and Culture*, ed. Pascal Boyer and James V. Wertsch (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), 238–51.
[17] Anna Lisa Tota.and Trever Hagen, *Routledge International Handbook of Memory Studies* (London: Routledge, 2015), 1. https://doi-org.ludwig.lub.lu.se/10.4324/9780203762844.

Memory, just as memory studies as a discipline, cannot be confined to singularity. Erl (2017) notes its heterogeneity as represented through the related but distinct terms of *mémoire collective*, *lieux de mémoire*, social memory and transcultural memory, but advocates for the use of the term collective memory, as established by Maurice Halbwachs, for it justifies the wider set of issues where different phenomena and correlations of memory interplay in e.g. the social, cultural, medial and political.[18] (Collective) memory, then, is defined as an overarching term of different kinds of processes that are assigned meaning and importance through their mutual impact on past, present and future in cultural contexts.[19]

As memory is the way and processes of how a society chooses to remember history, it can occur more randomly than history, but it is not necessarily the opposite of history. Rather, it is a reflection of the past that is re-interpreted, so memory is formed and acts for the present to "learn" and establish social connections and conventions.[20] It is because of this that memory is often connected with terms such as regret, guilt, nostalgia or hope, which signify an emotional context for the subject that is remembering in the present in which memory is embedded.

This opens up for discussion about the relation between memory and the formation of the self - is memory the dominant actor in shaping the self and its interests or is the individual, to an extent, in control of shaping and reshaping their memory? Certainly, memory is intimately intertwined with the identity of a given society or the identity or themselves because it enables us to think of ourselves beyond our own time.[21] In one way or another, the self cannot exist without memory

[18] Astrid Erll, *Kollektives Gedächtnis und Erinnerungskulturen* (Stuttgart: J.B. Metzler Verlag, 2017, my translation), 4-5.
[19] Ibid., 5.
[20] Pascal Boyer. "In Mind, Culture, and History: A Special Perspective," in *Memory in Mind and Culture*, ed. Pascal Boyer and James V. Wertsch (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), 3, doi:10.1017/CBO9780511626999.001.
[21] Jan Assmann, "Communicative and Cultural Memory," in Cultural Memories: The Geographical Point of View (Knowledge and Space 4), ed. Peter Meusburger, Michael Effernan, Edgar Wunder (Dordrecht, Heidelberg, London, New York: Springer), 15, https://archiv.ub.uni-heidelberg.de/propylaeumdok/4111/1/Assmann_Communicative_and_Cultural_Memory_2011.pdf.

but not all memory is equal.[22] Regarding the specificity of memory, Schacter et. al. (2009) explain how the specificity of memory can vary when it comes to retention, for one can recall highly specific details of a certain event while one's own life story is often a more generalized narrative.[23] Factors such as emotion, trauma, age or active remembering all have an influence on which memories are retained, produced or adjusted. People, then, can bring these memories into their communities from which they are told forward and possibly incorporated into a collective memory.

As one function, memory also plays a role in the historical consciousness of the self. Historical consciousness is to be understood as the awareness that one lives within a temporality and the awareness of the "historical experience" as a whole.[24] That can be true for the individual, while collective memory can be a powerful actor in manifesting the historical consciousness of a group as well.

Blight (2009) comments on the messy nature of the term collective memory; it can be difficult to distinguish where this phenomenon begins and ends but it is "indispensable to understanding how people comprehend themselves in time."[25] As memory serves to organize the self into a coherent being on the individual level, so too can collective memory serve as a catalyzer of organization for the group. Yet, too facile is the assumption that one can encompass a whole group, especially in the context of a nation as is befitting for the research of this thesis, without room for deviation and plurality within. With Maurice Halbwachs often named as the founding father of the term collective memory, Frederic Bartlett argued for a differentiated understanding

[22] Helen L. Williams and Martin A. Conway,"How Do Memories Construct Our Past?," in *Memory in Mind and Culture*, ed. Pascal Boyer and James V. Wertsch (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), 30. doi:10.1017/CBO9780511626999.003.
[23] Daniel L. Schacter, Angela H. Gutchess, and Elizabeth A. Kensinger, "Specificity of Memory: Implications for Individual and Collective Remembering," in *Memory in Mind and Culture*, ed. Pascal Boyer and James V. Wertsch (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), 83, doi:10.1017/CBO9780511626999.006.
[24] Andrew Glencross, 2015. "Doing History' to Thinking Historically: Historical Consciousness across History and International Relations," *International Relations* 29, no. 4 (December): 413-433. https://doi.org/10.1177/0047117815608233.
[25] David W. Blight, "The Memory Boom: Why and Why Now?," in *Memory in Mind and Culture*, ed. Pascal Boyer and James V. Wertsch (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), 239. doi:10.1017/CBO9780511626999.006.

between memory of a group and memory within a group.[26] As Bartlett understands the production of memory within a group as a social practice that has to be continuous with an active effort to maintain, one might even distinguish between memory and remembering as memory as a term assumes an inherent mental capacity that remains even in passivity.

Remembering on the other hand implies active socializing within a group in which all actors are responsive and responsible in the process of building a common group identity. This presupposes a tolerance for variety in the group where memory can be negotiated. Although progression and re-interpretation of previous understandings of history can be tolerated, in the case of the modern nation-state of which the majority of the human population is nowadays a citizen of, usually not all members of the community are included in or invited to the meaning-making process that is remembering.

3.1.1. The Power and Authority of Memory

The formation of memory can be influenced by many actors. In the private sphere, memory is passed down through older generations in the form of tales, customs and traditions but in the public, the celebrations of national holidays also come to mind where memory is a tool for instilling national thinking and identity. While both of these transmit their understanding of the past on the basis of authority, they are generally not considered authorities of history.

The concept of authority cannot be entirely disentangled from the concept of power, yet it is important to understand their differences to grasp their interrelation. According to Hannah Arendt (1954), while authority implies and presupposes an asymmetrical relationship, it is in itself free from coercion for authority is rather sustained through factors such as legitimacy, consent, respect from others - it is given to instead of forcibly claimed.[27] Of course, there is also an argument to be made for the authority having to take on what is given to them, but the inter-relational aspect is certainly of importance to establish a sustainable and legitimate authority, which is reinforced through the willingness of others to position themselves in relation

[26] James V. Wertsch, "Collective Memory," in *Memory in Mind and Culture*, ed. Pascal Boyer and James V. Wertsch (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), 119.
[27] Hannah Arendt, *Between Past, Present and Future: Six Exercises in Political Thought* (New York: The Viking Press, 1961), 91-92.

to that authority. With such authority, then, comes the possibility to exert power on an individual or collective.

"Power", as the term is relevant for this paper, bases its meaning on the works of Michel Foucault who asserted power as a relation, rather than a possession, that exists in constant negotiation with the goal to be productive.[28] Although it can act repressively, it should not be confused with repression itself as power is taken and given by actors within an aforementioned relationship through negotiation of knowledge, which constantly shifts the forces of power at different moments in time.[29] As such, power can be exerted through the acts of an individual or an institution and, in the process, exert authority or knowledge over other individuals or groups.

Museums are often viewed as an authority on history or natural science - as an objective educator of the truth and institution of knowledge; however, in modernity and with an increased decentralized dissemination of knowledge, this authority is called into question. The museum as an institution as funded by state or private organization is also reflective of its backers and their socio-political ideologies.

The authority of the museum arises partly from the authority of its curators, their credibility and intentions.[30] What is displayed in the museum and, consequently, what narrative is created surrounding these displays, is generally the accumulation of the curator's intent, their knowledge and values, but in the modern day, is also dependent on other actors behind the exhibition such as directors and funders. Insofar, the museum mediates not only knowledge but the specific knowledge, and its implications, of these actors behind the museum; this enables the historical

---

[28] Allen, Amy Allen, "The Impurity of Practical Reason: Power and Autonomy in Foucault," in *The Politics of Our Selves: Power, Autonomy, and Gender in Contemporary Critical Theory* (Columbia University Press, 2008), 49. http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.7312/alle13622.6. Accessed 16 Aug. 2022.

[29] Wolfgang Detel, "Foucault on Power and the Will to Knowledge," in European Journal of Philosophy 4, no. 3 (1996), 296-297. https://doi-org.ludwig.lub.lu.se/10.1111/j.1468-0378.1996.tb00080.x

[30] Samuel J. M. M. Alberti, "The Status of Museums: Authority, Identity and Material Culture," in *Geographies of Nineteenth Century Science,* ed. David N. Livingstone and Charles W.J. Withers (Chicago; London: The University of Chicago Press, 2011), 51.

museum to emerge as an institution of remembrance while also inheriting agenda, ideology and power from the one who speaks.

3.1.2. The Narrativity of Memory

With its roots in literary study, narratology can also be applied to the study of memory. The definition of narrative are multiple with e.g. Gerald Prince asserting that "an object is a narrative if it is taken to be the logically consistent representation of at least two asynchronous events that do not presuppose or imply each other". [31] Roland Barthes notes the communicative aspect of a narrative as narrative must always have a narrator and listener, all narratives share common structures and codes and that meanings in a narrative can only be revealed from the world that makes use of it.[32]

Complementary to research on collective memory, cultural memory offers insight into how memory is mediated through culture - that can be stories, music, film, literature or exhibitions and the narratives that are to be found in those media. In cultural memory, the information is not conveyed directly from one person to another, but mediated and, consequently, condensed into limited narratives.[33]

Collective memory as a cultural production as well as remembering as a cultural practice is, therefore, reliant on media where even a medium that is only inspired by historical events but to the largest extent historical, can have an impact on collective memory.[34] The narrative told in these media blur the lines of historical writing and creative imagination while often impacting memory of the audience to the same extent as oral story-telling might. Because of such a limited condensed storyline, these narratives can have an impact on attitudes towards certain memories

---

[31] Gerald Prince, "Narrativehood, Narrativeness, Narrativity, Narratability" in *Theorizing Narrativity*, eds. John Pier and José Ángel García Landa, Berlin, Boston: De Gruyter, 2011. 19-28. https://doi-org.ludwig.lub.lu.se/10.1515/9783110969801.19.
[32] Roland Barthes, "An Introduction to the Structural Analysis of Narrative," in *New Literary History* Vol. 6, no. 2 (1975), 269-264. https://doi.org/10.2307/468419.
[33] Ann Rigney, "Cultural memory studies: Mediation, narrative, and the aesthetic," in *Routledge International Handbook of Memory Studies*, ed. Anna Lisa Tota and Trever Hagen (London: Routledge, 2015), 66.
[34] Ibid, 67-69.

and discourses regarding past events. As such narratives are put forward and become wide-spread, certain ones may emerge as dominant narratives.

If we consider the negotiations of power, the asymmetricality must be reflected in the discourses and narratives. That is, the narrative of the one in power can become the dominant one, especially if given authority through institutionalization. Drawing from critical theory, dominant historical narratives benefit from and maintain their status through hegemony. Gramsci developed the term "hegemony" as a general notion of intellectual and moral bourgeois leadership, which is a result of the relations of forces in society.[35] Consequently, the dominant narrative is the one of the powerful that reinforces the authority and position of the one in power but it must be clarified that such a narrative does not act singularly. A society is most commonly informed by a set of dominant narratives that shape its memory, identity and individuals.

With the deconstruction of hegemony, power and dominant narratives, recent research in memory and historical writing has made advancements on non-dominant and counter-narratives as well. Still, the concept of dominant narratives offers valuable opportunities for the research of memory in the context of e.g. national identity, which often benefits from coherent narratives of its people and history while suffering instability if such narratives are contested or missing.

3.1.3. Memory of the GDR

Since the fall of the Berlin wall, memory of the GDR has been highly intellectualized and discussed on one hand; on the other, remembrance has been passed down in the private as people above the age of 40 still remember life clearly under the SED as first-hand witnesses. All these involved in shaping the discourse on the GDR tinge it with their specific goals and needs, be it political, personal or educational, which makes for a great variety in narratives in the sphere of GDR history.[36]

---

[35] Alex Williams, *Political Hegemony and Social Complexity: Mechanisms of Power After Gramsci* (Cham: Springer International Publishing, 2020), 91-92.
[36] David Clarke and Ute Wölfel, "Remembering the German Democratic Republic in a United Germany," in *Remembering the German Democratic Republic*, ed. David Clarke and Ute Wölfel (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011), 4.

Brockmann (2011) notes the distance that German intellectuals and creatives felt and packed into their narratives of another Germany that was unfamiliar and unreal.[37] This unfamiliarity and the curiosity of the unknown is one factor of why memory of the GDR is still of interest and debate in the German and international sphere.

Ever since 1989, public interest in the GDR has grown and especially in the past 20 years with GDR museums and memorials emerging in several German small towns and concentrated in Berlin itself.[38] However, none of them claim authority on research or memory of the GDR but rather to complement the plurality of voices present on the topic while benefiting off their perceived authority given by visitors and tourists. There is still no consensus on how best to convey the past as different GDR museums aim for different narratives in their exhibitions, which can range from sentimentalizing the past or put an emphasis on traumatic events such as the GDR as an illegitimate state and the influence of the oppressive state security apparatus in everyday life.[39]

Fulbrook (2011) notes the apparent division of GDR historians in which one side is oftentimes more concerned with the social fabric of the country with emphasis on adaptation of the population, everyday life and dissent, while the other side focuses on the GDR as a totalitarian state sustained through power and coercion.[40] There can certainly be made space for both sides, yet it is of continuous debate who represents the GDR in an accurate way. Positive evaluations of the society at the time as stated by former GDR citizens are often met and dismissed with rebuttals of idealization and nostalgia. Although such memories are certainly tinged in personal experiences, hardships and retrospective evaluation with the present day, the validity of such

---

[37] Stephen Brockmann, "Remembering GDR Culture in Postunification Germany and Beyond," in Twenty Years on: Competing Memories of the GDR in Postunification German Culture, ed. Renate Riechten and Dennis Tate, vol. 110 (Boydell & Brewer, 2011), 39-40, accessed 30 May, 2022. http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.7722/j.ctt1x72d3.7.

[38] Andreas Ludwig, "Representations of the Everyday and the Making of Memory: GDR History and Museums," in *Remembering the German Democratic Republic*, ed. David Clarke and Ute Wölfel (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan), 37.

[39] Silke Arnold-De Simine, Mediating Memory in the Museum: Empathy, Trauma, Nostalgia (New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013), 160.

[40] Mary Fulbrook, "Histories and Memories: Verklärung oder Erklärung?," in *Remembering the German Democratic Republic*, ed. David Clarke and Ute Wölfel (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011), 91.

memories should hardly be dismissed for falsity but as an opportunity to understand how a society can organize itself under an oppressive dictatorship.

Yet, it is also of importance to keep in mind the fact that the individual itself is outsourcing their memories by deciding what is important to to remember, to tell and to omit through reasons such as personal interest but also to divert blame or shame.[41] Life in the GDR can be a breeding ground for such feelings as there was significance e.g. in one's family history, agreement or disagreement with the party or even involvement with the Stasi. This ties into a major theory of GDR memory and also the argument against the idealization of individuals: *ostalgia*.

Ostalgia stems mainly from a sentimentalization and commodification of the GDR and objects of East German historical-cultural value in a renaissance-like recognition during the early 90s. The term can be connected to several values: some use it as a term to validate the past existence of the GDR and its history through objects in contrast to the intellectualization of the discourse after re-unification while for others, it is more of a self-identification of East German values and traditions.[42] Although the latter movement especially contains emotionality, it is not necessarily a strict protest movement against re-unification. Rather, it is connected to the caesura that occurred with the fall of the Berlin wall, which drastically changed society and economic dependencies for many East Germans who had to re-orientate themselves in their historical and national consciousness.

The fact that GDR discourse in the 1990s was predominantly negotiated between intellectuals and politicians of West Germany and former GDR citizens in East Germany makes an imbalance palpable. After reunification, historians of the GDR had largely been dismissed from their former positions with a lack of credibility due the status of socialist historiography and disputes between East and West German historians.[43] Even in research institutes, cooperation was rare with mostly

---

[41] Ibid, 95.
[42] Thomas Ahbe, *Ostalgie: Zum Umgang mit der DDR-Vergangenheit in den 1990er Jahren* (2011), 7, https://nbn-resolving.org/urn:nbn:de:gbv:27-20110526-135537-2.
[43] Stefan Berger, "Former GDR Historians in the Reunified Germany: An Alternative Historical Culture and Its Attempts to Come to Terms with the GDR Past," *Journal of Contemporary History* 38, no. 1 (2003): 63-65, http://www.jstor.org/stable/3180697.

West German historians in leading positions while East German historians had to prove the scientificity of their work under socialism.

While *ostalgia* insofar fulfills the function of protest through thought and values to carve out a place for East German identity in the West German narrative, it usually lacks the perceived antagonism towards unification that some fear it might proclaim.[44] The memory of the GDR underwent a process of othering with its narratives struggling to find their place in German identity. While resentment against reunification was generally low, the early West German take over strategy criticized in polls by many East Germans resulted in a one-sided demand for adaptation rather than reunification with loss of East German identity and the struggle of East Germans to perceive the reunification as a positive revolution.[45] In the postsocialist world, East Germans had to re-orientate themselves in an economic and value system that they had been thrust into with rhetorics emerging that proclaimed an us-them dichotomy as well as utterances of local adherence such as "from here" as opposed to from the West.[46] These re-interpretations and re-imaginings of memory and identity, can be seen as an act of self-preservation in which East Germans carve out a place for themselves in narratives predominantly defined through West Germanness.

This estrangement is most likely also a result of the foreignness of East Germany and its socialism to West Germany. Both shared certain cultural and social features of a common national identity such as language, but in the everyday, the status of material goods, employment and freetime activities differed as they were set in different governmental systems.[47] The reunified Germany has not yet entirely overcome this estrangement, which is why memory of the

---

[44] Thomas Ahbe, *Ostalgie: Zum Umgang mit der DDR-Vergangenheit in den 1990er Jahren* (2011), 64-66, https://nbn-resolving.org/urn:nbn:de:gbv:27-20110526-135537-2.
[45] Michael Minkenberg, "The Wall after the Wall: On Continuing Division of Germany and the Remaking Political Culture," *Comparative Politics* 26, no. 1 (1993), 64, https://doi-org.ludwig.lub.lu.se/10.2307/422173.
[46] Daphne Berdahl, *On the Social Life of Postsocialism: Memory, Consumption, Germany* (Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Press, 2010), 48-54.
[47] Stephen Brockmann, "Remembering GDR Culture in Postunification Germany and Beyond," in Twenty Years on: Competing Memories of the GDR in Postunification German Culture, ed. Renate Riechten and Dennis Tate, vol. 110, (Boydell & Brewer, 2011), 39-40 Accessed 30 May, 2022, 44.

GDR persists and is actually still of interest to many Germans and international visitors that hope to experience part of it in museums dedicated to its history.

3.2. Museum Studies - The Exhibition as a Discursive Object

As much as it is the underpinning of this thesis that memory shapes identity, it is an underpinning that museums function as a mediator of memory. When mentioning "the museum", the thesis refers to not simply a building itself but the institution as a whole, which encompasses exhibitions and objects housed within the exterior as well as various staff - from the director, the chief curator to tour guides.

These staff have engaged and continue to engage with their own memory as a force in shaping the museum: they choose what to display and how, they restrict or offer the availability of the museum to visitors and advertisement to the public and serve as the face of the institution. Bal (1996) notes that "in expositions a ´first-person´, the exposer, tells a ´second person´, the visitor, about a ´third person,´ the object on display, who does not participate in the conversation".[48] Although grammatically creating the image of a singular person, the work of curatorship in the current age is often far from being a single achievement. More often than not, an exhibition is created in the interest and with the help of several parties who lend their input and voice. Hence in the analysis, the thesis will refer to everyone involved in creating the exhibition as the exposer for simplicity, which is comparable to the narrator in literary studies. The object, therefore, becomes a speech act that intends to convey meaning, where the success of conveying said meaning depends partly on how the exposer has arranged the display and on the perception of the visitor, their previous knowledge and previously acquired discourses surrounding the object. The visitor will, nevertheless, perceive a narrative that they either recognize and agree or disagree with, or the narrative will be new information that is, then, internalized.

Here, the discursive object, the artifact or artwork is assigned meaning. It is then upon the exposer to mediate this meaning to others, so as to further manifest the object as relevant in a given societal context. As discussed previously, such an assignment of meaning can include one or several goals such as education or a sense of shared community.

[48] Mieke Bal, *Double Exposures* (New York: Routledge, 1996), 4.

3.2.1. Mediating Memory in the Museum

Investigating the significance of the museum, Pearce (1993) highlights the materiality of human and natural history that museums hold; a materiality which itself has actively been chosen, interpreted and displayed by the collector or curator.[49] Therefrom, one can acknowledge the influence of the subject on the object. Bal advocates for "the fundamental notion that exposition of display is a particular kind of speech act."[50] In themselves, objects are simply neutral materials void of meaning. The meaning assigned by the curator to the object is projected outward towards the visitor as decisions are made on how to position artifacts.

This act of display is informed by the change of cultural significance and customs and can be connected to Hall's shared conceptual maps and tools of representation to communicate effectively within a group dynamic.[51] As these meanings are not fixed but exist in a continuous process of change and reinterpretation, so can objects and entire displays be considered more or less accurate, meaningful or appropriate depending on time and space.[52] The museum, throughout time, then is issued with the responsibility of mediating these meanings of culture and history and in the context of the present. As a "contact zone", the museum is able to connect not only the curator to the visitor through the object, but connect the visitor to other visitors, different cultures, histories, realities and experiences resulting in different intersections and interactions between those.[53] The museum, its objects and the visitors all bring with them their different cultural maps and texts then, allowing for a kind of intertextuality in which the museum acts as the story-teller and authority on history - although, it would be misguided to view the visitor as passive as they evaluate the object through their own interpretations.

---

[49] Susan M. Pearce, *Museums, objects and collections: a cultural study* (Washington D.C.: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1993), 1.
[50] Mieke Bal, *Double Exposures: The Subject of Cultural Analysis* (New York: Routledge, 1996), 88.
[51] Stuart Hall, "Representation, meaning and language", in *Representation: Cultural Representations and Signifying Practices*, ed. Stuart Hall (London: Sage Publications, 1997): 15-24.
[52] Rhiannon Mason, "Cultural Theory and Museum Studies," in *A Companion To Museum Studies*, ed. Sharon Macdonald (Malden, MA; Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2006), 21-22.
[53] Ibid, 25.

This thesis, however, is more concerned with the museum and the exhibition as a discourse of the people behind the exhibition, the exposer(s), who seek to inform the visitor, rather than the visitor informing the exhibition itself. Appropriate here, then, is a further discussion of the sociology of the museum as a space of authority and institution of knowledge. Foucault describes the museum as a heterotopic space; that is, a place outside of all other places.[54] Wigley argues for the museum as extraordinary experiments in manufacturing humans where a subject is not simply educated and disciplined but manufactured.[55] Questions arise about who is in control of the space and its objects, who is allowed into the space and what discursive weight and responsibility is given to the museum. In accordance with discursive weight comes the responsibilities of mediation that is demanded of the museum as an institutional space.

In the case of mediation of memory, one of the goals is not only to inform the visitor but make them empathize with the past.[56] Creating empathy is to immerse the visitor in the objects and their stories, although it is difficult to determine which individual will react empathetically and to what extent it benefits memory and history education. As will be discussed later on, Berlin Global uses interactive games throughout its whole exhibition to keep the visitor personally engaged and thinking but it is not necessary for the visitor to engage in this interactivity to enter or experience the exhibition.

It is also of debate if there lies a benefit in eliciting empathy when mediating in the museum. Arnolde-De Simine (2013) notes the idealism of eighteenth century writers when it comes to empathy, yet also how empathy in itself must have a pleasurable aspect as the individual would otherwise be afraid to engage with it.[57] Thus, empathy as mediated in the museum needs to be told within a narrative or be created through discourse which sees the life of someone else in the

---

[54] Michel Foucault, "Different Spaces," in *Michel Foucault: The Essential Works, vol.2: Aesthetics, Method and Epistemology*, ed. James Faubion (London: Allen Lane, 1994), **quoted in** Gordon Fyfe, "Sociology and the Social Aspects of Museums," in *A Companion To Museum Studies*, ed. Sharon Macdonald (Malden, MA; Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2006), 35.
[55] Mark Wigley, "Discursive versus Immersive: The Museum is the Massage," in *Stedelijk Studies Journal 4* (2016), accesssed April 12, 2022, DOI: 10.54533/StedStud.vol004.art02.
[56] Silke Arnold-de Simine, *Mediating Memory in the Museum: Empathy, Trauma, Nostalgia* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013), 1.
[57] Silke Arnold-de Simine, Mediating Memory in the Museum: Empathy, Trauma, Nostalgia (Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire; New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013), 45.

center, be it another individual, a group or a nation. It can be disadvantageous for memory research insofar as not only commodification of suffering can be taking place but also potential processes of othering, victimization, or sentimentalization.

In that case, the museum can become a perpetrator in reinforcing dominant narratives or stereotypes. Then, the museum as an institution also has a responsibility to be as truthful and multifaceted a mediator as it can possibly be, which, depending on the memory it is trying to mediate, reaches its own limits in terms of e.g. size of exhibitions and funding.

In modern times, however, there exists a demand for the museum to explore these limits to its fullest as demand for plurality and diversity of voices grow (companion to museum studies.[58] In consequence, its curators are called to understand themselves as mediators between, not only but oftentimes, contradicting ideologies and identities. Through exposition, they decide what to show, what to point out or point to, what to explain, what to trash, what is and what to persuade the visitor of.[59] The exposers interpret and mediate between their objects, installations and presented discourses as much as between the object and the visitor. As such, they are not only given an opportunity to convey their understanding and interpretations of objects but are given responsibility to uniquely narrate and shape discourse regarding multiple views of given objects and histories.

3.2.2. Objects and Narratives of the GDR in the Museum

Apparent in the previous chapters is the capacity of the museum to communicate. It communicates through its curators, through its exhibitions and through its objects. Calderon (1990) argues that museums have to realize their responsibility in that they reflect the identity of a nation or community, their needs and aspirations.[60]

---

[58] Gordon Fyfe, "Sociology and the Social Aspects of Museums," in *A Companion to Museum Studies*, ed. Sharon Macdonald (Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing, 2006), 39-40, https://doi-org.ludwig.lub.lu.se/10.1002/9780470996836.ch3.
[59] Mieke Bal, *Double Exposures: The Subject of Cultural Analysis* (New York: Routledge, 1996), 88.
[60] Mary Jane Calderon,"Museums and Communication," *Philippine Quarterly of Culture and Society* 18, no. 2 (1990): 139, accessed May 20, 2022, http://www.jstor.org/stable/29792009.

Museums can be powerful actors in shaping national memory and enforcing German identity. As mentioned before, the discourse surrounding the GDR since the fall of the Berlin wall has been influenced by predominantly West German narratives about the former Eastern part. It is then of question how these and other narratives have been represented in various museums of German history, the GDR and communism.

Firstly, it must be noted that there are two basic designs of exhibition that are evaluated when it comes to the narratives constructed and communicated in the museum: the immersive and discursive design. Both are not opposites to each other but rather, they inform the visitor differently about objects displayed.[61] The discursive design can most often be found in history museums as it seeks to convey precise information, narratives and discourses about one or several aspects of the objects. There is room for plurality of information; the main goal is to engage the visitor in contradiction, education and debate - in objective thinking.

The immersive design, on the other hand, is more free in its interpretation and seeks to blur the boundary between the visitor and the exhibition. It seeks to transcend the natural boundaries that a museum establishes, as well as the boundaries that come with the materialism of the object According to Wigley (2016), "in the discursive exhibition, the (art)object transforms into evidence, whereas in the immersive exhibition the (art)object is transformed into its environment".[62] Often, the immersive design is therefore more interactive as the visitor does not have a choice but to interact as they are thrust into the exhibition as part of the performance. Both have advantages in terms of education and the creation of empathy towards an object and its history. Furthermore, elements of both designs can be found in an exhibition as will become apparent during the analysis of Berlin Global, an exhibition which not only creates immersion through interactivity but due to the space it is located in.

---

[61] Emilie Sitzia, "Narrative Theories and Learning in Contemporary Art Museums: A Theoretical Exploration" *Stedelijk Studies Journal 4* (2016), accessed April 12, 2002, DOI: 10.54533/StedStud.vol004.art04.

[62] Mark Wigley, "Discursive versus Immersive: The Museum is the Massage," in *Stedelijk Studies Journal 4* (2016), accesssed April 12, 2022, DOI: 10.54533/StedStud.vol004.art02.

Through the history of colonialism, collecting practices and the architectural design, the meaning of the museum that is the Humboldt Forum can arguably, according to Bal (1996), be derived from its history.[63] Other museums and memorials of GDR history can be ascribed the same; the Stasi-Museum in Berlin is housed in the headquarters of the former GDR Ministry for State Security (Stasi) and the Berlin-Schönhausen Memorial lets the visitor gain insight into the former main political prison of the Stasi by themself or through guided tours.[64] Furthermore, most GDR museums and memorial sites can be found within the territory of East Germany and Berlin.[65] All of these benefit from their location and history, which adds to their perceived authenticity, authority and historicity.

Significant for museums of the GDR and the cultural memory they mediate is the topical division between the crimes and violations of the state, and the documentation of the "every-day" and objects that are supposedly rather unpolitical and free of state-violence.[66] Although there can be overlapping topics and objects that exhibit examples of both aspects of the past life, these two types of museum are usually still distinct with separate aims of education. A commonality, however, can be found in the framing of the GDR as a backward country lacking progress and variety. Museums of the GDR do not only use slogans referring to the "gray" everyday of the GDR but also deliberately frame bright objects critically to dampen their perceived colorfulness.[67] Of course, "grayness" here is a rhetorical tool. Not all objects lack saturation or are of cheap quality. Rather, the "grayness" invokes a monotony, a reality that lacks happiness and free expression while also a metaphor for socialist uniformity and state control.

---

[63] Mieke Bal, *Double Exposures: The Subject of Cultural Analysis* (New York: Routledge, 1996), 17.
[64] "Stasimuseum," Stasimuseum/ASTAK e.V., accessed April 14, 2022, https://www.stasimuseum.de/en/enindex.htm; "Gedenkstätte Berlin-Hohenschönhausen," Gedenkstätte Berlin-Hohenschönhausen, accessed April 14, 2022, https://www.stiftung-hsh.de/en.
[65] "Gedenkstätten zur Erinnerung an Opposition, Widerstand und Verfolgung in der SBZ/DDR," Bundesstiftung Aufarbeitung, accessed April 14, 2022, https://www.bundesstiftung-aufarbeitung.de/de/erinnern/museen-und-gedenkstaetten/linkliste.
[66] Chloe Paver, "Colour and Time in Museums of East German Everyday Life," in *Remembering and Rethinking the GDR*, eds. Anna Saunders and Debbie Pinfold (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013), 132.
[67] Ibid, 136-137.

On the other hand, museums of everyday objects and positive narratives are often assigned as complicit in ostalgia. Arnold-De Simine also notes this dichotomy of either "trauma sites" or the sentimentalization of GDR history.[68] Even the first official government project advocating for reappraisal of the GDR, while at the same time making clear that the history and actions of the Stasi was as valid to represent the GDR, by the Sabrow Commission, named after historian Martin Sabrow who acted as chair, was accused of belittling the former East German state.[69]

While academic work on the debate of how to represent the GDR is vast and ever-so present, public knowledge and understanding of this specific battleground of memory is rarely known outside of Germany. Perhaps most fame on the topic was created through the movies *Goodbye Lenin* and *The Lives of Others*, which both had great success abroad, with the latter even receiving the Oscar for Best Foreign Film in 2007.

Only one year before, the privately funded DDR-Museum in Berlin was founded with the intent to focus on the everyday through objects and stories of people to oppose the dominant narrative by museums focusing on Stasi and GDR-dictatorship.[70] The variety of the museum is impressive while also involving visitors through interaction to take part in experiences of the time e.g. touching and sitting in a Trabant car, visiting a children's and living room with authentic furniture and personal objects or the ability to, by themselves, check drawers for more. As such, the DDR-Museum has been an influential actor in the re-emergence of a memory boom regarding the GDR.[71]

As is apparent, GDR history continues to be contested. GDR museums take on a unique position in which they mediate the history and memory of the other Germany while memories of West Germany are neither contested nor labeled - West German history museums deal with German history.

---

[68] Silke Arnold-de Simine, Mediating Memory in the Museum: Empathy, Trauma, Nostalgia (Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire; New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013), 160.
[69] Ibid, 162.
[70] Stephen M. Norris, "Stasiland or Spreewald Pickles? The Battle over the GDR in Berlin's DDR Museum," in *Museums of Communism*, ed. Stephen M. Norris (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2020), 252.
[71] Ibid, 260.

4. Methodology

To problematize these differences of narrative and discourses in the exhibition of *Berlin Global* and how said exhibition attempts to integrate East German history into an international narrative, a combination of methods is necessary. Analysis of museums and objects is at once concrete and vague. While the material component allows for a straightforward investigation of e.g. provenance of objects, architectural or economic analysis, analyzing the meanings embedded in the space and its displayed objects becomes at times as difficult to grasp as language in itself.

As previously established, this thesis is grounded in the understanding of the museum as an assortment of texts with potential; within and between these texts, discourses fluctuate, bend and communicate the ideologies and socio-cultural position of the actors responsible for the display. The term discourse here follows the common definition of a particular way of talking about and understanding the world or an aspect of the world.[72] Therefore, discourse analysis presented itself as the obvious choice as a method for analysis to unearth the meanings ascribed to objects and installations present at Berlin Global. While functioning as the main tool for analysis, the limitations of discourse analysis need to be acknowledged when it comes to a text. To experience an exhibition, the visitor is always presented with a narrative. The exhibition and its objects are in themselves highly visual experience - a narrative space in which the visitor is guided through the exhibitions and invited to perceive history as story with continuity, a start and an end, through interior design .

As these limitations need to be accounted for, this thesis supplies its discourse analysis approach with narrative analysis. As both discourse analysis and narrative analysis share a common background in semiotics with an influence of writers such as Barthes, Derrida and Saussure, a merging of both of these methods can be considered appropriate as well as necessary for the analysis of this paper to encompass all aspects and variety of the exhibition Berlin Global as well as to investigate how Berlin Global produces GDR memory.

[72] Marianne Jørgensen and Louise Phillips, *Discourse Analysis as Theory and Method* (London: Sage Publications, 2002), 1.

4.1. Discourse Analysis

As people learn and are shaped through interaction with their environment, they are intertwined with the discursive world with which their environment organizes itself.[73] As such, the organization of an environment, be it a political group, a family or a nation, necessitates common codes of knowledge through language which, in turn, bestows power onto the language used as well as on the discourses resulting from knowledge.

Although the arbitrariness of signs and, as a result, language had already been researched earlier, a focus on discourse and its dynamics only soared at the writings of Michel Foucault with his Archeology of Knowledge. Foucault describes one of the key features of discourse as a problem of "knowing whether the unity of a discourse is based not so much on the permanence or uniqueness of an object as on the space in which various objects emerge and are continuously transformed".[74]

The way we describe and use terms always has temporal and contextual components. Discourses have to be evaluated according to the time and space they take place, which person or group uses them and from where they emerge, so too must discourse analysis be flexible and require close attention for the socio-cultural environment at large.

To channel the insights of poststructural thinkers into a method, discourse analysis can be defined as the analysis of language, conventionally most often written and verbal, in context, breaking beyond the individual speaker and encompassing their social environment.[75] Although this definition serves as an appropriate starting point for the methodology of this thesis, the variety of discourse theoretical approaches and, in turn, the methods that arise from it need to be noted. Most confusion arguably arises from the comparison of discourse analysis and critical

[73] Florentine Maier and Siegfried Jäger, "Analysing discourses and dispositives: A Foucauldian Approach to theory and methodology," in Methods of *Critical Discourse Studies*, ed. Michael Meyer and Ruth Wodak (Los Angeles: SAGE, 2016), 110.
[74] Michel Foucault, *The Archeology of Knowledge and the Discourse on Language* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1982), 32.
[75] Stephanie Taylor, What is Discourse Analysis (Bloomsbury Publishing, 2013), 2.

discourse analysis with prominent work in the field by Ruth Wodak, Teun van Dijk and Norman Fairclough.[76]

The theories of Foucault, and other poststructural thinkers, make claim to the obscurity of objectivity - "truth" is only as true as the subject's interpretation of it. As such, discourses are involved in creating reality as reality lies in bringing forth discourses.[77] As such, discourse analysis can be argued to even challenge itself for it becomes irrelevant in the quest for scientific answers of objectivity and, as a method, possibly obsolete. Critical discourse analysis often assumes a less radical stance than is commonly assumed, for it does not necessarily strive to unveil the subjectivity of social life and practices but language in the context of said social life and practices while maintaining that there still exists a reality detached from language that suggests existence of a potential objectivity.

One problem specific to this thesis is how to situate the curatorship to analyze it accordingly. The curator is at once an agent of cultural production and mediation, yet also one of political and ideological interest while not even solely responsible for the exhibition, so that a breadth of approaches in CDA, such as the discourse-historical approach, seem valuable when examining the narrative of a curated exhibition.[78] The work of a curator can be described as creative but it is most definitely social in its endeavors, values and practices. Kreps (2003) notes the change in the role of the curator beyond exhibitions and care-taking to a role that is social-and people-oriented.[79] Just as the focus falls off the object as a material disconnected from context and the shift towards a focus on relationships between time, space and people and the object, so do museums have to problematize their purpose for and role within a society.[80] The curator then

---

[76] See Ruth Wodak and Michael Meyer (ed.), *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis* (SAGE Publications, 2011), https://dx.doi.org/10.4135/9780857028020.
[77] Siegfried Jäger and Florentine Maier, "Analysing Discourses and Dispositives: A Foucauldian Approach to Theory and Methodology," in Methods of Critical Discourse Studies, ed. Ruth Wodak and Michael Meyer (Los Angeles: SAGE, 2016), 110-112.
[78] Ruth Wodak, "The Discourse-Historical Approach," in *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*, eds. Michael Meyer and Ruth Wodak (London: SAGE, 2001), 63-94.
[79] Christian Kreps, "Curatorship as Social Practice," *Curator: The Museum Journal* 46, no. 3 (2003): 312, accessed June 3, 2022, https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2151-6952.2003.tb00097.x
[80] Ibid, 313.

becomes important in evaluating and communicating the role of the museum and what the objects it displays.

These discursive objects can speak because of the exposer's intent for communication and education. Therefore, Fairclough's work on discourse as social practice and his framework for discourse analysis provide a helpful tool in examining exhibitions. For Fairclough, all practices are productive and occuring in a domain of social action and interaction, which reproduce structures and have the potential to transform them.[81] Undoubtedly, the museum is such a domain with the practices of the exposer reproducing their discourses or transforming them through the choices made in their exhibitions.

Now, such discourse becomes visible in social practices through genre (the ways of (inter)acting discoursally), discourses (ways of representing the world, ourselves etc.), and style (ways of being and bodily behavior).[82] The first of the three can simply enough be identified as the exhibition itself through which the exposer interacts discoursally with visitors and the world at large. As I do not deal with real-time spoken and body language, the analysis of style is redundant for while exposers may have distinctive voices in their writing and possibly in the form of guided tours and interviews, none of these are visible in the exhibition at hand. *Berlin Global* is not the work of a single curator or even a single institution but a coordinated cooperational project of many. While both genre and style might be used in support of the analysis and discussion, it is the discourses, the representations of the world that are the focus of this research.

It is therefore that the exhibition *Berlin Global* as "text" is problematized and evaluated through CDA - these bodies of language are interpreted beyond the confines of explicit language, as already noted previously, to account for objects and their arrangement to position them as discursive objects.

---

[81] Norman Fairclough, "CDA as Method in Social Scientific Research," in *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*, ed. Michael Meyer and Ruth Wodak (London: SAGE, 2001), 3.
[82] Norman Fairclough, *Analysing Discourse: Textual Analysis for Social Research* (Routledge, 2003), 26.

4.2. Narrative Analysis

To evaluate the way history of the GDR is represented in *Berlin Global*, the thesis evaluates discourses through the narrative that is told to the visitor when they enter the exhibition. The study of narrative structures anchors in literature with its focus on fictional prose and storytelling.[83] Yet, the field has expanded across literary studies as a tool to evaluate narratives of all kinds in social and cultural life through what has come to be known as narrative inquiry.

As narratives, precisely like discourses, appear through language, they are inherently social and communicative. Some scholars focus on narratives as stories related to events. In the West, there often exists an endpoint to which events are leading up to and whose sequential order and cause construct the narrative.[84] In such arguments, narrative always provides progression and it arguably becomes progression itself. Although not necessarily positive progression, this view streamlines story and assigns every event meaning to reach an end that is definitive; a very structuralist approach to narrative inquiry.

Counter to event-centered research, other scholars have begun to include narrative as experience of the self. Experience-centered research, then, focuses on sequence and meaning of humans, how they represent and reconstitute and how these narratives display transformation and change rather than the constant progression to an end.[85] This reflects earlier thoughts on narrative as a natural occurrence and human ordering of the world for as it is not just humans that create such narratives but the narrative reflexively creates the self and humanity as a whole as it positions us in a timeline, so that we cannot exist without narrative at all.[86]

---

[83] Luc Herman and Bart Vervaeck, *Handbook of Narrative Analysis* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2019), 1.
[84] Kenneth J Gergen, *An Invitation to Social Construction* (Los Angeles: SAGE, 2015), 40-41.
[85] Corinne Squire, "Experience-Centred and Culturally-Oriented Approaches to Narrative," in *Doing Narrative Research*, eds. Molly Andrews, Corinne Squire and Maria Tamboukou (London: SAGE Publications, 2008),42-63, https://dx.doi.org/10.4135/9780857024992.
[86] Paul Ricoeur, Time and Narrative , trans. Kathleen McLaughlin and David Pellauer (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1984); Roland Barthes, “An Introduction to the Structural Analysis of Narrative,” *New Literary History* 6, no. 2 (1975), accessed June 10, 2022, https://www.jstor.org/stable/468419.

Although there is certain disagreement on what to focus on during narrative analysis, it is not to say that different approaches are completely incompatible but rather that these shifts in focus can provide a holistic view of narrative analysis. People learn through narrative, be it about themselves, others or historical events. It comes to no surprise then that narratives are especially present in museums where narrative is of essence to convey information to an audience. Museums are not, in the original sense, texts like prose. Yet, in accordance with postclassical narratology and based on Foucauldian arguments, the museum comes to be interpreted as a text that is analyzed for its narratives.[87] It can be read as a medium of narrative and as part of the intermedial turn where the museum is not a neutral channel to convey information, but a space in which narrative is presented, negotiated and exhibited with intent. [88] The museum can uniquely include all forms of media e.g. textual, visual and audio, so that the possibilities for narrative construction are multiple and extensive.

The thesis will approach this multimodality with a combination of narrative analysis as is previously discussed on the topic of the museum as a mediator and narrative analysis of written texts. At large, the museum experience of *Berlin Global* will be evaluated according to the modes of immersive and discursive exhibition designs.[89] Additionally, the three aspects of story that are events, actants and setting will be made visible to extract narratives and the resulting discourses of the exhibition.[90]

4.3. Data Collection

The collection of data was executed over two days on the 21 and 22 January 2022 by the author. The data comprises a series of photos taken at the exhibition, which show the arrangement of objects and installations as well as accompanying written information in *Berlin Global*.

---

[87] Rhiannon Mason, "Cultural Theory and Museum Studies," in *A Companion To Museum Studies*, ed. Sharon Macdonald (Malden, MA; Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2006), 26
[88] Luc Herman and Bart Vervaeck, *Handbook of Narrative Analysis* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2019), 116-117.
[89] Emilie Sitzia, "Narrative Theories and Learning in Contemporary Art Museums: A Theoretical Exploration" *Stedelijk Studies Journal 4* (2016), accessed April 12, 2002, DOI: 10.54533/StedStud.vol004.art04.
[90] Luc Herman and Bart Vervaeck, *Handbook of Narrative Analysis* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2019), 48-64.

5. Analysis

5.1. On Spatiality and the Divided Berlin as A Place of Memory

The concept of *Berlin Global* attempts to inform about history on three levels: the local, the national and the international. Berlin as a city is the focus and core of an exploration of German history and its place in the world with a focus on the social and cultural. It promises a plurality of voices and perspectives as it is an exhibition curated and overseen by teams of the Humboldt Forum and the foundation *Stiftung Stadtmuseum Berlin*, but including several actors from local associations, experts on urban society and independent curators.[91]

Through Berlin as a city of global relevance, the exhibition argues for the interconnection between the local and the world. This reflects arguments of globalization and its interconnection with local communities and the everyday personal life.[92] Furthermore, the issues and anxieties as a result of these interconnection are addressed, pointing towards an influence of critiques regarding globalization.[93]

As an exhibition space, *Berlin Global* consists of eleven thematic areas namely "Thinking of the World," "Berlin Images," "Revolution," "Free Space," "Boundaries," "Entertainment," "War," "Fashion," "Interconnection," "Open Spaces" and the "Lounge" in this order. While rough timelines exist in each area, the exhibition is not arranged chronologically but according to the themes present in the different areas. That said, the first area serves as an entry point not only spatially but mentally as the high walls and ceilings present a painted chronology from the discovery of the Americas to the modern day for the visitor to understand themselves in a globalized world as represented through the exhibition. As the painting is busy, at times chaotic and a lot of information to perceive, the lounge as the last thematic area offers the visitor the end to their journey at which they are invited to rest with several seating areas available.

---

[91] Partners and team," Berlin Global, accessed April 15, 2022. https://berlin-global-ausstellung.de/en/partners-and-team/.
[92] Anthony Giddens, *Runaway World: How Globalisation is Reshaping Our Lives* (London: Profile Books, 2002).
[93] Zygmunt Baumann, *Globalization: The Human Consequences* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1998).

Berlin Global, as becomes apparent through its title alone, aims to situate Berlin as a city of the world. The second thematic area "Berlin Images" seeks to showcase how every event that occurred there, every object shown in the exhibition, and every narrative told constitutes not only local and national history, but an international one. Upon entering, one is presented with a path of which both sides are lined with installations of historical pictures and the key topics written on them. One such topic, related to the GDR, can be found on the left hand side and it is one of the first the visitor sees and is asked to engage with when entering. The backside of the image, then, displays an informational text regarding this keyword.

A first observation is the translation of "Grenzen" to "Boundaries"; in fact, the German word "Grenzen" can be used for and translated into both "boundaries" and "borders". This double-meaning is lost when providing English visitors with only the term "boundaries". It shifts the focus on the association with national borders and strict political demarcation to a social and cultural phenomenon. For German visitors, at first glance, the instinctive association of the word "Grenze" is with the inner-German border as the image displays an example of the physical border alongside the keyword. The exposer here aims to create an immediate association between the term "Grenze" and the topic of inner-German division for German-speakers playing into common associations and discourses while also positioning the East-West divide as a boundary in the societal sense for English-speakers.

Yet, while displaying the image and explicitly mentioning the divide between East and West Germany, the text also associates boundaries and Grenzen with European colonialism and racist divisions on the African continent as well as the oppression and persecution of Jewish Berliners by the Nazis. In this case, the text assigns different historical events to the keyword "boundaries/Grenzen," while the German term among Germans is most often associated with the inner-German border and the Berlin wall. One could say the written text offers a variety of events when it comes to borders, of which the GDR is significant but just one.

Another installation in the same room does not offer such discursive variety. The display named "Revolution" represents only the fall of the Berlin wall and the end of the GDR. Although many

revolutionary events have taken place in Berlin, as is being recognized through other installations at *Berlin Global*, this piece focuses solely on the "peaceful revolution" while also highlighting the hardships of many East-German enterprises and workers following re-unification.

The part of the exhibition that is actually called "Revolution" is dedicated to the various revolutions that took place in Berlin. Objects connected to these revolutions are placed in the corners of the room while two large, curved walls rise and encase an open oval with a table in the center. Documentary footage is shown on the inner side of the walls, the topic dependent on the choice of the visitor as they choose via a table in the middle which revolution they would like to learn more about. The information provided about the protests of 1989 does not necessarily offer new aspects compared to the previous installations, rather it provides accessibility for visitors that might have difficulty reading the previous written texts. It also adds an immersive aspect as the visitor is in the center of the video playing around them. It mediates not just the historical but the emotional through moving image and sound, which helps the visitor connect to a historical event in a way that feels comparable to the present and natural experience of interpersonal communication. Yet it also limits the experience of GDR history, as the visitor, in collaboration with others to move the spinning table.

The theme appears again in the first side room that is situated on the left hand side of the third main room mentioned previously. It connects the term revolution to the building and the exterior of the museum itself, as it highlights protests that have taken place outside the Berlin Palace and the Palace of the Republic. Historical objects are displayed - arguably, an attempt of legitimizing the building's and museum's claim for authenticity.

One could derive how the exposer, at this point but also at others in the exhibition, is consciously addressing the controversy that is ongoing about the eradication of architecture and memory regarding the Palace of the Republic. A space, as part of a discoursal genre, holds information and attitudes in itself. Not only is the Palace of the Republic mentioned across the exhibition, but especially the area dedicated to Entertainment points out the vastness of culture that was taking

place in the space that was demolished in favor of the reconstruction of the Berlin Palace.[94] However, the fact that these memories in the form of narratives and objects of the GDR are contained within the reconstruction, with the Berlin Palace as the central architectural piece of presence on the island of the Spree, it can still be problematized in similar vein to the narratives of Prussian memory that experiences its revival in conservative and right-wing circles. A comparison can be drawn between the architectural debate and the dominant narratives of West Germany that swallowed and aimed to process GDR history within its own framework, so as to make it fit, conform and only occupy a minor deviation from an otherwise congruent German history and the values and identity that can be assigned to it.

While the space inside, the actual area inhabiting the exhibition *Berlin Global*, is mostly streamlined, the exhibition design is not. As mentioned, not only is the information arranged according to overarching topics rather than a timeline, but little rooms also force the visitor to diverge from the main path. At once, this creates a certain intimacy with the objects created in such side-rooms away from the busyness of the main path, but, of course, it is voluntary if the visitor even visits these spaces. Although the rooms usually show objects of both West and East Germany, the arrangement being placed so that the visitor can take a view outside the window, beyond the exhibition and onto either the inner courtyard of the Humboldt Forum or across the Spree island is at once a factor for reminding oneself of the exhibition taking place and being confined in the reconstruction of the Berlin Palace, but also in the heart of Berlin itself. It is a balance act of national, Prussian and GDR consciousness with the latter defined against or within it.

The area that uses and discusses space quite uniquely is “Boundaries”, which focuses on where people face exclusion instead of inclusion, be it dependent on matters of legality or accessibility. The visitor is invited to step into Berlin as the city map is displayed on the ground of the room with different objects relevant to the topic of borders encased in glass standing in the middle (see fig. 1). Several monitors, imitating laser line levels used in construction work, show the map with an interactive element and assign the city topics relating to the key theme: racism, noise,

[94] Objects and narratives of the Palace of the Republic are also present throughout the Humboldt Forum in the exhibitions “Spuren”, the Palace basement and the Video Panorama.

illegelisation, living, Humboldt Forum and East and West. The same map of Berlin, then, is also found on a gray wall alongside the room offering more concise historical information in text addressing the topic of Berlin's borders in relation to past events. As such, this thematic area offers great variety and potential for the space and its objects as a discursive object, which will be further discussed in chapter 5.4. about dual narratives.

Figure 1. Mental and societal boundaries are made visible through maps. In the middle, a piece of the Berlin Wall is on display next to other historical objects of divide.

The exhibition space houses a number of objects and installations related to several aspects of GDR social and cultural life, which are especially validating the legitimacy of the space e.g. in the area of "Entertainment", "Borders", "Revolution" with posters, installations, videos, objects and interactive experiences all relating to the cultural life of the GDR or the Palace of the Republic. Iconic objects such as old ceiling lamps of the Palace of the Republic are incorporated as part of the exhibition design rather than displayed behind a glass case and on eye-level. This

brings about an immersion and interaction with the object and entire space as the gaze of the visitor is invited to look around and experience the objects similar to how witnesses at the time might have experienced them and consequently, potentially mediating memory that is not the visitor's own.

5.2. Plurality of Memory

When it comes to mediating the memory of past witnesses, the area of "Revolution" offers a plurality of voices regarding the political culture of the GDR. The room displays photos taken at a demonstration in 1989, a sash worn at such a demonstration, again dated to 1989 and a poster which was sold at the 1989 "concert against violence" at the Church of the Redeemer in East Berlin. The headline of the informational text reads "wish for democracy".

All of these objects as well as the text signify a desire for the end of the GDR. It adds to showing the number and size of protests taking place at the time while also aiming to emphasize a peaceful change without violence and often in connection with the local culture and arts. A "wish for democracy" implies the agency of the people to want for this change to happen, yet "to wish" is also to want silently, to want patiently without the need for fast action and radical change. By emphasizing the theme of a peacefully protesting people, it separates the people from the state of the GDR. The GDR, then, stands in contrast to the people as a less peaceful and even violent state. This opens up questions of what is violence, what is a violent or nonviolent protest and state, but also the question of the people as a unity against the GDR. While the protests leading up to the fall of the Berlin wall happened across the country with people of various social backgrounds, the amount of oppositional actors that were actively acting out these protests remained low when compared to the overall population of the GDR.

The variety of oppositional actors, however, is also given attention in the exhibition. As previously mentioned, corners of the third room hold objects connected to different protest movements. The corner concerning the GDR displays an arrangement of posters, banners as well as video footage of contemporary witnesses of the *Wende*. This corner exemplifies the ambivalence towards the reunification among protesters. One poster reads "democracy - now or never", a second states how "we have a worldview without world-view[ing]", a third calls for

“1990- disposses bigwigs instead of unifying ´Germany´”, and yet another shows the caricature of a scale weighing the head of Helmut Kohl against a cabbage (“Kohl” in German).

All paint a picture of dissatisfaction with the GDR or the process of reunification. The first two posters problematize the lack of transparency and democracy under the SED-regime, with the term “world-view” commenting on the lack of physical and mental freedom to travel as citizens of the GDR were restricted to travel abroad and other worldviews, mainly those considered western and capitalist, were oppressed, denied or persecuted. They can be seen as the most common aspects mentioned when memory of the GDR is mediated in museums.

Compared to those dominant narratives, the latter two posters can be considered evidence of the disruption that occurred as the reunification was in process and completed. Although this disruption is well-known and continues to influence present German socio-cultural and economic differences, it is often less thematized in the retelling of history about reunification, so as to avoid sentimentalizing the GDR as mentioned in the previous chapter on Memory of the GDR.

A dissatisfaction with reunification is evident in the third poster; it sees the primary problem with the rich and influential elites and leadership rather than the division of the two German states, even insofar as the latter process would not be essentially necessary in the first place. Additionally, “Germany” as a whole is questioned. This, of course, can represent many ideas about two incompatible countries - socially, economically or ideologically, but it definitely shows that for the artist of this poster there does not yet exist a common national identity that could find itself in a common national state.

Critique of the Federal Republic of Germany (FRG), then, is more explicit in the last poster which leaves room for interpretation due to its caricatural character. As Kohl’s head is weighed against that of a cabbage, the cabbage is shown as heavier, further to mean more significant, trustworthy, or “weighted higher” (German: “höher gewichtet” meaning “more important/relevant”). In this part of the exhibit, the individual actor is made visible in the whole - a very literal pursuit of plurality of voices. Discourses of the time are facing each other, co-exist

next to each other on the wall, as they might have within society in the past, and negotiate their validity.

When compared to narratives of GDR museums and memorials previously discussed in this paper, *Berlin Global* employs already existing narratives, yet also incorporates new methods and narratives of memory. One example is the incorporation of objects of protest culture and interviews with guest workers who settled in the GDR before the wall fell in the room discussing Revolution. At the same time, this represents the repressive nature of the SED-dictatorship, as it does the social movement that opposes it while emphasizing the diversity within the protest movement through different wants and needs proclaimed on the posters. The peaceful protest saw a variety of people coming together. This variety is given attention in the overarching narrative of one unified thought behind the protest, which leads to a diversification of memory that pervades the German consensus on GDR history.

The attempt to diversify the view on GDR narratives is at once supported and undermined by the position of the Humboldt Forum as a formally non-GDR museum. It is perhaps why its efforts towards mediation of GDR are easily discredited or overlooked by critics as it does not enjoy the claims to authority on the topic as much as other GDR-museums. The Stasi-museum and even other smaller museums located in East-Germany benefit more greatly from their locality and their decision to place their exhibit in spaces that are historical and directly connected to the interior. In comparison, Berlin Global, while accurate locally, does not have the opportunity to exist and be prescribed authenticity in what is for one a modern reconstruction and second, the reconstruction of a building that has been at odds with the GDR, the values of the SED at the time and consequently, the origin of dispute and claim for power ever since.

At the same time, the debate that arises from it and the fact of integrating GDR-memory into such a disputed place with its multiplicity of discourses can also aid in the integration of multidimensional GDR memory into German national and international memory. The validity it is ascribed can support a process towards a unified German national identity in which all sides experience a new wave of recognition and GDR memory as a valuable part of European history and identity. As a satellite state with a solid connection to the West as part of not just a bordering

a Western state, but through the national, ethnic and socio-cultural identity of a divided people, the GDR occupies a space that is not Eastern European, yet, as public, academic and political debates reflect, not entirely Western either, where some of its identity had to be evaluated, negotiated and at times, erased to fit into a unified Germany.

5.3. Dual Narratives of East and West Germany in Past and Present

Negotiating validity is also of interest in the thematic area titled “Free Spaces”. It describes the emergence of free spaces following the fall of the wall that later got occupied by investors, commerce, artists and entertainment such as the Mauerpark and Potsdamer Platz. While mentioning the struggle and fight for free spaces in the city, for example in the case of affordable housing, the fall of the wall itself is positioned as an event that gave the opportunity for these free spaces to appear and be used in the first place. In essence, this part of the exhibition brings to the forefront the variety of and struggles within society of Berlin with examples of the past as well as the present and how these inform each other. This concerns parts of society such as religion, gender and sexuality, or ethnic minorities. These concepts are presented mostly through modern installations which include illustrations coupled with video material and objects relating to the video material.

One specific example of society in Berlin throughout time is the installation regarding religion, which shows a dialogue between three local representatives of Christianity, Islam and Judaism on video while objects of all religions are physically present for the visitor. The GDR only plays a subordinate role in this part of the exhibitions; yet, it is present nonetheless through an illustrated timeline, facing the video wall, in which the influence of religion on German society is described through historical key dates and events. The divide of East and West Germany is shown through a branched-out tree with information on each state on either side. For the GDR, the relevant historical information regarding religion depicted in the illustration are the separation of state and church, the first state-organized “Jugendweihe” as a replacement for confirmation in 1955, and the fact that the church offered space for oppositional groups and the interpretation of this fact as key to the peaceful revolution. It stands in contrast to the non-separation of state and church in the FRG as depicted on the other side of the timeline.

The narrative of the GDR here is one of separation, state-organized ceremony, and the church as an oppositional actor towards the revolution - more precisely, as a positive small actor leading to the resolution of a unified Germany. Meanwhile, the role of the German church in the FRG as an intercultural actor and communicator is emphasized through highlighting the emerging religious diversity through immigration from 1961 onwards and the arrangement of the first "intercultural week" in 1975 by the Evangelical Church in Germany. Not only is the church as an institution portrayed as a mediator between varying voices and opinions but a worldy, international and multicultural actor, much in contrast to the GDR as a more reclusive actor less focused on reaching out internationally and suppressing the church as a host of oppositional, multiple voices.

This dual display of the two Germanies continues on the illustrated timeline concerning "Gender". Three aspects of the GDR socio-cultural life are displayed: First, the disregard of paragraph 175, under which homosexuals were persecuted during the Nazis, from the 1950s onward. Second, the introduction of birth control in 1965 on the GDR market, and thirdly, the fact that from 1972 onwards, one was allowed to abort until the end of week 12 during pregnancy without medical reason.

Two of these events stand in direct comparison to a FRG equivalent. As this timeline is also color-coded (green for a unified Germany, yellow for the GDR and blue for the FRG) the information on the GDR does not only appear shorter when it comes to the actual information, but on a first glance visually, blue takes up more space on the board. This is, however, not to diminish the achievements of equality in the GDR; although the infographic on birth control makes it seem at first glance that the FRG was more progressive in its endeavors due to earlier introduction of *anovlar* on the market, the creators also included the marketing aspect of both birth controls. Thereby, *anovlar* advertised as an "anti-baby pill" while the GDR equivalent *ovosiston* was advertised as a "baby wish pill", a translation from the German *Wunschkind* and a more positive connotation in relation to birth control promoting agency and control over one's reproductive activities and family planning.

While illustrations about the GDR mainly concern female emancipation, illustrations regarding the FRG additionally focus more inclusively on LGBTQ+ issues as a whole with historical events highlighted such as the first Christopher Street Day celebrations and the introduction of the "transsexual law". As such, the FRG, through absence of information on the GDR, is portrayed once more as progressive when compared to the GDR where no such laws were introduced or no such Christopher Street Day marches were organized. The choice to omit the fact of the GDR as a state that, while legally accepting homosexuality, suppressed the public life of homosexuals can here, on one hand, benefit the GDR narrative in the exhibition, but also creates and incomplete picture that can leave the visitor wondering about the missing piece of the life and memory of LGBTQ+ individuals in East Germany.[95] Neither is there an attempt made to converge the narrative of LGBTQ+ people of both Germanies during and after the fall of the wall. With contact to the West came opportunities to expand networks, while there was also a fear of certain West-German laws being implemented following the unification such as e.g. stricter abortion laws and raise of the age of consent for homosexuals.[96]

Returning once again to "Boundaries", which I previously mentioned for its discursive potential of the use of space and objects, an interesting use of narratives is present in this section. With borders being addressed, of course the obvious choice to discuss the GDR comes in the form of the Berlin wall, but this part of the exhibition also offers discourses on the mental existence of borders and boundaries. On the microscopic level, the topic of East-West on the monitors lead to video and audio information on the existence of the wall through Berlin but also to the question of what meaning the past border has for young people in Berlin today. This part of the exhibition provides a view of the personal and tiniest part of society while connecting the past to the present generation of Berliners and Germans born in the former Eastern part. It is the part of the display which feels most subjective, creative and explorative as interviewees are telling their stories in connection to narratives and biases of East and West German relations.

[95] See Ursula Sillge, *Un-Sichtbare Frauen: Lesben und ihre Emanzipation in der DDR* for information on the life of Lesbian women in the GDR.
[96] See Kurt Klotzle and John Goetz, "East Meets Wild, Wild West," *OutWeek* no.56 (July 25, 1990): 38-43, accessed June 20, 2022, https://archive.org/details/outweek/OutWeek%2056/page/n33/mode/1up. 40-41 https://archive.org/details/outweek/OutWeek%2056/page/n33/mode/1up

“Boundaries” can be seen as a model reflection of the name of the exhibition, its goals and ideas. Through three levels, the visitor is invited to explore the topic of the GDR and its border in relevance to the local, national and international and how these intertwine. GDR history, here, is truly embedded not only spatially but timely, with its connection to Berlin and the world but also different generations. Interviewees had been chosen precisely for their upbringing in either the Eastern or Western parts of Berlin and offer reflections on divisions that may still exist economically, ideologically, or socially as a consequence of division.

Then, on the mesoscopic level, the “Brick in the Wall”. a piece of the Berlin Wall encased in a glass display, provides a view of the wall of local and communal, thereby creating a feeling of authentic examination of history through a historical object. The description reads how the piece dates back to 1961 during the first phase of construction, the material used in building the wall, how the border was protected as well as the number of people killed trying to cross with an additional emphasis on other victims such as civilians without intention to escape or soldiers.

It is contrasted, on the macroscopic level, with the information on the wall outside of the map. As the visitor physically moves outward towards the text on the wall corresponding to the topic of the Berlin wall, the big picture of Germany as a whole and the global East-West conflict of the Cold War become the focus.

While separating GDR history from FRG history through GDR-specific installations, displays of objects and informational text, the process of othering is limited. Narratives of the GDR are embedded in *Berlin Global* and present in all parts dealing with a variety of socio-cultural arenas.

Still today, memory research of the GDR is often treated as an arena of truth-seeking in which opinions, historical artifacts, documents and accounts are evaluated in their legitimacy to situate, and fit them, into a common national German identity. The most common attempt in the past 30 years was to make the GDR fit - an unimaginable German parallel world that with its own values

and society had existed for 40 years but, on the opposite end of a spectrum, incompatible with the reality of the FRG. Memory, in that sense, reveals itself as a seeker for truth in the present as memory is a symptom of the present and anxieties about the future.

5.4. The GDR in Cultural Memory

The part of the exhibition that can be described as especially rich in objects is "Entertainment". Coming in from "Boundaries" and its highlight on exclusion and differences, the room housing "Entertainment" reveals itself as colorful and combining cultural aspects of the FRG and GDR in a sea of entertainment. Therefore, naturally, traces of GDR history are found in abundance and placed to create a coherent room inspired by the Palace of the Republic.

When it comes to objects themselves, the two centerpieces hang in front of and above the head of the visitor: Lothar Zitzmann's *Weltjugendlied,* first exhibited as a decorative piece in the foyer of the Palace of the Republic, and ceiling lamps which used to lend illumination to the Palace of the Republic from 1976 to its closure in 1990 (see fig. 2). In addition, paintings, other art, and posters are present in the room, which creates an impression of the culture that was made and present in the Palace of the Republic. As previously discussed in this paper, the vanishing of the GDR Palace, and with it its history and memory, continues to be a topic of discussion. Here, the Palace is present through objects, information on the cultural events. The inclusion of such objects eases the effort of historical authenticity and the aim for legitimacy insofar as a room is created in which the visitor is submerged from all sides, as well as from above, in history.

Figure 2. Ceiling lamps above the painting *Weltjugendlied*. The visitor can enter red booths to listen to old music of acts native to the GDR and FRG.

It also aims for legitimization of the museum in itself as it was lacking spatial historical representation when it came to the Palace of the Republic, for it was the Berlin Palace which served as the main influence of architectural reconstruction. In that way, the objects exhibited in Entertainment also inform not only the legitimacy of the place but also each other. The posters on the wall connect to the music played in red booths shaped like globes, advertising local and international artists. In general, the dominant color patterns of the space are red, orange and yellow tones. Compared to the usual muted colors of objects in GDR museums and the perceived "grayness" of these exhibitions, *Berlin Global* attempts to bring back color to the cultural memory of the GDR. The tones are reflective of e.g. the painting while at the same time, falling under symbolism of communism and socialism to reflect the political reality and context the arts were created and performed in.

When it comes to the local cultural reality, the exhibition specifically highlights the underground hip/hop scene with interview footage and objects acquired or created by groups such as Boogie Wave, Electric Beat Crew and Downtown Lyrics, with most objects from private collections. These objects give unique insight into the life of artists under the GDR regime; artist DJ Jimmy X tells of the necessity of a clean criminal record to play festivals, and Master K. & M.A.C. emphasize how their group Electric Beat Crew managed to publish the first, and only, english-speaking hip-hop music under the state-controlled label AMIGA.

The objects of GDR hip hop culture and the music scene present the variety of culture found in the country that had certainly not existed in a vacuum but adopting international and western trends, too while struggling to conform under the strict laws of publication and censorship. It is perhaps one of the most clear instances of blurring the line between two dominant narratives of the GDR, one of sentimentalization or one of dictatorship, in the exhibition where culture is reflected upon as enjoyable, yet also not without the influence of the state. Areas of the everyday were not without influence of the authorities, but expression and joy was still found within these areas despite it.

In connection with artwork connected to the second room of the Palace of the Republic, which was state-controlled art entirely under the motto of *Dürfen Kommunisten Träumen* ("Are Communists allowed to dream?"), the room connects two aspects of GDR cultural society: state-control on every end and the underground music scene which existed outside the state as long as they did not perform officially in public. For the latter, their art had to be approved in post rather than approved to be created beforehand, which shows how both on one hand, the stereotype that all art within an authoritarian regime is necessarily state-created from the beginning is flawed, but on the other hand, if a product is to be presented officially to the people and does not fulfill the requirements of the state, it was blocked.

All of these objects are supported with video footage providing information about the construction of the Palace of the Republic, its use in the GDR and after the fall of the Berlin wall, as well as its demolition. This creates more context surrounding the controversy of the

cultural memory of the GDR that is argued to be suppressed and lost further with the reconstruction of the Berlin Palace.

Within the exhibition, one could argue that it is here that most *ostalgia* can be found. If we apply the definition of ostalgia most commonly understood to be a sentimentalisation of the everyday of the GDR, the "Entertainment" area of the exhibition could fall victim to such an interpretation with its focus on subculture, art and music which plays its part in the life of every person in past and present as an opportunity for escapism. Yet, of course, the exhibition makes mention of state-controlled music labels and requirements for musicians at the time to conform, to a certain extent, to even receive permission to perform. Consequently, the struggles of the cultural are not belittled and, while highlighting their value, aim for an informed view of the reality of artists and the production of art at the time.

Performance is also a topic of "Fashion" as this part of the exhibition focuses on clothes worn by different personalities of Berliners as well as the process of making clothes throughout history with a critique on the current state of labor laws. This is done by displaying the outfits of the present day in display cases attached to a construction that can be entered through two entrances on opposite sides in which the history of textile manufacturing is explained up until the current state of fast fashion production. Here, the local of Berlin fashion is combined with the international by tracing the back the origin of some of the garments displayed.

The topic of GDR history is explicit once again at this point in the exhibition as a separate room portrays images and objects of fashion in the Palace of the Republic as well as images and objects of fashion connected to uniforms worn by the emperor and military during the late nineteenth century and early twentieth century in connection with the history of the Berlin Palace. Although it is spatially sidelined once more as the visitor may find it in a separated room, a clear view into the room from the outside is possible through open and separate glass doors. The. In accordance with the juxtaposition, the text information regarding the objects is divided into "Uniforms for a modern palace" and "Uniforms for the emperor." Both emphasize the relevance of fashion as a tool for homogenisation to organize people of service, be it customer or military service. It stands in contrast to the main part of the fashion exhibition, which emphasizes

diversity and individual expression through fashion. Both texts are also roughly divided into three paragraphs of which the first sets the premise of the building and time that the fashion was connected to, the second focuses on the social aspect and status that came with the respective uniforms being worn and the last a short notice on how the clothes were produced.

Each time period takes their spot of display on opposite corners of the room, with the time of the Palace of the Republic on the right hand-side and involves a large, ceiling-reaching image of the bar in the foyer, and images of several uniforms for staff. It creates as much an immersive experience through the image of the bar as is possible with the limited space. The variety of uniforms gives an overview of the craft that was available in the GDR all the while situating the Palace of the Republic as a place of service and entertainment more so than a place of politics. The display also includes sample buttons which carry the logo of the Palace of the Republic. The gold buttons were once included in the uniforms worn by the staff. The informational text below situates them as a brand sign, highlighting a more commercial aspect of the Palace of the Republic, which evokes connections to design, brand management and the control of image.

In concordance with the outfits and installation in the main room, the GDR part of the fashion exhibition discusses the role that clothes play for people as they can be an impression of individualism but also a group, brand or nation. It connects fashion choices spatially to the local through presentation of fashion choices in Berlin while temporally exhibiting past and present outfits. The connection of fashion and other levels of society like class, nationality or occupation is present not only in the way that the exhibit explains who designed the staff uniforms and where but also who produces modern-day fashion.

As the last part of the exhibition, this room especially can connect the visitor with the familiar. Even unconsciously, fashion is part of an individual's life more so than other aspects of life as the choice of how one dresses can reflect, among other things, class, ideology, occupation and national identity. Although thematically it makes sense to focus on the Palace of the Republic, one cannot deny the fact that the uniforms of staff of the Palace of the Republic only represent a fraction of GDR fashion and further identity and memory. It can in no way be deemed representative of everyday fashion choices in East-Germany at the time as it only focuses on

certain specific job positions; however, it does show the local craftsmanship present at the time with mention of materials, processes and the name of the designer responsible for the staff uniforms.

Fashion, therefore, informs one of the most individualistic and materialistic aspects of identity formation and so adds this part of the exhibition to the awareness that such human interests for adherence or rejection to a group through outer visibility surpass time and space on the local, national and international as well as in the past and present.

6. Conclusion

The aim of this paper was to present and problematize the narrative constructions of memory regarding the GDR at the exhibition *Berlin Global*. The focus lay on the intention and design of the actors, the exposer, behind the exhibition and how their work informs and re-informs memory of the GDR.

As shown in the general and theoretical background, this topic is of importance due to the contested nature of GDR memory in the German public, museal, academic and political discourse. Consequently, it was of interest to enquire about the nature of *Berlin Global*, the aim of transferring historical knowledge and informing discourses of the GDR. This was done through answering specifically the questions of which narratives are constructed in the exhibition, which discourses reveal themselves, how do they situate the GDR as part of local, national and international history, and what is the role of objects and their arrangement in the narratives constructed.

The analysis rests on a theoretical background in museum and memory studies. When it comes to the latter, memory of the GDR as presented in German museums was especially of importance to compare *Berlin Global* to previous and other current exhibitions on the GDR. Furthermore, to achieve the extraction of information found in the exhibition, the analysis was methodologically informed through discourse and narrative analysis. Both methods in combination made the reveal of narratives and discourses found in *Berlin Global* possible.

The findings show that although certain common terms and narratives of the GDR, such as associations with (peaceful) revolution, borders and the GDR as a surveillance state, are used, *Berlin Global* adds valuable memories of the everyday and other socio-cultural aspects of life. A variety of information is present, which strives for a more holistic view of the GDR rather than specializing in a certain aspect of it as is done by e.g. the Stasi-museum or museums focusing on the everyday or *ostalgia*.

To argue for the presence of *ostalgia* in *Berlin Global* is as much an endless endeavor as is the debate on *ostalgia* itself. The author comes to the conclusion that *ostalgia* in *Berlin Global* is limited. Neither is *ostalgia* advertised at any point in the exhibition, nor does *Berlin Global* present the classic everyday objects associated with ostalgia. Rather, it displays objects of society that point towards the cultural and organizational life e.g. contracts of musicians, pins and uniforms of servants of the Palace of the Republic, and signs and posters used during protests. The exposer does not themself encourage nostalgia. Rather then, the potential nostalgic aspects of the objects would emerge through the own memory and agency of the visitor.

Another main finding of the research is the unique way that the exhibition embeds GDR history in national and international narratives. As a concept, *Berlin Global* aims to situate the city of Berlin in a globalized world, be it past or present. Consequently, GDR history is presented in the context of a globalized world, in the way the rest of the world affected the GDR and vice versa. Yet, design-wise, the exhibition still differentiates, of course, between the GDR and FRG as they were two different countries, but it refrains mostly from othering practices found in the political and public discourses.

There are still imbalances to be found in the information available on both Germanies e.g. on issues of gender and sexuality as well as the church that only make up a small part of the exhibition but are nonetheless of importance when it comes to the aim of portraying the GDR. Still, oftentimes, narratives and objects of the Palace of the Republic are juxtaposed with ones of the Berlin Palace, undoubtedly addressing the controversy of demolition and reconstruction of the facades of the Berlin Palace to house the Humboldt Forum and consequently *Berlin Global*. As time passes, so increases the chronological distance from the time of a separated Germany.

Economical and political efforts of re-unification have largely succeeded, yet socio-culturally, a division is still sensible as there are still several generations present who have been socialized with the inner German border in mind. Museums of GDR history are not losing their popularity, yet can vastly differ in their representations of memory. It is the museum that can instill objects and stories of the past with meaning and act as a mediator of memory that can be remembered and archived in the future.

When it comes to limitations, one main factor was the unavailability of a spokesperson regarding the exhibition as the Humboldt Forum was contacted before the research of the thesis to enquire about possible interviews with one or more members of the curatorial team. The email was left unanswered, which resulted in a general analysis of the exhibition itself. It is then important to note that just as every person is made up of internalized discourses, so too is the author informed by their discourses and biases. This also needs to be noted in conjunction with translations made by the authorStill, the author aimed for the most possible neutrality on the topic and refrained from speaking to any other visitors or staff at the exhibition to avoid internalizing opinions other than their own in the process.

The analysis was limited on *Berlin Global* as the design of GDR objects, knowledge and representation was spread out in the entire Humboldt Forum, which, while informative and possibly aiding in a more holistic analysis, was exceeding the available time and scope of the research paper. Therefore, any objects, plagues and other mentions and incorporations of GDR history outside of *Berlin Global* has to be disregarded in favor of a more concise writing as well as the fact that photography was not allowed in the entire house and would have hindered the research process.

Another aspect that was only discussed in passing was that of interactivity. Interactivity in *Berlin Global* is entirely its own topic worthy of further research. Upon request, interactivity is present at all times in the exhibition and can, to an extent, even influence the experience, what is seen, what is witnessed and what is taken in; however, this too would have exceeded the scope of the paper, but lends itself to interesting future research of interactivity and the multimodal potential of the museum.

Future research can also be undertaken in the guided tours offered by the Humboldt Forum and which major topics and discourses are presented there in conjunction with the exhibition. As the Humboldt Forum is a rather young museum and project, this thesis aims to contribute to early research on the activities and museum work found there. Future research can then also observe possible changes in approaches and methods used in *Berlin Global* and the Humboldt Forum.

Although basing its design off of previous narratives and discourses, *Berlin Global* offers new frames and varieties of examining and representing the GDR in the context of local, national and international histories. It can be another building block in a shared understanding of East-West German relations, cultures and attitudes, which can alleviate insecurities in debated national, and consequently international, identity. It can help deconstruct dominant narratives of the "other" illegitimate Germany through assigning GDR history meaning in the larger context of globalized history and the globalized world.

As time passes, so increases the chronological distance from the time of a separated Germany. Economical and political efforts of re-unification have largely succeeded, yet socio-culturally, a division is still sensible as there are still several generations present who have been socialized with the inner German border in mind. Museums of GDR history are not losing their popularity, yet can vastly differ in their representations of memory. It is the museum that can instill objects and stories of the past with meaning and act as a mediator of memory that can be remembered and archived in the future.

Bibliography

Ahbe, Thomas. *Ostalgie: Zum Umgang mit der DDR-Vergangenheit in den 1990er Jahren.* 2011. Accessed April 14, 2022. https://nbn-resolving.org/urn:nbn:de:gbv:27-20110526-135537-2.

Alberti, Samuel J. M. M. "The Status of Museums: Authority, Identity and Material Culture." In *Geographies of Nineteenth Century Science.* Edited by David N. Livingstone and Charles W.J. Withers. Chicago; London: The University of Chicago Press, 2011. 51-72.

Allen, Amy. "The Impurity of Practical Reason: POWER AND AUTONOMY IN FOUCAULT." In *The Politics of Our Selves: Power, Autonomy, and Gender in Contemporary Critical Theory.* Columbia University Press, 2008. 45-71. http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.7312/alle13622.6. Accessed 16 Aug. 2022.

Arendt, Hannah. *Between Past, Present and Future: Six Exercises in Political Thought*. New York: The Viking Press, 1961.

Arnold-de Simine, Silke. *Mediating Memory in the Museum: Empathy, Trauma Nostalgia*. Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire; New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013.

Assmann, Jan. "Communicative and Cultural Memory." In *Cultural Memories: The Geographical Point of View (Knowledge and Space 4.* Edited by Peter Meusburger, Michael Effernan and Edgar Wunder. Dordrecht, Heidelberg, London, New York: Springer. 15-27. Accessed June 28, 2022. https://archiv.ub.uni-heidelberg.de/propylaeumdok/4111/1/Assmann_Communicative_and_Cultural_Memory_2011.pdf.

Bal, Mieke. *Double Exposures: The Subject of Cultural Analysis.* New York: Routledge, 1996.

Barthes, Roland. "An Introduction to the Structural Analysis of Narrative." In *New Literary History* 6, no. 2 (1975). 237-272. https://doi.org/10.2307/468419.

Bauman, Zygmunt. *Globalization: The Human Consequences*. Oxford: Polity Press, 1998.

Berdahl, Daphne. *On the Social Life of Postsocialism: Memory, Consumption, Germany*. Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Press, 2010.

Berger, Stefan. "Former GDR Historians in the Reunified Germany: An Alternative Historical Culture and Its Attempts to Come to Terms with the GDR Past." *Journal of Contemporary History* 38, no. 1 (2003): 63–83. http://www.jstor.org/stable/3180697.

"Berlin - City of Stories." Berlin Global. Accessed June 20, 2022. https://berlin-global-ausstellung.de/

"Beschlussempfehlung und Bericht des Ausschusses für Kultur und Medien (23. Ausschuss)." Deutscher Bundestag. July 2, 2002. https://dserver.bundestag.de/btd/14/096/1409660.pdf.

Birkholz, Tim. *"Schloss mit der Debatte!"?: Die Zwischennutzung im palast der Republik im Kontext der Schlossplatzdebatte.* Berlin: Forum Stadt- und Regionalplanung E.V., 2008. https://depositonce.tu-berlin.de/bitstream/11303/2303/1/Dokument_10.pdf.

Blight, David W. "The Memory Boom: Why and Why Now?" In *Memory in Mind and Culture*. Edited by Pascal Boyer and James V. Wertsch. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), 238–251. Accessed April 12, 2022. doi:10.1017/CBO9780511626999.014.

Boyer, Pascal. "Mind, Culture, and History: A Special Perspective." In *Memory in Mind and Culture*. Edited by Pascal Boyer and James V. Wertsch. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009. Accessed April 12, 2022. doi:10.1017/CBO9780511626999.001.

Brockmann, Stephen. "Remembering GDR Culture in Postunification Germany and Beyond." In *Twenty Years on: Competing Memories of the GDR in Postunification German Culture*. Edited by Renate Riechten and Dennis Tate. Boydell & Brewer, 2011. 39-54. Accessed 30 May, 2022. http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.7722/j.ctt1x72d3.

Calderon, Mary Jane. "Museums and Communication." *Philippine Quarterly of Culture and Society* 18, no. 2 (1990): 137-140. Accessed May 20, 2022. http://www.jstor.org/stable/29792009.

Clarke David, and Ute Wölfel. "Remembering the German Democratic Republic in a United Germany." In *Remembering the German Democratic Republic*. Edited by David Clarke and Ute Wölfel. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011. 3-22.

Detel, Wolfgang."Foucault on Power and the Will to Knowledge." *European Journal of Philosophy* 4, no. 3 (1996): 296-327. Accessed July 9, 2022. https://doi-org.ludwig.lub.lu.se/10.1111/j.1468-0378.1996.tb00080.x.

Erdmenger, Jochen. "Das Humboldt-Forum als Diskussionsraum." SR 2 Kulturradio. July 20, 2021 (my translation). Accessed May 18 2022. Audio, 05:58. https://www.sr.de/sr/sr2/themen/kultur/20210720_dogerloh_hartmut_ueber_humboldt_forum_eroeffnung_interview_100.html.

Erll, Astrid. *Kollektives Gedächtnis und Erinnerungskulturen*. Stuttgart: J.B. Metzler Verlag, 2017.

Fairclough, Norman. *Analysing Discourse: Textual Analysis for Social Research*. Routledge, 2003.

Fairclough, Norman. “Critical Discourse Analysis as a Method in Social Scientific Research.” In *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*. Edited by Michael Meyer and Ruth Wodak. London: SAGE, 2001. 121-138. https://dx.doi.org/10.4135/9780857028020.n6.

Foucault, Michel. “Different Spaces.” In *Michel Foucault: The Essential Works, vol.2: Aesthetics, Method and Epistemology*. Edited by James Faubion. London: Allen Lane, 1994. 175-85.

Foucault, Michel. *The Archeology of Knowledge and the Discourse on Language*. New York: Pantheon Books, 1982.

Fulbrook, Mary. “Histories and Memories: Verklärung oder Erklärung?” In *Remembering the German Democratic Republic*. Edited by David Clarke and Ute Wölfel Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011. 91-101.

Fyfe, Gordon. “Sociology and the Social Aspects of Museums.” In *A Companion To Museum Studies*. Edited by Sharon Macdonald. Malden, MA; Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2006. 33-49. https://doi-org.ludwig.lub.lu.se/10.1002/9780470996836.ch3.

“Förderverin Palast der Republik e.V.” Accessed June 18, 2022. https://palast.jetzt/.

“Gedenkstätte Berlin-Hohenschönhausen.” Gedenkstätte Berlin-Hohenschönhausen. Accessed April 14, 2022. https://www.stiftung-hsh.de/en.

“Gedenkstätten zur Erinnerung an Opposition, Widerstand und Verfolgung in der SBZ/DDR.” Bundesstiftung Aufarbeitung. Accessed April 14, 2022. https://www.bundesstiftung-aufarbeitung.de/de/erinnern/museen-und-gedenkstaetten/linkliste.

Gergen, Kenneth J. *An Invitation to Social Construction*. Los Angeles: SAGE, 2015.

Giddens, Anthony. *Consequences of Modernity*. Cambridge: Polity in association with Blackwell, 1990.

Glencross, Andrew. 2015. “Doing History’ to Thinking Historically: Historical Consciousness across History and International Relations.” *International Relations* 29, no. 4 (December, 2015): 413-433. https://doi.org/10.1177/0047117815608233.

Hall, Stuart. “Representation, meaning and language.” In *Representation: Cultural Representations and Signifying Practices*. Edited by Stuart Hall. London: Sage Publications, 1997. 15-24.

Hennet, Anna Inés. “Die Berliner Schlossplatzdebatte: Die Geschichte einer Identitätssuche.” In *Palast der Republik: Diskurs und private Erinnerung*. Edited by Alexander Schug. Berlin: Berliner Wissenschaftsverlag, 2007. 54-66.

Inglis, David. “Globalization and/of Memory: On the complexification and contestation of memory cultures and practices.” In *Routledge International Handbook of Memory Studies.* Edited by Anna Lisa Tota and Trever Hagen. London: Routledge, 2015. 143-157 https://doi-org.ludwig.lub.lu.se/10.4324/9780203762844.

Jørgensen, Marianne, and Louise Phillips. *Discourse Analysis as Theory and Method*. London: Sage Publications, 2002.

Klotzle, Kurt and John Goetz. “East Meets Wild, Wild West.” *OutWeek* no.56 (July 25, 1990): 38-43. Accessed June 20, 2022. https://archive.org/details/outweek/OutWeek%2056/page/n33/mode/1up.

Kreps, Christian. “Curatorship as Social Practice.” *Curator: The Museum Journal* 46, no. 3 (2003): 311-323. Accessed June 3, 2022. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2151-6952.2003.tb00097.x.

Ludwig, Andreas. “Representations of the Everyday and the Making of Memory: GDR History and Museums.” In *Remembering the German Democratic Republic*. Edited by David Clarke and Ute Wölfel. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011. 37-53.

Maier, Florentine and Siegfried Jäger. “Analysing discourses and dispositives: A Foucauldian Approach to theory and methodology.” In *Methods of Critical Discourse Studies.* Edited by Michael Meyer and Ruth Wodak. Los Angeles: SAGE, 2016. 109-136.

Mason, Rhiannon. “Cultural Theory and Museum Studies.” In *A Companion To Museum Studies*. Edited by Sharon Macdonald. Malden, MA; Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2006.

Minkenberg, Michael. “The Wall after the Wall: On the Continuing Division of Germany and the Remaking of Political Culture.” *Comparative Politics* 26, no. 1 (1993): 53–68. https://doi.org/10.2307/422173.

Norris, Stephen M.“Stasiland or Spreewald Pickles? The Battle over the GDR in Berlin’s DDR Museum.” In *Museums of Communism*. Edited by Stephen M. Norris, Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2020.

“Partners.” Humboldt Forum. Accessed June 20, 2022. https://www.humboldtforum.org/en/about/.

Paver, Chloe. “Colour and Time in Museums of East German Everyday Life.” In *Remembering and Rethinking the GDR*. Edited by Anna Saunders and Debbie Pinfold. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013. 132-148.

Pearce, Susan M. *Museums, objects and collections: a cultural study*. Washington D.C.: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1993.

Prince, Gerald."Narrativehood, Narrativeness, Narrativity, Narratability." In *Theorizing Narrativity*. Edited by John Pier and José Ángel García Landa. Berlin, Boston: De Gruyter, 2011. 19-28. https://doi-org.ludwig.lub.lu.se/10.1515/9783110969801.19.

"Programme 30/04." Humboldt Forum. Accessed May 15, 2022. https://www.humboldtforum.org/en/programme-2/?start=20220430&end=20220430.

Reinbold, Fabian and Miriam Novak. "Leidenschaftliche Kämpfer: Die Abrissdebatte und ihre Akteure." In *Palast der Republik: Politischer Diskurs und Private Erinnerung*. Edited by Alexander Schug. Berlin: Berliner Wissenschafts-Verlag, 2007. 67-82.

Rogoff, Irit and Daniel J. Sherman. *Museum Culture: History, Discourses, Spectacle*. London: Routledge, 1994. 17-32.

Ricoeur, Paul. *Time and Narrative.* Translated by Kathleen McLaughlin and David Pellauer. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1984.

Rigney, Ann. "Cultural memory studies: Mediation, narrative, and the aesthetic." In *Routledge International Handbook of Memory Studies*. Edited by Anna Lisa Tota and Trever Hagen. London: Routledge, 2015. 65-76. https://doi-org.ludwig.lub.lu.se/10.4324/9780203762844.

"Rooms." Berlin Global. Accessed April 15, 2022. Point 2-8 of the floor plan as found via https://berlin-global-ausstellung.de/en/#Rooms.

Roth, Hannelore. "Das Berliner Schloss: mythologisches Relikt in einer mythenarmen Zeit." *arcadia* 54, no. 2 (2019): 257-278. https://doi.org/10.1515/arcadia-2019-0021.

Schacter, Daniel L., Angela H. Gutchess, and Elizabeth A. Kensinger. "Specificity of Memory: Implications for Individual and Collective Remembering." In *Memory in Mind and Culture*. Edited by Pascal Boyer and James V. Wertsch. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009. 83-112. doi:10.1017/CBO9780511626999.006.

Sitzia, Emilie. "Narrative Theories and Learning in Contemporary Art Museums: A Theoretical Exploration" *Stedelijk Studies Journal 4* (2016). Accessed April 12, 2002. DOI: 10.54533/StedStud.vol004.art04.

Squire, Corinne. "Experience-Centred and Culturally-Oriented Approaches to Narrative." In *Doing Narrative Research*. Edited by Molly Andrews, Corinne Squire and Maria Tamboukou. London: SAGE Publications, 2008. 42-63. https://dx.doi.org/10.4135/9780857024992.

"Stasimuseum." Stasimuseum/ASTAK e.V. Accessed April 14, 2022. https://www.stasimuseum.de/en/enindex.htm.

Taylor, Stephanie. *What is Discourse Analysis*. Bloomsbury Publishing, 2013.

Tkalec, Maritta. "„Wir müssen Schloss und Palast erklären“." *Humboldt Forum Magazin*. Humboldt Forum. Accessed May 19, 2022. https://www.humboldtforum.org/de/magazin/artikel/wir-mussen-schloss-und-palast-erklaren/.

Tota, Anna Lisa and Trever Hagen. *Routledge International Handbook of Memory Studies*. London: Routledge, 2015. https://doi-org.ludwig.lub.lu.se/10.4324/9780203762844.

Wertsch, James V. "Collective Memory." In *Memory in Mind and Culture*. Edited by Pascal Boyer and James V. Wertsch. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009. 117-137. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511626999.

Wigley, Mark. "Discursive versus Immersive: The Museum is the Massage." *Stedelijk Studies Journal 4* (2016). Accesssed April 12, 2022. DOI: 10.54533/StedStud.vol004.art02.

Williams, Alex. *Political Hegemony and Social Complexity: Mechanisms of Power After Gramsci*. Cham: Springer International Publishing, 2020.

Williams, Helen L. and Martin A. Conway. "How Do Memories Construct Our Past?" In *Memory in Mind and Culture*. Edited by Pascal Boyer and James V. Wertsch. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009. 29-32. doi:10.1017/CBO9780511626999.003.

Wodak, Ruth. "The Discourse-Historical Approach." In *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*. Edited by Michael Meyer and Ruth Wodak. London: SAGE, 2001. 63-94.