

WOMEN
WITHOUT A PAST?
GERMAN
AUTOBIOGRAPHICAL
WRITINGS AND FASCISM

GENUS
■ ■ ■ ■

Joanne Sayner

Women without a Past?

GENUS:
Gender in Modern Culture

8

Russell West-Pavlov (Berlin)
Jennifer Yee (Oxford)
Frank Lay (Cologne)
Sabine Schülting (Berlin)

Women without a Past?
German Autobiographical
Writings and Fascism

Joanne Sayner



Amsterdam - New York, NY 2007

Illustration cover: Joanne Sayner.

Cover design: Pier Post

The paper on which this book is printed meets the requirements of “ISO 9706:1994, Information and documentation - Paper for documents - Requirements for permanence”.

ISBN-13: 978-90-420-2228-7

©Editions Rodopi B.V., Amsterdam - New York, NY 2007

Printed in the Netherlands

For my parents

Acknowledgements

First and foremost, thanks must go to Franziska Meyer for her unstinting patience and constant support, advice and encouragement. Thanks also to Helmut Peitsch for his continued help and enthusiasm.

I am particularly grateful to Elfriede Brüning, Hilde Huppert and Shmuel Huppert for help and information. Thanks to Michaela Schenkirz for allowing me to quote Grete Weil's letters and to Adam Zweig for permission to quote Arnold Zweig's letters. Thanks also to Christa Stevens at Rodopi. Staff in the following archives provided vital assistance: Schiller-National-museum, Deutsches Literaturarchiv, Marbach am Neckar; Stiftung Archiv der Akademie der Künste, Berlin; Monacensia Literaturarchiv und Bibliothek, Munich; Bibliothek der Stadt Dortmund, Autorendokumentation, Dortmund.

Different, shorter, versions of the chapters on Elisabeth Langgässer, Melita Maschmann and Grete Weil have been published and are now reprinted by permission: "Eine Existenz aus Erinnerung. Grete Weils Leb ich denn, wenn andere leben", in Ilse Nagelschmidt, Alexandra Hanke, Lea Müller-Dannhausen, Melani Schröter, eds, *Zwischen Trivialität und Postmoderne. Literatur von Frauen in den 90er Jahren*. Frankfurt a.M.: Peter Lang 2002, pp. 95-112; "Constructing Identities and Remembering Fascism: The Published Letters of Elisabeth Langgässer", in Caroline Bland and Máire Cross, eds, *Gender and Politics in the Age of Letter Writing, 1750-2000*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 241-252. Copyright © 2004; "'Man muß die bunten Blüten abreißen': Melita Maschmann's Autobiographical Memories of Nazism". *Forum for Modern Language Studies*, 41:2, 2005, 213-225. Published by Oxford University Press.

The book benefited at different stages from the generous comments of: Mike Butler, Elystan Griffiths, Elizabeth Harvey, Beth Linklater, Rhiannon Mason, Heather Moyes, Karoline von Oppen, Katie Rickard, Ron Speirs, Marjolijn Storm, and Dennis Tate. My colleagues at the Centre for European Languages and Cultures at the University of Birmingham have provided help and advice throughout the writing process. It all would have been much harder without such a welcoming and supportive environment.

Friends and family have kept me going with their belief in, and healthy distrust of, academic pursuit. Above all, thanks to Adam for allowing this book to take up such a large part of our lives and never doubting that it was worthwhile.

Contents

Introduction: Patterns of Remembering	1
1. Memories of a Survivor: The Story of Hilde Huppert's Autobiographies	15
2. Competing Voices in Inge Scholl's <i>Die Weiße Rose</i>	75
3. Intoxicating Transience: Negotiations of Public and Private in Elisabeth Langgässer's Published Letters	119
4. "One Must Tear Aside the Flowers...": Melita Maschmann's <i>Fazit</i>	163
5. Clarity and Insight: Greta Kuckhoff's Memories of Resistance in <i>Vom Rosenkranz zur Roten Kapelle</i>	209
6. <i>Und außerdem war es mein Leben</i> : Subjectivity, Subjugation and Self-Justification in Elfriede Brüning's Autobiography	249
7. "To Write against Forgetting": Grete Weil's <i>Leb ich denn, wenn andere leben</i>	301
Conclusion	337
Works Cited	345

Introduction: Patterns of Remembering

Memory is about power. The power to decide who remembers what, where, when, how and on behalf of whom is at the very heart of political practice. Cultural manifestations of memory, past and present, are enmeshed in institutionalized political priorities. This book deals with the memories of seven women who wrote about their experiences of Nazism. The stories of these women have been told, retold and, sometimes, rewritten within very different historical contexts. All are contentious. They force us to question the role of literature as memory, as history and as autobiography. At the centre of this examination of the politics of the autobiographical genre, and the way it shapes these women's memories of the past, are issues of identity. As stories written by women, the texts are embroiled in debates about the gendered relationship between war and literature. They raise questions about the patriarchal conditions of literary production and reception.

This study brings together for the first time seven autobiographies written by women who experienced Nazism from very different perspectives. Through the stories of Hilde Huppert, Inge Scholl, Elisabeth Langgässer, Melita Maschmann, Greta Kuckhoff, Elfriede Brüning and Grete Weil, it foregrounds the positive political potential for rereading well-known texts and for seeking out reasons why others have been marginalized; each text has until now been subject either to institutional marginalization or to a reading radically different from that advocated here. Such rereadings are examples of the continued importance of actively remembering Nazism and highlight the necessity of making visible "the process of history and historicization" (Silberman 1998, 29). They simultaneously reinforce the usefulness of a literary historical approach founded on poststructuralist theory. This approach emphasizes both the importance of contextualized literary analysis and recognizes the political significance of a plurality of meanings which produce texts and which texts themselves produce. The following brief outline of the debates surrounding the seven texts, and their historical and theoretical contexts, will serve to introduce some of the complex issues to be explored in greater detail in the analyses of the individual works.

This book, as my title indicates, is a response to the ways that these women writing in German have remembered Nazism since the end of the Second World War. It takes as its impetus the gendered

dimensions of remembrance confronted polemically by Ruth Klüger, a child survivor of Auschwitz:

Die Kriege gehören den Männern, daher auch die Kriegserinnerungen. Und der Faschismus schon gar, ob man nun für oder gegen ihn gewesen ist: reine Männersache. Außerdem: Frauen haben keine Vergangenheit. Oder haben keine zu haben. (Klüger 1995, 12)

Wars, and hence the memories of wars, are owned by the male of the species. And fascism is decidedly male property, whether you were for or against it. Besides, women have no past, or aren't supposed to have one. (Klüger 2003, 7)

Klüger's claim about the exclusivity of memories of fascism reminds us of the need to be aware of hierarchies involved in the processes of remembering. This study makes apparent some of the diverse patterns of remembrance which have characterized East, West and unified Germany over the past five decades by looking at texts published between 1947 and 1998. Through an examination of competing politics of remembering in East and West Germany I suggest how both continuities and discontinuities have shaped, and continue to shape, narratives about the Nazi past since unification. The inherent complexity of individual publication histories is at the heart of this book, something which challenges simplistic teleological descriptions of memory politics since 1945. The vagaries of publication of Hilde Huppert's text, for example, stand as a particularly striking example of the intricacy of such histories. In the chapter on Huppert's autobiography, I highlight how memories engage with, contradict, and contribute to, wider narratives about the past and insist that memories are *social* constructs. All literary memories are discourses subject to power relations within institutional structures, here encapsulated in those of literary production and reception. They are influenced by ideological praxis at any given point in time. For this reason, the following investigations presuppose that no individual autobiographical memory can ever exist in isolation from its context (Halbwachs [1950] 1992, 43). Every autobiographical text is enmeshed in negotiations between a desire to communicate, often in tension with an impulse to censor what is communicable, and the availability of an audience prepared to listen. The repeated publication of Inge Scholl's autobiography, which became canonical within the school system of West Germany, stands as an example of how a narrative about resistance of young people to fascism acquired and encouraged such an audience.

As Andreas Huyssen argues, “the past is not simply there in memory but [...] must be articulated to become memory” (1995, 3). The language which an author employs to achieve this always contains present hierarchies of previous experience and is thus intricately bound up with dominant historical discourses. It is therefore essential for a literary historian to situate a text within discourses contemporary to its publication. For example, an analysis of the reception of Elisabeth Langgässer’s letters takes into account hegemonic narratives about the relationships between Christianity and Jewishness, and their links with interpretations of fascism which were prevalent at the time of publication. Furthermore, for my discussion of Melita Maschmann’s text it is crucial to understand that depictions of victimhood of German soldiers were prominent when her autobiography was written and published. As dominant discourses such as these “supply the very terms by which a private history is thought through” (Popular Memory Group 1982, 211), each of my analyses highlights how definitions of memories either *become* part of a larger understanding of history through their institutional prioritization or, conversely, are excluded from the same through marginalization. Based on the analyses of many competing narratives within these seven texts, my study challenges artificial distinctions between memory and history. I argue that such distinctions perpetuate a divide which fails to recognize who is given the right to remember and on behalf of whom. Significantly though, this does not imply that conceptions of the past which become dominant go unchallenged. I stress throughout that the “field [of public representations] is crossed by competing constructions of the past, often at war with each other” (Popular Memory Group 1982, 207). Greta Kuckhoff’s autobiography exemplifies such competing tensions, which are encapsulated in gendered concepts of antifascism. Within these seven texts, parameters of inclusion and exclusion highlight dominant claims to national memories and identities. Contemporary debates about the possibilities of national memories are particularly epitomized in two autobiographies written since unification by the East German Elfriede Brüning and the West German Jewish author Grete Weil.

Since discourses of memory are always multiple and always competing, these investigations must be aware of dates and events which have become canonized within memory politics dealing with the Nazi past. For example, in three of these chapters I show that assertions that there was silence about the Holocaust in East Germany during the 1950s are deeply problematic. Furthermore, in four of the

chapters I refute the claim that the televising of the American television series *Holocaust* in 1979 was the watershed in West Germany for remembering the Nazi persecution of European Jews. Within each chapter I also highlight the function of references within the narratives and their reception to canonized events such as the trial of Adolf Eichmann in Jerusalem in 1961 and the Auschwitz trials in Frankfurt between 1963 and 1965. Furthermore, my study emphasizes how ways of remembering the past in West Germany made possible, for example, the now infamous commemorative visit of Chancellor Helmut Kohl and President Ronald Reagan to a cemetery in Bitburg in 1985 where members of the SS were buried. These histories of republication and reception delineate continuities which show that the renewed debates about totalitarianism during the 1990s and contemporary discourses of German victimhood have their origins in shifting hierarchies of remembrance of the former West and East Germany.

Institutionalized discourses of the past often become separated from their historical contexts, being modified by the political needs of the present. The following chapters focus specifically on how the autobiographies confront these tendencies of ahistoricization in official memory discourses. Notwithstanding this confrontation, I discuss how ahistoricization is often perpetuated in the reception of these women's stories. Such tendencies are particularly visible in the reception of Hilde Huppert's and Inge Scholl's texts, spanning more than fifty years.

Women's Memories and Autobiographical Forms

This book contributes to the growing field of investigations of women's roles during Nazism. In doing so, it responds to Jürgen Danyel's call for biographically and autobiographically oriented research which helps to determine:

welche Formen und welche Intensität der individuellen Auseinandersetzung mit der eigenen nationalsozialistischen Vergangenheit beide Gesellschaften mit ihren unterschiedlichen Aufarbeitungsstrategien bei ihren Bürgern initiiert bzw. blockiert haben. (Danyel 1993, 42-43)

which forms of individual confrontation with the Nazi past, and at what level, were initiated or blocked by the two societies whose citizens adopted different strategies of working through the past.¹

Therefore, texts published in East, West and unified Germany have been chosen. From the beginning of the Cold War both East and West Germany were involved in a politics of memory defined in terms of an opposing other. Post-unification discourses of memory similarly revolve around understandings of Germanness and otherness, specifically Jewishness, through their engagement with debates about national identity. Questions of alterity are therefore integral to a reading of these autobiographical memories. Moreover, my inclusion of East German perspectives has become particularly important since unification, “when the tale [is being] told by the stronger party” (Behrend et al. 1991, 65). As such, the present study contributes to the fight against the relegation of East German literature to “a historical footnote” (Kane 1991, vii).

Given the many competing theories on history and memory it remains particularly important to analyse how these concepts work within actual texts written by women. The inherent “turn towards the subject” (Adorno [1963] 1998, 120) in autobiographical analysis is integral to increasing an understanding of the twelve years of German fascism and its consequences. Autobiographies written by women who were between the ages of 15 and 34 in 1933, and thus personally experienced Nazism, have been selected. A concentration on these experiences does not aim to imply any generational homogeneity; indeed, it highlights exactly the opposite.

Women’s autobiographies have, over the last thirty years, increasingly become the subject of academic interest. This study contributes to, and expands upon, readings of this form of writing, writing at the very centre of contemporary debates on ‘the self’, ‘truth’ and ‘history’. Autobiographies and autobiographical criticism still clearly have the potential to lead to further re-evaluations about how our pasts are written.

Feminist criticism has frequently pointed to the absence of women’s writing within both a long-established canon of ‘great autobiographies’ – from Augustine’s *Confessions* to Rousseau’s *Confessions* to Goethe’s *Dichtung und Wahrheit* – and also within the accompanying canon of literary criticism. At the same time, feminist

¹ Unless otherwise stated all translations are my own.

studies have emphasized that this absence nevertheless exists alongside frequent association of women with autobiographical writing, writing however supposedly devoid of the literary qualities connected with the canonical works (Finck 1999, 112). While some studies have problematically claimed that it is possible to read all women's texts as autobiographical, others have aimed to (re)discover a female autobiographical tradition (Goodman 1999, 166-176; Heuser 1996a, 4). Many of these studies have emphasized how women have been able to speak through autobiography in a way that was impossible, or at least very difficult, elsewhere (Swindells 1995, 7). However, feminist political agendas underlying the collection and analysis of such voices have often led to unifying tendencies in the search for a feminine aesthetic. As a result, essentializing dichotomies on which marginalization was originally founded have been consolidated rather than dismantled. Notions of a universal female self, which were criticized for their lack of an awareness of class and ethnicity as intersecting elements of women's experiences, have more recently foundered upon theories of poststructuralism and deconstruction, which have dismantled the idea of any unified 'self', be it male or female. While some feminist critics have lamented the loss of authority resulting from 'the death of the author' at the very time women have more prominently regained authorial status (Brodski 1988, 2; Kosta 1994, 15), others have pointed to the opportunities arising from an integration of poststructuralist and feminist literary theory. Chris Weedon, for example, has emphasized the possibilities for those wishing to retain 'women's writing' as a category which signifies women's "different placing within patriarchal social and cultural orders", but who are aware of the dangers of essentializing this difference (1997, 328).

Both a rejection of the traditionally defined, male-dominated, autobiographical canon and a recognition of the restrictions inherent in any attempt to define an autobiographical text have led to claims of 'the end of autobiography' and doubts about the existence of the genre as such (de Man 1979). My examination of the politics of the autobiographical genre looks at how not only canonization but also a refusal to define the genre are often part of gendered patterns of inclusion and exclusion. Dismissals of autobiography marginalize a way of writing chosen by many women in their confrontations with the Nazi past.

Therefore, in support of the continued relevance of the autobiographical genre, my analyses test traditional definitions of

autobiography against the practice of women's writing (Holdenried 1995, 10). In doing so, they reaffirm the validity of Philippe Lejeune's much cited requirement of an autobiography: that the protagonist, author and narrator are identical (1989, 14). Notwithstanding a recognition of its possible limitations, this definition of the "autobiographical pact" is particularly useful in highlighting the effects of different voices inscribed upon female texts, as is shown throughout the publishing history of Hilde Huppert's autobiography and its rewriting by Arnold Zweig.

An awareness of patterns of exclusion within the autobiographical genre has prompted me to include autobiographical forms such as letters and reports. My analyses of decisions to write and publish letters within the context of remembering the Nazi past contribute to an area of literary study which has previously been marginalized (Jolly 1995, 45). The chapters on Elisabeth Langgässer, Melita Maschmann and Grete Weil give insight into letters within the context of hybrid autobiographical forms, best encapsulated in what has been termed in German "Autobiographik" (Holdenried 1995, 10; Peitsch 1990, 24). Fundamental to a consideration of these epistolary memories is, as Helmut Peitsch emphasizes, a recognition of inherently different forms of both autobiographical speech and temporal perspectives (1990, 24). Temporal restrictions of retrospective narration, advocated in Lejeune's definition, are therefore challenged throughout this study.

Lejeune's work continues to provide a useful framework for discussing questions of authorial intention and authenticity. While Linda Anderson has read Lejeune's requirement of the fused identity of author, narrator and protagonist as placing the intention of the author at the forefront of any understanding of autobiography (2001, 3), Lejeune himself stressed that "autobiography is a mode of reading as much as it is a type of writing" (1989, 30). The resultant focus on the reader and their horizon of expectation allows for diverse readings of the same text. By horizon of expectation, I am referring to the "system of references [...] that a hypothetical reader might bring to any text" (Holub 1984, 59). The diverse political contexts examined here are obviously of primary significance as far as the readers are concerned. The possibility of multiple readings occurring in different socio-political contexts is central when looking at how autobiographies have been republished for changing audiences in different historical periods. Hilde Huppert and Inge Scholl's texts are particular cases in point. However, given the subject matter of the

texts, it is undoubtedly important to stress that the possibility of multiple interpretations does not lead to the loss of all meaning. Shared, albeit not static, meanings within memory discourses on the Nazi past set the parameters of interpretation so that the dangers of meaninglessness are avoided. An ethical imperative of commemoration is the basis for this book, something certainly not irreconcilable with the poststructuralist theory underpinning it (Finney 1998).

A shift in focus from the author to the reader raises the question of reader expectations of autobiographical authenticity. It is not my intention to compare any text to rarefied notions of the author's 'real life'. Nevertheless, reader expectations of autobiographical truth reinstate the significance of the author, something which becomes particularly, although not exclusively, pertinent when representations of the Nazi past are the object of study. As the controversy surrounding Benjamin Wilkomirski's *Bruchstücke* [Fragments] (1995) has shown, the physicality of a Holocaust witness remains of importance. It was the author's material presence and his testimony as one who survived which caused the text to be read as 'truthful' autobiography, in spite of its (subsequently alleged) fictional nature. The very reception of his work, and its high profile publication by a Jewish publishing house, was based on the fact that the author was still alive to tell the story. Taking into account the possible significance of authorial interviews, readings of the author become "one possible site of meaning, [...] a point of departure and not [...] the focus of absolute meaning or conclusion" (Kosta 1994, 5).

The traditional view of autobiography is that it portrays the development of a personality (Lejeune 1989, 4; Olney 1972, 35). The poststructuralist destabilization of such an understanding is useful for permitting "the surfacing of contradictory elements of personality" (Goodman 1986, iv). My investigations show how my chosen texts suggest or contradict the notion of a progression of identity (or identities). Childhood memories in the autobiographies of Melita Maschmann, Greta Kuckhoff and Elfriede Brüning are especially interesting in this respect. In contrast, notions of any such development are shown to be particularly problematic when the report of Jewish survivor, Hilde Huppert, is examined. As Ruth Klüger has suggested, playful autobiographical texts such as Barthes' *roland BARTHES par roland barthes* (1975) operate in a very different "intellectual space" than, for example, her own memories as a Holocaust survivor (1996, 410). Klüger also raises the relationship of

‘truth’ in such testimonies to ‘literature’. She notes that when her autobiography was praised for its literary qualities, its claims to truth and reality became peripheral (1996, 406). In contrast, all the autobiographies under investigation here are read as ‘literary’ texts while at the same time the claims of authenticity within them are highlighted. This is particularly important with respect to previous readings of the more institutionally prolific texts under discussion, written by Inge Scholl and Melita Maschmann, which have resulted from an understanding of women’s autobiographical literature as “naively mimetic” (Holdenried 1995, 9). Such readings, which have focused on the documentary nature of autobiography, have excluded these texts as possible subjects of literary study. This is not to say that I am attempting to argue for a set of literary qualities inherent to these memories, but rather that I set out to explore how these texts have been written.

Positioning Women’s Perspectives

A concept of positionality is used to investigate the depiction of identities within the seven texts. This concept is based on a Foucauldian understanding of discourses of power which, through material practice, construct multiple, competing subjectivities. I am therefore looking at different subject positions, or “ways of being an individual” (Weedon 2001, 3), conveyed in the autobiographies. More specifically, as Almut Finck has explained:

Was Identität konstituiert, charakterisiert und immer wieder modifiziert, hängt [...] von den zahlreichen und sehr heterogenen Positionen ab, die das Subjekt sowohl gleichzeitig als auch nacheinander, im Laufe seines Lebens, einnimmt – oder auch nicht einnimmt; Identität wird zudem nicht nur von der Positionalisierung des Subjekts innerhalb oder außerhalb einer Vielzahl diskursiver Felder bestimmt, sondern auch von deren untergeordneten oder dominanten Stellenwert innerhalb eines ganzen Netzwerks von Diskursen. [...] Von der Positionalität des Subjekts sprechen heißt demnach immer Aussagen machen über den jeweiligen Grad des Zugangs, den der Einzelne zu verschiedenen gesellschaftlichen Machtbereichen besitzt. (1999, 131-32)

The constitution, characterization and modification of identity depends on the numerous and very heterogeneous positions that the subject does, or doesn’t, adopt both simultaneously and consecutively during the course of her life. Identity is not just determined by the positioning of the subject inside or outside a multiplicity of discursive fields, but also through their subordinate or

dominant worth within a whole network of discourses. [...] To speak of the positionality of the subject means to make visible the current possibilities of access to different spheres of societal power which the individual has.

An examination of textual identities therefore takes into account that “what one learns when one learns one’s gender identity is the gender identity appropriate to one’s ethnic, class, national and racial identity” (Spelman 1988, 88). Due to the political constellations of East, West and unified Germany in which the texts were published, there are different understandings of class used within them. Similarly, discourses of Jewishness are prevalent within several of the autobiographies, the constructions of which are examined in each individual analysis, particularly those chapters on Elisabeth Langgässer, Melita Maschmann and Grete Weil. An essential part of my study involves interrogating what claims the texts make to collective experience based on understandings of gender, class, nation and ethnicity and how such claims engage with prevalent memory politics at the time of publication. Important for such claims is the presence or absence of significant dates during the Nazi years. For example, differing narratorial attitudes towards Hitler’s appointment as Chancellor on 30 January 1933, the Nuremberg Laws in September 1935, and the pogrom against the Jewish population of 9 November 1938 lead to contrasting emphases and competing identificatory forces within the texts. The analyses therefore pay particular attention, within both the texts and their reception, to the prioritization of such historical events and as well as to the prominent silences.

As the autobiographies examined here encompass very different perspectives on Nazism, I look at how the texts define notions of resistance and victimhood. Therefore, while it is possible to divide the autobiographies into those written by resisters (Inge Scholl, Greta Kuckhoff and Elfriede Brüning), Jewish victims (Hilde Huppert, Elisabeth Langgässer and Grete Weil), and one perpetrator (Melita Maschmann), the texts themselves use these concepts in very different and often starkly incomparable situations. I indicate how historiography, past and present, has defined these terms and how the texts contest and appropriate such definitions. In addition, I highlight how legislation and official state rhetoric on the past, combined with the time of writing and publication, influence the categories of resister and victim. In doing so, I examine in particular the complexity of questions of guilt and responsibility, in order “to move beyond language in which categories of victims and perpetrator [are] mutually

exclusive” (Moeller 1996, 1016). At the same time, I am mindful of the tendency to promote universal exoneration or condemnation. While there have been many studies focusing on one specific type of experience of Nazism, there have been no literary analyses of autobiography juxtaposing each of these different perspectives. As Omer Bartov has highlighted: “The historiographies of the perpetrators and victims rarely overlap” (1998, 797). Notwithstanding this, such a comparison does not in any way intend to blur the experiences of those who were racially persecuted by the regime with those who were not. Despite this combination of political and experiential perspectives, there is one noticeable gap – my study does not include an autobiography written from the ‘perpetrator perspective’ and published in East Germany. Analyses of the East German texts included here demonstrate how the state’s antifascist foundation meant that such narratives written by women were simply not published.

Looking at how various subject positions are taken up or refused within the women’s autobiographies raises the recurrent question as to how they negotiate issues of individuality and representativeness. As Almut Finck and Sidonie Smith have emphasized, the traditional autobiographical model of an exceptional individual self standing both as extraordinary and yet representative is problematic when women are not accorded the status of “eminent person” (1999, 121; 1987, 8). Nevertheless, there is often a tendency to see women’s autobiographies as representative of an amorphous female experience. While resisting attempts which posit a unified female whole, and yet viewing the texts as accounts of ‘social individuals’, that is, taking into account that the authors “speak out of particular positions in the complex of social relations characteristic of particular societies at particular historical times” (Popular Memory Group 1982, 234), these analyses contribute to a wider understanding of patriarchal relations in East, West and unified Germany. While such an understanding of positionality, encapsulated in these different perspectives, applies to both male and female figures within the text, it means that any analysis of women’s published autobiographies must recognize the patriarchal co-ordinates of production and reception (Finck 1999, 116). Patterns of gendered reception of autobiographical memories are therefore highlighted throughout.

Investigations of such gendered patterns confirm the fact that women’s writing is shaped by both resistance to and complicity with patriarchal power relations. Greta Kuckhoff’s and Elfriede Brüning’s

texts dramatically encompass such tensions through competing claims to identification with, and distance from, a masculinized portrayal of the GDR state. However, a gendered examination of autobiography raises specific methodological challenges where Holocaust texts are concerned. While the legitimacy of literary analysis of such texts has now become established through the well-respected work of scholars such as James E. Young and Lawrence L. Langer, doubts about the relevance of gendered approaches are still prevalent in much secondary literature (Langer 1998, 351; Reiter 2000, 48). The aim of diversifying an often monolithic representation of the Holocaust survivor, of dismantling the “split memory” between genocide and gender, and of preventing the absorption of women’s stories into men’s lives, still remains highly controversial (Ringelheim, 1985; 1997). Nevertheless, as the Nazi system of annihilation aimed specifically at eliminating gender identity, such an exploration of texts is undoubtedly necessary (Weigel 1995, 263). The difficulties of examining a text from a perspective which neither valorizes an essential femaleness nor implicitly condemns male victims is the challenge to contemporary feminist scholarship: by accentuating those elements in female survivor testimony to which the authors attribute their survival (often socialized skills of domesticity and altruism), one must be aware of the danger of constructing a hierarchy of victims which prioritizes female experience (Remmler 1995, 167; Kosnick 1992, 94).

These issues are particularly relevant in Chapter One which considers the various incarnations of Hilde Huppert’s autobiography, *Engpaß zur Freiheit. Aufzeichnungen der Frau Hilde Hupperts [sic] über ihre Erlebnisse im Nazi-Todesland und ihre wundersame Errettung aus Bergen-Belsen* [The narrow pass to freedom. Notes by Hilde Huppert on her experiences in the Nazi land of death and her wondrous deliverance from Bergen-Belsen]. Huppert, a Czech-Jewish survivor chose to write her text in German with the help of exiled German author Arnold Zweig. First published in 1947, it was reworked and republished by Zweig and then much later by her son, who, as a seven year old, survived the horrors of persecution alongside his mother. The fascinating publication history raises issues about how the different versions of the text attempt to communicate the trauma. I consider how alterations to the text are symptomatic of changes in official discourses about the fascist past in East, West and unified Germany.

Changing versions of an autobiographical text are also a significant element of the investigations in Chapter Two. This deals with the most canonical of the texts under discussion, Inge Scholl's *Die Weiße Rose* [The White Rose]. First published in West Germany in 1952, it soon became well-known as a text about youth resistance to Nazism. Widely read in schools, the text has played an often controversial role in memories and histories of resistance. Most often seen as a biography of Hans and Sophie Scholl, I discuss how an autobiographical reading can shift attention away from Christian motifs of redemption and masculinized notions of victimhood and onto very different considerations about the role of Inge Scholl herself.

Chapter Three similarly has an author of repute as its focus. The most prolific of the authors chosen, Elisabeth Langgässer has been the subject of much public and academic attention. Her letters, however, first published by her husband in 1954 entitled *...soviel berauschende Vergänglichkeit: Briefe 1926-1950* [...So much intoxicating transience: Letters 1926-1950] and republished by her granddaughter in 1990, have received little recognition in comparison. As a well-known pre-war author, Langgässer became a victim of the Nazi racial laws and was forbidden to publish. She continued to write during Nazism nevertheless and found fame again in the immediate post-war period. Focusing on the edition of 1954, my examination looks at the different ways in which identities of Elisabeth Langgässer are suggested by editorial selection of, and intervention in, the letters. Langgässer's often contentious understandings of Catholicism and the role of the author are examined alongside the gendered reception of her letters and of her memories of Nazism.

What is significant about the autobiography at the centre of Chapter Four is that it was first published in 1963, republished over the course of the next twenty years, and is often used as a important source within histories about the involvement of young people in the fascist system. Melita Maschmann's *Fazit. Kein Rechtfertigungsversuch* [Taking stock: No attempt at justification] tells the story of a leader of the League of German Girls. While those using her text as a source of historical information often stress its authenticity, I argue that a detailed investigation of her memories highlights both persisting patterns of fascist constructions of gender, 'race' and victimhood, as well as tensions with prominent discourses of the Cold War. It is a significant text within the continuing debate about women's

involvement with Nazism and in the light of the current controversy about the portrayal of German victimhood.

Chapter Five turns once again to the question of remembering resistance and the context of the Cold War. Greta Kuckhoff's *Vom Rosenkranz zur Roten Kapelle: ein Lebensbericht* [From the rosary to the Red Orchestra: A life-story] was first published in 1972. Looking at her autobiography in the context of official GDR discourse about both remembering Nazism and gender, I argue that her provocative text challenges dominant images of the male antifascist hero and of socialist equality. Kuckhoff was a supporter of socialist ideals within a large and diverse resistance group. Her memories cause us to look again at how her resistance group has often been marginalized, or worse, in both Germanies and to consider to what extent this has changed in a post-unification context.

The realities of remembering resistance in Germany since 1989 are further relevant to the discussion of Elfriede Brüning's *Und außerdem war es mein Leben* [And besides, it was my life] in Chapter Six. This text was first published in 1994 and describes her life as a writer and early resister to Nazism. These memories of resistance are subsequently pivotal to her self-understanding as an East German before and after unification. Tensions with regards to her support for, and antagonism towards, the SED can be traced back through her autobiography and pervade a text clearly aware of the contemporary marginalization of both East German experience and literature since the fall of the Berlin Wall.

In Chapter Seven, *Leb ich denn, wenn andere leben* [Can I live, if others live?] which was published in 1998 provocatively prompts us to confront the memories of a German-Jewish author forced into exile in the Netherlands and who returned to Germany in 1947. Negotiating the limits of her ability to bear witness to the horrors that changed her life, Grete Weil demands an attention based on an active engagement with the past. It is an attention, I argue, that has rarely been received in a contemporary German context preoccupied with a more passive understanding of reconciliation and 'normalization'. It is maybe these memories in particular which are a reminder that, in the face of repeated marginalization or homogenous interpretations of these women's autobiographical memories, there is still a need to look closely at their texts. This study therefore rises to Klüger's provocative challenge in order to explore whether, indeed, these "women have no past, or aren't supposed to have one".

1. Memories of a Survivor: The Story of Hilde Huppert's Autobiographies

I remember her sitting in a single room with the window facing the porch [...]. She was writing and crying. Jotting down the words and suffering. Expounding and cursing the Nazis. When she finally finished, quite worn out and drained, she gave the book the title *Warum ist das uns geschehen?* [Why did it happen to us?] a name which expressed both her searching and her condemnation. (S.Huppert 1990, 161)¹

When Jewish Hilde Huppert wrote her autobiography in 1945 she hoped it would be a cathartic act. At the suggestion of those around her, she put down on paper the memories of her persecution under Nazism in an attempt to combat the recurrent nightmares which pervaded her present life in Palestine. However, this attempt to deal with the trauma of her experiences soon gained a different impetus. An imperative to bear witness, to remember on behalf of those who had been murdered, led her to seek the text's publication.

Huppert, the daughter of a wealthy business-owning family, was born on 5 November 1910. She married and gave birth to a son, Tommy, in 1936. The family lived in Teschen, a town on the border between Czechoslovakia and Poland. In 1938 her husband emigrated to Palestine and secured visas for his wife and son to follow him. However, before they could leave, Germany invaded Poland. Huppert and her family fled to a village near Krosno, one of many towns turned into a ghetto by the Nazis. In 1942 they were arrested. The autobiography describes the journey from prison in Krosno, to the Rzesnow ghetto, to prison in Krakau and, finally, to Bergen-Belsen. Of the immediate family who were arrested, only Huppert and her son survived. Following liberation, Huppert travelled with 529 children to Palestine, arriving in July 1945.

Given the complexity of the text's publication history, a short résumé of the text's various republications is useful before I focus on a reading of the original autobiography and discuss the changes made in later versions. I explore questions about genre, gender, and Jewishness within the different publishing contexts and outline debates about remembering fascism contemporary to the text's publication in East Germany, West Germany, Israel and unified Germany. An analysis of discourses of antifascism and their intersection with different frameworks of remembering highlights

¹ My thanks go to Rabbi Yosi Ives for his verbal translation of this article from Hebrew into English.

many competing hierarchies of remembrance and suggests that different versions of the text have different addressees.

When Hilde Huppert composed her autobiography between August and October 1945, three months after her arrival in Palestine, she chose to write in German, even though her native language was Czech. She subsequently asked the well-known author Arnold Zweig to prepare her manuscript for publication.² Following some initial reservations, he took on the project and began work in 1946. In addition to stylistic changes, he added a preface and a conclusion. The text was first distributed as a duplicated copy in 1947 in Egypt, in a British prisoner-of-war camp for German soldiers, after it was refused by publishers in Palestine and in both the Eastern and Western zones of Germany. Before its dissemination in the camp, Zweig added a second preface addressing these problems of publication. The autobiography was part of a series called “Bausteine der Wahrheit” [Building blocks of truth]. At this stage the title was *Engpaß zur Freiheit. Aufzeichnungen der Frau Hilde Hupperts [sic] über ihre Erlebnisse im Nazi-Todesland und ihre wundersame Errettung aus Bergen-Belsen* [The narrow pass to freedom. Notes by Hilde Huppert on her experiences in the Nazi land of death and her wondrous deliverance from Bergen-Belsen] (Huppert 1947). In 1949 the text was translated and published in Czechoslovakia (Huppert 1949). A year earlier Zweig had left Palestine for East Germany and the text was published there in 1951 and 1961 under his name (Zweig 1951, 1961). He made several alterations at this stage. Meanwhile Huppert’s son translated the original text into Hebrew, naming it *Vehashohet Sahat* [The slaughterer slaughtered]. His attempts to get it published in Israel in 1955 failed. Following a radio interview between Huppert and her son in Israel in 1977, Shmuel [Tommy] Huppert began work on a ‘Hebrew version’ of the book. This version was published in 1978 in Tel Aviv, entitled *Jad Be Jad Im Tommy* [Hand in hand with Tommy] (Huppert 1978). Ten years later this version was translated into German and published in West Germany, along with a preface and epilogue by Shmuel Huppert, entitled *Hand in Hand mit Tommy. Ein autobiographischer Bericht 1939-1945* [Hand in hand with Tommy. An autobiographical report 1939-1945] (Huppert 1988). It was translated and published in the Netherlands during the 1980s with the title *De dood in de ogen* [Face to face with death]. It was

² Arnold Zweig (1887-1968), a German-Jewish author, emigrated in 1933 and spent the Nazi period in exile in Palestine. He returned to East Berlin in 1948, and between 1950 and 1953 was President of the East German Academy of the Arts.

subsequently translated into Arabic by Karim Awad, published by Al-Mashrak in 1985, and republished in 1997. A third edition of the 1988 German version was printed in reunified Germany in 1997 with an additional introduction by Shmuel Huppert (Huppert 1997). In the meantime, the original manuscript from 1947 was published in Berlin in 1990 as part of a series of texts commemorating 9 November 1938. This edition was edited by Heidrun Loeper and contained an essay by Detlev Claussen (Huppert 1990).³ In 1999 a text written by Shmuel Huppert in Hebrew two years earlier was published in Germany entitled *Habe ich Anne Frank gesehen?* [Did I see Anne Frank?] (S. Huppert 1999). It is a first-person narrative describing the history of the Huppert family, Shmuel Huppert's confrontations with his family past, and his experiences as a young boy in ghetto and concentration camp.

From *Warum ist das uns geschehen?* to *Engpaß zur Freiheit*: The Role of Arnold Zweig

When Hilde Huppert first approached Arnold Zweig and asked him to assist her in publication, the title of her narrative was *Warum ist das uns geschehen?* [Why did it happen to us?] This question embodied not only the traumatic bewilderment of a survivor, but also through its collective appeal sought an addressee. Zweig rejected this title, preferring instead *Engpaß zur Freiheit: Aufzeichnungen der Frau Hilde Hupperts [sic] über ihre Erlebnisse im Nazi-Todesland und ihre wundersame Errettung aus Bergen-Belsen* [The narrow pass to freedom. Notes by Hilde Huppert on her experiences in the Nazi land of death and her wondrous deliverance from Bergen-Belsen]. Although Huppert was in agreement with this, the change in emphasis from the original is manifold. While the individualization emphasizes how few survivors there were, it simultaneously reduces the previous narrative claim to representativeness. Zweig's title suggests the possibility of a post-Holocaust "freedom", while Huppert's looks for an answer to a still pervasive past in the present. Through poeticized references to the "wondrous deliverance from Bergen-Belsen" and the "Nazi land of death", Zweig sets a concrete historical situation alongside a wider metaphorization. In contrast, Huppert's use of the definite article ("das") signifies both the unnameable specificity of the event and the entirety of the persecution. The title of a text sets up

³ Further references will be to this edition. All translations are my own.

reader expectations. In Huppert's lingering question, the possibility of closure is rejected. Zweig's choice, in contrast, pre-empts the ending of narrative with an emphasis on the survival of the protagonist. While Huppert's title is a reminder of death, with the survivor's question representing the murder of millions, Zweig's title is an affirmation of a single life.

Along with these changes to the title, Zweig's addition of an introduction and a conclusion is of particular interest. He begins his introduction with an explicit assertion that he did not write the following text. Zweig describes the extent of his intervention and claims that it was limited to stylistic reworking. He writes of his alterations that his additions did not amount to more than one and a half sides in total, and his deletions to no more than one side. Nevertheless, he continues:

Dabei sah ich gleich, daß ich mich jeder Einmischung zu enthalten hatte. Weder an den Aufbau, noch an die Anordnung des Stoffes durfte ich rühren; das epische Nacheinander, das Zusammenfassen und Aneinanderreihen der kurzen Kapitel, ihre Zuspitzung, knappe Fassung und kluge Abwechslung – all das findet sich bereits in der Urschrift; es ist Eigentum der Frau, der es nicht nur gegeben war, diesen Lebensstoff durchzustehen, sondern ihn auch zu beschreiben. Und dennoch hatte ich jeden ihrer Sätze in mich aufzunehmen und ihn zurechtzurücken [sic] ohne ihn zu verändern. (9)

I immediately saw that I had to refrain from interfering. I was not allowed to touch either the structure or the ordering of the material: the epic succession, the summarizing, the stringing together of the short chapters, their pointedness, succinct composition, clever alternation – all of this can already be found in the original; it is the property of the woman to whom it was given not only to get through this experience, but also to describe it. But nevertheless – I had to absorb each of her sentences and straighten each one out without changing it.

Zweig therefore emphasizes an editorial role, but the scope and ambiguity of the task, in particular his aim of “zurechtrücken” [straightening out], lead us to question the extent of his involvement. What will become clear is that, while in the introduction of 1946 he is at pains to stress his background role, his sense of ownership and authorship of the text increases over time.

Within Zweig's introduction it is not only his self-understanding as the editor of Huppert's text, but also his Jewish identity which is clearly expressed. His initial reluctance to assist Huppert in publication gave way to a realization that he too could have faced the same persecution had he not left Germany soon after the Reichstag fire. By claiming that he and Huppert are compatriots, Zweig aligns himself with a Jewish collective under the Nazis and constructs a

claim to representativeness: “Dieser schlesische Bericht [...] schildert das Durchschnittserlebnis des östlichen Europa, wie es sich an seinen jüdischen Einwohnern abspielte” [This Silesian report depicts the average experience of Eastern Europe and what it was like for its Jewish inhabitants]. He reiterates his status as a victim of persecution by drawing parallels to his own children and to the murdered nieces of Huppert. It is these communal bonds which lead to a joint imperative to prepare the text for the public. Such a generic addressee later becomes specified as the Germans of the past, present and future and subsequently as all Europeans. Zweig simultaneously focuses throughout his introduction on German experiences and an international context. A conflict which arises during Zweig's task of editing between ‘the German’ and ‘the Jewish’ is for him resolved through the importance of the “wahren Menschlichen” [true humanity] (10). He calls Huppert's book “ein Hilfsmittel zur Erkenntnis der Ursachen und Wirkungen [...], die aus den Deutschen ihre heutige zwielichtige und formlose Schauergestalt machten” [an aid for recognizing the causes and effects which turned the German people into the shady and formless horror figure of today] (11). Zweig ends his first introduction with recourse to the eye-witness experience of Huppert while leaving what he wants to say “zur Deutung dieser Aufzeichnungen” [for the purposes of interpreting these notes] (12) to the conclusion.

After sixteen months, Zweig added a second introduction to the text in which he confronted not only difficulties he had encountered in getting the text published, but also, given the text's distribution in a prisoner of war camp, the new addressees. Thematically, the second introduction reiterates to a large extent the first; there are however some differences. The topos of “Verdrängung” [suppression] becomes prominent through a comparison of the current post-war situation and that at the end of the First World War. Zweig draws parallels between the contemporary lack of interest in Huppert's text from the publishers and his own previous experience of finding that literature about war experiences was likewise shunned by them. While considering the fact that Huppert's text had been rejected by publishers in several different countries, he maintains that this same text would have been in demand one and a half years earlier and probably will be in several years to come. He nevertheless insists that he and Huppert have an obligation as authors to publish and must not give up in the face of such refusals.

Throughout the second introduction Zweig directs his comments to the German people, even suggesting a notion of collective guilt by referring to “die ungeheuere Schuld, die das deutsche Volk auf sich

geladen hat” [the enormous guilt that the German people has brought upon itself] (15). He argues that the absolution from this guilt and the “Weg zur Gesundung” [road to recovery] can only be achieved by the German people recognizing who they really are. Zweig finishes his second introduction with an invitation to the addressees to watch as he “[zieht] den Vorhang von einer furchtbaren Bühne beiseite” [draws aside the curtain to reveal a dreadful stage] (16). In blurring genre in this way, Zweig portrays Huppert’s text as a mirror in which the addressees can watch and recognize the roles they played in the persecution of the European Jews. It also emphasizes the fact that Zweig himself was a distant spectator to the horrors of the ghettos and concentration camps.

Zweig begins his concluding comments with a modification of Huppert’s original title: “Warum geschieht uns das?” [Why is this happening to us?] (108) This question precedes an examination of, amongst other things: the nature of the Nazi persecution against the Jewish population of Europe; the role of Palestine and possibilities for emigration; the origins of the SS; and what Zweig considers to be inherent aspects of the German character. All of these, as stated in his introduction, are to serve as a framework for interpreting Huppert’s memories.

As in the introduction, where Zweig discusses Huppert’s murdered nieces, in his conclusion he emphasizes the horror of the Holocaust from the perspective of a child who asks his father whether it was really true that the Nazis burned children alive. In both cases, he begins with the innocence of children to represent that of the Jewish population and thus to emphasize the magnitude of the barbarity.

In repeating Huppert’s question, “Warum gerade uns, und warum läßt Gott das zu?” [Why us particularly, and why does God allow it?] (111), Zweig attempts an answer. He does this not through recourse to religious explanations, which he dismisses as limited, but through an in-depth analysis of ‘reality’. For him, the meaning for what happened can only be found by looking at its historical roots. He juxtaposes the break from humanity which he sees in Nazism with a teleological understanding of fascism; the Holocaust is set in a historical continuum dating back to the sixteenth century. In doing so, he considers Europe’s colonial past and the behaviour of the “höchst gesitteten Europavölker” [highly civilized nations of Europe], including Spain, Portugal, Holland, Britain, France and Belgium.

In seeing the events of the immediate past in the light of a longer continuum, Zweig comments that the German experience could have been repeated in other nations where the same characteristics exist.

Indeed, he argues it *was* repeated throughout the history of colonialism through the abusive imperialist traditions of the Europeans:

Aus der Eigenschaft dieses Naziimperialismus, nachholen zu wollen, was andere Imperialismen aus fernen Erdteilen in Jahrhunderten erbeuteten, erklärt sich auch der rasende Erpressungscharakter dieser Naziinvasion. (116)

The raging extortionate nature of the Nazi invasion can also be explained by the characteristic of Nazi imperialism, which aimed to make up for what other imperialist regimes had carried off from distant parts of the world over the centuries.

Zweig's focus is therefore firmly on an international understanding of, and responsibility for, Nazism. Such an interpretation stems from a class-based analysis of society, and Zweig refers repeatedly to the insights of Karl Marx. While Zweig gives one of the reasons for the persecution of the Jews as being the Nazis' "angstvolle und maßlose Judenüberschätzung" [fearful and extreme exaggeration about the Jews] (112), he also prioritizes the fact that their role in the 'upper' classes of German society meant that they were particularly suitable targets for the ire of the disadvantaged classes. The annihilation of the Jews was, he argues, part of a process of transferring power to a new class, and the barbarity of the process is, for him, inherent to a capitalist world-view:

Und ebenso entspricht es der feudalen und kapitalistischen Denkweise des aristokratischen Grundbesitzers, dessen mittelalterliche Funktion der Nazi hier übernimmt, aus Menschen mit Peitsche und Folter Arbeitsleistungen zu erpressen, ohne Nahrung zu investieren. (117)

And it likewise corresponds to the feudal and capitalist mindset of the aristocratic landowners, whose function from the Middle Ages the Nazis adopt, to blackmail people into working with whips and torture, without investing any sustenance.

Zweig therefore sees the roots of the Holocaust not in antisemitism, which he at first dismisses, but instead in the bourgeois system which economically enslaves the masses.

He juxtaposes these origins of fascism with images of a Jewish collective and a narrative of suffering: "Wer so lange gelebt hatte wie das jüdische Volk, wußte den guten Willen dankbar einzuschätzen, aber es konnte nicht umhin, bitter dabei zu lachen und sich auf den Massentod vorzubereiten" [Whoever has lived as long as the Jewish people have, knew to be grateful for good will, but could not avoid

laughing bitterly at the same time and preparing itself for death on a huge scale] (120). Despite such cynicism, it is within this community that the persecuted, in the absence of religious comfort, find solace. Zweig reads Huppert's text as an example of solidarity between the persecuted middle-class Jews and the non-Jewish working-class. For him, such solidarity replaces the inadequacies of religious faith.

Although Zweig's comments imply the inevitability of the Holocaust, he does set acts of resistance against a resigned acceptance of Jewish suffering. At a time when the existence of such resistance was highly contested, Zweig refers to Dr. Fink, a figure in Huppert's text, and also to the "jüdisch[e] Handwerker und Proletarier, die von Warschau bis Riga den Vernichtern der Ghettos heroischen und unvergänglichen Widerstand leisteten" [Jewish workers and proletarians, who from Warsaw to Riga offered heroic and immortal resistance to the annihilators of the ghettos] (120). It is in this resistance, and in the signs of humanity that persisted during Nazism, that Zweig finds some comfort. While describing such resistance, Zweig refers to the necessity of a concept of antifascism which includes and defends those who have been persecuted. Through repeated emphasis on the fact that the persecution was ended only by armed antifascism, Zweig comments positively on the liberating Red Army, "vor der das verbrecherische Nazivolk zittert" [before whom the criminal Nazi nation trembles] (119). In contrast to such praise for the forces of the Soviet Union, he is highly critical of the conservative British Government and the British public who refused visas for Palestine, one of the few ways that Jews could have been saved from annihilation.

Zweig focuses part of his discussion on an analysis of the German nation and society, considering how the Jewish population became the target for extinction with the complicity, involvement and responsibility of thousands of Germans. Through a rather problematic use of terms, Zweig falls short of collectively condemning the whole nation by asserting that even German society contained "wertvolles Menschenmaterial" [valuable human material] (129). Nevertheless, in his consideration of the characteristics of the German nation, he criticizes what he sees as the divisions inherent in German society. He then proceeds to discuss the origins of the SS, the inhumanity of the Germans encapsulated in "der kalte Blick" [the cold glance] (131), and a German history of antisemitism. In each case he returns to his class-based interpretation and sets the specific case of German history within a wider international context. Condemning the servility of the German population, Zweig argues that they have remained infantile

and as a result have accepted systematic humiliation and exploitation imposed upon them by the ruling classes. He continues:

Wer seit mehreren Jahrhunderten geprügelt worden ist [...], der hat in seiner Erbmasse so viele Demütigungen heruntergeschluckt und so viele Schläge empfangen, daß er zum Werkzeug einer prügelnden Herrenklasse prädestiniert ist. (128)

People who have been beaten for several centuries, have swallowed so many humiliations into their genetic make-up, received so many blows, are predestined to become the tool of a violent ruling class.

Antagonistic power relations between classes are thus manifested for Zweig in a genetically inherited history of oppression.

Alongside Zweig's assertion that the SS recruited from all the educated classes, he emphasizes the military tradition in which 'suitable' officer material is drawn from 'upper class' German families. In stressing that the SS's main role was directed at the "inner enemy", Zweig refers to the brutal suppression of those Germans who were against the fascist state in 1933: "Wir wollen nicht vergessen: das erste [der] Gebiete, mit Gewalt unterworfen, hieß Deutschland" [We should not forget that the first area suppressed by violence was called Germany] (131). A further distinction between fascist and German, drawn through parallels to the Russian Revolution of 1917, allows for possibilities of both post-war recuperation of German identity and a socialist revolution to rid the Germans of alien social structures. Zweig returns to the question of antisemitism and claims that it was a tradition of animosity towards the Jewish population which led the German population to react with such aggression and which, when combined with "ökonomische Triebkräfte und ideologische Überbauten" [economic driving forces and ideological superstructures], led to the horror personified in someone as barbaric as the SS-Mann Kramer (133).

Zweig's discussion of Nazism ultimately prompts only more questions: "Wie soll das weitergehen? Was lernen wir aus dem Durchlebten, wir ewigen Schüler der Wirklichkeit?" [Where do we go from here? What have we learned from the experience, we eternal students of reality?] (140) He suggests an answer once again based on a humanist imperative, advocating that people should focus on the things they have in common, that they should concentrate on the demands of the present and not on the hope of an afterlife. In the jubilation of liberation Zweig sees a true classless society with a "befreiende Unterschiedslosigkeit" [liberating lack of difference] and

a “warme menschliche Verbundenheit” [warm, human solidarity] (143). This idealized, utopian vision extends to Zweig’s understanding of the survivors’ reception into Palestine and his aspiration for the future. He believes that the Jewish community there can move away from nationalism towards greater self-awareness. The importance of the Palestinian visa for many survivors is reiterated throughout and there is an emphasis on the necessity of “ein Heim für die Befreiten und Verjagten” [a home for those liberated and hounded] (144), in the face of persistent antisemitism. He talks of the importance of a community where people can be amongst those who similarly experienced such horrors and he ends on the programmatic claim:

Und das Lebensrecht, den Ort zu wählen, wo man sich produktiv einordnet, kann man am Ende des antifaschistischen Krieges auch [den Verfolgten] nicht bestreiten [...]. Es ist gut, daß irgendwo Juden als Juden über die Straßen gehen können, ohne sich bemerkt und mit Blöcken [sic] verfolgt zu fühlen. (145)

And the vital right to choose the place where you can productively fit in – this cannot be denied at the end of this antifascist war also to those who were persecuted [...]. It is a good thing that Jews are somewhere able to cross the street as Jews without feeling that they are being noticed and persecuted by glances.

Zweig positions his concluding discussion within his previous writings, in particular *Bilanz der deutschen Judenheit* (Zweig [1934], 1998). This was a text noted for Zweig’s stance as a devout Jew and Zionist (Bodenheimer 2000, 633). However, since writing this book, his relationship to Zionism had become increasingly ambivalent, something mirrored to a certain extent in his conclusion to Huppert’s text. Alongside support for a Jewish state and his description of the Jewish population as a nation is a tension created by Zweig’s insistence on his own, and others’, European identity: “Als Juden Opfer, als Deutsche Täter – das wäre mehr, als der moderne Mensch ertragen könnte, wenn er nicht schon im Gefühl seit Jahrzehnten Europäer wäre” [As a Jew a victim, as a German a perpetrator – that would be more than the modern person could bear if he hadn’t already for decades felt himself to be a European].

Alongside Zweig’s discussion of broader issues surrounding the Holocaust, he also refers to Huppert’s text throughout the conclusion. Zweig asserts that it is an authentic source and claims that it is corroborated by other historical sources. He comments on the style and writes of how the stages of persecution are calmly described “ohne Aufregung und Überfärbung, getragen von der Pflicht zur Zeugenschaft und zur Teilnahme an der Wiedergutmachung” [without

excitement and exaggeration, carried by the duty to bear witness and to participate in reparation] (109). His discussion of the autobiography and his stress on its importance clearly contain a positive impetus for the present, the necessity of which he deems crucial if life is to continue. His words are pervaded by a reconciliatory tone, and Zweig's conviction, albeit qualified, that German-Jewish relations will once again be achievable is emphasized. Interestingly, these are elements which are arguably absent from Huppert's narrative, as I suggest below.

Zweig's title, introduction and conclusion were all part of the "schützende Hülle" [protective shell] (5) which enabled Huppert's text to be published, and were also, following Marlene E. Heinemann, "authenticity devices" for the time in which they were written (1986, 118). Zweig's reputation as an author and his Jewish background gave his statements on Huppert's text a certain authority. His shaping of a 'meaning' to both the text and the experiences of Jewish persecution in general undoubtedly provides a proscriptive framework for the reader and influences the understanding of what follows.

Hilde Huppert's Narrative – Wir wurden vernichtet

Reasserting the collective experience of persecution found in Huppert's original suggestion of a title, her narrative begins with a sub-heading: "Wir wurden vernichtet" [We were destroyed] (17). It is the voice of the survivor which once again claims attention in this simple, powerful phrase. This is in contrast to the title chosen by Zweig which talks about such experiences from an external perspective. Huppert's title begins the narrative with a clear demonstration that an active, identifiable force was responsible for the events which follow.

A short introduction opens the text. Not only is the protagonist's position as a survivor who experienced the destruction of the war between 1939 and 1945 demarcated, but there is also an appeal to different addressees. These are variously named as "unsere Nächsten" [our neighbours], "alle Zeitgenossen" [all my contemporaries], and "die Welt" [the world] (18). Underlying the breadth of these addressees was Huppert's aim to have the text translated and published in as many languages and countries as possible, as can be

seen in her letters to Zweig from the immediate post war period.⁴ Nonetheless, her original choice of writing in German, in spite of the difficulties it posed for her, suggests that a German-speaking audience was her primary target.

According to the introduction, her reasons for writing are fourfold. Firstly, the text should stand as a “Denkschrift” [memorial] for those who were murdered. Secondly, this should in turn, prevent the murder being forgotten, and, thirdly, allow the perpetrators to be punished. Fourthly, there is the aim of retribution, which recurs in the main body of Huppert’s text, and contrasts with the more reconciliatory tone of Zweig’s introductory and concluding comments. A sense of questioning pervades Huppert’s introduction and is linked to an intention that remembering should prevent a recurrence of the horrors. However, it is the imperative to bear witness which forms the basis of Huppert’s report: “Es ist meine Pflicht, in Kürze und der Reihe nach alle Begebenheiten und Erlebnisse, die uns zugestoßen sind, aufzuzeichnen” [It is my duty to detail succinctly and chronologically all the incidents and events which befell us] (18). An obligation to make communicable the horrors is paramount for the narrator and this individual intent is compounded later in the narrative through an assertion of an authentic collective of witnesses: “Wir alle, die in Bergen-Belsen gesessen haben, können diesen Sachverhalt bezeugen” [All of us who were imprisoned in Bergen-Belsen can bear witness to the content of this book] (85).

Huppert’s aim of ‘recording’ events echoes Zweig’s designation of Huppert’s text as “Aufzeichnungen” [notes]. He also refers to the text as a report, stressing its documentary and evidentiary aspects. Issues of genre become significant in the repeated claim to autobiographical authenticity and through the text’s first publication within the series “Building blocks of truth”. Notwithstanding Zweig’s stylistic interventions, Huppert’s introduction fulfils the primary requirement of an autobiography; that is, the author, protagonist and narrator are identical (Lejeune 1989, ix). This fact becomes of increasing importance when further editions of the text are considered. However, when the other requirements of the autobiographical pact are examined we can see how the subject matter of Huppert’s text gives a structure to the memories which subverts the form of autobiography.

⁴ The letters between Huppert and Zweig can be found in the Arnold Zweig Archiv, Stiftung der Archiv der Akademie der Künste (SAdK), Berlin, 19674-19699 1 (B). Letters between Zweig and the ‘Vereinigung der Vefolgtten des Naziregimes’ and the ‘Kultureller Beirat’ from 1950 are catalogued at 20137 11 (8) (52) and those between Zweig and the Union Verlag are at 20135.

Instead of being “the retrospective story of a life” (Lejeune 1989, xiii) Huppert’s autobiography covers only six years, although this time scale is not unusual in survivor testimonies (Hilberg 1988, 19). Apart from two sentences referring to the protagonist’s past life with which the text begins and a short reference to the months following her arrival in Palestine, the narrative focuses on the time between 1939 and 1945. Unlike some survivor autobiographies there is no detailed description of childhood or pre-Holocaust life. In a reflection of the totality of the effect of the persecution, the text does not construct a pre-fascism identity in this way, it does not refer to an “untainted area of reference” of the distant past (Ezrahi 1996, 138). The focus on six years refuses an attempt to normalize and integrate the experiences into a longer autobiographical time frame.

The text is divided into five parts and sub-divided into forty-nine chapters. Each of these very short chapters has a succinct title relating to themes of time, place, people, Jewish identity and the process of persecution, for example “Kriegsbeginn” [The Start of the War], “Krakau”, “Ghetto”, “Das Gefängnis” [Prison], “Der Oberwachmeister” [The Overseer], “Der edle Arzt” [The Noble Doctor], “Eine jüdische Mutter” [A Jewish Mother], “Chanukkah” [The Jewish Festival of Lights], “Aussiedlung” [Resettlement], “Verhaftet” [Arrested], and “Verschickt” [Deported]. Andrea Reiter suggests that such chapter headings are not only structural features but also “a strategy for handling certain experiences. By objectifying them in this way [the author gains] the distance they need to come to terms with them” (2000, 167). As these chapter headings highlight, Huppert’s text contains experiences of prison, ghetto and concentration camp life. The description of the latter follows to a large extent a pattern which Helmut Peitsch has highlighted as being prevalent in testimonies of the immediate post-war period (1990, 107, 136). Food, for example, is a recurrent theme throughout. Both its lack and the dangers involved in its procurement are epitomized in the episode “Eine Rübe” [A Carrot] (89). In contrast, some of the few positive titles of the narrative refer to life-saving food deliveries (“Eine kleine Wandlung” [A Small Change], “Ein Lichtstrahl” [A Ray of Light], and “Rettende Pakete” [Life-saving Packages]). Chapter headings marking out the process of extermination are finally followed by a simple “Befreit” [Liberated] (92). Yet, the brevity of the title hints at its insufficiency. In addition, while the last part begins with the heading announcing liberation, the narrative closes with a chapter called “In Palästina” [In Palestine]. The ending is not just liberation from the camps but the journey to, and arrival in, Palestine. Huppert’s

narrative thus ends on a beginning, with these activities becoming part of her testimony. It is this activity which arguably gives her a driving force when many other survivors succumbed to “release apathy” (Reiter 2000, 48). Unlike some testimonies which emphasize the discontinuity of their past life of persecution and present lives, Huppert’s text concludes with continuity through their new lives in Palestine, through the children who found new families and through the protagonist’s continued correspondence with the “Geretteten” [Saved] (107).

The brevity of the chapter titles is paralleled by concise descriptions of events within the text, a style which emphasizes the abruptly progressive nature of the annihilation:

Der Einzug der siegreichen deutschen Armee in jede polnische Stadt hatte für uns Juden das Ergebnis, daß eine Anzahl der angesehensten Juden mit hoch erhobenen Händen durch die Stadt marschierten, hinter die Stadt gebracht wurden, wo sie sich ihr Grab schaufeln mußten, dann entkleidet, erschossen und verscharrt wurden. (22)

The arrival of the victorious German army in every Polish town had the result for us Jews that a number of well-respected Jews marched through the town with their hands up, were taken to the outskirts where they had to dig their own graves, were stripped, were shot and buried.

Jetzt verstanden wir, was das heißt: “Eine Todeszelle, Vernichtungslager, Fertigmachen, Liquidieren”, lauter Ausdrücke, die uns die Deutschen verstehen lehrten. (84)

Now we understood what such terms meant: “A death cell, extermination camp, finishing someone off, liquidation”, all purely expressions the Germans taught us to understand.

As is illustrated by the above quotations, the narrator employs the first-person plural in describing the persecution of “us Jews”. The use of the plural within Holocaust narratives is significant because one of the “main forms of distancing is the concealment of the personal suffering of the narrator within the ‘we’” (Heinemann 1986, 43). However, in Huppert’s text, the plural voice is interchangeable with the first-person singular, at once uniting the protagonist from the group of those who were murdered and separating her from it. Thus there is a narrative tension, with individuality being constantly juxtaposed with representativeness. Such tension prevents the text from merely becoming “a group portrait” (Heinemann 1986, 75-76). While the Nazi system aimed at complete dehumanization and

deindividualization, there is a clear attempt to reassert a sense of individuality within Huppert's narrative.

Notwithstanding a relatively short six-year period of narrated time, the juxtaposition of plural and singular narrating voices is one way in which the text works on different time levels within each chapter. Indeed, although the narrative is broadly chronological, the intervening voice of the narrating present frequently interrupts the flow. The omnipresence of the experience is thus contained within a "relentless present tense" (Ezrahi 1996, 130; Reiter 2000, 153). As Cathy Caruth has pointed out, the continuing presence for the narrator of Holocaust testimony of images of death and survival are expressed within their narratives through changing tenses and an "immediacy [in] the form of belatedness" (1996, 92).

The disruption of chronology in Huppert's text, which was written almost immediately after the events described, thus refuses containment within a "sealed" narrative of the past (compare Sugolowsky 1990, 135). The very nature of the subject matter ultimately subverts the attempts to order it, such as the prominent dating throughout the text and the naming of the first and second parts as "1. September 1939", (19) and "14. November 1942" (38). There remains a tension between the narrative attempt to regain control over the progression of events and to impose conventions of normality on the timelessness of the world of prison, ghetto and concentration camp (Segev 1991, 3). This adherence to, yet disruption of, chronology is a significant feature of Holocaust testimony (Langer 1975, xii). It is also, Caruth claims, the fact which constitutes the text's historical witness: a witness rooted on "a kind of double telling, the oscillation between a *crisis of death* and the correlative *crisis of life*: between the story of the unbearable nature of an event and the story of the unbearable nature of its survival" (1996, 7).

Through both the use of the present tense and reference to future events, the text retrospectively highlights an inevitable progression of persecution:

Es herrschten Typhus, Verhaftungen und Zwangsarbeit, und das Schlimmste, es besteht eine Furcht, man weiß nicht wovor, aber eine große Angst herrscht im Ghetto [...]. Man drängte sich zur Arbeit, nur um nicht weggeschickt zu werden. Niemand wußte, daß alles vergeblich war, daß ein Vernichtungsplan ausgearbeitet worden war, wie er raffinierter und grausamer nicht erdacht werden konnte. (26)

Typhus, arrests, and forced labour prevailed, and the worst thing is a fear, one doesn't know what of, but a great fear prevails in the ghettos. One forced one's way to work just so as not to be sent away. No one knew that it was all in vain,

that a plan of destruction had been worked out, a more refined and cruel one could not have been made up.

Generic experience is expressed through the impersonal pronoun “man” [one] and the passive tense suggests an omniscient driving force, both of which create the impression of the inexorable nature of events. Yet, combined with this are many references which affirm that the protagonist will survive, did survive. A significant episode of such foresight is when an old woman, whom Huppert and her son Tommy meet in prison, prophesies that they will survive, thus placing an emphasis on the thwarting of Nazi aims. These repeated references to the protagonist’s own survival counterbalance the reinscription of powerlessness that she experiences while re-telling her story (compare Ezrahi 1996, 141).

While the inevitability of persecution is suggested, the haphazard nature of survival is simultaneously emphasized. As Sem Dresden has noted in his analyses of Holocaust testimony: “Chance reigns” (1995, 127). The narrative similarly restates this, not least the description of their life-saving luck with the postal system; had their papers for Palestine arrived a day later they would probably not have received them.

As noted above, in choosing to try to communicate the horrors of her experience, Huppert decided to write in German. Given her feelings of inadequacy with regard to her abilities in this language, the choice is significant. Many survivors found that fascist ideology had corrupted their native German tongue and as a result dissociated themselves permanently from it (Reiter 2000, 96). Huppert’s attempts at recuperation, of writing in the same language used by the Nazis in order to confront a German-speaking audience with the barbarity, demonstrates not only the underlying pedagogical imperative, but also the pervasiveness of the past in the present. In addressing a German audience in their own language, *Engpaß zur Freiheit* confronts them directly on several occasions. This not only reiterates the call for some kind of punishment for their crimes, but it also engages with discourses in Germany prominent at the time of writing which claimed a lack of knowledge about the concentration camps (see Mounier cited in Peitsch 1990, 101). The narrator confronts the reader with the experience of arriving at the railway station: “Ich muß dazu bemerken, daß auf den Bahnhöfen keine SS-Leute Dienst hatten, sondern biedere Deutsche, die heute erklären, sie wüßten von nichts und seien immer gegen das System gewesen” [I should note at this point that those working at the stations were not SS, but worthy Germans who today

say that they didn't know anything and had always been against the system] (47). Such episodes have been highlighted by Peitsch as being present in almost all reports of this kind, however Huppert's is exceptional in that it reflects on the knowledge of the German population (1990, 137). Further reflection occurs towards the end of the text both through the scathing depiction of the wife of a German soldier who had benefited from items taken from the homes of dispossessed Jews, and especially in the way those Germans who had 'lost' their identity papers are described:

Viel belacht wurde auch bei den Amerikanern die Aussage, mit der jeder Deutsche sein Anliegen einleitete, daß er kein Hitler-Anhänger gewesen, sondern von dem Strom mitgerissen worden sei und daß er besonders von Konzentrationslagern keine Ahnung gehabt habe. Hielt man ihnen dann die Frage entgegen, warum sie nicht gegen diese Regierung protestiert hätten, so fiel die prompte Antwort: "Da wären wir ja ins KZ geflogen". (98)

Amongst the Americans there was also much hilarity about the statement with which every German began to plead his case: that he hadn't been a supporter of Hitler but had been caught up with the tide and that he had in particular no idea about the concentration camps. If these people were then confronted with a question about why they hadn't protested against the government, then came the prompt reply: "Well then we would have ended up in a concentration camp".

A confrontation with these discourses illustrates how the expected response of the addressee becomes an integral part of the narrative, with the narrator directly pre-empting and ridiculing the Germans' answers.

While Huppert's text usually refers to "the Germans", rather than "the Nazis" (a fact which becomes significant when later editions are considered), they are not the only ones associated with antisemitism. Beginning the narrative is a statement about the antisemitism of the Polish population as a result of the change of power in the region in October 1938, criticism which is reiterated later in the text. Nevertheless, counterposed with scathing comments about the involvement of the Polish people with the Nazi system are examples of groups and individuals who made different choices. For example, the narrator refers to the Jews of Krakau who helped their fellow sufferers and to the Polish Commandant, a Catholic, who assisted the protagonist in finding her brother-in-law. Such a differentiated picture illustrates a narrative focus on the 'kleiner Faschismus' – of the general population's involvement in, and resistance to, Nazism.

Comments about the actions of others by the present narrator are arguably the site of most personal feeling within Huppert's text:

Er [der polnische Kommandant] war empört, besonders über das, was sie mit den kleinen Kindern gemacht, wie die Deutschen die Kleinen bei den Füßen genommen und den Schädel an den Telegrafentangen eingeschlagen hatten. Mein Begleiter war ein gläubiger Katholik, und er verabscheute als solcher die Bestialitäten der Deutschen. Er hat in seinem Beruf vielen Polen und Juden geholfen. (32)

He [the Polish Commandant] was outraged, particularly about what they had done to the children; how the Germans had picked them up by their feet and smashed their skulls against telegraph poles. My chaperone was a devout Catholic and as such despised the bestialities of the Germans. He helped many Poles and Jews through his work.

In describing both her Jewish helpers and the Polish Commandant, the narrator sees religious devotion as a basis for antifascism. Chapter headings similarly contain both criticism and praise, with two of them referring to external influences: "Hilfe aus dem Ausland" [Help From Abroad] and "Hilfe von draußen" [Help from Outside]. Notwithstanding their similarities, the descriptions within these chapters are diametrically opposed, as one describes apathy which proved life threatening, and the other help which proved life saving. Huppert's confrontation with fascist persecution therefore has an international dimension which corresponds to her decision to address her text to a wide audience. Alongside general calls for accountability there are several occasions where there is a very specific allocation of personal responsibility:

Dieser Herr, der 'st' auf norddeutsche Art getrennt aussprach und lahnte wie Herr Goebbels, hat viele hundert Menschen auf seinem Gewissen und läuft möglicherweise heute noch unbehelligt in Deutschland herum und zehrt von den geraubten Schätzen. (66)

This man, who pronounced his 'st' separately like they do in Northern Germany and limped like Goebbels had many hundreds of people on his conscience and is possibly still walking around freely in Germany, living off stolen treasures.

While there are clear tendencies within the text to focus on the specific in this way, the enormity of the experience is similarly visible. The events of persecution and annihilation are most frequently described as "das Unglück" [the disaster] (29, 31, 33, 54). Such a trope of unutterability is a response to the continued incomprehensibility of the events being described. In the same way

that “the disaster” comes to represent the negative, “ein Wunder” [a miracle] (30, 68), which is echoed in the title chosen by Zweig, signifies a similarly abstract force and is sometimes used in Huppert’s narrative to suggest unexpected positive events and the protagonist’s disbelief at their occurrence. The indefinite article expresses however the relative scarcity of such incidents in the face of the ever pervasive “Unglück”.

Ways of being an Individual: Gender and Jewish Identities

Heinemann has examined how “a common denominator [in texts about the Holocaust] seems to be to preserve as much of individual’s past identity as possible” (1986, 112). Such preservation was not only a means of survival during fascist persecution but also afterwards during the communication of the memories. As Omer Bartov reminds us: “The process of coming to terms with trauma is closely associated with reconstruction of both collective and individual identity and with compensation for loss” (1999, 258). In this section I examine the construction of identities within Huppert’s autobiography, focusing on gender and Jewishness. I consider how an identity of the future is also formed and how it displaces elements of the protagonist’s identity of the past – it is therefore looking at a process not just of reconstruction, but of shaping anew.

Within the first page of Huppert’s text, gendered experiences of persecution become evident. Huppert’s husband leaves for Palestine in order to try to make a living for the family. As Lenore J. Weitzman and Dalia Ofer have pointed out, such “anticipatory reactions” were often based on the fact that many Jews

believed that only men were in real danger, [and therefore] they responded with gender-specific plans [...]. Thus, in formulating their strategies for migration, hiding and escape, they typically decided that men should leave first and have priority for exit visas. (1998, 5)

Notwithstanding this, in her survey of Jewish women in Germany, Marion Kaplan has argued that it was women who “usually saw the danger signals first and urged their husbands to leave” (1995, 34). Reflecting such decisions, Huppert’s text describes how there were only women and children left in the area where she lived, as all the men had already gone to Russia. Hilde Huppert and her son survived mainly because her husband procured Palestinian visas and citizenship

for them; this made them “privileged victims” within the system of persecution. Bearing this in mind does not lead to invidious comparisons between victims, but rather helps to “enlarge our understanding of the impossible choices most Jews faced”, and is significant in the face of claims of representativeness (Kaplan 1995, 15).

The arrest of Hilde Huppert and her family and their transportation to prison demonstrates one of the fundamental elements of persecution – the separation of male and female experience. This was a pattern repeated throughout the process of annihilation, leading to the evident conclusion that “even the most impartial and sensitive male survivor will be unable to provide an insider’s picture of women’s experience” (Heinemann 1986, 3). At first glance though, much of the suffering the protagonist endured focused around realities equally terrible for men. Lack of food, fear of death and the harshness of forced labour feature in Huppert’s descriptions of prison, ghetto and concentration camp. Specifically female fears contained in other survivor reports, such as pregnancy, amenorrhoea, sterilization, and rape are to a large extent absent from Huppert’s text. What becomes pivotal, in contrast, is the protagonist’s identity as a mother.

Had it not been for Palestinian citizenship, the protagonist’s status as mother would undoubtedly have led to her murder at least by the time of arrival in the camp, if not before (Adelsberger 1995, 100; Ringelheim 1985, 746). Huppert’s text is filled with episodes detailing the murder of parents with and without their children. It is in her capacity as a mother that the protagonist discovers the real extent of the Nazi system of persecution. She is told by a fellow worker: “‘Sie sind noch sehr naiv Frau Huppert, wie gerne ich Ihnen das Schwere auch ersparen möchte, aber Sie sind Mutter und müssen wissen, in welchen Händen Sie sich befinden’” [‘You are still very naïve, Mrs Huppert, and no matter how much I would like to spare you the worst, you are a mother and must know in whose hands you find yourself’] (52). However, it is also her role as mother which saves her life, when the children, on the insistence of the protagonist’s own mother, call to her and bring her back from the dangerous unconsciousness of a typhoid fever. The maternal bond is definitely shown as a relationship of reciprocity, with the mother bringing food for Tommy and he in return providing support. Responsibility for another, when all normal patterns of behaviour have been overturned, is both a source of consolation and distress. The description of the daughter who volunteers to be beaten instead of her mother, the parents who volunteer to go with their son to their deaths, and the boy who remains

with his mother rather than accompany the refugees to Palestine all “resonate with the splendour of heroic determination” and yet the fear which the text conveys in these episodes illustrates at the same time “how provisional any position [was] under these circumstances” (Langer 2000, 240). The tortured reply of the Jewish mother in hiding whose young daughter’s identity has just been discovered exemplifies this: “‘Diese Lebensweise wird immer unerträglicher, auch geht mein Geld zu Ende. Als Mutter aber muß ich bis zum Schluß durchhalten, auch wenn es noch so schwer wird’” [‘This way of living is becoming more and more unbearable and I’m also running out of money, but as a mother I have to see it through to the end, even when it is becoming so hard’] (37).

Questions as to whether, due to prior socialization, women coped better through the experiences of persecution are rendered obsolete in Huppert’s text. Both positive male and female figures are described as coming to the aid of people in need. An essential femaleness is not valorized or imbued with any positive or ethical value, due to the lengthy critical portrayal of the German soldier’s wife at the end of the text. Nonetheless, there is a strong feeling of the importance of female support within the family. As Peitsch has pointed out, the way in which an author approaches issues of individuality or communal solidarity shapes to a certain extent how they write their report (1990, 139). In Huppert’s text a focus on the family illustrates the merciless destructiveness of Nazism as her sisters are murdered one by one. The relationship of the protagonist to her mother becomes increasingly important and also pervades the post-war context: her mother’s murder was one of the reasons behind Huppert’s decision to write in the first place. Their separation, reunion and ultimate parting is one of the most emotive themes within the text.

At the end of the narrative, the surviving children become representative of new hope, not only for those in Palestine, but also for parents in Europe. The desperation of French couples willing to adopt is testament to a need to try in some way to recoup irretrievable loss. Huppert’s role as the quasi mother for many orphans, personified in the figure of Lili, is one which tries to fulfil the impossible role “alles [zu] ersetzen, was ihnen das Wüten des Krieges und der Nazi-Irrsinn zerstört hat” [of replacing everything that the ravages of war and Nazi madness have destroyed for them] (107).

Intersections of gender and Jewishness are emphasized in the chapter “Eine jüdische Mutter” [A Jewish mother]. This chapter heading suggests, through the indefinite article, a generic fate. In the brief farewells of the protagonist’s sisters, the horror of a mother’s

loss is embodied. Juxtaposed with this is a characterization of the mother as admirable and hardworking, and her guilt at having gone into hiding. In her cry of: “Ich habe mich versteckt, und sie [the daughter] ist gegangen” [‘I hid and my daughter has gone’] (33), we hear the echoes of the protagonist’s brother-in-law’s earlier comments: “Ich verfluche mich, daß ich immer noch lebe” [‘I curse myself for still being alive’] (32). The torments of survivor guilt present in so many survivor reports are here emphasized as some of the few occasions of direct speech in Huppert’s text.

The description of “einige Mutige” [some courageous people] who got hold of ‘Aryan’ identity papers and of others who joined the Partisans raises questions about the representation of resistance within the text, followed as the latter is by the narrative comment: “Der einzig richtige Ausweg” [the only proper way out] (34). Not only in the description of her mother, but also through several other characters, the narrator-protagonist portrays a narrative of Jewish resistance. Possibilities for any kind of action are encapsulated in the spectrum between the chapter titles of “Selbsthilfe” [Self-help] and “Unschuldig ermordet” [Innocently Murdered]. The poignant hopelessness of the protagonist’s sister who declares that she no longer wants to save herself is followed by the actions of Dr. Fink, a doctor in the ghetto Rymanow, who resisted:

Dem Dr. Fink war es natürlich klar, daß er sich sein Todesurteil selbst gesprochen [sic], aber er konnte nicht schweigen, zu groß war das Unrecht, das man seinen Glaubensbrüdern und -schwestern angetan [...]. Unseren Dr. Fink haben sie totgeschlagen, aber sein Andenken bewahren wir in unseren Herzen. (30-31)

Obviously it was clear to Dr. Fink that he had pronounced his own death sentence, but he could not remain silent. The injustice being done to his fellow believers was too great [...]. They beat our Dr. Fink to death, but we preserve his memory in our hearts.

The text conveys very clearly on more than one occasion the merciless reactions towards those who resisted. Dr Fink’s murder is followed by that of a man known only to the protagonist through her having overheard his despairing comments:

In der Nacht weckte uns wüster Lärm; an der Stimme, die da schrie, erkannten wir unseren unbekanntem Freund. Als jetzt die Reihe an ihn kam, widersetzte er sich mit allen Kräften, aber was half es ihm? Schüsse – Schweigen... (45)

We were woken in the night by a wild din. We recognized the voice of the one who was screaming as that of our unknown friend. When it was his turn he fought with all his strength, but what good did it do him? Shots – silence...

Helplessness and collective suffering are here signified in the personal and possessive plural. The abruptness and finality of death are encompassed in this last short sentence, leaving “a fragmentary impression, although each instance is in itself complete” (Dresden 1995, 28). Here the factual narrative style “conveys an impression of detached observation”, but it may also, as Andrea Reiter suggests, “be due to a sense of helpless outrage” (2000, 168). In contrast to these episodes of impotence are set scenes where the protagonist halts the fatal disintegration of hope, for example, when she stops her father-in-law from taking poison during their transportation in a packed lorry to the Rzeszow ghetto. Another event which might be considered heroic in terms of the protagonist’s own actions is when she confesses to having shut a work-room door although she was not responsible for doing so. The seemingly harmless act was nevertheless punishable by severe beating. This episode is not narrated in terms of the protagonist’s success, merely as an opportunity to win time in a dangerously unpredictable situation. Nevertheless, one of the reasons which accentuates behaviour such as this is its juxtaposition with the ‘heroism’ of the perpetrators. The chapter in which the protagonist’s bravery is described is entitled “Der ‘Held’ des Ghettos” [The ‘Hero’ of the Ghetto] (52) and refers to the inspector of their workplace. This is one of several instances when Germans are referred to ironically as heroes while committing atrocious crimes: “Als eine der ersten Heldentaten wurden die Gotteshäuser verbrannt, wobei sich die Deutschen sehr amüsierten, aber tüchtig genug waren, zuerst das Silber aus den Tempeln herauszuholen” [As one of their first heroic deeds the synagogues were burned down, during which the Germans amused themselves considerably but were efficient enough to first of remove the silver from the temples] (22). Reiter examines how irony and sarcasm such as this are devices often found in concentration camp reports relating to criticism of the SS. She suggests that

in order to be able to describe their strongest impressions from the camps, the authors consciously belittle them in retrospect and thereby place them at a more bearable distance. By speaking ironically in general terms, they are best able to protect themselves from the fresh shock that accompanies any recollection of traumatic experience. (2000, 131)

Biting sarcasm pervades Huppert's report, not only in the representation of Bergen-Belsen but also in the depiction of the time before their arrival in the concentration camp. In so criticizing the perpetrators and pointing to the inherent cowardice of attacking those in a weaker position than themselves, the narrative of Jewish resistance is given more weight.

Given the general scarcity of information about Jewish religiosity in the concentration camps, it is important to consider the role it plays in the different stages of Huppert's report and how such description interacts with other elements of identity. Attacks against Jewish symbols of sanctity, such as the synagogues, are described by the narrator as one of the first atrocities. Along with the presence of rabbinical characters, the observance of "Chanukkah" in the cattle trucks is the most significantly religious episode and is emphasized by the chapter heading of the same name. Other survivor reports have shown how the marking of important dates in the Jewish calendar became an occasion of terror for many as the persecution progressed according to 'Goebbel's calendar' especially designed to accentuate the humiliation and destroy the sanctity of Jewish festivals (Rahe 1993, 90). For the protagonist however, this episode provides some solace: "Das war der alte Krosnoer Rabbiner, der sich bei uns befand. Er begrüßte den Sabbath, wie Juden ihn seit über 1000 Jahren begrüßten, und zündete das erste Chanukkah-Kerzchen an. Richtig!" [It was the old Rabbi from Krosno who was with us. He welcomed in the Sabbath just as Jews have done for more than 1000 years and lit the first little Chanukkah candle. Quite Right!] (48) By situating herself in an historical continuum the protagonist draws on the strength of continuity and collective identity.

This emphasis on the religious aspects of Jewish identity is accompanied by more clearly Zionist sentiments. While the latter are expressed at the beginning of the text through reference to the protagonist's elder brother who was living in Palestine, they become progressively stronger and eventually displace all possibilities of Czech national identity and all religious references. The geographical shift from a Czech national affiliation to a Palestinian one encapsulates the complete, irreversible, ostracization of the protagonist from her home. The protagonist's distancing from the religious sphere is maybe more surprising. However, religious narratives bring with them the necessity for forgiveness, not revenge, something that Huppert's text does not allow.

The longed-for world of Palestine is constantly juxtaposed with the harsh realities of life in prison, in the ghetto and in Bergen-Belsen. In

this way Huppert's narrative subverts a tendency of autobiography and memoir to "orient us towards the past rather than shaping fresh visions of the future" (Langer 1975, 75). As the end of the narrative draws near, the children's optimism conveys the importance of the Jewish state where the mere fact of being a Jew did not attract violence. This safety is contrasted to a situation of the murder of "junge Menschen, die das Unglück hatten, als Juden zur Welt zu kommen" [young people who had the misfortune of coming into the world as Jews] (26).

The ending is not just significant in terms of hopes for the future but is also highly meaningful with regards to the intersection of Jewishness and gender. Huppert takes control of a large group of children from Bergen-Belsen and Buchenwald; it is she who organizes their journey with the Red Cross and accompanies them to Palestine. A very significant role of leadership is thus portrayed and as such is notable in the context of women's usual roles in Eastern European Jewish society at that time. While Huppert and her sisters were well educated due to the wealth and class of her family, she was nevertheless subject to the prevalent patriarchal norms. Without wishing to valorize in any way the oppressive circumstances which led to the protagonist's post-liberation activities, I would agree with Yehuda Bauer's assertion that such descriptions are nonetheless important in considering how people coped with the terrible aftermath of the Holocaust. Nevertheless, Bauer's caveat with regards to examining leadership qualities of Jewish women during the Nazi years is also important. Writing of how infrequently Jewish women enjoyed any position of leadership in pre-fascism Eastern Europe, he continues:

When we speak today about the role of women in society and transpose our attitudes to the period of the Holocaust, we are doing something ahistoric. When we point out the heroic role, or the leading role, or the tragic but special role of Jewish women at that time, we tend to endow them with a consciousness that they did not possess and assign them a role that they were not aware of. They did not see themselves as fighting for their status as women in a male-dominated society; rather, they fought for the survival of their group, for revenge, for Jewish honor, for their own survival. They could do that because of the collapse of Jewish patriarchal society under the blows of the Nazis. Jewish society would not have allowed them to such a position in times of peace. (2001, 185)

Communicating the Horrors

The ways in which these different strands of identity are depicted are inextricably linked with the wider issue of how the narrator communicates the memories and how they were judged by the readers at the time of publication. The aim, and almost impossibility of, communication is prioritized throughout. Certain experiences are so horrific that the narrator maintains that they are unforgettable. These memories, relating to the murder of those in the barracks next to her, and the punishment of a prisoner for cannibalism, haunted the protagonist throughout the period of her persecution and still do. In contrast, the limits of memory are also explicitly referred to. The narrator notes how some information contained in the autobiography came from other witnesses, including a lawyer incarcerated in the Rzeszow ghetto. References to other sources are ways of both suggesting the authenticity of the memories and of emphasizing the disorientation of the victims who were unaware of the scale of the extermination at that time. Not knowing is focussed on throughout and is in itself a significant part of the trauma even when juxtaposed with the knowledge of individual survival (Caruth 1996, 3). The narrator 'fills in the gaps' for the readers with information external to the narrated time and prevents them from experiencing the same confusion. The text thus constructs a narrator who is explicitly conscious of issues of communication. This may be due, in part, to the very first experience of trying to tell her story, of the disbelief and the "collapse of witnessing" she encountered when she tried to tell her story to an American soldier (Felman and Laub 1992, 65). Mirroring the events of the narrative itself, the first communication of her story in Palestine was as an oral testimony – she had to read it to Zweig due to his bad eyesight. Indeed, in his article of 1990 Shmuel Huppert presents us with a very vivid description from his mother of how "every so often Zweig would tap on the table, signifying to pause. Then he would correct a word or change a sentence. I would rush to record his version lest I would not finish writing before he would urge, 'continue'" (S. Huppert 1990, 163). Having such a physical presence to confront the events with is possibly one of the reasons that the written text is constantly aware of the presence of an addressee, involving them in the narrative in several places and asking for their opinion, for example: "Das Urteil über die Oberin dieses Klosters überlasse ich den Lesern dieser Zeilen" [I will leave the readers to make their own judgement of the Mother Superior of the convent] (36). As Peitsch has shown in his discussion of autobiography of the

Western zones in the immediate post-war period, there was often a connection between the oral communication of survivor reports and written text (1990, 101). This was linked to an awareness on the part of the survivors that they were already facing competing versions of events. In Huppert's text such an awareness is obvious through her assertive references to the post-war trials. For example, referring to the former concentration camp commander Kramer, who claimed under oath that he believed those under his command were treating the inmates humanely, she writes simply that he lied.

From a distance of nearly sixty years it is difficult to determine how Huppert's text was received in the prisoner of war camp in 1947. However, it is possible to speculate as to the reasons why the text was only published in Egypt, in spite of many attempts to have it published elsewhere. When Zweig wrote his conclusion of 1946 he admitted:

Den Widerstand, auf welchen er [der Bericht] treffen wird, unterschätzen wir nicht, abgesehen von der Abneigung des Zeitgenossen, die ökonomischen Verhältnisse zu erörtern, unter denen er lebt. (117)

We don't underestimate the resistance this report will face, irrespective of the reluctance of contemporaries to discuss the economic conditions in which they exist.

Nevertheless, the comments of his second introduction after sixteen months suggest that in fact he did not expect such universal refusal. In the following section I discuss briefly the prevalent conditions of publication facing texts such as Huppert's in Palestine and divided Germany.

On her arrival in Palestine in July 1945, Huppert's attempts to tell people her story were, according to her son, initially thwarted (S. Huppert 1999, 193). Likewise once the text had been completed, and reworked by Zweig, the expected response from the Israeli publishers did not come:

Zweig war überzeugt, die israelischen Verlage würden ihm das Manuskript aus der Hand reißen und das Buch werde ein Bestseller. "So wie mein 'Sergeant Grischa'!", sagte er. Doch zum allgemeinen Erstaunen von Zweig und meiner Eltern lehnten die Verlage das Manuskript ab. Die Verleger schrieben, die wunderbare Geschichte habe sie sehr beeindruckt, aber die israelische Leserschaft sei noch nicht so weit, ein derart erschütterndes Zeugnis zu lesen. Sie schlugen Mutter vor, sich in Geduld zu fassen und das Manuskript in einer Schublade aufzubewahren. (S. Huppert 1999, 195)

Zweig was convinced that the Israeli publishers would eagerly snatch the manuscript from his hands and that the book would become a bestseller. "Just

like my 'Sergeant Grisha'!", he said. But to the astonishment of Zweig and my parents, the publishers rejected the manuscript. The publishers wrote that the wonderful story had impressed them very much but that the Israeli readers were not yet ready to read such a harrowing testament. They suggested that my mother be patient and store it away in a drawer.

Zweig's letters to Lion Feuchtwanger during the late 1940s are a testament to his many efforts at publication in Israel, where the manuscript was rejected by seven Hebrew publishers. While it is beyond the scope of this study to discuss in detail the politics of remembering the Holocaust in Israel, it is notable that several authors have written about a significant focus on the history of the Diaspora in Palestine and Israel in the immediate post-war period and up until 1961. This had the effect of displacing to some extent survivors' narratives of the Holocaust, although there were of course exceptions (Segev 1991, 11; Felman 1992, 228-29; Zimmerman 1994, 391; Bauer 2001, 242-60). It was in this context that not only Zweig, but also Shmuel Huppert, who attempted to get the text published in 1955 as a Hebrew translation entitled *Vehashohet Sahat* [*The Slaughterer Slaughtered*], were so unsuccessful. It is significant that Zweig's status as an author in Palestine was not as influential as Huppert might have hoped. As Bodenheimer informs us:

Zweig, der Deutschland als Autor von Weltruf verlassen hatte, fand sich in seiner 'neuen Heimat' in Haifa in jeder Hinsicht an der Peripherie der Gesellschaft wieder: Der kleine Literaturbetrieb wie das Alltagsleben des Jischuw waren radikal auf das Hebräische ausgerichtet. (2000, 633)

Zweig, who had left Germany as an author with an international reputation, found himself in every respect on the periphery of society in his new 'Homeland' of Haifa. The small publishing industry, as well as everyday life, was fundamentally orientated towards Hebrew.

Nevertheless, Zweig's failed attempts to get the text published in Palestine did not diminish his determination. As Hilde Huppert recalls:

I rushed back to Arnold Zweig to read the letters [of refusal] to him. The author, who hadn't been well treated by the publishers in Palestine and who was disappointed by the Hebrew readers, responded angrily when he heard the rebuffs, but tried to reassure me: "I am planning to travel to Europe. There I will find a famous publisher for you". (S. Huppert 1990, 164)

Notwithstanding Zweig's confidence, his attempts to get Huppert's autobiography published in either the Eastern or the Western zones

also failed. While there is no indication in his correspondence of the reasons for rejection, an examination of the historical context in the immediate post-war period can suggest the difficulties he may have encountered, as hinted at by Detlev Claussen:

[Zweig's] decision to leave exile in Palestine and go into the Soviet occupied zone did not help the reception of his work. In the West, he was quickly seen as a notorious hard-liner who had long ago reached his peak as a writer; in the East he was promoted, but he couldn't achieve everything that he had imagined was part of antifascist cultural production. (1997, 671)

Peitsch has discussed how, in contrast to the much-repeated claim of silence about the Holocaust, between 1945 and 1949 one hundred "Erlebnisberichte" [survivor reports] were published in the Western Zones and Sectors, forty-two of them categorizable as "KZ-Literatur" [literature about the concentration camps] (1990, 102). Among the authors of those reports the majority were Christians and Communists (1989, 184). However, by the time of Zweig's return to Germany in 1948 there was a gradual turn away from the publication of such testimony. Given the significance of the political orientation of the authors of the reports that were published, I would suggest that Zweig's introduction and conclusion would have played a fundamental role in the text being rejected, had it been submitted to publishers licensed in the West. The beginning of the Cold War was already shaping the conditions of publication, especially so by the time of his second introduction. As Peitsch writes, by 1947 the term antifascism was already a synonym for pro-Soviet sympathies (1990, 122). Zweig's criticism of the British Government, his broad linking of fascism and capitalism to the Holocaust, his insistence on a class-based analysis, and his repeated reference to an antifascism based upon it, would have positioned him clearly within an anti-Western camp.

Conditions for the publication of survivor autobiographies in the Soviet Zone were similarly pervaded by narratives of the Cold War. However, before considering why Huppert's text did not find an East German publisher until 1951 it is necessary to sound a note of caution. All too often, and particularly since 1990, discussion of the Soviet Zone of occupation and later the GDR has been reduced to problematic dismissals of its antifascism as "verordnet", that is, prescriptively imposed from above. In contrast, an examination of the competing tendencies at different times in the official discourses of antifascism can be much more productive (Heukenkamp 1996, 189; Kühnrich 1992, 819-33). This involves both the recognition that

publication practice often diverged from political agenda and that different spheres within the state and society contained contradictory forces (O'Doherty 2000, 75).

Official antifascism in the Soviet Zone and GDR focused on, and was shaped by, issues of concern both at home and abroad (Groehler 1994, 233). As early as July 1945 distinctions arose, to be legally consolidated four years later, as to who should be awarded compensation as "Opfer des Faschismus" [victims of fascism] and who as "Kämpfer gegen den Faschismus" [fighters against fascism] (Groehler 1993a, 47-48; Jung 1998, 54). Controversy over the inclusion of Jewish victims in the former category was based on, and helped to perpetuate, a narrative of Jewish passivity. It reflected a belief that antisemitism stemmed from the tensions between the classes. Groehler points out that many of the surviving Jews in the Soviet Zone and later GDR did not come from the working class but from the petit-bourgeoisie. He argues that there was a significant faction within the KPD/SED which was influenced by proletarian prejudice and which therefore did not consider Jews to be victims. Huppert's narrative describes her wealthy family, a wealth which saved them from starvation on several occasions. The emphases of official discourse which were based on Georgi Dimitrov's theory of fascism meant that the Holocaust was not seen in its specificity but as a consequence of fascist ideology which was itself a result of capitalism (Timm 1997, 388). As Jürgen Danyel highlights, the result was that there were already "sehr früh nach 1945 deutliche Tendenzen der politischen Ausgrenzung und Ignoranz insbesondere gegenüber den jüdischen Opfern des NS-Regimes" [clear tendencies very early after 1945 towards political exclusion and ignorance, particularly towards Jewish victims of the NS regime] (1993, 146).

Nevertheless, the immediate post-war period in the Soviet Zone did see the publication of concentration camp reports from many different perspectives, including those of Jewish survivors (Taterka 2000, 314). However, within two years this was to change with a backlash against the so-called "Greueliteratur" [terror literature] (Barck 1997, 266). In 1947 an organization called the VVN (Vereinigung der Verfolgten des Naziregimes) was set up specifically to look after the interests of those persecuted by the Nazis. However, there were already voices from the SED members within the very same organization, which declared that literature about the concentration camps which had been published up until that point was inappropriate. Criticism of "Leidensliteratur" [literature of suffering] and a prejudice in favour of the portrayal of

“kämpferische[r] Antifaschismus” [militant antifascism] (Groehler 1994, 240) meant that:

noch ehe die Vielfalt des Lager-Erlebens in ihrer alltäglichen Schrecklichkeit dokumentiert war, begann sich so eine Ausgrenzung der spezifischen Erfahrung und Erlebnisse der jüdischen Massenverfolgten abzuzeichnen. (Barck 1997, 269)

even before the diversity of camp experience had been documented in its quotidian horror, an exclusion of the specific experiences of the Jews who had been persecuted *en masse* began to emerge.

By the time Zweig returned to East Germany in 1948, not only a wave of antisemitic attacks and supposed and real ignorance as to the horrors of the immediate past, but also institutional pressures to emphasize the communist fight against fascism were all competing against those survivors who were trying to make their voices heard.

In 1949 the VVN was awarded a licence for publishing books. The licence was originally aimed at the publication of resistance literature, which was to include reports, diaries, and so-called ‘camp literature’ (Jung 1998, 61). Its programme contained particular emphasis on reports of eye-witnesses (Barck 1997, 268). However, in the same year competing tendencies within the central committee of the VVN led to a debate on 9 November culminating in a statement from the committee which proclaimed “daß es keine Judenprobleme mehr in der SBZ gebe [sic]. Die jüdische Frage sei [sic] einfach damit geklärt” [there is no longer a ‘Jewish problem’ in the Soviet Zone. Thus the Jewish Question has simply been solved] (Groehler 1993b, 54). The sense of finality in this statement has led Danyel to describe 1949 as a caesura, albeit not absolute, in the politics of remembrance of the Soviet Zone and GDR (1995, 31).

In a context where Zweig increasingly felt threatened by the antisemitic campaign initiated by Stalin in 1949 and where anti-Zionism was becoming an integral part of SED policy and could promote a state-sanctioned latent antisemitism (see Groehler 1993b, 52; Timm 1997, 398), he attempted to get Huppert’s text published.

From *Engpaß zur Freiheit* to *Fahrt zum Acheron*

In 1949 Zweig succeeded in getting the text published in Czechoslovakia, with a print run of fifteen thousand copies (Huppert 1949). At the same time, as letters from this period indicate, he

continued his efforts to find an East German publisher and approached the VVN. However, from 1950, the VVN was fighting a battle to keep to its original programme while at the same time being marginalized politically. In order to have a chance of publication, Zweig had to make changes in Huppert's manuscript to accord with the demands of the party leadership of the publishing house. The VVN was required to turn more towards a "Gegenwarts- und zukunftsweisenden Perspektive" [a perspective which emphasized the present and looked to the future] (Jung 1998, 61). The shift in emphasis resulted in "inhaltliche Korrekturen an Manuskripten und den Verlagsprogrammen" [substantive alterations to manuscripts and the publishing programme] and led to a renewed focus on resistance literature (Barck 1997, 265, 284).

Zweig's alterations to the manuscript amounted to three pages, doubling his interventions in Huppert's original text. These modifications were on the insistence of the censor, although Zweig's letter to the "Kultureller Beirat" [Advisory Board for Culture] shows that he refused to make all the changes they demanded (Barck 1997, 284). Zweig's choice of title, *Fahrt zum Acheron* [Journey to Acheron] refers to one of the four rivers of Hades, the river of woe or pain. His recourse to metaphor to represent Huppert's narrative is in stark contrast to the almost complete absence of such a linguistic device in the original text. Indeed, it is a title which was originally expressly rejected by Hilde Huppert, as is shown in a letter from her to Zweig on 13 May 1956. A letter six days later contains the assertion by Zweig that "die Änderung des Titels 'Der Weg zum Acheron' [sic] nötig [würde], weil der Verlag mit dem erst vorgeschlagenen Titel unzufrieden war" [the change of the title 'The Way to Acheron' was necessary because the publisher was unhappy with the title first suggested]. According to Shmuel Huppert (pers. com. 2001) his "mother rejected the mythological title *Fahrt zum Acheron*, that Zweig favoured. She wrote in a simple concrete German, and the title seemed too rhetorical to her". Nevertheless it was with this title that the text went to print.

For the 1951 publication Zweig made alterations to the main body of the text as well as to his introductions and conclusion. As Barck has suggested, these changes were in response to the new addressees in the GDR and demonstrate the already concretizing political constellations of the Cold War (1997, 285). One such example is that rather than addressing all Europeans in the closing sentiments of the introduction, Zweig instead writes: "Es wäre nur gut, wenn die Atlantikpartner etwas daraus lernten und uns und unseren Kindern

eine Wiederholung ersparten" [It would be good if our Atlantic partners could learn something from the book and spare our children a repetition] (1951, 10). In the 1951 edition Zweig emphasizes his Marxist understanding of Zionism in his additional footnotes meant for his new GDR audience. For example, his reference to explain "Kibbutzim" states that they are "Arbeiter-siedlungen, nach dem Prinzip eines utopischen Kommunismus errichtet" [worker's settlements set up according to the principles of utopian Communism] (Zweig 1951, 105). Zweig's closing comments are addressed to Huppert and, in doing so, make the link between the new socialist state and Zionism ever more explicit, coming closer to a utopian answer to the question first suggested in the earlier edition:

Und Sie, liebe Hilde Huppert, verknüpft (sic) unsere vor fünf Jahren begründete Arbeitsgemeinschaft und Ihre Rettung aus den Todeslagern mit dem freilich noch bleichen Sonnenaufgang, der die zweite Hälfte des 20. Jahrhunderts einleitet und der uns vorkommen will wie eine Sinngebung – die Antwort auf Ihre Frage, warum das alles geschehen sei. Die Grundlagen unserer Vergesellschaftung erfreuten sich nur einer dumpfen Vernünftigkeit, einer von Zufall allzuoft bestimmten Planlosigkeit. Jetzt erkennen wir immer deutlicher die schädlichen Lücken und schließen sie, indem wir verständig planen, planvoll ordnen und geordnet handeln. Und das tut doch wohl, nicht wahr, und schlägt eine Brücke von Berlin nach Haifa, die sich fast anläßt wie ein zarter Regenbogen. (121)

And you, dear Mrs Huppert, link our working relationship, founded five years ago, and your rescue from the death camps with the admittedly still pale rising of the sun which inaugurates the second half of the twentieth century and seems to us like it gives us a meaning - the answer to your question about why it all happened. The foundations of our nationalization take pleasure only in a dull rationality, in a certain lack of planning which was all to often down to chance. Now we can see the harmful gaps more and more clearly and we are closing them by planning sensibly, organizing according to plan, and behaving in an orderly way. And that feels good, doesn't it? And it builds a bridge from Berlin to Haifa, which has begun to form almost like a delicate rainbow.

Zweig's emphasis on the links between the GDR and Israel are significant, given that they were published at a time when official relations between the states were increasingly tense following Israel's demand for reparations for the Jewish victims of the Holocaust (Timm 1997, 128).

Fahrt zum Acheron retains the original structure and titles, with only minor variations, but omits the chapter heading "Befreit" [Liberated]. Simone Barck has examined how substantive changes to the manuscript relate to three themes (1997, 282-83): firstly, to statements about the involvement and responsibility of Germans for

the Holocaust; secondly, the deletion of statements about Polish and Ukrainian antisemitism; and thirdly, regarding a shortening of the description about the British and American allies and a removal of comments criticising the lack of allied help. In a letter from Zweig to the Advisory Board for Culture on 7 June 1951 it is clear that they demanded further deletions in this respect, which Zweig did not concede. He writes:

[Ich] halte mich weiterhin an meinem Text, was die Rolle der Amerikaner bei der Befreiung der Nazi-Opfer im Jahre 1945 angeht. Das Buch wird eine internationale Wirkung haben und darf nicht von der historischen Gegebenheit abweichen, da damals und noch zu Zeiten der Nürnberger Prozesse die von Roosevelt geschaffene Einheitsfront in Wirksamkeit war.

I continue to stand by my text with regards to the role of the Americans in the liberating of Nazi victims in 1945. The book will have international reach and must not deviate from historical fact, since at that time and also during the Nuremberg Trials, the united front created by Roosevelt was still a reality.

Barck sees the replacement of references to “the Germans” by “the Nazis”, “the Fascists”, or “the SS-Men”, as demanded by the Advisory Board for Culture on 7 June 1951, as being symptomatic of both Zweig’s refusal of the ‘collective guilt theory’ and also as a reflection of the SED’s policy of reintegration of former fascists (1997, 283). In addition, as Angelika Timm highlights, such alterations arose from the definition of fascism promoted at that time, which did not see the majority of the population as responsible for the persecution of the European Jews (1997, 388). This alteration fundamentally changes the way in which Huppert’s text engages with questions of the responsibility of ordinary Germans.

In 1951 *Fahrt zum Acheron* was finally published with a print run of twenty thousand. Despite Zweig’s reiteration in the introduction that he was not the author of the book, it is only his name which appears on the front cover. This was undoubtedly an attempt to increase book sales as readers would more than likely assume his authorship. It has also led to the text being included in bibliographies of Zweig’s work with no mention of Huppert; for example, in a contemporary edition of *Sinn und Form: Beiträge zur Literatur. Sonderheft Arnold Zweig* edited by the Deutsche Akademie der Künste, *Fahrt zum Acheron* is included under Zweig’s novella and short stories (1952, 284). Such gendered canonization has likewise been perpetuated by some academics who mistakenly assume Zweig’s authorship: Jung refers to “Arnold Zweig’s short story” in his discussion of GDR censorship (1998, 69; similarly, Reuter and Hansel

1997, 140). The publication of this text, as is demonstrated in letters between Huppert and Zweig, raises some important questions as to the autobiographical pact. A “process of creative adoption” (S. Huppert 1990, 167) initially detectable in Zweig’s letters to Feuchtwanger is brought into sharp contrast in letters between Huppert and Zweig, where Huppert claims that she had not, as Barck speculates, transferred the rights of ownership of the manuscript to Zweig for the publication in 1951. The letters demonstrate an increasingly acrimonious relationship, with a marked change in tone which modulates from the originally friendly correspondence to a battle for authorship. For example, initial references by Huppert to possible publications of “*unser gemeinsames Buch*” [our joint book] in March and May of 1950 are followed by a letter from Huppert to Zweig five years after publication stating:

Nur durch Zufall kam mir mein Buch mit einem neuen Titel in deutscher Sprache zu Handen [sic]. Nachdem ich niemandem ein Recht zum Drucke meiner Schilderungen gab, wäre ich Ihnen geehrter Herr Zweig für eine Aufklärung der näheren Umstände dankbar.

It was only by chance that my book with a new title in German fell into my hands. As I gave no one the rights to publish my account I would be grateful dear Mr Zweig for an explanation of the circumstances.

She continues: “[Es handelt sich] nicht um eine gemeinsame Arbeit, sondern um mein Buch” [It is not about a joint piece of work but about my book] (15 March 1956). In a letter two months later, Huppert reiterates: “Sie hatten daher keine rechtliche Genehmigung [sic] mein Buch in Deutschland unter Ihrem Namen [...] zu publizieren” [You therefore had no legal permission to publish my book under your name in Germany] (13 May 1956). Following a request by Huppert, Zweig sent her copies of *Fahrt zum Acheron*. In a seemingly reconciliatory, yet simultaneously possessive gesture, he wrote a dedication inside: “To the girl Huppert, the mother of the book, with heartfelt blessings from its father. Arnold Zweig” (S. Huppert 1990, 168). Shmuel Huppert has more recently characterized his mother’s relationship to Zweig as a mixture of “gratitude, amazement and anger” (S. Huppert pers. com. 2001).

Shmuel Huppert has written that *Fahrt zum Acheron* was very successful in East Germany in the 1950s and 1960s, although this seems to be partly contradicted by other sources. Zweig writes to Huppert as early as June 1950 that “ein Stoff wie der unseres Buches stösst jetzt auf Widerstand” [material like that in our book now meets

with resistance], and yet a letter to him from the VVN only six months later expresses regret at the delay in publication as many people had already pre-ordered the text following pre-launch publicity. A letter from July 1956 to Huppert from Zweig's secretary referring to the amount of books sold is similarly ambiguous. It includes the comment:

Inzwischen haben wir festgestellt, daß die Gesamtauflage von 20,000 Exemplaren zum ursprünglichen Preise von DM 3.25 nicht abgesetzt werden konnte. 1953 wurde der Preis herabgesetzt, es läßt sich zur Zeit nicht ermitteln um wieviel [...].

We have meanwhile established that the total print run of 20,000 copies could not be sold at the original price of DM 3.25. In 1953 the price was reduced, although it is not possible to determine at this time by how much [...].

However, earlier letters state that Huppert was owed DM 3,000 from the 1951 edition and that she and Zweig were to share all royalties equally. If the DM 6,000 royalties represented a ten percent share of the book's total income, this would suggest that most of the copies had indeed been sold. Huppert eventually received payment for this 1951 edition on 23 January 1961. Zweig reiterates in 1958 in a letter to Feuchtwanger "daß mein nach der Niederschrift von Hilde Huppert geschriebenes 'Acheron'-Büchlein völlig im Leeren verpuffte" [that my little 'Acheron' book, which I wrote following the draft by Hilde Huppert has disappeared into thin air] (Feuchtwanger and Zweig 1986, 358). He wrote to Huppert in August 1958 that "Exemplare unseres Buches sind im Buchhandel nicht mehr aufzutreiben" [it is no longer possible to get hold of copies of our book in bookshops]. There was certainly not a lot of attention from the press, with only one brief review in 1952 (Burberg cited in Barck 1997, 285).

During the ten years between *Fahrt zum Acheron*'s first and second publication – 1951 to 1961 – there were many contradictory signals within GDR antifascism with regards to philo- and antisemitic measures. Groehler points out that although the subject of 'Jews' was for different reasons subject to taboo, he insists that cautious attempts were nonetheless being made by the state to try and rid it of the stigma of antisemitism (1993, 52). Such signs included commemorations in 1954 and 1956 of the November pogrom of 1938. Groehler's recognition of these opposing tendencies is important in reiterating that the official policy of antifascism was by no means monolithic. In contrast to the claim that in the GDR Jewish voices were silenced after 1953, a silence which supposedly lasted for at least another ten years

(Jung 1998, 65), the second publication of Huppert's text in 1961 represents an exception.

Fahrt zum Acheron was published in 1961 with the Union Verlag, the VVN having been disbanded in East Germany in 1953. The print run comprised only 3,000 copies and it was not subsequently reprinted. Arnold Zweig appeared both as editor and author of the book, despite an explicit request by Huppert in November 1961 that the book should appear as a "Huppert-Zweig" book. In Zweig's letters to the Union Verlag there is discussion about the title (Zweig suggested changing it to "Hitlerfahrt zum Acheron" but this was rejected by the publishers), but there is no mention of Huppert's request, or indeed, of her authorship. Zweig maintained to Huppert in February 1961 that "es ist leider verlagsgesetzlich unmöglich, Ihren Namen als Mitverfasserin meiner 'Fahrt zum Acheron' auf den Umschlag und den Titel zu setzen" [it is unfortunately impossible due to publishing legalities to put your name as co-author of my 'Journey to Acheron' on the front cover and title page]. He thus extended his proprietorial claim to the text. The book appeared with minor changes, which according to Union Verlag were to reflect the "veränderte Weltsituation" [altered situation of the world] since its first publication. As Shmuel Huppert has pointed out, this involved removing all remaining introductory and concluding references to Israel. Nevertheless, as he also notes, while Zweig conformed to the censor's anti-Zionist stance at this point, in future years he would refuse "to sign a statement by communist intellectuals criticizing the state of Israel after the Six Day War, which was a courageous act" (1990, 169) and is illustrative of his continued ambivalence towards Zionism.

Fahrt zum Acheron was republished in East Germany at the time of the Adolf Eichmann trial in Israel. Eichmann's arrest in 1960 had prompted the publication of historical reports and personal testimony about the Holocaust. It had also perpetuated Cold War discussion of the link between fascism and capitalism and had led in the GDR to public equations of Eichmann with the West German Hans Globke.⁵ Timm argues that this focus on the FRG meant that "auch dieser Anlaß wurde letztlich nicht genutzt, um massenwirksam ostdeutsche Mitverantwortung für den Judenmord zu hinterfragen" [even this

⁵ Globke was Konrad Adenauer's influential permanent secretary who, during Nazism, had been involved in writing the commentary for the Nuremberg Laws. His appointment was seen by many as embodying a failure of Adenauer's government to adequately confront the Nazi past.

event was ultimately not used to analyse to mass effect upon East Germany's joint responsibility for the murder of the Jews] (1997, 390). Four years later, Zweig's comments following a request to include excerpts of *Fahrt zum Acheron* in a publication by the Evangelische Verlagsanstalt entitled *Das Brandscheit*, edited by Anneliese Wallmann, support Timm's claim (Wallmann 1967). Zweig agreed to the publication, with the proviso made to the Union publishing house that the following statement be included:

Diese Proben aus meinem Buch "Fahrt zum Acheron" könnten wir dem Leser nicht vorlegen, wenn mir nicht vor etwa zwanzig Jahren die Verfasserin, Frau Hilde Huppert, das Manuskript ihrer Aufzeichnungen vorgelesen hätte. Sie tat dies, damit ich ihnen zum Druck verhülfe, alsbald sah sie ein, daß ihr Geschäftsdeutsch für diese Publikation gründlich verwandelt werden müßte. So kam mein kleines Buch zustande. Möge es den Lesern deutlich machen, wie heftig sich *unser Teil des deutschen Volkes* gegen das Grauen wehrt, das von der braunen Diktatur ausging. Februar 1965. [my emphasis]

We could not have presented these extracts from my book "Journey to Acheron" to the reader had the author, Mrs Hilde Huppert, not read the manuscript of her notes to me about twenty years ago. She did this so that I could help her get into print, as she immediately saw that her business German had to be fundamentally transformed for publication. In this way my little book came into being. Lets hope it will make clear to the readers, how vehemently *our part of the German nation* defends itself against the horror that arose from the fascist dictatorship. February 1965.

When Christian Helm reviewed *Fahrt zum Acheron* in 1961 in an article entitled "Ein beschwörender Ruf an die Menschheit" [A beseeching appeal to humanity] he similarly did not consider the role of the German population in the persecution described (1961). He reinforced the text's claim to authenticity, naming it objective and concise. He continued: "So ist dieser Bericht [...] das geblieben, was er sein soll: ein Dokument, in dem ein Minimum an Emotion ist, aber eine fast schon übergenu zu nennende Detailtreue" [So the report has remained what it ought to be: a document containing the minimum of emotion but an attention to detail which could almost be called over meticulous]. Notwithstanding his discussion of the involvement of Arnold Zweig, Helm maintains that Huppert's text is "[ein] von jedem Literarischen freie[s] Dokument" [a document free from all literary effects]. As such, he argues, it is comparable to the Diary of Anne Frank, ghetto diaries and the final letters written by resisters who were executed. These comparisons are significant for two reasons. Firstly, the analogy with Anne Frank is one which has subsequently been drawn in the case of many Holocaust testimonies. Hanno Loewy

suggests that the success of Frank's text was founded on "the reduction of the dimension of the horror to the personalized world of family experience", and as such parallels with Huppert's text are indicated (1999, 156). However, as Langer writes:

[The work by authors of testimony] constitutes a sequel to hers [Anne Frank's] and ultimately challenges the principle that for her was both premise and epitaph – "In spite of everything, I still think people are good at heart" – a conception of character which dies hard, but dies pitilessly [...] in literature of atrocity [...]. (1975, 77)

Secondly, Helm's reference to resistance is significant in a context in which reviewers of Jewish literature tended to focus on the protagonists' status as passive victims. While Helm quotes from Huppert's introduction to characterize her text as "ein Ruf in die Welt" [an appeal to the world], he refers to Arnold Zweig's analyses in his fore- and afterwords that point to the social causes of the persecution. The Holocaust is named as a Jewish tragedy through which Huppert survived as if by a miracle. Huppert's voice is once again framed and interpreted by Zweig's, with an emphasis on his specific linkage of fascism and capitalism.

The publishing histories of *Engpaß zur Freiheit* and *Fahrt zum Acheron* are, in many respects, emblematic of the contradictory tendencies within the antifascist policy of the Soviet Zone and GDR. They remind us of the impossibility of creating simple categories of texts within a cultural field dominated by so many conflicting strands. That the text was published at all is significant enough. Nevertheless, it is clear that Zweig's framing comments were also instrumental in affecting how the manuscript was perceived by publishers both in Palestine and in Germany.

From *Fahrt zum Acheron* to *Hand in Hand mit Tommy*

Mother, when I remember the war days it seems to me that in those days we went hand in hand. If you had loosened your grip I would have stumbled and fallen, and you would not have had this conversation with me today in Jerusalem. Mother, tell me were there moments that you thought that my hand was slipping out of yours?⁶

⁶ Excerpt from a radio interview between Huppert and her son, reproduced in a review of the Israeli edition of the book by Dan Omer in *Haolam Haze* 25 April 1979. Translated by Rabbi Yossi Ives.

Following a radio interview between Shmuel Huppert and his mother on the Israeli Holocaust Remembrance Day in 1977, entitled “Meine Mutter gebar mich ein zweites Mal” [My mother delivered me a second time], there was renewed interest in Huppert’s text. Shmuel Huppert writes of how they were overwhelmed with hundreds of letters expressing their sympathy and wanting to know more (1999, 196). Such a private response was matched by public reaction, as Shmuel Huppert was awarded the Israel Broadcasting Authority Prize for this interview.⁷ In response to this, Shmuel Huppert rewrote his mother’s text in Hebrew with a new title. It was published by Moreshet in 1978. While it is not the aim of this study to investigate in detail the patterns of the text’s reception in Israel, it should be mentioned that there were several reviews of the edition in 1978. Elie Wiesel also wrote to Shmuel Huppert to praise the text: “Deep thanks for *Hand in Hand with Tommy*. This is a book of great literary value. Very human indeed. I read it and a shudder overcame me”.⁸ In 1979 the Hebrew version was translated into English but not published. Shmuel Huppert writes of this edition, entitled *Hand in Hand with Tommy*: “I have tens of rejections from all over the world, in which the publishers say that book is good and moving but difficult to sell”. At the same time he received “polite rejections from most of the major publishing houses in Germany” (1990, 172). However, it was translated from English into Dutch and published in 1980. According to Shmuel Huppert (pers. com. 2001) the publishers wanted to change the title of *Hand in Hand with Tommy*, because they considered it to be “too calm”; however he disliked the Dutch title, *De dood in de ogen* [Face to face with death] for its melodramatic tone. The Dutch edition was reviewed twice, with both reviewers recommending the book and stressing its historical significance (Maandag 1981; Sijstma 1981). An Arabic version followed shortly after as part of an attempt “to counterbalance Arab publications distorting the story of the Holocaust”, and was published for Hilde Huppert’s seventy-fifth birthday with a print run of one thousand copies (S. Huppert 1990, 172).

When the book was finally translated into German in 1988 the title included the additional subheading “ein autobiographischer Bericht 1939-1945” [an autobiographical report 1939-1945]. This reinstating of autobiographical intention must be considered in the light of

⁷ My thanks to Thomas Sick of Röhrig Verlag for this information.

⁸ Letter in possession of Shmuel Huppert from 1978. My thanks to Rabbi Yossi Ives for the translation of this letter.

Lejeune's requirements of the autobiographical pact, which Shmuel Huppert explicitly refutes in his introduction: the author, protagonist and narrator are no longer identical, as I show below. Shmuel Huppert is named in the publishing information only as the translator of the text. This West German edition contains an introduction by Shmuel Huppert and an afterword by Karin Lorenz-Lindemann. It was reprinted several times, and in 1997 it appeared in the re-unified Germany with an additional preface by Shmuel Huppert. He has commented several times about his choice of title for the text:

[Hand in Hand with Tommy is] a name without tragic connotations, a name which reflected my feeling that Mother and I survived because we managed to always stay together. (S. Huppert 1990, 170)

[The title] "Hand in Hand with Tommy" was suggested by me, and accepted by my mother. It gives the essence of the report: the miraculous delivery of a mother and her son. Very few Jewish mothers succeeding in holding on to their children [...]. The title also expresses my restrained stylistic approach, which prefers to present the facts and enables the reader to absorb the story and react emotionally in his own way. (pers. com. 2001)

Both these comments by Shmuel Huppert and the title of the radio broadcast raise two interesting points. Firstly, the individualized relationship between Huppert and Tommy, and thus her identity as a mother, is at the forefront of the later version. Secondly, as can be seen from the large public response to the broadcast, the implicit addressee played a significant role, both in getting the text published and in the way it was written.

Shmuel Huppert makes it clear both in his introductions and in his correspondence that his text is a "version", an adaptation, of the original (1997, 6). Hilde Huppert was involved in the re-writing towards the end and, as noted above, agreed to the change in title (S. Huppert 1990, 170). Shmuel Huppert (pers. com. 2001) explains his changes to the original manuscript as follows:

I have omitted the accusations and pathos, that suited the state of mind of my mother, who was mourning her mother, her three sisters and their families [...]. Her emotional style seemed to me out of date in the late seventies.

In addition, he states that he cut Zweig's introduction and conclusion because Zweig still retained the copyright and because they "were written according to communist directions and ideology". Shmuel Huppert continues: "I had no interest in a censored, indoctrinated contribution from the 'captured' Zweig". He does, nevertheless, refer

to Zweig's role in enabling publication. Hilde Huppert's very powerful introduction is also omitted from Shmuel Huppert's version, presumably because it fell into the category of "accusation and pathos", although Shmuel Huppert writes that its sentiments continue to be relevant (1997, 7).

Within his introduction of 1988, Shmuel Huppert explicitly refers to the new addressee, the West German reader, particularly young people. Such an appeal is reiterated in 1997 following Shmuel Huppert's meeting with a girl involved in work at what is now the memorial site Bergen-Belsen: "Ich hoffe, daß diese dritte Auflage des Buches Hand in Hand mit Tommy von diesem engagierten Mädchen und seiner Generation gelesen wird" [I hope that this third edition of the book Hand in Hand with Tommy will be read by this politically committed girl and her generation] (1997, 9). Through the emphasis on youth, the impetus to continue the remembering begun by his mother is reinforced. The preface to the third edition makes explicit reference to institutionalized remembering in the reunified Germany, by mentioning both a trip to Bergen-Belsen on the commemoration of the fiftieth anniversary of liberation and to the fact that the text appeared with the financial support of the 'Bundeszentrale für politische Bildung' (1997, 10). However, it is above all the renewed impetus to bear witness which becomes prominent in the introductions, with the accompanying photo of, and dedication to, Tommy's murdered eight-year old cousin Ruti testifying to this. The report is, according to the introduction, "die wahre Geschichte über eine tapfere Mutter" [the true story of a brave mother] and at the same time a report about Jews and Christians "die ihren Zeitgenossen in den schwersten Situationen zur Seite standen" [who stood by their contemporaries in the most difficult of situations] (1997, 7). The actions of Frau Keronova, a Polish Catholic who helped the persecuted mother and son, are mentioned in this introduction. They are presented as having universal importance and as such they emphasize the significance of religious belief and place individual responses within a wider context. Such an emphasis on Frau Keronova in the introduction is striking given the simultaneous focus on Ruti – it was the behaviour of a Catholic abbess who refused Ruti shelter that condemned her to death. This persistent initial emphasis on Christianity is possibly explained in the context of Shmuel Huppert's Zionism, an element of which, Moshe Zimmermann argues, is that "der Glaube ist die Rettung. Die Angst vor dem Säkularismus ist im religiösen Zionismus so stark verbreitet, daß man sogar die Wiederkehr der Religiosität bei Christen begrüßt" [faith is salvation.

Fear of secularism is so strongly disseminated in religious Zionism that even the return of religiosity among Christians is welcomed] (1994, 397). Both Hilde and Shmuel Huppert therefore include Christians in a community whose humanity stems from their religious convictions. Nevertheless, the inclusion of the abbess in their reports, particularly in *Engpaß zur Freiheit* where the narrator is bitingly critical of her, illustrates the wide spectrum of behaviour during Nazism among those adhering to Catholic beliefs.

Instead of the numerous short chapters in Hilde Huppert's original text, Shmuel Huppert's edition contains only seven chapters. The first and last ("Kriegsanfang" [The Beginning of the War] and "Befreiung" [Liberation] respectively), provide a teleological framing of the narrative, with the intervening chapter titles all containing the place names of prison and concentration camps Iwonicz, Krosno, Rzeszów, Monte Lupe, and Bergen-Belsen. This topography of suffering is comparable to the many headings of persecution in the original. Nevertheless, episodes described in abrupt brevity in the original and epitomized by the chapter headings, are significantly more poeticized in Shmuel Huppert's text. This is exemplified in the scene where the protagonist has to leave her house for the last time. Hilde Huppert wrote:

So liefen wir die Treppen eilends hinab, nur einen kleinen Rucksack in der Hand. An der Straßenecke blieb ich zurückblickend stehen, wehmütig unser friedliches Haus betrachtend. Ich erfaßte mit Schaudern, daß ich schon am ersten Kriegstage heimatlos geworden [sic]. (20)

We ran hurriedly down the stairs, carrying only a rucksack. At the corner of the street I stopped and looked back, sadly looking at our peaceful house. I realised with a shudder that on the very first day of the war I had become homeless.

In contrast, the narrator of Shmuel Huppert's text describes the same scene:

Ich tat einen letzten Blick in mein Zimmer, auf die selbst gehäkelten Gardinen, auf das Doppelbett und den Spiegel, aus dem mich eine Frau mit Rucksack ansah. Dann fiel mein Blick auf den Gobelin, an dem ich zehn Jahre gestickt hatte, er war als Hochzeitsgeschenk für meine Schwester Rosa gedacht. – Zwei Liebende sitzen am Fluß, umrahmt von Bäumen, Blüten und Vögeln –. [sic] Rosa wollte von mir aber solch kostbares Geschenk nicht annehmen, und ich war froh, es behalten zu dürfen. Ich nahm den Gobelin aus seinem Rahmen und steckte ihn zusammengerollt in den Rucksack. (Huppert 1997, 19)

I cast a last glance around my room, at the curtains I had crocheted myself, at the double bed and at the mirror, from which a woman with a rucksack looked

back at me. Then my eyes fell on the tapestry that I had spent ten years embroidering and which was meant as a wedding present for my sister Rosa – two lovers are sitting by the river and are surrounded by trees, flowers and birds. However, Rosa didn't want to accept such a precious gift and I was glad to be able to keep it. I took the tapestry out of its frame, rolled it up and put it into my rucksack.

The brevity of the first version encapsulates how quickly and irrevocably the events occurred. Through the detail of the second abstract, in contrast, reference is made to the protagonist's past life, her identity as a seamstress and also, through the wedding present, her shattered hopes for the future (S. Huppert, 1990, 170).

An extra chapter opens *Hand in Hand mit Tommy*. Its inclusion, "in response to the request of many readers", "tell[s] of [the protagonist's] parents' home in Bilitz, of her marriage to Walter, my father and her migration to Teshin [sic]" (1990, 172). As mentioned above, this creation of a pre-Holocaust life is sometimes present in Holocaust testimony, although absent in Hilde Huppert's original. The beginning of this additional chapter contains many themes which become prevalent in Shmuel Huppert's narrative and is therefore worth quoting at length:

Ich wurde in einem traditionell jüdischen Haus in der Stadt Bielitz, in Schlesien geboren. Bluma und Selig, meine Eltern, besaßen zwei Obst- und Delikateßläden und führten einen Verkaufsstand im Zigeunerwald. Während meine drei Schwestern und ich dort in den Läden die Kunden bedienten, studierten die beiden Brüder die Thora. Unsere Kundschaft wußte von den schönen Schwestern der Familie Biegeleisen zu berichten. Die jungen Männer riefen uns das "Viermädelhaus". Wir waren sorgsam darauf bedacht, daß Vater dies nicht zu Ohren kam. Vater war ein kleiner robuster Mann mit einem dichten Bart. Er achtete bei uns Vieren auf ordentliches und bescheidenes Verhalten und auf Einhaltung der jüdischen Tradition. (1997, 13)

I was born in a traditionally Jewish home in the town of Bielitz in Silesia. My parents, Bluma and Selig, owned two delicatessen and fruit shops and ran a stall in the Zigeunerwald. While my sisters and I served customers in the shops my two brothers studied the Thora. Our customers used to talk about the beautiful sisters of the Biegeleisen family. The young men used to call us the "House of the Four Girls". We were careful that my father didn't get to hear of this. Father was a small, robust man with a thick beard. He took care that the four of us behaved properly and modestly and followed the Jewish traditions.

Thus, elements of Jewish identity, tradition and gender are emphasized in Shmuel Huppert's narrative. At many points, religion is given prominence, which simultaneously locates the narrative within a historical continuum and dehistoricizes it. In contrast, the few

sentences in Huppert's original text describing her pre-war life focus on her home in Czechoslovakia and the naming of Tommy after the democrat Masaryk which suggests a more international perspective. Themes of religiosity and gender are reiterated throughout Shmuel Huppert's version through a variety of linguistic devices including direct speech, stream of consciousness and a multitude of narrative voices.

Prevalent in *Hand in Hand mit Tommy*, and in contrast to the original, are many extracts of direct speech. The narration of such dialogue, which conveys a sense of immediacy, is combined with a lack of intervention from the present narrator. Shmuel Huppert removes not only many such interventions also cut by Zweig, as discussed above, but several others too emphasizing the brutality of the events witnessed. For example, Hilde Huppert's text contains the following:

Unerbittlich schlug man auf die wehrlosen und geschwächten Menschen ein, deren Heulen und Wimmern erst gegen Morgen schwächer wurde. Je länger es dauerte, desto wilder wurde es; aus sadistischen Menschenquälern waren offenbar wilde Tiere geworden, die im Blutausch nicht mehr aufhören konnten, auf ihre Opfer loszuschlagen. (83)

Pitilessly they struck the defenceless and weakened people whose cries and whimpers became only weaker towards morning. The longer it lasted, the wilder it became; sadistic torturers had obviously turned into wild animals who could no longer stop hitting out at their victims in their frenzy.

In contrast, the later version states: "Wir hörten deutlich das Geräusch von dumpfen Schlägen, von Peitschenhieben und das Flehen der Gequälten: 'Vater hilf uns und höre unsere Stimmen'" [We clearly heard the noise of muffled blows, of whip lashes and the pleading of those being tortured: 'Lord, help us and hear our prayers'] (1997, 100). The shortening of the episode emphasizes the victims' recourse to prayer and their links to a religious collective. It simultaneously allows for individualization of character, something which becomes prominent in the text.

While gender and motherhood were undoubtedly integral to Hilde Huppert's original report, their (re)configuration in Shmuel Huppert's version is noticeable. Through stream of consciousness the narrative often refers to thoughts about the protagonist's family, conveying worries not explicit in the original:

Während der vielen schlaflosen Nächte auf der schmalen Pritsche, Tommy an meiner Seite, dachte ich an meine Lieben, die ich im Getto Rzeszow hatte

zurücklassen müssen. Ich quälte mich mit dem Gedanken, daß ich mein Versprechen nicht einlösen konnte, mich um ihre Befreiung zu kümmern. (1997, 92)

During the many sleepless nights on the narrow bunk, Tommy at my side, I thought of the loved ones I had had to leave behind in the Rzeszow ghetto. I tortured myself with the thought that I could not keep the promise I made to see to their release.

Similarly, in the chapter describing how the protagonist confesses to shutting the workroom door and thus risking punishment, another voice is included which reinforces the responsibilities of the parental role. In Shmuel Huppert's text, a reprimanding voice is included of "Aber Hilde [...] hast du auch an Tommy gedacht?" [But Hilde [...] did you think about Tommy?] (1997, 63) This changes the interpretation of the act from a courageous to a rather foolhardy one. The absence of such thought in the original suggests that our understanding of gender roles is not applicable to the circumstances of the ghetto and concentration camp. Their reinscription in the later version can lead to a tendency to judge the characters by contemporary and thus anachronistic standards.

The diversity of voices in this later version is in contrast to the omniscient present narrator in the original. As such these different voices are an integral part of a framework which aims to give the reader "Freiraum für eigene Gedanken und Gefühle" [freedom for their own thoughts and feelings] (1997, 6). In their emphasis on the behaviour of the individual characters they are, however, no less prescriptive than in the original.

A renewed focus on Tommy, contained firstly in the title of his book, is reiterated throughout Shmuel Huppert's text. Tommy is noticeably named and referred to more often. His character is also made more concrete through the photograph on the front cover. This photograph was taken just before the arrest of mother and son in 1940 and Shmuel Huppert chose it in the hope that it portrays an "optimistic picture" (S. Huppert, 1990, 171). In addition, his role is further prioritized by the diminished significance of collective experience, as the following example illustrates. After a scene describing some particularly brutal murders, the original describes how "diesen Abend drückte jede Mutter von uns beim Schlafengehen ihr Kind fester an sich, wußten wir doch nicht, ob uns morgen nicht das gleiche Schicksal erwartete" [on this evening every mother pressed her child closer to her as she went to sleep – we didn't know whether the same

fate awaited us tomorrow] (79). A very different, narrower focus is prevalent in the later version:

In dieser Nacht schlief ich näher an Tommy gerückt, ich fürchtete den Tag, an dem man uns trennen würde. Der Achtjährige hat meine Angst verstanden. "Willst du, daß ich dir ein Lied singe?" "Ja, Tommy, sing mir, aber leise, die anderen schlafen schon". (1997, 96)

During the night I slept closer to Tommy. I feared the day on which they would separate us. The eight year old felt my fear. "Do you want me to sing you a song?" "Yes, Tommy, sing to me, but do it quietly as the others are already asleep".

Tommy is not the only character referred to by name and thus distinguished from the collective. In place of references to her sister, the 'little one', and her father-in-law, the characters are named Rose, Ruti and Sigmund respectively. In addition, the voice of the first-person singular predominates throughout.

Notwithstanding this increased individualization there are two episodes in the later version which raise the question of solidarity between the protagonist and those around her. One of these is entirely absent from the original narrative, and the other is narrated quite differently. Shmuel Huppert's text describes how the protagonist manages to exchange her watch for bread. On her return to the barracks she shares it with Tommy and is overheard by the others:

Die Frau auf der Nachbarpritsche sagte leise: "Hilde, ich rieche Brot, gib mir ein Stück". Ich gab ihr. Auch von einer anderen Pritsche reckte sich eine Hand. Ich gab wieder. Und noch eine Hand und noch viele. Niemand sprach, nur Hände reckten sich in Richtung unserer Liege. Ich schämte mich wie eine ertappte Diebin. (1997, 106)

The woman on the bunk next to me said quietly: "Hilde, I can smell bread, give me a piece". I gave it to her. Another hand reached from another bunk. I gave out some more. Then another hand, then many others. No one spoke, the hands simply stretched in the direction of our bunk. I was as ashamed as a thief caught in the act.

Food sharing is often seen as a signifier of solidarity in concentration camp reports (Baumel 1995, 71). The episode described above is given prominence in *Hand in Hand mit Tommy* as it is also placed on the dustcover, and yet it is not in the original text. It suggests the survival of an underlying altruism and, through the protagonist's feeling of guilt, the continued awareness of pre-Holocaust moral values. The inclusion of this episode in Shmuel Huppert's version is

paralleled by the omission of Huppert's assertion, found in the original, that those persecuted would have to learn "wieder an die menschliche Gesittung zu glauben" [to believe again in civilized modes of behaviour] (105). Through an emphasis on episodes such as the above, the later version suggests that a certain altruism did survive. A belief that retaining a sense of humanity was vital for those persecuted in the struggle for survival is something that Shmuel Huppert has reiterated elsewhere (1999, 187).

In contrast, the second episode, which concerns the appearance in the protagonist's barracks of a man who has fled from the murderous 'games' of the camp personnel, is narrated very differently. Hilde Huppert's original contains the following:

In dieser mondlosen Nacht des Grauens war unsere Barackentür aufgerissen, ein zerschlagener Mann stürzte hinein, mit vergehender Stimme erbat er ein bisschen Wasser, und als er sich gestärkt, erzählte er: Teufel seien gekommen, um alle mit ihren Pauken zu Tode zu schlagen, einige hundert Opfer seien auf Lastautos weggeschafft worden [...]. Und dann kam das Schwerste: Der Unglückliche mußte auf demselben Weg, auf dem er gekommen, wieder hinaus, denn an ein Verstecken oder Entkommen war in Bergen-Belsen nicht zu denken. "Ich weiß ja, daß ich nicht bleiben kann", sagte er, ein Jude aus Polen, "Ich will Euch nicht unglücklich machen, wenn man mich hier findet", damit verschwand er in der Nacht. (84)

In the moonless night of horror the door to our barracks was torn open and a man who had been beaten fell inside. With a halting voice he asked for some water, and when he felt stronger he said that the devils had come to beat everyone to death with their bludgeons. Several hundred victims had been taken away on lorries [...]. And then came the worst bit: the poor man had to go back out, to return the way he had come, as a place to hide or escape was unthinkable in Bergen Belsen. "I know that I can't stay", the Jew from Poland, said. "I don't want to cause more trouble for you if they find me here", and with this he disappeared into the night.

Shmuel Huppert's version describes the event as follows:

Die Tür unserer Baracke wurde aufgerissen und im Gegenlicht sah ich die Umriss eines Mannes. "Geb mir Wasser", bat er mit schwacher Stimme. Jemand reichte ihm die Schöpfkelle. [...] "Sie kamen, schlugen bis zum Tod, bis zum Tod", wiederholte er wie in Trance, "ich bin durch den Zaun gekrochen, kann ich bei euch bleiben?" Wir schwiegen [...]. "In unserer Baracke sind Kinder", klang aus dem Dunkel die Stimme einer Mutter. "Kinder?" "Wenn sie dich finden, werden sie unsere Kinder ermorden", unterstützte sie eine andere Frau. "Also, ist es unmöglich?" "Ja, das muß du einsehen", sagte wieder einer von uns. Ich hörte, daß der Mann aus der anderen Baracke jetzt mühsam sein Weinen unterdrücken mußte. Wir brachten ihm Brot und Wasser. Jemand reichte ihm eine Zigarette, ein Streichholz flammte auf, und ich konnte sein

gequältes Gesicht und die blutverschmierten Hände sehen. Er rauchte die Zigarette zu Ende und stolperte hinaus. (1997, 100)

The door of our barracks was torn open and we saw the silhouette of a man. "Give me water" he said in a weak voice. Someone passed him the ladle. "They came and beat us to death, to death", he repeated as if in a trance. "I crawled through the fence. Can I stay here with you?" We were silent [...]. "There are children in our barracks" said the voice of a mother from the darkness. "Children?" "If they find you, they will murder our children" another woman added. "So it's impossible?" "Yes, you have to see that" said yet another. I heard the man from the other barracks suppressing his tears with difficulty. We brought him bread and water. Someone passed him a cigarette. The match flared and I could see his tortured face and hands covered in blood. He finished the cigarette and stumbled out.

The second extract demonstrates, like the first, the eventual decision by the man not to endanger the others. However, it is the voice of a mother which refuses this possibility. The children, as representatives of continuity and a refutation of all Nazi plans to eliminate them, are given priority. Such arguments are significant for understanding how different memories suggest very different meanings and, in both cases, show the impossible choices the victims faced (Heinemann 1986, 81).

Tensions between individual and collective, which occur within Shmuel Huppert's framework of individualization, are reinforced within the depiction of the liberation and the ending of the text. We know that Huppert's original description of the liberating American soldiers was cut to some extent by Zweig, although her original depiction comprised less than two pages. In *Engpaß zur Freiheit* there is both an emphasis on the reciprocal emotion felt by the Jewish group and by the soldiers of "Tränen der Rührung und Freude, weil es ihnen [den Soldaten] beschert gewesen, das Leiden so schwer geprüfter Menschen zu beenden" [sic] [tears of emotion and joy because the soldiers had been blessed with being able to end the suffering of people put so very hard to the test] (92). The protagonist describes her conversation with one officer, to whom she tries to convey the horror of what they had suffered. In contrast, Shmuel Huppert's narrator emphasizes an aspect not mentioned in the original:

Ein anderer [Soldat] zog unter seiner Uniform ein Medaillon hervor und zeigte uns seinen Davidstern. "Auch ich bin Jude" [...]. Wir versuchten, mit dem jüdischen Soldaten ins Gespräch zu kommen, aber der sprach nur wenig Jiddisch, und unsere Englischkenntnisse waren auch nur dürftig. Wir versuchten, aus ihm herauszubekommen, woher er kam, wo seine Familie herstammte und ob er diesen oder jenen kannte. Alle wollten mit ihm verwandt sein, mit einem jüdischen Soldaten, der bewaffnet war. (1997, 109)

Another soldier pulled a medallion from beneath his uniform and showed us his Star of David. "I am a Jew too!" [...] We tried to talk to the Jewish soldier but he only spoke a bit of Yiddish and our knowledge of English was patchy. We tried to find out from him where he came from, where his family was from and whether he knew this person or that. Everyone wanted to be related to a Jewish soldier who was armed.

Karin Lorenz-Lindemann, in her afterword for the 1988 German edition, interprets this scene as being especially illustrative of how the liberated camp inmates felt (1997, 135), and yet this episode is not mentioned by Hilde Huppert. Use of the plural "wir" is set against individualization of one of the soldiers and provides a connection between those persecuted and their liberators. The arming of the Jewish population becomes symbolic of a programme for the future and the importance of an Israeli nation state. Within the contemporary context of publication of the Hebrew version in 1978 the text provided a reassertion of Israel's right to exist after the Six Day War.

Validation for an Israeli nation state is conveyed through a final significant difference – the endings of the two texts. While both end on arrival in Palestine, Shmuel Huppert's version contains two additional elements. Firstly, a paragraph which places the narrator at some distance from the events:

Tage und Jahre vergingen. Die Kinder, die ich ins Land brachte, sind längst erwachsen und haben Familien gegründet. Manchmal treffe ich mich mit ihnen, oder man schreibt mir Postkarten aus aller Welt. Das gemeinsam Durchlebte hat uns einander näher gebracht. Ich lebe heute im Staat Israel, dem versprochenen Land des jüdischen Volkes, hier wurde mein zweiter Sohn Schlomo geboren. Ich bin glücklich, und ich fühle, daß ich hier zu Hause bin. Ich bete nur, daß wir hier in Frieden leben können. Ich vergesse nicht. (1997, 122)

Days and years passed. The children whom I brought to this country have long grown up and had their own families. Sometimes I meet up with them or they send me postcards from all over the world. What we went through together has brought us closer. Today I live in the state of Israel, the promised land of the Jewish people, it was here that my second son was born. I am happy and feel at home here. I only pray that we can live in peace here. I do not forget.

Thus, where Hilde Huppert's narrator talks only of months having passed since the events being described and the visits of the survivors who were still children, the narrator of Shmuel Huppert's version talks of days and years. Lorenz-Lindemann, who wrote an afterword for this 1988 edition, emphasizes how Hilde Huppert wrote her book immediately after her liberation, yet she does not mention this apparent contradiction at the end of Shmuel Huppert's version (1997, 129-39). The narrator's reference above to Israel through the discourse

of the Old Testament, the Promised Land, epitomizes a religious Zionist sentiment present throughout *Hand in Hand mit Tommy* and suggests an intended Israeli addressee of the Hebrew edition of 1978. The republication of this version in its many translations since then consolidates the emphasis on the Jewish state in the context of much political uncertainty.

The emphatic ending of "I do not forget" is not only a final statement of intent to bear witness, but it also signifies the still experienced trauma. A new epilogue by Shmuel Huppert, where his authorship is explicitly stated, continues this theme of an inescapable past. Narrated in the first person through the child's perspective, the past merges in and out of the present. It pivots on a description of a Rabbi visiting Tommy's ill mother during their incarceration and his conversation with Tommy's grandmother. On this occasion the Rabbi relates a dream of their survival: "[I]ch sah deine Tochter mit dem Jungen in Erez Israel. Oh, Erez Israel, gebe Gott, daß alle aus dem Zimmer hier solch ein gutes Schicksal haben mögen wie die beiden" [I saw your daughter with the boy in Israel. Oh Israel, God grant that everyone here in this room will have as good a fate as these two] (1997, 124). The subsequent journey of Tommy and his mother from the ghetto to the prison is paralleled by the adult narrator's journey with two young children of his own in Israel:

Wir saßen in Dunkel, Mutters Hand hielt ich fest gedrückt. [...] Ich wußte nicht, wo die Fahrt enden wird und dachte angestrengt an den Vater in Palästina. Die Droschke hielt [...]. Und wir beide, Mutter und ich, rieben unsere geblendeten Augen. Um uns herum bewaffnete Deutsche, vor uns ein bedrohliches Gebäude, das Hauptgefängnis von Krakau, Monte Lupe. Ich öffnete meine Augen, die Kutsche galoppierte am Strand entlang, meine Tochter, gereizt von der Salzlufte, begann Interesse zu zeigen: "Vater, schau, wie schön sich die Sonne im Meer spiegelt". (1997, 127)

We sat in the dark. I held mother's hand tight. [...] I didn't know where the journey would end and thought hard about father in Palestine. The cab stopped [...]. Both of us, mother and I, rubbed our eyes. All around us were armed Germans, and in front of us a threatening building, the main prison of Krakau, Monte Lupe. I opened my eyes, the carriage was galloping along the beach, my daughter, thrilled by the sea air, began to take an interest: "Father, look at how the sun is beautifully reflected in the sea".

Contrasting descriptions of light and dark juxtapose the worlds of past and present and the final appeal by his daughter encapsulates a childhood innocence lost to Tommy as a young boy.

In her prologue to the 1988 West German edition, Karin Lorenz-Lindemann argues that the writing and publication of Hilde Huppert's

text in the immediate post-war period was an exception within a context where many of the victims remained silent for years. She names the Eichmann trial as the catalyst which caused them to speak out. Yet, the very publishing history of Huppert's narrative demonstrates how problematic such sweeping generalizations are. Such comments display a continued prominence of narratives claiming silence about the Holocaust. These narratives also do not take into account how voices such as Huppert's are themselves dis/articulated through institutional frameworks, that is, through decisions about which texts should be published and which should be reviewed.

While critically discussing Zweig's publication of Huppert's narrative in 1951, Lorenz-Lindemann maintains that his interventions point to the fact that he was completely embroiled in the "ideologischen Geschichtsklitterung, die den Aufbau der DDR begleitete" [ideological historical misrepresentation which accompanied the building of the GDR] (1997, 132). She refers throughout to canonized East German texts about the Holocaust, discussing East German authors Jurek Becker and Bruno Apitz, and Austrian writers Ilse Aichinger and Fred Wander. Lorenz-Lindemann sets Huppert's text apart from the fictional accounts by the above-named authors through what she sees as the book's lack of artistic organization. In this her comments both frame and reflect the reception of the text in West Germany in 1988. She writes that Hilde Huppert did not give any interpretation of the events she was describing, that "unkommentiert bleibt ihr Schrecken über das Unfaßliche, einfach und kunstlos in Sprache gebannt" [her terror about the incomprehensible remains uncommented on – simply and without sophistication it is exorcized in language]. She insists that the material has not been "gestaltet" [moulded] (1997, 130, 135). Similarly Röhrig's publicity material for *Hand in Hand mit Tommy* stresses both the authenticity of the text and the "einfach[e] und emotionslos gehalten[e] Sprache" [language which has been kept simple and unemotional]. Reviewers such as Andrea Dittgen reiterate this, stating that Huppert writes "mit einfachen Worten, nüchtern, fast schon emotionslos, und ohne ihre Peiniger anzuklagen" [with simple words, matter of factly, almost entirely without emotion and without accusing her tormentors] (1988, 10) Lorenz-Lindemann also claims that there is an absence of any call for revenge. As I have shown, in Huppert's original text the voice of the narrating present frequently intervenes to interpret, contradict and emphasize certain aspects of her and her son's experience. There is particularly a clear call for

retribution and an allocation of responsibility for the persecution. Lorenz-Lindemann and Dittgen's assertion of a lack of such a narratorial voice in the later version is based on a reading of a text 'modified' by both Zweig and Shmuel Huppert. The theme of revenge was marginalized in preparation of the text for the East German context of 1951 and 1961, the Israeli context of the late 1970s and the West German context of 1988. Such marginalization was then reiterated by the reviewers, particularly in West Germany in the late 1980s. Dittgen continues that it is not only the experiences themselves which make the text important and interesting but also that Huppert's style of writing is "zugleich fesselnd, schockierend und nachdenklich machend" [at once captivating, shocking and something which sets you thinking]. Both Dittgen and Lorenz-Lindemann refer, in support of their arguments about the emotive nature of the text, to the episode of the man in the barracks, which was significantly reworked by Shmuel Huppert.

Dittgen emphasizes both Huppert's identity as a mother and her status as "eine einfache Frau" [a simple woman] who is "keine Literatin" [not a woman of letters] (1988, 10). In another review Lutz Tantow makes a similar point that in Huppert's text a mother makes a report without any form of "literarische Zutat" [literary accessories] (1988). Dieter Gräf also asserts that the book is particularly moving because Huppert abstains from literary pretensions and avoids "Reflexionen und Bewertungen" [reflection and assessment] (1988, 12). It is a feeling of rationality, they all claim, which gives the autobiography a documentary character, and the inconspicuous, non-interventionary nature of the author which increases the power of her writing.

The 'normality' of the author and her life is repeatedly stressed by the reviewers, to the extent that her experiences are even interpreted as being universal: "Beschrieben wird ein scheinbar typisches Schicksal in Deutschland" [An apparently typical fate in Germany is being described] (Tantow 1988). The reviewer later qualifies this, not as one might expect through an awareness of such a dubious equation of German and Jewish experience, but instead through a rather problematic listing of those Jewish survivors, who, it is implied, were 'just as bad as the Germans':

Ist es der erstaunliche Mut zur Selbstkritik, der in Hilde Hupperts Bericht überrascht? Nach der Befreiung plünderten KZ-Häftlinge ebenso ungeniert die Häuser der Deutschen, wie sie es selbst hatten erfahren müssen. Und noch zwei Beobachtungen stimmen nachdenklich: Erst in der Freiheit erfuhr Hilde Huppert, daß während der NS-Zeit auch deutsche Oppositionelle inhaftiert

waren und daß die SS-Ärzte im KZ medizinische Versuche mit Gefangenen gemacht haben. Läßt sich da der Vorwurf gegen andere Deutsche, sie hätten das alles wissen müssen, noch aufrechterhalten. Zum zweiten: Hildes Schwester sagte: "Wie gut, daß wenigstens Ihr Euch retten konntet und den Tag der Rache miterlebt". Und am Ende des Buches ist von der guten Laune die Rede, die die Befreiten überfiel, als sie die zerbombten und zerstörten Städte sahen. (Tantow 1988)

Is it the astonishing courage for self-criticism which surprises one in Hilde Huppert's report? After liberation, concentration camp inmates plundered the houses of the Germans with the same lack of embarrassment that they had themselves experienced. Two observations go together thought-provokingly: It was only when she was free that Hilde Huppert discovered that during the NS regime German resisters had also been imprisoned and that SS doctors had carried out medical experiments on prisoners in the concentration camps. Does the reproach made of other Germans that they should have known about everything still hold water in the light of this?; secondly, Hilde's sister said: "What a good thing you were able save yourselves and experience the day of retribution". And at the end of the book there is talk of the good mood which overcame those who had been liberated when they saw the bombed-out and destroyed cities.

Such comments are especially striking given the West German publication context of 1988: debates about the equation of the German population with victims of Nazi persecution had by this time become prominent in public discourse following the still reverberating controversy about President Reagan's visit to the military cemetery in Bitburg, where members of the SS were buried.

Lorenz-Lindemann, Tantow and Gräf all consider the text's publication in East Germany and the role of Arnold Zweig. However, Shmuel Huppert's authorial role is not mentioned. Thus they praise the text for a 'non-literary' style which, as I have shown, is considerably more poeticized than the original. They also emphasize an authenticity due to the immediacy of the time in which it was written, despite contradictory indications at the end of the text. Their claims about the lack of literary qualities is likewise part of a claim to authenticity and their attendant 'normalization' of the author leads to possibilities of empathy and problematic identification. Such individualization occurs to differing extents in both the original and Shmuel Huppert's version of the text, and yet the ever present claim to representative Jewish suffering in the text from 1945 denies any such simple identification with the protagonist.

Publications of the 1990s

If we consider Heidrun Loeper's introduction to the 1990 edition, we find that it was the centenary of Zweig's birth in 1987 which led to renewed interest in him and his work, and consequently to Huppert's text. Loeper writes that it is the first publication in German of the "Urschrift" (6), that is, the text written by Huppert, with the first stylistic changes and title by Zweig. Loeper does not mention the editions by Shmuel Huppert which had appeared two years before. Accompanying this text are the forewords and conclusion by Zweig, plus an article by Detlev Claussen entitled "Aufklärung in der Wüste" [Enlightenment in the Desert].⁹ In this article Claussen considers Zweig's background as editor of Huppert's text. He also examines Zweig's identity as an author and how his understanding of Marx, Freud, Zionism, and the events leading to the Holocaust fed into his fictional work. Claussen sees a stylistic change in Zweig's post-Holocaust work. He argues that this was necessitated by a need to try and educate the German prisoners of war about the causes of the crimes and their own guilt. He continues: "Wie kaum ein anderes erzählt und analysiert Zweigs episches Werk die Vorgeschichte von Auschwitz; aber die Erzählkunst kapituliert vor einer Wirklichkeit, die Kunst unmöglich macht" [Almost unlike any other, Zweig's epic work analyses the pre-history of Auschwitz. But, this art of narration capitulates in the face of a reality which makes art impossible] (154). Notwithstanding this, Claussen does not consider how such conclusions relate to possibilities of communication in Huppert's text, of which he merely writes:

Aus jeder Zeile des vorliegenden Bandes spricht traumatische Erfahrung. Es ist, als ob die Augenzeugin einem Zuhörer berichten würde, der mit analytischem Abstand und Introspektionsfähigkeit versucht, das Unerhörte zu verarbeiten. Auf diese Weise gewinnt der Leser eine größere Chance, sich nicht von seiner eigenen Abwehr überwältigen zu lassen. (155)

Every line of this book speaks of a traumatic experience. It is as if the eye-witness wants to report to a listener who tries to digest the outrageous events with analytical distance and the ability of introspection. In this way, the reader has a better chance of not being overwhelmed by his own self-defence mechanisms.

Claussen instead turns his attention to the contemporary context of 1990, in light of "eine neue Offensive zur Bewältigung der

⁹ A shorter version of this essay appeared in *Freibeuter*, 39 (1988), 96-103.

Vergangenheit” [a new offensive in the battle to overcome the past] (155). His discussion of the current publication context involves both a biting criticism of the “Mythos Vergangenheitsbewältigung” [myth of coming to terms with the past] (155) of West Germany and the imposition of its narratives of remembrance onto the historiography of the East.

Kontext, the small publisher of the 1990 edition, produced some publicity information on their website to accompany the text. This includes extracts of Arnold Zweig’s first introduction and an article by Ulrich Karger. Karger condemns the fact that in the contemporary context the acquittal of concentration camp guards was a common occurrence. He juxtaposes this fact with the significance of the autobiography written immediately at the end of the war, “noch unter dem Eindruck des Gerade-erst-Befreitseins” [while still under the impression of having just been liberated]. The immediacy of writing is again seen as a marker of authenticity. Karger continues:

[Das Buch] leistet alles, was gute Literatur ausmachen kann. Ohne den Ballast sentimentaler Kommentierung bleibt für den gefesselten Leser der nötige Freiraum, eigene Gedanken und Gefühle zu entwickeln. Mit dieser ‘wirklichen’ Zeugenaussage vor Augen liegt es nun an uns, nicht zu Fortsetzungstätern zu werden ... und nicht Fortsetzungstäter zu bleiben! (2002)

[The book] achieves everything that can make good literature. Without the ballast of sentimental commentary, the enthralled reader is allowed the free space to develop her/his own thoughts and feelings. With this ‘realistic’ eye-witness statement in front of us, it is up to us not to become or remain complicit in continuing the wrongs of the past.

His comments here echo those of Shmuel Huppert, yet are applied to a fundamentally different text. Like Huppert, he also emphasizes the reciprocity of the process of witnessing and of the involvement of the German reader. Whether this appeal to the reader found resonance is difficult to judge. According to Kontext Verlag, this 1990 edition was not reviewed by the press.¹⁰ Kontext published Huppert’s text as part of a series of texts commemorating 9 November 1938. In doing so, it prioritized the pogrom against the Jewish community in the context of discussion in the recently reunified Germany about the fall of the Berlin Wall and the controversy about the celebration of this date as a national holiday (Domansky 1992, 60-94).

¹⁰ Letter from Torsten Metelka of the Kontext Verlag to the author on 21 February 2001.

In 1999 Shmuel Huppert's book, *Habe ich Anne Frank gesehen?*, was published in Germany. The Hebrew version had already appeared two years earlier. The text contains both stories from the Huppert family history and episodes from the adult narrator's present. Several chapters contain different versions of events narrated in Hilde Huppert's original text, this time from the first-person perspective of Tommy. As in Shmuel Huppert's *Hand in Hand mit Tommy*, there is a repeated emphasis on the signifiers of the Jewish identity of Tommy and his mother. These episodes are followed by chapters devoted to describing different relatives, including his grandfather. The text also contains description of difficult educational visits to West Germany following the publication of his version of the text, and to his former home-town of Teschen, in Silesia. The narrator questions how the past is represented, considering where the borders between fact and fiction become blurred. The title, which once again reminds us of canonized texts of Holocaust memory stems from an imaginary question Huppert is asked by a German schoolgirl. In the final chapter, "Von Bergen-Belsen nach Jerusalem" [From Bergen-Belsen to Jerusalem], the narrator addresses the publishing history of Hilde Huppert's autobiography and considers the problematic nature of memory. He finds himself questioning what he can actually still remember, what he has to reconstruct, and what he knows only from his mother's stories and "aus ihrer Autobiographie *Hand in Hand mit Tommy*, die ich übersetzt habe" [from her autobiography *Hand in Hand with Tommy*, which I translated] (S. Huppert 1999, 176). Shmuel Huppert here downplays his involvement in his mother's text, asserting a translator's rather than an author's role. He later considers the resulting different versions of the text:

Über Jahrzehnte blieb ich unschlüssig, ob ich berechtigt sei, Geschichten über die in *Hand in Hand mit Tommy* dokumentierte zu verfassen. Ich wollte nicht in Konkurrenz zu Mutters Buch treten und hatte Mühe, zwischen Dingen, die mir in Erinnerung geblieben waren, und Geschichten zu unterscheiden, die ich möglicherweise aus dem Buch, das mir in Fleisch und Blut übergegangen war, 'entwendet' haben könnte. Das schmale Bändchen von Erzählungen mit dem Titel *Habe ich Anne Frank gesehen?* ist Zeugnis meiner Skrupel und Beweis, daß es mir nicht gelungen ist, die Worte zurückzuhalten, die niedergeschrieben werden wollten. (S. Huppert 1999, 197)

For decades I remained uncertain as to whether I was justified in writing stories beyond those documented in *Hand in Hand with Tommy*. I didn't want to enter into competition with mother's book and had trouble differentiating between things which were still in my own memory, and which were stories that I could have 'purloined' from a book that had become part of my own flesh and blood. The small volume of stories entitled *Did I see Anne Frank?* bears witness to my

scruples and proves that I was not successful in keeping back the words that wanted to be written.

Echoing Zweig's comment, an imperative of writing and of bearing witness is used as a justification for intervention in the original text. The assertion about the inviolability of Huppert's manuscript provides the framework for that very same intervention.

Conclusion: The Importance of the Interlocutor

Huppert's text contains her specific experiences and her own perspective on them. In a context where, as Joan Ringelheim emphasizes, the experiences of Jewish women have seldom become part of the canon of Holocaust literature, it is therefore significant in its own right. Ringelheim continues:

Den Holocaust zu erinnern, bedeutet nicht einfach, die Verluste zu betauern und das Übel zu kritisieren. Dies wäre zu leicht. Neben vielem anderen könnte diese Erinnerung auch in der Rekonstruktion eines historischen Verständnisses bestehen, das die Opfer berücksichtigt, die bisher ausgeschlossen waren. (1992, 158)

Remembering the Holocaust does not simply mean mourning the losses and criticizing the evil. This would be too easy. Amongst many other things this process of remembering could comprise the reconstruction of a historical understanding which takes victims into account who have, until now, been excluded.

As such, Huppert's narrative is important to our understanding of the events. Witness testimony like hers allows us, albeit in very diverse ways, not to lose sight of the horrors upon which the Nazi system was based. Questions as to whether survivor reports should be subject to academic scrutiny arguably find their answer in the imperative of the authors themselves. In order to hear the voice of the survivor we have to listen to *how* she is saying what she is, to look at the text that gives form to her memories (Kosnick 1992, 92; see also Lang 1988, 3). In addition, by looking at the way such a text arrives in the public domain, through the complex and contradictory impulses which led to its publication, such analysis resists the danger of dehistoricized deconstruction, which in turn runs the risk of displacing the subject matter of the Holocaust altogether (Young 1988, 1-5).

An analysis of the publishing history of Huppert's text highlights many things, not least the "privileged position of the Holocaust

reader” (Ezrahi 1982, 8). The subject matter of Huppert’s report illustrates both how “the testimony to the trauma thus includes its hearer” (Laub 1992, 57) and how there is an imperative “to listen to the voices from a universe we cannot penetrate, even if we will never understand” (Langer 2000, 235). An awareness of the reciprocity of the process of bearing witness to the Holocaust strengthens not only the autobiographical pact but also influences the way in which the authors construct their memories. The problems of publication illustrate the dependence of the witness on an audience, on “an addressable other, an other who can hear the anguish of one’s memories and thus affirm and recognise their realness” (Laub 1992, 68). This mutual presence is linked not only to the significance of the memories themselves, but also to the attempts at coping with them. As Goldhorn emphasizes, this type of remembering *needs* an interlocutor, and if no one is listening it robs the survivor of both their memory and of their identity, particularly their identity of survival (Goldhorn cited in Wobbe 1992, 17).

Different forms of the “protective shell” around Huppert’s text show how memories are not only interpreted by their author but by many others in the course of publication. The significance of literature as witness arises from the very burden carried by the individual survivor in her capacity as an isolated carrier of partial knowledge of the event. Thus, repeated inscriptions of meaning both external and internal to the narrative become doubly significant. When multiple intersecting identities are examined within this context, it becomes important to recognize the differences and similarities in the way they are portrayed. Such an appreciation of difference involves looking at the texts from a gendered perspective, examining how female voices are published with the ‘protective’ surrounding of predominantly male perspectives. It involves looking at the way in which the memories within the text describe how, while the Jewish population was marked for extinction because of fascist racism, gender intersected with this at all levels. Finally, it involves a recognition that the canonized interpretative voice of Holocaust experience is predominantly male and that repeated denial of interpretative elements and ‘literariness’ within a female survivor’s text perpetuates this exclusion (Horowitz 1997, 132).

In the context of contemporary postmodernism, literary historical analysis such as this cannot fail to be aware of the dangers of examining divergent narratives of Hilde Huppert’s experiences. In order to guard against such analysis being seen as as meaningless relativism, it should be stressed that the communication of a plurality

of histories is founded in an ethical imperative, which seeks to increase the understanding of the Holocaust in order that it may be remembered not denied (see Eaglestone and Pitt 1998, 309-12). At the same time it is recognized that any such moral or ethical framework must, to a large extent, halt at the gates of the “l’univers concentrationnaire”. As Langer writes: “As these tales unfold [...] the insufficiency of the idea of moral striving as a frame for hearing them, or for understanding victim behaviour, becomes ever plainer” (2000, 237).

Conflicting notions within the different versions of the text demonstrating hope and despair, destruction and preservation are to a certain extent inherent to the nature of persecution. Nonetheless, as I have indicated, the complex publication history shows how certain experiences are dis/articulated within different institutional frameworks. As a result it is important to hear the contradictions, not as examples of competing versions of ‘the truth’, but as the voices of three survivors with different experiences struggling to live with the past and be heard in the present. Competing versions of the self which arise in many Holocaust narratives are exemplified in Huppert’s text by the inscriptions of Shmuel Huppert, Arnold Zweig and all the others responsible for the framing of the text. In a context of many such competing discourses, it therefore becomes even more important that we try to listen to what Hilde Huppert herself is saying.

2. Competing Voices in Inge Scholl's *Die Weiße Rose*

On 22 February 1943 Hans and Sophie Scholl were executed for treason. They had been members of a group calling themselves the 'Weiße Rose' [White Rose], which had produced antifascist leaflets. They had been arrested four days earlier during the distribution of such leaflets at the University of Munich, where they both studied. They were tried and executed on the same day, along with Christoph Probst, another member of the group, in a first round of executions of students and academics.

Over the last sixty years, the events surrounding the Munich student resistance have been subject to numerous re-writings. The body of literature focusing on the 'Weiße Rose' and its place within the youth opposition to Nazism now encompasses nearly one thousand titles (Schilde 1995, 37). It is within this context that a text written by Inge Scholl, sister of Hans and Sophie, has been republished annually since 1952. Within a field of many contested discourses about these events of the past, Scholl's *Die Weiße Rose* has become canonized as a classic of German literary memories of fascism. Rethinking the text and looking at the different voices contained within it raises questions of genre, gender, reception and hierarchies of remembrance as they have evolved in West German memory politics. Scholl's text has long been established as a standard work on youth opposition to Nazism; as such it highlights particularly the importance of investigating what is remembered and on behalf of whom.

Inge Scholl, the daughter of Robert Scholl, mayor of Forchtenberg, was born in 1917. As a young woman she witnessed her siblings' increasing disillusion with the Nazi state. Following their execution, Inge Scholl and her family were arrested by the Gestapo. She was imprisoned for four months. After her release Scholl married Otl Aicher with whom she founded the Ulm School of Design in 1946 and which she led until 1974. In the 1980s Scholl was an active member of the German peace movement. She died in 1998.

Die Weiße Rose was first published in 1952 in West Germany by the publishing house Frankfurter Hefte. On its initial publication the book entered a public arena in which the student resistance was remembered yearly in commemorative speeches at the University of Munich. Yet, it appeared at a time when different forms of public commemoration showed competing tendencies. For example, in the same year Robert Scholl wrote a letter to the *Süddeutsche Zeitung* complaining that the anniversary of the execution of his children had passed unremarked by the newspaper (Kirchberger 1987, 39). The

early success of the text is however demonstrated by the fact that an expanded edition was published by Fischer-Bücherei in 1955. Over the next forty years, further expanded editions were published in 1972, 1982 and 1993 by Fischer Taschenbuch Verlag and S. Fischer. In addition, there have been many translations and several republications by other publishing houses and book clubs within Germany (Scholl 1983a, 1983b, 1986, 1990).

A Process of ‘Biographization’ or an Autobiographical Account?

Both Wilfried Breyvogel and Barbara Schüler situate the original publication of Scholl’s text within what they define as the second phase in the historical reconstruction of events of the student resistance (1991, 175; 2000, 164). According to Breyvogel and Schüler this phase, spanning from 1948/9 to 1955, is characterized by attempts to refute the ‘myths’ that had arisen about the resistance in Germany and abroad in the immediate post-war period. Such a categorization implies a certain level of accuracy in texts such as Scholl’s. Nevertheless, Schüler also writes of the persistent blurring of the border between what she calls ‘poetry’ and ‘truth’ in these accounts (2000, 163). In texts by those she calls close relatives, amongst whom she would presumably include Inge Scholl, Schüler claims that an unconscious process of ‘biographization’ is prevalent (2000, 163-64). Breyvogel likewise contends that Scholl was writing to oppose the prevalent tendency to stress the heroic status of the students through a “biographische Historisierung” [biographical historicization] (1991, 165) of the events. A consideration of the role of different textual voices in the alleged process of ‘biographization’, shows how they create or refute expectations of genre. It is my contention that the text can be productively considered as an autobiography.

In the immediate post-war period Inge Scholl wrote two texts for her parents: ‘Erinnerungen an München’ [Memories of Munich] and ‘Biographische Notizen von Hans und Sophie Scholl’ [Biographical Notes about Hans and Sophie Scholl]. These documents have never been published in their entirety, although detailed extracts can be read in Schüler’s monograph on the group and the latter is stored at the Institut für Zeitgeschichte in Munich (IfZ ZS A26/4). Scholl sent her ‘Erinnerungen an München’ to Ricarda Huch, who used it in her depiction of Hans and Sophie in *Die Aktion der Münchener Studenten gegen Hitler* (1948/9). By this time Scholl had written the text which

was to become *Die Weiße Rose*, and extracts were published in her article entitled "Menschen wie du und ich" [People like you and I] in 1951. When *Die Weiße Rose* was published a year later it differed significantly in style from her two earlier narratives. It also involved, as Wilfried Breyvogel has analysed, a change in stylistic emphasis from the extracts of 1951: from the third-person narrative to a multiplicity of voices (1991, 175-79). In the text of 1952 first-person narration is juxtaposed with various character focalizers, descriptions in the third person and rhetorical questions. Interspersed within the retrospective narration are instances of direct speech and quotations from other sources, including letters and diaries of Hans and Sophie Scholl. It is my contention that these voices, which are considered in detail below, do indeed provide a framework for additional biographical details of Hans and Sophie Scholl. At the same time, they position Inge, the sister-protagonist, within the student resistance through an emphasis on age, youthfulness and shared experience.

The text is framed by first-person retrospective narration, situating the protagonist as a schoolgirl and member of the Scholl family. The youth of the protagonist and members of the 'Weiße Rose' at the time the fascists came to power is stressed through reference to the landscape of their childhood. The relatively young age of the main characters is reiterated and authenticated by the interspersal of photos within the narrative and through the perpetrators' voice on the posters detailing the executions of those involved:

Wegen Hochverrats wurden zum Tode verurteilt:
 Der 24jährige Christoph Probst
 der 25jährige Hans Scholl
 die 22jährige Sophia [sic] Scholl
 Das Urteil wurde bereits vollstreckt. (Scholl 1997, 11)¹

Sentenced to Death for High Treason:
 Christoph Probst, age 24
 Hans Scholl, age 25
 Sophie Scholl, age 22
 The Sentences Have Already Been Carried Out (Scholl 1983, 3)²

¹ Further references in the text are to this edition. As will be seen later, there are substantive differences between editions. However, all quotes used in this chapter from the 1997 edition are identical to those in the original 1952 edition.

² Translations of the quotations from the 1952 edition are taken from the translation of 1983 by Arthur R. Schultz. Further references in the text are to this edition. Where I wish to emphasize an element of the original not reflected in the translation, I have shown this in square brackets. All other translations are my own.

The process of 'biographization' therefore highlights youthfulness. This emphasis on age is significant not only in terms of the protagonist's identities, but also for the interaction with post-war discourse about youth and responsibility, and for the appeal to young addressees.

Fundamental to the first-person protagonist's memories is her involvement in the Hitler Youth. Memories of this participation are not individualized. In describing the attraction of the columns of young people with their flags, the protagonist is situated both within the group of brothers and sisters and within the youth organisation itself. Rhetorical questions express the power of conformism, inviting a response which justifies their youthful enthusiasm: "War es nicht etwas Überwältigendes, diese Gemeinschaft?" (14) [Was not this sense of fellowship overpowering? (6)] Through romanticized images of belonging and poeticized descriptions of nature, the narrator links an idealized notion of landscape and home to youthful naivety. Stylized sensuality conveys, and recuperates, a romanticized discourse of 'Heimat', which was highly contested at the time of publication (Boa and Palfreyman 2000, 10-11):

Wir hatten den Geruch von Moos, von feuchter Erde und duftenden Äpfeln im Sinn, wenn wir an unsere Heimat dachten [...] Wir liebten es und konnten kaum sagen, warum. (13)

We sniffed the odor of moss, damp earth, and sweet apples whenever we thought of our homeland [...] We loved it, though we couldn't say why. (5-6)

The persuasiveness of Nazi propaganda and its self-evident effect on young people are reiterated by the narrative. The narrator maintains that it was hardly surprising that the Scholl family all joined the Hitler Youth, thus legitimizing her behaviour by situating it alongside others. The protagonist's later break from fascism is signified not only by her change in attitude but also in the physical process of ageing. In contrast to her support for fascism, this break is not described in terms of collective behaviour, but it occurs instead vicariously. Emphasizing delusion as an integral part their of childhood, the narrative describes how political enlightenment occurred for all the siblings as their brother Hans became an adult. His behaviour is taken as emblematic for the whole family and the protagonist's antifascist identity is suggested through her proximity to him: "Der Funke quälenden Zweifels, der in Hans erglommen war, sprang auf uns alle über" (17) [The spark of tormenting doubt which was kindled in Hans spread to the rest of us (10)].

Through an emphasis on Hans' development there is distance from discourses which were prevalent in the late 1940s – and which recurred after the publication of Scholl's text – suggesting that the Scholls were still children at the time of resistance and execution. For example, both J. P. Stern and Ricarda Huch make such claims, seeing the Scholls' refusal to accept fascist norms, and the so-called self-evident nature of their opposition, as being elements of childhood. Huch frequently refers to Hans and Sophie Scholl as 'Kinder' (1948/9, 970) and Stern echoes these comments ten years later: "If to grow up means to accept the world's coins and weights and measures, to come to terms with and make the best of and conform to, then he [Hans Scholl] never did grow up" (1958, 83). In Scholl's text the contrasting emphasis is significant both in terms of the historical depiction of the student resistance and in terms of a wider understanding of the role of young people during fascism. The support base that Nazism created among the German youth is well documented, as is their involvement in acts of fascist aggression (Klönne 1984). However, in post-war West German society there was a call to exonerate those who had been so involved due to their young age (see for example, Andersch 1946, 21-26). In stressing that the students had become adults by the time of their resistance, Scholl's text contributes to such a discourse, with her descriptions being used subsequently as proof that 'even' the Scholl family at first succumbed to fascism. A later text stresses, for example, that they grew up as "reinrassige Zöglinge des Hitlerismus" [pure-blooded pupils of Hitler] (Hanser 1982, 15). While it is important that the Scholls' involvement in Nazi youth activities be mentioned, given a tendency in other narratives about the group to deny it retrospectively (Hübner 1982, 112), the construction of their conduct as self-evident in the circumstances prioritizes memories of behaviour of this kind over those young people who chose not to join the Hitler Youth, who were not permitted to join because of 'racial' reasons, or who were members of other resistance movements by this time.

In spite of the insistence on adulthood within Scholl's text, the Munich students have often been portrayed as naive and unpolitical as part of the discourse precluding responsibility for young people (Stern 1991, 91). A focus on an idealized explanation of their behaviour has been used to distance their actions from political interpretation. Since the 1960s, historians have argued that such early depictions were due to a Western attempt to downplay communist sympathies within the group (Jahnke 1968, 883; von Kardorff 1968, 41; Moll 1999, 131). An alleged lack of an overriding political impetus has left the group open

to charges of a reckless disregard for their own lives and of the lives of others – an interpretation that has been repeatedly opposed by the relatives and friends of the group, including Inge Scholl and her father. Another way in which Scholl's text counters these discourses of youth and naivety is by rooting the students' actions politically through a description of interest in literature. Literature is repeatedly and progressively inscribed as a site of resistance within the text, with Hans' initial doubts about Nazism stemming from the fact that he was forbidden to read a book of poetry by Stefan Zweig. The description of intellectual growth revolves, once again, around Hans and becomes emblematic of all the brothers and sisters. The repeated reference to Jewish authors banned under Nazism is also significant in the context of publication: it allows not only for the reappropriation of such literature and a repossessing of pre-fascist German tradition, but also for a refutation of a 'Zero Hour', of a time in 1945 when Germany had to, and could, start entirely from scratch.

The thematization of the role of literature in Scholl's text is also of importance when the addressees of the text are considered. It has been well established that Scholl wrote the text as a pedagogical tool and that her addressees were German schoolchildren (Schüler 2000, 103). In stressing the importance of literature as instrumental to psychological development and resistance to fascism, the text validates itself. Its positioning as an 'educational document' creates a framework of accuracy and authenticity. Such textual aims have been consolidated within the memory politics of West Germany through the text's repeated use within the school system; it has become part of institutionalized memories on fascism in West Germany since the 1950s.

The addressee is repeatedly involved within Scholl's text by means of rhetorical questions, which reiterate the reciprocity of the process of remembering. These rhetorical questions frequently intersect with changes of narrative focus and embody stream-of-consciousness alongside description in the third person:

Hans fiel dieses zwiespältige Leben besonders schwer. Schwerer noch und dunkler aber lastete auf ihm, daß er in einem Staat leben mußte, in dem die Unfreiheit, der Haß und die Lüge nun zum Normalzustand geworden waren. Wurde nicht die Klammer der Gewaltherrschaft immer enger und unerträglicher? War nicht jeder Tag, an dem man noch in Freiheit lebte, ein Geschenk? [...] Konnte Hans sich wundern, wenn morgen früh die Geheime Staatspolizei klingelte und seiner Freiheit ein Ende setzte? (23)

This split existence was difficult enough, but the heavier and gloomier burden he [Hans] had to bear was that he lived in a country where bondage, hatred and

falsehood had become the normal mode of existence. [Wasn't the] viselike rule of naked force [...] becoming tighter and ever more unbearable [?]. [Wasn't each] day of liberty [...] a gift [?][...]. Would he be surprised if tomorrow morning the Gestapo were to come to his door and put an end to his freedom? (17)

These questions create narrative space for answers and it is noticeable that it is often within such space that the text discusses, refutes, and contributes to post-war discourses on the 'Weiße Rose' group: in particular, in relation to the intersecting issues of the group's motivations, definitions of 'German' and 'fascist', and debates about martyrdom and betrayal. For example, at the start of the text the narrator asks what it was that these 'criminals' had done, and then goes on to address the motivations of the group:

Während die einen über sie spotteten und sie in den Schmutz zogen, sprachen die anderen von Helden der Freiheit. Aber kann man sie Helden nennen? Sie haben nichts Übermenschliches unternommen. Sie haben etwas Einfaches verteidigt, sind für etwas Einfaches eingestanden, für das Recht und die Freiheit des einzelnen Menschen, für seine freie Entfaltung und ein freies Leben. [...] Was sie wollten, war, daß Menschen wie du und ich in einer menschlichen Welt leben können. (12)

While some people mocked and vilified them, others described them as heroes of freedom. But were they heroes? They attempted no superhuman task. They stood up for a simple matter, an elementary principle: the right of the individual to choose his manner of life and to live in freedom [...]. They wanted to make it possible for people like you and me to live in a humane society. (4)

Through the individualized appeal to the reader, the narrator both negates the heroicized remembrance of the group, which was prominent both in the university memorial lectures during the late 1940s (Vossler 1947) and exemplified by Ricarda Huch's text, and roots their resistance in an existentialist discourse of self-determination. The powerful, idealistic rhetoric of the individual is linked to a recognition within the group of the significance of their actions. Rhetorical questions further encapsulate an awareness about the seriousness and possible consequences of their behaviour, thus militating against a reading of the group's actions as naive:

Sie empfanden schmerzlich, wie grenzenlos isoliert sie waren, und daß vielleicht die besten Freunde sich entsetzt zurückziehen würden, wüßten sie davon. Denn allein das Mitwissen war ja eine ungeheure Gefährdung. Sie waren sich in solchen Stunden voll bewußt, daß sie auf einem schmalen Grat gingen. Wer wußte denn, ob man ihnen nicht inzwischen schon auf der Spur war, ob die Nachbarn, die sie arglos grüßten, nicht schon ein Unternehmen eingeleitet

hatten, sie alle zu fangen? Ob hinter ihnen irgendeiner auf der Straße ging, der ihre Wege beobachtete? (48)

They realised with dismay how immeasurably lonely they were, that their closest friends would draw back from them in horror if they knew. For just to know what was going on entailed a tremendous danger. At these times they were fully aware that they walked on a razor's edge. Who could know whether they were not already under surveillance; whether the neighbours to whom they innocently said hello had not already started the process that would lead to their capture; whether someone was not following them in the streets, observing all their movements. (41)

Episodes such as the above create a framework of authenticity, speaking as they do from the perspective of the murdered protagonists. However, given the textual insistence on the vicarious experiencing of resistance, it could be argued that these episodes also contain the voice of the sister-protagonist. This will be explored further below.

As the sister of Hans and Sophie, Inge Scholl's account has been received by many as the definitive account of their motivations for resistance. Historians repeatedly quote these passages of rhetorical thought as factual evidence within their accounts. Scholl's familial connection thus privileges her position as a witness to the events. Even though it is well established that Inge Scholl did not know in detail about their actions until after the event, the text positions a sister-protagonist very much involved in their progression towards resistance.

Juxtaposed with the many rhetorical questions and constant use of streams-of-consciousness are episodes of direct speech. These occur in the present tense and switch the time level of the text to the narrative past, conveying a sense of immediacy. They are important in deepening understanding of the motivations for the students' resistance. Opposing viewpoints on the situation in Nazi Germany are conveyed through such means, and fall into two types. On the one hand, there are those comments of pro-Nazi supporters and those which contain the voice of the regime: "Nun wird alles besser werden in Deutschland. Hitler hat das Ruder ergriffen" (13) [Now there will be better times in Germany. Hitler is at the helm (5)]. These can be read as emblematic of wider sentiments, not just restricted to their speaker. On the other hand, there are comments from the side of the resistance, most frequently from Hans, Sophie and their father. Stylized exchanges suggest a clear teleology of the students' decision to resist: from questions about concentration camps to the need to get hold of a printing machine. Through their initially naive questions and the interspersal of dramatized metaphor within their father's answers,

the domestic sphere is equated with Germany: "In uns erwachte ein Gefühl, als lebten wir in einem einst schönen und reinen Haus, in dessen Keller hinter verschlossenen Türen furchtbare, böse, unheimliche Dinge geschehen" (18) [There awoke in us a feeling of living in a house once beautiful and clean but in whose cellars behind locked doors frightful, evil and fearsome things were happening (11)]. Such narrative demarcation of the progression of these resistance activities – with significant decisions being attributed through direct speech to the brother and sister – is part of what has been criticized as a repeated tendency towards 'homogenization' and 'centralization' within Scholl's text (Schüler 2000, 165).

In addition to these individualized, yet at the same time representative, voices are the perspectives of people within the Scholl family circle, who are shown to be instrumental in prompting their changed attitude towards the Nazi regime. At several points in the narrative these voices describe the instigation of the fascist euthanasia programme. These episodes are significant as they not only epitomize the brutality of the Nazi regime, but they also involve narratorial comment as to the possibility of resistance. Following an emotive description of the murder of mentally disabled children, the narrator compares the defiant voice of a hospital doctor to the nurses who experience complete helplessness in the face of Nazi terror, a feeling exemplified by the soldier who returned from service at the Russian front to find that his disabled child was no longer alive.

As is illustrated by this example of the soldier, the two opposing sides of resistance and conformity constructed through the voices within the text are themselves not shown to be simplistic, unproblematic or homogenous. The voice of those responsible for the execution of Scholl's brother and sister, as spoken through the "Plakate zur Beruhigung der Bevölkerung" (11) [posters to calm the populace] and the voice of the presiding judge, the notorious Roland Freisler, is differentiated several times from an unspecified mass of the German population. Such sentiments are reiterated both through the perspective of Hans: "Hans wußte gut, daß er nur einer von Millionen in Deutschland war, die ähnlich wie er empfanden" (24) [Hans knew, of course, that he was but one of millions in Germany who felt as he did (16)]; and Sophie: "'Was wir sagten und schrieben, denken ja so viele. Nur wagten sie nicht, es auszusprechen'" (61) [What we said and wrote is what many people are thinking. Only they don't dare to say it (59)]. The repetition of such sentiments can be situated within immediate post-war discourses surrounding the group which negated theories of collective guilt. However, according to later

critics, these led to the problematic appropriation of the resistance as a universal alibi (Kirchberger 1987, 40).

Fundamental to an interpretation which differentiates between fascist and German is the figure of the soldier, which is thematized within Scholl's text through description of the students' role in the German army. This is given prominence within the narrative: the text begins with a reference to the Battle of Stalingrad, the first of several references to German war losses. Stalingrad has become a controversial motif within discussions about the resistance. Writing before the publication of Scholl's text, Hans Rothfels claimed that although the student resistance began before the defeat at Stalingrad, there had already been a tendency in literature and public commemoration to focus on the years of 1942 and 1943, years with which the resistance has now become synonymous (Rothfels 1949, 18). Breyvogel is one of several historians who suggests that the letters and diaries of the group date their resistance to the regime from 1938 (1991, 185). However, the emphasis in Scholl's text on the resistance in 1942 links the students' actions very clearly as the result of German losses. It thus excludes other motivations and ignores the impact of earlier events. For example, the pogrom against the Jewish population in Germany of 1938, which could well have contributed to the students' growing uncertainty, is disarticulated through a later focus. Schüler contends that a constricted chronology in the history of the 'Weiße Rose' precludes consideration of the reasons that prompted the Scholls' change in attitude towards fascism and downplays the fact that the decision to resist was a possibility that other people had too (2000, 12). The textual prominence of Stalingrad must also be considered in the context of publication in the 1950s during the Cold War; such references project anger at defeat onto the then enemy, the Soviet Union, thus displacing questions of responsibility for fascism.

The repeated equation of death at Stalingrad and the execution of the students, both at the beginning and end of the text, could also be situated within a pattern of remembrance which prioritized the students' deaths rather than their actions. Kurt Schilde points out that such an equation has been read as suggesting a convenient futility of resistance against the fascist state (1995, 43). Such an emphasis is present within the memorial lectures of the late 1940s, some of which, like that given by the renowned Catholic theologian-philosopher Romano Guardini, did not mention the students' actions at all, concentrating instead on abstract ideals (1946). The focus on their deaths reduces the need to examine their motivations and simultaneously leads to the exclusion of the resisters who survived

(Breyvogel 1991, 182; Schilde 1995, 167). However, Scholl's narrative emphatically contradicts discourses proclaiming that the students' aim was death and martyrdom:

Zunächst, bis unter der Last des Beweismaterials alle ihre Verschleierungsversuche sinnlos geworden waren, hatten sie durchaus einen anderen Weg gesehen und *gewollt*: zu überleben und nach dem Ende der Gewaltherrschaft an einem neuen Leben mitzuwirken. (58, emphasis in original)

At first, until their efforts to hold back information had become meaningless in the face of the evidence and proof of their complicity, they had conceived and chosen a different course: to survive and to take their part in the creation of a new order after the [tyranny] was overthrown. (54)

While the text on one level clearly contests such narratives further by exploring the reasons for the students' change in attitude towards Nazism and suggesting motivations for their resistance, there is still a structural tendency within the narrative to a reduction to the time of Stalingrad and to a focus on their deaths.

The narration moves quickly to the time just before the resistance and thus gives primacy to the figure of the soldier. The text includes a photograph of the student resister Willi Graf in his uniform, which reminds the reader of the much-deployed image of the group of friends on their departure to the front. Thus, resisters and soldiers are constantly equated as victims of fascism. Such a narrative contributed to the context of West Germany of the 1950s where the paradigm of German soldiers as victims was prevalent. The continued republication of the text contributes to the repeated prominence given to German soldiers in hierarchies of remembrance in West Germany that lasted into the late 1990s (Peitsch 1998, xv). The narrative addresses difficulties of the members of the 'Weiße Rose' group in their dual role as soldiers and resisters, counteracting discourses which equated resistance with betrayal as follows:

Denn es kostete keine geringe Kraft, gegen den Strom zu schwimmen. Schwieriger aber und bitterer noch war es, dem eigenen Volk die militärische Niederlage wünschen zu müssen; sie schien die einzige Möglichkeit zu sein, es von dem Parasiten zu befreien, der sein innerstes Mark aussaugte. (44)

For it took a great deal of strength to swim against the current. But even more difficult and much more bitter was the need to hope for the defeat of one's own people, for that seemed to be the only possible way of ridding the country of the parasite draining the nation's strength. (37)

In using the metaphor of the sick German nation, which was prevalent at the time, the narrator presents fascism as an invasive outside Other, attacking an inherently healthy collective. Such an understanding of Nazism contrasts noticeably with the emphasis in Hilde Huppert's text on the 'kleiner Faschismus', that is, on the actions of the wider German population.

Scholl's acknowledgement that resistance was still tainted with the reproach of betrayal was echoed some years later by Clara Huber, the wife of Kurt Huber, an academic also executed in 1943 (1986, 19). *Die Weiße Rose* was published at a time when, as Peter Steinbach writes:

[...] der Widerstand gegen den Nationalsozialismus nicht nur um seine Anerkennung und Würdigung im öffentlichen Bewußtsein ringen mußte, sondern auch viele Zeitgenossen ihre Anpassungs- und Folgebereitschaft, ihren fehlenden Mut und ihr Versagen vor dem Nationalsozialismus durch eine Diffamierung von Exil und Widerstand rechtfertigen wollten. (1993b, 132)

[...] resistance to National Socialism did not only have to fight for recognition and acknowledgement in public consciousness, but also [when] many contemporaries were wanting to justify their willingness to conform, their lack of courage and their failure in the face of National Socialism through a defamation of exile and resistance.

However, the actions of Hans and Sophie Scholl have never been viewed as critically in this respect as has, for example, the resistance of the members of the Communist Party, which is explored in the chapter on Greta Kuckhoff's autobiography. While this can partly be explained by the international political constellations of the Cold War, it could also be attributed to the emphasis on the youth of the protagonists and their consequent freedom from blame. In subsequent secondary literature it is repeatedly stressed that the young students had first carried out their military duty in the East, with their status as soldiers being seen by some as a fact that made their resistance possible (Bald 2003; Kirchberger 1987, 11; Weniger 1954, 165). In addition, since Ricarda Huch's text of 1948, there have been frequent comparisons made between the members of the 'Weiße Rose' and the resisters of 20 July. It is the latter who have been given greater prominence within West German remembrance since the end of the war. The comparison between the two groups is also made on the dustcover of the 1952 edition of Scholl's text: "Ihre Aktion steht neben der der Offiziere des 20. Juli als das erste weit sichtbar gewordene Zeichen des anderen Deutschland" [Their actions stand, alongside those of the officers of the resistance group known as 20th

July, as the first significantly visible sign of the other Germany]. As high profile military figures, these men, who aimed to destroy Hitler but not the authoritarian system, similarly exemplified public commemoration focusing on the soldier as victim.

A textual focus on the death of the students or the male members' role as soldiers conveys memories which, on one level, exclude the protagonist. Recent sources have indicated that Inge Scholl's soldier boyfriend, Ernst Reden, was killed early in the war (Schüler 2000, 48). In spite of such personal loss, Scholl's text makes no mention of these events. On another level, the identity of the protagonist as a remaining member of the Scholl family and as a German who survived Nazism is simultaneously emphasized. By dismantling the equation of German and fascist and problematizing the dichotomy of acceptance versus resistance (as encapsulated by the figure of the soldier), the text engages with a context in the immediate post-war period in which concepts of generic guilt were put forward. It is my contention that the identity of the sister protagonist, as constructed through the intersection of voices within the text – that is, the figure of Inge Scholl herself – is fundamental to this deconstructed dichotomy.

In the secondary literature on resistance, little notice is taken of Inge Scholl, designated an "Unperson" [non-person] in the history of the 'Weiße Rose' group (Schüler 2000, 48). A textual framework of authenticity within her narrative has led to a tendency to situate it within the historiography of the group, to read it either as an historical account or simply as a biography of Hans and Sophie Scholl. Such readings have resulted in an increased concentration on these two protagonists, to the persistent disadvantage of Inge Scholl herself. The resultant emphasis is on those narratives highlighted above as associated with her brother and sister, for example, resistance, death and victimhood. The appropriation of Scholl's text in historical narratives, within a framework creating expectations of accuracy, has led to it being criticized for alleged inaccuracies by later historians (Petry 1968, 51). However, a reading of Scholl's text as autobiography, rather than biography, allows for a productive reconsideration of such criticisms. Such a reconsideration is all the more necessary due to the canonical status achieved by the text.

At first glance it may seem that the text militates against a reading as autobiography. The title clearly spotlights the events of the group and not the role of the author. However, following Lejeune's definition, it is clear that the name of the author, the protagonist, as revealed in the first lines of the text in the first person, and the narrator are identical (1989, 5). Likewise, the author's name and the title are

clearly connected; as Konstantin von Bayern wrote, “Scholl! Bei diesem Namen werden Erinnerungen wach an die ‘Weiße Rose’” (1956, 448) [Scholl! When you hear this name you think of the ‘White Rose’ group]. The author’s surname had therefore already become synonymous with the actions of the group and a part of ritualized commemoration in West Germany by the time of the text’s publication. Textual links are repeatedly made to this canonical memory by the first-person narrator’s location with respect to her brothers, sisters, and parents, reminding the reader of the protagonist’s subject position.

The text clearly begins with the first-person singular but, as has been shown, this is juxtaposed with many other perspectives within the narrative. It is my contention that such narratorial shifts do not negate the autobiographical pact; rather, that it becomes important to examine how these voices interact. The first-person narrator becomes particularly prominent on the death of Hans and Sophie Scholl, both at the beginning and the end of the narrative. At such moments, the emphasis is on the sister who is left behind. At other times, the first person is merged within both a familial and a wider collective, with the attendant change in focus reflecting a textual closeness to the other figures involved and arguably embodying a narrative confrontation of mourning and loss.

Other sources indicate that Inge Scholl was very involved with the Hitler Youth, was an enthusiastic youth leader at the start of the Nazi regime and took pride in an unexpected meeting with Hitler (Aicher 1998, 73; Leisner 2000, 92). They likewise show that, although not involved in the production of the resistance leaflets, she participated in opposition to the Nazis through her assistance with the preparation of a circular called *Windlicht*, for which she was arrested by the Gestapo in August 1942 (Schüler, 2000, 178-80). This followed an earlier arrest in 1937 when she maintained ties to a forbidden youth movement while in the Hitler Youth (Hartnagel 2003, 48). As has been discussed above, according to Scholl’s text, her change in attitude was rooted in the family environment but is not individualized – the reader learns nothing explicitly about her involvement in resistance or of her initial personal enthusiasm for the Nazi state. From Scholl’s later publications we learn that her personal suffering began with the arrest of her family, at which point the narrative of *Die Weiße Rose* ends (Aicher-Scholl 1993). Nevertheless, it is my contention that this is not enough to negate Lejeune’s requirement that an autobiography must be “the story of a life” (1989, 4). Following feminist scholarship that enables a definition of autobiography based

on the telling of women's lives through the stories of others' subjectivity (Marcus 1995, 20), I examine how Scholl's portrayal of the events of the 'Weiße Rose' throws light on her own.³ The (re)placing of Inge Scholl within the events of resistance described leads to significant conclusions about gender and memories of fascism in West Germany during the 1950s and in subsequent years. These conclusions are related particularly to hierarchies of experience and the right to tell one's story. They focus on textual constructions of religiosity and meaning, concepts of nationhood, and the depiction of Sophie.

Constellations of Gender

Reading Scholl's text as autobiography places it within the discourse surrounding women's involvement in fascism in a different way than if it were read as a biography. Since the late 1970s, the role of women in the establishment and perpetuation of the Nazi system has become a subject of intense debate, with historians vacillating from positions which exonerate women completely from responsibility or those which lay the blame for Nazism entirely at their feet (Windaus-Walser 1988). Since the late 1980s more differentiated studies have attempted to distance themselves from such binary oppositions and enable a picture of women's everyday lives under fascism to be established (Gravenhorst and Tatschmurat 1990; Heinsohn et al. 1997). A reading of Scholl's text as an autobiography contributes to this debate. It highlights the role of a woman who initially supported fascism but following the persecution of members of her family became a victim of its terror. Instead of focusing on those murdered by the Nazis, such a reading concentrates on the position and actions of Inge Scholl herself.

Although Scholl's involvement in the production of the resistance circular, *Windlicht*, and her subsequent arrest were not made public, it is notable that she does not choose to mention them in her text. Later texts have published information that Hans confronted Inge with the possibility of further resistance, but that her terrified reaction prevented him from telling her of their involvement:

³ This vicarious telling of her life history predominates in writing by and about Scholl, particularly in relation to her work at the 'Hochschule für Gestaltung' in Ulm (Konstantin von Bayern 1956, 451).

Wahrscheinlich 1942 sprach Hans Scholl zum ersten Male seiner Schwester gegenüber von der Notwendigkeit, einen ganz klaren und sichtbaren Protest gegen das Regime zu wagen. Die Schwester Inge sagte: Warum müssen wir es tun, die Fährte zu uns ist schon so tief ausgetreten, können es nicht andere tun, von denen man noch nicht so viel weiß? Der Bruder lenkte ab. (Erich Kuby in an article published in 1953, cited in Petry 1968, 89)

It was probably in 1942 when Hans Scholl first spoke to his sister about the necessity of daring to make a quite clear and visible protest against the regime. Inge, the sister, said: Why do we have to do it? There are already too many leads that point to us. Can't others, about whom they don't know so much, do it? The brother changed the subject.

Hermann Vinke, whose book was written with Scholl's co-operation, confirms this episode, so it would seem that this is an accurate description of her reaction (1980, 125). Similarly, Schüler refers to Scholl's comments in 'Erinnerungen an München':

“Ich wagte sie [die Flugblätter] nicht einmal zu lesen, um nicht aus dem Stil die volle Gewißheit zu bekommen, daß sie von Hans seien” [...]. Für Inge Scholl [bestand] kein Zweifel daran, daß der Bruder Hans etwas damit zu tun haben mußte. (2000, 110)

“I didn't even dare to read them [the leaflets] as I knew the style would tell me in all certainty that Hans had written them” [...]. For Inge Scholl there was no doubt that her brother Hans must have something to do with it.

I suggest that, in a continuation of the paradigm of vicarious experience, Inge Scholl's fears about involvement in resistance *are* contained in *Die Weiße Rose*, but spoken from Sophie's perspective rather than that of the first-person narrator. The text thus shifts the focus away from questions of resistance and Inge Scholl, back onto the actions of her brother and sister. Rather than denigrating the extent of Scholl's opposition to the regime, as Christian Petry seems to do (1968, 89), it is my contention that it is more productive to look at such episodes as constructing hierarchies of memories about fascism. Through the focalizer Sophie, Scholl's text gives prime emphasis once again to those who can categorically be claimed as belonging to 'das andere Deutschland' [the other Germany], and turns away from fears about the very real dangers of resistance as expressed in these other documents by the surviving sister.

The only textual reference to the protagonist's individual opposition to the regime occurs following the description of Erwin Rommel's funeral, where she managed to creep past the flags in order

to avoid saluting them. This example of individual defiance occurs in the context of the "missing stories" of resistance:

Sie [die Zeitungen] berichteten kein Wort davon, daß täglich nicht nur ein Todesurteil, sondern Dutzende gefällt wurden. Die Wochenschau schaute weiß Gott nicht in die Gefängnisse, die beinahe barsten vor Überfüllung, obwohl ihre Insassen mehr Schatten und Skeletten als menschlichen Körpern glichen. Sie sah nicht die blassen Gesichter dahinter, sie hörte nicht die klopfenden Herzen, nicht den stummen Schrei, der durch ganz Deutschland ging. (51)

They [the newspapers] made no mention of the fact that day after day not one but dozens of executions took place. God knows the newsreel cameras never got inside the prisons which were crowded to bursting, though the inmates resembled ghosts and skeletons rather than human bodies. They did not film the pale, drawn faces behind the bars; they did not record the pounding of hearts, the silent cry that went through all Germany. (46)

The narrative listing of these stories which did not appear in the press reinforces the terror of fascism. Such pervasive fear is then placed within a wider context of victimhood through the figure of a German woman who wandered through Dresden carrying her dead child in a suitcase, looking for somewhere to bury it. In mentioning this episode, which other sources indicate was witnessed by Hans (Stern 1991, 15), the narrator gives an emotive reminder of the consequences of Nazism. The effect of the horrific allied bombing raids, epitomized in the figure of the dead child, contributes to the notion of an innocent German population suffering because of the actions of 'the Nazis'.

Reading Scholl's text as an autobiography, in line with postmodern genre theory, highlights the element of subjectivity. Construction and interpretation of memories therefore become more significant than 'objective truth', something which successive historians have claimed to seek in writing on the group since the late 1940s. Petry, for example, is critical of the inaccuracy of Scholl's linking of the student leaflets to a letter from Clemens August Graf von Galen calling for resistance (1968, 51). What becomes important in such an autobiographical reading, rather than the temporal or textual distance between the letter and the leaflets, is that Inge Scholl sees the two as connected. This connection is instrumental in constructing a 'meaning' behind the student resistance, the search for which is symptomatic of writing about the group from the late 1940s, beginning with Ricarda Huch's assertion that the group did not die in vain (Huch 1948/9, 965). Finding a 'meaning' is also, as Schüler has noted, a way of making sense of the events for those remaining, a way of coping, and even surviving (2000, 397). In fact Scholl's text locates

a ‘meaning’ within the religious beliefs of Hans and Sophie. The parameters of such an interpretation perpetuate the narrative focus on Hans Scholl; he becomes emblematic of a wider Christianity. As we shall see, such a focus has textual implications for the positioning of memories of the Holocaust and for the depiction of Sophie Scholl within the context of other gender divisions within the text.

According to *Die Weiße Rose* it was not only the resistance leaflets that were a result of the Christian beliefs held by Hans and Sophie Scholl. Christianity is seen, by an authoritative first-person voice of the present narrator, as the basis for all aspects of their behaviour and as a source of solace in their last hours. Central to the narrative focus on Hans and to the understanding of religiosity are three episodes which are listed as part of Hans’ stream-of-consciousness; these are prompted by Hans hearing of the arrest of his father and his decision not to plead with the Nazi authorities for his father’s release. As Hans returns to his company in Russia he is overcome by memories: two of the episodes he remembers involve Jewish enforced labourers and one a dying German soldier. When Hans sees these workers and offers them food and tobacco, he is met with exaggerated expressions of gratitude, albeit not immediate, on the part of their Jewish recipients: “Nie würde Hans den jähen Anflug von Glück vergessen, der in diesen Augen erglomm” (47) [Never would Hans forget the quick flash of joy which ignited in those eyes (40)]. In the third episode, Hans is unable to help a German soldier who dies from his wounds. These three episodes are linked, both through their immediate textual proximity and through Hans’ subsequent rhetorical question: “Wann endlich, wann erkannte der Staat, daß ihm nichts höher sein sollte als das bißchen Glück der Millionen kleiner Menschen ?” (47) [When, when will the state finally recognize that it has no higher duty than to safeguard the happiness of millions of ordinary people? (40)]. The textual juxtaposition of the three examples leads to an equation of victims. The Jewish woman who stands with a white daisy in her hair finds the same compassion from Hans as the soldier’s widow whom he meets “selig vor Erwartung, mit einem bunten Blumenstrauß in den Armen” (47) [blissful with expectation, carrying a large bouquet of bright flowers (40)]. This image is an echo of an earlier description of Sophie, who on the night before her departure for university, similarly stood with a flower in her hair. However, the equation of these victims is problematic. It relativizes the crimes against the Jewish population through its gendered universalization. A gendered suggestion of the redemptive powers of patriarchal Christianity, which was prevalent in the writing of memories of fascism in West Germany at the time of

publication (Peitsch 1990, 172), is thus emphasized through the focus on Hans. The accompanying publication blurb reinforces the placing of the text within a narrative of the redemption of Jewish victims by Christians: the dust-cover from 1952 contains information about a book by Lotte Paepcke, a Jewish woman who found sanctuary in a monastery during the fascist period. Subsequent secondary literature has reinforced the significance of these episodes: Weniger refers to Hans' behaviour "als Ausdruck der Humanitas" [as an expression of humanity] (1954, 165) and Klaus Scholder interprets his response as showing exemplary humaneness (1963, 49). While Scholl's text emphasizes the positive reaction of Jewish workers to Hans' kindness, the focus on his experiences rather than theirs also leads to some anomalous commentary: The West German historian Scholder is implicitly critical of the initial reaction of the Jewish girl who, when faced with Hans' pity, throws his 'gift' back at him. That Scholder could maintain, in 1963 when the Auschwitz trials were just beginning, that such depictions of Hans' meeting with enforced labour were events "marginal to the big picture" (1963, 49), leads to questions about the role of Scholl's text in the construction of memories about the Holocaust.

Given *Die Weiße Rose's* canonical status in West Germany these episodes are significant in terms of the way they present the annihilation of the Jewish population through a focus on the figure of Hans. The enforced labourers that Hans meets are alive, although clearly suffering, and are thus exceptions in the context of the systematic murder. Before these episodes, previous reference to the Holocaust is only by circuitous reference to "die Sache mit den Juden" (15) [this thing about the Jews (7)]. The main body of the text contains no further details as to the progressive persecution and murder. While the existence of concentration camps is mentioned it is not in a specifically Jewish connection, but in the context of "Krieg mitten im tiefsten Frieden und im eigenen Volk" (17) [war in the midst of peace and within our own people (11)]. However, this is not to say that there is no reference within the text as a whole: the students' second leaflet is explicit about the fact that "seit der Eroberung Polens [sind] dreihunderttausend Juden in diesem Land [Polen] auf bestialischste Art ermodet worden [...]" (81, emphasis in original) [since the conquest of Poland *three hundred thousand* Jews have been murdered in this country in the most bestial way (78)]. In referring to the invasion of Poland, the role of the German army in the atrocities is also highlighted. The fifth leaflet, which along with the others forms a part of Scholl's text in all editions, contains a warning to the German

people that a similar fate could befall them if they do not resist the oppressive Nazi state. The leaflets appeal to fear and self-preservation through reference to the Jewish population.

Notwithstanding this presence of Jewish suffering in Scholl's narrative, by the time it was published in 1952 the student resistance had already become part of a narrative of atonement. In 1950 Hans Werner Richter wrote in an article for the *Münchener Merkur*:

Sie [Hans und Sophie Scholl] haben die Verbrechen des Dritten Reiches für das deutsche Volk gesühnt, denn nicht das Leid, das durch Leid gesühnt wird, bedeutet Rechtfertigung, sondern nur die freie Tat. (cited Schilde 1995, 42)

They [Hans and Sophie Scholl] have atoned for the crimes of the Third Reich on behalf of the German people, for justification does not mean atoning for suffering, with suffering, but only with the freely chosen deed.

The emphasis is thus transferred from the suffering of the Jewish population to the actions of the Munich students. In the process, any impetus to bring the perpetrators to account is lost. Hans' behaviour is universalized and "die damals durchaus auf eine konkrete Wirkung abzielende Tat wurde in ein Sühneopfer umgedeutet [...]" [the deed which, at that time, was intended to have a concrete effect was turned into an expiatory sacrifice] (Kirchberger 1987, 40).

Notwithstanding the restricted focus of remembrance in the main body of Scholl's text, the narratives of the leaflets and those surrounding the 'Weiße Rose' stand, as J. Stern remarks, as evidence that the "knowledge of the genocide of Jews and Poles in the East was not at all hard to come by [...]" (1991, 27). Even given the specific reception of these events during the 1950s, their publication contradicts the often repeated charge of silence about the Holocaust in West Germany during this time and up until 1979. Kurt Schilde suggests, however, that this date *was* significant in terms of the remembering of resistance in West Germany. He argues that the primacy of the 'Weiße Rose' as representative of youth resistance in West Germany changed with the televising of *Holocaust* (Schilder 1995, 23). The subsequent focus on other resistance groups, for example the Gruppe-Baum, contrasts with the passive image of the Jewish population portrayed in Scholl's text and which had become a dominant narrative by the 1970s.

While Scholl's text emphasizes a religious grounding for the resistance, it counters a narrative of martyrdom by insisting on the political nature of religion. This is significant given the churches' ambiguous role during fascism and given that the text's publication

followed discourses that were prominent in the late 1940s in West Germany which continuously insisted on keeping religion and politics separate. For example, in his writing on resistance Paul Kluge maintained in 1949:

Aber Aufgabe der Kirchen selbst war es doch nicht, in die politische Arena hinabzusteigen, sondern die Leute rein zu halten, die christlichen Gewissen zu wecken und zu schärfen, Kultur und Jugenderziehung, den rechten Dienst am göttlichen Wort zu behaupten. (1949, 139)

But it was not the task of the churches themselves to descend into the political arena but to keep people pure, to awaken and sharpen the Christian's conscience, culture and the education of the young, and maintain proper observance of the divine word.

By attributing religious meaning to the events surrounding the 'WeiÙe Rose' group, Scholl's text engages with controversies about whether such an interpretation precludes a political assessment of their actions. Huch, among others, argued that religious motivations in fact supersede political ones, placing struggles within a wider struggle between good and evil (1948/9, 967). One significant implication of this interpretation for the contemporary context was that it allowed the students' actions to be ahistoricized and 'lessons' applied to all political eras, thus embroiling them within the context of the Cold War. Inge Scholl stressed in an early post-war radio interview:

Meine Geschwister waren Christen von einer tiefen Überzeugung [...]. Sie sahen die großen totalitären politischen Strömungen in unserer Zeit, die das Leben des Menschen nicht achten und es wie eine Walze erdrücken. (Weisenborn 1983)

My siblings were Christians with deep conviction [...]. They saw the totalitarian political forces of our time, which do not respect human life, crushing it to death.

Her use of the present tense clearly signifies her conception of an ongoing battle. Tensions between the telling of the White Rose story at an individual level and its wider application pervade the politics of remembering this group. A reading of Scholl's text as autobiography looks for an individualized focus. As has been shown, however, the text partially militates against such a reading through a collectivization of experience. Public commemoration of Hans and Sophie Scholl repeatedly portrayed them as generically representative of 'the other Germany' and thus offered a way of excusing the German population as a whole from fascist atrocities. However, it was not only Hans and

Sophie Scholl's actions that were appropriated in this way. Although dismissed as a protagonist in her own autobiography, Inge Scholl became herself a "Symbol für Deutschland" [symbol of Germany], a "Muster für das andere Deutschland" [a model of the other Germany] (Schüler 2000, 335-6) in the West Germany of the 1950s. In contradiction of those narratives focusing on the executed resisters rather than those still alive, Scholl's own intentions of remembering the actions of her brother and sister, of acting "im Geiste der Gemordeten" [in the spirit of those who were murdered], were conjoined with an identity imposed upon her by those who believed that she had a role to fulfil (Konstantin von Bayern 1956, 457). Schüler writes of how Inge Scholl was considered "eine der Besten der jungen Generation" [one of the best of the young generation] (2000, 336), how she became symbolic of an otherwise masculinized notion of youth. The behaviour of Sophie and Hans Scholl was projected onto their sister even though, as has been shown, their reactions to the possibilities of resistance were very different. In the same way that the voice of the first person becomes textually prominent after the students' execution, 1950s discourses of nationhood focused their attention on Inge Scholl following the students' deaths. She was seen as a living representative of resistance to the fascist state. This served, as Schüler writes, "durch Entzeitlichung einen Mythos zu pflegen, neue 'Nationalheilige' zu schaffen" [to cultivate a new myth through ahistoricization, to create new 'national saints'] (2000, 11). In conjunction with narratives which perpetuated the prominence of soldiers as victims of Nazism, discourses of 'misused' and 'exploited' patriotism became prevalent in West Germany. A negation of responsibility allowed for a reappropriation of this patriotism and its subsequent projection onto a new concept of the nation. The resultant notion of nationhood was thus inherently masculinized, excluding female figures such as Inge Scholl on which it was originally based. By the 1980s, the attempt to 'normalize' the past by reviving a sense of German nationhood based on masculinized patriotism found its expression in the events surrounding the visit of Helmut Kohl and Ronald Reagan to the soldiers' cemetery in Bitburg (see Lipstadt 1994, 111).

Although many texts about the group, particularly early ones, made links between martyrdom and nationhood, talking of the Scholls' "Opfertod für's Vaterland" [sacrifice for the fatherland] (Alt 1946, 88), it is a link that Inge Scholl's original narrative challenges. Whilst there is a textual division between German and fascist, and possibility is raised of the re-appropriation of pre-fascist German literature, there

is likewise an insistence that the students resisted on behalf of individualized “Menschen wie du und ich” (12) [people like you and me (4)] and *not* for the German nation. In corroboration, commentators on the leaflets have frequently pointed to Hans Scholl’s abhorrence of nationalism, while Sophie’s much quoted “sag nicht, es ist fürs Vaterland” [don’t say that it’s for the fatherland] shows her clear rejection of nationalism (Jens 1984; Vinke 1980, 47).

In considering questions of responsibility, victimhood, nationhood and resistance within a religious framework, a gender dichotomy becomes apparent. As has been shown, *Die Weiße Rose* centres on the figure of Hans, with over half the text being devoted to a discussion of his path to resistance. This prominence mirrors and contributes to his dominant position in the secondary literature until the late 1970s. Only relatively recently has the position of Sophie Scholl been reconsidered, with the number of texts devoted entirely to her now being more numerous than those concerning any other group member (Knoop-Graf 1999, 58). An increased interest in Sophie, and indeed her recent commemoration in Germany’s ‘Hall of Fame’, Walhalla, and nomination along with Hans as one of ‘Unsere Besten’ [Our Best Germans] (see Rickard 2005), has been part of a gendered reworking of the institutional histories of fascism, and a reconsideration of previously marginalized histories of women who resisted (Wickert 1992). Inge Scholl was instrumental in constructing this later history of her sister, possibly in an attempt to redress the perceived imbalance in her original text.

Sophie’s voice first becomes apparent through her description of Willi Graf. Her direct speech is used as a positive character witness for her male counterpart. The description of the night before Sophie’s departure to university which follows is the most detailed account of her within the text. In it, her detachment from those around her is counterposed with a closeness to intellectual thought and nature. The latter is linked to a sense of religious order:

Sophie hatte in der Nähe des Lagers eine kleine Kapelle entdeckt. Manchmal war sie dorthin gegangen. Schön war es gewesen, an der Orgel zu sitzen und zu spielen – und dazwischen nichts zu tun als nachzudenken und in die Natur hinauszuhorchen, in der sich ihre zerrissene Welt sanft ineinanderfügte und wieder Ordnung und Sinn gewann. (31)

Sophie had discovered a small chapel near the camp and had visited it at times. It had been pleasant to sit at the organ and play, or to idle and daydream, listening to the sounds of nature. Then her shattered world was gently rebuilt and took on a sense of order and meaning. (24)

This rather stylized description is juxtaposed with the present voice of the first-person narrator whose vivid imagery captures a loss that is still felt: “Ich sehe sie noch vor mir, meine Schwester, wie sie am nächsten Morgen dastand, reisefertig und voll Erwartung” (34) [I still see her, as she stood before me, my sister, on the following morning, ready to set off and full of expectation (26)]. The next most detailed episode of the narrative in terms of the development of Sophie’s identity is her discovery of Hans’ involvement in the production of the resistance leaflets. In the section that follows are numerous rhetorical questions within Sophie’s stream-of-consciousness:

Eine erstickende Angst ergriff sie, und ein einziger großer Vorwurf gegen Hans erhob sich in ihr. Warum gerade er? Dachte er nicht an den Vater, an die ohnehin schon gefährdeten Lieben daheim? Warum überließ er das nicht politischen Menschen, Leuten mit Erfahrung und Routine? Warum erhielt er sein Leben nicht für eine große Aufgabe, er, mit seinen ungewöhnlichen Begabungen? (41)

A strangling fear took hold of her, and a great, overwhelming remonstrance against Hans arose within her. Why [him]? Had he forgotten his father, the family at home who were in jeopardy as it was? Why did he not leave this job to people who were politically minded, people with experience and practical knowledge? Why did he not save himself for a great mission – he with his unusual talents? (33)

The depth of feeling contained within this stream of questions is suggestive of the voice of the first-person narrator, paralleling as it does Inge Scholl’s own thoughts as described earlier. The narrative expresses these fears through the perspective of someone to whom the audience is predisposed to listen. The reasons that the text gives for Sophie’s participation in the resistance are suggestive of love and fear for Hans, rather than her own strongly held convictions against the Nazi regime. This is emphasized by the self-evident nature of her participation and the subsequent narratorial references to a pause in the appearance of the leaflets when the students were sent to the front, emphasising a connection to the (male) soldiers. Harald Steffahn argues that the positioning of Sophie in her brother’s shadow in Scholl’s text was unintentional (1992, 24). While this may be so, in the institutionalization of the memories of the ‘Weiße Rose’ Sophie has, at least until the last twenty years, become iconic along with Hans but not in her own right. Since the immediate post-war period, the focus has been on Hans Scholl, with any agency in Sophie’s actions being subsumed by Hans’ preceding development: “Als an Sophie diese Fragen herantraten, war die Lage schon geklärt, sodaß sie keine

einschneidende Bedeutung mehr für sie haben konnten" [By the time Sophie got to these questions, they had already been answered, so they didn't have any significant meaning for her] (Huch 1948/9, 973). Even the witness description of her last hours is reduced to an addendum of her brother's story: "In ähnlicher Weise vollzog sich auch die Abschiedsstunde der ebenso lieblichen wie tapferen Schwester Sophie" [The final hour of the likewise dear and brave sister Sophie passed in a similar way] (Alt 1946, 89). In the context of West German remembrance of fascism in the 1950s, when hegemonic discourse promoted a selectively feminized understanding of nation and victimhood (Heinemann 1996), as opposed to a masculinized conception of youth, Sophie Scholl remained in the shadow of her brother. The redundancy of heroic masculine war images could be reappropriated in the redemptive figure of Hans Scholl. As a soldier and a resister he became symbolic of a patriarchal martyrdom. Such an image left no room for independent female resistance or even a feminized victimhood within the narrative of the group.

The images of Sophie Scholl which have predominated within the historiography on the group are illustrative of competing gender expectations. Huch positively described her in 1948 as "kühn wie ein Junge" [bold as a boy] (1948/9, 971). Six years later Erich Weniger, expressing an individualized and simplistic understanding of equality, asserted that "die Gleichberechtigung der Frau im akademischen Raum wurde durch ihre Mitverantwortung und Mitleiden, durch ihr [Sophies] Opfer endgültig gesichert" [equality of women in academia was finally secured through her shared responsibility, her shared suffering and her sacrifice] (1954, 162). Literature of the early 1980s focused on her supposedly unflattering dress and 'unfeminine' behaviour (Hanser 1982, 15). In Vinke's book, in contrast, Inge Scholl's comments about her sister counteract these masculinized depictions, emphasizing that Sophie used to play with dolls as a child, that they shared "ein richtiges Mädchenzimmer" [a proper girl's bedroom] (1980, 27), and that on reaching puberty Sophie was proud of becoming a woman. It is in Vinke's text that Sophie's relationship with her boyfriend Fritz Hartnagel is explored for the first time (1980, 57, 71-80). By the mid 1990s Breyvogel interprets her behaviour as encapsulating a gendered dichotomy:

Ihr zentrales Motiv war Angst und Sorge um den Bruder. Sie ist andererseits durch die Merkmale einer modernen Frauenbiographie gezeichnet. Ihre Sensibilität, ihre philosophischen Interessen, ihre Reflexivität, ihre Anmut: In einem besonders engen Verhältnis zum älteren Bruder, geprägt von zugleich

männlichen Idealen und weiblichen Wünschen, ist sie in einer Diskrepanz, die ihre Selbstäußerungen bis zur Zerreißprobe anspannen. (1991, 200)

Her central motive was fear and concern for her brother. On the other hand, she was characterized by the features of a modern woman's biography – her sensibility, her philosophical interests, her reflectiveness, her grace. In her particularly close relationship with her older brother, influenced simultaneously by both male ideals and female desires, she is caught in a state of contradiction, which her self expressions push to breaking point.

His definition of 'a modern woman' thus rests on an essentialist division of "männliche Ideale" [male ideals] and "weibliche Wünsche" [female desires], which includes Sophie's similarly gendered grace, and ultimately still contains a universalizing patriarchal focus.

Inge Scholl's depiction of Sophie can be positioned within other constructions of gender in her narrative. These include: fascist notions of gender; the depiction of the familial sphere and the mother; and gender divisions illustrated as existing prior to resistance. The text is critical of a fascist conception of women's role after 1939, as expressed in a speech given by Gauleiter Paul Gießler at Munich university, that "sie [die Frauen] sollten sich während des Krieges nicht länger an den Universitäten herumdrücken, sondern 'lieber dem Führer ein Kind schenken'" (38) [it was better to 'present the Führer with a child' than to hang on at the university (31)]. The narrative suggests that the speech by Gießler was instrumental in prompting the resistance of the 'Weiße Rose' group, although Breyvogel maintains that in Scholl's text it has been predated (1991, 172). The content of this speech contrasts with the protagonist's earlier memories of the girls of the Hitler Youth and their adventurous hiking expeditions, highlighting the contradictory tendencies within fascist gender politics. An emphasis on Sophie's isolation from the girls at a labour camp, along with textual proximity of the Gauleiter's speech and the start of the students' resistance suggests a rejection of contrasting female roles advocated by Gießler and by fascist propaganda. Given the repeated republication of Scholl's text from the 1970s, these contradictions are part of ongoing debates on the emancipatory nature of fascism (Koonz 1977, Reese 1995).

Juxtaposed with competing fascist notions of gender is the suggestion that the familial and traditionally female sphere is the site of ethical values which enabled Hans and Sophie to resist Nazism. The Scholl family becomes "eine kleine feste Insel in dem unverständlichen und immer fremder werdenden Getriebe" (19) [a

small, stable island in the ever stranger, incomprehensible swirl of events (13)]. Once again, an isolation of the family is emphasized, with Nazism being defined as an external 'other'. However, the textual inability to maintain such divisions illustrates that fascism pervaded most areas of life, those traditionally defined both as private and public. The fact that the resistance of Hans and Sophie, in terms of the production of the leaflets, did not take place within the family – presumably due to the danger to those involved – exemplifies the fact that the site of the private could not be isolated from the events surrounding it. Indeed, it is this pervasiveness that marks a change in Hans, who, the narrator states, suffered from the “Drill und Uniformierung bis ins persönliche Leben hinein” (16) [discipline and conformity [...] including personal life (8)]. Petry has criticized the tendency within Scholl's narrative, and those texts on the group of the late 1940s, to portray the family as an isolated unit, claiming that it contributed to the 'centralization' of commemoration. He dismisses entirely the supposition that the family played a role in the student resistance, maintaining instead that it was Hans' experiences in Munich and not Ulm that led to his change of mind (1968, 52); however, Petry's comments must be seen in the context of 1968, written during the students' movement when the institution of the family was a site of conflict and university a site of student empowerment. Scholl's focus on the family unit is significant because it reiterates the religious upbringing of the students and the role she feels this played in their resistance, and also because it emphasizes her own involvement with the group and re-validates her role as a witness.

Central to a consideration of the role of the family within the narrative is the depiction of the mother. In a description of her thoughts, her religiosity is stressed. She is positioned always within the family, becoming representative of a generic suffering, of “Tausende und aber Tausende von Müttern” (53) [thousands upon thousands of mothers (47)]. Both her religious beliefs and her role as a mother are exemplified at the end of the narrative. Her comment to Sophie in prison, “Gelt, Sophie: Jesus” [You know, Sophie – Jesus] and Sophie's reply, “Ja, aber du auch” (64) [Yes, but you too (62)], is remembered nearly forty years later by Scholl as being transformed into practical behaviour:

Die Beerdigung fand spätnachmittag statt [...]. Meine Mutter sagte in unser Schweigen, jetzt sei es an der Zeit, etwas zu essen. Sie machte eine Andeutung wie: Ich muß mich auch noch um die lebenden Kinder kümmern [...]. Und ich denke immer, sie hat im Sinne von Sophie gehandelt. Dieser 'Befehl' von

Sophie in der Vollzugsanstalt – “Aber du auch, Mutter”, – dieses Ja zum Leben, das galt auch in der schwersten Situation. (Vinke 1980, 179)

The burial took place late in the afternoon [...]. Into the silence my mother said ‘now it’s time to have something to eat’. She made a gesture as if to say – I still have to look after my other children. And I think she was acting as Sophie wanted. This ‘order’ at the prison – ‘Yes, but you too, Mother’ – this affirmation of life, this also applied in the most difficult situation.

Scholl does not include her mother’s defiant action, the continued resistance to the regime, in her original text. Instead the focus remains firmly upon the murder of her brother and sister, while still suggesting the ethical values of a more passive familial sphere. This construction of motherhood, which Breyvogel argues first appeared as the idealized cliché of the “unerschöpfliche Liebe der Mutter” [inexhaustible love of the mother] (1991, 168) in Huch’s depiction of the group, has been employed by subsequent writers publishing in the Protestant press, glorifying the self-sacrificing mother of the domestic sphere:

Frau Scholl war eine freundliche und sanfte Frau, die ihren Ehemann, ihre Kinder und ihr Heim zum Zentrum und zur Hauptaufgabe ihres Lebens gemacht hatte. So war sie – ganz im traditionellen Sinne – der Rückhalt ihres tatkräftigen und eigenwilligen Mannes. (Dumbach and Newborn 1989, 33)

Mrs Scholl was a friendly and gentle woman, who had made her husband, her children and her home the central focus of her life. She was, in a quite traditional sense, the support for her energetic and self-willed husband.

In addition to an isolated familial realm is the depiction of a very different gendered sphere. Scholl’s text attributes Hans’ increasingly critical attitude towards fascism to his time within the “jungenschaft” [sic], an organisation which was banned by the Gestapo. According to the narrator, it was a group that sang international songs, read books by exiled authors and existed where there were still signs of unfettered cultural life. This exclusively male enclave is captured textually, with the female protagonist’s exclusion and longing to participate being represented through the repetitious listing of a distanced third person plural:

Sie waren ernst und verschwiegen, sie hatten ihren eigenen Humor und ganze Eimer voll Witz und Skepsis und Spott. Sie konnten wild und ausgelassen durch die Wälder jagen, sie warfen sich am frühen Morgen in eiskalte Flüsse; sie konnten stundenlang still auf dem Bauch liegen, um Wild oder Vögel zu beobachten. (21)

They were solemn and silent; with their own peculiar sense of humor they had whole buckets of sarcasm, mockery and scepticism. They would race through the woods in wild, unrestrained excitement; plunge into ice-cold rivers during early mornings; then for hours on end lie on their stomachs watching the game and the wildfowl. (14)

Resistance thus originates from within a male collective, consolidating the focus upon Hans within the group.

Competing Frames of Reception

The historiographical reception of Scholl's text has been extremely varied. In early reviews, there is a distinctly gendered approach. For example, Weniger, while praising the emancipated actions of Sophie Scholl, criticizes Inge Scholl's report as being "ein wenig zu geschwisterlich und zu fraulich" [slightly too sisterly, and too feminine] (Weniger 1954, 162). He thus sees Scholl's close relationship to the students as negative in an attempt to reclaim the notion of 'historical truth' as a male domain. East German, West German and British historians who published between 1959 and 1963 show competing genre expectations. James Donohoe and Karl Heinz Jahnke simply refer to *Die Weiße Rose*, and particularly the sections of Hans' stream-of-consciousness, as documentary material within their own texts, assuming its status as historical evidence (1961, 151); (1959, 215). Richard Hanser claims that the familial framework supports authenticity rather than indicates bias, interpreting Scholl's position as that of the "Sicht eines Zeugen, der über Informationen aus erster Hand verfügt" [perspective of a witness who possesses first hand information], which leads to "eine bewundernswert einfühlsame, intelligente und zurückhaltende Schilderung, fast eine Art 'Klassiker' seines Genres" [an admirably sensitive, intelligent and reserved depiction, almost a 'classic' of its genre] (Hanser 1982, 7). Like Hanser, Karl Dietrich Bracher prioritizes accounts by familial members, mentioning texts by Scholl and Huber, as "ergreifend[e] Bücher" [gripping books] (1963, 12). During the mid to late 1960s, the criticism became more hostile, with both East and West German historians attacking Scholl's text. In a change from his earlier work on the group, Jahnke, writing in 1965, maintains that while he still considers Scholl's text to be a "wertvolle Publikation" [valuable publication], it had contributed to the fact that "wiederholt die historische Wahrheit verzerrt bzw. verfälscht dargestellt wird" [the historical truth is repeatedly distorted or falsified] (1965, 329). Such a

clear distinction between what the reviewers categorize as historical narratives and Scholl's text is to be found in the most severe criticism, which came in 1968, from Petry. His aim of confronting those he saw as responsible for perpetuating a focus on Hans and Sophie meant that Scholl's text became his primary target (Breyvogel 1991, 197). He criticized it on several counts, including her interpretation of the group as lonely and isolated among its peers and also for her insistence that it was Hans who wrote the leaflets (Petry 1968, 48-50). While these criticisms were aimed against the centralizing tendencies he detected in the remembrance of the group, his other criticisms highlight genre expectations and are therefore worth quoting at length:

Es ist allerdings anzunehmen, daß der wörtlich zitierte Dialog der einschlafenden und von Flugblättern träumenden Sophie mit Hans Scholl eine Fiktion von Inge Scholl ist. Sie könnte diese Szene nur von ihren Geschwistern selbst erfahren haben. Da aber Inge Scholl erst nach der Hinrichtung erfuhr, daß Hans und Sophie die Autoren der Flugblätter waren, ist es unwahrscheinlich, daß Hans und Sophie ihr erzählt haben, wie der Entschluß dazu zustande kam. Es soll hier angemerkt werden, daß an und für sich keine zwingende Notwendigkeit bestünde, so in das Detail der Kritik an dem ursprünglich für Jugendliche geschriebenen Buch von Inge Scholl zu gehen, wenn der Quellenwert dieses Buches nicht hoch eingeschätzt worden wäre und nicht ausdrücklich in dem Hinweis des Verlags zu diesem Buch versichert wäre, daß Inge Scholl "anhand der geretteten Dokumente" ihren Bericht abgefaßt habe. Da in ihrem Buch [...] der Eindruck entstehen kann, sie selbst sei Zeugin vieler Vorgänge gewesen, ist eine genaue Prüfung ihrer Darstellung unvermeidlich (Petry 1968, 233).

It can in any case be assumed that the dialogue in direct speech between Sophie, who was on the point of falling asleep and dreaming of leaflets, and Hans is a fiction of Inge Scholl's. She could only have learned about this scene from her siblings themselves. But, as Inge Scholl only discovered that Hans and Sophie were the authors of the leaflets after their execution, it is unlikely that Hans and Sophie told her how they arrived at the decision to produce them. It should be noted here that in itself there would be no pressing reason to criticize in detail Inge Scholl's book, originally written for young people, if it weren't for the fact that the source value of this book had been held in such high esteem and for the fact that the book's blurb explicitly assures us that Inge Scholl wrote her book based on 'documents which have been preserved'. As the impression can arise from her book [...] that she was herself a witness of the events, a detailed examination of her portrayal is unavoidable.

The dustcover to the 1952 edition of *Die Weiße Rose* claims the book to be "der unabhängige Versuch [...] 'zu sagen was ist'" [an independent attempt to 'tell it like it is']. It assures the reader that "ihr [Inge Scholls] Buch ist zweierlei: eine zuverlässige Darstellung und ein schönes und nobles Zeugnis" [Inge Scholl's text is twofold: a

reliable portrayal and a beautiful and noble testimonial]. As Petry claims, the dustcover reiterates the importance of “genaue Zeugnisse” [exact testimonials]; the blurb continues, “Inge Scholl [...] weiß als Schwester der beiden Scholl genau Bescheid und ist im Besitz der Dokumente” [Inge Scholl, as the sister of the two Scholls is well informed and is in possession of the documents]. A framework of authenticity is thus constructed both around and within Scholl’s text.

Petry chooses excerpts from *Die Weiße Rose* and other subsequent texts to illustrate alleged contradictions in order to discredit Scholl’s original text (1968, 80-90). He creates his own hierarchy of memories about the group, giving prominence to those which he considers have been marginalized within the institutional version of events. While such a differentiated picture is laudable within the context of contemporary attempts to broaden the memories of fascism, his undermining of Scholl’s text shows how he too had expected the narrative to be ‘true’, an expectation, he claimed, that had been created by the book’s reception.

Many of Petry’s arguments, have been questioned by historians in the context of the 1990s criticism of the student movement (Breyvogel 1991, 184). Despite attempts to refute Petry, the criticism of Scholl’s text has not abated. Indeed, it has perpetuated a tendency among reviewers prominent since the late 1980s to dismiss Scholl’s text as “emotional vorbelastet” [emotionally biased], giving primacy to more recent reports, which they state, have the benefit of distance and ‘objectivity’ (Kirchberger 1987, 44). Indeed, throughout the 1990s, Scholl was criticized for conveying an incomplete picture of the events. Steffahn comments, in respect of the depiction of Carl Muth:

Wer die Kenntnis vom Wirken der Weißen Rose später allein aus Inge Scholls Gedenkbuch bezog, las zwangsläufig an dem bedeutenden Namen vorbei, weil er im Halbdunkel anonymer Andeutung belassen wurde. (1992, 49)

Whoever retrospectively got their knowledge about the work of the White Rose only from Inge Scholl’s text would have missed this significant name because it was left in the obscurity of a brief anonymous reference.

Likewise, Wolfgang Jaeger points out that Scholl’s focus on her brother and sister in the first substantive account on the group led to a certain resentment among the relatives of the other resisters who were executed (1993, 183). Christiane Moll maintains that the constant focus on Hans and Sophie in the remembrance of the resistance group is, first and foremost, the legacy of Scholl’s book (1999, 131). A common feature in the historians’ reviews of Scholl’s text is their

implicit insistence on historical truths which are obscured by her narrative. They criticize the focus, subsequently institutionalized, in what they read as a biography of Hans and Sophie Scholl. None of them consider the aesthetic qualities of *Die Weiße Rose*, and this approach results in an exclusion of the story of Inge Scholl. A reading of the text as autobiography in the context of such criticism facilitates a consideration of multiple histories, including that of the first-person protagonist and thus enriches our experience of the text.

The Changing Narrative: 1955, 1972, 1982 and 1993

Scholl altered her original text in subsequent editions and it can be argued that this was partly in response to the criticisms noted above. It is thus assumed within the following discussion that Scholl intended to engage with the historical discourse on the group. An analysis of these changes and their location within ever shifting memory discourses in East and West Germany will highlight just how vigorously the interpretation of the events has been contested.

Die Weiße Rose has undergone several stages of alteration. The first significant changes after the text's initial publication in 1952 were made in 1955. It was then republished unaltered until 1972, when an afterword was added and the main body of the narrative was subjected to some changes. In 1982 many more documents were added. A new edition was published in 1993 with a further addition. Significantly, the changes involve those narratives that have already been highlighted as figuring prominently within the original text, especially those concerning 'youth', 'meaning', and above all the focus on Hans.

In successive editions, the text progressively downplays the enthusiasm of the Scholl family for the Hitler Youth. Passages marking a change in their attitude towards Nazism were deleted, for example: "Unser Vertrauen hatte einen Riß bekommen, und die alte frische Begeisterung wurde von quälender Enttäuschung bedrängt" [a rift in our trust developed and the old, fresh enthusiasm was beset by agonizing disappointment] (1952 edition, 16, subsequently removed). The retrospective description of the Hitler Youth becomes increasingly more critical in the edition of 1972, where language which could be seen in a post-war context as problematic is omitted. For example: "in unseren Gruppen wurde zusammengehalten wie unter Freunden. Die Kameradschaft war etwas *Schönes*" [in our groups we stuck together as friends. The camaraderie was something

beautiful] (1952, 12, my emphasis) is replaced with “in unseren Gruppen entstand ein Zusammenhalt, der uns über die Schwierigkeiten und die Einsamkeit jener Entwicklungsjahre hinwegtrug, vielleicht auch *hinwegtäuschte*” [in our groups there was a togetherness that led us through the difficulties and loneliness of adolescence, perhaps also *misled* us] (1972, 16, my emphasis).

When the question of different voices is considered, the section which describes Hans and Sophie's imprisonment contains very different textual constructions. In the 1952 edition the text reads: “Manche, die ihnen im Gefängnis begegneten, haben uns über die letzten Tage und Stunden vor ihrem Tod berichtet. Else Gebel, die mit Sophie eine Zelle teilte, berichtete uns 1945 [...]” [many of those who met them in prison have told us about the last days and hours before their death. Else Gebel, who shared a prison cell with Sophie told us in 1945 ...] (1952, 63). This is followed by the inclusion of a statement by Gebel in the present tense and direct speech. It begins with Sophie's incarceration, and Sophie is the text's addressee:

Ein paar Stunden später stehst du, Sophie, von einem Beamten begleitet, im Aufnahmeraum. Ruhig, gelassen, fast heiter über all die Aufregung rings um dich. Dein Bruder Hans war kurz zuvor aufgenommen und bereits in einer Zelle verwahrt worden. (1952, 64)

A few hours later you stand there in the reception room, Sophie, accompanied by a warder. Quiet, composed, almost cheerful about all the excitement surrounding you. Your brother, Hans, had been admitted shortly before and was already in his cell.

A report from witness Helmut F. follows, which details his meeting with Hans in prison, similarly in direct speech. In the version from 1955 these witness accounts have been subsumed into the main narrative of the text.⁴ They are no longer in direct speech and take on a broader, more representative tone:

Alle, die in jenen Tagen noch mit ihnen in Berührung kamen, die Mitgefangenen, die Gefängnisgeistlichen, die Gefangenenwärter, ja selbst die Gestapobeamten, waren von ihrer Tapferkeit und von der Noblesse ihrer Haltung aufs stärkste betroffen [...]. Diese vielen kleinen Berichte, sie fügten sich wie winzige Magnete zusammen zu einem Ganzen, zu einigen Tagen starken Lebens. (1956, 94-95)

All those who came into contact with them during those last days – fellow prisoners, prison chaplains, warders, even the Gestapo officials, were deeply

⁴ This chapter will refer to the page numbers in a 1956 edition which was published with the changes from 1955.

affected by their bravery and by the *noblesse* of their behaviour [...] These many short reports joined together like tiny magnets to form a whole, a few days of vibrant living.

In choosing to report only excerpts from these statements, the 1955 text omits those narratives contained within direct speech in the earlier edition and which had become prevalent in the late 1940s in literature on the group. For example, Gebel's statement, which contributes to a discourse of martyrdom, that "[d]ein unerschütterlicher Glaube gibt dir die Kraft, dich für andere zu opfern" [your unshakeable faith gives you the strength to sacrifice yourself for others] (1952, 66) is removed. The text then reemphasizes a meaning of their actions through the voice of the present narrator:

Ich hatte Gelegenheit gehabt, nach ihrem Tod selbst im Gefängnis in den endlos sich hinziehenden Stunden der Ungewißheit und des Schmerzes über die Haltung, die Worte, den Weg meiner Geschwister und ihre Freunde nachzudenken, und hatte versucht, durch das Filter der Trauer hindurch *den tieferen politischen Sinn* ihres Handelns zu begreifen. (1956, 95-96, my emphasis)

I had the opportunity after their death, when I was in prison myself, to consider during the endless drawn out hours of uncertainty and pain the actions, words and path my siblings and their friends had taken. I tried to understand, through the filter of mourning, *the deeper political meaning* of their actions.

Thus the text once again explicitly engages with those discourses discussed above that negated the political nature of their resistance.

Scholl begins the afterword of 1972 with an assertion that her book had led to some misunderstandings:

Man ist heute geneigt, sehr oft in dem Widerstand der Münchner Studenten des Jahres 1943 nur eine moralische Gesinnungstat zu sehen, einen politisch nicht kalkulierten spontanen Aufbruch. Bei einem Buch, das für Kinder, für Jugendliche geschrieben wurde, besteht leicht die Gefahr, daß man die politische Dimension zu knapp hält, weil man historisches Interesse und politische Reflexion in diesem Alter noch nicht erwarten zu können glaubt [...]. Es wäre verfehlt, die Aktion der Studenten in München von 1942/43 so gemeinhin als eine allgemeine schöne menschliche Tat zu verstehen. Sie war konkret und hatte konkrete Ziele und konkrete Anlässe. Insofern wäre es auch falsch, ihr Handeln als symbolisch zu verstehen. (1972, 135)

It is often the case nowadays that one tends only to see a morally motivated act in the resistance of the Munich students in 1943; a politically uncalculated spontaneous outburst. In a book written for children and young people, the danger exists that one is too conservative with the political aspects because one doesn't believe that one can expect historical interest and the ability to reflect

on political matters at that age [...]. It would be wrong to understand the action of the students in Munich in 1942/3 simply as a general, beautiful, humane deed. It was a concrete one, had concrete aims and concrete causes. To this is extent it would also be incorrect to see their actions as symbolic.

In order to emphasize the political platform of the students, Scholl quotes from the leaflets and from Hans' diary. Hans' intentions are very much at the centre of this piece, with the only reference to other members of the group being to 'five or six students'. The claim to the political nature of their actions is again juxtaposed with the students' discovery of Christianity, where the names of Carl Muth, Theodor Haecker and Jean Cocteau become prominent for the first time. Similarly refuted is any nationalistic impetus behind the students' actions:

[Mein Bruder] sah im Zweiten Weltkrieg das Ende des Nationalismus gekommen, eines Nationalismus, der in sich den gefährlichen Keim des Faschismus trug. Daher war auch, nach dem Bericht eines Überlebenden, beim zweitletzten Flugblatt in der Überschrift "Flugblätter der Widerstandsbewegung in Deutschland" bewußt auf die Bezeichnung "deutsche" verzichtet worden. (1972, 138-39)

My brother saw the end of nationalism in the Second World War, a nationalism which carried with it the dangerous seed of fascism. It was for this reason, according to the report of a survivor, that the term "German" was consciously omitted from the title of the penultimate leaflet: "Leaflet of the Resistance Movement in Germany".

In discussing the meaning of 'passive resistance', the afterword uses the example of the first-person protagonist's own resistance, from the main body of the text – her refusal to raise her arm in the fascist salute – as an illustration of "Zivilcourage" [courage to stand up for one's beliefs]. Through an equation of her own actions with those of the aims of the student resisters, the protagonist is placed within a collective of resistance. At the same time, the protagonist is distanced from the students through a reference to their isolation even within the family: "[Die Studenten nahmen] die Einsamkeit auf sich, nicht einmal mit Angehörigen darüber sprechen zu können" [The students accepted their loneliness, not even being able to speak to their relatives about it] (1972, 147).

Two further elements are striking in the light of when the addition was published: firstly, an emphasis that it was not the students' intention "die Gegenerschaft gegen Hitler mit einem Anti-kommunismus [zu honorieren]" [to reward opposition to Hitler with anti-communism] (1972, 144) signifies changing memory politics

initiated by new perspectives on fascism within the West German Left and the students' movement; secondly, seven years before the supposed 'watershed' of 1979 there is repeated reference to the persecution of the Jewish population, to the legalization of genocide.

In her 'Bemerkungen zu den Zielen der Weißen Rose' [Comments on the Aims of the White Rose] (which supplemented the afterword of 1972, were added to the 1982 edition, and reprinted in subsequent editions) Inge Scholl once again explicitly confronts those criticisms levelled at the text. The references to certain 'misunderstandings' are cut, but the focus on her brother and sister within the narrative is defended. The positioning of the protagonist as a familial member is given as the reason for the focus on Hans and Sophie Scholl:

Damals schrieb ich die Geschichte der Weißen Rose auf, ausgehend von der Geschichte meiner Geschwister Hans und Sophie, weil ich immer und immer wieder danach gefragt wurde.' (96)

At that time I wrote the story of the White Rose starting from the story of my siblings Hans and Sophie, because I was being asked about it time and again.

The inquiring addressee thus gave Scholl's memories the space, and right, to be heard. In the context of West Germany of the 1950s this demand for information can be contrasted with the lack of interest that survivors of the concentration camps reported in their stories.⁵ The text's authenticity is reaffirmed through mention of its having been written in the immediate post-war period, thus underlining its status as the account of an eye-witness. Thus the immediacy of the text is emphasized, and yet at the same time the selection of memories is defended:

Im Laufe der Zeit kamen Dokumente ans Licht, die meine Aufzeichnungen durch wichtige Details präzisierten; sie gaben Hinweise auf Zusammenhänge und machten die politischen Konturen dieses Widerstandskreises sichtbarer. Eine Auswahl der Dokumente ist in diese neue Ausgabe aufgenommen. Vor allem die Augenzeugenberichte der Freunde haben dazu beigetragen, das Wissen um die Weiße Rose zu vertiefen. (97)

In the course of time, documents came to light which supplemented my notes with important details; they gave hints as to connections and made the political contours of the resistance circle clearer. A selection of the documents is included in this new edition. Above all, the eye-witness statements of their friends have contributed to a deepening of the knowledge about the White Rose.

⁵ The chapters on Weil and Langgässer will suggest that Jewish memories were not prioritized during this time in West Germany.

While disarmingly describing *Die Weiße Rose* as 'notes', the above extract simultaneously reaffirms first-person eye-witness testimony and therefore the authenticity of the text itself. Scholl reiterates that the first edition was written for young people, and the student group is named as a site of identification for "die jungen Menschen, deren Gutgläubigkeit so sehr mißbraucht worden war" (96-97) [the young people whose trusting nature had been so abused]. Such possibilities of identification contrast sharply with the assertion ten years earlier that "Nutzanwendungen gibt es keine, höchstens Belege" [there are no practical applications, at the most pieces of evidence] (1972, 146). A generational representativeness is now claimed: young people who were inherently good were misled by malevolent forces. Additional reference is made within these concluding comments of 1982 to the destruction of the Jewish population. In contrast, the reference to an anonymous survivor's testimony about the students refusing the designation "German" within the title of the leaflets due to their concerns about nationalism has been cut, as has the reference to the students' refusal to espouse anti-Communism.

Turning to the effect of the different versions for the focus on Hans, we see that in the 1955 version the description of Hans' imprisonment comes first, with the episode about Sophie's imprisonment being considerably shortened, as compared to the original of 1952. It is Hans who, once again, becomes central: "Schwere Stunden der Verantwortung und Sorge kamen, vor allem für Hans" [These were difficult hours of responsibility and worry, particularly for Hans] (1956, 98). Whilst these changes remain in the 1982 edition, there are alterations which reverse a tendency towards 'centralization'. Many other people are specifically named rather than just being mentioned obliquely: for example, instead of being referred to as "ein silberhaariger Gelehrter" [a silver-haired scholar] (1952, 25), the text now contains references to "Carl Muth, den ergrauten Herausgeber des 'Hochland', einer bekannten Zeitschrift [...], die von den Nazis verboten war" [Carl Muth, the long-standing editor of 'Hochland', a well-known journal forbidden by the Nazis] (1982, 32). While such details are necessary to give some context to contemporary readers, they also serve to locate these people more clearly as historical actors. Significantly, the voice of the present narrator interjects to emphasize that Hans was not alone in producing the leaflets: "Ich bin überzeugt, daß die Initiative zu den Widerstandsaktionen der Weißen Rose von ihm [Alexander Schmorell] zusammen mit Hans ausgegangen ist" [I am convinced that the initiative for the resistance of the White Rose came from him

(Alexander Schmorell), together with Hans] (32, 1982). Likewise, the narrator insists: “Zweifellos hatte Christl [Christoph Probst] beim Entwurf und der Formulierung der Texte eine wichtige Rolle gespielt” [Undoubtedly Christl played an important role in the drafting and formulation of the texts] (1982, 32-34).

A widening of the ‘Weiße Rose’ circle also involves significant changes to the end of the narrative in the 1982 edition, which is dominated by a multitude of voices. Firstly, there is the inclusion of Kurt Huber’s “Schlußwort des Angeklagten” [Final Statement of the Accused] and secondly, a chapter about the involvement of other students in the resistance, especially those in Hamburg. Finally, the 1982 edition includes the court judgments, the eye-witness accounts, and a collection of “Reaktionen und Stimmen” [reactions and voices].

Kurt Huber’s voice, as representative of the intellectual origins of the students’ resistance against fascism, clearly explains his own motivation for resistance. For Scholl, Huber’s words give her narrative additional authenticity on two grounds: they stem from a written document and “es sind Worte, die, wie berichtet wird, mindestens ihrem Sinn nach, vor dem Volksgericht wiederholt wurden” (65) [It has been reported that these remarks – or at least their essence – were delivered before the People’s Court (63)]. The inclusion of Huber’s speech is significant for several reasons: firstly, because it can be seen as a response to the criticism that the students’ mentors were not previously referred to by Scholl; secondly, given Huber’s well documented disagreement with Hans Scholl and Schmorrel over the wording of the leaflets as regards the German army, his inclusion signifies that the group did not share the same viewpoints (Kirchberger 1987, 27); and thirdly, as an avowed anti-Bolshevik, Huber was an academic who fitted conveniently into the heightened context of the Cold War in the early 1980s.

In a further widening of the circle around Hans and Sophie Scholl, the final chapter names many of those involved and the sentences they received, including the students in Hamburg. The chapter includes references to two books by Ilse Jacob and by Ursel Hochmuth/Gertrud Meyer on this branch of the group, incorporating historical accounts to represent details of events to which the protagonist was not party. A focus on Konrad Liepelt introduces for the first time the narrative of Jewish resistance and can be seen as part of an increasing institutionalization of interest about these resisters by the 1980s (for example, Wippermann 1981).

Following the evidence about the students’ reticence to use the term “German” in the titles of their leaflets, the court judgments are

ironically striking in their heading “[i]m Namen des deutschen Volkes” [In the name of the German people]. Through these judgements, the persecutors state clearly the names of those who resisted as well as those involved in their conviction. In a context where many former fascists still held positions of authority in post-war West German society, the naming of the perpetrators highlights individual responsibility. Similarly, the repeated designation of the students within these judgements as traitors found an echo in those post-war discourses which focused on notions of betrayal. As historical documents, these judgements convey the full horror of the death sentences once more, as well as corroborating the events of the text, and give additional information about the resistance and those who participated in it – information not included in the main narrative.

The 1982 edition appeared, according to Breyvogel, in the context of further attempts to complete the process of biographization through authentic witness reports (1991, 165). However, it is not just the biographies of Hans and Sophie Scholl that this text elaborates. Through the inclusion of many more voices, the text focuses on other historical actors, including both the victims and the perpetrators. The text from 1982 therefore reverses the trend away from witness testimony that was found in the 1955 version, albeit not within the main body of the narrative. The eye-witness testimonies range from those of the immediate post-war period, for example, Josef Söhnngen (1945) and Dr Falk Harnack (1947), to those of a later period, for example, Elisabeth Hartnagel and Wilhelm Geyer (1968). They include the voices of Robert Mohr, the official responsible for Sophie’s interrogation, other members of the resistance group and people tangentially involved in the trial and execution. While Breyvogel is dismissive of those statements written after 1945, “d.h. zu einem Zeitpunkt, an dem sich gerne mancher zu den “Beteiligten” zählen möchte” [that is, at a time when many would have liked to count themselves amongst those ‘who had been involved’] (1991, 164), the unanimity of these witnesses on certain aspects, despite their diverse origins, is particularly persuasive. The inclusion of a text by Elisabeth Hartnagel (nee Scholl), is significant, being the voice of ‘the other sister’. That the surviving members of the Scholl family can now make their voices heard is exemplified in the advertising of *Sippenhaft: Nachrichten und Botschaften der Familie in der Gestapo-Haft nach der Hinrichtung von Hans und Sophie Scholl* in the accompanying publishing information of editions of Scholl’s text after 1993. Through the inclusion of letters smuggled into and out of prison during the family’s incarceration, *Sippenhaft* tells the story of how

“[...] viele Freunde [...], die unter den zunehmend schwierigen und gefährlichen Verhältnissen jener Zeit die Familie der ‘Vaterlandsverräter’ Hans und Sophie Scholl unterstützten und sich zu ihr bekannten” [many friends, under the increasingly difficult and dangerous circumstances of the time, supported the family of the ‘traitors’ Hans and Sophie Scholl and declared their support for them] (1997, 208). Inge Scholl’s experiences after 1943 are once again placed very much within the larger family story.

The 1982 edition ends with the collection of reactions and voices, that demonstrate the wider national and international impact of the resistance. They link to themes found within the main narrative, for example, emphasizing the significance of the media and its presentation of the events during and after fascism, and the restoration of literature as a site of resistance through the inclusion of the canonized voice of Thomas Mann.

In 1993 a foreword by the Jewish author Ilse Aichinger was added to Scholl’s narrative. Aichinger, a peer of Sophie Scholl, was, according to Vinke, involved in the creation of Scholl’s book (1980, 179). Aichinger told Vinke of how the student resistance gave Jewish victims hope: “Und diese Hoffnung war so stark in den letzten Jahren, gerade nach der Hinrichtung der Geschwister Scholl und ihrer Freunde” [This hope was so strong in the final years, particularly after the execution of Hans and Sophie Scholl and their friends] (Vinke 1980, 181). That it should be their deaths, and not their actions, which were the focus of such hope, associates their actions with the already explored paradigm of Christian redemption which was prevalent in the late 1940s. The canonical status of Aichinger’s post-war text, *Die größere Hoffnung*, first published in 1948, about the death of a young Jewish girl, and Aichinger’s own persecution, frames Scholl’s narrative in such a way as to situate it within the history of the Holocaust. A reader in 1993 thus finds reference to the persecution of the Jewish population of Europe in the preface, in the leaflets themselves, and Scholl’s comments on their aims. Aichinger’s foreword reaffirms expectations that the text which follows will concern the events of Jewish persecution. Through Aichinger’s warning against the relegation of the resistance to history, Scholl’s narrative is given contemporary relevance. Aichinger’s depiction and criticism of Germany in the early 1990s is one that focuses on the increasing materialism of its citizens: ‘Mitten auf den hellen Straßen, zwischen überfüllten Schaufenstern das Erwerbbar mit dem Unerwerbbar und eigentlich Teuren zu verwechseln, macht die Welt leer [...]. Wir müssen auf der Hut sein.’ [On brightly lit streets, amidst

overfilled shop windows, the confusion between what is there to be bought and what cannot be bought, but which is in fact truly dear empties the world of meaning. We need to be on our guard] (7).

Many Voices – a Hybrid Genre?

The resistance leaflets have been included in every edition since 1952, and they have attracted much commentary. They have been read as the only real ‘authentic voice’ telling of the motivations of the group. As such, they have been subjected to multiple readings, revealing as much about the historians’ involvement in the Cold War as about the events of the fascist past. Both East and West German historians have ‘claimed’ the group for their own camp, by interpreting historical events in the light of statements in the leaflets (Jahnke 1983, 32; Ritter 1963, 27; Verner 1954, 291; Weniger 1954, 164). This was especially so during the 1950s and 1960s, although the phenomenon persisted until the 1980s. For example, the students’ time in Russia is interpreted as either a fulfilment of their idealization of landscape and nature, or as a significant episode which changed their political viewpoint. The leaflets are extensively quoted by authors of secondary literature concerned to construct a specific ‘meaning’. Inge Scholl similarly refers to them throughout her text and, in the later editions, they are followed by her ‘Comments’, thus emphasizing the proximity of Scholl’s comments and the ideas of Hans and Sophie. Due to the extensive coverage of the leaflets in the secondary literature, they are not discussed further here, except to re-emphasize that, in the context of the events of the Holocaust within these institutionalized memories, the role the leaflets play is significant. In the context of the text’s original publication, the leaflets therefore challenge discourses which claimed ignorance about the systematic murder of the Jews.

The inclusion of a multitude of other voices in the editions after 1982 could arguably affect the text’s claim to autobiographical status. While these voices are predominantly situated outside the main narrative and have the effect of authenticating that which precedes them, the information conveyed certainly relates more to Hans and Sophie Scholl than to their sister. Therefore taking the text as a whole, the later editions can be classified as hybrid conglomerations of memories, straddling the boundaries between autobiography and biography. The publisher’s synopsis of the later editions refers to the “Erinnerungen und geretteten Dokumente” [memories and documents

which have been preserved] and the structure of the text suggests a corresponding division between the main narrative and the additional information. However, such a division is problematic due to the fact that documents used within the main body of Scholl's texts and the witness reports are both simultaneously documents and sites of personal memories.

The different editions of *Die Weiße Rose* epitomize the well established theory that memories are socially constructed, and as such, inherently fluid. As an often changed narrative of the past, the text and reception of Scholl's narrative are symptomatic of the contemporary debate about the relationship between memory and history. Many historians create a dichotomy between (supposedly) accurate historical accounts about the 'Weiße Rose' group and the narratives of the family members, such as Scholl. However, this dichotomy fails to address how the familial narratives have fed into subsequent historical accounts and how they have been appropriated in the construction of specific historical meanings. In contrast, an unsatisfied expectation of the text as a 'true' historical account has led to it being criticized as factually defective.

Conclusion: Contested Memories

In conclusion, my analysis of Inge Scholl's *Die Weiße Rose* has highlighted multiple narratives about the resistance group, many of which are engaged with through the different voices within the text. As a subject that has repeatedly been the object of public scrutiny events surrounding the group have been both interpreted as rooted in their historical context and simultaneously ahistoricized. A focus on Inge Scholl's text as an accurate historical account and as a biography of Hans and Sophie Scholl has given prominence to those discourses emphasizing masculinized notions of youth and victimhood which have been seen as part of a wider dialogue about issues of guilt and responsibility. While there is undoubtedly a textual focus on Hans in Inge Scholl's book, the narrative also militates against notions of 'centralization', especially in the later editions. Tensions between familial identity, with a focus both on the father and Hans, a wider collective German identity and the protagonist's own story pervade the narrative. A reading of the text as an autobiography gives prominence to the voice of Inge Scholl, as narrated through the stories of others, and places it within a gendered framework in which memories of fascism and their institutionalization can be re-examined.

The analysis has highlighted how public discourse of the 1950s stressed generic experience or interpreted individual experience as representative of the whole. The consistent reappropriation of Scholl's text by one faction or another, and the reshaping of the memories in response to critical reception indicates their socially constructed fluidity. Contemporary debates on resistance, gender and the Holocaust highlight the continued relevance of the themes raised by her narrative. The recent disputes about the role of German soldiers and the increasing prominence of Sophie Scholl in the media and film are clear testimony to continued public interest. The death of Inge Scholl in 1998 means that the main body of her text will not undergo further alterations. However, the history of the White Rose resistance group and the role of Inge Scholl's text within it will, undoubtedly, provoke continued controversy in the years to come.

3. Intoxicating Transience: Negotiations of Public and Private in Elisabeth Langgässer's Published Letters

Elisabeth Langgässer was posthumously awarded the Georg Büchner Prize in West Germany in 1950, the year of her death. The prize was recognition of her status in the immediate post-war period as a prolific author. She was particularly known as an author of 'inner emigration', that is, someone who remained in Germany during Nazism, who considered herself to be against the regime, but was not outwardly critical of it. Two edited collections of Elisabeth Langgässer's letters will be considered in this chapter, with a focus on the narratives within and surrounding them. These letters give insight into Langgässer's life between 1933 and 1945, particularly the effect of the Nuremberg Laws on her family.

Born in 1899 in Alzey to a middle-class Catholic family, Langgässer became a school teacher in 1922. Following an affair with Hermann Heller, she gave birth to an illegitimate daughter, Cordelia, in 1929. Consequently, Langgässer lost her teaching position. As a published author of volumes of poetry and reviews since 1924, Langgässer devoted herself to her literary career thereafter. In July 1935, she married Wilhelm Hoffman and they had three daughters. The marriage saved Langgässer from deportation when the fascist racial laws designated her as "Halbjüdin" [half-Jewish] due to Jewish relatives on her father's side. However, Heller's Jewish background meant that Cordelia was subject to deportation. Aged fifteen, Cordelia was transported to Theresienstadt and then Auschwitz in 1944, but survived following an exchange of camp inmates with German prisoners in Sweden. Langgässer's literary career spanned almost three decades. Her most famous works were published shortly after the end of the war, although she continued to write until just before her death on 25 July 1950.

A consideration of Langgässer's published letters will revolve around issues of gender and definitions of public and private, stressing the significance of the time of publication and time of writing. It will examine how multiple identities of author and addressee are constructed both within the letters themselves and through the selections made by the editors. It will look at how the inclusion of an open letter, in an edition published in 1954, places emphasis on particular elements of Langgässer's life and work. Contesting strands of identity will be analysed along with gendered perspectives in the editorial frameworks and reception. I will argue that these implicitly

and explicitly have as their aim the revelation of the ‘complete’, ‘authentic’ self of Elisabeth Langgässer. The inherent possibility of letters as a genre to reflect the ‘real’ personality of their author pervades much epistolary theory of the nineteenth and early twentieth century (Heuschele 1943, 213). In contrast, it is not the aim of this chapter to attempt to reconstruct the ‘authentic’ historical figure of Elisabeth Langgässer, but to deconstruct the concepts of femininity, Jewishness, public and private in their relation to the genre of letters and memories of fascism. I will focus in particular on Langgässer’s identities as author, wife and mother in the context of Nazism. Angelika Ebrecht asserts that at times of extreme pressure, like war, letters gain “eine existentielle psychische Dimension” [an existential, psychic dimension] (1990, 245). Similarly, Margaretta Jolly claims that during war letters become even more significant in “preserv[ing] a sense of identity in new, strange contexts” (1997, 49).¹ It is against the background of such assertions that my analysis will consider how letters written during and immediately following Nazism and selected by the editors shape Langgässer’s identities.

An edition of Langgässer’s letters was first published in West Germany in 1954. This volume was edited by her husband, and was reprinted in 1981.² It contained 163 of the 670 letters that Wilhelm Hoffmann possessed at the time. In 1990 an edition was published by Elisabeth Hoffmann, the granddaughter of Langgässer, containing approximately half of the 1080 letters she had collected. Although several critics have used the letters in their analyses of Langgässer’s literary work (Meyer 1973; Schiller 1987, 412-65), the collections of letters themselves have not been subject to examination. Nor have the letters been read, on the whole, as literary texts. Instead, a pattern pervades which Mireille Bossis has highlighted: with correspondences of “famous people [...] an author’s correspondence is [...] treated as a gold mine of biographical information”. Bossis continues: “the *real weight* of their letters obscures all other aspects, especially the process of writing itself” (1986, 65). In contrast, I will focus mainly on a literary historical analysis of the edition of 1954, paying particular attention to the depiction of fascism, and analysing how gender discourses in the reception intersect with those on remembering the Nazi past contemporary to publication. On the basis of the letters

¹ Subsequently republished in 2001. As this latter publication of the thesis from 1997 has been substantially abridged, further references will be to the original dissertation.

² Unless otherwise stated further references in the text are to this edition. All translations are my own.

published in the later edition, conclusions will be drawn with regards to the focus of Wilhelm Hoffmann's edition.

The significance of the editor's role in producing a volume of letters has been discussed by many epistolary theorists (Jolly 1997, 19-24). Such editorial intervention will also be considered here, ultimately looking at how, through the choice of the addressees and the selection of excerpts from the letters, the letters become "*readdressed* to a new readership and often *redressed* (corrected, revised, truncated, contextualized) by the publisher [...] who negotiates a new, more perdurable relationship between the letters and the reading public for whom the correspondence is now intended" (Gurkin Altman 1986, 19). In particular, these new addressees will be considered in the light of the shifting politics of remembering during the 1950s and the 1990s.

Wilhelm Hoffmann's Edition

In his introduction to the 1954 edition, Wilhelm Hoffmann sets out the parameters for his selection and emphasizes what he sees as some of the characteristics of Langgässer's correspondence. The elements that he stresses, particularly those of spontaneity and completeness, are reiterated time and again in the reception of Langgässer's work, and perpetuate a tradition of reading women's letters dating from the eighteenth century (Runge and Steinbrügge 1991, 8).

Hoffmann emphasizes that within the collection there is "kein Schema" [no pattern] and thus suggests a certain spontaneity in Langgässer's writing. The inclusion of a hand-written letter (93) without an accompanying printed version similarly attempts to convey an unmediated vitality to the reader. Through a stress on the "Individualität eines jeden Briefes" [the individuality of every single letter], Hoffmann downplays the possibility of preconceived literariness. He connects this style of writing to the personality of the author: "Sie verraten noch heute die Intensität und das lebendige Beteiligtsein der Verfasserin" [They still betray today the intensity and lively involvement of their author]. Deviation from the conventions of the epistolary genre through variations of address and signature, along with the haphazard choice of writing paper, are likewise interpreted as reflecting the impulsiveness of the author. Hoffmann refers to Langgässer's subversion of letter-writing conventions through her 'dating' of letters with, for example, "Cöpenick, am Rande der Stadt zwischen Schrebergärten, mit dem Blick auf Gärten und

abschließenden Bach, auf Gänse und Enten” [Cöpenick, on the edge of town among allotments, with a view of gardens and bordering stream, of geese and ducks] (5). He thus suggests a connection between the natural world and the author and her letter-writing style. This linking of a spontaneous, ‘natural’ female character to the genre of letters has long prevailed in epistolary criticism (Runge and Steinbrügge 1991, 9). As Ruth-Ellen Boetcher Joeres has discussed, “the concept of subjectivity that is touched upon here is highly constructed, even circular in its argumentation: letters reflect women because women, as constructed, are ‘natural’” (2000, 162). Such an identification of the written style with the character of the author is epitomized in Hoffmann’s choice of a quotation from one of Langgässer’s letters as the collection’s title, *...soviel berauschende Vergänglichkeit* [so much intoxicating transience], which becomes a signifier of Langgässer herself. It is a phrase in a letter describing a vase of flowers.

Wilhelm Hoffmann states in his introduction: “Die Auswahl der Briefe soll keine Autobiographie in Briefen sein” [The selection of the letters is not meant to be an autobiography in letters]. The reason for this, he argues, is because certain letters to people still alive at the time of publication have been excluded. However, he continues authoritatively, “wenn einmal alle Briefe veröffentlicht werden können, dann wird grundsätzlich kein neuer Gesichtspunkt hervortreten” [when all the letters can eventually be published no fundamentally new point of view will emerge]. The husband’s selection of letters therefore claims to be representative of a definable whole, with the letters conveying the contents of Langgässer’s life. Inherent to such an assertion of completeness is a claim to authenticity. The all-encompassing nature of the contents is suggested through what Hoffmann calls a linking of “persönliche[n] Frage[n]” [personal questions] and “Wesensfragen” [fundamental questions about existence] in the letters (6). Hoffmann’s comments mirror those of many theorists who, in their reception of women’s letters, represent women as “lebendigen und ganzheitlichen Wesen” [vivid and holistic beings] (Ebrecht 1990, 249). Diversity is confined within a definable whole and becomes part of an attempt “to locate one (and one only) authentic self behind a letter” (Ferguson 1981, 108).

Within this stated framework of completeness Hoffmann nevertheless qualifies his selection. We read that he has chosen letters relating to three themes:

Zunächst wurden die Briefe ausgewählt, in denen sich die Schreiberin mit dem eigenen Werk befaßt; und ebenso solche, die sich mit Dichtung überhaupt beschäftigen. Erweitert wurde diese Auswahl durch Briefe, in denen sich die Verfasserin mit der Zeit und der Umwelt auseinandersetzt. Endlich folgen noch Briefe, in denen Elisabeth Langgässer ihren Alltag bewußt und unbewußt als Folie ihres eigenen Schaffens schildert. (6)

First of all, letters have been chosen in which the author writes about her own work, and likewise those which have anything to do with poetry. The selection is then expanded by letters in which the author deals with her times and her surroundings. Finally, letters are also included in which Elisabeth Langgässer describes, either consciously or unconsciously, her everyday life as being the background for her own creativity.

Hoffmann thus stresses Langgässer's identity as an author. He further maintains that "[j]eder Brief hat seine Gestalt" [every letter has its form] (5), an emphasis which contradicts his previous assertions of spontaneity. In addition, he highlights the historicity of the letters. Given that Langgässer was writing in Germany between 1926 and 1950, and Hitler was in power for half of this time, these editorial comments create certain expectations with respect to the depiction of fascism within the edition. Hoffmann, thirdly, promotes a certain relationship between Langgässer's work and everyday life. Interestingly, this listing seems to separate this relationship from the rootedness of the letters in their historical context. Hoffmann's framing of the edition links not only an ahistorical, spontaneous female identity to the genre of letters, but perpetuates an often attendant expectation that women's letters are especially suited for conveying "de[n] unmittelbarste[n] Ausdruck des Empfindens, der Kultur [ihrer] Zeit" [the most immediate expression of feeling, of the culture of their time] (Brunnemann 1911, 454).

A consideration of Langgässer's identities as expressed in her letters involves an exploration of their editorial construction. In setting out terms of reference with which to describe competing strands of identity in different spheres of Langgässer's life, underlying concepts of public and private have to be considered. Recent feminist scholarship has explored both traditional and revisionist understanding of public and private and in doing so has highlighted the pitfalls of an adherence to singular, dichotomized, and essentially opposing spheres (Fraser 1992, 109-42; Ryan 1992, 259-88; Eley 1992, 289-339). Just how genre and gender are integral to negotiations of public and private in Langgässer's published letters is thus important to my argument. By looking at the choice of addressees and the choice of letters I will draw conclusions as to how the editors of the letters variously

accentuate or marginalize identities of the professional and domestic spheres, in particular Langgässer's depiction as wife, mother and author.

Fundamental to the genre of letter writing is the absent presence of an addressee. As an inherently dialogical process the implicit characterization of the addressee simultaneously constructs the writer's own self-understanding (Runge and Steinbrügge 1991, 9). In Langgässer's letters, rhetorical involvement of the addressee creates an often vivid image of her interlocutor. In addition, the letters are frequently intended for more than one addressee. In choosing those letters which "[expand] the original intimacy of two", Hoffmann suggests a wider validity of the sentiments encapsulated in them (Meyer Spacks 1986, 73).

Wife, Mother and Author: Langgässer's Identities

Notwithstanding Hoffmann's introductory assertion that he will include letters relating to Langgässer's everyday life, many letters to Hoffmann himself which would clearly position her as a wife are omitted from his edition. He makes no reference to his connection with her in his introduction and omits parts of the letter referring to their wedding (E. Hoffmann 1990, 239). Given that such a marriage was outlawed only two months later by the Nuremberg Laws and saved Langgässer from deportation, its omission is striking. However, as will be suggested, this is part of the edition's perspective on the author's Jewishness. Letters written to Hoffmann which are included are addressed to a more universal "Lieber Freund" [dear friend] and thus conceal his identity as her husband, to the extent that they have been taken by some readers to be letters written by Langgässer to her priest (E. Hoffmann 1987, 7b). The only occasional signifier of Langgässer's marital status is that she sometimes signs herself "Elisabeth Langgässer-Hoffmann", although most signatures are missing from the letters in this edition. In a letter to Eugen Claassen, the original publisher, Hoffmann modestly states his reticence about including the letters written to him:

Ich kann sie deshalb nicht bringen, weil sie [diese Briefe] mich in einem derart günstigen Licht zeigen, daß es schon unanständig ist, wenn ich zu meinen Lebzeiten solche Schilderungen über mich veröffentliche. (E. Hoffmann 1987, 4-5)

I cannot include [these letters] because they portray me in such a favourable light that it would be indecent if I published such depictions about myself during my lifetime.

A comparison with those letters included in Elisabeth Hoffmann's later version does indeed demonstrate the strength of feeling Langgässer had for her husband; the latter emphasizing a very close emotional and intellectual relationship between them. However, many of the letters addressed to him, which were subsequently published in the later edition, express a more ambiguous gender hierarchy between Langgässer and her husband, belying Hoffmann's modest comments. Many letters are addressed in the diminutive to "Reinholdchen", and Langgässer refers frequently to her "kleiner Reinhold" [little Reinhold] (E. Hoffmann 1990, 193, 195). Langgässer's daughter has written about how her mother usually referred to Hoffmann in this way and says that the name comes from a short story similarly entitled (Edvardson cited in Müller 1990, 118-20). Ursula El-Akramy disparagingly considers this insight into the relationship between Wilhelm Hoffmann and Elisabeth Langgässer as being a product of the "Prototyp des Mannes" [prototype of man] which had "schon früh die Fantasie der Schriftstellerin beschäftigt" [long preoccupied the fantasy of the author], namely the aim of finding someone "rein und hold" [pure and meek] (1997, 64). The intimacy visible in Langgässer's nomenclature is likewise present, for example, when she admonishes Hoffmann for his illegible handwriting and for being a "Schmierpfötchen" [mucky pup] (E. Hoffmann 1990, 193). The tone of such comments is characterized by the description of Barbara Grüttner, Langgässer's daughter, that Wilhelm Hoffmann was "für die Mutter ein zusätzliches Kind" [an additional child for her mother] (El Akramy 1997, 108). The shifting co-ordinates of this relationship, as suggested in the letters, are especially interesting in view of the fact that Hoffmann is often referred to as Langgässer's "geistiger Mentor" [intellectual mentor] (Schiller 1987, 414). He is frequently given the credit for inspiring Langgässer's use of theology and often assumes the role of the authoritative interpreter of her work. In his biography of Langgässer, Frederik Hetmann reiterates Hoffmann's influence in the relationship but he sees Langgässer as the "drängend-werbende Teil" [coercive driving force] (1999, 84).

Many other personal details are excluded from Wilhelm Hoffmann's selection. Indeed, according to quotations from Hoffmann's early correspondence with the publisher, it was his original intention to eradicate *all* biographical material. Claassen however insisted: "Vor

allem sind Briefe ja auch wirklich Dokumente, die aus einer jeweiligen Lebenssituation heraus geschrieben werden. Man kann also das Biographische einfach nicht eliminieren" [Above all, letters really are documents written at a particular moment in a person's life. You therefore can not just simply eliminate the biographical elements] (E. Hoffmann 1987, 4). Nonetheless, most of the letters containing details about the birth of Cordelia and the births of three daughters with Hoffmann are omitted. In fact, many references that position Langgässer as a mother are excluded, with the first detailed mention of the children being in a letter dated 22 December 1945 (135). This pattern is repeated in several biographical summaries that Hoffmann has written about Langgässer, including the one appended to his collection of letters. In the context in which this edition of 1954 was published, where hegemonic discourses promoted a politicization of motherhood through an "Appell an die Mütterlichkeit" [appeal to motherliness], such omissions are striking (Heukenkamp 2001, 257). Karlheinz Müller suggests that Hoffmann excluded these letters because he wanted "alles allzu Persönliche und Private herausfiltern, um so die geistige Auseinandersetzung mit der Autorin in der Vordergrund zu stellen" [to filter out anything too personal and private in order to prioritize the intellectual examination of the author] (1986, 44). It is my contention that this marginalization of motherhood in Wilhelm Hoffmann's edition is linked to the marginalization of discourses of Jewishness and the Holocaust in memories of Nazism in West Germany during the 1950s, to which I will return.

Hoffmann's introductory focus on Langgässer's authorial identity and her "Selbstcharakterisierung als Briefschreiberin" [self-characterization as a letter-writer] (5) is continued throughout his selection. Her professional literary identity becomes most prominent in the 1954 edition, and is emphasized through the biographical notes and the bibliography of her work at the end of the collection. Two thirds of the letters included in this edition involve discussion of Langgässer's work and the writing process, and the inclusion of a "Rechenschaftsbericht an meinen Leser" [report to my reader] (230-41) accentuates such references.

Addressees integral to Langgässer's identity as an author include those belonging to the literary sphere – for example, other authors, publishers and members of the reading public. These are all included in the 1954 edition. However, a comparison with the later edition highlights some noticeable omissions. Many of the most prolific addressees with whom Langgässer was in contact in a professional capacity have been excluded – for example, while the names of Martin

Heidegger and Ina Seidel appear in the body of the letters, the letters to them are excluded. Given Langgässer's prominent status as an author in the immediate post-war period and at the time of publication in 1954, it is interesting to note that a significant number of the letters chosen by her husband, including many discussing her work, are addressed to her personal friends Elisabeth Andre and Martha Friedländer. The situating of the public figure in the realm of private letters to female addressees reduces Langgässer's authorial status and simultaneously suggests a hitherto undisclosed side of her identity. Further diminishing the professional correspondence is the omission of a large number of letters to the distinguished poet Wilhelm Lehmann. Given the tradition, within the otherwise feminized genre of letters, of published epistolary exchanges between 'great' (that is to say, canonized) men of literature, the omission of correspondence to such figures is noticeable.

Hoffmann excludes much, but not all, of Langgässer's correspondence with Lehmann, pointing to the fact that the omissions are not due to the fact of his being alive at the time of publication. The letters to him which *have* been included are pertinent examples of Langgässer's own evaluation of her authorial abilities. In a letter from July 1943, she creates for herself a stylized position of inferiority in relation to the addressee: "Sie wissen ja, daß ich im Gefühl meiner Minderwertigkeit, an Ihnen gemessen, lange gezögert habe, Ihnen die Verse zu schicken" [You know that due to my feeling of inferiority, as measured against you, I hesitated for a long time before sending you the verses] (2 July 1943, 109). Langgässer's self-deprecation and reiterated praise for "der große Zauberer" [the great magician] (24 November 1942, 107) ultimately become a mirror of her own ability: "[Meine Verse] stehen als äußerste Entsprechung, als entscheidender Gegenpol den Ihren gegenüber und können daher einzig von Ihnen verstanden und aufgenommen werden" [My verses are the extreme counterpart, the crucial opposite to yours and can therefore only be understood and grasped by you] (108). Within discussions of these letters it is usually the effect that Lehmann had on Langgässer's work which is stressed (Schäfer 1990, 193). Such letters have been read by some critics not as an expression of Langgässer's own abilities but instead as a eulogy to the male poet, with her letters simply being a medium through which his greatness is portrayed (Rollett 1954, 13; Usinger 1954, 9). Ingeborg Drewitz disagrees with such an interpretation, stating that "der Briefwechsel mit Wilhelm Lehmann ja nicht nur das Zeugnis einer Freundschaft, sondern auch einer Gleichgestimmtheit ist" [the exchange of letters with Wilhelm

Lehmann not only bears witness to a friendship but also to the harmony between them] (1984). However, it is arguable that the cuts Hoffmann made in the letters increase this effect. He omits for example an opening statement by Langgässer in reaction to Lehmann's dedication to her: "Herzensdank an Elisabeth Langgässer, die diesem Buch zum Leben verhalf!" [Heartfelt thanks to Elisabeth Langgässer who helped this book into being]. She writes that she was "ganz beschämt über seine ehrenvoll übertriebene Widmung" [quite embarrassed by his nobly exaggerated dedication] (E. Hoffmann 1990, 407).

Lehmann was one of the authors with whom Langgässer corresponded who was decidedly non-Christian. The letters which are included in this edition are, however, ones in which Langgässer's Catholicism and its place in her literature are highlighted. Omissions from the body of the letters reinforce this emphasis and continue the exclusion of other spheres of Langgässer's life. For example, Hoffmann omits her closing comment: "Heute nur diese Zeilen – das Baby hat seine Fütterzeit und meldet sich nachdrücklich" [I've only got time for this today, it's the baby's feeding time and she's making her presence felt] (E. Hoffmann 1990, 426). The letters included to Lehmann, which were written during 1938, 1941, 1942 and 1943, emphasize both Langgässer's authorial identity and her Catholicism.

In addition to the letters to Lehmann there are two further texts which are pivotal to the depiction of Langgässer's authorial identity. The first is to the editor Hans Gerth and the second to Marion von Eltz-Rübenach, a member of the Catholic Women's Organization. Both were written in 1935, the first being an open reply to a newspaper article by Gerth. This letter is another example which challenges the claims that only spontaneous letters of the private sphere have been included – it was written for publication in the same newspaper. The letter to Gerth from 11 August 1935 (65-70) illustrates how Langgässer deals with a certain kind of literary criticism with acerbity. It is one of the few letters to which Hoffmann made no changes. Here Langgässer progressively dismantles Gerth's pretensions as a literary critic. She creates a dichotomy between his thoughts ("eine kleine Empfindung", "ein Sentiment", 65, "artistische Spielerei", 66 [a small feeling, a sentiment, artistic frivolity]) and her work. Combined with rhetorical questions rejecting his intellectual integrity ("Oder sollten Sie, sehr verehrter Herr Gerth, am Ende weniger nachgedacht [...] haben wollen?" [or maybe, my dear Mr Gerth, in the end you didn't really want to think about it? 65]), she creates distance between herself and her addressee and dogmatically

denies the validity of his criticism: “Doch diese Ansicht, verehrter Herr Gerth, ist ausschließlich Ihre Sache – die Qualität jener Verse, die Ihnen mißfallen haben, hingegen *meine allein*” [This opinion is, dear Mr Gerth, your business alone, the quality of the verses which displease you is, however, *entirely mine* (67, emphasis in original).

The letter to von Eltz-Rübenach on 23 November 1935, which it has been suggested was a reply to comments about Langgässer's portrayal of the figure Laura in *Mars*, is significant for several reasons (Stutz 1957, 103-16). Firstly, given the claims to spontaneity, it is noticeable that Langgässer stresses her aim of giving “eine klare und deutliche Antwort” [a straight and clear answer] (71), reinforcing the fact that the letter has been carefully thought through. Secondly, Langgässer reiterates that it is a letter addressed to more than one person – it is a letter to be made public. Thirdly, it is in this letter that Langgässer clearly defines her restrictive understanding of the role of literature as art and its relationship to her Catholicism:

Lassen Sie mich zunächst vom Künstlerischen reden. Hier, gnädige Frau, müssen wir allerdings schon die Maßstäbe der Masse fallen lassen und uns mit der allgemein gültigen Tatsache abfinden, daß Kunst die durchaus aristokratische Angelegenheit einer geistigen Elite ist, die sie sowohl hervorbringt, als [sic] nachempfindend empfängt. (72)

Let me talk about artistic matters. Here, dear lady, we must of course reject the standards of the masses and come to terms with the generally valid fact that art is the aristocratic prerogative of an intellectual elite, who both produce it and subsequently empathetically receive it.

This attitude, encapsulated in her motto ‘commisto commystis’, is repeated throughout the volume and is in line with the author's poetics; a poetics which demands that the reader be ‘initiated’ in order to comprehend (Korn 1988, 161). Through the exclusion of her addressee's criticism the author's understanding of art and religious faith as the prerogative of an elite few is stressed:

Diese Annahme ist wohl allzu oberflächlich, als daß man sie einem denkenden Menschen im Ernst zutrauen könnte – aber auch von dem Inhalt her gesehen, kann ich Ihnen leider nicht zustimmen, denn wie Ihr Brief mit geradezu erschütternder Offenheit beweist, dürften Sie nicht nur von der Realität des Kunstwerks keine zutreffende Vorstellung haben, sondern auch keine von der Realität des Christentums [...]. (73)

This assumption is I suppose too superficial for one to seriously believe a thinking person capable of it – but also in terms of the content I can unfortunately not agree with you; as your letter proves with startling openness,

you not only have no accurate idea of the reality of the work of art but also none of the reality of Christianity [...].

The letters to Gerth and von Eltz-Rübenach emphasize Langgässer's view of the reception of her work. They were written to refute criticism about her explicit fictional depiction of evil, redemption and mercy. Her insistence on such a portrayal of sin becomes particularly relevant when the depiction of fascism and questions of guilt are considered. By excluding her addressees from both her literature and her Catholicism, Langgässer advocates a world view which insists on 'reality' and yet situates that same 'reality' in an artistic sphere accessible only to a few.

The inclusion of Langgässer's "Rechenschaftsbericht an meinen Leser" [Report for my reader] (230-41) at the end of the collection underlines her status as an author. The report, which takes the form of a letter, epitomizes the fact that for Langgässer all writing was dialogical, "daß der Akt des Schreibens für sie nur in der Auseinandersetzung mit dem Leser denkbar [war]" [the act of writing was only conceivable for her as a debate with the reader] (Schirmbeck 1977, 50). In explicitly addressing "mein lieber Leser" [my dear reader], a rhetorical figure of speech reiterated throughout, through the informal, singular pronoun of "Dich" [you], the narrative voice individualizes its appeal. The narrator's assertion, "Du, lieber Leser, mir und ich, die Autorin, Dir – einander manches zu sagen haben" (230) [you, dear reader, you and I, the author, have a lot to say to each other], suggests the revelation of intimacy. Nevertheless, the main tenet of this report is that access to the 'private' sphere, to Langgässer's literature, and by implication real dialogue with the addressee, can only be attained through a common acceptance of "eine Rangordnung geistiger Werte" [a hierarchy of spiritual values] (235), that is, of her interpretation of Christianity:

Wenn Du aber geneigt bist, mir diese Prämisse zuzugestehen, wird sicherlich auch das letzte und größte Mißverständnis wie die Samenkugel des Löwenzahns in die Winde geblasen werden; jenes Mißverständnis, mit dem Du mich immer wieder gefragt hast, ob es denn wirklich notwendig wäre, die Sünde so "rundherum" darzustellen, in so prangender Fülle, in teuflischem Hochmut und üppiger Augenlust. (237)

If you are inclined towards granting me this premise, then undoubtedly the last and greatest misunderstanding will be blown away in the wind like the seeds of a dandelion. That misunderstanding, which has caused you to ask repeatedly whether it is really necessary to portray sin so "completely", in such resplendent abundance, in devilish arrogance and opulent sensuality.

Through the report, Langgässer's abiding principles are made explicit. The sentiments of the letter to von Eltz-Rübenach are reiterated, as is the fact that Langgässer is writing for her "Mitmysten" [fellow mystics] (186). By confronting criticism of her work, the report allows the narrator to reiterate the religious beliefs underlying, and allowing accessibility to, her fictional and poetic texts. Its inclusion suggests that it can become a tool of interpretation for the letters preceding it which, through their publication, are no less public and which now have the same wider addressees as the report. The "Rechenschaftsbericht" serves to some extent as a summary of the themes, especially those relating to Langgässer's Catholicism, which become prominent within the letters, and as such it consolidates a religious meaning attributable to her correspondence. As Margareta Jolly points out, the concluding letter in a published volume is significant for "the imposition of an ideological meaning" on the text (1997, 169).

The letters selected, along with the report and bibliography, place an emphasis on Langgässer as an author, yet this is not without contradiction given the significant omissions of addressees from the professional sphere. In addition, it is my contention that further noticeable interventions within the letters are a result of the *actual* reception of Langgässer's *fictional* texts, as is thematized in these letters.

Luise Rinser has discussed how reviewers of the late 1940s went as far as to label Langgässer's fictional work "sancta pornographica" (1990a, 55), something which Rinser retrospectively interprets as a response by "böse Männer [...] in einer noch pruden Zeit" [evil men in a time still marked by prudery] (1980). A gendered dimension to the reception is suggested here by Rinser, and certainly the reviewers focused much of their attention on the depiction of sexuality in Langgässer's literature. It was, however, not just restricted to her work, but transferred a "Gott-Satan-Dualität [...] zum Prüfstein der Autorencharakteristik" [God-Satan-Duality, which became the touchstone of the author's character] (Fliedl 1986, 5). Some of the editor's omissions and interventions within the letters from the 1954 edition suggest that his awareness of such criticism – in particular the venomous outbursts of the reviewers about eroticism and lesbianism – led him to downplay the closeness of the relationship between Langgässer and Elisabeth Andre. It is arguably the animosity of such comments like that of Rose Matz in response to the love scenes in *Das unauslöschliche Siegel* – "Ihre [Langgässers] Laster gehören nicht vor die Ohren eines Beichtvaters, sondern in das Sprechzimmer eines Psychiaters" [Her vices belong not to the confessional but to the

psychiatrist's consulting room] – which influenced Hoffmann's selection (1951, 186). Many of the letters to Andre, which Cathy Gelbin considers to be “Langgässer's most beautiful love letters”, have been extensively edited or omitted altogether (2001, 53). While it should be noted that Elisabeth Andre destroyed many of her letters from Langgässer, the collection by Elisabeth Hoffmann is arguably sufficient to make a comparison; one which highlights that in addition to the exclusion of much tender description of time spent together, effusive forms of address and closing expressions are also significantly reduced. For example, the quite flamboyant “Mein allersüßestes, zärtlich geliebtes und innigverehrtes Mädchen” [my sweetest, tenderly loved and deeply adored girl] (E. Hoffmann 1990, 208), and “Ich küsse Dich, Einziges, Treuestes, Bestes, unablässig und überallhin” [I kiss you, the only one, the most loyal, the best, incessantly and everywhere] (E. Hoffmann 1990, 168) become the altogether more restrained “Meine liebe Lisle!” [My dear Lisle!] (49).

Effects of Fascism on Langgässer's Professional and Family Life

In the letters discussed above which stress Langgässer's authorial identity there is no mention of Nazism. Given the extended length and the expressly open character of the responses to Gerth and von Eltz-Rübenach such letters show that in 1935 Langgässer did not publicly explain her understanding of literature in relation to the contemporary political context. The letters to Lehmann written during the war similarly reiterate a distance from the historical context. Other letters, however, do show encroaching effects of fascist literary policy, but, as will be shown, these are mostly contained in letters to close friends.

Langgässer's professional life was affected following Hitler's accession to power, although not immediately. Writing to Elisabeth Andre on 17 March 1933, Langgässer states that she has been invited to read from her work on the “Tag des Buches” [Book Day] (50). Unlike explanatory notes about other occasions when Langgässer spoke, Wilhelm Hoffmann does not explain this invitation further. However, a note in the later edited collection informs us that this event took place under the auspices of “Nation und Buch” [Nation and book] (E. Hoffmann 1990, 1084). Langgässer thus did not initially shirk from participation in such events. While making no mention of the Nazis' rise to power, the selected letters do refer to the ever crystallizing implications of the fascist system for the literary sphere and the type of literature allowed to be published within it:

Merkwürdig bleibt es natürlich doch, daß dieses Werk in den ersten Tagen des "dritten Reiches" verlegt wird – umso [sic] merkwürdiger, als alles, was geschieht, einen realen Zusammenhang auf der symbolischen Ebene hat, einerlei, ob es die Akteure der Weltgeschichte wissen oder nicht! Allerdings gibt es ja wohl auch nichts *deutscheres* als "Proserpina" – und nichts, was so wenig "Volk" hinter sich haben wird. (March, 1933, 51, emphasis in original)

It is naturally still strange that this work is being published during the first days of the "Third Reich" – and even more strange as everything that happens has a real connection on the symbolic level regardless of whether the protagonists of world history know it or not! Nevertheless, there is also truly nothing more *German* than "Proserpina" and nothing that will have so little "nation" behind it.

Langgässer distanced herself from the Nazi designation of such terms as "German" and "nation", dissociating her literature and religious belief from the events of first months of Nazi rule. In reappropriating the term "German" and linking it to the "symbolic level", she simultaneously reaffirms her repeatedly expressed belief "daß menschliches Dasein von höherer Ordnung und Gesetzmäßigkeit bestimmt [wird]" [that human existence is determined by a higher order and legitimacy] (Bolduan 1979, 40). In the face of the Nazi dictatorship such an understanding has particular implications with regard to responsibility and the possibilities of individual agency within a dichotomized fight between good and evil. Comments such as the above raise questions as to what Langgässer's letters suggest that she did understand regarding notions of Germanness and nation. In letters to her close friends, she scathingly defines what, in her opinion, contemporary publishers see as 'German': "Na ja – je weniger gedacht, desto 'deutscher', je weniger Form, desto mehr 'Seele'" [Yes well, the less-thoughtout, the more 'German' it is, the less form it has, the more 'soul'] (1934, 57). Much later she suggests what her own understanding of 'German' poetry is: "Vielleicht ist es überhaupt das 'deutscheste' aller Gedichte, die ich bisher geschrieben habe – das innigste, liedhafteste, einfachste" [Perhaps it is the most 'German' of all the poems that I've written up until now – the most heartfelt, the most lyrical and the simplest] (26 March 1941, 97). In redefining these terms Langgässer nevertheless appropriates the germanized language of Nazism throughout her letters. Writing to Gerth she claims for her own "die spezifisch germanische Aufgabe der Mitte und Vermittlung" [the specifically Germanic task of taking the centre ground and mediating] (11 August 1935, 68), which is founded in a unification of "[d]as Christliche und das Nordische" [the Christian and the Nordic]

(24 November 1942, 108). This linking of the religious, the spatial and the temporal was not absent from Nazi propaganda at that time (Loewy 1983, 60; Wulf 1989, 340). Given that Langgässer continued to publish until 1936, her use of terms at times seems to confirm Dieter Schiller's comment that Langgässer was, at least within the first few years of Nazism, "sichtlich bemüht, sich der ideologischen Konjunktur im dritten Reich anzupassen" [clearly attempting to adapt to the ideology of the Third Reich] (1987, 421), albeit while renegotiating these terms in her letters.

Juxtaposed with continued attempts at publication, her correspondence illustrates a progressive silencing within the publishing sphere; not, as some commentators have suggested, a sudden break on Hitler's coming to power (Wegner 1999). Her letter to author Agnes Herkommer on 29 March 1934 illustrates her opinion of the changing political constellations and their effect on her chances of publication:

Ja, wahrhaftig: es ist notwendig und beglückend ein solches Echo zu hören – doppelt notwendig in einer Zeit, die jede Sache nur gelten läßt, wenn sie sich nach ihren Maßen biegen und ausdenken läßt, und die Betrachtungsweise aus den Eigengesetzen der Dichtung nicht mehr kennt. (56)

Yes, truly: it is necessary and delightful to hear such an echo – doubly necessary in a time which only allows a text to be valid if it can be made to fit into certain categories, and no longer knows the inherent rules of poetry.

In the first three years of the Nazis being in power, Langgässer partly attributes her lack of success to financial reasons and to the fact that publishers are all being very careful (4 July 1934, 59). As a result, she sarcastically concludes "Dichtung 'interessiert nicht'" [no one is 'interested' in poetry] (4 July 1934, 60). Langgässer's conviction of her own literary talent leads to a fierce outburst about contemporary publishing conditions: "Ich höre schon, wie das Literaturgeschmeiß über mich herfällt. Oder: mich weiterhin verschweigt" [I can already hear how the literary vermin are besieging me: Or rather, continuing to silence me] (57). Set alongside this external silencing is Langgässer's own unequivocal assertion: "Man muß schweigen und warten" [one must remain silent and wait] (1 August 1934, 60). This is significant in the context of critics who focus on the fact that after 1936 the Nuremberg Laws forbade her to publish (Hautumm 1964, 43). While this was undoubtedly the case, an emphasis on the Nazi enforcing of such silence downplays the fact that Langgässer had already decided to withdraw to a certain extent. It relativizes her decision not to write literature which she knows would be acceptable

in the prevailing political climate while this was still possible. Langgässer's numerous assertions of her elitist understanding of literature and its audience show how she distanced her writing from the Nazi literary sphere: "Und vielleicht eine handvoll Menschen wird sie im heutigen Deutschland aufnehmen und verstehen. Welch ein Literaturbetrieb!!" [And perhaps a handful of people in today's Germany will pick it up and grasp it. What a business this publishing is!] (22 May 1934, 56) The internal and external pressures preventing publication did not, however, stop her writing. In continuing to do so, the isolation Langgässer felt as integral to the creative process was accentuated. Her decision to withdraw professionally encapsulated a wider understanding of the contemporary context and her alienation from it:

Sie [Lehmann] wüßten es, wenn Sie die vollkommene Einsamkeit kennten, die taube Stille, in der ich lebe, soweit ich ein Schaffender bin. Kein Wort von mir, kein Reim, dringt mehr nach außen – *darf* mehr nach außen dringen. Ich habe vieles versucht, nichts ist geglückt [...]. (22 July 1938, 86, emphasis in original)

You [Lehmann] would know it, if you knew the complete loneliness in which I am living, in so far as I am a creative individual. No longer can a word or rhyme of mine penetrate the outside world – no longer is it *allowed* to penetrate the outside world. I have tried many things but nothing has worked.

Hoffmann's chosen letters underline problems of publication and the eventual public literary silence. A focus on authorial identity means that there is an attendant emphasis on Langgässer's status as a victim of fascist literary policy. As the above letter suggests however, Langgässer did initially attempt to resist this isolation. These efforts are not elaborated further in Wilhelm Hoffmann's edition. In contrast, the letters of Elisabeth Hoffmann's later edition show that Langgässer in fact became a member of the 'Reichsschrifttumskammer' [Reich Chamber of Literature], and when she was excluded on 'racial' grounds she appealed first to Hans Hinkel (August 1937) and then to Joseph Goebbels himself (April 1938) (E. Hoffmann 1990, 204, 277, 293). Within these two highly problematic letters, Langgässer makes reference to the "rein arische Linie" [pure Aryan line] of her mother and uses criticism of her work by the Jewish author Alfred Döblin to assert its value. Elisabeth Hoffmann's notes to this letter indicate the problematic nature of such comments, pointing to the fact that the supposed attempt by Döblin to prevent Langgässer being awarded a civic prize belies that fact that he gave the speech in honour of Langgässer on the occasion of this award (1990, 293, 277, 1103). The

two letters to Hinkel and Goebbels are ones which, Anthony Riley suggests, were written by Langgässer with help from both Wilhelm Hoffmann and Ina Seidel, a fact which once again contradicts the notion of spontaneous writing (1987, 192, 213). The letters have been interpreted as either demonstrating Langgässer's "weitgehende Kompromißbereitschaft" [far-reaching willingness to compromise] (Reinhold 1996, 321), and her preparedness "sich politisch zu prostituieren" [to prostitute herself politically] (Müller 1990, 12), or as interventions "mit dem guten Gewissen der deutschen Staatsbürgerin und Katholikin, die noch nicht durchschaut, wohin das faschistische Deutschland treibt" [with the clear conscience of the German citizen and Catholic who hasn't yet seen where fascist Germany is heading] (Bircken 1995, 177). Riley, more sympathetically, goes as far as to state:

So erscheint der Versuch Elisabeth Langgässers, die deutsche Bürokratie u.a. durch die Anwendung des der NSDAP eigenen Vokabulars, Stils und Gedankenguts zu überlisten, in der besonderen Notlage sogar verständlich. (Riley 1987, 191)

Thus Elisabeth Langgässer's attempt to outwit the German bureaucracy by, among other things, using the NSDAP's own vocabulary, style and thought, even appears understandable given the particularly dire situation.

In contrast, Elisabeth Hoffmann denies that these letters can be seen as tactical or subversive due to Langgässer's relationship to Jewishness (1990, 9). Gelbin has described this relationship as being a result of Langgässer's "position between complicity and victimization, between privilege and persecution", based on Langgässer's designation as a "Mischling" [hybrid] (1997, 145). Gelbin maintains that Langgässer was attempting "to carve out a space for the hybrid within nationalistic Germany" and in so doing regurgitated fascist language (2001, 117). In the face of such competing views, the assertion that Langgässer is someone "die sich auf eine makellose Rolle im Hitler-Reich berufen [...] konnte" [who could point to the impeccable role she played during the Third Reich] is at the very least problematic (Wegner 1999). The omission of these two letters from Wilhelm Hoffmann's selection obscures the ambiguity of Langgässer's professional position during Nazism, emphasizing instead her victimization as an author.

One third of the letters included in the volume were written between 1933 and 1945 and the letters containing most comment on the developing political situation are addressed to her friends Elisabeth Andre and Martha Friedländer. This emphasis on correspondents

belonging to the non-professional sphere suggests a parallel withdrawal of Langgässer from public life. In the letters included by her husband there is no mention of 30 January 1933 or of the fact that Langgässer voted for Hitler (El-Akramy 1997, 28). Apart from comments about the changing conditions of the literary sphere there are no direct references to the contemporary political situation in these letters until 23 July 1941 when, almost incidentally, Langgässer states: "Und der Krieg geht weiter" [the war continues] (100). A letter from 26 August 1941 reasserts Langgässer's tendency to withdraw from external events and confront them only in writing:

Als ich neulich am Rande der deutschen Wochenschau vom russisch-deutschen Feldzug ein Wiesenstück mit windbewegten Blumen mitten im Grund der Verwüstung blühen sah, da wußte ich, daß man diesen Geschehnissen nur zwei Dinge gegenüber setzen kann: das eigene *Sein* – lebensmäßig; und das unsterbliche *Lied* – künstlerisch. (102)

When I recently saw in passing in the news of the Russian-German campaign, a meadow with wind-swept flowers blossoming in the midst of the destruction, then I knew that one can only oppose these events with two things: one's own *existence* – by living; and the immortal *song* – artistically.

However, by 1943 Langgässer writes of how Berlin has been affected by the constant bombing, and a year later she speaks of "der zunehmende Luftterror" [the increasing terror attacks by air] (1944, 120) and "der furchtbare Druck des Krieges" [the terrible pressure of the war] (1944, 122).

Juxtaposed with repeated references to the outcome of the allied bombing and the suffering of the German population are a small number of letters describing the progressive persecution of those affected by the Nazi racial laws. The contrasting priorities given to these two strands within Wilhelm Hoffmann's edition are demonstrated in two letters from 1941. A letter to Martha Friedländer is significant when the entire extract published by Wilhelm Hoffmann is considered:

...Hier in Berlin werden übrigens die "Sterntäger" [man nennt ihren Orden "pour le sémite"] mit Achtung und Mitgefühl behandelt, und noch niemals habe ich beobachtet, daß auch nur *irgend* ein Mensch es an Rücksichtnahme ihnen gegenüber fehlen läßt. Sollte diese Maßnahme eine Brandmarkung sein, so ist sie höchstwahrscheinlich das Gegenteil geworden. Besonders die einfachen Leute, deren Herzentakt [sic] noch rein und gut erhalten ist, sind höflich und wahrhaft menschlich gegen sie. Diese Tatsache hat mich mit meinem Volk doch sehr versöhnt und war ein kleiner Balsam für vieles... (23 September 1941, 102-3)

...By the way, here in Berlin those wearing the star [it's called the order of the semites] are being treated with respect and empathy, and I have never noticed *even* one person lacking in consideration towards them. If this measure was supposed to stigmatize them, then in all probability it has achieved the opposite. Particularly the simple people, whose hearts still remain pure and good, are polite and truly humane towards them. This fact has considerably reconciled me with my people and was a small balm for many things.

This letter has been considerably abridged by Wilhelm Hoffmann and his omissions thus emphasize points which demonstrate a rather naive understanding of the situation, which has been given a positive slant reported from a distanced, impersonal perspective. When the full text of the letter, as printed by Elisabeth Hoffmann, is considered, the picture portrayed is rather different. Her version includes the following:

[Ich möchte] Ihnen heute sagen, dass es Dela nicht schlecht geht; "gut" kann man natürlich nicht sagen, aber abgesehen von dem entsetzlichen Stern, mit dem zu gehen, sie immer noch (wie sie mir klagte) als ein "Spiessrutenlaufen" empfindet, und der Trennung von zu Hause, hat sich ihre Lage im Gegensatz zu vorher nur verbessert. (E. Hoffmann 1990, 372)

I would like to tell you today that Dela is not doing too badly; obviously one can't say she's doing "well", but apart from the terrible star, which, when she's wearing it, still feels, as she complained to me, like she's "running the gauntlet", and apart from the separation from home, her situation has, in comparison to before, only improved.

The inclusion of Cordelia's perspective portrays the situation in a more negative, albeit still faintly optimistic, light. In the context of Wilhelm Hoffmann's 1954 publication, such an abridgement is significant given the letter immediately following, where Langgässer also confronts the consequences of war, but with a distinctly different focus: a letter from 4 December 1941, one of the few not to have been abridged by Hoffmann, offers condolences on the death of Helene Heuss's husband. While offering religious comfort to the addressee, whose husband was presumably a soldier, Langgässer generalizes her distress. She writes of the similar suffering of "tausende von jungen, liebenden Frauen heute" [thousands of young, loving women today] (103). Such a letter prioritizes the anguish of all German women and portrays a universalized notion of victimhood. Both in terms of textual space devoted to the letter and its narrative emphasis, the sentiments of this letter are more powerfully conveyed than the preceding one.

The naivety suggested by Wilhelm Hoffmann's framing of the letter about the "Sternträger" [those wearing the star] is similarly

expressed in a later letter to Friedländer detailing Cordelia's deportation, which came, Langgässer writes, "wie ein Blitz aus heiterem, zumindest aber ahnungslosem Himmel!!" [like a bolt from the blue, or at least unsuspecting sky!!] (13 March 1944, 120). Langgässer's apparent surprise is paralleled by a similar response from the reader, due to Wilhelm Hoffmann's omission of Langgässer's Jewish background and Cordelia's experience of progressive persecution. It is, as one reviewer notes, "dem unkundigen Leser unverständlich [...] warum gerade ein Kind, die älteste Tochter, ein so besonders hartes Schicksal gehabt hat" [incomprehensible for an unformed reader why particularly a child, the oldest daughter, had suffered such an especially harsh fate] (Korn 1954). Given Langgässer's immediate post-war prominence it is significant that this reviewer considers that there will be readers of Langgässer's letters who are unaware of why Cordelia was deported. Written on 13 March 1944, the letter detailing Cordelia's departure for Theresienstadt is strikingly optimistic:

Wir fanden sie [Cordelia] vollkommen gefaßt, ja sogar fröhlich und zuversichtlich, denn erstens war es ja wirklich "nur" Theresienstadt [und nicht etwa Polen] und zweitens ging sie als Säuglingsschwester und begleitendes Sanitätspersonal mit dem Zug, hatte 2 Kinder und einen Säugling zu betreuen und war bereits in Tracht und Häubchen, was sie, glaube ich, mit großem Stolz erfüllte. (120)

We found her completely composed, yes, even happy and confident, because, firstly, it was really "only" Theresienstadt [and not Poland for example], and secondly, she was travelling in the train as a nurse for the babies and as accompanying medical personnel; she had two children and an infant to look after and was already in uniform and cap, which filled her, I believe, with great pride.

While Hetmann argues that this positive tone can be explained by the fact that Langgässer's letters were being censored, this was highly unlikely (1999, 122). Werner Dürrson considers the tone of this letter, noting how it sounds "mütterlich-optimistisch, wenn nicht ahnungslos, und paßt nicht zu ihren nächtlichen Alpträumen" [maternally optimistic, if not naive, and doesn't fit with her nightly nightmares] (1993). What is significant though is that while the letter sounds optimistic, it does show some awareness of what deportation meant through its reference to Poland. The letter has been edited by Hoffmann so that it ends on the positive, omitting the mother's distress: "Ich leide schrecklich unter dieser Trennung" [I'm suffering terribly from this separation] (E. Hoffmann 1990, 447).

A suggestion of Langgässer's lack of knowledge of the extent of the persecution of Jews in Wilhelm Hoffmann's edition is contradicted when a comparison with the later letters is made. These show Langgässer responding to Cordelia's Jewish guardian being deported in 1942, as Karlheinz Müller has emphasized (1990, 79). None of the 1954 letters contain any reflection by Langgässer on the effects of persecution on other members of her close circle. As Ursula Reinhold reminds us, Langgässer's former publisher Jakob Hegner, in whom she writes that she had found her "geistige[s] Haus" [spiritual home] (64), had fled into exile in 1936 (1996, 324). In addition, the daughter of Martha Friedländer was forced to emigrate in 1934 due to Jewish relatives on her father's side. Friedländer is the second most prominent recipient of Langgässer's letters during the Nazi years in Wilhelm Hoffmann's edition, but letters including reference to her daughter's exile have been omitted or crucially edited. Letters written to Marianne Friedländer herself are, according to Elisabeth Hoffmann, no longer in existence (1990, 1250). The lack of such addressees contributes to the earlier mentioned marginalization of Langgässer's discussions of Jewishness and the references to Cordelia.

Notwithstanding an emphasis on Langgässer's naivety in the 1954 edition, the volume does include a description of how she encountered the rounding up of Jewish citizens when a lorry arrives to take them away "zwecks 'Registrierung'" [for the purpose of 'registration'] (5 March 1943, 109). In an article from 1960 containing a detailed description of this episode, Hoffmann maintains his stress on Langgässer's innocence as to what was happening while omitting all references to Cordelia, who was present according to the letters:

Elisabeth Langgässer war allein mit einem ein und einhalb Jahre alten Töchterchen, dem sie gerade das Mittagessen gab. Elisabeth Langgässer fragte auf die Aufforderung mitzukommen: "Kann ich vielleicht wissen, warum Sie mich mitnehmen wollen?" Der Gestapomann: "Sie lesen wohl keine Zeitung und hören kein Radio?" EL: "Ich habe nichts gelesen was mich betrifft". [...] Er: "Na, im Hinblick uff det Kleene, bleiben Sie mal". (W. Hoffmann 1960, cf. 1954, 109; E. Hoffmann 1990, 416)

Elisabeth Langgässer was alone with her eighteen month old daughter, to whom she had just given lunch. Elisabeth Langgässer asked, in response to the demand that she go with them: "Can I perhaps ask why you want to take me with you?" The Gestapo man answered: "Don't you read a newspaper or listen to the radio?" EL: "I haven't read anything that concerns me". Him: "Well 'cos of the little one, stay where you are".

Further references to the effect of racial laws are mentioned within his edition but not connected explicitly to Jewishness. So, for example, Langgässer writes that she is "einsatzpflichtig" [obliged to work] (127) due to her "*besondere Situation*" [*particular situation*] (18 January 1945, 126). Such euphemisms are symptomatic of Langgässer's understanding of Jewishness and Hoffmann's editorial construction of it, both of which are highlighted through a comparison with the letters published in 1990.

Notwithstanding the effect of the Nazi racial laws for Langgässer and Cordelia, Wilhelm Hoffmann removes most of the explicit references to Langgässer's Jewishness in his selection. While the inclusion of a short biography at the end of the letters does refer to Langgässer's categorization as 'half-Jewish' and the accompanying notes refer to the demand for "Abstammungspapiere" [papers proving who her descendants were] (249) and her status as a "Mischling" [hybrid] (250), references within the letters themselves are to a large extent absent. Hoffmann omits her discussion of the process of having to try and prove her 'Aryan' descent and her confession to him "dass ich kein A. [Arier] bin" [that I'm not an A.] (E. Hoffmann 1990, 182). In addition, the exclusion of many letters which describe Langgässer as Cordelia's mother, her fears for her daughter, and her attempts to prevent her deportation through adoption further reduce the link to Jewishness.

Wilhelm Hoffmann also edits letters suggesting Langgässer's more ambivalent attitude to Jewishness. He changes, for example, a pre-war letter in which she refers to Siegfried Kracauer as a "fiese[r], zynische[r] kleine[r] Jude" [horrible, cynical little Jew] (E. Hoffmann 1990, 53) to "fiese[r], zynische[r] kleine[r] Kerl" [horrible, cynical little fellow] (2 August 1926, 14). Gelbin has pointed to the fact that in some of the still unpublished letters Langgässer makes explicit links about Cordelia's character, appearance and Jewishness (2001, 122). However, Hoffmann does include some texts from the post-war period to Andre and Lehmann in which there are explicit references to the fact that he is the "Mann einer Nichtarierin" [husband of a non-Aryan] (1 August 1945, 130) and where Langgässer makes reference to her Jewish background: "bin ich Halbjüdin" [I am half-Jewish] (23 March 1949, 204). Such repetition of fascist stereotypes and her use of antisemitic terms to describe herself after 1945, has led Gelbin to argue that in the post-war period "Langgässer merely changes the negative connotations of older discourses around the Jew and the hybrid into positive ones, while leaving the stereotype itself intact" (1997, 159). In omitting elements of antisemitism, Hoffmann distorts

the very essence of the unreflected use of Nazi language. Elisabeth Hoffmann has suggested that antisemitic comments found in Langgässer's early letters "rein privaten, zufälligen Charakter haben" [have a purely private, random character], but given that these comments have been published, such an assertion is problematic and, indeed, Hoffmann herself later questions "ob nicht gerade solche unzensurierten Äußerungen mitunter mehr über das Bewußtsein eines Autors verraten als ausgeklügelte, programmatische Konzepte" [whether it is precisely such uncensored comments that in fact betray more about the consciousness of an author than any cleverly worked-out programmatic concepts] (1993, 289).

The inclusion by Wilhelm Hoffmann of two further post-war references to the fact that "Cordelia über Auschwitz nach Schweden gekommen war" [Cordelia had arrived in Sweden via Auschwitz] (11 January 1946, 137) and that Langgässer "Delas wegen bereits halbwegs als 'Opfer des Faschismus' gelte" [was already half way to counting as 'victim of fascism' because of Dela] (13 March 1947, 152) are significant in highlighting Langgässer's status as a Jewish victim, but they are not as prominent as they might be. For example, Hoffmann omits letters written to the "Hauptausschuss Opfer des Faschismus" [Main Committee for Victims of Fascism], in which Langgässer describes her "seelische Folterungen" [spiritual torture] resulting from the familial and professional persecution by the Nazis (E. Hoffmann 1990, 533). These numerous omissions with respect to notions of Jewishness are arguably indicative of both a discursive taboo that was prevalent in West Germany during the 1950s (Braese 2002, 17-28), and Hoffmann's response to Langgässer's own ambivalent relationship to her Jewish background, one which has been explored elsewhere by Elisabeth Hoffmann (1990, 35-39; 1993, 286-95).

While marginalizing letters which refer to Jewishness, Wilhelm Hoffmann includes letters in which Langgässer's faith and religious interpretation of the recent past underline her suffering:

Wenn ich das letzte Jahr überdenke: es war fürchterlicher als 10 Jahre Zuchthaus! Welche Ängste, welche Not, Qual, Todesgefahr, Mühsal, Hunger, Kälte, innere Verlassenheit! Und inmitten all dieser Schrecken doch immer: welch wunderbare Führung und Fügung; wie deutlich die Hand und der Finger Gottes! (3 December 1945, 134)

When I think back on this last year – it was worse than 10 years in prison! What fear, what distress, torture, danger of death, hardship, hunger, cold, inner desolation! And yet, still in the midst of all these terrors: what wonderful guidance and divine providence; how clear the hand and finger of God!

Langgässer's repeated reference to the religious paradigm in the post-war period emphasizes the continued strengthening of her Catholicism and the comfort it provides. This perspective on the recent past reiterates that her decision to retreat during Nazism was embedded in her religious beliefs. It was Langgässer's specific perception of Catholicism that made inner emigration within the Nazi system inevitable for her. Such post-war references consolidate numerous earlier allusions to Langgässer's submission to divine order, for example: "Und so lege ich denn meine Liebe in größere Hände – dorthin, von wo sie ausgegangen ist und wo sie behütet werden wird wie das Haar auf dem Haupt und der Sperling auf dem Dach" [So I put my love into greater hands –from whence it came and where it will be protected just like the hair on your head and the sparrow on the roof] (17 February 1935, 62). In the light of such comments, Ingeborg Drewitz describes Langgässer's position as one of "geduldige Demut statt Protest und Verantwortung" [patient humility instead of protest and responsibility] (1981, 151). In the context of the 1954 edition's depiction of Nazism, it is an understanding of fascism which raises questions about the possibilities of resistance.

Horst Krüger maintains that "[Langgässers] Haus damals eine der wenigen, winzigen Zellen geistigen Widerstands gegen den Nazismus [war]" [Langgässer's house was, at that time, one of the few tiny cells of intellectual resistance to Nazism] (1981, 319). In contrast, Gertrud Seehaus asks whether religion was a source of resistance for Langgässer or instead simply a refuge (1994). It was indeed the case that during the twelve years of Nazism overtly declaring your Christian faith was a sign of political resistance and if we judge resistance by what the fascist regime considered as such then Langgässer's attempts to get Cordelia out of danger would certainly be included (Reppen 1987, 15, 18). These attempts are described more fully in the later edition, as are Langgässer's fears for her daughter.

The article by Wilhelm Hoffman describes how a final decision not to send Cordelia abroad was due to Langgässer's priest:

Der Pfarrer sagte: "Wenn Sie den Plan durchführen, so darf niemand Ihnen einen Vorwurf machen. Lassen Sie ihn aber fallen, so tun Sie das Vollkommenere". Eine tiefe, tiefe Stille herrschte im Zimmer. Nach einiger Zeit sagte Elisabeth Langgässer: "Ich lasse ihn fallen". Aber später schrieb sie, was es jedoch heißt, ein Kind der Barmherzigkeit Gottes in einer solchen Situation anzuvertrauen, das weiß nur der, der es erlebt hat. (1960, 7)

The priest said: "If you carry out this plan, then no one can reproach you. However, if you drop it you'll be doing the more perfect thing". A deep silence reigned in the room. After a time Elisabeth Langgässer said: "I'll drop the plan then". But later she wrote that only a person who has experienced it knows what it means to entrust a child to God's mercy in such a situation.

An acceptance of such faith in divine intervention is accentuated in Wilhelm Hoffmann's edition. It is expressed through letters in which, when Cordelia's deportation becomes inevitable, she becomes stylized as a martyr. As Langgässer writes to Martha Friedländer in 1939: "Wir warten wieder zusammen auf die Entscheidung, die der Himmel über das Kind verhängt" [We are again waiting together for the decision that Heaven will impose on the child] (88). Ehrhard Bahr maintains, in a discussion of how this response to fascism similarly pervades Langgässer's post-war fiction, that such a response is problematic because "[d]er Holocaust wird hier für eine einseitige katholische Theologie annektiert, während die Probleme des Judentums völlig übersehen werden" [the Holocaust is here being annexed for a one-sided Catholic theology, while the problems of the Jews are being completely overlooked] (1977, 145). Within such a narrative, Nazism becomes relativized as part of the perpetual fight between good and evil. In this scenario, the scope for individual action is downplayed and, indeed, there is a complete lack in Langgässer's letters of reference to people as historical actors with responsibility for the rise of fascism, emphasising how completely her world view was shaped by such beliefs.

The only reference to guilt and the German population is in a letter to Cordelia in June 1948 asking her for information about "die typischen deutschen Sünden" [the typical German sins] (184). In the same letter she requests: "[S]childere mir, was und wie Du es erlebst hast, vor allem das 'Äußere' Deines 'Lebens' in Auschwitz" [Describe for me what you experienced and how you experienced it – above all your 'external life' in Auschwitz] (184). Although she maintains "in Wirklichkeit weiß ich ja alles" [in reality I do know everything], omissions from this letter made by Wilhelm Hoffmann, in which Langgässer bemoans the lack of fat rations in the French zone and the wide-spread "Hungersnot" [famine] suggest a lack of awareness of the conditions in Auschwitz (E. Hoffmann, 1990 784). The request for information, along with Cordelia's stylization as a martyr has led Elisabeth Endres to assert:

Elisabeth Langgässer fühlte sich schuldig, aber sie begriff auch in ihrem Schuldgefühl nicht, was geschehen war. Sie lebte in einer anderen Welt. Und in dieser war die Tochter Cordelia nicht das arme verfolgte Kind, das dringend

Hilfe brauchte. Sie war eine Gestalt in einem Geschehen, das man einen großen katholischen Mythos nennen könnte. (1988)

Elisabeth Langgässer felt guilty, but she also didn't understand in her feeling of guilt what had happened. She lived in another world. And in this world her daughter Cordelia was not the poor persecuted child who urgently needed help. She was a figure in a series of events which one could call a great Catholic myth.

Such critical assessments of Langgässer's actions during 1933 to 1945 predominate in more recent secondary literature. In the context of the 1990s and the focus upon categories of perpetrator and victim within post-unification discourses of remembering, her reactions have been subject to competing interpretation. Peter Michael Ehre rejects the possibility of that Langgässer was a resister, but vindicates her behaviour through a totalizing characterization: "Ein solcher Akt wäre ihrer Natur zuwider gewesen" [Such an act would have been antithetical to her nature] (1994, 2). Annette Wassermann, on the other hand, asserts that: "Aus einem Opfer des nationalsozialistischen Regimes wurde eine Unterlassungstäterin" [A victim of the NS regime became a perpetrator by omission] (1997). Nevertheless, Langgässer was recently included in an exhibition on resistance (Riley 1987, 189; Wehinger 1994, 30-31). Konstanze Fliedl has suggested that the appropriation of Langgässer as a resister has been in part due to the way in which Krüger has written about her, which has coloured subsequent reception. Fliedl in particular takes issue with Horst Krüger and his analysis of her poem "Frühjahr 1946", where the latter makes the problematic assertion that Langgässer's poetry is antifascist by dint of what is *not* said (1977, 134-39).

While Wilhelm Hoffmann's edition marginalizes questions of resistance in terms of the adoption of Cordelia, but emphasizes it in terms of Catholicism, he has, in other sources, commented on what he defines as Langgässer's opposition to the fascist system. He mentions approvingly the fact included in a letter in his edition that Langgässer refused to take over a still-occupied house of a former Nazi when theirs was destroyed: "Vielleicht steht ein verlassenes Parteihaus leer. Hinaustreiben möchte ich natürlich um Gotteswillen keinen Menschen" [Perhaps an abandoned party house is empty. Of course I don't want to drive anyone else out for goodness sake] (11 January 1946, 136). Her post-war behaviour, including her rejection of a former Nazi as a domestic-help, is presented as being representative of her past attitude towards Nazism. Hoffmann writes that she considered such behaviour would amount to the "Fortsetzung des Systems"

[perpetuation of the system] (W. Hoffmann 1960, 7). In the same article, he points out that Langgässer helped to feed prisoners of war. Yet, as is clear from a letter in Elisabeth Hoffmann's edition, the family did employ a "Pflichtjahrmädel" [a girl on her compulsory domestic service year] (1990, 336). In addition, Langgässer describes how it was a girl from the League of German Girls who 'rescued' her children and brought them home at the end of the war. Thus the family had cause at some points to rely on help from those socialized as part of Nazi youth policy.

Half of the letters included in Wilhelm Hoffmann's edition are from the post-war period. They reflect Langgässer's growing public prominence, with an increased correspondence with the literary world. Nonetheless, after the war Langgässer's letters suggest that she initially felt no less marginalized than during it, claiming that she was "sehr am Rande des Literaturbetriebs" [at the very edge of the hustle and bustle of the literary world] (20 February 1946, 138). Her fame, when it does come, is still ambiguous:

[E]s besteht für mich nicht die geringste Gefahr, daß mir der "Weihrauch des Ruhmes" zu Kopfe steigt. Es ist ein sehr umstrittener Ruhm und eine Position, die ich mit jedem Gespräch neu erkämpfen muß. Die geistige Anmaßung der "Gebildeten", ihre Eitelkeit und die Naivität, mit der sie glauben zu all und jedem etwas Bedeutendes sagen zu müssen, ist ungeheuer. Jeder "Auch-Schriftsteller", jeder Journalist würde sterben, wenn er sich eingestehen müßte, daß es Rangunterschiede gibt, Unterschiede der Erfahrung und eine Stufenordnung der Werte. (12 March 1949, 199-200)

There is not the slightest danger of the "incense of fame" going to my head. It is a very controversial fame and a position that I have to fight to retain with every new conversation. The intellectual presumptuousness of the "educated", their vanity, and the naivety with which they believe they have to say something meaningful about each and every thing, is immense. Every second-rate author, every journalist would die if he had to admit that there are differences in status, differences in experience, and a hierarchy of values.

Langgässer's elitist understanding of literature and the literary audience is thus a persistent theme of the post-war letters. She is similarly very dismissive about her role in the first German writers' congress of 1947: "Man sollte arbeiten und nicht Kongreß halten" [One should be working not holding conferences] (21 October 1947, 170). Langgässer thus reiterates her understanding of her literary work as an activity distinct from public life. Her speech at this congress had two main tenets, which are significant given the depiction of fascism in the edition. Firstly, she emphasized the aim of reclaiming the German language from the Nazis and, secondly, she denied the divide

between those writers of inner emigration and those forced into exile (Langgässer 1997, 136-41). In merging the difference between those who left Germany and those who remained, Langgässer downplays exile as a response to Nazism, something which is similarly emphasized in Wilhelm Hoffmann's edition through his omission of letters to exiled addressees. The ambiguity of her positioning with regard to the fascist system shown in her letters is reinforced by her much quoted statements about mercy in her conference speech:

Es ist eine große, eine unverdiente Gnade gewesen, wenn Gott einem Menschen den Arm festgehalten hatte [...], bevor er noch in die Versuchung kam, mit diesem Gesindel einen Pakt zu schließen. (Langgässer 1997, 141)

It is a great and undeserved mercy when God takes a person firmly by the arm before he succumbs to the temptation of forming a pact with this rabble.

While the strength of the language used to refer to the Nazi authorities reinforces her distance from them, the use of the third person depersonalizes the danger of complicity so clearly highlighted in the letters.

Reception of the 1954 Edition

The reviews of the edition of 1954 are all positive. They stress that the volume "gehört zu den wichtigsten Büchern des Jahres" [belongs to the most important books of the year], and that it is "ein ungewöhnliches, ja erregendes Buch" [an unusual, yes, exciting book] (Günther 1954; Korn 1954). These reviews contain three particular arguments. Firstly, there is an assumption by the reviewers that the themes they draw from the letters, work and life of Langgässer are synonymous. They see the letters as the link between the spheres they define as personal (that is, familial) and professional. Secondly, what Boetcher Joeres has called "the ambiguous subject-object dichotomy" is visible when male authors review the letters, many of whom repeat the essentialist comments from Wilhelm Hoffmann's introduction (2000, 163). Thirdly, there is a tendency within comments by female reviewers, which continues into the 1990s, to claim a wider identification with Langgässer as a woman.

Many reviewers begin by situating Wilhelm Hoffmann as Langgässer's husband and authority on her literary work. This personal connection reiterates Langgässer's role as a wife, albeit one marginalized in the volume, and suggests the authenticity of the

letters. Authenticity is similarly stressed by reference to the correspondence as a “document humain” (CS 1954), and as a “bezwingendes literarisches Dokument” [compelling literary document] of “tagebuchartige Genauigkeit” [diary-like exactness] (Günther 1954). Several links are made between the letters and Langgässer’s work, with the former being seen as an important extension, and a confirmation, of her literature. A wider interpretative relevance is suggested in Karl Korn’s assertion that the letters are a “kostbare Funde zum Verständnis von Lyrik überhaupt” [a valuable find for the comprehension of poetry in general] (1954). Anneliese Dempf claims that “[a]lles ist da, was wir aus den Büchern kennen” [everything is there that we know from her books] (1954, 352). Yet, the critics argue that due to the inclusion of letters to “Privatpersonen” [private individuals], they are “manchem Zeitgenossen wohl näher [...] als ihr ganzes übriges Werk” [some readers will find them more accessible than all the rest of her work] (CS 1954). It is through this insight into the ‘personal and private’ aspects of Langgässer’s life which, they claim, causes “mancherlei Masken [zu fallen]” [many masks to fall] and which reveals “der wirkliche Mensch” [the real person] and “das [...] verborgene Leben” [the concealed life] (Günther 1954; Krüger 1954/5, 79). This insight is not however without its problems for some reviewers, who are conscious of “[die] Verletzung des Briefgeheimnisses” [the invasion of the privacy of correspondence] and who claim that “bei Elisabeth Langgässer kommt noch dazu, daß man eine große, edle und vornehme Frau auch bei ihrem Gebet belauscht” [where Elisabeth Langgässer is concerned one is also eavesdropping on the prayers of a great, noble and distinguished woman] (Rollet 1954). The reviewers often comment on Langgässer’s Christianity and emphasize her place on the margins of institutionalized Catholicism. They describe her “ketzerischer Manichäismus” [heretical Manichaeism] and “militanten Katholizismus” [militant Catholicism] (Korn 1954). This is linked to Langgässer’s own self-characterization of inner turmoil, with the reviewers stressing a symptomatically gendered split in Langgässer’s character: she suffers, they argue, from “Zwiespältigkeit, Unrast und Unausgeglichenheit” [a contradictory nature, restlessness and instability] (Dempf 1954, 352) and the “unruhige[m] Blut der Frau” [troubled blood of a woman] (Korn 1954).

Many of these early reviews by men once again refer to the notion of completeness, following the tradition of reading women’s letters as spontaneous, authentic expressions of a natural, identifiable, ahistorical, female identity. Joachim Günther writes, for example, that

the letters are “natürlich und schlicht” [natural and simple] and reveal “einen ausgesprochen sympathischen, überraschend fraulich, ja mütterlich warmen Menschen” [an extremely pleasant, surprisingly womanly, maternally warm person] (1954). Karl Korn comments on the “unsagbar zarte, weibliche Innigkeit, von mütterlicher Sorge, von intensiv genossenem und mitgeteiltem häuslichen Glück” [inexpressibly tender, female intensity, [the] motherly care, [the] intensely enjoyed and communicated domestic bliss] (1954). These reviewers thus frequently emphasize Langgässer’s role as a mother. Others speak of the “erquickende Natürlichkeit” [refreshing naturalness] (Rittermann 1955, 1), of the “absolut spontaner schriftlicher Äußerungen” [absolutely spontaneous written utterances] (Honig 1954, 156), arguing that the letters reflect Langgässer’s “Mittelpunkt” [centre] (Ortner 1954, 9), are a “Handschrift des Herzens” [signature of her heart] (Krolow 1954, 6), and “ein stetes Bekenntnis ihres Herzens” [a continuous confession of her heart] (Honig 154, 157). They are, the reviewers write, “wirklich Briefe und keine literarischen Episteln” [really letters and not literary epistles] (Herzog 1954/55, 279), “keine mit einem heimlichen Blick auf die Nachwelt abgefaßten autobiographischen Aphorismen, sie sind ohne epistolarischen Schliff” [they are not autobiographical aphorisms, written with a hidden eye on posterity, they are without any epistolary polish] (Pointek 1954, 286). Therefore despite the repeated link between Langgässer’s literary work and the letters, the letters themselves are denied status as constructed texts. In respect of the letters to Wilhelm Lehmann this spontaneous “Innigkeit” [interiority] is presented as reaching its height (Rollet 1954, 19). These letters, it is claimed, demonstrate “die Stimme der Dichterin ganz unintellektuell, nur verehrend und oft von einem mädchenhaften Charme, der bezaubert [...]” [the voice of the poet, completely unintellectual, simply adoring and often with a captivating girlish charm] (Krüger 1954/55, 79).

Cordelia’s absence for the most part in Wilhelm Hoffmann’s edition, due to his emphasis on Langgässer’s authorial identity, is reflected in the majority of the reviews from 1954. One reviewer even asserts that during the war “wohl wird niemand aus ihrer [Langgässers] Familie verletzt oder [...] sonst einen körperlichen Schaden erleidet” [it is true that no one in Langgässer’s family was hurt or otherwise suffered physical harm] (Usinger 1954, 7). Where Langgässer’s status as so-called ‘Half-Jew’ is mentioned, it is her suffering as a mother that becomes prominent, and not that of Cordelia. Where the latter is mentioned, euphemisms to describe

deportation, such as “hartes Schicksal” [harsh fate] are prevalent. This is a trend which persists into the 1960s, with Kurt Ihlenfeld stating that Langgässer’s letters demonstrate worry about “die ins Ausland verschickten Kinder” [the children who have been sent abroad]. Such a term, which can be read as encompassing those involved in the “Kindertransporte”, once again submerges the deportation of Jewish children within a wider narrative (1961, 358). On the rare occasions where Auschwitz is mentioned in the reviews of the 1954 edition, Cordelia’s Jewishness is not. This may, in part, be a reflection of the omissions in Wilhelm Hoffmann’s edition. However, the reviewers are also more preoccupied with a generic notion of suffering. They highlight the “furchtbare Zerstörungen” [dreadful destruction] (Rollet 1954, 7) of Berlin, the terror of the bombing raids (Blöcker 1954, 4) and the “Schrecken und Enttäuschungen der Nachkriegszeit” [horrors and disappointments of the post war period] (Giachi 1954, 180) which they see conveyed through Langgässer’s letters. Her suffering is described as being encapsulated in a world “die wir als die unsere erkennen” [in a world that we recognize as our own] (Krolow 1954, 6). The letters are read as an accurate depiction of the war and suffering of the German population which, given the marginalization of Jews within the edition, is significant. Similarly problematic is the repeated claim that the universality of Langgässer’s naive behaviour exonerates more widely (E. Hoffmann 1990, 12; Wehinger 1994, 30), especially when the letter about Cordelia’s deportation is taken by an early reviewer as representative, revealing “über das Zeitbedingte hinaus die Bedrohungen eines Dichterschicksals” [the timeless dangers of a life as a poet] (Kreuder 1950, 144).

A focus on Langgässer’s life and suffering, as interpreted by the reviewers through her letters, is seen as symbolic of a wider German fate. The originally feminized notion of suffering and victimhood through motherhood becomes universalized and ultimately degendered. In addition, Langgässer’s understanding of Catholic notions of martyrdom is transposed onto a larger German picture. The letters and the attendant access to her ‘private’ life are used as representative of a Christian interpretation of fascism. The appropriation of Langgässer’s religious understanding of the war years in terms of sin and redemption, of “[d]as Welttheater [...] zwischen Gott und dem Satan” [the world theatre [...] enacted between God and Satan] (Langgässer 1961, 39), provides in many of the reviews a universalized alibi for the entire German nation since it does not anticipate any form of resistance, other than conversion to Christianity (Schiller 1987, 457). An emphasis on subjugation to divine

intervention, as prioritized within the early edition, becomes a framework of reception in the 1950s. In a post-war political context when depictions of Hitler as Satan were prominent in West Germany, and allowed for a convenient transference of responsibility, Langgässer became a privileged witness of the experiences of fascism. As Gelbin writes: “[Langgässer’s] publicly known status as a once persecuted writer therefore also lent particular authority to the relativizing tendencies in her writings”, and, by implication, in the volume of her letters (2001, 127). The result, as can be seen in the reviews from 1954, is that the Jewish victims and specific questions of guilt are entirely displaced.

The commemoration of Langgässer’s eightieth birthday in 1979 and of the thirtieth anniversary of her death in 1980 coincided with an increased interest in women’s literature and new feminist readings. As a result, the 1980s saw the republication of Langgässer’s work and led to a renewed attention to what Fliedl calls her “biographische-historische Wiederentdeckung” [biographical-historical rediscovery] (1986, 135). The republication of the letters in 1981 was a part of this. Within this context, reviews by female critics of Wilhelm Hoffmann’s edition illustrate another gendered dimension, one with its roots in the reception of Langgässer prevalent from the 1960s. Luise Rinser, Oda Schaefer and Ingeborg Drewitz were all authors of repute who wrote about Langgässer before the publication of the 1990 edition. What is interesting is how they all identify gendered polarities within the letters and see them as allowing for identification with Langgässer as a woman. In 1960 Catholic author Rinser writes that Langgässer’s letters encompass “jene Lebenslast, die jede Frau zu tragen hat” [that burden of life that every woman has to bear] and continues:

wie nah rückt Elisabeth Langgässer zu ihren Mitschwestern mit einem Brief wie diesem: “Ich bin seit vierzehn Tagen ohne Mädchen [...] und an mir hängt einfach alles: Putzen, Kochen, Einholen, Feuern, Wäsche – – alles, alles”. (Rinser 1960, 93-94).

how close Elisabeth Langgässer comes to her fellow sisters with a letter like this one: “I’ve haven’t had a maid for two weeks [...] absolutely everything is down to me: cleaning, cooking, shopping, heating, washing, everything, everything”.

The inherent class implications of such a comment by Langgässer are subsumed in Rinser’s generalized notion of “Mitschwester” [sisters]. In asserting that “in diesen Briefen erkennen wir sie als eine gar nicht elitäre, sondern ganz einfach die Leiden aller Frauen jener Zeit

mitleidende Frau" [in these letters we recognize her as a woman who is not at all elitist but someone who quite simply suffered the sorrows of all women at that time], Rinser genericizes Langgässer's experiences at a national level (1979, 345). Rinser claims that "durch diese Briefe erst wird sie [Langgässer] uns menschlich" [it is only through these letters that she becomes human for us], in comparison to "das harte Bild" [the harsh picture] that is portrayed through her fiction. She continues:

Selten nur sind die Briefe hart und scharf, außer dort, wo Elisabeth Langgässer auf eine geistige Herausforderung antwortet und ihre künstlerischen Erkenntnisse und Absichten zu verteidigen hat. Fast immer sind sie liebevoll, besorgt, zärtlich, dankbar, traurig oder mutlos. (1960, 94)

Very seldom are the letters harsh and sharp, apart from where Elisabeth Langgässer is responding to an intellectual demand and must defend her artistic insights and intentions. Almost always they are loving, concerned, tender, grateful, sad or despondent.

Thus a division is made: 'the female', for Rinser, is situated in the private, inner realm of the letters; 'the male' is situated in the professional sphere, defined as Langgässer's literary work. Both of these literary spheres supposedly contain the entirety of Langgässer's life. This is a division likewise referred to by Oda Schaefer and J.P.R. Maassen. Schaefer speaks of a dichotomy of "männlicher Verstand und weibliches Empfinden" [male reason and feminine feeling] within Langgässer's work (1970, 250). Maassen refutes an assertion that "der Tonfall der Briefe sei selbstbewußt und von männlicher Kraft" [the tone of the letters is self-conscious and full of manly strength] (Perfahl cited in Maassen 1973, 13), through a description of Langgässer's outer appearance, coming to the conclusion that:

[e]s ist doch schon nach der erster Lektüre der Briefe deutlich, daß Elisabeth Langgässer in Leben, Fühlen und Denken eine Frau ist. Kein besserer Beweis läßt sich dafür anführen als der Brief vom 8. März 1950, den sie der Freundin nach einem Pariser Besuch schreibt.

It is already clear after the first reading of the letters that in life, feeling and thought, Elisabeth Langgässer is a woman. There is no better proof of this than the letter from 8th March 1950, which she wrote to her friend after a visit to Paris.

The possibility of identification within the traditionally female domestic sphere is epitomized by Ingeborg Drewitz, writing in 1984:

Für mich hat die Warmherzigkeit und Bestimmtheit ihrer Briefe [...] Nähe vermittelt, die es vorstellbar macht, daß wir zusammen sind in dem engen Zimmer, das abgenutzte Wachstuch auf dem Tisch, die Kinder auf dem Fußboden [...]. Ich kann ihr nicht zustimmen, aber ich respektiere – ja – liebe sie, weil sie hat schreiben *und* mit den Menschen leben und leiden können. (1981, 157)

For me the warm-heartedness and certainty of her letters conveys a closeness that makes it possible for me to imagine that we are together in the narrow room, the worn out oilcloth on the table, the children on the floor [...] I cannot agree with her, but I respect, yes – love – her because she was able to write *and* live and suffer with people.

Continuities in the notion of completeness that we have seen in the reviews from the 1950s are thus repeated. Drewitz's comments are also symptomatic of how these reviewers of the 1954 edition repeatedly inscribe Langgässer's role as a mother and her role in the domestic sphere in spite of Hoffmann's omissions.

On the back cover of the text of 1954, republished in 1981, are the words of Luise Rinser, which focus on Langgässer's authorial identity for the contemporary addressees. Rinser, imprisoned during fascism, was a well-known West German author who wrote about her experience of persecution autobiographically, in *Gefängnistagebuch* (1977, first published 1946). Rinser characterizes Langgässer's letters as "Privatbriefe" [private letters] and emphasizes her identity as a "hochintellektuelle Dichterin" [highly intellectual poet]. Her words thus imply the revelation of a hitherto unknown side of the public figure. It is within a supposed private sphere that the poet's "blinde[r] Glauben" [blind faith] is situated. Rinser's comments thus separate Langgässer's religious beliefs and her public persona, and suggest that it is through revelations in the letters that it is possible to 'understand' her. Rinser has herself spoken of "die starke Identifikation" [the strong identification] that she feels with Langgässer and through the inclusion of her comments the publishers accentuate connections between Catholicism, persecution during the Nazi years and authorial identity (1990b, 199).

Elisabeth Hoffmann's Edition of 1990

In 1990 Elisabeth Hoffmann set out to correct the prevalent picture of her grandmother.³ Her introduction to the expanded edition states

³ Elisabeth Hoffmann is the daughter of Langgässer's daughter Cordelia. Elisabeth was adopted by her grandfather, Wilhelm Hoffmann, after her mother's divorce.

that it is her intention to present a “repräsentative, wissenschaftlichen Ansprüchen gerecht werdende Briefausgabe” [representative edition, which does justice to academic standards] (1990, 8).⁴ She criticizes the “schmale Auswahl” [meagre selection] and the “gravierenden Kürzungen/Textveränderungen” [serious abridgements/textual alterations] (8) of the 1954 edition. Her edition will, she claims, correct “nicht nur das Bild der Autorin, sondern auch das des Adressaten” [not only the picture of the author but also that of the addressee]. However, she is quite prescriptive in setting the parameters of the new and contradictory picture of Langgässer that she constructs. In the introduction and “Editorischer Bericht” [editorial report], Hoffmann defines what the reader can expect from the letters (8) and her categories of selection that enabled this ‘objective’ picture to be created (1229).

At the centre of Hoffmann’s analysis is the emphasis on Langgässer’s identity in her “Dreifachrolle als Autorin, Ehefrau und Mutter” [threefold role as author, wife and mother] (12). Despite this, “Briefe, die nur von familiären Problemen, Haushalts- und Nahrungs- und Geldsorgen berichten, bleiben weitgehend unberücksichtigt” [letters which only talk about familial problems, household, food and money worries are to a large extent unconsidered] (1229). There is thus to some extent still a marginalization of the domestic sphere in this edition as in 1954, although, as Rinser has highlighted, such letters do not just belong to a private realm: “[D]iese Briefe zeigen nämlich meist auch das Stilgepräge des Schriftstellers, und so können Briefe, in denen es ohne künstlerische Absicht um eine sachliche Mitteilung geht, künstlerische Dokumente sein” [These letters namely also mostly show the style of the author and therefore letters which deal with practical information and which are without artistic intention, can be artistic documents] (1975, 109). In addition, as Karlheinz Müller has shown, it is not only these letters relating to domestic matters which have been excluded. For example, Elisabeth Hoffmann has omitted letters to Martin Raschke, of the *Kolonne* magazine, in which Langgässer is explicitly critical of “die Lyrik des 3. Reiches” [poetry of the Third Reich] (1994, 14-15). In addition, some of the letters detailing Langgässer’s deliberations about sending Cordelia away are absent (Gelbin 2001, 64-66).

Hoffmann states that the different aspects of Langgässer’s identity, as she has identified them, become prominent at different times in the letters. What becomes clear in her edition is that she prioritizes

⁴ Further references to this edition are given after quotations in the text.

Langgässer's "weibliche Identität" [female identity] and the "Selbstverständnis der schreibenden Frau" [self-conception of the writing woman] (11). Female identity is once again connected to a characterization of the letters themselves, which are, Hoffmann states, "keine Kunstwerke" [not works of art] but "spontan niedergeschrieben" [spontaneously written down] (12). This is despite her admission that her selection was made easier, notwithstanding the huge volume of letters, because "die einzelnen Briefe an verschiedene Adressaten zahlreiche Übereinstimmungen aufwiesen" [individual letters to different addressees proved to contain numerous similarities] (1230), and that she has specifically chosen letters "die mir ein Maximum an Neuigkeiten und ein Minimum an Wiederholungen zu enthalten schienen" [which seemed to me to contain the maximum amount of new information and the minimum amount of repetition] (1230). The trope of spontaneity and its associated claim to authenticity are similarly emphasized in the reviews of the 1990 edition, for example that by Gertrud Seehaus, within the context of a differently gendered reception from that of 1954 (1991, 2).

Hoffmann's emphasis on Langgässer's female identity is to a large extent based on an increased number of comments by Langgässer herself about gender in the later edition, especially in her early letters from 1924 and 1925. The competing hierarchies resulting from the selection of the 1954 edition, in terms of Langgässer's authorial identity and her submission to religious dictates, are further complicated by increased information on Langgässer's own contradictory writing of female identity. Her letters highlight the difficulties she had in combining her domestic tasks with her writing and job as a teacher, and they also demonstrate Langgässer's own polarized understanding of what characterizes male and female qualities:

Und wo ist der männliche Intellekt, der hier allein Richtung und Klarheit schaffen könnte? Gewiss, ich leugne nicht, für ein Mädchen ziemlich viel Verstand mitbekommen zu haben – aber jene höchste geistige Klarheit und Ordnung, die ich über alles liebe [...], die muss ich ausser mir suchen. (16 August 1925, 28)

And where is the male intellect, the only thing which is here capable of creating direction and clarity? Certainly, I don't deny I've acquired quite a lot of sense for a girl, but for that highest mental clarity and order which I love above all else [...] I have to search beyond myself.

She confesses to Friedländer that she has "gar keinen Ehrgeiz und kein Talent zur self made woman" [no ambition at all and no talent to

become a self-made woman] (11 April 1930, 96). The contradictions inherent in such comments and in Langgässer's life as the only woman of her close literary circle within the male dominated sphere of publishing, are exemplified by the following comment: "Wenn man doch nur all diese Mädels verheiraten könnte – vielleicht fänden sie dann ihr inneres Gleichgewicht wieder und gäben den Ehrgeiz auf 'geistige Frauen' zu sein" [If only one could marry off all these girls – perhaps then they would find their inner balance and give up the ambition of being 'intellectual women']. Hoffmann suggests that the key to understanding Langgässer's prioritization of this "männlicher Intellekt" [male intellect] can be found in her construction of Wilhelm Hoffmann as the epitome of the "priesterlichen Mannes" [the priestly man] (11). Langgässer links her own religious submissiveness, as one who is capable of "blinde, gläubige, schrankenlose vertrauende Hingabe" [blind, faithful, unrestrained, trusting devotion] to her femaleness – she is, as we read, capable of such devotion "weil das mir als Frau näher liegt" [because it suits me better as a woman] (17 February 1935, 232). However, as the letters to her husband and Wilhelm Lehmann demonstrate, the link that Langgässer makes between femininity and devotion must be juxtaposed with her self-confident self-definition as author and wife. These intersecting, and often contradictory, levels of Langgässer's understanding of gender have been highlighted by Angela G. Zimmer Lauman's analysis of the relationship between the new edition of letters, Langgässer's essays on motherhood and the female characters in her fiction (1994).

It is not only Langgässer's identity as a woman which Hoffmann prioritizes in her introduction. She also problematizes the issue of Langgässer's relationship to her Jewish background. Such a trend, which has become prominent in the reception of Langgässer from the 1980s, marks a shift towards an increased investigation of Jewish memories in the 1990s (Gelbin 1997, 142). Indeed, Frederik Hetmann begins his popular, reprinted biography of Langgässer with the assertion that the remembrance of the Holocaust is a central impetus for his work (1999, 9-12). As a devout Catholic, whose Jewish father died when she was ten, Langgässer's ambivalence towards her Jewishness possibly resulted from the fact that it played no role in her youth. Nazi racial laws imposed an identity of 'hybridity' upon her. Beate Meyer has examined how, notwithstanding an increased interest in Jewish depictions of the past, the experiences of people so classified have been subject to marginalization within discourse about Jewish victims (1999, 9). Gelbin argues that the reception of Langgässer's work perpetuates this state of affairs by looking at

'German' or 'Jewish' identity (1997, 142). The expanded version of the letters illustrates in more detail the ambiguities inherent in this position of 'hybridity' and their effect on both Langgässer's familial and professional life. Despite this increased insight, such marginalization is repeated within certain sections of the reception of the later edition. It results from the publication in 1986 of Cordelia's autobiography, *Gebranntes Kind sucht das Feuer*, which was published under Cordelia's married name of Edvardson and translated into English. It has led to a reconsideration of her mother's life due to the subsequent reception of events contained within it.

As the letters in the 1990 edition show, in order to try to save Cordelia from deportation Langgässer arranged her adoption by a Spanish couple. What Edvardson's autobiography describes, and which is not present in the letters, is a scene which took place in 1943 when Cordelia was pressured by the Gestapo to renounce her Spanish citizenship, with the threat that her mother would be arrested for treason if she did not do so. She agreed and was subsequently deported. It is the reading of Edvardson's autobiography which has, to a large extent, shaped the reception of Langgässer's letters and the construction of her Jewishness in the 1990s – albeit in very different ways. Edvardson has repeatedly asserted that her mother was a victim of the fascist state (Ehrle 1994, 4; Gelbin 1998, 566). Nonetheless, many reviewers have been very critical of Langgässer's failure to fight against the deportation of her daughter. Such condemnation, as Gelbin points out, is due to the predominant "cultural expectation of the self-sacrificing mother" (1998, 568) within contemporary gender discourse of the 1980s and 1990s. This, Gelbin asserts, is part of "misogynist discourses surrounding the Shoah" (2001, 113) in which Langgässer has increasingly become the target for the guilt of others (1998, 567). In such discourses the victim becomes the perpetrator. Rather than examining the system that put Langgässer in a position where she had to choose between allowing her daughter to be deported alone or face deportation with her, many reviewers condemn her in terms of the lack of "zu erwartende mütterliche Gefühle" [the expected motherly feelings] (Maassen 1973, 17), and describe her behaviour as the "Verrat einer Mutter" [mother's betrayal] (Wassermann, 1997).

Further consideration of the reviews of the 1990 edition illustrates a different emphasis, involving other familial constellations. As in the 1950s, several reviewers see the letters within the framework of a personal family story, but this time they focus on the connections between Elisabeth Hoffmann, Cordelia Edvardson and Elisabeth Langgässer. Four reviews of the 1990 edition stress Elisabeth

Hoffmann's relationship to Elisabeth Langgässer and, resulting from this relationship, the notion of authenticity (Horst 1991; Riley 1992, 81; Kircher 1991; Hinck 1991). Such an understanding of authenticity does not however, they argue, negate the 'objectivity' of Elisabeth Hoffmann as an editor (Horst 1991; Kircher 1991; Riley 1992 81; Bluhm 1992, 165). Unlike comments about the 1954 edition which consider the "verständliche" [understandable] (Riley 1992, 81), "liebe- und pietätvolle Zensur" [loving and reverent censorship] (Hetmann 1987, 48) of Wilhelm Hoffmann, the later reviews praise the "academic nature" of the edition. While Elisabeth Hoffmann does not mention the family connections in her introduction, in a radio interview describing the preparation of the edition she refers to her work as "Annäherung an eine Großmutter" [approaching a grandmother] (1987, 1). A focus on the familial connection between Elisabeth Hoffmann and Elisabeth Langgässer leads to a seemingly renewed emphasis on the autobiography of Edvardson. Thus the necessity of hearing the 'other voice' alongside Langgässer's letters is reiterated (Hinck 1991; Horst 1991). However, the private relationships between these figures are seen in the reviews as being representative, both of a universalized, public, mother-daughter relationship, and also of the tragedy of the German experience under the Nazis. In this way the fate of Edvardson as a Jewish survivor is merged with that of her Catholic mother and denied specificity. That Langgässer's letters were specifically reviewed as part of a renewed interest in her work and that of other women writers during the 1980s in the context of "Literatur nach Auschwitz" [literature after Auschwitz] (Schwerbrock 1980) once again makes these links between gender and memories of the Holocaust significant – in such discourses about fascism hierarchies of victims are perpetuated.

It is apparent from the reviews of Elisabeth Hoffmann's edition that issues of Jewishness and gender, particularly motherhood, are linked in 1990 as they were in 1954, but the way in which they are configured is different. In the 1950s, the emphasis on Langgässer's role as a mother led to a subsuming of Cordelia's experiences and Jewishness; in the 1990s the condemnation of Langgässer as a mother by certain reviewers prioritizes Cordelia's voice but only through a marginalization of Langgässer's own victim status as a Jew. In other reviews, a generic understanding of the family story blurs any historical specificity of the positions of either Langgässer or Edvardson.

Conclusion: The Inevitable Artifice of their Form

An investigation of these two editions of Langgässer's letters has highlighted different constellations of gender, Jewishness and victimhood within the memories in, and surrounding, the period of fascism. It has considered how, in the reception of the 1950s, there was a focus on Langgässer's Catholicism and her generic suffering as a mother. While the first was prioritized within Hoffmann's selection through his choice of letters and inclusion of the "Rechenschaftsbericht" [report], the second was noticeable by its absence. Langgässer's role as mother was however reinscribed by reviewers of the 1954 edition and linked to wider German suffering. Wilhelm Hoffmann's emphasis on both a 'private' side of Langgässer (through his choice of addressees from her circle of friends) and her authorial identity (through his choice of letters and his editing of them) highlights how her elitist view of literature enabled her to withdraw from the political context. His selection reaffirms a sense of naivety in Langgässer's understanding of antisemitism and his omission of her complex relationship to Jewishness, along with a retrospective assertion of her resistance to the Nazis, simplifies her competing positionalities with regard to the fascist system. His omissions and those of the reviewers are symptomatic of a marginalization of issues of Jewishness in West Germany during the 1950s. In contrast, within the changing constellations of reception in the 1990s there has been an emphasis on competing narratives of Jewish experience, which repeatedly, however, pivot on simplistic allocations of guilt and responsibility.

The above discussions show that "contemporary editors [...] use letters in terms of a particular cultural moment, reflecting current notions of the war experience and literary value" and this becomes particularly clear when questions of Jewishness and the Holocaust are considered (Jolly 1997, 8). In looking at the shifting memories of fascism constructed in the edited versions of these letters and their reception, this analysis has aimed to follow Bircken's imperative that "[e]s geht nicht darum, Opfer- und Täterperspektive zu verwischen, sondern nachzuvollziehen, wie der Prozeß des Zum-Objekt-Werdens verläuft, über welche Stufen der Ausgrenzung, der Abgrenzung" [it is not a matter of blurring the victim and perpetrator perspectives but to reconstruct the ways in which someone becomes an object, by what stages of exclusion and inclusion] (1995, 180). Such an emphasis on the ambiguities of Langgässer's position is particularly important in the context of some strands of recent reception where her victim status

is seen as sufficient to include her as someone in the category of resisters, as someone who can stand as representative of the “unbefleckte[s] Deutschland” [unsullied Germany] (Wegner 1999).

Given the strength of Langgässer’s own self-understanding as conveyed through the letters (something accentuated by the inclusion of only her side of the correspondence) it does not seem to be the case that “the ideology of the anthology submerges the private voice” (Jolly 1997, 91). But, it is clear that the frameworks adopted by the editors shape her identities in order to stress certain elements and downplay others. Wilhelm Hoffmann’s framing of his own edition has particular weight due to his role as “Gesprächspartner und Interpret der ‘klassischen’ Langgässer” [interlocutor and interpreter of the ‘classic’ Langgässer] (Korn 1988, 164).

In both the framing of the editions and their subsequent reception, the retrospective consideration of Langgässer’s letters has been linked to a ‘privatization’ of the author and with it, to an insistence on the possibility that letters to reflect a spontaneous, natural, female writer. Throughout the post-war period, there are continuities in assumptions about the spontaneous character of correspondence and its linking to uncomplicated understanding of a homogenous female character. The result is an accentuation of the documentary, non-literary character of the letters. As Franziska Meyer has shown: “Die Integration der ‘natürlichen Frau’ bedarf der Desintegration ihrer ‘künstlichen’ Texte” [the integration of the ‘natural’ woman necessitates the disintegration of her ‘artistic’ texts] (1999, 40, 136). An emphasis on spontaneity at the expense of the literary and artistic status of the letters repeats the stereotype of women as writers of letters but not as authors of literature. The letters themselves challenge these very distinctions, not only in their emphasis on Langgässer as a professional author, but also in their repetition of tropes emphasizing the “inevitable artifice of [their] form” (Porter 1986, 4). Langgässer’s letters show how divisions of public and private, spontaneous and constructed, cannot be maintained and that her attempts to withdraw into “a personal creative world of her own” (Theunissen 1949, 196) were ultimately thwarted. As such the letters are the site of an “autobiographical unification of public and private” (Jolly, 1997, 91) and are “part of not only the continuing inquiry into the history of women and women’s writing but also the understanding of the public sphere and its constitution [...]” (Goldsmith and Goodman 1995, 9).

Since her death in 1950 the question “Wer war Elisabeth Langgässer?” [Who was Elisabeth Langgässer?] (Pohlmann 1979) has been consistently repeated. While the letters cannot answer this

question, they can give some indication of who the editors of the volumes and the reviewers of the letters assumed she was or wanted her to be, and how they integrated such assumptions and expectations into discourses on the Nazi past that were prevalent during the 1950s and 1990s.

4. “One Must Tear Aside the Flowers...”: Melita Maschmann’s *Fazit*

Melita Maschmann’s autobiography tells the story of a female protagonist who was fifteen when the Nazis came to power. Brought up in Berlin in a wealthy middle-class family, Maschmann joined the Hitler Youth against her parents’ wishes in 1933. Having completed her education she worked for the press and propaganda section of the “Bund Deutscher Mädel” (BDM) [League of German Girls] in East Prussia. From 1939 she was in charge of the press in “Reichsgau Wartheland” and in 1942 she became a leader of a Women’s Labour Service camp there. During this time she was involved in the expulsion of Polish civilians. She returned to Berlin in 1943 and worked in the Reich Youth Leadership. She was interned at the end of the war and, following ‘denazification’, became a journalist and novelist in West Germany. Her autobiography, *Fazit. Kein Rechtfertigungsversuch* [Taking stock: No attempt at justification], was first published by the West German Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt in 1963 and was an immediate commercial success. Within a year it had been reprinted, translated into both French and English, and the office of education in North Rhine Westphalia had recommended it to teachers involved in political education (Offers 1965, 20). It was republished by Deutscher Taschenbuch-Verlag sixteen years later with the title *Fazit. Mein Weg in der Hitler-Jugend* [Taking stock: My journey within the Hitler Youth] and subsequently reprinted several times until 1987.¹

Yet, this is not an uncontroversial text. While the autobiography was praised by many reviewers for its forthright and authentic stance, it was dismissed by others as a perpetuation of fascist rhetoric. Such diversely opposing reactions are a result of the seemingly self-critical, but often highly contradictory, depiction and interpretation of the memories of the protagonist’s Nazi past. In this chapter I will consider how competing narratives within the text allow for such significantly divergent readings. I will suggest that the structuring of the protagonist’s memories can be read as contradicting the explicitly stated and frequently reiterated narrative claims of the introduction: that the text is not an attempt at justification.

At the start of the text the protagonist confronts her motive for writing. A narrative intention is clearly demarcated by the first person narrator who states that the purpose of the text is “um [...] meinen

¹ Further references in the text will be given to the edition from 1983.

politischen Weg bis zu dem Punkt, an dem ich heute stehe, deutlich zu machen" (22) [to explain [...] my political road up to the point where I now stand (23)²]. The teleological nature of the narrative is pre-empted in this trope of a journey, with the reader later learning that the narrator's present position supposedly marks the successful "innere Ablösung vom Nationalsozialismus" (214) [inner break with National Socialism (198)]. The positioning of the protagonist as a detached observer of her own past and the repeated denial of any justificatory motivation in writing are two themes repeated throughout the text. Indeed, they are embodied within the original title of *Fazit. Kein Rechtfertigungsversuch*: "Fazit" suggests a certain closure and distance (Schaumann 1999, 1). However, in this chapter I will contend that the very way in which memories of fascism are constructed contradicts these claims of separateness of past and present identities of the protagonist. I argue that *Fazit* can indeed be read as providing a framework of justification; in particular, I will consider how the appeal to various addressees promotes justificatory notions of victimhood and show how concepts of youth and gender are integral to them.

A Jewish School Friend as Addressee

Fazit is written in the first person as a letter to a Jewish schoolfriend. The voice of the narrating present enters into the autobiographical pact, suggesting sincerity and authenticity, through an addendum to the text, which reads:

Für diesen Bericht wurde die Briefform gewählt, weil sie es in einer lebendigeren Darstellungsweise ermöglicht, die Tatsachen der Vergangenheit aus der doppelten Perspektive von damals und heute zu betrachten. Der Brief ist jedoch nicht fingiert. (243)

The letter form was chosen for this account because it enables the facts of the past to be presented more vividly. They can be viewed in the twin perspectives of those days and our own time. But the letter is not fiction. (6)

The dust cover of the 1963 edition states that the Jewish textual addressee serves to put the protagonist "unter eine[n] unerbittlich

² Translations are taken from the English version of 1964 by G. Strachan. Further references in the text will be given to this translation. Where I wish to emphasize an element of the original not reflected in the translation, I have shown this in square brackets. All other translations are my own.

prüfenden Blick" [under a relentlessly searching look]. The addressee and the textual form are thus externally framed as serving functions of authenticity. The centrality of both is reiterated in the opening lines of the text:

Dies ist, seitdem wir uns zum letztenmal gesehen haben, also in einem Zeitraum von fünfundzwanzig Jahren, mein zweiter Brief an dich. (5)

This is my second letter to you since we last saw one another twenty-five years ago. (7)

The letter-writing protagonist here begins by referring to a communal past, summoning the addressee to the narrating present, and introducing the first collective "wir" [we] of the narrative. We subsequently learn that this addressee is a former friend and that the narrating time is 1963. It will be argued here that the appeal to this addressee is one of the most problematic elements of Maschmann's text. What follows is an examination of how the addressee's involvement functions to prioritize certain types of memories.

The choice of the letter form seems, on first sight, to accord with a stated intention of a "dauernden Dialog" (6) [lasting dialogue (7)] with the addressee. However, on closer analysis, it is the very reciprocity inherent to the genre of letter writing that poses a problem. At no point in the text is the addressee's voice heard, nor do we learn anything about what happened to her; a possible dialogue remains in fact a monologue. Indeed, the protagonist's confession that the letter has inadvertently become "der Bericht" (22) [the report (23)] reflects this. While a letter makes claims to authenticity through a notion of spontaneity, the genre of report brings with it an implicit claim to truth. The witnessing presence of the addressee is stated as being a necessary part of this revelation of truth: "Du wirst mich zwingen, genauer dabei zu verfahren, als ich es, mir allein überlassen, könnte" (5) [You will compel me to be much more precise than I could be if left to myself (7)]. This is accompanied by a claim to completeness, to an assertion that the protagonist does not have the right "Wesentliches auszulassen" (35) [to leave out anything important (35)]. Yet, as the narrative progresses, it becomes clear that there is an emphasis on episodes interpreted as being positive and a marginalization of those defined as negative. For example, a significant amount of text is devoted to describing the teenage protagonist's early years in the BDM, while in contrast the narrative moves swiftly over the events in the last months of the Nazi regime and leaves the reader unclear as to what happened during this time. The voice of the narrating present

justifies this selection of memories through appeals to the friend, arguing that there is a lack of detail about her “‘Kriegseinsatz’” (167) [‘war work’ (155)] because she wants to avoid making the report too long for her friend to read, and to avoid boring her. On the one hand the text thus makes repeated claims to completeness, while on the other it makes explicit reference to the intentional omission and suppression of certain memories:

Obwohl die letzten anderthalb Kriegsjahre zeitlich näher liegen, ist meine Erinnerung an sie schwächer als an die vorangegangenen Jahre. Dies mag folgende Gründe haben: Jene letzten achtzehn Monate vor dem Zusammenbruch waren so düster, daß man sie nur zu gern in unerreichbare Tiefen des Gedächtnisses verbannen möchte. [...] Schließlich wird es auch eine Rolle gespielt haben, daß ich meine damalige Arbeit nicht liebte: *das Herz* hat nur wenig Mitteilenswertes davon aufbewahrt. (155) (my emphasis)

Although the last year and a half of the war are nearer to me in time, I remember them less well than the years which preceded them. This may be because those last eighteen months before the collapse were so grim that one is only too glad to lock them away deep in the recesses of one’s memory. [...] Finally, too, the fact that I did not like my work must have something to do with it. [*My heart* has only preserved a few things about that period worth relating]. (145)

A hierarchy of memories prioritizes experiences of the protagonist defined by the narrative as positive. The omission of those in the last months before the end of the war emphasizes that the defeat of the Nazis was a negative event for the protagonist, signified through the term “Zusammenbruch” (155) [collapse (145)], rather than a liberation from a repressive regime. The transferral of mostly positive memories is again linked to a notion of truth:

Ich denke auch immer wieder darüber nach, ob ich das, was wir damals im Arbeitsdienst für gut hielten, heute und vor dir noch gut heißen darf. Gewiß wirst du mir zustimmen, wenn ich sage: Ein wahrheitsgemäßer Bericht darf auch die Erinnerungen nicht unterschlagen, von denen ich meine, sie bezögen sich auf Gutes. (141)

I keep wondering too, whether in my report to you I should still approve of the things which seemed good to us in the Labour Service at that time. You will certainly agree with me that a truthful report should equally not suppress the memories of things I believe to be good. (132)

The present narrator here justifies the choice of memories and their retrospective interpretation by imputing the addressee’s consent. In addressing the Jewish schoolfriend, the narrator therefore situates

those positively interpreted memories as emanating from “the heart”, which in turn becomes the site of ‘truth’ and ‘goodness’. The choice of the letter form and addressee are, as expressed in the addendum to the text, likewise seen as facilitators of this ‘truth’ and ‘goodness’. In remembering the fascist past, Maschmann chooses a genre associated with gendered spontaneity, the letter, to convey to her Jewish addressee the ‘true’ picture of the ‘positive’ side of Nazism.

Appeals to the Jewish addressee occur throughout the text. The addressee’s first involvement is portrayed, significantly, as an absence. Focussing on the events of 30 January 1933, the narrator admits: “Welche Erinnerungen du mit dem ‘Tag der Machtergreifung’ verbinden magst, weiß ich nicht. Sie werden von einer dunkleren Stimmung getönt sein als die meinen” (7) [I do not know what memories you may associate with the ‘Day of the seizure of power’. They will be darker ones than mine (9)]. Why this should be is not explored further, with the narrative instead investigating the protagonist’s childhood, “um dir verständlich zu machen, wie tief nationales Fühlen und Denken mein Leben von früh an mitbestimmte” (10) [in order to explain [to you] how deeply nationalist thought and feeling were ingrained into my life from an early age (12)]. The focus shifts onto the protagonist and only returns to the addressee to begin the reiteration of common experience: “Da wir auf unseren gemeinsamen Schulwegen über all diese Fragen ausführlich miteinander gesprochen haben, wird dir manches vielleicht wieder aus der Erinnerung auftauchen” (18) [You and I discussed all these matters fully on the way to school together, so perhaps much of this will surface again in your memory (19)]. Repeated references to memories of their school days emphasize the age of the protagonist and become part of a claim to share the “ganz[e] Naivität der Jugend” (22) [full naivety of youth (23)]. Evocation of shared experience is used to retrospectively suggest an exculpatory naivety on the part of the protagonist:

Wie ahnungslos ich damals in bezug auf die eigentlichen Intentionen des Nationalsozialismus war, geht daraus hervor, daß ich dich bestürmte, unserer Gruppe beizutreten [...]. Daß du vermutlich abgelehnt hast, weil du die schärfere Witterung für das hattest, was auf uns zukam, begriff ich erst viele Jahre später. (18)

The degree of my naivety in those days concerning the aims of National Socialism is apparent from the fact that I plagued you to join our group [...]. The fact that you probably refused because you had a keener sense of what lay before us only became clear to me many years later. (20)

When the text progresses to events in which the addressee had no part, the narrator continues to impute shared thoughts and feelings, which are problematic considering the addressee's Jewish identity. In describing how the protagonist's parents were killed in a bombing raid where thirty people suffocated or burned to death, the narrator asks, with, in the circumstances, startling complacency: "Ich frage mich, ob du jemals etwas Ähnliches erlebt haben magst" (163) [I wonder if you can ever have experienced anything similar (152)]. When interned after the war and confronted with "Fotoplakaten [...] auf denen Berge von KZ-Leichen oder sterbende KZ-Häftlinge zu sehen waren" [photographs of mountains of corpses in concentration camps or dying concentration camp prisoners (187)], the protagonist comments: "Wahrscheinlich kennst du die Plakate" (202) [You probably know the posters (187)]. In stating her reasons for confronting the past, the protagonist foregrounds her aim of dialogue, and of writing for the addressee and her children, thus ignoring the gendered realities of Nazi exterminatory racism. Such statements suggest that the protagonist completely disassociates the Holocaust from her Jewish addressee. As one reviewer suggests, if the addressee did in fact exist, which the addendum of the text seems to claim, then the possibility also exists that she died in the concentration camps (Zimmermann 1963, 445). The protagonist instead assumes that the addressee managed to emigrate to England or America and to make her home there. In confronting the possibility that these thoughts may be erroneous, the present narrator again equates the protagonist's experience with that of the addressee, suggesting a shared trauma and an ongoing victimhood:

Wer sagt mir denn, ob es dir nicht viel öfter als mir so ergeht, daß du nachts aus dem Schlaf auffährst oder daß dir die Hand stockt, mit der du einen Bissen zum Munde führen willst: Plötzlich mißtraut man dem Frieden [...]. Ist das alles Wirklichkeit? [sic] fragt man sich. Oder träume ich nur und werde zu der Wirklichkeit des Grauens aufwachen? (164)

So who can say if you too do not wake up in the night with a start, or [hesitate] when you are about to put a piece of food in your mouth more often than I do? Suddenly one mistrusts peace [...]. "Is all this real?" one wonders. "Or am I simply dreaming before waking again to grim reality?" (153)

These examples are symptomatic of the way in which the addressee, either as an individual or part of a Jewish collective, is detached from any suffering, other than that also endured by the protagonist. Namelessness contributes to the nebulous nature of the addressee and is epitomized by the protagonist's description of her in a dream: "Ich

sah nicht einen Augenblick dein Gesicht, aber ich hörte ununterbrochen deine Stimme [...]. Was du sagtest, weiß ich nicht mehr" (145) [I could not catch a glimpse of your face but I could hear your voice all the time [...]. I cannot remember what you were saying (135)]. Facelessness reduces the addressee to the de-individualized status she experienced as a victim of Nazism and the voicelessness of the present once again perpetuates this exclusion. The addressee becomes a symbolically representative Jewish figure which gives prominence to the protagonist and her suffering, rather than to the antisemitism of Nazism and to its victims.

When the text does turn to the "Phänomen des Antisemitismus" [phenomenon of antisemitism], it is in the form of a separate chapter, which interrupts "der chronologische Bericht" (36) [the chronological account (36)]. Such separation means that many issues are dealt with within the confines of the chapter rather than alongside the events of the protagonist's life. This in turn emphasizes how the protagonist saw such events as distinct from her own story, and indeed, the following chapter recommences as if the 'digression' had not occurred. The narrator asserts that "[f]ast alles, was ich hier schreibe, mir nebensächlich [vorkommt]. Bei jedem zweiten Satz bin ich in Versuchung, ihn wieder zu streichen, weil ich denke: wie unwichtig, wenn man auf das Ganze sieht" (53) [almost everything I am writing here seems to me trivial. I am tempted to cross out every second sentence because I think: how trivial, if one looks at the whole picture (52)]. Yet, the Holocaust is not central to the text. The abstract reference to "das Ganze" [the whole picture] metaphorically conceals the very nature of the persecution. There are many subsequent direct and indirect narrative encounters with the topic of antisemitism, notwithstanding attempts to downplay its significance in the protagonist's story. The ultimate impossibility of confining it to one chapter is indicative of its absolute centrality to Nazi ideologies (Kinz 1990, 91). However, certain narrative strategies deal with these encounters, fundamental to which is the trope of sight.

Frequently, the protagonist confronts the addressee with a series of hypothetical situations in the conditional tense. When the protagonist witnesses the aftermath of the pogrom against the Jewish community in 1938, something which she deals with through a "schnelles Abschalten" (58) [switching off (56)], her decision to turn away from the suffering is juxtaposed with the elliptical comment: "Vielleicht, wenn mir einer der Verfolgten und Geschundenen begegnet wäre; ein alter Mann, dem die Todesangst im Gesicht stand. Vielleicht..." (58) [Perhaps if I had met one of the persecuted and oppressed, an old man

with the fear of death in his face, perhaps...(57)]. The chapter concludes on the unspoken possibility that the protagonist may have acted differently. Similarly:

Wenn meine Führerinnen mich damals aufgefordert hätten, etwa Streit mit meinen Eltern, die ja Gegner des Nationalsozialismus waren, zu suchen oder Haßgefühle für meine jüdischen Klassenkameradinnen zu entwickeln, ich hätte vermutlich bald den Absprung aus der Hitler-Jugend gefunden. (25)

If my leaders had at that time required me to quarrel with my parents, who were indeed opponents of National Socialism, or to cultivate hostility towards my Jewish classmates, I should probably have soon found my way out of the Hitler Youth. (26)

These episodes imply modes of behaviour understood as self-evident and natural to the protagonist, which are more certain than their conditional phrasing suggests.

When the protagonist *is* confronted with sights of suffering in a Jewish ghetto, she writes how “von jetzt an warf ich keinen Blick mehr durch den Zaun in das Judenlager” (87) [from now on [I] cast no more glances through the fence into the Jews’ camp (82)]. Likewise, on seeing expelled Poles leaving in their carts, it was possible “den Blick abzuwenden” (127) [that one could look the other way (119)]. The trope of not seeing therefore turns into one of choosing not to see. It is accompanied by many references to the blindness of the protagonist and her contemporaries. In describing the protagonist as one of the “blinden Gefolgsleute” (82) [blind followers (81)], the text invokes a notion of innocent guilt and reiterates an underlying goodness to her work within the BDM. This blindness is juxtaposed, firstly, with a theme of fascination and, secondly, with a paradigm of clarity.

In numerous references to the fascination that fascism exerted on the protagonist, the text creates the impression of a state of hypnosis alongside that of blindness:

Aus Erfahrung weiß ich: Es ist wohl nur für wenige, die damals “außerhalb” standen, möglich, [sic] nachzufühlen, welche unwiderstehliche Faszination Worte wie “Reich” oder “Führer” auf uns ausübten. (76)

I know from experience that only a very few of the people who [stood “outside”] at that time can understand the irresistible fascination words like “Reich” and “Führer” had for us. (72)

By suggesting an omniscient power exerted over the protagonist which she was not able to resist, all possibilities of agency are

excluded. In repeatedly emphasizing this trope of fascination to the Jewish addressee, the text repeats the exclusionary language of the fascist state and yet simultaneously marginalizes the horror of fascist segregation; the use of the verb “außerhalb stehen” [to stand outside] is a weak reflection of the Nazi laws of discrimination and extermination.

The paradigm of clarity is manifested, firstly, in the protagonist's insistence that it was the sight of “das Leid der Deutschen” (88) [sufferings of the German community (83)] which justified for her the treatment of “the Jews”. Secondly, it becomes apparent in the protagonist's experience during an attack on a Polish village, during which she felt a “besondere Schärfe des Beobachtens” (113) [particular clarity of vision (106)]:

Ich wollte es genau sehen, wie der Verzweifelte sich in einer solchen Lage verhält. Die Scheu, die den leidenden Mitmenschen vor sezierenden Blicken bewahrt, hatte sich in ihr Gegenteil verkehrt: in eine lieblose Gier des Durchschauen-Wollens. (113)

I wanted to observe precisely how the desperate person behaved in a situation like this. That [inhibition] which normally protects our fellow men in distress from prying eyes had turned into its opposite, into a ruthless desire [to see to the core of things]. (106)

The “fast rauschhaftes Gefühl der Überlegenheit” (113) [almost intoxicating feeling of superiority (106)] of the colonizing gaze is reiterated during the expulsion of the Poles from their village. At no point when narrating these episodes to her Jewish addressee does the protagonist recognize the similarities to the deportation of the Jews. This tendency of separation, which becomes prominent when the narrative treatment of antisemitism is considered, has caused Irmgard Weyrather to maintain that Maschmann's text merely re-enacts the fascist position of superiority of the protagonist over the addressee (1981, 76). In detailing episodes which were anything but positive for those victims of the Nazi “expansion” policy in the tenor of “äußerlich betrachtet habe ich sogar Gutes getan” (113) [viewed externally, what I did then was even good (106)], the addressee is forced again to face the consequences of fascism in a way that the narrative itself does not do. The protagonist's confession that, “ich kann nicht behaupten, daß ich dir darüber gern berichte” (126) [I cannot pretend to enjoying telling you about it (118)], once again places the protagonist's feelings, and her claim to suffering in the re-telling, over those of her addressee.

It can therefore be seen that there are contradictory tendencies within the text in terms of the separation and the equation of experiences of the addressee and the protagonist. These promote narratives of the protagonist's victimhood whilst displacing that of the addressee. Underlying the appeal to her Jewish school-friend is an assumption that her gaze will prompt the revelation of "the truth". In doing so, however, it legitimizes the inclusion of memories that the protagonist defines as positive and relegates those defined as negative. In accordance with contemporary reviewers of the text, I would agree that the "Künstlichkeit der Briefform" [artificiality of the letter form] (Böll 1967, 336) constructs an appeal to an addressee that is at best both "ein unglückliche[r] Einfall" [an unfortunate idea] (Hoffmann 1963) and "geschmacklich zweifelhaft" [dubious in terms of taste] (Ohff 1963), and, at worst, a reiteration of fascist antisemitism.

The Question of Generation: Figures of Authority and Notions of Superiority

Maschmann's story claims to be not just an autobiography of an individual, but the story of the youth of a nation. The protagonist legitimizes her experiences by addressing contemporaries not excluded by Nazi racial ideology. There is a focus on generational identity, with repeated references to the protagonist's experiences being those of "einer ganzen Generation" (10) [a whole generation (12)]. The prefixing of many episodes with "ich darf hier für viele meiner Gefährten sprechen" (89) [I can speak here for many of my companions (84)] makes claims to a homogenous generational representativeness. Such references to generation are linked to the theme of youth, as represented in memories of childhood, which foregrounds the age of the protagonist and her contemporaries during the years of fascism. A notion of an elite generation is created along clearly demarcated national and racial lines, upon which various notions of victimhood are subsequently imposed. Integral to the creation of a generational identity and the framework of justification are figures of authority from the protagonist's past and present.

Identificatory figures of authority are significant for the protagonist's self-understanding and for her interpretation of the events described. The focus on generational identity is strengthened by the narratorial emphasis on *public* figures of authority. The prominence of such figures, which Ortrun Niethammer has highlighted as being characteristic of autobiographies of former Nazi

women, displaces the protagonist's relationship to the traditional role models, her parents (1996, 103). Niethammer contends that this transferred and persistent reference to authority is integral to the "mangelnde Einsicht" [lack of insight] (1996, 100) in autobiographies of some former fascist women, amongst which I would include *Fazit*. This section will examine how the protagonist relates to various figures of authority. Following a consideration of how she describes those integral to the creation of her "fascist self" and those she refers to in the narrative present as being instrumental to her "new enlightened self", it will examine how notions of class and gender frame the relationships to such figures and how these relationships are inherently contradictory.

Significantly, the first textual reference to a male figure of authority is not to the protagonist's father but to Hindenburg, who is referred to within childhood memories as "ein Vater für alle Deutschen" (11) [a father to all Germans (13)]. Alongside the child's understanding of Hindenburg's relationship to all Germans is the retrospective, interpretative voice of the present adult narrator. This voice equates Hindenburg with themes which subsequently became prominent in fascist propaganda:

Von ihm [Hindenburg] hofften viele Menschen, daß er unser Volk aus der Not herausführen würde. Die Not hing mit dem verlorenen Krieg zusammen. Nachträglich will es mir scheinen, als hätte es während meiner Kindheit unter den Erwachsenen kein häufigeres und mit leidenschaftlicherem Ernst erörtertes Gesprächsthema gegeben als den Weltkrieg. (11)

Many people had hopes that he would lead our nation out of [its distress]. The [distress] was connected with the war which we had lost. It seems to me in retrospect as if there was no topic of conversation during my childhood which was discussed more frequently or with more passionate seriousness than the [First] World War. (13-14)

These changes in the time level of the text, from the past to present perspective, reinforce the protagonist's innocence and naivety, which subsequently become a signifier of a whole generation's state of mind.

Other figures of authority include the leaders of the BDM. The young adult protagonist generally refers positively to her immediate female superiors within the BDM, stressing their hard-working, self-sacrificing natures. The attributes of these women become symbolic of those of a broader, degendered generation. The voice of the present narrator retrospectively interprets the characters of her female superiors in a way which remains positive and serves to justify her own behaviour through comparison:

Auf meiner neuen Dienststelle fand ich das vor, was man heute ein ideales Team nennen würde. Es wurde von einer Frau geleitet, die ein halbes Theologie- und ein ganzes Sportstudium hinter sich hatte. Von allen nationalsozialistischen Jugendführern, die ich kennengelernt habe, verkörperte sie das Bild, das mir vorschwebte, am reinsten. Mit dem Blick auf ein so gutes Vorbild war es leicht, darüber hinwegzukommen, daß es auch ehrgeizige Blender, Maulhelden und engstirnige Fanatiker unter uns gab. Zu der letztgenannten Kategorie gehörten wir aber im Grunde alle, wenn auch in abgestufter Intensität: Selbst eine so gescheite und sittlich hochstehende Frau wie unsere Dienststellenleiterin überstieg im Denken und Fühlen niemals die Schranke, die durch unsere "Weltanschauung" aufgerichtet war. (53)

At my new post I met with what might now be called an ideal working team. It was run by a woman who had started by studying theology and then qualified as a sports instructor. Of all the National Socialist youth leaders I came to know, she was the closest to my ideal. With such a good example before one's eyes it was easy to forget that there were also ambitious humbugs, braggarts and narrowminded fanatics amongst us. Of course we all belonged basically in the latter category, to a lesser degree, for even a woman as highly moral and intelligent as the head of our office never overstepped the limits of thought and feeling laid down by our "world view". (51)

Notwithstanding the seemingly self-critical awareness of the text, the reader is reminded here of the hierarchical positioning of the protagonist through emphasis on women of superior rank. The positive elements are thus applied to all; the division of responsibility is, however, clearly demarcated. Negative aspects of the protagonist's female superiors are countered with a diverting emphasis on the positive. For example, the antisemitism of her superiors is either not addressed by the adult narrator, or is dismissed through an emphasis on their sympathetic natures:

Die Redakteurin, die für die weiblichen Jugend innerhalb des Amtes verantwortlich war, gehörte zu den markantesten Leuten in der Führung der Hitler-Jugend [...]. Sie habe auch den "böartigen" Antisemitismus nur für eine vorübergehende Übertreibung gehalten, von der die Partei selbst eines Tages abrücken würde. (27)

The editor who was responsible within this office for the girl's section was one of the most striking people in the leadership of the Hitler Youth [...]. She had also considered the "virulent" anti-semitism to be simply a passing excess which the Party itself would one day disavow. (28)

In contrast to the positive depiction of the protagonist's superiors, criticism of others above her, through which the protagonist's own self importance and feelings of superiority are conveyed, pivots around intersections of class, gender, and generation. These diverse intersections remain significant in Maschmann's text in the light of

Dagmar Reese's claim that in the BDM "new bonds of solidarity [...] no longer ran along gender or class lines but along generational ones" (1995, 232).

Early on the young protagonist criticizes her parents for being bourgeois, stating that her initial enthusiasm for National Socialism was founded on "Widerstand gegen jede Äußerung bürgerlichen Standesdünkels" (7) [an antagonism to every manifestation of bourgeois snobbery (10)]. As a result, the protagonist rejects the "höhere Töchter" (16) ["well-born daughters" (16)] she first encounters in the Hitler Youth in favour of the "Jungarbeiterinnen" (17) ["young working girls" from factories (17)]. However, she later dismisses these workers in order to form an "Elite-Club" (19) of equals. Such definitions of class therefore stem from childhood memories in Maschmann's text and later affect how the young protagonist positions herself with respect to her Nazi superiors. She asserts:

Sie ["die alten Kämpfer"] waren zum Teil von einer peinlichen Grobschlächtigkeit und Primitivität und entsprachen – ich stellte es bekümmert fest – dem Bild, das meine Mutter von "Proleten" zu entwerfen pflegte. (19)

They [the "Old Guard"] were sometimes painfully coarse and primitive, and corresponded – I was unhappy to observe – with the image of "proletarians" which my mother was wont to evoke. (20)

These contradictory understandings of class intersect with gendered divisions. In contrast to the positive description of her female superiors, the protagonist rejects many of her male superiors. She is critical of the head of Youth Education, Baldur von Schirach, and the Youth Leader, Arthur Axmann, because of what she describes as their pompous and hedonistic lifestyles during the war. In both cases their opulent lifestyle is set against that of other, female, superiors who lived "sehr bescheiden" (160) [very modestly (146)], leading the protagonist to mourn "der verratene Sozialismus!" (161) [the betrayal of socialism! (150)] The understanding of such "socialism" is however signified by contradictory claims which were inherent to Nazi ideologies: support of the ideal of a "Volksgemeinschaft" [national community] and yet the assertion that this community could not simply comprise of equals because it would lead to the creation of a "monströse[n] Verein von Mitläufern" (21) [a monstrous company of fellow-travellers (22)]. The narrator considers that it was ultimately a lack of an elite that led to the defeat of fascism. These ambivalent attitudes towards leadership, based on competing conceptions of class

and gender, reflect Hitler's division between the elite and the masses, an integral part of the Nazi "Rassenlehre" [racial teachings] (Kinz 1990, 91).

Further criticism of those above the protagonist in the Nazi hierarchy links a notion of superiority with an interpretation along generational lines. As a young protagonist, she pities older people having to get used to Nazism. Such sentiments provide a justification for demarcating her superiors, and their negative behaviour, from her own age-group:

Der dickbäuchige, versoffene Ortsgruppenleiter oder Arbeitsfrontfunktionär waren allmählich zu einem Typus für mich geworden, den ich mehr haßte als jeden Gegner der Partei. Eines Tages, so rechnete ich, würden diese mediokeren Bonzen ausgestorben sein, und dann würde eine Generation in die Verantwortung hineinwachsen, die als Jugendführer gelernt hatte, freiwillige Selbstdisziplin zu üben. (93)

For me the fat bellied, drunken Ortsgruppenleiter (local S.S. group leader) or Labour Front official had gradually become a type I hated more than any enemy of the Party. One day, I believed, these third rate Party bosses would die out and then a generation would take charge who had learned to practise voluntary self-discipline as youth leaders. (88)

A sense of generational superiority is one which the Nazis originally encouraged in order to gain the support of young people, but which they subsequently attempted to downplay in favour of national unity (Klönne 1984, 87).

According to the contrasting depictions of Nazi figures of authority in Maschmann's text, the 'true' Nazis are women, and the protagonist's desired fascist elite, as distinct from the 'masses', is likewise female. Paradoxically, the text attempts to divert answerability away from the protagonist, whilst at the same time a sense of superiority emphasizes that she personified her fascist ideal.

In contrast to the description of the other male superiors, the present narrator's discussion of the young protagonist's perception of Hitler does not include the same scathing dismissiveness. Indeed, he is seen as personifying the protagonist's "höchstes Ideal: die Volksgemeinschaft" (189) [highest ideal – the National Community (175)]. As "ein 'Mann aus dem Volk'" (188) ['man of the people' (175)] he represents both the elitism and collectivism of the protagonist's understanding of fascism. The narrator denies any demagogical relationship to Hitler, dismissing the time taken up by "die 'Ausschweifung' einer ekstatischen Hingerissenheit" (188) [the 'debauchery' of ecstatic rapture (175)], and yet later describes the

young protagonist's "leidenschaftlich[e] Verehrung" (238) [passionate devotion (220)] to him. As a figure, Hitler is referred to infrequently in the text, although the emphasis on 30 January 1933 with which the text begins, and the numerous later references to it, places him firmly in the centre of the protagonist's report. Whereas Elizabeth Heinemann has remarked how "the recollections of the large majority of German women who were politically acceptable to the regime typically begin with their husbands' or fathers' departures" (1996, 359), Maschmann's focus on Hitler's accession to power, in contrast, suggests his centrality to the narrative. References such as: "Im Zusammenhang mit der von Hitler heraufbeschworenen Sudetenkrise im Herbst 1938" (60) [During the Sudeten Crisis conjured up by Hitler in autumn 1938 (58)] personalize his responsibility. Towards the end of the text the narrator considers how blaming Hitler for the Holocaust was one of the necessary steps on the way to enlightenment and to a realization that the protagonist was responsible for her own actions. Nevertheless, when the voice of the narrating present interprets memories of the past there is still a very clear tendency towards transferral of responsibility onto the man who is described as being the one who betrayed them: "Damals konnten wir uns nicht vorstellen, daß Schirach in Nürnberg mit Beweismaterial konfrontiert worden war, aus dem hervorging, daß Hitler in der Tat Millionen ermordet hatte" (203) [At that time we could have no idea that at Nuremberg Schirach had been confronted with evidence that Hitler really had murdered millions of people (188)]. Signifiers of time, of then and now, and the repeated use of the collective merge the distance between the adult protagonist and the young adult who identified "mit jedem Gebot Hitlers" (59) [with every one of Hitler's commands (58)]. Indeed, the dramatic pathos associated with descriptions of Hitler's death, in a narrative which claims to have suppressed all private feelings (a claim which will be considered below), suggests that such identification still persists: "In diesem Augenblick wartete ich mit einer Gewißheit, die keinem Hauch eines Zweifels Raum ließ, darauf, daß die Felswände sich bäumen und ins Tal stürzen würden: Hitler war tot!" (187) [At that moment, with a certainty which left no room for the slightest shadow of doubt, I expected the wall of rock to rear up and plunge into the valley below. Hitler was dead! (174)] A recurrent focus on representatives of the fascist system, from the protagonist's immediate female superiors to Hitler helps her to avoid answering for her actions. By placing ultimate responsibility on Hitler, the text not only reflects prominent immediate post-war discourse in West Germany, but it also corresponds to the Nazi interpretation of

history which, as Gabriele Rosenthal points out, understood society's achievements and mistakes as being the work of individuals (1987, 105).

The Nazi regime intended the BDM to replace the three main institutions of socialization: parents, school and church (Klönne 1984, 50). Indeed, the protagonist's parents are noticeably absent from the majority of the text. Nevertheless, they play a significant role in childhood memories and function as an alibi for the protagonist's later enthusiastic involvement in the youth movement. Despite their opposition to Nazism, the protagonist attributes her nationalism and antisemitism to the influence of her parents. These parental figures of authority are therefore instrumental to the framework of justification which serves to exonerate the protagonist from responsibility for her past actions.

The text repeatedly stresses that the politics of the protagonist's parents were responsible for transferring a preconditioned feeling of nationalism onto their daughter. The notion of pre-formed and preconditioned reactions to later events is emphasized in the first chapter in the way that concepts of nation and prejudice are related to early stages in the protagonist's childhood. Phrases pointing repeatedly to her pre-school age suggest ideas being absorbed at a very young age and formed beyond the protagonist's control. The suggested self-evident nature of the link between her upbringing and later nationalism ignores the fact that her brother was similarly socialized and yet rejected Nazism. Descriptions linking the immaturity of the protagonist with current political events instead serve to reiterate this parental influence:

In unserem siebenten Lebensjahr wurden mein Bruder und ich eines Nachts von unseren Eltern aus den Betten geholt und ins Eßzimmer getragen, in dem der Radioapparat stand. Es war Mitternacht. Um diese Stunde begann der Abzug der Besatzungstruppen aus dem Rheinland. Unsere Eltern schoben uns die Kopfhörer über die zerzausten Haare. Hört ihr? Das sind die Glocken vom Kölner Dom. Die Engländer ziehen ab. Die Zeit der Besetzung ist vorbei. Unsere Heimat ist wieder ein freies Land. Aus den Hörmuscheln dröhnte es schreckenerregend und gewaltig. In den Augen der Eltern standen Tränen, und die Herzen der Kinder füllten sich mit einer Ahnung, daß dieses Deutschland ein angsteinflößend herrliches Geheimnis sein müsse. (11)

One night in our seventh year my brother and I were fetched out of bed by our parents and brought into the dining room where the wireless stood. It was midnight. It was at this hour that the occupying troops began to leave the Rhineland. Our parents thrust the head-phones over our tousled hair. "Can you hear? Those are the bells of Cologne Cathedral. The English are going. The occupation is over. Our home is a free country once more". The earpieces

buzzed violently and alarmingly. The parents' eyes were filled with tears and the children were left with the vague feeling that this 'Germany' must be a terrible and wonderful mystery. (13)

The language used by the adult narrator ("geholt [...] getragen" [fetched [...] brought], "die zerzausten Haare" [tousled hair]) emphasizes the childlike features of the protagonist, as do the simple sentences of the free indirect discourse of the parents, conveyed through the perspective of the child. Repetitive childhood events serve to concretize these vague understandings, with the adult narrator associating nationalist themes with images of violence and death. These are retrospectively interpreted as culminating in the events of 30 January 1933, when Hitler became Chancellor, with the marching columns of boys and girls carrying flags "auf denen die Namen ihrer Toten standen" (6) [on which the names of their dead were written (11)]. The accompanying response of her parents, the "Kältegefühl [...] das von der Reserviertheit der Eltern ausgestrahlt wurde" (9) [the icy blast which emanated from my parents' reserve (11)], is not considered further by the adult narrator. In contrast, the interpretative voice of the narrating present becomes prominent in the discussion of antisemitism, insisting that the protagonist had no influence on the factors which caused her to accept Nazism's "unmoralischste Maxime" (37) [most immoral maxim (37)] so unquestioningly. For example, the narrator comments: "Der Antisemitismus meiner Eltern war ein für uns Kinder selbstverständlicher Bestandteil ihrer Gesinnung" (40) [The anti-semitism of my parents was a part of their outlook which was taken for granted (40)] and "Die Erwachsenen 'wußten' es, und man übernahm dieses Wissen ohne Mißtrauen" (40) [The grownups 'knew' it and one took over this knowledge without mistrust (40)]. The present narrator states that it is her parent's condemnation of "*der Jude*" (41) [*the Jew*] as the enemy and yet their friendliness to their Jewish neighbours and colleagues that she learnt to emulate: "Solange wir zurückdenken konnten, wurde uns dieser Widerspruch mit aller Unbefangenheit von den Erwachsenen vorgelebt" (41) [For as long as we could remember, the adults had lived in this contradictory way with complete unconcern (40)]. Following this construction, the protagonist's parents are entirely responsible for her undifferentiated condemnation of 'the enemy' of the past. Agency is completely removed from the protagonist in her acceptance of the Nazi racist doctrine. This emphasis marginalizes the fact that the protagonist *did* disagree with her parents on many other aspects, not least over her participation in the Hitler Youth, ultimately

distancing herself from them. In addition, as I have shown, the text arguably reiterates these patterns of supposedly socialized racism in its appeal to the Jewish addressee of the present, thus refuting the suggestion that the protagonist has achieved distance from her antisemitic identity of the past.

The figures of authority which the narrative suggests influenced the development of a 'fascist self' can be contrasted to those that are seen as instrumental in aiding the transformation into the 'new, enlightened self'. It is particularly interesting to consider the role that literature plays in relation to these 'new' role models. For literature is integral to the present narrator's attempts to claim that the fascist system catered for the "sublimen kulturellen Bedürfnisse" (57) [deepest cultural needs (55)] of the Hitler Youth. As a motif of the bourgeois that the protagonist at once despises and embraces, literature becomes a signifier of superiority and elitism. The protagonist is therefore at first positively disposed towards von Schirach because of his intellectual interests and his declared affinity for Goethe, although she later rejects him for his so-called extravagant lifestyle. The protagonist's appreciation of a library, in particular a collected edition of Shakespeare, which had been confiscated for destruction, is seen as putting her above those Nazis who did not see its worth, with her questioning: "Aber sollte man so etwas Kostbares der Vernichtung übergeben?" (78) [But should one let something so precious be destroyed? (74)] In the context of the Nazi book burnings, which are not mentioned in the text, and the pernicious destruction of Nazism's enemies, the protagonist's sentimentality over a volume of Shakespeare demonstrates a significant sense of hierarchy. Maschmann refers to literature in order to demonstrate, as Elisabeth Langgässer did, that the Nazis were an uneducated collective and to set herself apart from them. The initial reference to Shakespeare becomes significant later in the text, when the protagonist describes a friend who "hat im Sommer 1945 in jeder freien Minute Goethe und Shakespeare gelesen, und als sie diese geistig-seelische Reinigungskur hinter sich hatte, war sie 'geheilt'" (215) [during the summer of 1945 spent every spare moment reading Goethe and Shakespeare, and when she had put this intellectual and spiritual cleansing cure behind her she was 'healed' (98)]. Literature thus becomes a site of redemption, a link between the time before 1933 and 1945 and a cure for the 'sickness' of Nazism.

The authors who are supposedly instrumental to the protagonist's distancing from fascist ideologies include Jean Paul Sartre, Friedrich Hölderlin, Gottfried Benn and Martin Heidegger, despite the fact that

Benn and Heidegger certainly had a rather ambiguous relationship to fascism (Wulf 1989, 131-44; Ott 1994, 133-39). Along with a student of Heidegger, two other figures are named as being enlightening representatives of democracy who prompted the protagonist's 'conversion': Hermann Schafft, who helped those who were "politisch belastet" (218) [politically suspect (202)] to find work; and the abbess of a Protestant convent. These figures are interesting for several reasons. Firstly, as democratic representatives, the text emphasizes their situation in the *West* German context. In the context of publication, this is one of many references in which the text is positioned within the discourses of the Cold War. Secondly, in the light of criticism that former fascists assumed positions in post-war West German society relatively easily, the emphasis on Schafft can be viewed more critically than the narrative suggests. Thirdly, as representatives of the Protestant church, the institutional background of the abbess and Schafft likewise contains ambiguities with regards to its role during Nazism.

The meeting with the abbess is one of two that supposedly signal a change in the protagonist. The abbess's acceptance of her, in contrast to the reception from others who saw her as a criminal, causes the present narrator to come to the conclusion: "Die Schuld, die ich – so wie sie die Dinge sah – objektiv auf mich geladen hatte, war getilgt und wie niemals gewesen" (217) [The guilt which I (in [her] view) had objectively taken on myself was wiped out, and it was as if it had never been (201)]. This meeting is followed by an encounter with a Jewish woman, after which the protagonist states: "Die verzeihende Liebe, die mir begegnet war, schenkte mir die Kraft, unsere und meine Schuld anzunehmen" (231) [The forgiving love which I had encountered gave me the strength to accept our guilt and my own (213)]. While such a recognition is portrayed positively in the text, it has been viewed less so by one reviewer, due to the fact that it places the burden of responsibility for the protagonist's change with other people, notably the Jewish victims. K. Offers poses the question: "Sollen wir darin etwa das Rezept erblicken: vergebt doch endlich den ach so unschuldigen Nazis, dann gibt es auch keine mehr?" (1965, 21) [Is this the remedy we are supposed to perceive: forgive those poor innocent Nazis and then there won't be any of them any more?]

These three figures of authority become representative of those to whom the protagonist claims she was instinctively drawn because of their "charakterlichen Qualität und geistigen Überlegenheit" (216) [quality of character and intellectual eminence (199)], which had prevented them following Nazism. In her identification with them,

the protagonist is thus raised to their level, with the text implying that only her youth and lack of role models prevented her from achieving their insight. In the same way that the young protagonist criticizes her superiors along generational lines, as an adult she complains that “[d]as nationalsozialistische Prinzip, ‘Jugend muß von Jugend geführt werden’ [...], bewirkte für die heranwachsende Generation einen verhängnisvollen Ausfall an Kontakten mit reiferen Menschen” (215) [The National Socialist principle, ‘Youth must be led by Youth’ [...] meant that the rising generation was fatally lacking in contacts with more mature people (199)], culminating in the retrospective charge that “[d]ie Alten (nämlich die, auf die es ankommt) lassen uns allein!” (216) [“the older generation (that is, the ones I cared about) leave us alone!” (199)] The generational division is here not a signifier of superiority, but is once again a method of avoiding responsibility.

Those to whom the protagonist refers as her “heutige Freunde” [contemporary friends] are important in legitimizing the protagonist’s behaviour of the past on the level of the narrating present. These fall into two groups – those she defines as her former enemies, and those former members of the Nazi hierarchy.

At various times throughout the narrative the protagonist refers to her conversations “mit einem fair gesinnten Franzosen” (25) [with a fair-minded Frenchman (26)], to English friends, and to a Japanese Christian. The narrator imputes questions to these figures in order to reassert her version of events. Therefore, while their inclusion seems to reinforce the theme of ongoing dialogue, the rhetoric of the narrative in fact excludes other voices. There remains a tension between a suggested critical awareness by the protagonist and a repetition of positive characteristics of the past:

Erst 1950 oder 1951 begriff ich im Gespräch mit einem japanischen Christen plötzlich, wie engherzig diese Liebe gewesen war: eine Art von primitiven Familienegoismus. Was sind Güte, Opferbereitschaft, Tatkraft und Verantwortungsbewußtsein, wenn sie, so eifersüchtig gehütet, nur dem Bruder und der Schwester zugute kommen dürfen? Nicht viel mehr als die Instinktionen, die eine Herde wilde Tiere zusammenhalten. (229)

Only in 1950 or 1951, in the course of conversation with a Japanese Christian, did I suddenly grasp how narrow this love had been – a kind of primitive family selfishness. What good are kindness, self sacrifice, energy and a sense of responsibility, if they are so jealously guarded that only one’s brothers and sisters benefit from them? Not much more than the instinctive reactions which keep a herd of wild animals together. (211)

By emphasizing an international dimension these addressees serve to suggest distance from nationalism. Such a claim to internationalism signals a departure from fascist ideologies (Kinz 1990, 87). However, the protagonist's relationship to the second group of "contemporary friends" implies a rather different relationship to the past.

Narratorial references to former Nazis suggest a continued psychological embeddedness in old fascist hierarchies. The narrative uses the criticism of the protagonist's former superiors to validate actions involving a contravention of Nazi policy. For example, the protagonist's "appropriation" of furniture for a German settler, through the forging of an official document:

Sechs oder sieben Jahre nach Kriegsende habe ich meinen damaligen Arbeitsdienst-Vorgesetzten von diesem "Abenteuer" berichtet, und meine Schilderung löste auch dann noch Empörung aus. (138)

Six or seven years after the end of the war I told the person who had been my superior in the Labour Service about this adventure, and even then my account horrified her. (129)

Similarly, preceding her involvement in the expulsion of Polish farmers from their homes, which was theoretically beyond the remit of her orders, the protagonist raises the question:

Würde ich bereit dazu sein, so war es ziemlich sicher, daß ich mit einer scharfen Rüge zu rechnen hatte. (Ich bekam sie übrigens quasi posthum, noch zehn Jahre später, als ich mit meiner ehemaligen vorgesetzten Führerin über diese Dinge sprach.) (127)

And if I *were* prepared to do it, it was fairly certain that I should have to take a sharp reproof. (I got it by the way, posthumously as it were, ten years after the war when I was telling my former chief about this). (119)

These asides continue the theme of ongoing dialogue but, this time, the former Nazis are given a voice. The function of these episodes is to exonerate, either by suggesting that the protagonist had positioned herself in 'opposition' to fascism in order to carry out intrinsically good deeds, or by reaffirming that the protagonist's female superiors were in fact inherently 'good' people. Yet, it becomes obvious that hierarchies of fascism are unquestioningly maintained, with the narrative still clinging to the "Führerprinzip" [leader principle] in the present.

The repeated emphasis on figures of authority serves to project guilt away from the protagonist. When juxtaposed with generational delineations, both emphasize the age of the protagonist, thus fore-

grounding a discourse of youth. Childhood memories bring to the fore the age of the protagonist when the Nazis came to power but, as the narrative details the progressive displacement of the parental socialising influence by the BDM, the way in which the narrative refers to youth alters. On the one hand, the narrator refers more frequently to the protagonist belonging to the Hitler Youth than to the BDM, thus emphasising a degendered collective youthfulness. On the other, the protagonist's positioning in relation to those around her and her elevated sense of self serves to downplay her age and promote a sense of superiority.

At the Nuremberg trials Schirach maintained that the younger generation were not guilty (Klönne 1984, 8). A corresponding emphasis in Maschmann's text must be seen in a West German context. The publication of the last edition of the autobiography in 1983 just preceded Helmut Kohl's public insistence on the "Gnade der späten Geburt" [the fortune of having been born late enough not to have been involved in Nazism], a concept which was to become embedded as part of a wider narrative of German victimhood in hegemonic discourse. The present narrator reflects on these exonerative claims of youth:

In dem Jahr der Reichskristallnacht war ich zwanzigjährig [...]. Als ich vor den Ghettos in Lodz und Kutno stand, war ich drei, vier Jahre älter, und ich war in der Tat an große Selbständigkeit gewöhnt. Mit welchem Rechte, so fragte ich mich jetzt, kann ich mich darauf berufen, ich sei noch zu jung gewesen, um zu durchschauen, was sich abgespielt hat? [...] Ich war nicht zu jung, sondern zu hartherzig, zu feige und zu geschmeichelt von der Führungsrolle, die ich im "Dritten Reich" spielte [...]. (232)

In the year of the "Night of the Broken Glass" I was twenty [...]. When I stood before the ghettos in Lodz and Kutno I was three or four years older and I was in fact used to an extremely independent existence. What right have I, I asked myself now, to claim that I was still too young to perceive what was going on? I was not too young but too hard-hearted, too cowardly and too flattered by the role of leader which I played in the Third Reich [...]. (214)

This assertion nonetheless appears towards the end of a narrative in which many memories foreground the youth of the protagonist. In addition, the reference to playing a role resulting in a hard heartedness is part of another justificatory framework, to be examined below.

Juxtaposed with these competing narratives about youth and culpability is a construction of superiority. For example, the depiction of fanaticism at work is interpreted by the narrator in terms of her loyalty to Hitler and a deeper understanding of Nazism: "Hitler hat

recht, dachte ich. Wir dürfen keine Minute mit unserer Kraft sparen [...]. Allein in dieser geschichtlichen Stunde kann Großdeutschland gebaut werden" (95) [Hitler is right, I thought, we must not spare our strength for a single minute [...]. It is only at this historic hour that Greater Germany can be built (89)]. Similarly, in relation to the German farmers in Poland, the protagonist's condescension is plainly seen through her portrayal of these people as ignorant. Arno Klönne contends that this "forcierte Selbstbewußtsein" [forced self-confidence] (1984, 80) was prevalent in the Hitler Youth and allowed for a certain amount of egocentricism within an otherwise collective identity. The narrative itself questions this assumed superiority:

Während ich diesen alten Bericht eben für dich abgeschrieben habe, meldete sich an bestimmten Stellen ein deutliches Unbehagen in mir [...]. Merkwürdig wie fraglos ich mich der Bäuerin überlegen fühlte. (106)

While I was copying out this old account for you, I became aware, in certain places, of a [distinctly] uncomfortable feeling [...]. It is remarkable how unquestionably superior to the farmer's wife I felt. (99)

Through the inclusion of original work reports containing the perspective of the teenager, the text claims the "Wert authentischen Materials" (99) [virtue of being authentic documents (93)]. In fact, these reports, as is recognized by the narrator above, serve to repeat the disdain of the past. Notwithstanding such recognition, the present narrator intervenes only at the end to describe these episodes as "ein[e] Hoch-Zeit" [a high period] in which the protagonist was "im Dienst an etwas Großgegläubtem" (106) [in the service of something one believes to be great (100)]. These hierarchical relationships of the past are therefore likewise interpreted as positive. As the above examples have shown, the structuring of the protagonist's memories in the BDM repeatedly foregrounds these mutually redefining and often contradicting narratives of youth and superiority, in spite of contrasting assertions by the adult narrator of the present.

The textual addressing of Maschmann's contemporaries through the construct of generation highlights narratives which shift responsibility away from the protagonist and emphasize narratives of youthful victimhood. Claims to a homogenized representativeness of experience along generational lines marginalize the experience of those young people who, unlike Maschmann, chose not to join the Hitler Youth or participated in resistance. Such claims rest uneasily with the notions of superiority and elitism simultaneously depicted. This self-understanding of elitism is reflected in the continuation of

former hierarchical structures in the narrative present, once again refuting the separateness of the protagonist's past and present identities. Such elitism can be seen to have its very roots in the process of fascist socialization, based on Hitler's belief that education in the Hitler Youth should be unequivocally targeted at convincing the young people of their innate superiority (Kinz 1990, 107).

Nation and Victimhood

By repeatedly asserting the protagonist's embeddedness within a collective, the narrative demarcates an opposing Other outside the elite generation. In defining the Other as 'the enemy' along national lines, the racially purified nation becomes a textual addressee. This outside Other is created within the memories of the fascist past and is maintained by the narrative voice of the present, along with a feeling of national and racial superiority. Such demarcations, exemplified through various depictions of foreign soldiers, contradict the narrative's claims to a newly discovered internationalist understanding. The present narrator draws on a childhood memory of meeting black soldiers after the First World War as part of her explanation of the preconditioned understanding of the "Bedeutung des Wortes Deutschland" (10) [the meaning of the word 'Germany' (13)]:

Damals war das Rheinland von den Franzosen besetzt. In einem Eisenbahnzug trafen wir die ersten farbigen Soldaten. Ihr Anblick überfiel mich mit Grauen. Wir flohen in ein leeres Abteil. Ich weiß nicht mehr, was meine Mutter sagte, um uns zu beruhigen, aber es ist mir ein Schauer in der Erinnerung geblieben, als hätte sich alles Elend Deutschlands in diesen schwarzhäutigen Männern verkörpert. (11)

At that time the Rhineland was occupied by the French. We met the first [black] soldiers on the train. The sight of them filled me with dread. We fled into an empty compartment. I cannot remember what my mother said to soothe us, but I remember a feeling of horror, as if all the misery of Germany were incarnate in those black skinned men. (13)

Such description echoes that in *Mein Kampf* where, as Martin Durham writes, Hitler referred to the black soldiers in the Rhineland as a racial threat to Germany. In fascist rhetoric this was inherently antisemitic, with the soldiers being part of the Jewish attempt to "attack the white race [...] and ruin its women" (1998, 17). In *Fazit* however, such a threat is juxtaposed with the protagonist's love for the nation, defined

as “etwas geheimnisvoll von Trauer überschattetes, unendlich Teueres und Gefährdetes” (10) [something mysteriously overshadowed with grief, something infinitely dear and threatened with danger (13)]. The voice of the narrating present recognizes in retrospect that such “pure”, childlike love inevitably brought with it a hatred of other nations.

Nevertheless, the racialized threat is once again encapsulated in the experiences of the protagonist, when, at the end of the Second World War, American soldiers discover the hospital in which she is hiding:

Einer der beiden war ein Mexikaner von fast negerhafter Schwärze. In kurzer Zeit betrank er sich und wurde dann so wild, daß sein weißhäutiger Kamerad aus dem Haus flüchtete. Der Betrunkene riß plötzlich auch die Tür zu meinem Zimmer auf und lag fast augenblicklich mit seinem Gewehr neben mir. (187)

One of the two was a Mexican, almost as black as a negro. He got drunk very quickly and then became so wild that his fair skinned comrade fled the house. The drunken man suddenly flung open the door of my room and lay down beside me with his gun almost in one bound. (173)

Through the implied threat of rape by the soldier, to which the text subconsciously refers, the danger to the protagonist is racially gendered. These gendered depictions of the behaviour of American soldiers can be contrasted with the protagonist's portrayal of a group of SS men with whom she hides after the war. The protagonist emphasizes that at no time did she feel sexually threatened by the male group. Their behaviour towards her is taken to be symptomatic of their inherently good natures, something which can only happen through a disarticulation of the atrocities the SS had been involved in:

Wenn ich jetzt an meine Kameraden aus der Hütte zurückdenke, möchte ich sagen: Sie waren rauhe, aber anständige Kerle. Ich möchte sie nicht verdächtigen, daß sie zu denen gehörten ... Nun, du weißt, was ich meine. Ich selbst habe keine unangenehmen Erfahrungen mit ihnen gemacht. Das ist alles was ich sagen kann. (186)

If I think back to my comrades in the hut I should say they were rough but decent fellows. I would not suspect them of being the ones who ... But you know what I mean. I had no unpleasant experiences with them myself. That is all I can say. (173)

The insistence here on individual feelings portrays a defensive tone. In contrast to such an individual focus, claims to generational representativeness, and the linking of the protagonist's experience to a

gendered understanding of nationhood, set up a dichotomy of a much broader Americanness and Germanness.

Omar Bartov has highlighted the fact that defining the enemy and making victims was integral not only to fascist ideologies, but was also a persistent trend in West Germany in the post-war period (1998, 771-816). In the context of the publication of Maschmann's text, narratives of pro- and anti-Americanism are significant, encompassing as they do discourses of both past and present. Given the text's publication when Cold War and *pro*-American sentiments were dominant in West Germany, the anti-Americanism of the text is therefore noticeable. As Dan Diner has examined though, discourses about North America in West Germany have always been highly contradictory (1993). In Maschmann's text, narratives of anti-Americanism run alongside those situating the protagonist firmly within the Western faction of the Cold War. These competing narratives are founded on the reciprocally redefining notions of victimhood and 'the enemy', the function of which will now be explored.

Anti-Americanism in West Germany, Bartov states, arose from the feeling "in some quarters that Germany [...] had been the victim of Western (and especially American) military might and imperialistic policies, now pursued by other means in a campaign of 'cultural imperialism' that threatened the German way of life" (1998, 790). Anti-Americanism therefore focused around a victimhood of the past and a threat (and therefore victimhood) posed by the present. It was part of a narrative of a 'lost' war and an enemy occupation of Germany by American soldiers. As can be seen from the depiction of the behaviour of these soldiers in *Fazit*, the individual experience of the protagonist becomes representative of a wider German victimhood in Maschmann's text. Alongside this are references to events which have become synonymous with German suffering as a result of Allied bombing. The protagonist writes of sending a group of children to Dresden, "in dem dort die grauenhaftesten Bombenangriffe des Zweiten Weltkrieges niederrasten" (168) [when the most terrible bombing attacks of the Second World War were descending on that city (156)], an event she calls, with a notable lack of reflection, "eines der entsetzlichsten Massensterben der deutschen Geschichte" (168) [one of the most ghastly massacres in German history (156)]. At the end of the war, this outside threat is continued in the portrayal of a German mother who is forced into prostitution with American soldiers in order to feed her children. A further 'cultural' threat in the present is suggested through the criticism of, firstly, materialism and,

secondly, technology. Both of these were equated with contemporary American society in discourses of anti-Americanism. The protagonist rejects such materialism, asserting that she suffered a certain guilt due to the wealth of her childhood. The present narrator describes how poverty-stricken districts had “eine unwiderstehliche Anziehung” [irresistible attraction] for the teenager, romanticizing those areas where “[es] roch nach Elend” (26) [there rose a smell of poverty (27)]. With a tone of pride, the narrator describes how the girls of the BDM worked for almost nothing, something frequently emphasized by their leader, Getrud Scholz-Klink (Stephenson 1982, 44), and how the protagonist refused to use Nazi privileges to buy goods in short supply while in Poland. She emphasizes that the volume of Shakespeare was the only thing “aus fremden Besitz, an dem ich mich jemals bereichert habe” (78) [of someone else’s property that I ever appropriated (74)]. As a result of the bombing raid in which her parents are killed, the protagonist writes of how she suddenly lost interest in material things, a disinterest which lasted for seven years. Such a claim can be compared with the protagonist’s critical description of the immediate post-war period in which “hemmungslos [...] der Materialismus überhand [nahm]” (223) [uncontrollably materialism was getting the upper hand (206)]. The post-war destitution of the protagonist mirrors that of West Germany, with the encroaching North American influence leading to a narrative criticism of corrupt authorities and young people who “im schwarzen Markt versackten” (223) [were up to their ears in the black market (206)].

Alongside a condemnation of materialism is a criticism of technology, in which descriptions of the past contain implicit comment on the present:

Die Führer dieses Staates hatten zwar eine Blut- und Bodenkultur proklamiert und machten krampfhaft Anstrengungen, ethische Werte aus der Zeit der Nibelungen zu restaurieren, aber für die eigentliche Bedrohung, die aus der fortschreitenden Autonomie der Technik auf uns alle zukommt, waren sie blind. Etwas von der Entmenschlichung, vom Sieg der Technik über die “Seele” (wenn du mir diesen altmodischen Ausdruck hier erlauben willst), wie er in der Einrichtung massenmörderischen Apparaturen (KZ) zum Ausdruck kommt, war auch in der Art, wie der nationalsozialistische Staat seine Jugend “verorganisierte”. (153)

The rulers of the state might have proclaimed a culture of “blood and soil”, and they made spasmodic efforts to restore the ethical values of the age of the Nibelungen, but they were blind to the particular threat to us all of the domination of technology. Something of the dehumanization – of the victory of technology over the soul, if I may use this old-fashioned word – which was expressed in the institution of apparatuses for mass murder (the concentration

camps), could also be seen in the way the National Socialist state over-organized its young people. (143)

In this retrospective interpretation, the text here in fact attributes the evils of Nazism to the outside influence of an impersonal technology. By constructing a dichotomy of technology and the concept of “soul”, the text equates the victimhood of those in concentration camps to that of the young people of the Hitler Youth, a highly problematic universalizing of experience. Paradoxically, by emphasizing the ‘ethical’ impetus to fascism and the criticism of technology, the narrative in fact leads to a transferral of responsibility, and arguably runs the risk of “die direkte Identifizierung der USA mit den Verbrechen der Nazis” [the direct identification of the USA with the crimes of the Nazis] (Diner 1993, 147).

Notwithstanding the anti-Americanism of the text, it engages with discourses of the Cold War and addresses the nation through negative depictions of communism and the Soviet Union. There is a repeated equation of communism and fascism, with the protagonist’s supposed position of enlightenment allowing her to see the pitfalls of “dieses imponierend geschlossenen Denksystems” (224) [this impressive closed system of thought (207)]:

Aber glaube mir: Daß ich heute von der realpolitischen Möglichkeit eines friedlichen Miteinanderlebens benachbarter Völker (ihre Verwirklichung ist freilich noch immer – jedenfalls was die östlichen Nachbarn betrifft – schmerzlich weit entfernt) überzeugt sein kann, empfinde ich wie die Befreiung von einem bösen Fluch. Es ist qualvoll, in einer Vorstellungswelt zu leben, für die der Haß und die Feindschaft zwischen den Völkern die ultima ratio und der einzige Ausweg sind. An der inneren Umkehr, von der hier die Rede ist, habe ich erfahren, wieviel glücklicher wir leben könnten, wenn wir Ernst machen würden mit dem utopischen: Liebe deinen Nächsten! (134)

But believe me: the fact that I can now believe that peaceful coexistence between neighbouring nations is a practical possibility – however painfully far from realization this remains as far as the East is concerned – feels to me like release from an evil curse. It is a torment to live in a world of ideas where hate and enmity between nations are the ultima ratio and only solution. In making the inner volte face I am speaking of, I discovered how much more happily we can live if we are prepared to take the utopian commandment, “Love thy neighbour”, seriously. (125)

While the present narrator considers it to have been a terrible mistake that Germany was divided in two, the textual emphasis on the positive memories conveys a past that was anything but a “torment”. Victimhood is constructed retrospectively and becomes pivotal to the

political constellations of the Cold War. Maschmann's text mirrors and contributes to post-war discourse in which the original feminization of nationhood through the image of rape subsequently served to represent not only a degendered national victimhood of the past but also a racialized threat of the present (Heinemann 1996, 367). The Soviet Union is portrayed as threatening West Germany, with the racially defined Other feeding in to contemporary anti-communist discourses. Bartov writes of how, as new enemies were created, the present need to unite against communism "was accomplished by representing the war as a site of near 'universal victimhood'" (Bartov 1998, 787).

In *Fazit*, a universalization of national victimhood takes place through the juxtaposition of feminized and masculinized concepts of nation. Images of the female body come to personify a degendered German nation, upon which a masculinized notion of youth is imposed. The text equates the role of the Hitler Youth generation with that of soldiers:

Gewiß, sie haben zu viel und zu bedingungslos gehorchen und zu wenig eigenes Denken und Verantwortung gelernt. Aber dieser Gehorsam hatte für sie das Ethos, das im rechtverstandenen Gehorsam des Soldaten liegt [...]. Daß er sie in dem Kampf für eine schlechte Sache führte, war ein Unglück [...]. (154)

Of course they learned to obey too often and too unhesitatingly – they learned too little about thinking for themselves and acting on their own initiative. But this obedience had for them the moral value of a soldier's obedience, rightly understood [...]. The fact that it led them into a fight for a bad cause was a misfortune [...]. (143-44)

As examined in the chapter on Inge Scholl, the narrative of soldiers as victims of the fascist system has figured in post-war West German discourse since the late 1940s. In Maschmann's text, the link between discourses of masculinized youth and generation, is exemplified by the description of the deployment of six hundred boys aged fifteen and sixteen in the last stages of the war, who are described as "Milchgesichter unter dem Stahlhelm" (169) [angel faces beneath the steel helmets (158)]. However, the discourse of male military images was problematic in the immediate post-war context however, with a masculinized national experience swinging from polarities of the positively "active identity of soldiers and the passive identity of victimhood" (Heinemann 1996, 356). For this reason, Heinemann argues, feminized images helped to fill a "representational vacuum" with the emotive image of rape being used to define both a national experience of the past and the 'enemy' of the present (1996, 356).

These competing gender strands have, as Heinemann points out, fought for prominence as being representative of national experience at various times in West Germany (1996, 355). In the process of such contest, individuals become disenfranchised from their experiences. Universalization downplays individual historical agency. The prominence of such victim motifs marginalizes reminders of those persecuted by Nazism. In *Fazit*, for example, these narratives of generational and national victimhood draw attention away from the protagonist's involvement in the crimes against the Polish population, including the persecution of Polish Jews.

Concurrent to this marginalization of Jewish experience is the fact that the anti-Americanism could also be seen as a further symptom of antisemitism, given that references to the "ewige[r] Jude" [the eternal Jew] predominated within anti-American propaganda (Diner 1993, 89). As has been suggested, the protagonist's relationship to the Jewish addressee at times perpetuates fascist stereotypes. The link between the addressee and America can be seen not only in the protagonist's assumption that this is where the addressee emigrated to, but also in the portrayal of the American friend of Hermann Schafft, who had emigrated in 1933 and returned to Germany at the end of the war. In the description of the meeting with this friend, the present narrator comments that "[d]er Amerikaner war ein lebhafter alter Mann, dem ich die jüdische Abstammung nicht ansah" (229) [the American was a lively old man who did not look particularly Jewish (212)]. Such a description reiterates the antisemitic equation of appearance and race, the foundation for its exterminatory eugenics. The contrasting gendered approaches to defining enemies and making victims in Maschmann's text are therefore not only symptomatic of the competing discourses in West Germany at the time of publication, but they also reflect Nazism's ambivalent stance towards America upon which the text seemingly draws.

Competing totalitarian equations of communism and Americanism with fascism are also one way in which the text denies the specificity of the Holocaust. In addition, juxtaposed with the national delineation of experience is a wider appeal to an international addressee, based on the protagonist's understanding of a dichotomized fight between good and evil. So, for example, the present narrator claims: "Man zittert um die Gutheit der guten Menschen überall in der Welt. Nicht nur im eigenen Volk" (240) [one trembles for the goodness of good people all over the world. Not only amongst one's own people (221)]. The repetition of "good" here is the culmination of the numerous references to the inherent goodness in people and episodes from the

fascist past. It is also the culmination of the positive references to fascism: “Du hast weiter gesehen, daß ich in dem von ihm [Hitler] befohlenen Dienst mancherlei getan habe, was wohl einfach für sich genommen – eher ‘gut’ als ‘böse’ genannt werden muß” (238) [And you have further seen that in the service he commanded I have done many things which – taken in themselves – must be called ‘good’ rather than ‘evil’ (220)]. While the narrator in this instance individualizes the experiences and tries to separate them from their context, more often than not it is a generic notion of victimhood which is stressed:

Erlaube mir ein etwas gewagtes Bild: Man muß die bunten Blüten abreißen, um erkennen zu können, daß die Wurzeln giftig waren. Millionen Menschen sind an diesem Gift gestorben, zu ihnen gehören auch die Soldaten und die Opfer der Bombenangriffe. (56)

One must tear aside the flowers, if I may use a somewhat bold image, in order to be able to recognize that the roots were poisonous. Millions of [people] died from this poison, among them German soldiers and the victims of the bombing raids. (55)

In spite of such seemingly self-critical recognition, there is an insistence by the voice of the narrating present that the events of the Nazi past can *still* be considered positively, thus contradicting the earlier assertion that such memories are insignificant “wenn man auf das Ganze sieht” (53) [if one looks at the whole picture (52)]. By consistently emphasizing the ‘goodness’ of members of the Hitler Youth and the aims they adhered to, the text displaces antisemitism and the resulting Holocaust from the centre of fascist ideologies. The suggestion of an inherent goodness abused by the Nazis is epitomized, despite narrative claims to the contrary, by reference to the concentration camp commander who was “in seinem Privatleben ein Freund der Kinder, der Tiere und der Blumen” (240) [in private life a lover of children, animals and flowers (221)].

A universalized appeal to an endangered “goodness” of mankind becomes embroiled in the narrative tone of superiority, with the warning:

Das ist es, was ich jedem guten Menschen sagen möchte. Nicht mit dem Hintergedanken: Deine Gutheit steht auf genauso tönernen Füßen wie die meine stand. Ich möchte ihn beschwören: Sei wachsam! Laß Dich warnen. Es gibt nirgends etwas Gutes – und scheine es noch so verehrungswürdig – , dem man mit Mitteln des Bösen (der Lieblosigkeit) dienen dürfte. (240)

That is what I should like to say to every good person. Not with the implication: “Your goodness has feet of clay just as much as mine had”, but rather to implore him: “Be on your guard”. Take warning. There is nowhere anything good – however worthy of respect it may seem – which one may serve with the means of evil (that is of lovelessness). (222)

With its repetition of generic goodness, such a statement not only serves to exonerate the protagonist and her contemporaries, but also maintains the retrospectively defensive assertion that fascism could have the appearance of being “*verehrungswürdig*” [worthy of respect].

A textual equation of a concept of goodness with love and evil with lovelessness forms the foundation for the previously argued necessity of dialogue. The narrator claims that such dialogue is the basis of human existence and a prerequisite “*das es Juden und Deutschen vielleicht trotz allem und allem wieder ermöglicht, einander zu lieben*” (235) [which may perhaps enable Jews and Germans, despite everything, to live together and to love one another (217)]. This quasi-religious notion of love is used to blur distinctions between experiences of the past through a supposedly moral imperative for the future. In this universalized appeal, the present narrator reduces all addressees to the level of those perpetrators of fascist crimes, claiming “*auch du hättest das Zeug zum Mörder!*” (240) [even you were capable of murder! (221)]. In a highly problematic use of the conditional tense, the ambiguity of whether the addressee is a generic “*du*” [you] or the Jewish school friend thus turns the persecuted victim of Nazism into a potential persecutor.

Contradictory Dichotomies: The Representation of Women

Within the appeal to a universalized addressee there is one other selective addressee. Fundamentally, the memories of the past are structured in such a way as to foreground the notion that the protagonist and her female compatriots were victims of patriarchy within the fascist system. The narrative sets up a dichotomy of what it defines as female and male behaviour, a dichotomy which is linked to notions of the political, the body, and victimhood. Textual constructions of gender and of ‘public’, ‘political’ and ‘private’ spheres are however inherently contradictory. It is my contention that these contradictions are in part a reflection of contested meanings of ‘female’ within Nazism, and that the text appropriates these conflicting discourses without recognizing their opposing tendencies. The contradictions are exemplified in the description of the

protagonist's voluntary involvement in the "härteren Osteinsatz" (97) [tougher 'Eastern Venture' (92)].

In describing the expulsion of Polish farmers, the adult narrator claims that the girls had to adopt the attitude of the "Master-Race", a "Herren-Menschen-Haltung" (74), to wear "eine starre Maske" (75) [a rigid mask (71)], in order to carry out "Männerarbeit" (127) [men's work (119)]. This was work that the women were not normally required to do, and could have legitimately refused to partake in. As Claudia Koonz and Daniel Goldhagen have emphasized, there was still an impetus within the fascist system to keep what were considered appropriate tasks for 'the female sphere' separate from the crimes (1986, 29; 1999, 242). Nevertheless, the protagonist makes a decision to participate in the expulsions, while stating that for her the situation was "höchst widerwärtig" (129) [highly unpleasant (120)]. In interpreting this decision retrospectively, the present narrator refers to three justificatory frames of reference: firstly, to school education, where they learnt of "die großen Männer der Weltgeschichte" (76) [the great men of world history (72)] and which she claims taught her that Germany could not afford to be "moralisch besonders zimperlich" (129) [very squeamish about morality (120)]; secondly, to a comparison with soldiers, the "unzählige Männer, [die] im Krieg [hatten] lernen müssen, Menschen des feindlichen Volkes kaltblütig zu töten, obwohl sie ihrer Veranlagung nach sensibel, rücksichtsvoll und hilfsbereit waren" (129) [countless men had had to learn to kill the members of enemy nations in cold blood, although by inclination they might be sensitive, considerate and kindly people (121)]; finally, and in contrast, the adult narrator returns once again to a feminized notion of victimhood and the trope of rape:

Heute weiß ich, daß dieser "Einsatz" in den Aussiedlungsdörfern den Mädchen zum Schaden gereichte. Sie waren wohl eine besondere aktive Auslese, aber sie waren nicht herzlos. Die Aufgabe, vor die sie gestellt waren, zwang sie dazu, sich selbst zu vergewaltigen, um eine kriegerische Männerrolle zu spielen. Es gehört eine andere psychische Konstitution als die unsere dazu, ungekränkten Gemütes mitanzusehen, wie ganze Familien von ihren angestammten Höfen vertrieben wurden. (129)

I know now that taking part in this special action against the villagers who were being expelled was harmful to the girls. They were certainly a particularly lively group, but they were not heartless. The task they were given [forced them to rape themselves] to play military roles more suited to men. It required a different temperament from ours to watch unmoved as whole families were driven from their ancestral farms. (121)

These conflicting gendered interpretations of her actions are epitomized by her description of having armed herself defensively with a clothes iron, which she refers to as her “Amazonenbewaffnung” (130) [Amazonian weapon (121)]. Thus, whilst evincing victimhood based on the imposition of a male military role, she simultaneously constructs an image of an heroic female fighter.

The “persönlichkeitsfremde[s] Verhalten” (129) [behaviour which goes so much against the grain of one’s own personality (121)] involved in the expulsion of the Polish population is defined as antithetical to the female character. The repeated denial of the women’s heartlessness, in retrospect, presupposes an essential goodness in the female. Responsibility for women’s actions is thus diminished, aided by their distancing characterization as “Helfershelfer einer räuberischen Haßpolitik” (128) [accomplices of a policy of hatred and banditry (120)]. The repeated tropes of goodness, heart and soul are frequently linked to the female characters and used to suggest a positive idealism abused by a masculinized fascism, exemplified by the emotive image of rape. This construction has parallels with a gender division which was inherent to the fascist system itself, with Nazi ideologies emphasizing gender roles based on the “seelische Veranlagung der Frau” [spiritual disposition of woman] (Kade cited in Kinz 1990, 121). This positively defined notion of a female soul was, of course, applicable only to those racially acceptable to the regime – it is therefore indicative that at no point in the text is there a gendered equation of victimhood with the Jewish addressee although she is female.

Directly following the description of the expulsion of the Poles from their village is an episode which suggests that a female sphere is the site of values destroyed by fascism. A Slovenian woman gives the protagonist a silent tour of her home pointing to various items she was packing when faced with expulsion. It is one of two episodes in which the protagonist is confronted by women in the home, whose actions aim to persuade the protagonist of the error of her ways. Neither is successful. While supposedly adopting the (rather conflicting) male military role, the protagonist had to suppress memories of these females, admitting that such individual cases never crossed her mind when confronted with the generic ‘enemy’. Similarly, the text reiterates that in order to fulfil her duties the protagonist had to eliminate the “private Gefühle” (73) [private feelings (70)] which originated as compassion and pity when faced with the plight of the Polish population, and especially their children. When she first sees these children, she states that her sympathies were “ganz auf der Seite

der Kinder" (68) [entirely on the side of the children (65)]. However, such "spontanes Mitleid" (71) [spontaneous sympathy (68)], is later banished: "Kurze Zeit später nannte ich diese 'unkontrollierte' Art und Weise, in der ich auf diese Begegnung mit menschlichen Unglück reagiert hatte, selbst naiv und unpolitisch" (68) [In a very short time I was describing as politically naïve the 'uncontrolled' way I had reacted to this encounter with human misery (65)]. A textual division is thus made between female, private, unpolitical actions, and male, political ones.

Maschmann's text therefore suggests that 'the female' is located in the private sphere, defined as the home. As mentioned above, this is exemplified in the description of the SS men who were kind fathers and attentive husbands. Such a separation of spheres is problematic not only because, as feminist scholars have shown, the home can equally be seen as a site of collaboration as well as of possible resistance (Koonz 1986, 14-33), but also because the situating of women within a sphere outside the events leading to the Holocaust, reflects a refusal to imagine women as historical actors (Taylor Allen 1997, 351). Maschmann's text, with its emphasis on the positive female figures of Nazi authority and their involvement and commitment to the fascist system, itself refutes this notion of historical inactivity.

A situating of 'the female' within the private sphere is therefore questionable not only in terms of historical agency, but also because it perpetuates Nazi propaganda which insisted that women had been corrupted whenever they had entered the male sphere. Although gender divisions such as these are by no means exclusive to fascist ideology, and indeed have supporters in many liberal democracies, what is significant in *Fazit* is that the gendered division of spheres is directly linked to the concept of 'soul', thus mirroring fascist propaganda and Hitler's comments in his "Reichsparteitag" address of 1934:

Wir empfinden es nicht als richtig, wenn das Weib in die Welt des Mannes, in sein Hauptgebiet eindringt, sondern wir empfinden es als natürlich, wenn diese beiden Welten geschieden bleiben. In die eine gehört die Kraft des Gemütes, die Kraft der Seele! Zur anderen gehört die Kraft des Sehens, die Kraft der Härte, der Entschlüsse und die Einsatzwilligkeit. (Reden an die deutsche Frau, 4)

We do not feel it right that woman forces her way into the man's world, into his domain, but we do feel it is natural that the two worlds stay separate. In the one belongs the strength of the heart, the strength of the soul. In the other belongs

the strength of vision, the strength of hardness, of decisions and of the willingness to act.

In addition, despite the supposed fascist suppression of the personal and private in *Fazit*, the narrative in fact reiterates such patterns through a supposed elimination of all personal feelings, except for those which “in Zusammenhang mit meiner politischen Entwicklung stehen” (22) [are related to my political development (23)]. A closer examination of what constitutes this supposedly eliminated ‘female’ of the ‘private sphere’ in Maschmann’s text reveals, to a large extent, an adherence to the contradictory Nazi ideologies relating to gender.

Socialization in the BDM prioritized the “körperliche Ausbildung” [physical education] of women, as Dagmar Reese has stressed (1989, 45). At the same time motherhood formed the backdrop of much work done in the BDM. Many of the tasks in *Fazit*, described as the protagonist’s work “bei unseren Bauern” (98) [with our peasants (93)], are of a domestic nature and narrated in a positive light: “Es ist jeden Tag eine neue Freude, für sie zu kochen und ihnen nach und nach Haus und Garten in Ordnung zu bringen” (101) [Every day it is a new pleasure to work for them and [gradually] to set the house and garden in order for them (95)]. The reports detailing the protagonist’s orders to ensure the survival of babies born to German farmers in the East demonstrate her involvement in the Nazis’ population policy. This work in Poland also highlights definitions of motherhood according to Nazi ideologies: that it was not reproduction at all costs, but only according to the racialized norms of “Sauberkeit, Ordnung, Pünktlichkeit und Effizienz” [cleanliness, order, exactingness and efficiency] (Reese 1989, 44). The protagonist’s reports, however, are not seen within this context, either from the perspective of the young adult narrator or the narrator of the present. Instead they serve to emphasize the self-sacrificing and sympathetic nature of the protagonist combined with her positioning of superiority over those she works for. At no point in the narrative does the protagonist consider the fascist obligation to become a mother, although celebrating “die Heiligkeit [...] des Mutterseins” (121) [the holiness of [...] maternity (114)] is part of her educational programme for the German farmers.

The changes in Nazi policy towards women in employment necessitated by the war, and the attendant opportunities to move into a different sphere, have been interpreted by some, particularly those writers of neo-Nazi literature, as emancipatory tendencies (Griesmayr 1980, 210). In contrast, Dagmar Reese stresses the problems

accompanying this form of Nazi 'emancipation', which women could not "draw upon [after the war] in a productive way", due to its foundation in a criminal system (1995, 231).

Notwithstanding the limited duration of any such opportunities, it is significant that the protagonist herself does not consider her work during the war in terms of emancipation. Although relatively senior within the Nazi youth hierarchy, her experience of the war is marked by "eine Abgelöstheit vom Ich" (63) [a release from the ego (61)] – a degendered, collective understanding of national experience. Indeed, the protagonist explicitly states that she would fight for equality only "sobald die Sorge um die Existenz unseres Volkes nicht mehr all unsere Kraft in Anspruch nehmen würde" (92) [as soon as the concern for the very existence of our nation had ceased to call for all our energies (87)]. Nation takes precedence over individual, as advocated by fascist ideology. What exactly is understood by future equality is however not clear. The protagonist states that she rejected "Frauen, die flammende politische Reden hielten" (92) [women who [...] made inflammatory political speeches (87)]. This rejection of what the narrator defines as feminism is accompanied by a rejection of many other elements which the protagonist sees as constituting female experience. For example, she rejects the trappings of femininity following an invitation by Axmann, her superior, to a party, complaining about the wasted time spent at the hairdressers. The protagonist also criticizes women expressing thoughts about sexuality, describing them as girls who came from "sehr ärmlichen Verhältnissen" [from very poor homes] and who "für Schlager und amerikanische Tänze schwärmten" (142) [wanted [...] pop songs and American dances (133)]. These comments underline both the contradictory notions of class and an anti-American stance voiced by the present narrator and characteristically found in fascist ideologies (Pine 1999, 27). When working on a farm, the protagonist feels that it is liberating to be able to shout at the horses, and yet the present narrator comments that it was not very flattering to be told that she worked "wie ein alter Landsknecht" (34) [like an old trooper (34)]. The reaction of the young protagonist, who initially attempts to alter her behaviour accordingly, embodies Nazism's contrasting gender notions. The tasks involved in physical education allowed girls in the BDM to move beyond traditional gender boundaries, leading to a paradox in Nazi ideology:

[...] die extrem polarisierten Geschlechtsverschiedenheiten, die männlich und weiblich so weit voneinander getrennt hielten, schienen den "männlichen

Männern” und den “weiblichen Frauen” eine gewisse Freiheit zu geben, zu einem Benehmen das normalerweise als unpassend galt (Koonz 1986, 18).

[...] the extremely polarized gender differences which kept male and female so far from one another appeared to give “male men” and “female women” a certain freedom of behaviour that normally was deemed inappropriate.

The textual intersections of notions of feminism, femininity and sexuality are all sited in a female realm supposedly suppressed by the fascist system. In contrast to these antinomies of the suppressed female in favour of the male, however, the text simultaneously denies that the protagonist’s work was political, that is, that it belonged to the male sphere. The protagonist criticizes the Nazi policy of limiting “de[n] Aufgabenbereich der Frau” [women’s activities] to “die Familie und das soziale Feld” (91) [family and social spheres (86)], claiming that she wanted her work to be more political. This very limited understanding of what constitutes ‘the political’ in the work of the BDM in Maschmann’s text is, in part, reflected in secondary literature (Reese 1981, 163-64). Such a viewpoint diminishes the fact that *all* aspects of female socialization were designed to serve the political aims of the state and were therefore in themselves inherently political. The lack of understanding about the political consequences of this work led, as Annette Kuhn points out, to the courts sentencing Gertrud Scholz-Klink to only eighteen months in a labour camp at the end of the war:

Als strafmildernd wurde festgehalten, daß sie sich in ihrer politischen Arbeit “vorwiegend mit den hauswirtschaftlichen, sozialen und karitativen Aufgaben der Frauen” befaßt habe. Daß diese Aufgaben der eugenischen und rassistischen Zielsetzung der NS-Politik zugeordnet waren, wurde somit auch durch die Gegner des NS verdeckt. (1994b, 19)

Used in evidence of mitigation was the fact that in her political work she had concerned herself “predominantly with women’s domestic, social and charitable tasks”. That these tasks were related to the eugenic and racist aims of National Socialist policy was thus also concealed by the opponents of National Socialism.

The contradictions in the description of the protagonist’s work as both political and unpolitical stem firstly, from the competing time levels of the text – the necessity to claim the protagonist’s actions were unpolitical in retrospect can be seen as an attempt to downplay her involvement – and secondly, from the definition within fascist ideologies of the relationship between women and politics:

Wir wollen darum bewußt politische Mädels formen. Das bedeutet nicht: Frauen, die später in Parlamenten debattieren oder diskutieren, sondern Mädels und Frauen, die von den Lebensnotwendigkeiten des deutschen Volkes wissen und dementsprechend handeln". (Rüdiger cited in Klönne 1984, 89)

We therefore consciously want to mould political girls. That does not mean women who will later debate or discuss in Parliament, but girls and women who know about the needs of the German people and act accordingly.

This particular combination of "politisch-aber fraulich" [political but female] (Kinz 1990, 145) demonstrates how Nazism aimed at the politicization of all spheres while simultaneously maintaining their distinctness. In this context, domestic duties, sport and health education, were all part of the sexist 'Aryan' policy of producing efficient, subservient women and mothers, perpetuating and concealing power divisions within the fascist state.

As Joan Scott has examined, these diverse conceptions of gender are sites embodying relationships of power (1988, 44). Maschmann's text claims that patriarchal power victimized the protagonist and her female peers. As such it can be seen as a precursor of some feminist texts of the late 1970s and early 1980s which, in coming to the "global diagnosis: patriarchy" (Gravenhurst 1990, 29) saw women only as victims of fascism. These texts, like Maschmann's, interpreted "Faschismus als männlicher Dämon" [fascism as a male demon] (Walser 1984, 51) and even decreed antisemitism to be a "Männerkrankheit" [male illness] (Mitscherlich-Nielsen 1983, 41-53). The subsequent female historians' debate since the late 1970s on the role of women under fascism attempted, as Taylor Allen writes, "to restore women to history by presenting them not as symbols but as subjects who, despite their disadvantaged status, made choices and bore moral responsibilities" (1997, 354). Within such a context, Maschmann's use of a concept of gender, in particular that of feminized victimhood, must be shown as being a way of concealing crimes that the protagonist committed against the Polish population (Kuhn 1994b, 25). The retrospective change of power to victimhood and the attendant transfer of culpability, means that gender becomes integral to the framework of justification.

Reception

Fazit was originally published in the wake of the Eichmann trial and subsequently republished shortly after the televising of the series

Holocaust in West Germany. The text thus appeared at times of intense public debate about the involvement of Germans in the Holocaust. As has already been suggested, the text met with a highly controversial reaction and was read in distinctly opposing ways.

The text of 1963 contained a foreword by Ida Görres, which asserted that “richtig gelesen, könnte dieses Buch vielen Menschen ein Markstein der Besinnung, ja des Umdenkens werden” [if read properly this book could be a milestone of reflection, of revised thinking for many people] (Maschmann 1963, 5-14). Görres defends the text against a reading which prioritized a feeling of justification and many reviewers agreed with her. What becomes clear, however, is that in asserting that the protagonist had succeeded in distancing herself from her Nazi past, Görres and these reviewers repeat the very frameworks of Maschmann’s text. They reinforce the claim to authenticity by naming it “ein ehrliches Geständnis” [an honest confession] (Bremser 1963), and “ein glaubwürdiger Bericht” [a credible report] (Moser 1963). They state that it conveys “plausible Erklärungen, die durchaus in die Tiefe gehen” [convincing explanations which thoroughly get to the bottom of things] (Sturm 1963), that it displays “Züge des Authentischen und Dokumentarischen” [characteristics of the authentic and documentary] and contains the “Rohmaterialien der Erinnerung” [raw materials of remembering] (n.a. 1963b, 10). They praise the tone, which they define as “sachlich und kritisch” [objective and critical] (Moser 1963), “nüchtern und nobel” [sober and noble] and “ehrlich” [honest] (Schmitz 1963). In examining “die innere Umkehr” [the inner reversal] (Brauer 1963), they reiterate both the trope of sight and the motif of the goodness of the heart. Thus, they write of how the text describes “blinde Begeisterung” [blind enthusiasm] (Beckmann 1963), “blinde[n] Gehorsam” [blind obedience] (Bremser 1963), “die Verblendung eines jungen Menschen” [the blindness of a young person] (Beckmann 1963) and even “ethische Blindheit” [ethical blindness] (n.a. 1963a). They argue that Maschmann’s autobiography depicts the protagonist’s experiences “mit offenem Herz, mit hinhörender Güte” [with an open heart, with attentive goodness] (Beckmann 1963), with the reader becoming involved in the “so ehrlich zum Herzen gehende Offenheit” [such honestly touching openness] (Bremser 1963). Often such critics also see Maschmann’s story as being representative, “ein reiner Spiegel” [a pure mirror] (Sturm 1963), of the experience of her compatriots. They follow her universalized understanding of good and evil, naming it “ein Versuch neue Maßstäbe für Gut und Böse zu finden” [an attempt to find new

ways of measuring good and evil] (Zimmermann 1963, 445). These reviewers agree that Nazism had a positive aspect and claim that “für die junge Gefolgschaft damals die Blüten wirklich bunt waren” [for the young followers the flowers really were colourful then] (Beckmann 1963). They advocate the importance of the experiences for the following generations. In stating that the book should serve as a warning, the reviews likewise contribute to the anti-communist discourse of the Cold War by equating communism with fascism:

Vielleicht liegt darin das Erstaunliche und Wesentliche für unsere Erziehungsaufgabe: der ganze erste Teil des Buches kann für unsere Jugend ein Anschauungsbild geben, wie auch im kommunistischen System die Jugend durch “Aufgaben” gepackt und fasziniert wird, wie ihr ehrlicher Wille mißbraucht wird [...]. (Brauer 1963)

Perhaps therein lies the astonishing and important thing for our educational purpose: the whole first part of the book can make visible for our young people the ways in which the young are also recruited in the communist system for “tasks”, how they become fascinated, how their honest will is abused.

In considering Maschmann's text in a positive light, these reviewers do not see the text as an attempt at justification and they do not regard her actions as criminal. In following her frameworks of remembrance, the emphasis is on the narratives of an abused youth rather than an acknowledgement of the consequences of the protagonist's behaviour. Only one reviewer who judges the text positively highlights the concurrent events of the Holocaust (Köpke 1963).

In contrast to these positive reviews, there were many who read the text in a distinctly negative light. These reviewers call the style “melodramatisch” [melodramatic] (Ohff 1963), “sentimental-kitschig” [sentimental kitsch] (Horn 1964, 82), “flach und primitiv” [flat and primitive] (Tauchel 1963), written in “erbarmungswürdiges Deutsch” [pitiful German] (Böll 1967, 338), and “von falschen Tönen durchsetzt” [interspersed with false sentiments] (Hoffmann 1963). They deny the separation of the protagonist's past and present identities, arguing that “jeder Versuch distanzierender Neuorientierung zusammenbricht” [every attempt at distanced reorientation collapses] (Hoffmann 1963), and that the present narrator “heute nicht frei von irrationalen Vorstellungen ist” [is still not free from irrational ideas] (n.a. 1963c, 26). Gabriele Wohmann calls Maschmann's so-called transformation “amputiert und unzuverlässig” [truncated and unreliable] (1963). A failure to distance herself is located by some reviewers in the repetition of fascist language, in the “immer wieder durchbrechende Nazijargon” [the ever intrusive Nazi jargon] (Tauchel

1963), and the “NS-Stil” [Nazi style] (Offers 1965, 20). The positive interpretation of past events is criticized by some reviewers. They maintain that the text is unable to create any distance from the “Sinnerfülltheit jener Zeiten” [feeling that those times were full of meaning] (Offers 1965, 20), something which is “peinigend für alle, die es besser wissen, weil sie es erfahren haben” [painful for all those who know better, because they experienced it] (Wohmann 1963). These reviewers likewise reject Maschmann’s construction of generic goodness, stating that the text contains “ein dummdreister Versuch, Hitlers Massenmörder mit dem Flair liebevoller Menschlichkeit zu umgeben” [an insolent attempt, to surround Hitler’s mass murderers with the aura of loving humanity] (Tauchel 1963).

The reviewers of the text are split on Maschmann’s claims to generational representativeness, with commentators from both camps upholding or refuting her claims of generic experience. Christoph Moser and Annemarie Zimmermann agree that the text portrays “die Biographie einer ganzen Generation” [the biography of a whole generation]. In contrast, Jens Hoffmann, Heinz Ohff and K. Offers all claim that Maschmann stands apart from those of her generation as “ein Sonderfall von Fanatismus” [a special case of fanaticism]. She was not therefore, they claim, representative of her contemporaries, most of whom were “zutiefst apolitisch” [deeply apolitical]. The majority of these reviewers are male and, significantly, their arguments refuting the claims to generic experience are not based on gender. Instead, these reviewers are more inclined to follow Maschmann’s own constructions of gender, reiterating the imposed masculinization of her story through comparisons with Eichmann and Rudolf Höss. Similarly, the appeal to Maschmann’s female contemporaries is not raised by any of the reviews and, as Elizabeth Harvey has pointed out, when the text was first published it was rejected by Maschmann’s former peers from the BDM. They dismissed the text for telling “Wild-West-Geschichte” [wild West stories] and read it as putting Jewish experience of persecution and the involvement of the BDM at the forefront of the narrative (2006). As can be seen from the above analysis, I would disagree that Maschmann’s text does this in any way, rather that it marginalizes those very aspects it claims to confront.

Yet the origin of much of the heated criticism in the press about the original publication of Maschmann’s text is not rooted in its treatment, or lack of treatment, of the Holocaust – few of the reviewers mention its marginalization within the narrative. They focus instead on the institutional importance attributed to a text which they read as

perpetuating fascist language. Offers, for example, questions why the North Rhein Westphalian office of education is disseminating the text without comment and Tauchel questions why a well respected publishing house like the Deutsche Verlagsanstalt Stuttgart is publishing a text which he considers belongs "auf den geistigen Schrotthaufen" [on the intellectual scrap heap].

Notwithstanding the dichotomized reaction to the 1963 edition, the text was viewed positively enough to be translated and republished several times. In 1964 Abelard Schuman published the English translation with the title *Account Rendered: A Dossier on My Former Self*; a title which encapsulates a belief in the successful distancing of the protagonist from her past. In contrast, the French title, *Ma jeunesse au service du nazisme* [My youth in the service of Nazism], emphasizes instead both youth and subservience. The 1979 edition published by dtv contained critical concluding remarks by Helga Grebing who, whilst analysing the "psychischen Deformationen" [psychic deformities] of the text, still maintains the importance of its publication (Maschmann 1979, 248). Grebing and Heinrich Böll are two of several reviewers who believe that the significance of the text is encapsulated in the revelation of the superficiality and contradictoriness of Nazi ideology, that its authenticity "besteht darin, daß die Sprache gar keine authentische Auskunft zuläßt" [can be found in the fact that the language does not allow for any authentic information] (Böll 1967, 228).

Conclusion: Critical Historiography

There have been few published texts written by women implicated in the Nazi regime (Böltken 1995), although recent academic work has given an increased insight into the role women such as Maschmann played in Eastern Europe (Harvey 2003). In this context, the appeals to Maschmann's contemporaries in *Fazit* are suggestive of a continued claim to represent this 'silent generation' (Reese 1995, 240; Dischner 1984; Niethammer 1996, 100). This, and the repeated publication of her story, give a certain authority to her version of events. Indeed, in any attempt to understand the past and to discover why so many young people followed Nazism, it is arguably necessary "to study the guilty" (Adorno [1963] 1998, 199). As Lotte Paepcke, a Jewish author and reviewer of Maschmann's text, writes:

Wenn das Wort von der Bewältigung einen Sinn haben soll, so ist es hier anzuwenden. Denn zu bewältigen haben wir nicht nur ein Etwas, das in der Vergangenheit getan wurde oder geschah; zu bewältigen haben wir einander: der eine den andern, so wie er war und heute ist. Zu bewältigen haben wir nicht ein vergangenes, abgeschlossenes "Es", von dem wir uns mehr und mehr entfernen, und das immer mehr zu neutraler Historie wird. Nein, wir haben zu fragen nach uns selbst: nach mir, nach Ihnen und nach jedem Dritten, mit dem wir es zu tun haben. Und Melita Maschmann ist ein Mitmensch, der sich uns stellt und sagt: "so war ich, so wurde ich, so bin ich heute". Deshalb, ob es uns leichtfällt oder nicht: wir sind verpflichtet, sie zu hören. (1963, 49)

If the word[s] 'coming to terms' [with the past] are to make any sense at all, then we should apply them here. We do not simply have to come terms with something that was done in the past or that happened, we have to come to terms with one another: the one with the other, as he was and still is today. We do not have to come to terms with a past "something", something which is over and which we are leaving further and further behind and that is more and more turning into neutral history. No, we have to put questions to ourselves; to ask about me, about you and about every third party with whom we have something to do. And Melita Maschmann is a fellow human being, who presents herself to us and says: "This is what I was, what I became, and what I am today". Therefore whether we find it easy or not: we are obliged to listen to her.

Paepcke's review is generally positive, and she comes to the conclusion that Maschmann's narrative contains a credible representation of the protagonist's "Loslösung vom Nationalsozialismus" [detachment from National Socialism] (1963, 49). The need to listen that Paepcke advocates requires that the perpetrators, too, have "einen historischen Erinnerungsraum" [a historical space to remember] (Kuhn 1994b, 25). The publication of Maschmann's text gave her memories, with their inherent contradictions and emphases, precisely such a space. When the text was republished in 1979, it was in a context where secondary literature defending the Hitler Youth was much more common (Klönne 1984, 292). In the intervening sixteen years, narratives of German victimhood had become more entrenched in hegemonic discourse in West Germany, aided by the international political constellations of the Cold War. As both the extremely critical element of the reception of *Fazit* and the analysis in this chapter have shown, such narratives displace other ways of remembering the past. The historical studies on the BDM and the Hitler Youth which have since used Maschmann's narrative uncritically in their reconstructions of the past, have further established the status of the text as an authentic documentary source (see Goldhagen 1999, 88-89; Klönne 1984, 128; Kinz 1990). Literary analyses have begun to reconsider the autobiography, but usually as part of a wider study of female perpetrators (see Seiler, 1994;

Schaumann 1999; Martin, 2000). While Maschmann's text explicitly states that it is not "eine vollständige Analyse des Nationalsozialismus" [a complete analysis of National Socialism], separating itself from the work of historians (241), its simultaneous claims to truth and completeness override the constructed nature of the text. In their appropriation of Maschmann's narrative, historical texts often make no mention of the fact that it was written by someone trained in the BDM in the skills of "rhetorische[r] Ausdruckskraft" [rhetoric] (Kinz 1990, 259), and who spent several years producing articles for the *Ostdeutscher Beobachter* and *Das deutsche Mädel*, which were "beispielhaft für die damalige Propaganda über die Rolle der Jugend im *Volkstumskampf*" [exemplary for the propaganda about the role of youth in the *ethnic struggle* prevalent at that time] (Harvey 2006). Whether the author intended it or not, it seems that Nazi propaganda was so inherently ingrained that it pervaded a text written nearly twenty years after the end of Nazism. The 'total' Nazi worldview, revolving around the principles of "Rasse-Gemeinschaft-Führer" [race-community-leader] (Kinz 1990, 90), is thus deeply embedded within the narrative, notwithstanding numerous narratorial claims to the contrary. Complex and competing narratives of generation, 'race', class, nation and gender, expressed through the appeal to different individuals and groups, illustrate that Maschmann's *Fazit* remains worthy of in-depth literary analysis and of critical use within historical education.

5. Clarity and Insight: Greta Kuckhoff's Memories of Resistance in *Vom Rosenkranz zur Roten Kapelle*

Members of Greta Kuckhoff's resistance group were arrested in September 1942. At this point she saw for the first time that she was part of a large group of anti-Nazis who had resisted for a multitude of political and religious reasons. Many of this group, including her husband, were executed five months later. Collectively condemned as Communists and traitors by the Gestapo, they were labelled the 'Rote Kapelle' [Red Orchestra], a name designed to emphasize a connection to the Soviet Union. Greta Kuckhoff began writing autobiographical articles about her experiences of resistance and imprisonment in the immediate post-war period, but it was not until 1972 that her autobiography of some four hundred pages was first published in East Germany. While there are many historical studies on the circle of resisters to which Greta Kuckhoff belonged, there are no literary investigations of her autobiography. In this chapter I will consider how shifts in the contemporary reception of resistance facilitated the publication of Kuckhoff's memories of her fight against the fascist system. I will examine the controversy surrounding her resistance group, focusing on how the text from 1972 engages with prevalent discourses about the Nazi past and negotiates issues of resistance and betrayal. Concentrating on the pivotal themes of class, gender and 'race', this analysis will explore how narrative tensions arise between a unifying teleological interpretation of the past and a gendered multiplicity of voices.

Born on 14 December 1902 in Frankfurt an der Oder, Greta Lorke grew up in a Catholic lower-middle-class family. Her father worked as a carpenter and her mother as a seamstress. During the economic depression of the 1920s her father was made redundant. In 1927, after studying for a degree in economics, Greta went to North America for two years to continue her university studies. On her return she became involved in the resistance activities of the 'Rote Kapelle' from 1933, a group which was involved in collecting evidence of Nazi atrocities, producing antifascist leaflets and supporting victims of the Nazi regime. She married the dramatist and novelist Adam Kuckhoff in 1937 and a year later gave birth to a son, Ule. Following their arrests Greta Kuckhoff was also sentenced to death but, for reasons which are unclear, her sentence was commuted to ten years imprisonment. She was freed by the Red Army in May 1945. She lived in East Germany,

becoming president of the East German national bank between 1950 and 1958. She died on 11 November 1981.

Vom Rosenkranz zur Roten Kapelle: ein Lebensbericht [From the Rosary to the Red Orchestra: A Life-Story] was published by Verlag Neues Leben with an initial print run of eight thousand. It was subsequently reprinted several times, with ninety thousand copies being produced by 1979. The autobiography was also published in West Germany by the left-wing Röderberg-Verlag in 1974.¹ The text tells the story of the protagonist's childhood, young adulthood, and subsequent participation in the resistance group. The text comprises one continuous narrative with no chapter divisions or headings, thus emphasizing the significance of the title. As indicated by the sub-title, the movement "Vom Rosenkranz zur Roten Kapelle" refers to the protagonist's personal development. This succinct teleological prolepsis suggests a linear progression of the protagonist's identity. In referring to the 'Rote Kapelle', the title situates the text within a highly contested field of memories about resistance to the fascist system. Numerous historians have pointed to the problematic appropriation of the Nazi terminology in descriptions of the group, given its tendency to unify what was in fact disparate and to emphasize the resisters' connection to the Soviet Union (Steinbach 1995a; Tuchel 1998, 269; Danyel 1994a, 14). These elements should be borne in mind during the discussion of how the text portrays the relationships within the resistance group. It is my contention that the narrative indicates a more diverse picture than that suggested by the connotations of the title. Given that Kuckhoff herself once expressed her reluctance to use the name 'Rote Kapelle' (1948, 60) the reference to it could have been an attempt by the publisher to alter the associations that the readers had with the name, while at the same time exploiting the prominence it enjoyed in public consciousness. Alternatively, Kuckhoff may have come to the same conclusion as another surviving group member, Leopold Trepper, who asserts: "Den Namen 'Rote Kapelle' gab uns die Gestapo. Wir haben ihn als Ehrennamen übernommen. Denn 'Rot' steht für das Blut, das unsere Mitkämpfer geopfert haben" [The Gestapo gave us the name 'Red Orchestra'. We adopted it as a name of honour, for 'Red' stands for the blood that our fellow fighters sacrificed] (1975, 14).

Despite the claim of the subtitle that the autobiography is "a life-story", the main narrative ends in 1945 with the protagonist's

¹ Unless otherwise stated all quotations refer to this edition and appropriate page numbers follow within the text. All translations are my own.

liberation, thus suggesting that the preceding circumstances were the foundation for everything that followed. While the narrative does manage to escape the temporal boundaries of the time after 1945 through interventions of the voice of the narrating present, this voice narrates from a position detailing a life as a complete entity. The adult narrator continually examines and interprets the memories described, relating their content to the contemporary context of the 1970s.

Although not divided into chapters, the text is separable into two distinct parts, the first of which culminates in the protagonist's decision to join the resistance in 1933. A progression to this point in the protagonist's life is marked explicitly by the voice of the narrating present. Within this first part, the protagonist becomes a narrator within her own story. The resulting layers of narration and the thematization of issues of telling, listening and seeing will be examined to show how the narrative constructs a specific understanding of the events of the past.

Elements of Childhood: The Voice of the Young Narrator

The text begins in 1927 with the protagonist's departure, aged twenty-five, for North America. The physical distancing from her parents and Germany instigates a parallel journey into her past. As a catalyst for the revelation of childhood memories and memories of the recent past, the journey to America provides the framework not only for a description by the young protagonist of her early life, but also for its attendant interpretation by the voice of the narrating present. Prompted by a meeting with a rich, elderly gentleman, Mr. Gerald, the young narrator begins to tell him about episodes from her childhood. These episodes highlight contrasts between his world and hers, while simultaneously accentuating certain character traits of the young protagonist.

Mr. Gerald listens to descriptions of the protagonist's recent education and of the "Erwerb [eines] Negerjungen" [purchase of a negro boy] (18). The first of these describes the protagonist's recognition that she had attempted to study economics without being aware of the contemporary situation surrounding her, "als gäbe es keine Arbeiterunruhen in Wien – keine Kampfmaßnahmen in Deutschland für den Achtstundentag und für höhere Löhne" [as if there was no worker unrest in Vienna, no struggle in Germany for the eight-hour day and for higher wages] (16). The second episode emphasizes the protagonist's hardworking, self-disciplined nature.

The narrator tells of how, as a young girl, she wanted to ‘buy’ a black child to live with her family, having misunderstood that the church was instead collecting money to buy the child free from work so that she or he could attend school. Alongside a misplaced tenacity, the young girl’s “eingeborener Widerstandsgeist” [innate spirit of resistance] (89) becomes prominent:

Ich hatte wenig Einkünfte [...]. Außerdem mußte ich auch noch um die Klippe rumkommen und das Geld nicht in den Schlitz stecken, wodurch im “Weltpanorama” die schönsten Bilder vor mein Auge ruckten [sic], ein Vergnügen, auf das zu verzichten meine ganze Charakterstärke nötig war. Ich hatte ein Ziel. Ich widerstand. (18-19)

I had little income [...]. Besides, I also had to overcome all obstacles and not put my money into the slot machine to make the most beautiful pictures of a “world panorama” move before my eyes; the sacrifice of this pleasure demanded my entire strength of character. I had an aim. I resisted.

The voice of the young adult narrator merges with the perspective of the child through both direct and reported speech, emphasizing the naive determination of the young girl:

“Klappt es noch bis Weihnachten? Es soll eine Überraschung sein für die Mutter!” Er [der Pfarrer] zog wortlos seinen großen Atlas aus dem Bücherschrank. Er zeigte mir, welche Reise das Kind aus dem heißen Land über warme und immer kältere Meere würde machen müssen [...]. Er sagte auch, daß eine solche Reise sehr teuer wäre. Aber hatte ich denn nicht reichlich Geld hingeschüttet? Er lachte nicht darüber. (20)

“Can we manage it by Christmas? It is supposed to be a surprise for my mother!” The vicar wordlessly took his large atlas from the shelf. He showed me the journey that the child from the warm climates would have to make over warm, and increasingly colder, seas. He also said that such a journey would be very expensive. But hadn’t I poured in enough money? He didn’t laugh.

Episodes such as this from the protagonist’s childhood stress her independent and head-strong behaviour, epitomized by her rejection of the “Gebote der Kirche” [commandments of the church] (5). Her parents’ strong Catholic beliefs are dismissed by the protagonist, although little narrative space is devoted to the rejection encapsulated in the title. A critical voice of the young narrator considers how the protagonist is telling her story, with the young focalizer becoming her own addressee: “Meine Gute, so ungern hörst du nicht, daß du ein originelles, einfallsreiches Kind gewesen bist” [My goodness, don’t you like hearing that you were an original and inventive child!] (17). Such self-mockery brings to the fore questions about the process of

retrospective interpretation, one of several occasions within the text when the process of remembering is thematized.

As a passenger from the first-class deck of the ship, Mr. Gerald represents a way of life alien to the protagonist. Their discussion highlights tensions within the protagonist's life relating to class differences, these being symbolized by the strict class divisions on board. Through the protagonist's descent into the body of the ship, the text positions her both as someone belonging to the 'lower-classes' and as someone who subsequently transgresses imposed boundaries through her acquaintance with Mr. Gerald. The latter is portrayed as someone who is incapable of understanding the young protagonist's situation, as someone who has never had to worry about where the next month's rent was coming from. In the stories that the protagonist tells Mr. Gerald there are repeated contrasts between the perceived injustices of the lives of her parents and overt demonstrations of wealth, for example, stories of her mother waiting on tables where caviar, frogs legs and other luxuries were conspicuously consumed. Recognition of these economic disparities gives rise to defensive indignation, expressed through the young narrator's rhetorical questions: "[W]arum zum Teufel mußte bei soviel Verschwendung jeder Arbeiter einzeln zum 'Herrn' gehen, wenn er zwei Pfennige mehr Stundenlohn haben wollte?" [Why, for goodness sake, when there was such waste, did every worker have to go individually to the 'boss' if he wanted a pay rise of a few pennies?] (22) The protagonist's subsequent political development is shown to be very much rooted within these early feelings of dissatisfaction.

The Voice of the Present Narrator as Interpreter of the Past

The protagonist's character traits, the familial stories and the awareness of economic disputes are described and interpreted through the voice of the young narrating protagonist. In addition, the voice of the narrating present elucidates these memories further. For example, the young narrator states repeatedly that such episodes were not told with an attempt to discover their profundity; yet, it is simultaneously reiterated by the voice of the adult narrator that many of these positive childlike qualities, the "Grundelemente" [fundamental elements] (18), were the prerequisites for what was to follow. The importance of these qualities, the narrator claims, was not however recognized by the young protagonist due to her insufficient comprehension of events happening around her at that time: "Ich wollte die Welt verändern,

aber ich hatte keinen festen Standort, von dem aus ein Weg, und wäre er noch so beschwerlich, zu einem erkennbaren Ziel begehbar geworden wäre” [I wanted to change the world but did not have a firm basis from which a path, no matter how arduous, would have led to a recognisable aim] (28-29). The necessary foundations for the critical stance, the cornerstones of Marxism, are introduced through an omniscient, programmatic textual voice which merges with that of the adult focalizer:

Verallgemeinerungen kommen aus dem Studium konkreter Verhältnisse. Eine zielgerichtete Überzeugungsarbeit verlangt beides, die Fähigkeit zu nüchterner Analyse und zu gültiger Verallgemeinerung. Daß ein Drittes dazugehört: Parteilichkeit, habe ich damals noch nicht erkannt. (13)

Generalizations are the result of studying concrete situations. Targeted efforts at persuasion demand both the ability for sober analysis and for valid generalisation. At that time I had not yet realized that a third element was also necessary: partisanship.

Following the teleology of Kuckhoff's title, the text frequently uses the metaphor of a journey to mark the progression of the protagonist's political ideas: “Von der Ablehnung der Unterdrückung, der Ungerechtigkeit, von Kolonialismus und Krieg bis zum Kampf um die Befreiung der Arbeiterklasse war auch jetzt noch ein langer Weg” [It was also still a long way to go from the rejection of oppression, of injustice, of colonialism and war to the fight for the liberation of the working-class] (40). Through the familial memories, the voice of the narrating present thus emphasizes the tenets of the adult protagonist's socialist beliefs.

During the protagonist's time in America and journey back to Germany the initial emphases on the current standpoint from which the narrator can “correctly” interpret these past experiences are reiterated through images of sight. At many stages within the first part of the text, the narrator examines whether the protagonist had “ein[e] klar[e] Zielstellung” [a clear aim] (38), equating naivety with blindness and setting both against a progressively clearer vision, against episodes which are “einleuchtend” [illuminating] (77). Many references to future events describe the protagonist's political development, a development which ultimately enables her to draw “die richtigen Schlußfolgerungen” [the correct conclusions] (163).

The memories of the protagonist's time in North America underline contradictions already highlighted in the early memories, containing contrasts of rich and poor no less stark than those on the

divided ship. An international dimension is accorded to her experiences with the things she sees being part of the “Weltprobleme” [world’s problems] (93). When she finally reaches “das gelobte Land” [the promised land] (43), the protagonist is confronted by many competing images, the multiplicity of which is conveyed through a kaleidoscope of narrative viewpoints. Mirroring the diversity of the new impressions, the narrative lingers only briefly on these descriptions, which are implicitly linked through their textual proximity:

Die ersten Tage in New York [...] brachten mir [...] neue Entdeckungen [...]. Kinopaläste und Schaufenster mit Auslagen von nie gesehener Pracht. Vom Wind schon zerfleddert, hingen hier und dort, vor allem in Klein-Italien und Harlem, Plakate, die noch zur Solidarität mit Sacco und Vanzetti aufforderten. Kurze Zeit zuvor, ehe wir im Hafen anlegten, hatte man die unschuldigen Opfer der Klassenjustiz auf dem elektrischen Stuhl festgeschnallt. [...] Die Freiheitsstatue hatte die italienischen Arbeiter bei ihrer Einwanderung in die USA im Jahre 1908 begrüßt. [...] Die Gedanken rissen ab ... Es gab so vieles zu sehen und zu hören [...]. (43)

The first days in New York [...] brought me [...] new discoveries. Cinemas and shop windows with displays of previously unseen splendour. Posters, already torn by the wind, hung here and there, particularly in Little Italy and Harlem, and continued to demand solidarity with Sacco and Vanzetti. A short time earlier, before we had docked in the harbour, these innocent victims of class justice had been fastened into the electric chair [...]. The statue of liberty had greeted these Italian workers on their emmigration to the USA in 1908 [...]. My thoughts broke off... There was so much to see and hear [...].

The protagonist’s physical displacement in North America is paralleled by repeated temporal displacement through the voice of the narrating present: in addition to the consolidation of *past* experience by the present narrator, there is also some intimation within the first part of the text to *future* events. References to the future narrated time of Nazism, to the post-war situation and to the contemporary context of the 1970s in the GDR are linked within little textual space, thus stressing their interconnectedness:

Daß dieses Problem der Rassendiskriminierung nach fast einem halben Jahrhundert noch immer nicht gelöst ist, daß in den USA noch immer darum gekämpft werden muß, daß alle Kinder gleiche Ausbildungsmöglichkeiten erhalten und auch entsprechend ihrem Wissen und Können Arbeit finden – damals hätte ich das nie geglaubt, nie geahnt, daß wir eine internationale Solidaritätsbewegung für die kluge und mutige schwarze Kommunistin Angela Davis und für viele Opfer des Terrors in den USA wüßten entfachen müssen. Allerdings hätte ich es für noch unglaubwürdiger gehalten, hätte mir jemand vorausgesagt, daß in meinem eigenen Vaterland, in dem faschistischen

Deutschen Reich Rassenhaß und –vernichtung wie eine Seuche wüten, der Millionen zum Opfer fallen würden. (49)

That this problem of racial discrimination has still not been solved after almost half a century, that in the USA there is still a struggle to enable all children have the same opportunities and can find work according to their knowledge and ability – at that time, I would never have believed, or suspected, that we would have to instigate an international movement of solidarity for the wise and courageous black Communist Angela Davis and for many victims of terror in the USA. Though I would also have found it more impossible to believe, had someone predicted that in my own country, in the fascist German Reich, racist hatred and racist destruction would rage like a plague and claim millions of victims.

In linking different spatial and temporal contexts in this way, individual experience is placed within a wider historical framework. The protagonist identifies, through the use of the first-person plural, with the later GDR state. The experience of America emphasizes the barbaric results of class and racial discrimination through reference to the Holocaust. These allusions to Nicola Sacco, Bartholomeo Vanzetti and Angela Davis are followed by references to the protagonist's own individual fight against the fascist system, to her arrest and imprisonment. These initial references to future struggles, aligned as they are in the first part of the text with the programmatic claims of the present narrating voice, reinforce the origins of the resistance and place it within the wider context of the protagonist's socialist beliefs. That both these beliefs and the protagonist's resistance to the prevailing conditions predate Nazism is made explicit through the description of the protagonist's journey home. On her departure, the protagonist travels on "ein gutes Einheitsklassen-Touristenschiff" [on a good single-class tourist ship] (88), with both the ship and the weather – October sun rather than oppressive fog of the earlier journey – representing a clarity of purpose and a more determined awareness of her political point of view. On reading Lenin's *Staat und Revolution* she concludes: "Welch Vergnügen, dunkel empfundene Ansichten plötzlich theoretisch und historisch klar begründet als für die weitere Entwicklung der Menschheit bedeutsam zu erkennen" [What a pleasure it was to find vague, half-articulated opinions suddenly clearly founded both theoretically and historically and to recognize them as being important for the future development of humankind] (88). The temporal and spatial journey home is thus accompanied by an intellectual one.

Resistance to Fascism

While the narration slows down in the second part of the text, representing the fact that this period is the main focus of the protagonist's life-story, references to the future increase. References are made more frequently to both the end of the war and the contemporary context of the 1970s. In addition, it is within this second part that tensions within the programmatic political maxims become apparent, that the voice of the narrative present links the GDR state with the antifascist struggle, and that contemporary discourses on remembering the past are engaged with.

At no point does the narrator refute the overt political statements of the first part of the text, statements which signpost the compressed narration of the protagonist's life until 1933. What becomes obvious, however, is that there are certain gendered tensions with this overarching political teleology. As with the protagonist's socialist orientation, the origin of these tensions is seen in examples drawn from the protagonist's early life, and they become increasingly more prominent.

The text begins with the protagonist's non-adherence to contemporary gender expectations. The journey to North America represents an independent act, with her father's disapproval of the trip reflecting a more general disapproval of his daughter. His expectations are examined through a distancing third-person perspective:

Er hatte sich das Leben seiner Tochter so ganz anders gedacht: mit dem schönen Beruf der Lehrerin, mit einem gescheitern Mann und zwei, drei gesunden, rotbäckigen Kindern, die er lieben wollte, die ihn lieben würden. Eigentlich war der Traum schon lange in rissige Stücke zerfallen. Dieses Mädchen, das so sanft aussah, fügte sich nicht. (5)

He had imagined the life of his daughter quite differently – with the nice job of teacher, with an intelligent husband and two or three healthy, rosy-cheeked children, whom he would love and who would love him in return. Actually, the dream had disintegrated long ago. This girl, who looked so sweet, would not obey.

Despite the rejection of her father's aspirations, the protagonist cannot completely dismiss him from her thoughts, as is shown by his continual presence in the stories told to Mr. Gerald. However, the physical distance between the protagonist and her father while she is in America, and her refusal to meet his expectations, are mirrored on a textual level in his absence from much of the following story.

In focusing on family life through childhood memories, the narrator considers the position of women around her, especially those who, she claims, surely had wanted a greater degree of education than was permissible and who would instead become “gute Ehefrauen und Mütter und aufopferungsbereite Schwestern” [good wives and mothers and self-sacrificing sisters] (28). In the assertion that the protagonist would have studied architecture if she had been male, and through the description of the dismissive treatment of the female students by the rector of the Friedrich-Wilhelm University in Berlin, sexist attitudes are shown to pervade education. From an initial focus on the protagonist’s own immediate educational and familial experience, the narrative perspective then widens to talk of a universal struggle by both the bourgeois and proletarian women’s movements. A link is repeatedly made between sexism of the familial and public spheres and class struggle, once again equating individual and collective experience through the motif of sight:

Diese Familienharmonie täuschte eine Gesellschaftsharmonie vor, die ein falsches Weltbild förderte, in dem Gedanken wie die vom Klassenkampfcharakter der Geschichte keine Wurzeln schlagen konnten. Wie sehr der Blick durch all diese Umstände getrübt wurde, so daß es zu keiner klaren Einsicht in die meiner Klasse gebührende historische Rolle kam! (28)

This family harmony feigned a societal harmony, which promoted an incorrect understanding of the world, where thoughts like those about the class struggle in history could not take root. How greatly one’s vision was distorted by all these circumstances, so that it was not possible to reach a clear insight about the proper historical role of one’s class!

The protagonist’s refusal of her familial role at a stage when, according to the text’s teleology, her political ideals had not yet been clarified, and its emphatic position at the start of the narrative, suggests an overriding importance of these gender issues. Significantly, however, such discussion precedes, or occurs outside, the realms of conversation with Mr. Gerald. Such a lack of communication about these issues is mirrored by the protagonist’s inability to explain to her father “was er falsch gemacht [hat]” [what he had done wrong], and why “alles, was ihm teuer [ist], von [ihr] in Frage gestellt wurde” [she was questioning everything that was dear to him] (6). Such major initial absences relating to gender in discussions with these two father figures are significant when the protagonist’s relationships to other male figures of authority later in the text are considered.

Through the interpretation of memories of the protagonist's childhood and teenage years by the voice of the narrating present, a claim to the possibility of achieving gender equality is made through the protagonist's political philosophy, which "kämpfte für die volle Befreiung der werktätigen Frauen durch den Sturz des Kapitalismus und den Sieg des Sozialismus" [fought for the liberation of working women by overthrowing capitalism and the victory of socialism] (9). The gendered reality of capitalism is highlighted through the portrayal of the almost entirely female workforce at the Ford factory during the industrial rationalization of the 1920s. The narrative takes up the theme of not only the inequality of pay and working hours, but also the hazardous working conditions, both of which are set against the possibilities of female liberation through socialism. Nevertheless, when the depiction of resistance to the fascist system is considered, a depiction which shows the protagonist's immediate circle of friends adhering to the same political beliefs as she does, gendered tensions remain. The following section will analyse how the narrative emphasizes the importance of women in the resistance, how it describes the protagonist's decision to resist, and how tensions with male members of the group are portrayed.

One of the first references to Nazism is within a portrait of Mildred Harnack, whom the protagonist meets in America. It is one of several connections to the future in the early part of the narrative which serve to juxtapose the description of young, enthusiastic idealists and their subsequent horrific experiences under the fascist dictatorship. Emphasizing connections already made between the class system, capitalism and female suffering, many of these first references to the future describe the experiences of women. Tension is heightened through a comparison of their lives before 1933 with their later participation in the resistance to fascism and the brutality of the system's reaction. Mildred Harnack's execution after the intervention of Hitler (he changed her sentence from imprisonment to death) represents a particularly horrific episode and is set against an emphasis on Mildred's love of Germany. Given her American citizenship, Mildred's death not only reiterates the connections made to the protagonist's own American experiences, but also signifies the breadth of resistance to fascism and exemplifies a belief in the possibilities of an international socialism. Within the narrative as a whole, there are many such individualized descriptions, focusing on the characters' backgrounds and subsequent involvement with resistance. The majority of these descriptions focus on some of the forty women of the group, thus emphasising how numerous they were

in this resistance cell; for example, Liesel Paxmann, Libertas Schulze-Boysen, Hilde Coppi, Cato Bontjes van Beek, Martel Husemann, Anna Krause, Ilse Schaeffer, Ilse Stöbe, Elisabeth Schumacher, Eva Maria Buch, Erika von Brockdorff, Käthe Tucholla and Laine Berkowitz. In fact, women comprised nearly forty percent of the total membership (Foitzik 1994, 69). By giving primacy to the stories of these women in the first references to resistance, the text commemorates those who died and emphasizes the danger of the work both they, and the protagonist, were involved in. When the protagonist is arrested on 12 September 1942 she draws strength from the other women in the prison, many of whom, she subsequently discovers, were also members of her organisation. In accentuating the women's participation, the text at the same time points to the protagonist's initial lack of knowledge about others involved with the resistance. This is significant as it contradicts depictions of the group, including that in one of the most widely read West German historiographies on the 'Rote Kapelle' by Heinz Höhne (1970), which present the resisters as a unified, co-ordinated whole.

The present narrator marks the protagonist's admission to the circle of resistance with Adam Kuckhoff's "Ultimatum" (116). He demands of her "ein Bekenntnis zu den Weisungen der Kommunistischen Partei" [a declaration of belief in the directives of the Communist Party] (125) and a willingness to participate in the political struggle. The significance of the decision she makes is shown textually through the separation of eleven pages from the narrative. That this section begins "Wir waren also wieder einmal soweit" [so, we had once again arrived at this point] (116) and ends "Jetzt war es *endlich* soweit" [it had *finally* come to this] (127), reinforces both the importance attached to the event and the sense of reaching a psychological marker. Her agreement is shown through her meeting him at the Kaiser-Wilhelm-Gedächtnis-Kirche. The physical setting reinforces the decision made to stay in Germany to fight against Nazism, rather than go into exile. It is a decision which, the narrator earlier stresses, was an inevitable, unequivocal conclusion to past events, and which necessitated her return to Germany from a research trip to London. It is also a decision which Kuckhoff has reiterated and defended in her other writing (1948, 30). Nonetheless, in *Vom Rosenkranz* the amount of textual space devoted to the episode suggests longer deliberation.

A stream of rhetorical questions by the present adult narrator precedes the description of the protagonist's acquiescence to Adam Kuckhoff's demand. These questions epitomize tensions within her

decision, which recur later in the narrative and destabilize the certainty of the dogmatic teleological assertions of the first part of the text:

Die Liebe zwischen Adam und mir, die mich selbst so aus der Tiefe des Lebensgrundes gepackt hatte, durfte sie, konnte sie von meiner politischen Entscheidung, vom Grad meiner Handlungsbereitschaft abhängig gemacht werden? Was eigentlich machte mir die endgültige Entscheidung so schwer? War mein Weg bis hierher nicht mit Meilensteinen wohlverstanden gewesen? Hatte es nicht ausreichend Wegweiser gegeben? Da mir das eigene Ziel nicht klar war, verstand ich die Wegweiser nicht zu lesen. Da stand: Klassenkampf, Marxismus, Leninismus, Kommunistische Partei Deutschlands und Komintern. Und ich guckte mir die Augen aus nach: Gerechtigkeit, Freiheit und Menschenwürde für alle. So blieb ich auf der Suche, obwohl die Wegweiser schließlich so dicht standen, daß man sie kaum übersehen konnte. [...] Mußte der Mann, den ich liebte, jetzt drängend sagen: Muß es eigentlich noch härter kommen, damit du weißt, wohin du gehörst? Wenn etwas an dir dran ist, entscheide dich! [...] Warum wehrte ich mich eigentlich so lange gerade Adam gegenüber? Ich wollte doch gefordert werden. (125-26)

Could the love between Adam and I, which had so taken me by surprise, be made to depend on my political decision, on the degree of my preparedness to act? What actually made the final decision so difficult for me? Hadn't my path up until now been well provided with way-markers? Hadn't there been sufficient signs? As my own aim wasn't clear to me I didn't know how to read the signs, on which stood: class struggle, Marxism, Leninism, Communist party, Comintern. And I was looking for: justice, freedom, dignity for all. So I carried on searching although the signs were finally so close that I could hardly miss them. [...] Did the man I loved now urgently have to say: Does it have to get any worse before you know where you belong? If you've got anything about you, then decide! [...] Why did I actually struggle for so long against Adam, of all people? I had wanted to be challenged.

The voice of the narrating present is juxtaposed with the husband's prescriptive, rhetorical questions, thus highlighting their opposing ways of thinking. Tensions between the protagonist's doubts and this exacting viewpoint are not resolved, despite her succumbing to Adam Kuckhoff's ultimatum. It is thus emphasized that it was Adam Kuckhoff who persuaded Greta into taking a political decision. The depiction of these events is significant not only within Kuckhoff's narrative itself, but also in their further divergence from Höhne's text. He maintains that Greta Kuckhoff was called back to Germany by the Communist party, although she was not, in fact, a member at this time. Höhne therefore portrays the gender hierarchy of the Kuckhoffs' relationship in very different terms, insisting that it was Greta who helped Adam out of his "ideologischen Schwierigkeiten" [ideological difficulties] (Höhne 1970, 147-48) and introduced him to conspirative work. Höhne's divergent description is part of his attempt to cast the

members of the resistance group as experienced Soviet agents and to suggest a continued threat to Western interests in the 1970s, through Greta Kuckhoff, within the context of the Cold War.

When the protagonist begins her resistance work of proof-reading illegal flyers and acting as a courier for Adam Kuckhoff and Arvid Harnack in 1933, these gendered tensions do not dissipate. They are conveyed in the narrative through the juxtaposition of the authoritarian tone with which these men dictate her behaviour and discussion in which the narrator rails against such demands. Ultimately, the protagonist does accede to their requests, albeit with reluctance:

“Spaziere einfach durch die Straßen, such [sic] dir eine Frau, die sich unauffällig, aber gut anzuziehen versteht. Was tut sie? Bleibt sie vor Läden – vor welchen? – stehen. An wen geht sie heran, wenn sie zum Beispiel wissen möchte, wo eine Straße ist, in der sie noch nicht war? Oder geht sie lieber in ein Café und breitet dort gelassen den Stadtplan aus? Vielleicht hilft es dir, wenn du dir vorstellst, du solltest mir aus dem Stegreif Szenen aus dem Bürgerlichen [sic] Leben vorspielen, weil du als Schauspielerin oder wenigstens als Statistin in meinem Theater engagiert werden möchtest”. Also meinem Geschmack entsprach das Ganze nicht! Hatte ich mich nicht in Florenz, New York, London und Zürich wie ein “normaler” Mensch, eine junge Frau, nicht ohne Anmut – und, was jetzt nötig war, ohne aufzufallen, bewegt? [...] Damals sah ich es nicht recht ein – das Gelernte erwies sich erst später als nützlich. (128-30)

“Walk through the streets and look for a woman who knows how to dress well but inconspicuously. What does she do? Does she stop at shops – which ones? Who does she go up to if she wants to know, for example, where a street is that she hasn’t been to before? Or does she prefer to go into a café and unhurriedly spread the map out there? Perhaps it would help you if you imagine that you are performing impromptu scenes from bourgeois life for me because you want to be taken on as an actress, or at least as an extra, in my theatre”. None of this was to *my* taste! Hadn’t I moved around Florence, New York, London and Zurich like a “normal” person, a young woman, not without charm, and, as was now necessary, without being noticed? At that time I didn’t realize the value of it– what I learnt only proved to be useful later on.

While the narrator on this occasion reconciles the usefulness of such demands in retrospect, the present narrating voice does not refrain from criticizing decisions that it considers to be wrong. Similarly, the narrator chafes against the repeated “Lektion in Fragen des konspirativen Verhaltens” [lessons in conspiratorial behaviour] (203), pointing to episodes when the protagonist’s behaviour proved to be more appropriate for the situation. When the question of her assisting Jewish victims by giving them English lessons to help them emigrate is considered, the text demonstrates a split within the group of resisters as to the aims they were working towards. The protagonist’s

intention of providing immediate practical help for those persecuted is seen, by the men of the group, as subordinate to the wider aim of defeating fascism:

Mein Mann betonte immer wieder, daß es für alle Verfolgten nur eine wirkliche Hilfe gebe: den Nationalsozialismus, das Hitlerregime so schnell wie möglich zu stürzen. Einzelaktionen, mochten sie noch so großherzig sein, brachten dem einen oder anderen Trost und dem eigenen Gewissen eine scheinbare Entlastung. Ein großes Herz zeige nur der, der das Herz als starke Schwester des Kopfes einsetzte: Es ging um die vollständige Ausrottung der Nazi-Ideologie und ihrer Herrschaft, um nichts weniger! (233)

My husband kept on emphasizing that there was only one real way to help all those being persecuted: to topple National Socialism, the Hitler regime, as quickly as possible. Individual acts, however magnanimous, only brought comfort to someone or other and illusory relief to one's conscience. True generosity was in fact only shown by those who put their heart at the service of their head: the point was the complete extermination of Nazi ideology and leadership, nothing less!

Such comments, suggesting a gendered division between feeling ("heart") and intelligence ("head"), are reiterated by Arvid Harnack who scathingly reproaches the protagonist after her attempt to visit a Jewish family. Her discovery that they have been deported is seen by Harnack as endangering the group. Harnack's behaviour is interpreted as "hart" [hard] (239) and is later contradicted by implication through the description of people like the protagonist's mother who would leave food for prisoners and who, although they were not involved in "große Heldentaten" [great heroic deeds], made sure that "wenigstens die menschlichen Gefühle nicht ganz verdorrten" [at least human feelings did not wither away entirely] (253). There is a juxtaposition within the male voices of such hardness attained through clarity of political purpose and a sense of intuitive feeling contained in the protagonist's behaviour, interpreted by the men of the group as female weakness. Such a division is reported and at the same time rejected by the narrator who emphasizes the rational validity of her actions on several occasions. A gendered distinction such as this has also been seen as problematic by Kuckhoff in her earlier writing. In an essay from the immediate post-war period she denies that women are essentially altruistic, yet simultaneously appeals to those females, whose "Herzlichkeit" [kindness] was abused by the Nazis, that they must "klar denken lernen" [learn to think clearly] (1946, 1).

Harnack and Kuckhoff's rejection of such 'weakness' is however not without contradiction either, as becomes apparent in an episode in which Adam Kuckhoff requires the arduous preparation of a meal.

The time and effort which was necessary for such an event is not conveyed with regret, but the narrator's interpretation of the event is also not without irony:

Es brodelte in allen Töpfen. Der Tisch sollte auf Adams Wunsch [...] besonders hübsch gedeckt werden. [...] Als dann im großen Atelier der Tisch gedeckt war und die beiden Männer in blütenweißen Hemden und dunklen Anzügen mir auch noch Blumen überreichten, wurde mir klar: Die Helden waren müde. Sie brauchten nach all ihren Mühen einfach ein Fest. (296-97)

All the saucepans were bubbling away. Adam had requested that the table be set prettily. [...] When the table in the large hall was laid and the two men in sparkling white shirts and dark suits also gave me flowers, it became clear to me: the heroes were tired. After all their efforts they were simply in need of a celebration.

Thus when the male figures are in need of support they withdraw to the domestic sphere, which, as the narrator has already maintained, becomes a site of support and renewed strength. Hans Coppi and Jürgen Danyel comment on the frequency of such social occasions in the memories of survivors of the resistance, seeing in them an affirmation of belief in an otherwise alien and dangerous environment (1993, 66-67). The protagonist's adherence to the domestic tasks required of her in this instance is representative of a gendered division of labour that prevails within the description of resistance, and is particularly illustrative of the role that the protagonist accepted in the fight against the fascist system. Tensions about this division are conveyed through reported speech alongside the voice of the first-person narrator: "Mildred brauche Hilfe – sie habe bereits einen kleinen Kreis junger Frauen um sich versammelt, mit denen sie das Manifest durcharbeite. Sollte sie doch! Ich wollte mit Männern zusammen arbeiten" ['Mildred needs help – she has already gathered a small circle of young woman with whom she is working through the manifesto'. Good for her! I wanted to work with the men] (131). Such a sense of frustration is not, however, combined with a determination to change the prevailing situation, as expressed in so many other places of the text during the years of the protagonist's youth. Often, within such descriptions, it is the critically framed reported speech of the men in the group that predominates. Occasionally there is an exchange of direct speech, and only on one occasion does the protagonist confront her husband about her lack of involvement in political decisions. Nevertheless, further references are made to the protagonist's continued exclusion, something which she does not fight against:

Ich hörte jetzt selten einmal das mir so liebe "Frotzeln" zwischen Adam und Arvid. Die Gesichter waren ernst. Ich fragte nicht. Obwohl es mir manchmal bitter schwer war, hielt ich mich in eiserner Disziplin an die Abmachung, daß ich nur bei bestimmten Aufgaben herangezogen werden würde. (295)

Now I rarely heard the teasing between Adam and Arvid that was once so dear to me. Their faces were serious. I asked no questions. Although it was sometimes extremely hard, I remained resolutely disciplined and kept to our agreement that I would only be involved in certain tasks.

Man sagte mir nicht die ganze Wahrheit, das war unbehaglich – aber ich war gewohnt, nicht zu fragen. Und ich schwieg. (309)

I was not told the whole truth, which made me uneasy – but I was used to not asking questions and I kept quiet.

This division of labour, where the women participated in dangerous activities only within pre-arranged spheres of action, predominates in women's reports of work in the resistance, as Klaus-Michael Mallmann has shown (1995, 88). The inherently necessary restriction of knowledge between the resisters thus follows gendered lines, resulting in discrimination and suppression of the female protagonist within a group whose political beliefs apparently presupposed equality. Notwithstanding the claims in the first part of the narrative that the ideals of socialism are capable of resolving the oppression of women, the present narrator does not explicitly confront this lack in the second part of the narrative. As the protagonist's socialist beliefs harden through the influence of male figures around her, they are accompanied by her increased silence. In contrast to the criticism of the women who accept socially inferior roles at the start of the text and her self-characterization as someone constantly questioning during the 1920s, the protagonist is unable, or unwilling, to confront the male figures about her subordination ten years later. Instead, there is a positive focus on self-discipline, the character trait the narrator has emphasized as being learned during childhood. The protagonist's lack of voice within the resistance group is thus founded on the quality much prized by the men: "Er [Adam] wollte keine Ratschläge, sondern diszipliniertes Handeln" [Adam didn't want advice, he wanted disciplined behaviour] (125). Discipline is thus masculinized and becomes a vital pre-requisite for successful resistance, in comparison to a dangerous, life-threatening spontaneity. Thus self-discipline becomes synonymous with the protagonist's exclusion and subordination to the male members of the group. She repeats the very gender behaviour scathingly and ironically dismissed at the start of the text, when she points to the friend who would get married, have well-

brought-up young daughters, and be “feinnervig, leidensfähig und diszipliniert” [sensitive, disciplined and with a capacity for suffering] (7).

The reasons for the change in the protagonist’s role from the highly independent person portrayed at the start to her acceptance of these gendered divisions seems to stem partly from the wish to have a family. On the birth of their child in 1938 her colleagues decided to involve her less. While the narrator admits that they protected her, it is also clear that the protagonist’s role was not simply reduced to that of motherhood. Certain tasks are required of her particularly as a woman:

John Sieg hatte sich bereit erklärt, einen Koffer mit marxistischer Literatur in der Nähe des S-Bahnhofes Tempelhof zu übernehmen, um ihn zu Freunden in einem Laubengrundstück zu schaffen. “Muß das ausgerechnet eine Frau tun? Ihr wißt genau, daß ich nicht schwer schleppen kann”. Arvid meinte ruhig: “Wenn sich eine Frau mit einem Mann trifft, das fällt weniger auf”. (205)

John Sieg had already said that he was prepared to take delivery of a suitcase of Marxist literature near to the Tempelhof station in order to pass it on to friends with a summer house. “Does it have to be a woman that does this? You know that I can’t carry heavy things”. Arvid insisted quietly: “If a woman meets up with a man it is less noticeable”.

The role and expectations of a woman in the group are therefore double-edged, used to both include her in certain tasks and exclude her from others. Yet the voice of the present narrator reproduces these very divisions through the reference to a task that is difficult for a woman to carry out and the portrayal of Harnack as rational and “ruhig” [calm]. Conflicting aspects of gender are later starkly visible in the protagonist’s treatment by the Gestapo: while initially treating her with respect and courtesy, the interrogators use her position as a mother to threaten her (Danyel 1994a, 33).

The description of the role of protagonist’s own mother, who previously succumbed to her father’s prohibition to go travelling, mirrors in some ways the contradictory depiction of the protagonist herself. The father’s refusal to let her mother travel meant that she did not gain the same position of independence as her daughter, so she vicariously enjoys the pleasure of her daughter’s visit to America. However, she is not simply shown to be a passive figure in her relationship with her husband: “Meine Mutter, energischer als der Vater, riet [sic] wohl zornig: ‘Nun tut euch doch endlich zusammen, macht den Mund auf und kämpft um euer Recht. Wenn ihr nicht wäret, was wär denn *der!*’” [My mother, who was more energetic than my father, gave us an angry piece of advice: ‘Why don’t all of you get

together, open your mouths and fight for your rights. What would *he* be if you weren't there!"] (22, emphasis in original) Notwithstanding this attitude, which seems rebellious to the "zaghaften Vater" [timid father] (22), the narrator's comments highlight the limits to the mother's criticism of the prevailing situation and the acceptance of the domestic role allotted to her:

Der schönste Raum wurde allerdings an Baugewerkschüler vermietet, für die unsere Mutter auch wusch und kochte. Ich habe in meiner Familie nie ein Wort der Klage über zuviel Arbeit gehört. Die Tatsache aber, daß sie jeden Pfennig dreimal umdrehen mußte, mißfiel meiner Mutter sehr. Mehr noch empörte sie jegliche Ungerechtigkeit und Abhängigkeit. Hätte ihr katholischer Glaube nicht die ewige Seligkeit hoch über die irdische Gerechtigkeit gestellt, sie wäre, glaube ich, ein mutiger Mitstreiter geworden. So erwies sie sich später unter schwierigen Verhältnissen als ein treuer unermüdlicher Kamerad. (p. 25)

The nicest room was however rented out to labouring students, for whom our mother also cooked and did their washing. I never once heard a word of complaint in my family about too much work, but the fact that she had to watch every penny was something that my mother very much disliked. If her Catholic faith hadn't placed eternal bliss above earthly justice she would have been, I think, a courageous comrade-in-arms. Later, under difficult circumstances, she proved herself to be a loyal and untiring comrade.

Thus while her spirit and tenacity are emphasized, she is likewise disciplined, conforms to familial gender roles, and proves a valuable help during the protagonist's imprisonment. Notwithstanding the tensions, the positive emphasis on the concept of discipline causes the text to advocate the suppression of individual needs for a greater goal. Such an emphasis on self-abnegation became one of the pervasive characteristics of the SED's political platform (Danyel 1995, 33). It is also something which some historians claim the women resisters accepted without question (Coburger 1994, 94). Therefore, when the role of women is considered, tensions exist between the men and women of the group and also within the women's own behaviour. While the private, familial sphere remains the female domain, it is defined paradoxically both as positive and restrictive. The discipline needed to resist is prioritized and yet simultaneously shown to be insufficient.

Such a portrayal of the relationships within Kuckhoff's circle of resistance is significant, given the somewhat contradictory insistence in some historical literature on the equality of roles within this particular group (Hervé, 1995, 122-23; Coppi and Danyel 1993, 67). Kuckhoff's text is also important in showing the extent to which women did participate in resistance, both in terms of individual acts

and in terms of support for their husbands and families. The women's contribution was equal to that of the men and certainly no less dangerous. But it was also, so it seems from Kuckhoff's text, dictated by them.

The Politics of Remembering Resistance

Throughout the second half of the text there are frequent references to the time beyond the scope of the main narrative, that is after 1945. Such prolepses, firstly, validate the behaviour of the past by stressing its relevance for the future, secondly, allow for self-reflection on the processes of remembering, and thirdly, engage with historiography on the resistance in East and West Germany.

Following the emphasis on individual portraits, there are descriptions about those people with whom the protagonist stayed in contact after the war. At the same time, there is also a recognition of how few of her close friends did in fact survive. In a tone of both commemoration and justification, the effectiveness of particular resistance activities is stressed and linked to an imperative for the present; for example, the resisters' educational agenda which aimed, among other things, to combat an increasing anti-communism:

Die antifaschistische Front wurde gestärkt. Nicht selten hat sich das damalige Bemühen auch nach 1945 noch positiv ausgewirkt. Der erneut angestachelte Antikommunismus und Antisowjetismus konnte dort nicht Wurzeln schlagen, wo die Grundlagen des gegenseitigen Vertrauens geschaffen waren. Mir will das ein durchaus positives Resultat auch heutiger Bemühungen scheinen. (251)

The antifascist front was strengthened. Not infrequently did the efforts of those years also prove to have positive effects after 1945: the renewed incitement to anti-communism and anti-sovietism could not take root where there was already a basis of reciprocal trust. That seems to me to be an entirely positive result, of today's efforts too.

The linking of past and present in this way means that resistance does not just gain meaning from the historical context of the National Socialist regime, but also from within the context of the GDR (Danyel 1995, 37).

In discussing the importance of the odious task of translating Hitler's *Mein Kampf*, reference is made to the memoirs of a Soviet ambassador, Ivan Maïski (Majskij [sic], 1967), where he details a meeting with Lloyd George. At this meeting, in September 1936, it transpired that Lloyd George possessed an incomplete translation of

Hitler's text, one which omitted mention of his aggressive expansionist intentions. The narrative thus justifies the protagonist's work of translating such a text. In addition to these memoirs, a letter written to Kuckhoff in 1967 is referred to. These are just two of several external sources which substantiate the claims made by the present narrator that her activity was worthwhile. In fact, letters figure prominently in Kuckhoff's autobiography and are a site where the past and present intersect: they are often dated from the late 1960s and contain people's accounts both of antifascist resistance and details about the resisters themselves. Used within the text, the extracts contain different voices to expand, consolidate and authenticate the present narrator's versions of events. Such letters are sometimes also subject to reinterpretation by the voice of the narrating present; for example, a letter written by Adolf Grimme in 1946 in which he emphasizes his connection to Adam Kuckhoff with whom he claims to have worked intensively. While not contradicting this statement, the present narrator notes how Grimme, who was culture minister for Hannover between 1946 and 1948 and then went on to be director of the North West German radio, gradually moved away from the path that her husband "so vertrauensvoll als Testament hinterließ" [had so trustingly left as his legacy] (378). Discussion of Grimme's letter also hints at one of the horrors omitted from Kuckhoff's narrative; he mentions the torture the group suffered, the brutality of which is also testified to by other historical and fictionalized sources (Lehmann 1948, 19; Grabowski and Tomin 1967, 73; Steinbach 1995a; Weiss 1981, 211). Despite detailed description of the time in prison there is no explicit mention of either the protagonist's suffering or that of the others. There are however allusions to the fear of such torture, culminating in Libertas Schulze-Boysen's "Schwächegeständnis" [confession of weakness] (285) and references to the possibility of a "verschärftes Verhör" [intensified interrogation] (322). Through the direct speech of the Gestapo officials and the matter-of-fact way in which they talk about "'Leute unter Druck zum Reden zu bringen'" ['persuading people to speak through pressure'] (347), the terror is both distanced from the experiences of the protagonist and conveyed through its absence.

Included within the narrative are not only letters written after the war but also letters written during imprisonment. Those written by Adam and Greta Kuckhoff are particularly emotive and capture both an unrepentant certainty in their political beliefs alongside their personal loss and their love for their families. An explicit appeal to an addressee precedes the inclusion of the first letter: "Ob man das

Gefühl nachempfinden kann, aus dem er entstand?“ [Is it possible to experience now the feelings from which it arose?] (370) Such a sentiment expresses both an intention to convey certain emotions and a fear of the impossibility of doing so.

While stressing an imperative to communicate, the present narrator reflects on the process of telling that must also involve omissions:

Hätte ich mir die Aufgabe gestellt, die Geschichte der Gesamtorganisation zu schreiben, würde ich hier der zahlreichen Gruppen gedenken, die, manche in fester, andere in loser Verbindung mit Harnacks und Schulze-Boysen standen. Da ich aber aus eigenem Erleben übersehbare Ereignisse, Gruppierungen und Kämpfe mir zu schildern vorgenommen habe, muß eine vollständige, tiefgründige Darstellung dem Historiker überlassen bleiben. Eine solche Aufgabe ginge über meine Kraft: sich über vier Jahrzehnte zurückzuerinnern, ohne Notizen, mit wenigen eigenen Unterlagen, ist schwierig, zumal die Jahre dazwischen, auch nach der Befreiung mit vielfältigen Tätigkeiten, mit der Begegnung zahlreicher Menschen bis zum Rande gefüllt waren. (265-66)

If I had given myself the task of writing the history of the whole organisation I would at this point remember the numerous groups which had ties, some close, some not so close, to the Harnacks and Schulze-Boysen. But as I decided to describe from my own experience, events, groupings and struggles that could be clearly understood, I'll have to leave a complete, indepth portrayal to the historians. Such a task would be beyond me: to think back over four decades, without notes and with few personal documents is particularly difficult since the years in between, and also since liberation, have been packed with diverse activities, with the encounters with numerous people.

Through the reference to post-war activities a continuation of endeavour is accentuated, again validating the importance of the preceding memories. An individual focus is also stressed and the fallibility of memory reiterated. Subsequently, however, the narrator questions such a personalized focus while again linking the present to the past:

Jetzt bin ich mit meiner Erzählung schon jenseits unseres gemeinsamen Urteils. Ich frage mich, warum spinne ich alle möglichen Fäden an und gehe dem Prozeß aus dem Wege? Ist die Erzählung von der Entgegennahme der Todesurteile etwas in anderen Schilderungen so heroisch Festgelegtes, daß ich nicht wage zu sagen, wie es sich – anders vielleicht, als man gemeinhin annimmt – bei uns zugetragen hat? Oder ist es ganz einfach die Scheu, von dem Schicksal einzelner heute zu sprechen, wo ganze Völker täglich unter dem Schatten des Todes leben, gebären, Häuser und Wege bauen – um sich zu wehren, um frei zu sein von imperialistischer Unterdrückung? (361)

Now I've got past the point in my story of our joint sentence. I ask myself, why do I keep digressing to avoid the trial? Is the story of the handing out of the death sentence something which has been so heroically established in other

accounts that I don't dare to say – differently than perhaps is generally assumed – how it was for us? Or is it quite simply a reticence to talk today of the fates of individuals when entire peoples live daily under the shadow of death, give birth, build houses and roads – in order to defend themselves, in order to be free from imperialist oppression?

The present narrator thus addresses contested narratives about the resistance and reflects on how other voices pervade her own story. Reticence to talk about the horror of receiving the death penalty is founded in a persistent trauma, a trauma which would contradict heroic narratives on the group. In addition to such discussion of the processes of remembering, the narrator makes explicit information known only in retrospect in order to facilitate the reader's understanding. Such interventions clarify what was once obscure and leave little room for speculation as to why events occurred as they did.

Historiography which has surrounded the resistance group is thus both accorded a place and challenged by the present narrator. In order to show how the text engages with the differing historiographical contexts of East and West Germany, it is necessary to situate it within various discourses of remembrance in the two states. While the following analysis aims to show fluidity, diversity and antagonism within patterns of remembrance in East and West, there are, nevertheless, similarities in the reception of the group, albeit at different times: a tendency to stress a unity of purpose and political agenda, and a link to the Soviet Union prevailed in both Germanys. Ironically, these were aspects stressed in the group's trial by the fascist state. They are also the elements challenged by Kuckhoff.

The "heroisch Festgelegte" [established heroism] of the depictions referred to by Kuckhoff was only a fairly recent phenomenon at the time of the text's publication in East Germany in 1972 (n.a. 1969, 3-4). Published in celebration of her 70th birthday, the autobiography appeared when Kuckhoff was particularly prominent in East German society, having been named an honorary citizen of the city Frankfurt/Oder in 1967 and having received the Carl-von-Ossietzky medal a year later. Only three years before the publication of *Vom Rosenkranz*, the resisters of the group named 'Rote Kapelle' had been awarded honours by the Soviet government, leading to a proliferation of literature about the group in the Soviet Union and East Germany. This political change marked a different direction in the reception of this group in the GDR and a resultant shift in historiography (Hartinger 1976, 30; Biernat 1965). The changed reception focused, however, on how the group was incorporated into "die Legende von der ungebrochenen Kontinuität des von der KPD geführten

Widerstands" [the myth of unbroken continuity of resistance led by the KPD] (Coppi et al. 1994, 8). Kuckhoff's text was one of several published by "Altkommunisten" [old Communists], with the promise to tell "wie es eigentlich gewesen ist" [what really happened] and which proved very popular with the reading public (Emmerich 1996, 291). Its publication was therefore symptomatic of an increased interest in the group. This was the second period of such interest, the first being immediately after the war when Kuckhoff began writing about her experiences. While this analysis concentrates on the text of the 1970s, Kuckhoff's earlier writings are significant for several reasons. Firstly, their extensive nature refutes both the tendency in secondary literature to maintain that her group was not considered at all in East Germany before the end of the 1960s (Tuchel 1998, 267) and also the insistence by West German historian Heinz Höhne that survivors of the group were silent in the post-war period and refused to discuss the activities of resistance (Höhne 1970, 15, 18). Secondly, a survey of the titles of the articles from both the late 1940s and the late 1960s shows that they highlight the emphases within the later autobiography: individualized portraits, especially those of women resisters; the persecution of Jews (the depiction of which will be considered below); and contemporary historiography are all addressed (Kuckhoff 1946b; 1947; 1948a; 1948b; 1948c; 1969a; 1969b; 1969c; 1969d; 1970a; 1970b; 1970c).

Although Kuckhoff's writing on resistance figured in two phases in the Soviet Zone and East Germany in which there was particular emphasis on the 'Rote Kapelle', literature on the group continued to be produced throughout the intervening period as the work referred to in this chapter illustrates (Reich 1994, 635; Prümm 1977, 34-36). However, official discourses on the fascist past in East Germany during this time marginalized memories such as Kuckhoff's due to their controversial emphases, which will now be considered.

While resistance became the core of GDR state legitimacy, it was only one aspect of this experience which became prominent, leading to a hierarchy of remembrance which marginalized other perspectives. The experiences of those Communists who had spent time in exile in the Soviet Union took priority. In the essays of the late 1940s and in her autobiography, Kuckhoff emphasizes the decision to return to Germany in 1933. In accentuating the necessity for all those who were "unbelastet" [clean] to stay and fight in Germany, the texts are thus implicitly critical of those who went into exile. As Jürgen Danyel has shown, it was those returning from exile in Moscow who held the power in the post-war East German government and who therefore

affected the emphasis within state supported discourse on the past. (1992, 921; 1995, 32; also Rosenhaft 1990). By 1949, according to Danyel, there was a consolidation of what was an originally diverse culture of remembering, leading to a focus on the version of the past promoted by the party political interests of the KPD and SED (1995, 31). While some competing discourses remained alive within different sections of GDR society, by the 1950s communist resistance, and particularly the experiences of those in exile in Moscow, had taken centre stage (Faulenbach 1994, 592). These emphases became institutionalized and persisted until the early 1960s to the exclusion of *official* remembrance of Kuckhoff's group, as Karl Heinz Jahnke demonstrated when he remarked at that time:

Können wir aber bereits mit unseren Geschichtsbüchern zufrieden sein? Die Darstellung entspricht der historischen Wahrheit, aber häufig wirkt sie noch leblos und schematisch. [...] Die Darstellung würde aber überzeugender sein, wenn statt zahlreicher Hinweise, die aussagen, daß die Kommunistische Partei die Führung im Widerstand hatte, an einigen konkreten Beispielen aus dem illegalen Kampf bewiesen worden wäre, wie die Kommunisten sich das Vertrauen der anderen Widerstandskämpfer erwarben und zu einer führenden Kraft im Widerstandskampf wurden. Ich denke hier z.B an die Schulze-Boysen-Harnack Gruppe, die im Lehrbuch überhaupt nicht erwähnt wird. (1962, 44)

Can we be satisfied with our history books now? The depiction corresponds to historical reality but sometimes appears lifeless and schematic. [...] The narrative would be more convincing if, instead of numerous references to the leadership of the KPD within the resistance, some concrete examples from the underground activities were used to prove how the Communists gained the trust of other resistance fighters and became a leading force in the fight. I'm thinking here, for example, of the Schulze-Boysen-Harnack group [Kuckhoff's group], which is not mentioned anywhere in textbooks.

Those who had spent most of the twelve years of Nazism in the Soviet Union, mainly in Moscow, not only had different experiences from those who had remained in Germany; they also embodied a link and an allegiance to the Soviet Union. Such allegiance was promoted because, as Danyel has shown, it allowed for an equation of the Soviet Zone and GDR with the victorious Red Army and "deutete die Niederlage der KPD von 1933 und das Scheitern des Widerstands in Deutschland entsprechend um" [correspondingly reinterpreted the defeat of the KPD in 1933 and the failure of the resistance in Germany] (1995, 33).

In a context of increased emphasis on ties to the Soviet Union, Kuckhoff was outspokenly critical of the Soviet administration. Hans Coppi and Jürgen Danyel have considered how Kuckhoff attempted,

after 1945, to find out how the Soviets had dealt with information about her group, accusing them of being careless with their names and addresses (1993, 75). It is ironic that, at the time Kuckhoff was most critical of the Soviet Union, she was being targeted by the CIA as a possibly dangerous agent working for that state (Danyel 1994a, 19). A hint of her previous criticism remains in *Vom Rosenkranz*, when the protagonist replies to Adam Kuckhoff's revelation that their names and addresses had been sent in a radio message to Brussels: "Waren so viele Namen nötig, hätte nicht einer genügt?" [Were so many names necessary? Wouldn't one have sufficed?] (309) While official discourses emphasized the role of communist resistance to Nazism, an error of the Soviet administration in detailing many names in one radio message (which led to the deaths of many of the resisters) was taboo and initially contributed to the group being excluded from discourses of remembrance (Danyel 1994a, 19). With a change in patterns of remembrance in the late 1960s and 1970s in East Germany, much more was made of the connection of this group to the Soviet Union, but the subject of the Soviet Union's failures remained prohibited. *Vom Rosenkranz* is therefore significant because it not only downplays such a link, but does indeed show that the sporadic contact with Moscow was unsuccessful and mired in frustration due to the fact that their warnings about impending the German invasion were not believed.

With the emphasis on members of the communist resistance in the hierarchy of remembrance in the GDR from the early 1950s to the late 1960s, prevailing conditions were against the reception of Kuckhoff's memories. In addition, Kuckhoff's writings also considered the experiences of another marginalized group – the Jewish victims. As discussed in the chapter on Hilde Huppert, official antifascism focused only on those who, by state definition, had "actively resisted fascism", leading to a lack of emphasis on others persecuted by Nazism. This was originally based, as Thomas Jung points out, on the classification of the "Anerkannte Opfer des Faschismus" [Recognized Victims of Fascism]; in this list the Jewish population comes only in twelfth place (1998, 67). While memories of the Holocaust never entirely disappeared from the East German context, they also never gained the same prominence as the narrative of communist resistance, in spite of there being increased attention from the 1960s onwards (Groehler 1993; Danyel 1993). Such marginalization was due to the adherence among many of the exile group to the belief that the problem of antisemitism was a product of capitalism and had been extinguished with the post-war redistribution of the means of production within the

GDR economy (Kahn 1960, 522-27). While there were important figures within the SED, including Paul Merker, who had spent time in Western exile and were proponents of restitution for Jewish victims, they suffered repression and marginalization at the hands of the leadership (Groehler 1994, 233-34; Herf 1997, 92).

A consideration of Kuckhoff's text highlights both adherence to, and conflict with, those discourses prevailing at the time of publication with regards to Jewish persecution. By the 1970s, increased historical studies of the Holocaust in East Germany had, to a certain extent, intensified awareness about the systematic annihilation of European Jews. Kuckhoff's text contributes to these narratives and to the rehabilitation of such memories, mentioning in detail the progressive stages of persecution: from the Nuremberg laws, to the pogrom of 1938, to the Wannsee conference, to the deportations, concentration camps and crematoria. In her autobiography, both individual and collective Jewish suffering are frequently referred to. As has been shown, within the resistance group there were certain tensions as to the best way of helping Jewish victims, but it is emphasized that such persecution was part of their motivation for resisting. Descriptions of the work of Libertas Schulze-Boysen, who collected photographs of the atrocities on the Eastern Front in an attempt to gain support for their cause, and the dissemination of a letter from Captain Denken to his son, describing the murder of a mother and child, were both integral parts of the resisters' work. In addition, the activities of the Herbert-Baum-Gruppe are discussed, thus contesting the claim that Jews offered no resistance.

While Kuckhoff's autobiography gives prominence to these memories, it also adheres to the prevalent interpretation of the Holocaust within GDR theories of fascism. Following the interpretation accorded to racial discrimination in the protagonist's memories of America, in which "eine klare Erkenntnis der Zusammenhänge" [a clear recognition of the connections] led black friends "an die Seite der kämpfenden Arbeiterklasse" [to the side of the fighting working-class] (48-49), the narrator considers why so few Jews joined their resistance group and comes to the conclusion:

Es war aber auch möglich, daß wir nicht genügend jüdische Menschen kannten, die aus der Einsicht, daß es keine losgelöste Rassenfrage war, die ihr Leben und Leiden bestimmte, sondern ein Teil der großen Klassenauseinandersetzung, zu Kommunisten geworden waren. (232)

But it was also possible that we did not know enough Jewish men and women who had become Communists due to their recognition that it wasn't an

autonomous question of race that was determining their lives and their suffering, but a part of the wider class struggle.

Therefore, when questions about the depiction of the Holocaust are considered, Kuckhoff's text engages with discourses contemporary to publication. In both adhering to and contesting such discourses, her text is one which must negate Katharina von Ankum's generalizing assertion that "assuming and maintaining a communist identity within the context of the GDR's antifascist discourse [...] meant embracing its hierarchy of victims and evading or repressing memories of a significant part of German history" (Ankum 1996, 43). Given Kuckhoff's prominent position within the GDR, as one of the two high-profile women within the "frauenlose Welt" [woman-free world] of GDR politics (Meyer 1991, 159), these contradictions are inherent to her "communist identity".

Kuckhoff confronts the heroic depictions of members of her group with a text which includes both their weaknesses and mistakes. When the protagonist begins writing about the resistance in prison, for example, it is with the explicit aim "die Problematik nicht zu verwischen" [of not blurring the complexity of the issues] (352). The differing opinions of the resisters, their conflicts and their sometimes overbearing attitudes are testament to the 'normality' of those involved. As the text does not end with the execution of many members but continues until the liberation, the focus is shifted from death to survival and thus to continuity in the post-war period. In a context of remembrance in the GDR which frequently focused on those who were murdered, the ending of Kuckhoff's text is significant for several reasons. Firstly, it emphasizes that there were those who did survive and were actively involved in the building of the new antifascist state. Many studies about opposition to Nazism focus only on those who died, including Karl Heinz Biernat and Luise Kraushaar's book on the 'Rote Kapelle', and the information produced by the 'Gedenkstätte deutscher Widerstand' [Memorial Site for German Resistance], both of which omit an individualized portrait of Greta Kuckhoff (Biernat and Kraushaar 1972; Stebinach 1995b). Considering the fact that Kuckhoff is one of the more widely known names it is clear that, as Marlies Coburger reiterates, that other women survivors are totally unheard of (1994, 94). Kuckhoff's text shifts the attention back to the acts of resistance rather than focussing on the resisters' deaths, which in turn leads to a closer consideration of those non-Communists within the group; while Communists comprised just over one third of the group they were two thirds of those murdered

(Herlemann 1994, 81). A focus on those executed therefore stresses a communist affiliation, something which became part of communist claims to state legitimacy, founded in a tradition of victimhood and sacrifice (Herlemann 1994, 81). Secondly, the text reminds the reader that it was not just those resistance survivors who participated in the new GDR state, but also many former Nazi party members. In referring to the reintegration of these people into East German society on the last page, Kuckhoff's text brings into question the status frequently claimed by the GDR of being "Sieger der Geschichte" [victors of history]. Similarly, the text questions the assertion that the German working-class was antifascist en masse. In doing so it can be seen to oppose the "schizophrene Eindruck" [schizophrenic impression] which had arisen in official discourses in East Germany by the 1970s that it was only those in West Germany who were responsible for the fascist system and the war (Groehler 1990, 48):

Wer die damalige Zeit miterlebt hat, weiß, daß es auch Arbeiter – und das nimmt nichts weg von dem heldenhaften Kampf vieler klassenbewußter Arbeiter – durch Lügen von einem neuen antikommunistischen Sozialismus betrogen, durch Siege berauscht, es verlernten, die Politik der nationalsozialistischen Regierung realistisch mit den Prinzipien sozialistischer Moral, internationaler Verantwortung einzuschätzen. (253)

Those who lived through that time know that workers, deceived by lies about a new anti-communist socialism and intoxicated by victories, forgot to measure the politics of the National Socialist government against the principles of socialist morality and international responsibility – and this is to take nothing away from the heroic struggle of many class-conscious workers.

Through the behaviour and expectations of the protagonist's parents, the narrator considers the persuasive power of authoritarian bureaucracy and the need for employment. Such an emphasis is significant given the frequent focus within GDR historiography on the role of the bourgeoisie in causing Nazism, a focus which exonerated the working class entirely (Biernat 1972, 8). In stressing the responsibility of individuals across class boundaries, the text accentuates, as did Hilde Huppert's autobiography, the importance of the 'kleiner Faschismus' [involvement of ordinary people in fascism], a subject that was not more widely tackled in the GDR until the 1970s (Groehler 1990, 50-51).

When considering the narrator's discussion of the involvement, or lack of it, of the working-class in the resistance, the positioning of the protagonist in relation to this class is important. The identity of the protagonist as a member of the working-class is constructed through

her memories of childhood, albeit with the caveat that her experiences were probably not typical for those of most working-class children. Alongside descriptions which emphasize her working-class background are those which position the family as wealthier than those around them: “Und dann kam die Zeit, wo die anderen in die Fabrik gingen oder ins Geschäft. Ich aber ging noch jahrelang zur Schule” [And then came the time when the others went to work in the factory or in the shops and offices but I stayed at school for many more years] (30). Later the protagonist reasserts herself as an “Arbeiterkind” [working-class child] (94) and yet comes to the conclusion that she knows only the “wrong sort” of working-class people, ones with “verstümmelte[s] Klassenbewußtsein” [a mutilated class consciousness] (90). Familial memories which are in conflict with her reading of Marx and Lenin are dismissed as distractions, as are the past worries about how she would buy food, pay the rent and her student fees, which interrupted the study of the “vielfältigsten Weltproblem[e]” [the most diverse problems of the world] (93). During the resistance to Nazism the narrator admits that the contact she and her husband had to the workers was limited and thus indicates that the resisters around her were not members of the working-class either. By the 1970s, there had been much controversy over the role of the working-class in the resistance (Krumrey 1981, 41-77). While its role was repeatedly stressed in official GDR discourse few members of the ruling power group did in fact belong to the working class. The result, as Danyel has examined, was “eine Symbiose von proletarischem Habitus und kleinbürgerlicher Vorstellungswelt” [a symbiosis of proletarian habitus and the world-view of the petit-bourgeois] (1995, 34), a juxtaposition which is arguably apparent in Kuckhoff’s memories.

Antifascism was integral to the foundational legitimacy of the GDR, and integral to that was antifascist resistance. As has been shown, through gendered tensions within the resistance narrative, Kuckhoff’s text stresses the masculinized nature of resistance and an emphasis on the future reinforces its continued legacy. Indeed, as Sabina Schroeter has demonstrated, a masculinized “Kampfwortschatz” [vocabulary of struggle] was pivotal to the politics of East Germany (1994, 169). The narrative thus challenges the assertion that “die Frauenfrage” [the woman question] had been solved in East Germany through a dismantling of the economic system that was said to cause it (see Kuhrig 1978, 9). Kuckhoff was, of course, not the only writer to have been questioning such claims at this time, as Ute Gerhard has shown (1994, 383-403).

An emphasis on equality within the resistance group in the historiography of the East had helped to strengthen the claim that 'the woman question' was no longer an issue in the new state. In contrast, the relationships within the socialist microcosm of Kuckhoff's text highlight a dimension which Herta Kuhrig has recently examined as persisting in the post-war East German society until the 1980s: Marxism-Leninism was interpreted as giving rise to the possibility of solving 'the woman question' through rights to equality, but it did not consider "die Geschlechterfrage" [the gender question], in spite of it having been a preoccupation of central Marxist thinkers such as August Bebel, Clara Zetkin and Friedrich Engels (Eberlein 1985, 38). The result was a marginalization of the issue of the power relationships between men and women *within* classes (Kuhrig 1995, 213-16). In addition, a tendency to see any remaining inequalities in the system as part of the legacy of capitalism, rather than of persisting patriarchal structures in socialist society, did not facilitate introspection. Within Kuckhoff's autobiography, tensions arise due to both the patriarchal determination within the group and the protagonist's simultaneous acceptance and resentment of it. Kuhrig maintains that criticism of patriarchy was left to feminists in the West, yet *Vom Rosenkranz* was part of an increasing number of texts written by women from the start of the 1970s which examined critically women's role in the GDR (Schmidt 2000, 190-99). As one of the few prominent females in GDR society, a position to which the narrative alludes, Kuckhoff wrote a text which challenges the very foundations upon which gender "equality" was based.

As well as taking issue with prevalent inclinations within East German historiography, *Vom Rosenkranz* also adheres to one of its fundamental strands: criticism of West German histories about the resistance group. The text's republication in West Germany in 1974 marked an important milestone in shaping memories about the fascist past, and followed a change which began ten years before (Prümm 1977, 64). Until the mid 1960s, the resisters in Kuckhoff's group were excluded from official remembrance in West Germany under a blanket dismissal as 'communist'. They were the focus only of historiography and public discourses of remembrance which condemned them as traitors (for example, texts by Ritter 1956; Perrault 1969; Ritter von Schramm 1967; Martini 1966), articles which are not far from the position of the NPD journals and their vociferous condemnation of the women of the group (Kern 1972, 7). Indeed, in West Germany, the group became, "an object of cultivated oblivion" (Rosenhaft 1990, 369). Such reception had practical consequences, particularly in the

Western Zones in the immediate post-war period, both for the survivors and their families who were denied compensation due to the stigma of “betrayal” (Coppi and Danyel 1993, 83). The text engages with this charge of treason on several levels: firstly, in the discussion of the same accusation made by those around the protagonist during the Nazi period; secondly, through a direct confrontation with West German historians; and thirdly, through an emphasis on the patriotism of those involved in resistance.

In order to confront the criticism made during the later years of fascism, often by people close to the protagonist and her husband, that “man solle ‘das eigene Nest nicht beschmutzen’, oder man dürfe doch den Soldaten, die soviel ausstehen müssen, nicht ‘in den Rücken fallen’” [one should not ‘dirty one’s own nest’, or one should not ‘stab the soldiers, who have to put up with so much, in the back’] (252), a sympathetic voice of the narrating present emphasizes the importance of educational work within the resistance group. In doing so, the success of such work is reiterated and Kuckhoff’s own autobiography legitimized. Biting criticism is instead directed at the reactionary West German press where “die Flut der Anschuldigungen [hat] wegen dieser Verbindung [mit der SU] unmittelbar nach 1945 eingesetzt” [the flood of accusations had begun immediately after 1945 because of the connection to the Soviet Union] (310). The narrator condemns the slander inherent in the public discourse which appropriated the antisemitic ‘stab in the back argument’. Through an appeal to German nationhood, West German historians are equated with the Nazis:

Alle die reaktionären Historiker gestehen durch die Art ihrer Darstellungen ein, daß es ihnen nie ernst darum war, den deutschen Faschismus als Feind und Verderber der Nation zu erkennen, niemals ernst darum, ihn niederzuringen, um das deutsche Volk zu retten, das in seiner Existenz bedroht war. (311)

All the reactionary historians show through their way of writing that they were never serious about recognising German fascism as an enemy and a destroyer of the nation, never serious about getting rid of it in order to save the German people, threatened in its existence.

References to “the German people” predominate within the narrative, both during the passages when the protagonist discusses her increasing political awareness and within the description of resistance:

Es war keine leere Litanei mehr für mich, es war eine im Kampf der Gedanken gewonnene Erkenntnis: Ich liebe das Land, mit dessen Sprache und Geschichte ich untrennbar verbunden bin. [...] Ich will dafür mitkämpfen, daß alles, was in diesem Volk verwilderte und verrohete, ausgerottet wird! Mein Volk soll groß

und anerkannt sein, aber wegen seiner revolutionären Gedankenfülle, soll geachtet werden als Förderer des Sozialismus, ohne den die Welt zurückfällt in die Barbarei. (150)

It was no longer an empty litany for me, it was realization won by wrestling with my thoughts: I love the country to whose language and history I am inseparably connected. [...] I will fight so that everything that is going to seed and being brutalized in this people will be rooted out. My people shall be great and recognized, but recognized because of its wealth of revolutionary thought, shall be respected as a promoter of socialism, without which the world will fall back into barbarism.

Such strength of feeling conveyed through the voice of the young narrator is nonetheless qualified as being not simply a blind nationalist tendency but "eine kritische Liebe" [a critical love] (338):

Und dann sah ich plötzlich die Wahrheit! Wie alle Wahrheit ist sie, einmal erkannt, einfach. Ohne einfache Vaterlandsliebe kein proletarischer Internationalismus. Und das eben brachten mir Arvid und Adam bei: Wir haben ein Vaterland. Sei stolz auf alles, was im Ablauf der Jahrhunderte in deutscher Sprache an fortschrittlichen Gedanken geschaffen wurde. (149)

And then suddenly I saw the truth. It was, as with all truth, once recognized, simple. Without simple love of the fatherland no proletarian internationalism is possible. And it was exactly that which Arvid and Adam taught me. We have a fatherland. Be proud of all progressive thoughts that were created in the course of the centuries in the German language.

The juxtaposition of national and international perspectives allows for recuperation of Germany and an awareness "daß ich mein Vaterland lieben müsse und daß ich nicht das ganze Vaterland als Nazi-Deutschland verurteilen dürfe" [that I must love my fatherland and that I must not condemn the whole fatherland as Nazi-Germany] (148). Redefinitions of national identity were an integral part of Cold War discourse in both Germanys. Kuckhoff's stress on a German, antifascist tradition and on the aim to liberate and rebuild Germany must be seen in the context of repeated claims by West German historiography that the group aimed for a "Sowjetisierung Deutschlands" [Sovietization of Germany] (Steinbach 1993a, 776).

Connections between Kuckhoff's circle of resisters and the Soviet Union were frequently stressed by West German historians in the post-war period, and this trend has continued in some areas up to the present day. As mentioned above, the use of the name 'Rote Kapelle' was one way in which both a communist link and increased sense of an organisational centre were emphasized (Coppi and Danyel 1993, 66). Within the constellations of the Cold War, Western discourses of

remembrance unified the group in order to dismiss more easily an ideological enemy. In doing so, Nazi propaganda which had publicly downplayed the diversity of the group was perpetuated (Danyel 1994b, 472). As Peter Steinbach has examined, the projection of guilt onto an identified enemy in West Germany during the 1950s and 1960s led to a lack of consideration of individual responsibility and to the exoneration of a whole generation (1990, 84). The extent of the resisters' contact with the Soviet Union is still subject to controversy. It is now certain that many of the resisters did not know about such a connection due to the very conspiratorial requirements of resistance work (Coppi and Danyel 1993, 65; Danyel 1994b, 468). As such, Höhne's insistence that the surviving members of the group, Kuckhoff included, participated in a "Verschleierungstaktik" [creating a smoke-screen] in order to obscure the links of the resistance to the Soviet Union must be treated with caution (1970, 23).

Both Kuckhoff's early articles and *Vom Rosenkranz* work against sweeping condemnation and the unifying link to the Soviet Union through the individualized portraits, which show not only the diversity of tasks within the group, but also the diversity of motives for resisting. Activities described in Kuckhoff's writing include finding support in factories, making contact with foreign enforced labour and Jewish victims, producing leaflets and magazines, fund-raising, and teaching. Contact with Moscow is mentioned only infrequently. In addition, the present narrator discusses "wie bunt zusammengesetzt unsere Gruppe war" [how diverse our group was] (351) and considers both those who followed her own strengthening political beliefs and those who rejected any communist affiliation (for example Margarete Lachmund and her husband). Given how few biographical portraits of the leading figures and other members of the group there were, and still are, such individual detail is significant (Tuchel 1998, 274). The diversity of this group has since been stressed in more recent work (Tuchel 1998, 271; Danyel 1994b, 468) although Klaus Lehmann also made this point in his early depiction of the group (1948, 5-8). As Kuckhoff herself has highlighted, such diversity brings with it attendant problems for those trying to reconstruct what happened (1947, 1169).

When the left-wing Röderberg Verlag published *Vom Rosenkranz* in 1974 as part of its 'Bibliothek des Widerstands' [library of resistance], it was an attempt to create a more differentiated picture of remembrance in the West. It took over ten years before official institutional change came about, with the highly controversial inclusion of the 'Rote Kapelle' in the 'Topographie des Terrors'

[Topography of Terror] exhibition in West Berlin in 1987. Protests following attempts to include the group in the 'Gedenkstätte Deutscher Widerstand' meant that it was only in August 1992 that a comprehensive exhibition was mounted (Coppi and Danyel 1993, 89; Niven 2002, 74). Before this there were attempts to rehabilitate the group by insisting that they were not communist and therefore *could* be considered as resisters. In a re-edited information leaflet for schools in 1987, the political diversity of the group was given as a reason for remembering their resistance (n.a. 1987). While the inclusion of the group signalled a broadening of the concept of resistance within the politics of remembrance in West Germany, such an emphasis simultaneously continued to perpetuate the discourse of betrayal of communist resisters and disarticulate their experiences.

Addressees and Reception in East and West Germany

As can be seen from the multiple ways in which Kuckhoff's text engages with past and contemporary discourses in East and West Germany, the autobiography is addressed to all those who have read or written about the group, and this invites introspection. Through a reference to school children of the GDR studying the Marxist-Leninist principles on which the protagonist's actions were founded, the text implicitly recognizes its role within prevalent antifascist discourse. In addition, the emphasis on a broader international perspective makes claims to a wider validity. Notwithstanding the many tensions described above, a socialist political agenda remains at the forefront.

It is striking that all the reviews of *Vom Rosenkranz*, from both East and West, are positive. They stress how the reader becomes involved in the text, in a text which they describe as "ehrlich" [honest] and "vorbildlich" [exemplary] (Greulich 1973, 54; Keisch 1973; Donate 1973). Reviewers from East Germany emphasize a representativeness of experience and proclaim the protagonist's experience as a "Symbol für das Ganze" [a symbol of the whole] (Greulich 1973, 157), "ein typisches Bild proletarischer Verhältnisse" [a typical picture of proletarian relations] (Keisch 1973) and a "typisches Zeitschicksal" [a typical contemporary fate] (Hartmann 193, 14). Following the structure of Kuckhoff's autobiography, the reviews emphasize the importance of her childhood years and teenage visit to North America for the consolidation of her socialist beliefs, claiming that the narrative focuses on the "Wesentliche" and "Grundsätzliche" [the essential and fundamental things] (Hartmann

1973, 14; Greulich 1973, 155). In using extracts from the text, some articles allow Kuckhoff's voice to predominate, choosing episodes such as a discussion about the Spanish Civil War, about resistance in the factories, and about the dangers of resistance work. An article in memory of Kuckhoff from 1982 is comprised entirely of her description of the first meeting after liberation in which the hopes and plans for the future Germany are discussed.

While emphasising that the tone of *Vom Rosenkranz* is "direkt, frei von Pose oder Selbstgefälligkeit" [direct, free of pose or complacency] (Keisch 1973), and comprises "knappe Worte" [succinct words] (Hartmann 1973, 14), there is nevertheless repeated reference to a style which is "fast lyrisch" [almost lyrical] (Donate 1973), and which has "übers Dokumentarische hinaus eine ästhetische Dimension" [an aesthetic dimension which goes beyond the documentary] (Keisch 1973). E.R. Greulich is full of praise for the text, yet finds that it could have benefited from a "geschickterem dramaturgischem Aufbau" [a more skilful dramatical structure], arguing that it gives the impression of being "atemlos geschrieben" [written breathlessly] (1973).

Given the above discussion on the prevailing contradictory conditions within the West German context of remembrance during the early 1970s it is significant that, while the autobiography was hardly reviewed in the West, one of the most extensive discussions was in *Die Zeit*. Written by Claus Donate in 1973, it mentions Kuckhoff's book as being available in international bookshops as it had not yet been published in the West, and it refers to an interview between himself and Kuckhoff. It situates the text within contesting discourses about whether the members were traitors or fighters against fascism and stresses the importance of an autobiography written by someone who was "ein aktiver Mitkämpfer" [an active co-fighter]. He considers there to be surprisingly few "marxistisch-leninistische Formeln" [Marxist-Leninist slogans] in a narrative written by someone who explicitly advocates "Parteilichkeit" [partisanship]. Donate stresses both the diversity of members within the group and mentions the unusually high number of women. Significantly, he also emphasizes the post-war prominence of Kuckhoff and that her position remained contentious:

Anpassen wollte sie sich auch in der DDR nicht. 1958 schied die Notenbankpräsidentin aus Volkskammer und Ministerrat aus, weil sie sich mit Walter Ulbricht über die Rolle der Banken im sozialistischen Staat nicht einig wurde. Seitdem sitzt sie als "Vizepräsidentin des Deutschen Friedensrats" [...]. (Donate 1973)

Neither did she want to conform in the GDR. In 1958 the President of the state bank [Kuckhoff] left the parliament and the council of ministers because she did not agree with Walter Ulbricht about the role of the banks in the socialist state. Since then she has been the "Vice-President of the German Council of Peace".

Many of the Eastern reviewers emphasize Kuckhoff's intellectual status and involvement within the resistance, but do not consider the role of women as such. In fact, several show a tendency to reduce Kuckhoff's actions to those of accompanist to her husband, stressing that she stood by him during the antifascist struggle (n.a. 1972; n.a. 1973). Notwithstanding the focus on Jewish persecution within Kuckhoff's text, none of the reviewers mention the Holocaust, thus perpetuating the exclusion of these experiences.

Within the many historical studies on the group written since 1972, *Vom Rosenkranz* is occasionally included as a corroboratory source, but rarely is it considered as a text in its own right. West German commentators who mention the autobiography remain generally positive. When considering texts of the 1960s and 1970s, Gert Rosiejka, for example, claims that such narratives suffer from inadequate knowledge due to the paucity of information at the time. However, he does praise Kuckhoff's text which is not, he argues, "mit weitschweifigen allgemein politischen und rückblickenden Einschätzungen versehen" [full of sweeping, generally political, or retrospective evaluations] (1986, 21). Within an individual portrait of one of the women of the resistance group, Karl Schoepke praises Kuckhoff's "Aussagekraft" [meaningfulness] and "kämpferisch[e] Grundhaltung" [fighting stance] (1972, 944).

Coppi and Danyel consider Kuckhoff's narrative within the context of several published around the same time in which tensions arise between the prevalent interpretations of the group and the author's own perspective. They maintain that, notwithstanding an engagement with contemporary discourses:

allerdings tragen auch sie deutliche Spuren von Selbstzensur gegenüber den herrschenden Geschichtsinterpretationen und erfahren die übliche "Bearbeitung" durch das System politischer Begutachtung und "Autorenbetreuung" in Verlagen. (Coppi and Danyel 1993, 86)

they too certainly show clear traces of self-censorship with respect to prevailing historical interpretations and were subject to the usual "rewriting" via the system of political assessment and "supervision" of authors that exists within the publishing houses.

Donate, in contrast, writes:

Als das SED-Zentralkomitee sie [Kuckhoff] aufforderte, in ihrem Manuskript einiges zu streichen oder zu verändern, erwiderte sie, dies sei keine Geschichte der Roten Kapelle, sondern "die Geschichte meines Lebens", und beließ die meisten beanstandeten Stellen. (1973)

When the SED Central Committee demanded that she [Kuckhoff] cut or change things in her manuscript she replied that the text was not a history of the Red Orchestra, but a "history of my life", and left most of the queried passages as they were.

Conclusion: A Force of Resistance

With an increase in the perceived importance of research into individual members of resistance groups, autobiographical narratives such as Kuckhoff's remain significant. Women of the resistance are often still defined in historical studies as complementary, without "eigene Individualität und Autonomie" [their own individuality and autonomy] (Hervé 1995, 125), and although there are exceptions (see Paul 1947), Kuckhoff is usually ignored. Yet, in this context, personal testimonies such as Kuckhoff's are invaluable and validate the work of those literary historians aiming for a more differentiated analysis. Such analyses should consider the gendered tensions within Kuckhoff's narrative to show, given the large number of women involved, how the extent of their participation was determined and accepted. Explorations of these tensions should lead to a reconsideration of the assertion that what is known about Kuckhoff has been firmly established by her autobiography (Coburger 1994, 102).

Following reunification, the resistance group has continued to be the focus of competing interest (Tuchel 1993, 144). Within discourses of new totalitarianism, attacks against the group have continued, not least in the reception of exhibitions aimed at broadening an understanding of resistance. For example, following the publication of the Gestapo file on the 'Rote Kapelle', Berthold Seewald reviewed the displays on the group in the 'Gedenkstätte Deutscher Widerstand' and came to the conclusion that: "Die Berliner Ausstellung [...] blendet jedoch die furchtbare Konsequenz der Roten Kapelle aus: Sie wollte die braune Diktatur durch eine rote ersetzen" [The Berlin exhibition, however, obscures the terrible single-mindedness of the Red Orchestra: it wanted to replace the brown dictatorship with a red one]

(1992). Comments such as this perpetuate a more personal condemnation of Kuckhoff herself, for example that that found in W. F. Flicke's novelistic account of the resistance group of 1990. Flicke, a former member of the "Abhördienst" [phone-tapping service] until 1945, attacks Kuckhoff, maintaining that she was "[e]ine der fanatischen Aktivistinnen der Deutschlandgruppe der 'Roten Kapelle', überzeugte Marxistin und Kommunistin" [one of the fantastical activists of the German group 'Red Orchestra', a convinced Marxist and Communist]. He is scathing about her post-war attempts to portray the group "im Sinne einer reinen Widerstandsbewegung" [purely as a resistance movement] (Flicke 1990, 408). In the context of such comments it is maybe not surprising that attempts to commemorate Kuckhoff in a post-unification context have met with opposition. In the Schöneberg district of Berlin, for example, a plan to name a small square in memory of both Adam and Greta Kuckhoff was turned down; it is now called the "Adam-Kuckhoff-Platz" (n.a. 1999).

A reconsideration of Greta Kuckhoff's autobiography is now particularly timely, given the opening of archives across Eastern Europe which can complement and contest sources already available. When the efficacy of GDR antifascism and its literature are often being doubted and denied, to the extent that Bernd Faulenbach considers whether GDR historiography can even be used as a source of information about resistance (1994, 594), Kuckhoff's autobiography stands as an example which cannot simply be dismissed as a "mere illustration of the SED's legitimatory historical discourse", but rather as one which illustrates "repressed contradictions and conflicts within the political project" (Hell 1992, 25). Against a backdrop of claims of increasingly abstract and undifferentiated remembrance and a discourse of remembering focusing on an "ahistorische Essenz" [ahistorical essence], in both of which the victims lose their individuality and become political symbols, Kuckhoff's text is an example of "konkrete Erinnerung" [concrete remembrance] within the story of GDR antifascism (Danyl 1995, 38, 41).

The teleological framework of Kuckhoff's text becomes a structure for personal commemoration of all those members of the resistance who were murdered, especially Adam Kuckhoff. To a certain extent, Greta Kuckhoff's text is the book that Adam Kuckhoff wanted to write. She describes how it was his intention to write "einen Rechenschaftsbericht über seine eigene Entwicklung" [a report about his own development], but that in order to play an effective role in the

resistance her husband had to sacrifice a literary ambition that could have brought them under suspicion and endangered their work (1946, 17-21). The autobiography was, however, also a way of reaffirming the reasons for resistance and her political standpoint in the present. The concomitant theme of telling and listening situates Kuckhoff's text within others published in the 1970s in East Germany where the importance of these issues was addressed (Kaufmann 1981, 23). With its numerous parallel time levels, *Vom Rosenkranz* contributed to a body of literature which became increasingly aware of the reciprocal, dialectical relationship between past, present and future (Hartinger 1976, 45). The gendered tensions referring to past and present are important both in challenging the contemporary role of women in the GDR, a state whose legitimacy was founded on a masculinized antifascism, and in portraying the members of the resistance as people with individual strengths and weaknesses and not "fast makellos[e] Helden, die einem historischen Tugendroman entstiegen zu sein schienen" [heroes almost without faults, who seemed to have stepped out of a historical quest novel] (Groehler 1990, 52). As such, it is a narrative which can "expose the limits of the [...] discourse of victory" (Spivak cited in Hell 1992, 37). A recognition of such tensions makes it easier for readers to empathize with those described, to identify with their doubts about socialism and with their efforts to resolve them.

Kuckhoff saw it as her obligation as a survivor to be witness to both the brutality of the fascist state and the resistance to it (1947, 1169). As a figure of importance in East German society, Kuckhoff was able to contradict misleading descriptions of, and tendentious interpretations attributed to, her group of resisters. The publication history of her early writings and the autobiography itself illustrate the fact that, notwithstanding her personal commitment, the prevailing conditions of remembrance had to be conducive to her voice being heard.

No other resistance group has had to face to the same extent the accusations of treason which have dogged the members of the group called 'Rote Kapelle'. Ironically, this phenomenon was intensified by the efforts of the very East German historians who intended to commemorate them. Despite the polarization in the reception of the group in East and West Germany, both aimed to stress the connection of the group to the Soviet Union, just as the Nazis had done before them. Kuckhoff's text is thus important in challenging such a unifying tendency – it is a force of resistance no less significant than the actions it describes.

6. *Und außerdem war es mein Leben*: Subjectivity, Subjugation and Self-Justification in Elfriede Brünig's Autobiography

Since the unification of Germany, Elfriede Brünig's writing has focused on her past. Through fictional and non-fictional works, Brünig has confronted both her life as an author in the former GDR and her position as an elderly woman in post-unification society. Within a text spanning over eighty years, Brünig's autobiography similarly addresses these issues, rooting her present within descriptions of the past. Memories of Nazism, including her involvement in antifascist resistance, are fundamental to the protagonist's present self-understanding and to her past participation within the East German state. As sites of multiple tensions, these memories of the years of fascism contain conflicts which are symptomatic of those within the wider narrative. In this chapter I will examine how the protagonist's attempts to reassert her East German subjectivity in a post-unification context are based on familial memories of antifascism. Focusing on these memories, I will consider how the protagonist's positioning within the family gives rise to tensions based on class and gender, many of which persist in her memories of the time after 1945. I will argue that attempts to resist dominant discourses of totalitarianism and a 'normalization' of the past are undermined by the inclusion of narratives contemporary to publication which criticize the very identities the protagonist is trying to assert. Such tensions are encapsulated in competing individual experiences and claims to representativeness.

Brünig was born in 1910 in Berlin to a lower-middle-class family. Her father, an independent carpenter by trade, lost his job during the economic crisis of the 1920s and opened a library with his wife. Brünig worked from the age of fifteen as a secretary, later becoming a journalist and then a novelist. In 1930 she joined the Communist party (KPD) and, in 1932, the 'Bund proletarisch-revolutionärer Schriftsteller' (BPRS) [Association of Proletarian-Revolutionary Writers], both of which were subsequently outlawed when the Nazis came to power. She was arrested in 1935 due to her continued work in the BPRS but was released under Gestapo surveillance shortly after. From 1945 she worked as a journalist and author in the GDR. Brünig currently lives in Berlin.

Cornerstones of Identity

Und außerdem war es mein Leben [And besides, it was my life] was first published in 1994 by the small left-wing publishing house, Elefanten Press. Subsequent editions appeared in 1996, 1998 and 2004 with Agimos and dtv respectively.¹ Initially subtitled “Aufzeichnungen einer Schriftstellerin” [notes of an author], these later editions were, in contrast, marketed as “Bekenntnisse einer Zeitzeugin” [confessions of a contemporary eye-witness]. Such a change encapsulates a tension between the different identities constructed within the text. The protagonist’s personal experience and authorial identity are juxtaposed with a claim to a wider validity for her life story. A shift in focus from “notes” to “confessions” at the same time increases both the personal weight of the material and implies a need to communicate a failure. It also provokes a certain voyeurism in the reader. Questions of genre, authorial identity and representativeness of experience raised in these subtitles are addressed by the narrator in the opening chapter “Zur Einstimmung” [setting the scene]. Here the historical and personal parameters for the memories which follow are set. Beginning with a personal imperative to communicate, “Ich will alles aufschreiben, wie es in meiner Erinnerung lebt” [I want to write everything down just as it lives in my memory] (7), the introductory sentences immediately bring this aim into question: “Vielleicht hat sich nicht jede Begebenheit so abgespielt, wie ich sie in diesem Buch schildern werde” [Perhaps not every event occurred in the way I will describe it in this book]. A tendency towards “Phantasie” [imagination] is juxtaposed with an aim of achieving “Wahrheit” [truth], with the narrator’s authorial identity being where the two converge. An alleged avoidance of elements of fiction within the narrative is part of a reiterated claim to authenticity. Self-definition as an author is underlined in this introduction with the definition of work being “[d]as Wertvollste” [the most valuable thing], “das Wichtigste im Leben” [the most important thing in life] (7) and something which has, for the author, replaced “die große Leidenschaft” [the great passion].

Omissions from the text are acknowledged in this introductory statement. These relate to people still alive and thus emphasize the continuing reciprocal effect of past and present. From the vantage point of old age the narrator claims an authority to speak, with her

¹ Unless otherwise stated, all further references within the text are taken from the 1998 edition. All translations are my own.

ninety-two years allowing a broad perspective on the past. An individual life story is linked to historical epochs: "Ich habe vier Staatsformen durchlebt: Als Kind noch das Kaiserreich, als Halbwüchsige die Weimarer Republik, als Erwachsene den Faschismus und danach den versuchten Sozialismus in der DDR" [I have lived through four forms of state: as a child the Empire, as an adolescent the Weimar Republic, as an adult fascism and, after that, the attempt at socialism in the GDR]. Hopes for the future are similarly conveyed through familial succession, with the desire that her grandchildren might experience the future she longs for. An individual life story is thus set within a wider social history which is projected beyond the protagonist's death. It is the focus of these hopes which are pivotal to the teleology of the narrative:

In meiner Jugend träumte ich vom Sozialismus, dessen weltweiten Zusammenbruch ich jetzt im Alter erlebe; und ich finde mich wieder in den Kapitalismus zurückgeworfen. Habe ich meine Träume für immer ausgeträumt? Nein, denn ich weiß, daß die Menschen niemals aufhören werden, nach Mustern zu suchen, die es ermöglichen, die Güter der Erde gerecht zu verteilen. (7)

In my youth I dreamed of socialism, the world-wide collapse of which I am now experiencing in old age; and I find myself cast back once again into capitalism. Are my dreams really over forever? No, because I know that people will never give up looking for models which make it possible to distribute earthly goods justly.

Thus, in the context of 1994, following the collapse of East German socialism, the narrator begins the text with a declaration of a collective, utopian, socialist standpoint.

The protagonist's socialist beliefs are one of the three cornerstones of her self-understanding. Triangulating with this are her identities as an author and as a woman. A focus on "my life" in the title of the text and the emphasis on the first-person inherent to the genre of autobiography place negotiations of these different subjectivities at the centre of the narrative. At various points within the text these three elements of identity vary in prominence. In this analysis I will consider the hierarchies of competing identities during the protagonist's childhood and early youth, during fascism, in the GDR and since 1989, with a particular focus on memories of fascism. An examination of such vacillating emphases allows constructions of gender, class and the role of literature as a site of resistance to be examined. Although these time periods will be considered separately,

the discussion will highlight how the text militates against such separation through a mixing of time levels.

Following the introductory pages, the text is divided into a further twenty-three chapters, which are broadly chronological. The chapter titles focus on the experiences of the protagonist, but in their breadth are also readable as signifiers of generic experience: “Krieg” [War], “Krankheit und Tod” [Illness and death], “Frauen allein” [Women alone], “Kinder ohne Eltern” [Children without parents]. Unlike those that follow, the first two chapter titles place personal experience at the forefront through the use of the first-person pronoun: “Woher ich gekommen bin” [Where I came from]; “Ich wollte schreiben, immer nur schreiben” [I wanted to write, only to write]. The title headings emphasize the familial sphere (“Erste Ehejahre” [First years of marriage], “Ehebruch” [Adultery], “Ende der Ehe” [The end of the marriage]) and the protagonist’s authorial identity (“Schreiben oder leben?” [To write or to live?], “Wie es dazu kam, daß ich ein Mädchenbuch schrieb” [How I came to write a book for girls], “‘Rom hauptpostlagernd’ und anderes” [Rome poste restante and other stories]). Progression of time is marked pictorially through the inclusion of photographs showing the protagonist from age fifteen to seventy-six. These similarly focus on familial images and those relating to her professional life, including readings, book fairs and a writers’ congress. Half of the text describes the time period before 1947, with slightly more narrative space being devoted to the first half of the protagonist’s life than to the second.

The memories of family history which are included in the autobiography precede the protagonist’s birth and have been passed down to her by her mother. By including experiences that the protagonist did not witness, the text thus goes beyond the authority of first-person knowledge. Through the focus on the family, an interpretative voice of the narrating present emphasizes the patriarchal co-ordinates of these origins communicated to her by her mother, as is signified by the words which begin the first of these two chapters: “Mein Vater [...]” [my father] (9). Critical interventions by the voice of the narrating present emphasize issues of gender through references to the numerous unwanted pregnancies of the grandmother, which jar with the celebration at her funeral of her “‘erfülltes Leben’” [fulfilled life] (9). Notions of motherhood are brought to the fore through depictions of the protagonist’s female relatives; from the grandmother who refuses to be seen in public while pregnant, to the stepmother who attempts “ihre vier Stiefkinder aus dem Haus zu ekeln” [to drive her four step-children out of the house in disgust] (10), and to Tante

Auguste who left her son with the protagonist's parents "da sie selbst keine Zeit für ihn hatte" [because she didn't have any time for him herself] (11). In contrast, both the protagonist and her mother describe positively the relationship with their mothers. Whether positively or negatively portrayed, it is the female characters which figure prominently in this initial chapter. All the women referred to are strong characters who influence those around them. External circumstances, particularly the effects of both the First and Second World War on the lives of these women, are emphasized. The trauma of widowhood and the hard work needed to rebuild lives in the absence of men after the Second World War are stressed through the stories of Aunt Lene and Aunt Emma. The narrator laconically describes how Tante Emma had to bury "was von Onkel Gustav noch übrig war" [what was left of uncle Gustav] (15) after he was killed in an air raid. The first references to the effects of fascism are therefore gendered memories of suffering and of surviving in adversity.

In describing the class and political stance of the protagonist's family ("Verkörperte meine Mutter mit ihren Geschwistern das typische Kleinbürgertum, so brachte Vaters Familie mehr das proletarische Element hinein" [if my mother and siblings personified the typical petit-bourgeoisie then my father's family brought more the proletarian element to the mix] 13), the text pre-empts future events in their lives. Such references repeatedly focus on the Nazi period, with apolitical members of her family being described as an easy target for the Nazis. Against the setting of an initially apolitical upbringing, the narrator describes events which are interpreted as giving rise to the young protagonist's political beliefs and reshaping those of her parents. In an episode very similar to that in Greta Kuckhoff's text, memories of naive childhood industriousness are linked directly to the protagonist's later entry into the Communist party, with the voice of the narrating present emphasizing their interconnectedness:

Der Weg von der zehnjährigen Blumenverkäuferin, die durchaus das Ihre zum Lebensunterhalt der Familie beitragen wollte, bis zu der Genossin, die in der Wohngruppenzelle die kritische Wirtschaftslage erörterte und den Text zu einem Flugblatt verfaßte, war beschwerlich und ist durchaus nicht immer geradlinig verlaufen. Heute scheint es mir, als seien es die wichtigsten Jahre meines Lebens gewesen. (17)

The journey from the ten-year old flower seller, who certainly wanted to do her bit to contribute to the family income, to the comrade who discussed the critical economic situation with those she lived with and wrote up the text into a leaflet, was difficult and certainly did not go smoothly. Today it seems to me that these were the most important years of my life.

A pivotal episode during this journey is one in which communist friends rescue the family's possessions from the bailiff following a failed attempt to open a library. Their behaviour epitomizes the meaning of solidarity for the present narrator. The incident juxtaposes the dangers of capitalist "Schwindelunternehmen" [bogus firms] (18) with the humanity and honesty of her political friends. The resulting involvement of the protagonist's parents with the KPD in 1933 provides the first reference to antifascist resistance. Through a listing of the 'visitors' to the parents' shop (Walter Ulbricht, Wilhelm Pieck and Ernst Thälmann) and the prominence that these figures achieved in post-war East German society, the importance of the family's involvement is suggested. However, the narrator's dismissive description of Ulbricht ("Man fröstelt, wenn man ihn nur ansieht" ['one shudders just to look at him'] 20) at the same time distances the text from any retrospective admiration of the future East German head of state.

The protagonist's political direction is emphasized in contrast to that of her brother, a member of both the 'Bündische Jugend' [youth movement] and Leni Riefenstahl's entourage. The narrator asserts that she followed a distinctly different path. When discussing collective experience in the KPD the narrative changes from the first-person singular to the first-person plural. A historical panorama covering the time from 1930 to 1989 is encapsulated within the final sentences of the first chapter:

Wir [die KPD] wollten die alte verrottete Welt aus den Angeln heben, eine neue gerechte Ordnung errichten, in der, unter anderem, auch Köchinnen Schulen und Universitäten besuchen können, um Minister zu werden, wie Lenin forderte. Aber wir mußten erst das Ende des Zweiten Weltkrieges erleben, ehe wir in einem Teil des zerstückelten Landes den Versuch unternehmen konnten, unsere Ideale zu verwirklichen. Und wieder vierzig Jahre später ist unser Versuch gescheitert. Um dahinterzukommen, wie das geschehen konnte, will ich mein Leben durchforschen. (23)

We [the Communist party] wanted to turn the old rotten world upside down, to set up a new, just order in which cooks, amongst others, could also attend schools and universities in order to become ministers, as Lenin demanded. But first of all we had to experience the end of the Second World War before we could attempt to realize our ideals in one part of the dismembered country. And now forty years later our attempt has failed. In order to get to the bottom of how this could happen, I'm going to investigate my life.

Memories of the protagonist's youth are linked here with the GDR, and a continuity of communist belief which predated Nazism is emphasized. Significantly, however, the years of fascism are not

referred to, but merely the end of the war. This compression of time will be shown as being symptomatic of the depiction of fascism within the text. The narrator asserts that, on the basis of individual experience an explanation for wider historical events can be found. At the same time, as seen through the repeated use of the first-person plural, the text makes claims to be representative. The aim of understanding historical events through personal history is a prominent theme within Brüning's narrative. Yet, it is the very tensions between the protagonist's prioritization of her own experience and competing assertions of collective validity which prove to be problematic.

Following the impetus noted above to analyse what led to the collapse of the GDR, Brüning's next chapter focuses on the authorial identity of the protagonist. This implicitly raises questions about the role of literature in the former GDR and in the post-unification context. The initial description of the protagonist's difficult path to authorship is rooted by the narrator in terms of both advantages and disadvantages attributable to her position as a member of the "Kleinbürgertum" [petit-bourgeoisie] (25). It is also affected by her being female. In the second chapter, the portrayal of the protagonist's early work within publishing houses is linked to traumatic events stemming from gendered power relations. Hans-Wolfgang Hillers, a playwright, is the first person to take the young protagonist seriously as an author. He is also described as the first man with whom she had an intimate relationship, as someone who was "eine absolute Autorität" [an absolute authority] (33) for the protagonist. Such a description belies the fact that he raped the fifteen-year-old when she was most dependent on him. This brutal episode is followed by a description of her discovering him with another woman. Through the voice of the young girl, who contemplates throwing herself from a bridge, the protagonist's predicament is romanticized and narrated with pathos:

Ich dachte daran, mich einfach fallen zu lassen. Es mußte nicht schlimm sein, in den Fluß zu tauchen und mit den kurzen Wellen, die die Oberfläche kräuselten, eins zu werden. Da ich nicht schwimmen konnte, würde der Todeskampf nicht lange währen, und ich konnte allen Schmerz und alle Verzweiflung hinter mir lassen. (35)

I thought of just letting myself fall. It couldn't be bad to dive into the river and to become one with the small waves which rippled the surface. As I could not swim the struggle would not last long and I could leave all the pain and despair behind me.

The present narrator emphasizes in retrospect Hillers' positive sides, judging him as a reliable friend who was merely "ungezügelt in seinem sexuellen Verhalten" [without restraint in his sexual behaviour]. Through such euphemism he is forgiven because of his interest in her as an author, which the present narrator considers to be most important. The protagonist's emotional entanglement with Heinz Pol, a communist of "bürgerliche Herkunft" [bourgeois origins] (44) and editor of the *Neue Montagszeitung*, is described more critically. He is seen as someone who took advantage of "das Abenteuer, das [sie] ihm zu bieten schien" [the adventure that she seemed to offer him] (43) and who was already married. Their later estrangement centres on the protagonist's abortion and his preoccupation with the cost rather than the emotional trauma of the young girl. The narrator discusses how these prominent characters from her early literary life were affected by Nazism. In the same justificatory tone in which Hillers' sexual behaviour is defended, she describes how he "habe mit den Nazis seinen Frieden gemacht" [made his peace with the Nazis] (36) by working for the Ufa film company. In contrast, Heinz Pol flees into exile in Prague following the fire at the Reichstag and the persecution of communists, while his Jewish family emigrates to Palestine.

Through a focus on the intersection of familial, political and gender constellations within these early memories, Brüning's text concentrates on the individual identificatory figure of the protagonist. By juxtaposing such memories with the later events of Nazism, a spectrum of experience is depicted, including antifascist resistance and both general and individual suffering. For the latter, a wider empathetic focus is stressed through the portrayal of the women of the family.

"The Darkest of Times": Memories of Fascism

Intertwined with memories of the first stages of the protagonist's literary career are frequent references to the years just before and after the Nazis' seizure of power. These emphasize not only the significance of this crucial historical period, but also its effect on the protagonist as author and Communist.

The years around 1932 are positively interpreted in retrospect as being the time of the protagonist's political awakening: "Heute scheint mir, daß in geistiger Hinsicht nie eine Zeit lebendiger war als die der zu Ende gehenden Weimarer Republik" [Today, it seems to me that,

intellectually speaking, there was never a more lively time than when the Weimar Republic was coming to its end] (32). Given the temporal scope of the narrative, this prioritization is significant for its implications for the portrayal of life in the GDR. Yet, the depiction of these later Weimar years contains many contradictions. Alongside such positive elements are placed the increasing economic hardships, which lead to the protagonist's father being made redundant. In addition, her individual experiences as an author prove more testing. Her first meeting with the BPRS is less than positive. "Vieles", states the narrator, "erschien mir fremd, manches sogar absurd" [much seemed strange to me, a lot even absurd] (41). Significant post-war figures such as Johannes R. Becher, Anna Seghers and Jan Petersen are mentioned, but, apart from a complimentary reference to Seghers, they are subsumed under generic criticism:

Die Ästhetiker im "Bund" blickten nach dem "großen proletarischen Kunstwerk" aus und übersahen dabei, daß es schon etliche Werke erschienen waren, die durchaus als ein Schritt dorthin zu werten waren. (42)

The aesthetes in the "Association" were on the look-out for "the great proletarian work of art" and while they were doing so overlooked the fact that several works had appeared which were definitely to be seen as a step in this direction.

Within her local branch of the BPRS the protagonist at first finds rejection, which causes "eine schöpferische Krise" [a creative crisis] (41) and leads to her drawing a line under that part of her literary life. Her subsequent work was to focus on the problems of "das wirkliche Leben" [real life] and not "die Sonntage des Lebens" [the halcyon days] (42). There is an emphasis on those in the BPRS with whom the protagonist disagreed, although subsequent references to figures such as Trude Richter highlight that in fact there were people with whom the protagonist did form lasting contact.

The protagonist's authorial identity is inextricably linked to memories of the early years of Nazism. The "Doppelleben" [double life] referred to in the fourth chapter heading signifies not only her resistance to the fascist system, but also her double identity as an author. Following an unsuccessful attempt to publish in exile on completion of her book in 1933, she decides to stay in Germany:

Für mich war es richtiger, nach Deutschland zurückzukehren und dort an der illegalen Arbeit teilzunehmen. Ich vergrub also mein Manuskript in der untersten Schreibtisch-Schublade, wo es für lange Zeit liegen blieb – und schrieb ein neues Buch. Meine Freunde im "Bund" gaben den Anstoß dazu. "Du kennst das Leben und Treiben auf den märkischen Seen", sagten sie eines

Tages zu mir, "schreib ein unbeschwertes, zeitloses Sommerbuch. Du verdienst damit, was du für deinen Unterhalt brauchst, und tarnst dich gegenüber den Nazis". (49)

It was better for me to return to Germany and to take part in the illegal work there. So I buried my manuscript in the bottom drawer of my desk, where it stayed for a long time, and wrote a new book. My friends in the BPRS prompted me to do it. One day they said to me: "You know about life and what goes on by the Märkisch Lakes. Write a light-hearted, timeless summer book. You will earn what you need to live on from it and you will disguise yourself from the Nazis".

The protagonist's decision to become a member of the 'Reich Chamber of Literature' is thus framed as an act of resistance. Through the voice of other resisters, the narrator justifies her continued writing of a "zarte Liebesgeschichte" [tender love-story] (50). The publication of the books *Und außerdem ist es Sommer* in 1934, of *Junges Herz muß wandern* in 1936, and of *Auf schmalem Land* in 1938, shows that while Nazi literary policy undoubtedly had an effect on her life as an author, it was some years before it forced her "zum Verstummen" [into silence] (39). The writing of these books also meant that she did not have to undertake tasks which would have amounted to Nazi propaganda: for example, writing superficially about a sports training camp which she saw as a militarized precursor to the airforce.

The chapter "My Double-life" contains details of the protagonist's resistance work. As such it is the basis upon which her subsequent antifascist self-understanding is built and is of primary significance within the autobiography as a whole. Between 1934 and 1935, Brüning worked for the BPRS, producing articles which appeared under the heading of "Stimme aus Deutschland" [Voice from Germany] in the exile magazine *Neue Deutsche Blätter* in Prague. In addition, she was involved in posting illegal flyers and attending Marxist discussion groups in Berlin. She also became a courier, smuggling minutes from meetings of the propaganda ministry over the border into Prague during 1935. Within the description of this work and of the community of resisters, there are many tensions on the level of the narrating present. These arise, firstly, from a division between those authors who went into exile and those who stayed in Germany; secondly, from an avoidance of a confrontation with negative experiences of antifascist friends and the very brief narration of the protagonist's arrest; and thirdly, I suggest, from a need to justify a lack of the protagonist's resistance from 1937 onwards.

The protagonist's first illegal crossing of the border into Lithuania is dramatized with the description of a rain-swept seascape heightening tension. However, it is an episode which ends in an anti-climax: having crossed the border she simply returns home. The border represents the two juxtaposed worlds of fascism and exile. Debate about whether to stay in Germany recurs within this chapter and the decision to remain is set within a discussion of the prominent exiled author, Thomas Mann. While achieving a certain moral authority as one who stayed (“[u]m uns Zurückgebliebene wurde es immer leerer” [around those of us who stayed it became more and more empty] 53) the narrative makes it clear that the protagonist did not really have another option given her financial circumstances.

A tension is suggested between those who left and those who remained in Germany to work illegally through a reiteration that the agenda of such work was set by those in exile, particularly Grete Weiskopf (Alex Wedding), Oskar Maria Graf, Wieland Herzfelde and Anna Seghers. Such a division of labour is commented on by the voice of the narrating present:

Oft ist später um die Frage gestritten worden, wer es schwerer hatte, die Schriftsteller der äußeren oder der inneren Emigration. Der Streit ist wohl niemals entschieden worden. Doch mir scheint, daß sich in der äußeren Emigration zahlreiche Schriftsteller zur Reife entwickelt haben [...]. Wir aber blieben zwölf Jahre lang von der Weltliteratur abgeschnitten [...], wir vegetierten geistig dahin. (64)

Later on the question was often debated as to who had a more difficult time, the writers of exile or of inner emigration. The argument can perhaps never be decided. But it seems to me that in exile numerous writers developed into maturity [...]. Whereas we remained cut off from world literature for twelve years [...], we vegetated intellectually.

This feeling of marginalization within the antifascist group is reiterated in a much later description of the 1947 First German Writers Congress, when attention is only belatedly accorded to Brüning and her colleagues, “die Namenlosen unter den anwesenden Autoren, die bisher noch durch kein öffentliches Lob oder einen Verriß ins Scheinwerferlicht der Aufmerksamkeit gerückt worden waren” [the nameless ones among the authors present, who until now had never been brought into the spotlight of attention through public praise or a slating review] (206). Strength of feeling on this subject is further suggested when the present narrator points to the success of those who wrote in exile, describing 1945 as a caesura after which the protagonist as author “mußte [...] gleichsam noch einmal neu

anfangen” [had to began again, as it were, from scratch] (64). She could not compete against the subsequent fame in East Germany of those authors of exile who had published abroad during fascism.

Acknowledging the debate over inner emigration, and thus positioning the text within the parameters of contemporary West German academic discourse, the narrator continues a defensive stance:

Heute, nach langem Abstand, wissen wir, daß es andere Widerstandsgruppen gegeben hat, die ungleich Wichtigeres geleistet haben. Aber auch unsere Arbeit, denke ich, ist nicht nutzlos gewesen. Gibt sie doch den nach uns Geborenen Kunde davon, daß es selbst in der finstersten Zeit unserer Vergangenheit Menschen gab, die sich bemühten, die Wahrheit zu schreiben. (63)

Today, from considerable distance, we know that there were other resistance groups who achieved very different and more important things. But also our work, I think, was not useless. It lets those born after us know that even in the darkest times of our past there were people who made the effort to write the truth.

Given this assertion as to the “truth” of their resistance writings, it is striking that there is no detail about the content of their work in the autobiography – this in comparison to later, detailed interludes describing the content of the protagonist’s post-war fictional work. A disillusionment with some of the prolific members of the BPRS may be a reason why such minimal space is devoted to the protagonist’s literary resistance activities. But, this leads to the paradoxical situation that, in much biographical writing about Brüning, it is her membership of the illegal BPRS which is stressed (Wall 1995, 58; Heitzenröther 1964, 32), and yet, in an autobiography of over three hundred pages, there are only two occasions when her literary resistance is described, each comprizing no more than a few sentences. No details about the dates or subject matter of the articles are included. The only hint given about the later focus of such writing is the protagonist’s unfulfilled assignment to write a book about “Die Lage der Frau im dritten Reich” [‘The situation of women in the third reich’] (58) a task elevated in stature through the fact that she was asked to do it by Johannes R. Becher. A reticence to specify these literary resistance activities any further recurs in Brüning’s earlier writing. For example, in an article called “Man nannte mich Agnes” [They called me Agnes] Brüning wrote: “Über unsere illegale Arbeit im ‘Bund’ möchte ich hier nicht näher berichten” [I don’t want to write here any more about our illegal work in the ‘Association’] (1983, 12). Also, still earlier in “Um uns wurde es immer leerer”, the only reference to resistance is: “Wir versorgten die Emigrantepresse mit Berichten aus

Nazideutschland” [We provided the émigré press with reports from Nazi Germany] (1955, 37). However, thanks to Ursula Steinhaußen’s afterword to a collection of Brüning’s fiction, we know that Brüning published in Prague under the pseudonym Elke Kent (Brüning 1977, 426). A further insight into her work is given by Johannes R. Becher when he writes of a small, active resistance group in Berlin, including Elfriede Brüning, who “nicht nur an den illegalen Zeitschriften literarisch mitarbeitet, sondern in der letzten Zeit auch dazu übergegangen ist, eine eigene Zeitschrift herzustellen” [not only works on the underground newspapers, but also more recently has in addition produced its own newspaper] (1967, 589, 798). Therefore, what is interesting in terms of the autobiography is that the very foundation of Brüning’s antifascist identity – her antifascist writings – is subject to marginalization within her own text. Such a gap may reflect a refusal to dwell on the fact that this resistance was unable to combat fascism. It also suggests a continued disillusionment with the prominent members of the BPRS in the post-war period. In addition, in the context of 1994, such reticence could be seen as an unwillingness to include reference to antifascist discourses of the 1930s which had fallen into disrepute at the time of publication.

In contrast to a lack of detail about the resistance literature, there is more information about the posting of illegal flyers and the protagonist’s work as a courier. She illegally carried documents to Prague which “[ihren] Freunden vom ‘Bund’ als Unterlage für ihre in der Emigrantenpresse erscheinenden Glossen und Kommentare dienen sollte” [were supposed to serve, for her friends in the ‘Association’, as documents for the notes and commentaries which would appear in the émigré press] (56). There is a focus within the autobiography on these practical, and dangerous, acts of resistance. The possible consequences of such action are also emphasized through references to those members of the BPRS who were arrested, tortured or committed suicide. Further references to the protagonist’s direct involvement in resistance are few, although she is described much later as passing both food and ration cards to those in contact with people hiding in Berlin.

Interspersed with brief descriptions of the protagonist’s own resistance are character portraits of other people which highlight their devotion to the cause of antifascism. Within these portraits, the narrator points to future events revealing discrepancies between the socialism for which these people were fighting and the systems of the Soviet Union and GDR that they were later to experience. The protagonist’s Jewish friend, the author Heinz Pol, is described as

someone who “beteiligte sich eifrig an allen Aktivitäten der täglichen Parteiarbeit” [enthusiastically involved himself in all activities of the daily work of the party] (44) but who, after the war, refused to visit the GDR because he “mit seinen Neigungen zum Trotzkyismus [...] keine Lust [hatte], in ein Land zu kommen, das von Leuten regiert wurde, die er nicht sonderlich schätzte” [did not, with his tendency towards Trotzkyism, want to visit a country that was ruled by people of whom he did not think particularly highly] (57). Similarly, the well-known East German Trude Richter, leader of the protagonist’s Marxist circle and former secretary of the BPRS, emigrated to the Soviet Union and “verschwand für zwanzig Jahre in einem sibirischen Lager” [disappeared for twenty years into a Siberian labour camp] (58). Notwithstanding the initial narratorial imperative to examine the protagonist’s life with a view to investigating why the GDR failed, there is no intervention of the voice of the narrating present as to these negative experiences of her dedicated antifascist friends. Instead the narrator reiterates that, notwithstanding Trude Richter’s lengthy imprisonment, she returned in the 1950s to Leipzig “ungebrochen und stürzte sich sofort wieder in die politische Arbeit” [unbroken and immediately threw herself back into political work] (58). A narrative link between Richter’s antifascism and her later work in the GDR disarticulates her Soviet experiences through this claim to continuity.

Pivotal to the experience of resistance is the protagonist’s unexpected and sudden arrest following a meeting with the BPRS in 1935. Again there is only very brief discussion of the event, with both the protagonist’s fallibility and infallibility being portrayed simultaneously. Her emotional collapse on arriving in her cell portrays an abject figure, yet it is also repeatedly stressed that she is quick thinking, with an ability “den Kopf aus der Schlinge [zu ziehen]” [to get out of trouble] (63). Within the prison walls, the protagonist continues an authorial double life, continuing work on the love-story which was to be published on her release. It is in relation to this book that the trauma of the experience is retrospectively encapsulated: “Aber die ‘junge, verheißungsvolle Autorin’, wie es in der Bildunterschrift hieß, ging ihrer dunkelsten Zeit entgegen” [But the ‘young, promising author’, as it said in the caption, faced her darkest time] (61). The episode culminates in the description of a court appearance “nach einigen Monaten” [after several months] (62) at which she is discharged under surveillance, but there is very little preceding detail about this time. In her article entitled “Solidarität” [solidarity], Brüning emphasizes that in prison there was “ein unterirdisches Nachrichtennetz” [an underground news network]

which “die politischen Gefangenen verband, und ihnen die Gewißheit gab, ein Teil der unüberwindlichen internationalen Arbeitermacht zu sein, für die die Besten, wenn es sein mußte, in den Tod gingen [...]” [which linked the prisoners and gave them the certainty that they were part of the invincible might of international workers, for which the best went to their deaths if necessary] (1955, 34). No such detail is given in the autobiography – the narrator does not situate the protagonist in a collective of resisters, but emphasizes instead the individual and lonely trauma of imprisonment.

When the protagonist marries Joachim Barckhausen in 1937 she gives up her resistance work. The text implies that she does so partly because her husband considers “jeden Widerstand gegen die Nazis für sinnlos [...] und alle, die dennoch an ihrer konspirativen Spielerei festhielten, für lächerliche Spinner” [all resistance to the Nazis to be pointless [...] and all those who nevertheless stuck to their conspiratorial game to be ridiculous nutcases] (80), and partly because she moves away from her resistance group in Berlin. Her antifascist identity is therefore founded on her work in the early years of Nazism. It is my contention that the depiction of the remaining time until 1945, which focuses largely on the familial sphere, is pervaded by a need to justify the lack of any further involvement in resistance. By the summer of 1940, the narrator maintains, “einen wirksamen inneren Widerstand gab es nicht mehr” [there was no longer an effective internal resistance] (85). Such an assertion is later contradicted through a frequent recourse to the stories of resisters of the group ‘Rote Kapelle’ who fought on until 1942, including Harro Schulze-Boysen, Ilse Stöbe, and Hilde and Hans Coppi. However, the narrator repeatedly stresses that the activities of this group, their arrest and execution were unknown at the time:

Die Bevölkerung – auch ich – ahnte von [den Verhören, der Folter, dem Tod] nichts, denn Hitler hatte befohlen, die “Liquidierung der Verräter” streng geheim zu behandeln; kein Sterbenswort gelangte an die Öffentlichkeit, alles geschah sozusagen unterirdisch. [...] Jeder hatte mit sich zu tun, hatte seine eigenen Sorgen – ebenso wie ich. Von der Tragödie um die Verfolgung der Gruppe um Harro Schulze-Boysen und Arvid Harnack [...] habe ich erst nach 1945 erfahren. Vorher waren meine Sorgen und Gedanken auf anderes, Persönliches gerichtet. (104)

The population – me too – suspected nothing of [the interrogations, the torture, the deaths], for Hitler had ordered that the “liquidation of the traitors” be kept strictly secret; no final last words reached the public, everything happened, so to speak, underground. [...] Everyone was concerned about themselves, had their own worries – just as I did. I first learned about the tragedy of the persecution of the group surrounding Harro Schulze-Boysen and Arvid Harnack

after 1945. Before that all my worries and thoughts were directed at other, personal, things.

Given the protagonist's previous knowledge of, and involvement in, resistance such comments are both self-critical and defensive – as seen through the repetition of the first person “auch ich” [me too], “ebenso wie ich” [just like me], and the setting of the protagonist in a wider collective. There is one further, final, reference to resistance. This deals with the military resistance of the Stauffenberg group who, the narrator claims, “vielleicht noch das Schlimmste verhindern und einen Kompromiß mit den Westmächten [hätten] aushandeln können” [could have perhaps prevented the worst and negotiated a compromise with the Western powers] (112). Given that this failed action occurred as late as July 1944, it begs the question as to the definition of “the worst”.

“Other, Personal, Things”

In the light of the narrative emphasis on the protagonist's lack of knowledge about such resistance groups due to her preoccupation with other matters, I will now consider what the focus of the distracting “Persönliches” [personal things] was, and how the wider population and their different experiences of Nazism are depicted.

While there are six chapters covering the years of fascism, only one, “Mein Doppelleben”, details the protagonist's involvement in illegal work. Subsequently there is a shift in emphasis towards the familial, a shift which increases throughout the text. Progression of time is often marked through personal experiences, particularly the opportunities the protagonist has to publish. Thus, in addition to the texts of 1934 and 1936, the year 1938 is marked by the publication of *Auf schmalem Land* and the year 1939 as the time when the protagonist gave up writing in order to avoid making concessions to the Nazi authorities. Historical events within these years are subordinate to personal milestones.

Notwithstanding the protagonist's decision to give up her literary career in 1939, she does continue to work, reading and writing manuscripts for films. There is the implication that such later work did not involve political compromise. For example, there is an insistence on the apolitical stance of a film about a doctor that she works on, despite an earlier claim that from the beginning of the war paper was only permitted for manuscripts “die die Nazi-Ideologie verherrlichten,

und auf der Leinwand erschienen Hetzfilme wie 'Jud Süß'" [which glorified Nazi-ideology and on the screen inflammatory films like 'Jud Süß' appeared] (73). An attempt is thus made to justify her involvement in a project which, unlike her earlier publications, is not presented as an act of resistance.

Authorial and personal relationships converge in 1936 when the protagonist meets Joachim Barckhausen in his capacity as editor and whom she marries eighteen months later. This relationship is fundamental to the familial memories of fascism, a fact emphasized by the framing of the years 1937-1947 in terms of both the duration of the marriage and the wider historical context: "Wer diese Zahlen liest, weiß, daß jene Zeiten geprägt waren von der Angst vor dem Krieg, den wir kommen sahen, von den Kriegseignissen selbst und von den ersten schweren Nachkriegsjahren" [Whoever reads these dates knows that these times were characterized by fear of the war which we saw coming, by the events of the war itself and of the first difficult years of the immediate post-war period] (73). The marriage is the focal point of questions of class and gender, and the relationship of the couple to those around them brings into focus different group experiences of the Nazi years.

In contrast to the protagonist, Barckhausen comes from the land- and factory-owning upper-classes; his brother owned sixteen hundred acres of land and a house in Holstein, and his parents owned an even grander estate called Marienstuhl, photographs of which are included in the text. The protagonist's first encounter with these two properties contains contradictory responses. Her social alienation from the surroundings is emphasized by the animosity of Barckhausen's mother, but it is not an alienation considered by the voice of the narrating present. Descriptions of "ein Schloß, ein protziges Haus mit neun Badezimmern" [a castle, a swanky home with nine bathrooms] (66), of servants, a gardener and a driver at his brother's house, and the arrival in Marienstuhl which was "noch um Nuancen prächtiger" [several shades more splendid] (69), are likened to paradise and a fairytale. Notwithstanding the contradictions between such wealth and her political beliefs, Holstein is somewhere that the present narrator claims was close to her heart and which she fondly remembers years later.

Contrasts are repeatedly made between the protagonist's family and her husband's, with a parallel disparity in the positive and negative ways in which they are described. "Die feudale Umgebung" [the most feudal of surroundings] with its stilted and unfriendly atmosphere is juxtaposed with the "primitiv" [simple] but welcoming

surroundings of her parents. The latter are also a site of resistance, with the meetings of “verschworene Antifaschisten” [sworn antifascists] (72) taking place there. Communist resistance is therefore linked to the protagonist’s class background. While Barckhausen’s family are originally against Hitler, during the war their support changes and “die Widersprüche brechen offen aus” [the contradictions break out openly] (83), which alienates the protagonist further. However, such contradictions are also apparent in the protagonist’s own behaviour. One episode in particular causes the voice of the narrating present to reflect on the ambivalence of her situation, but also raises further questions: previously unmentioned by the narrator are the forced labourers working near their sugar factory and as domestic help in Marienstuhl. These were Ukrainian women, who “die SS [hatte] von der Straße weg auf Lastautos geladen und ‘ins Reich’ verschleppt” [the SS had grabbed off the street, loaded onto lorries and carted off ‘into the Reich’]. The protagonist did not approach these women, it is claimed, firstly, because she did not want to disturb them after a long day’s work, and, secondly, because she doubted they would believe her indignation at the way they were being treated:

Wieder fühlte ich deutlich das Paradoxe meiner Lage: Ich, eine Kommunistin, wohnte im Schloß, gehörte in ihren Augen zur “herrschenden Klasse”; wie sollte ich ihnen klar machen, daß ich mich mit ihnen und ihrem Schicksal verbunden fühlte? Und doch war es so; ich hätte alles dafür gegeben, wenn sie mich als eine der ihren und nicht als Feindin betrachtet hätten. (122)

Once again I clearly felt the paradox of my situation: I, a Communist, lived in the castle, belonged in their eyes to the “ruling classes”; how was I to make it clear to them that I felt connected to them and to their fate? And yet, it was so; I would have given everything if they had looked upon me as one of them and not as an enemy.

Notwithstanding such emotional identification, the narration of the situation from the protagonist’s perspective and the emphasis on her feelings leads to her to criticize these women for not recognizing the kind intentions of her and her husband when they visit. In fact, her and her husband’s surprise that one of the women is highly educated and that the baby born to another woman died within hours of birth suggests more their total lack of comprehension of what is happening on their own doorstep. Similarly, the protagonist’s attempts to show camaraderie to a Ukrainian cook in their house does not stretch so far as to defend her when she is mistakenly accused of theft. The narrator’s description of the forced labour is framed in such a way as

to reassert the protagonist's self-identity as a Communist, but in doing so the perspective of the forced labourers is effectively marginalized.

In contrast to the discussions of wealth and class in Grete Kuckhoff's text, the present narrator of *Und außerdem* does not link the nobility's position to the position of forced labour or to the fascist system. While there is reference to the advantages of living on the estate during war, in terms of greater food and less danger from bombing raids, the protagonist's moral standpoint prevents introspection. It is striking, therefore, that the implication of the upper classes in the perpetuation of the system of forced labour and the war is accentuated by the two photos of Holstein and Marienstuhl in all their splendour on the page following the chapter entitled "Krieg" [War].

Repeating a pattern prominent in her earlier memories, the protagonist's relationships during fascism are described in terms of subordination and repression. The prominence of her identities as wife and mother after 1937 is reflected in the amount of textual space devoted to them. The announcement of her marriage by her future husband, when she is unaware of anything more than friendship, is not resisted by her. This signifies not only a compromising of political beliefs, as she was against marriage, but also the first of many instances of the protagonist's passive role in a life-changing decision. Even her future father-in-law's decision that she should provide him with a grandson leads only to a hypothetical rebellion: "Der Wein hatte meine Sinne umnebelt und mein Bewußtsein eingeschläfert, sonst hätte ich spätestens jetzt revoltiert" [The wine had clouded my senses and put my consciousness to sleep, otherwise I would have rebelled at the very latest at this point] (71). While her pregnancy is described as "eine erfreuliche Nachricht" [a pleasing piece of news] (86), the protagonist's role as a mother is conveyed no more positively than that of her grandmother. The feeling of being treated as both "einen kostbaren Gegenstand" [a valuable object] (86) and the "Gefäß" [vessel] (87) which carried the child are replaced on its birth by "eine trostlose Verlassenheit" [a comfortless desolation] (90). The employment of a nanny by her mother-in-law means that the protagonist's first experiences as a mother are marked by her child's absence over which she has no control. The impact of such alienation is emphasized by the voice of the narrating present through a comparison with the protagonist's granddaughter. Contemporary approaches to both motherhood and to sexuality are addressed in the chapter "Krankheit und Tod" [Illness and death], with control over decisions relating to these marking a female emancipation, which the

protagonist claims not to have experienced. Nevertheless, there is some form of resistance to the family's expectations: in contrast to the women of her husband's family who were only given any recognition when bearing children, the protagonist returns to work after her daughter Christiane's birth.

Notwithstanding her initially estranged relationship to motherhood, when Christiane becomes ill in the third year of the war the protagonist's desperation for her child is clear: "Jetzt erst spürte ich, wie stark ich mich schon an das kleine Wesen gewöhnt hatte, wie sehr es ein Teil von mir selber war" [It was now for the first time that I felt how much I had already become used to this tiny being, how very much a part of myself it was] (98). Both parents focus at this point entirely on their child. The description of the war is as a backdrop to the fear felt by the mother and father for their daughter. Problems of transport, hospitals, rations and communication all make her treatment more difficult but are narrated in retrospect as subordinate to the family problems. Later, the increasing chaos of the war is seen in terms of difficulties it presents for the deterioration of Barckhausen's sight and the obstacles it presents for necessary treatment. Family illness due to natural causes and exacerbated by effects of the war emphasizes the protagonist's roles as mother and wife. These gender identities are brought to the fore in the chapter entitled "Krieg" where war and its impact are rather peripheral. This chapter opens with reference to the effect on the protagonist's immediate sphere: "Für uns änderte sich im Alltag zunächst wenig" [at first for us everyday life changed very little] (83). Beginning on 1 September 1939, accelerated narration within the next two pages mentions the progression of the invading German army, the bombing of London and Coventry, and the invasion of the Soviet Union in June 1941, with the focus then shifting to the protagonist's pregnancy. This is a pattern reiterated in the following chapter where more than three quarters of the text is devoted to the illness of Christiane and the suicide of Barckhausen's father.

While the protagonist is portrayed as someone active in a caring role, she is also frequently marginalized within these roles. Her frequent impotence as a woman within her husband's family mirrors her impotence as a socialist and former resister to the regime. As in the earlier relationships with Hans Schwalm and Heinz Pol, the protagonist tries to define her own limits within her marriage. Her failure to do so leads to an affair in which she attempts to reassert herself and reject the claustrophobic atmosphere of Marienstuhl.

Instead, feelings of self-hatred accompany her brief relationship with the man who raped her as a girl.

What becomes clear from these memories is a gender hierarchy in relation to the protagonist's husband and his world. What is not focussed on is the role of women as determined by the Nazi dictatorship. Much later, when discussing the provisions for women in the GDR, the narrator asserts: "Ich hatte zwölf Nazijahre hindurch schwer darunter gelitten, daß die Frauen zu Gebärmaschinen herabgewürdigt worden waren" [I suffered for twelve Nazi years from the fact that women were humiliatingly reduced to machines for producing children] (242). This is, however, the only reference to many contradictory Nazi notions of woman's role. Given that Brüning was later to stress repeatedly, both in television and press interviews, that she suffered because "wir Frauen [waren] so an die Wand gedrückt" [we women were sidelined] such an absence is surprising (Heinz 2000).

Given the extended description of family illness in "Krankheit und Tod" [Illness and death], two of the last four pages are significant for a widening of perspective and the expression of different experiences of fascism. In mentioning the ongoing battle at Stalingrad and the heavy bombing raids on Berlin of 1942, the protagonist's fear and suffering are placed within a wider collective of "Hunderte von Obdachlosen und zahllose[r] Toten" [hundreds of homeless and countless dead]. Sympathy is evoked for the ordinary German population through an identificatory fear of the protagonist as mother. However, this is set against the portrayal of another mother, who gave birth in the women's prison shortly following the bombing raid. Framing the protagonist's familial memories are references to the stories of resistance fighters Hilde and Hans Coppi, members of the resistance group 'Rote Kapelle'. The narrator emphasizes that it was the aim of these resisters to shorten the war, and that, following their arrests, they were subject to brutal torture. Alongside such an individualized focus on Hilde Coppi there is, due to textual proximity, an equation of her suffering with that of countless others. In describing how the horrific experiences of those arrested happened "sozusagen unterirdisch" [so to speak underground], the narrator continues:

Aber auch oben, also sichtbar für alle, wurde in diesen Zeiten geweint und getrauert; wurde der Tod von Söhnen und Brüdern "in stolzer Trauer" in den Zeitungen bekanntgegeben. Frauen bangten um das Leben ihrer Männer, die vor Stalingrad lagen, flüchteten abends in die Luftschutzkeller. (104)

But also above ground, therefore visible for all, there was much weeping and mourning at this time; the death of sons and brothers were announced as “in proud mourning” in the newspapers. Women feared for the lives of their husbands who were involved in the siege of Stalingrad, and fled to the air raid shelters every evening.

There is thus a gendered division of experience, with both the male soldiers and women at home being portrayed as victims. Through the inclusion of Hilde Coppi in this way, the text universalizes suffering.

Unlike the chapter describing the protagonist’s resistance, which takes place in Berlin, many of the subsequent memories of fascism are set in the country, at Marienstuhl. Symptomatic of the accelerated description of the war is the ending of chapter eight on 22 December 1942 and the start of chapter nine in autumn 1944. While there are subsequent flashbacks to the evacuation from Berlin in August 1943 and to the bombing raids in Hamburg of July in the same year, the focus on the time after 1944 compresses the years of the protagonist’s lack of resistance activities. Indeed, until Brüning’s autobiography was published, the time from 1937 to the end of the war was not considered in any of her other autobiographical texts (Eberlein 1985, 48). The move from Berlin to Marienstuhl represents a corresponding move from the centre to the periphery in terms of resistance and of distance from the danger of air raids: “Wir hatten die schweren Luftangriffe auf Hamburg von ferne miterlebt” [We experienced the heavy bombing raids on Hamburg from a distance] (107). Nonetheless, the subsequent influx of refugees to their land brings the terror with them: “[Sie] erzählten von Phosphorkanistern, die die Menschen in lebende Fackeln verwandelt hätten. Um sich zu retten, seien viele in Panik in die Elbe gerannt und ertrunken” [They told of canisters of phosphorous which turned people into living torches. In order to save themselves many of them ran into the Elbe in panic and drowned] (107). The relatively safe and well-provided life that the family enjoys in 1944 is, indeed, far removed from life in the city, as is reflected in the fact that the memories of this time centre on Barckhausen’s illness and plans for the post-war period. When the protagonist is forced to confront the realities of war-torn Magdeburg in 1945, where her husband is hospitalized, her feelings are markedly contradictory:

Zu Fuß mußte man sich dann durchkämpfen, über Trümmerberge hinweg, an Leichen vorbei, die verkohlt oder in skurrilen Verrenkungen am Wege lagen. Mir wurde übel, aber es wäre sinnlos gewesen, um Hilfe zu rufen. Hier gab es niemanden mehr, der helfen konnte. [...] Mir erschien das Ganze unwirklich, wie in einem Alptraum, als sähe ich alles hinter Glas. Ich erlebte zum erstenmal

eine durch Luftangriffe zerstörte Stadt; eine Stadt, die "ausradiert" worden war, die grausame Vergeltung für Coventry. Ich weiß nicht, was in diesen Augenblicken in meinem Gefühl überwog: Trauer oder Wut oder einfach Verzweiflung darüber, wie ohnmächtig wir alles hatten hinnehmen müssen, was jetzt auf uns zurückschlug, was uns geschah. (116)

One had to struggle through on foot, over mountains of rubble, past bodies burnt to cinders or which lay in absurd distortions on the path. I felt sick, but it would have been useless to call for help. There was no longer any one here who could help. [...] The whole thing seemed unreal to me, like a nightmare, as if I was seeing everything from behind glass. For the first time I experienced a town destroyed by bombing raids; a town that had been "wiped out", the horrific retaliation for Coventry. I do not know what I was feeling more at this moment: grief or rage or simply despair at how helplessly we had to take everything that was now striking back at us, everything that was happening to us.

While referring for the second time to the horror inflicted by the German airforce on Coventry and thus contextualizing the destruction, the voice of the narrating present intervenes in the last sentence. The lack of an explicit subject makes it uncertain against whom the rage and helplessness were directed. Collective experience encapsulated in the "uns" [us] makes it unclear whether it is the resisters, the wider German population, or Nazi Germany that is being referred to. At other points within the text, the question of the general population's responsibility for fascism is likewise addressed ambivalently. For example, the narrator differentiates between "kleine PGs, Mitläufer" [the insignificant party members, fellow-travellers] and "die Oberen, die [...] für die vergangenen zwölf Jahre verantworten sollten" [the superiors who [...] should take responsibility for the past twelve years] (138). At the same time the narrator shows that both "fanatische [und] harmlose Nationalsozialisten" [fanatical and harmless National Socialists] (112) were responsible for the dissemination of anti-communist propaganda.

While the end of the war is recurrently referred to as the liberation, the inclusion of horrific memories provides a rather different, more negative perspective:

Und die Rotarmisten übten ihrerseits grausame Rache. In Prenzlau, wo ich noch Verwandte hatte, wurde die halbe Bevölkerung ausgelöscht. Viele, wie auch mein Großvater, sind verhungert und kamen ins Massengrab. Eine meiner Tanten flüchtete mit anderen Frauen aus Angst vor den Repressalien, indem sie in die Ucker rannte und darin ertrank. Aber das alles habe ich erst viel später erfahren. Bei uns, hinter der Elbe, ging es in diesen Wochen vergleichsweise ruhiger zu. Aber bis zur Kapitulation schwebten auch wir in ständiger Furcht,

daß die SS uns erneut überrollen und unsere Befreiung noch einmal verzögern würde. (134)

And on their side the Red Army soldiers took horrible revenge. In Prenzlau where I still had relatives half the population was wiped out. Many, including my grandfather, died of starvation and ended up in a mass grave. One of my aunts fled with other women out of fear of reprisals by running into the Ucker and drowning. But I discovered all this only much later. At our home, behind the Elbe, everything was a lot calmer in comparison. But until capitulation we lingered in constant fear that the SS would once again overrun us and delay our liberation once again.

Having spent the evening of 8 May 1945 in the stables, the family's mood was subdued due to, among other things, the fact that in Germany "kaum ein Stein auf dem anderen stand und die Menschen im größten Elend dahinvegetierten" [hardly one stone was left standing on another and the people eked out the most miserable existence] (134). The text does not contain the heroic jubilation of liberation narratives. Instead it focuses on the suffering of the German populace. Yet, as shown from the quotation above, such suffering is set against the continued fanaticism of the SS and an emphasis on the behaviour of the Soviet army as retaliatory.

Despite the protagonist's resistance work and her continued thoughts about those in hiding or in prison, the focus on air raids, refugees and reprisals by the liberating forces leads to a vacillation between different stories of suffering. Through the prioritization of the protagonist's own experience, the descriptions of the bombing raids and German refugees are most prominent. In the post-Wende context in which Brüning's text was published, where there was a focus on the "Täter-Opfer-Problematik" [perpetrator-victim-problem] in much literature about the Nazi past, such hierarchies of experience are significant (Knobloch 2001, 89). They raise the question as to how the suffering of those targeted by the Nazi regime on 'racial' grounds is conveyed.

Within *Und außerdem*, there are tensions resulting from an ambiguous description of fascist antisemitism. From the relationships with Heinz Pol and Bruno Heilig to the description of friends of the protagonist and her husband, several Jewish victims are portrayed. While the passing of the Nuremberg laws is not mentioned, the results of these laws are. The wife of Hans Schoßberger and Bertha Waterstradt are both protected from deportation through marriage to an 'Aryan', although Waterstradt cannot avoid being conscripted for factory work. Antisemitic propaganda is similarly indicated, the present narrator referring both to the fact that the Nazis held Jewish

warehouses responsible for ruining business, and that Barckhausen's mother accused the protagonist of helping "Juden und [...] Vaterlandsverräter[n]" [Jews and traitors] (110). Such an inclusion of the practical consequences of fascist conceptions of race is juxtaposed with significant absences.

As early as 1932, the protagonist is confronted with the verbal abuse of Heinz Pol by an SA man: "War das erst der Anfang von Drangsalierungen gegen Menschen jüdischer Herkunft? Was hatten wir noch zu erwarten?" [Was this the beginning of the oppression of people of Jewish origin? What did we still have to come?] (46) Within the framework of such problematic identification, these rhetorical questions are not answered. Ten years later, it is emphasized that the protagonist's mother has contact with Jews in hiding and that she has witnessed the deportations taking place:

Mutter berichtete fast in jedem ihrer Briefe von Judentransporten [...]. Es hieß, die Juden kämen in ein Arbeitslager. Aber Mutter hat nie wieder ein Lebenszeichen von ihnen bekommen, obwohl sie vorher mit den meisten gut befreundet war. (100)

Mother reported in almost all of her letters about transports of Jews [...]. It was said that the Jews ended up in a work camp. But mother never heard from them again, even though she had previously been good friends with most of them.

There is no intervention of the voice of the narrating present as to the futility of her mother's expectations or subsequent knowledge of the extent of the terror – the Holocaust is not made visible on the level of the narrating present. Indeed, Jewish experience of fascism is tangential to memories in *Und außerdem*, and Jewish suffering does not impinge on the protagonist's everyday life after Pol has emigrated. Instead, the focus is on the familial sphere and of the military progression of the war. This focus is most obvious just before the start of the war, where the narrator states: "In der Tat war die Lage verzweifelt. 1938 war die Nazi-Wehrmacht in Wien einmarschiert, und ein Jahr später besetzen sie die Tschechoslowakei" [In fact the situation was desperate. In 1938 the Nazi army marched into Vienna and one year later they occupied Czechoslovakia] (80). Thus, the accelerated narration excludes, for example, the pogrom of 9 November in 1938. These significant absences contrast with the reiterated reference to Jewish persecution within the resistance narrative by Greta Kuckhoff.

In contrast to the ambivalent narrative involvement with the plight of Jewish characters, there is a marked concern about those who were

conscripted to fight. Following the invasion of the Soviet Union, the narrator describes soldiers in Berlin: “Urlauber, die man jetzt zu sehen bekam, erschienen gar nicht mehr als die strahlenden Helden, sondern sie wirkten, erschöpft von den vorangegangenen Kämpfen, müde und ausgezehrt” [People on leave who we now got to see no longer appeared to be the glorious heroes, instead they seemed exhausted by the past struggles, tired and drained] (86). The suffering of her sister-in-law due to her absent husband and her hopes for victory as a soldier’s wife are reiterated through the worry of the protagonist’s mother and her fear for her son who was involved in U-boat expeditions. The narrator conveys continued concern for his well-being and, through this, the difficult, conflicting situation for those antifascists who hoped for the defeat of the fascist system yet worried about their loved ones.

With liberation comes memories of Russian and American soldiers, the depiction of whom is emphasized due detailed narration of the time between April and August 1945. Contrasts are made not only between the Americans and Russians, but also between different memories the protagonist has of the Soviet army. The Americans are described negatively as thieves who “waren [...] auch in bezug auf Frauen durchaus nicht zimperlich” [were certainly not soft even when it came to women] (133). In contrast, the liberating Russians are portrayed as humble, honest and educated. On the other hand, negative experiences with the soldiers of the Red Army are not entirely absent from the narrative. At first they come in the form of reported speech, which the narrator dismisses as “Greuelpropaganda” [horror propaganda] (135). Later however, through the experiences of her mother and of Barckhausen, the protagonist is forced to confront a different image of the Russian liberators. Notwithstanding her subsequent knowledge of rape and murder, the abiding image of the Russians is conveyed through the naive memory of four-year-old Christiane:

“Die Russen sind gut. Ich weiß das, denn Boris hat meinen Schlitten aus dem Feuer gerettet”. Und kein Bericht über angebliche Untaten “der Russen” hat sie von ihrer Überzeugung abbringen können. (177)

“The Russians are good people. I know that because Boris rescued my toboggan from the fire”. And no report about the supposed atrocities of “the Russians” could dissuade her.

Thus, despite a recognition of the behaviour of the Russian soldiers, such knowledge is simultaneously undermined through the direct speech and the voice of the present narrator.

Furthermore, explicit comparisons between Americans and Russians with regard to their participation in the war suggest a present narrative voice conforming to the political dimensions which characterized the Cold War:

[...] sie [die Russen] waren es, meine Befreier, die ich so lange sehnlichst herbeigewünscht hatte, meine Genossen aus der Sowjetunion, die für mich immer noch das Vaterland der Arbeiter war. [...] Diese erschöpft wirkenden Männer, mußte ich denken, hatten ja alle die Jahre hindurch die Hauptlast des Krieges getragen [...]. Die Westalliierten schickten allenfalls einiges Kriegsmaterial – die Menschen sparten sie auf bis zuletzt, so daß diese schließlich als strahlende Besatzer ihren Jeeps entstiegen: kraftstrotzende, wohlgenährte Gestalten in Uniformen, die nur selten Spuren von Kämpfen aufwiesen. (137)

[...] they [the Russians] were it, my liberators for whom I had ardently wished for so long, my comrades from the Soviet Union, which for me was still the fatherland of the workers. [...] I had to remind myself that these exhausted looking men had carried the main burden of the war all these years [...]. The Western allies sent at best some war materials – they saved the people until the last moment, so that these ultimately climbed out of their jeeps as beaming occupiers: vigorous, well-fed figures in uniforms, who only seldom bore traces of fighting.

And yet, through the inclusion of narratives such as the rape of German women by Soviet soldiers, the text includes Western narratives which were prominent at the time of publication in 1994. In addition, the implicit equation of the exhausted German soldiers with those of the Russian army contributes to a discourse of the common victimhood of soldiers.

Thus, memories of fascism in Brüning's autobiography are characterized by accelerated narration, lack of detail about the protagonist's resistance, an emphasis on familial memories and wider notions of victimhood. Notwithstanding the focus on individual life facilitated by the genre of autobiography, these memories contain many contradictions preventing self-criticism and leading to ambiguous notions of responsibility. A clear division between fascist and antifascist suggested by the narrator in the memories of the early years of Nazism is unsustainable on many levels. The text contains many figures who are not so easily compartmentalized, notably her husband and immediate family-in-law. Such focus on familial memories raises questions as to the protagonist's 'political' behaviour

within the domestic sphere, and her later reflection on her participation within the system. What is clear is that her subjugation to imposed relations of class and gender takes priority over antifascist and socialist beliefs, both of which nevertheless continue to be stressed throughout the text.

A New Beginning? 1945-1949

The period from the end of war to the founding of the new East German state is subject in particular to detailed narration. A focus on the immediate post-war period and the socialist enthusiasm which proliferated in the Soviet Zone is framed by a repeated emphasis on familial memories. The arrest of her husband in a chapter entitled “Ab nach Sibirien?” [Off to Siberia?] and the visit to the place where he is imprisoned, dominated by huge picture of Stalin, causes the protagonist to reassess her expectations of the Russian liberators. An insistence by the Russians that they be addressed by rank, and their refusal to believe that the protagonist and her husband were opponents of the Hitler regime give rise to the protagonist’s doubts.

The first years of the post-war period leading up to 1949 offer numerous problems for the protagonist. Combining the roles of working mother and wife causes impossible strains and leads to her sacrificing her own work. In addition, there are continued tensions with the new administration in the Soviet Zone. In the description of these tensions, the narrative’s attempts to reassert individual experience, and simultaneously claim wider validity for them, become more acute. Elements of the political measures taken by the Soviet authorities which the protagonist finds problematic include restrictions on press freedom, “der Personenkult um Stalin” [cult of personality surrounding Stalin], and the division of rations according to different types of worker:

Dabei störte uns, die das “Dritte Reich” im Inland erlebt hatten, so manches an der neuen Entwicklung [...]. So hatten wir uns den Sozialismus nicht vorgestellt. Aber wir hatten ihn uns auch nicht selber erkämpft. Wir mußten ihn hinnehmen, wie er uns von der Siegermacht geboten wurde. (196)

Many things about the new development bothered those of us who had experienced the “Third Reich” in Germany [...]. We had not imagined socialism like that. But we also hadn’t fought for it ourselves. We had to accept it as it was offered to us by the victorious power.

From the retrospective position of the present narrator, a differentiation is once again made between the experiences of those who remained in Germany ("Im Inland") and those who went into exile. Such a distinction alongside Brüning's negative portrayal of these early years is significant for two reasons. Firstly, it was the group of resisters who survived fascism in Moscow, including Walter Ulbricht, who subsequently comprised the majority of the ruling political elite of the GDR. Secondly, official discourse of the GDR soon equated the liberating Soviet Army with victorious antifascism, and portrayed the state as the 'victors of history'. In Brüning's comments a distance is maintained, not only from the beginnings of the new state and from those returning from exile, but also from the type of socialism "imposed" upon a passively collective "wir" [we]. A lack of agency encapsulated in such distance problematizes the original narrative claim to investigate the socialist system of the GDR through the protagonist's own life.

Notwithstanding such qualms about the new administration, the narrator stresses an involvement within the new literary sphere, through the "Kulturbund" [Cultural Association], "Arbeitsgemeinschaft sozialistischer Schriftsteller und Journalisten" [Working Group of socialist writers and journalists], and through participation on different editorial boards. One of the most significant literary aspects of these memories of the immediate post-war years pivots around antifascist resistance: through the story of Hilde Coppi, the foundations of the new socialist state are clearly demarcated in these terms. The protagonist is briefed to write an article for the memorial day to fighters of the antifascist resistance, highlighting that antifascism had already become political practice in the Soviet Zone by September 1946. These beginnings are emphasized through a contrast with memories in the Western zones, through the despairing voice of Coppi's mother: "'Der verdammte Krieg sollte doch ein Ende haben. Sie haben ihr Leben aufs Spiel gesetzt, dafür beschimpft man sie jetzt als Landesverräter'" ['There should finally be an end to the damn war. They put their lives on the line and as a result they are now being insulted for being traitors'] (183). The inclusion in the autobiography of both the mother's appeal to the protagonist to write the truth, and extracts of very emotive last letters written by Hans and Hilde Coppi from prison, lay a claim to authenticity. Prompted by the task to write about Hilde Coppi, the narrator reasserts the protagonist's identity as a resister through hypothetical conjecture:

Wie hatte es nur geschehen können, fragten wir uns zum wiederholten Mal, daß wir von der Existenz dieser großen Widerstandsgruppe [Schulze-Boysen/Harnack], der hunderte Antifaschisten angehörten, nichts gewußt hatten? [...] Wie leicht hätten sich unsere Wege kreuzen können, so lange wir noch in Berlin gelebt hatten. Aber hätten wir wirklich mitgemacht? Was mich betrifft, so glaubte ich die Frage rückhaltlos bejahen zu können; ich hatte immer die Verbindung zu den Genossen schmerzlich vermißt. (184)

How could it have happened, we asked ourselves for the umpteenth, time that we didn't know about the existence of this large resistance group [Schulze-Boysen/Harnack], to which hundreds of antifascists belonged? [...] How easily our paths could have crossed while we were still living in Berlin. But would we really have joined in? As far as I'm concerned, I believe I can unreservedly answer the question in the affirmative; I had always painfully missed the connection to my comrades.

A collective "wir", referring to the protagonist and her husband, rhetorically justifies non-participation. However, the narrowed focus on the first-person singular and the resolute answer points clearly to a regret about the lack of involvement in resistance.

The resulting book about Coppi from 1949, *Damit Du weiterlebst* [So you go on living], is the text for which Brüning is best known, and is still being republished. Indeed, in his extensive survey of East German literature Wolfgang Emmerich's only reference to Brüning is in respect of this book (1996, 90). It tells the story of the resisters Hans and Hilde Coppi, the birth of their son, and their execution. There is an emphasis in the autobiography on the factual nature of *Damit Du weiterlebst*, despite the text being subtitled "Roman" [A novel]. The narrator in *Und außerdem* describes how the book contained the story not only of the Coppis but also of Lotte Holzer, a Jewish resister of the Baum Group and her daughter:

Die Schicksale dieser zwei Frauen, Hilde Coppis und Lotte Holzers, die einander in der Realität nie begegnet sind, habe ich in der Handlung meines Buches miteinander verknüpft, da ich einen tiefen inneren Zusammenhang zwischen ihnen zu erkennen meinte: Beide hatte man gewaltsam, auf tyrannische Weise, von ihrem Kind getrennt. (214)

I linked the fates of these two women, Hilde Coppi and Lotte Holzer, who in reality never met one another, within the action of my book, because I felt that I recognized a deep, inner connection between them: both of them were violently, in a tyrannical way, separated from their child.

Given how few memories of Jewish experiences there are during the period of Nazism in the autobiography, it is noticeable that these become a point of focus in the immediate post-war period. The

description of *Damit Du weiterlebst* thus recuperates a Jewish narrative within the autobiography as a whole. It is a narrative which is linked to both the protagonist's post-war authorial identity and, given that the text became "[ein] bedeutend[er] Beitrag zur antifaschistischen Tradition" [a significant contribution to the antifascist tradition] (Herminghouse 1999, 482), also to the founding narrative of the GDR. Considering the very contradictory discourses in the Soviet Zone and GDR in the late 1940s about Jewish persecution during fascism, as discussed in the chapter on Hilde Huppert, it is significant that a Jewish figure is prominent in *Damit Du weiterlebst*. Including reference to Jewish experiences in the fictional text which did not feature in her own memories of fascism, and placing them within the context of antifascist resistance, the text suggests a prioritization of such memories which are not otherwise considered by the present narrator. Such emphases contribute to a context in the mid 1990s where, as I will show in the following chapter on Grete Weil, memories of Jewish experiences of fascism became more prominent.

It is also significant that a focus was placed on female resisters in *Damit Du weiterlebst*, an aspect which, as has been discussed in the chapter on Greta Kuckhoff, has never been prominent before. However, this focus on Holzer and Coppi is somewhat problematic. Through the concentration on the mother-daughter relationship, their stories are taken out of their historical contexts. Parallels are then drawn between these two women and the protagonist through an extended description of own custody battle for her daughter following her divorce from Barckhausen in 1947.

In the context of publication in 1994, recourse to the identificatory figures of Holzer and Coppi is significant for the priority given to two types of experience of Nazism: resistance and persecution. In writing about antifascist resistance in the immediate post-war period, the protagonist thus concentrated on others' experiences rather than her own. Nevertheless, the discussion of her hypothetical resistance suggests a need to reiterate an antifascist identity and to contribute to the founding narratives of the new socialist state.

A Vision of Socialism – The GDR

While it is beyond the scope of this study to examine in detail the memories of the GDR, certain elements will be discussed, given the primary imperative of the text to examine the history of the state

through an individual life story and the frequent recourse to the past. Firstly, I will consider some factors prominent in the retrospective analysis of the GDR, particularly the protagonist's identity as an author and the significance of gender and censorship. Secondly, I will address the role that the depiction of West Germany plays in terms of its significance in a post-unification context. Thirdly, I will analyse the prominence of, and distance from, Stalinism.

The protagonist's identity as an author in the GDR is prominent throughout the second half of the text. Multiple references to her fictional work emphasize this, and their correlations to her life reiterate that all her fictional work "hat etwas Autobiographisches" [contains something autobiographical] (Brüning 2000). The narrator considers the choice of literary subjects, linking personal experiences with generic ones and emphasizing their importance for her literary work; for example, stories of "Ehetragödien" [tragedies of marriage] (223) and intergenerational relationships. In addition to the gendered focus in the protagonist's fictional texts there are discussions by the present narrating voice which continue to challenge the discourse of supposed equality and the solution of the 'woman question' in the socialist state (Eberlein 1985, 27-41). Considering the position of women in a "Männerstaat" [men's state] (252), the narrator raises discrepancies in the theoretical provision of childcare and the practical difficulties for working mothers through the experiences of her daughter, Christiane. Likewise, difficulties for women who want to write and who have families and/or famous husbands are considered through the examples of Eva Strittmatter and Maxie Wander. Personal stories pervade the memories of the GDR as they did in the depiction of fascism. Life histories of the protagonist's brother, of Christiane, of grand-daughter Jasmina and her partner Dario are all examined as microcosms of society's problems. The individual stories of the protagonist's female friends continue this gendered focus.

The voice of the narrating present compares the situation of women in the former GDR with that in unified Germany. The text is thus situated in a contemporary debate about whether women were the real losers of reunification (Dodds 1994, 107). While the present narrator emphasizes the failings of the socialist state in respect of gender, there is, nonetheless, repeated reference to the fact that the GDR was striving for equality, in contrast to its West German and unified counterparts. The priority given to gender issues in the GDR is sufficient to reconcile the narrator with many things even retrospectively, and the voice of the present narrator emphasizes that it was one of the main reasons for *supporting* the state. For example, the

foundation of the GDR in 1949 and the subsequent recognition of the rights of a mother in the courts prompts the following:

Kann man jetzt verstehen, daß ich voll und ganz die Politik unserer Regierung bejahte und mich nach Kräften für sie einsetzte – ungeachtet dessen, daß das Gros der Bevölkerung sie ablehnte und über Ungerechtigkeiten murrte, die zweifellos vorhanden waren und zum Himmel schriean? [...] Dies alles sah ich mit Betrübniß, versuchte es aber vor meinem Gewissen zu verteidigen. (221)

Can you now understand, that I completely and utterly agreed with the policy of our Government and fought for it to the best of my abilities – regardless of the fact that the majority of the population rejected it and grumbled about injustices, which were no doubt present and were a scandal? [...] I saw all this with distress, but tried to defend it to my conscience.

Tensions pervade the autobiography as the protagonist defines herself as someone critical of the regime through her fictional writing yet also as someone who also identifies with it. In addition, she is here described as being separate from the “Gros der Bevölkerung” [majority of the population], within the very framework which insists on her experience as explanatory for the history of the whole.

Notwithstanding the protagonist's self-image of someone who was overtly critical of the system in respect of gender, her discovery after 1989 of her file held by the Stasi shows a rather different picture. In her musings as to what it might contain, the narrator considers her “Westkontakte” [‘Western contacts’] (264) and the historically unspecified “Vergehen bei der Grenzüberschreitung” [offence during a border crossing], including her attempt to smuggle a book by Simone de Beauvoir. Her discovery that the file is in fact empty, apart from formal yearly questionnaires, leads the narrator to conclude: “Deutlicher als durch das Fehlen einer Stasinotiz hätte man mir meine Unwichtigkeit nicht attestieren können” [One couldn't have attested any more clearly to my unimportance than through the lack of a note by Stasi] (264). In a post-unification context, the protagonist is positioned as someone who resisted the regime through such border-crossing transgressions, but who is at the same time belittled through her designation as unimportant. In the context of the debate about involvement with the Stasi of the early 1990s, the lack of any further information in the folder also stresses that she was not involved in work *for* the regime. By the time of the text's publication in 1994, in the wake of the ‘Literaturstreit’ [Literature Debate] and the controversy about the role of authors in the GDR, the absence of such information would be read in a context where the involvement of

authors with the state authorities was still heatedly debated (Anz 1995; Wallace 1991).

In addition, the lack of importance to which this Stasi file testifies is illustrative of the prominence given to questions of gender in the GDR. As has been examined in the chapter on Greta Kuckhoff, any remaining gender inequalities in the socialist state were attributed to the not-yet-solved remnants of the inherited failings of capitalism, not as endemic to the new state itself. Although the protagonist was critical of the inequalities of the GDR within her fictional works, her criticism “[wurde] nicht als Angriff auf das System selbst, sondern als Hinweis auf ‘nicht-antagonistische Widersprüche’ verstanden, die im Kontext des Sozialismus zu lösen waren” [was not seen as an attack against the system itself, but understood as an indication of the ‘non-antagonistic contradictions’ which were to be solved within the context of socialism itself] (Herminghouse 1999, 480).

When considering these contradicting tendencies of conformism and resistance in the depiction of the protagonist’s role as an author within the GDR, questions of censorship also become prominent. In a description of a reading by an unnamed author from the Soviet Union, the narrator is implicitly critical about him ignoring a question about censorship. Yet, denial of censorship is later repeated by the narrator through assertions that censorship had no effect (“denn es wäre gelogen, wenn ich behaupten würde, ich hätte unter der Zensur gelitten” [it would be a lie if I were to claim that I had suffered from censorship] 324), something Brüning has reiterated elsewhere since the fall of the Berlin Wall (1995, 74-76). This contrasts directly with her repeated reference to restrictions on publication. David Rock has considered this denial of restrictions by censor in post-Wende autobiographies. He argues that such a claim might be symptomatic of the authors subsequently feeling lost without it. Rock particularly refers to Jurek Becker’s comments that the censor was an “Orientierungshilfe” [orientation point] for East German writers (1997, 192). However, what becomes clear for Brüning is that in terms of her texts about women’s familial lives there was little intervention from the state. In contrast, a book she wrote about students, *Vor uns das Leben* (1952), and which was pre-released in their newspaper was heavily criticized and then withdrawn for not conforming to the demands of socialist realism. The narrator angrily notes: “Man forderte also nach wie vor von uns Schriftstellern, Propagandisten des Sozialismus zu sein, vorbildliche Arbeiterfiguren zu gestalten und die Wirklichkeit schönzufärben” [They still demanded from us authors that we be propagandists for socialism, creating exemplary images of

the workers and glossing over reality] (256). The protagonist's last project under GDR rule – interviews with victims of Stalinism – was one that she admits she thought it would not have been possible to publish. Such competing tensions within Brüning's text corroborate Diana Alberghini's assertion that:

Prior to the Revolution of 1989, many writers in the GDR operated within a very ambiguous space between state censorship, their commitment to the socialist cause and their determination to expose the failings of state socialism as practised in the GDR. (2000, 34)

The ambivalent position of the protagonist towards the state and the shifting positions of conformism and non-conformism are further highlighted through the inclusion of exchanges with reviewers of the protagonist's novels. Dialogues with their responses allow a retrospective defence of her writing and the positive elements of the work to be stressed. Through the appeal to numerous readers' letters stating that she has created positive identificatory figures, the protagonist's work is legitimized. She defends her work through reference to prominent figures such as Lilli Becher, wife of culture minister Johannes R. Becher, Anna Seghers and Christa Wolf, who spoke in support of her writing. In contrast are ruminations on the lack of official recognition, particularly in the 1950s and 1960s. Despite her texts selling over one and a half million copies, Brüning did not receive such recognition until the early 1980s when she was awarded two literary prizes, the 'Goethepreis der Hauptstadt der DDR' and the 'Literaturpreis der DFD'; the latter being the prize of the Democratic Women's Federation of the GDR. Alongside an affirmation of the authorial role in the GDR, the criticism included by the narrator serves to emphasize a contentious position towards the state, as the reviewers write of her not adhering sufficiently to a socialist realist model. Within a dominant post-unification framework of criticism of East German authors' support of the state, these negative reviews function as positive indications of past distance to official discourse, and undermine the protagonist's identification with the GDR. The involvement of the population of the GDR with its authors and literature is reiterated through reader response, and yet the narrator is also forced to answer in the affirmative the question "Waren wir privilegiert?" [Were we privileged?] (325), thus emphasizing a certain distance from those she claimed to be so close to. Elizabeth Mittman provides useful insight into these contradictions:

For many writers, then, the literary public sphere in the GDR was a conflict-ridden space, within which they often tried to work from two different directions at once: on the one hand institutionally embedded within a totalizing, statist public sphere, and on the other hand counter-institutionally responsible for articulation of those particularities that resisted incorporation into the collective. In a certain concrete sense, the writer bore the inscription of the difficult task that all GDR citizens faced in negotiating their individual and corporate selves. By exposing the seam between these different selves, the writer was reproducing a fundamental trope of daily life. (1995, 23)

This divide becomes particularly apparent when the depiction of West Germany is considered.

The retrospective portrayal of West Germany in texts written by former East Germans is of continuing significance, linked both to the interpretation of the Nazi past and to current re-formations of East German identities. The narrator explicitly addresses West German compatriots on several occasions, expressing hope that they will be able to read her texts, including the republished *Damit Du weiterlebst*, and learn from them. That the West Germans were primarily her intended readers is something that she has reiterated in an interview:

Sie [die Westdeutschen] wissen ja alles besser. Sie wissen ja genau, wie wir hier in der DDR gelebt haben, nicht? Obwohl die meisten nie einen Fuß über die Grenze gesetzt haben, aber darum wollte ich mal schreiben, wie wir gelebt haben, damit sie erfahren von einer, die es wirklich erlebt hatte, nicht? Das war mir ganz wichtig. (Interview 21 November 2001)

They [the West Germans] know better about everything. They know exactly how we lived in the GDR, right? Although most of them have never set foot over the border, but that's why I wanted to write about how we lived, so that they can discover it from someone who really experienced it, right? That was very important to me.

As noted above, one of the reasons given for the protagonist's staying in the East is linked to the provision made for women, which had particular advantages for her and the custody of her child. In addition, it is the antifascist tradition, as reiterated through an attendant reminder of connections she perceived with the fascist state and West Germany, which consolidates her beliefs. When describing the teenage trauma of her daughter and her flight to her father in the West, the narrator considers the image of West Germany prominent at that time. It was an image that, she now notes, was based on "schwarz-weiß" [black and white] (260) understandings of the other state. That the experiences of the GDR citizens were often far more complex is

suggested in the description of her own trips across the border to buy Western goods:

Ich tat es, aber immer mit Herzklopfen und mit schlechtem Gewissen. [...] Heute, nachdem ich weiß, wie großzügig sich unsere hohen Funktionäre mit Westwaren versorgt haben, während sich in ihrer Nachbarschaft [...] die Bewohner nach einer raren Delikatesse noch die Hacken ablaufen mußten, erscheinen mir meine damaligen Bedenken übertrieben, ja geradezu lächerlich und kleinkariert. Aber in jener Zeit haben sie mich schwer belastet, denn wollten wir als Genossen nicht Vorbild sein? [...] Wie sollte ich aber Leute, die unsere Gegner waren, von der Richtigkeit unseres Weges überzeugen, wenn ich selber den eigenen Vorteil über den der Allgemeinheit stellte? (222)

I did it, but always with a pounding heart and bad conscience. [...] Today, now that I know how generously our top functionaries supplied themselves with Western goods, while in their neighbourhood [...] the inhabitants had to walk their legs off looking for a rare delicacy, my reservations from that time seem exaggerated, almost laughable and petty-minded. But at that time they were a burden to me, for didn't we want to set an example as comrades? [...] But how could I convince people who were against us that our path was the right one, if I myself put my own good above that of the general public?

Her behaviour is thus retrospectively justified through the hypocrisy of those in power, while contradictions inherent in her own worldview are not addressed. In referring to the group of "comrades" the protagonist identifies with the SED. Further patterns of identification within descriptions of key events in the GDR's history which were subject not only to controversy at the time, but also to criticism following unification, demonstrate once again ambivalent attitudes towards the state. An emphasis on the GDR's antifascist origins is contained within descriptions of the uprising of 1953, the building of the Berlin Wall, and the invasion of Czechoslovakia in 1968. As regards the 1953 uprising, the narrator emphasizes that those who ordered its suppression were "[i]n der Mehrheit [...] die Antifaschisten, die den Terror des 'Tausendjährigen Reiches' gerade hinter sich hatten" [in the majority [...] antifascists who had recently experienced the terror of the 'Thousand year Reich'] (241). Such a comment echoes Christa Wolf's claim that her generation felt considerable reluctance to oppose people who had been prisoners of the concentration camps (Mittman 1995, 25). Such references in *Und außerdem* suggest a need to justify the events to the contemporary readers, a pattern reiterated in the discussion of the Berlin Wall: "So beschämend es war, daß wir uns auf diese Weise vom Westen abschirmen mußten – es war damals die einzige Möglichkeit, die DDR zu erhalten" [As shameful as it was that we had to protect ourselves

from the West in this manner, at that time it was the only possibility of preserving the GDR] (265). Once again, the protagonist is situated in the wider collective of the GDR which indicates a dichotomized anti-Western identification with the state. However, Brüning's writings of 1961 suggest that she did not, at that time, feel that the actions were shameful; like other prominent East German authors, she wrote an article strongly in support of the Berlin Wall and maintained that it was better "heute auf den Besuch in Wannsee zu verzichten als morgen durch die Atombombe umzukommen" [to give up on a trip to Wannsee today than to be killed by an atomic bomb tomorrow] (Brüning 1961, 41).

The portrayal of the invasion of Czechoslovakia on 21 August 1968 by Eastern Bloc troops and the protagonist's contemplation about whether to stay in the GDR contains different, competing identifications:

Was konnten wir noch erwarten von unserer DDR, an deren Aufbau wir so begeistert mitgewirkt hatten, die aber mehr und mehr zu einem Polizeistaat entartete[!]? [...] Aber hörten die Genossen im Politbüro – Antifaschisten wie wir, die durch die faschistischen Zuchthäuser und Konzentrationslager gegangen waren [...] –, überhaupt noch auf uns, die dem Volk und ihren Alltagsorgen näher waren? (287)

What could we still expect from our GDR, for whose construction we had worked so enthusiastically together, but which had degenerated more and more into a police state? [...] But did the comrades in the Politburo – antifascists like us, who had been through the fascist prisons and concentration camps [...] – listen at all to those of us who were closer to the people and to their daily worries?

On the one hand, she identifies with the ruling powers through her antifascist self-understanding, albeit with a problematic equation of her experience with those who had suffered in concentration camps. She identifies with the state, this time emphasizing unity in the founding of it, rather than an alien imposition of an outside system. On the other hand, she stresses distance from the ruling "Genossen" [comrades] by positioning herself within the group of "Außenstehende" [outsiders] and "das Volk" [the people]. The problematic reference to the GDR's "degeneration" into a police state conveys a perspective which is highly critical. Thus, on the one hand, it is possible to argue that the autobiography confronts many of the historically significant decisions made by those in power and that there are few "taboo zones" (Kuhn 1994a, 212) and little "patchiness" (Tate 1997, 210) in the narrative; on the other, the voice of the present

narrator vacillates between a defensive, justificatory and self-legitimizing tone.

Multiple references to the Stalinist past by Brüning's narrator are part of a textual strategy suggesting an honest appraisal of the past and a recognition of mistakes. Repeated reference to the departure to the Soviet Union in 1935 of Trude Richter, who was sent to a Siberian labour camp, to Susanne Leonhard who similarly spent ten years in a camp, to a group of women and girls who were being transported from Siberia to Pirna in 1948, and to Anni Sauer who was also interned, make visible the stories which these women were previously unable or unwilling to tell. The protagonist collected their stories, with the aim of having at least one of them published in 1990 as part of a book celebrating her 80th birthday; a move which would necessitate "daß der Verlagsleiter den Mut besaß, sich gegenüber den Zensoren durchzusetzen" [the publisher having the courage to assert himself against the censor] (335). The protagonist is here again positioned as someone struggling against the state, despite the earlier affirmation that censorship did not prevent her publishing what she wanted. The text makes clear that the hidden stories of Stalinist crimes were preoccupying the protagonist by the mid-1980s. However, reference to these stories after the collapse of the Wall must be considered in terms of responsibility. Patricia Herminhouse warns that a retrospective appeal to the confession of Stalinist crimes in post-unification literature "enable[s] GDR citizens to attempt to escape their own responsibility by pointing the finger of guilt at a few 'Stalinists'" (1991, 350). She continues:

Without acceding to the resurgence of totalitarianism theories which seek to equate fascism, Stalinism and GDR-style socialism, one needs to ask whether belated recent preoccupation with Stalin and Stalinism represents a genuine attempt to come to terms with the past or whether it sometimes merely provides a convenient way to reassign guilt and responsibility for the past. (359)

A consideration of Brüning's introduction to these women's stories, *Lästige Zeugen? Tonbandgespräche mit Opfern der Stalinzeit* [Troublesome Witnesses? Interviews with victims of the Stalin era], which was published at the end of 1989, just after the fall of the Berlin Wall, highlights a rather ambivalent allocation of responsibility:

Ich widme mein Buch auch allen jenen unter den Opfern, denen es nicht mehr vergönnt ist, die Erneuerung des Sozialismus mitzuerleben, die uns mit so großer Hoffnung erfüllt und die eine Wiederholung so tragischer Ereignisse, wie sie sie erfahren mußten, für alle Zeiten unmöglich macht. (1989, 12)

I dedicate this book also to all those among the victims for whom it has not been granted to experience with us the renewal of socialism, which fills us with such great hope and which will make impossible for all time a repetition of the tragic events that they had to suffer.

The distancing “tragischer Ereignisse” [tragic events] removes all agency. An assertion by the present narrator of *Und außerdem* that, during the Nazi years, the communist resisters in Germany “[g]ewissermaßen hatten wie [...] unter Glas gelebt, eingesponnen in [ihre] eigenen Wünsche und Hoffnungen” [to a certain extent lived as if [...] under glass, cocooned in their own wishes and hopes] (199), ignoring the rumours of Soviet show trials, conveys a notion of collective delusion and victimhood. In emphasizing the protagonist’s naivety there is a simultaneous rejection of responsibility.

Brüning stresses that her work with the victims of Stalinism predated unification. Yet, at the same time, *Und außerdem* contributes to discourses of ‘Stalinism’ of the mid 1990s, which were framed in different terms. Such discourses, which continued the Historians’ Debate of West Germany of the mid-1980s as to the uniqueness of the Holocaust, and gave rise to renewed theories of totalitarianism in the 1990s, belittled the GDR’s confrontation with the Stalinist past during the 1950s and 1960s. The suggestion in Brüning’s text of an unwillingness until the mid-1980s to investigate the stories of the women who returned from Siberia, and the collectivizing of disbelief as to the existence of Soviet camps, similarly marginalizes tendencies prevalent in East German literature thirty years before.

Unification – “I’m not Really Living in this Time”

The narrator asserts that it was the events of August 1968 which prompted her “Zweifel an der heilen Welt der DDR” [doubts about the perfect world of the GDR]. At the same time, a suggestion of a persistent naive belief is encapsulated in the title of the final chapter – “Verlust der Illusionen” [Loss of Illusions] (327). These references point to vacillations in the protagonist’s socialist beliefs and at the same time undermine the suggestion of a critical stance towards the state.

At first glance, the text avoids discussing political processes and effects of unification: it ends on 3 October 1990, thus refusing to confront what came afterwards, and seeing the unification as “etwas Punktuelles” [something isolated] rather than a process (compare

Soldat 1997, 134, 145). Notwithstanding this abrupt chronological end to the narrative, there are many references throughout the text to the time after 1990. These are scathingly negative, and focus on the effect of unification on the three cornerstones of the protagonist's identity. In addition to the worsening situation of women in the new state, she describes how the libraries, writers' retreats and publishers have closed, and how she has to collect her books from among hundreds which are to be destroyed because they are now seen as part of an obsolete world-view: "Bücher, die unser Leben ausmachten" [books that made up our life] (261-62). High unemployment, neo-Nazism, antisemitism and other racist attacks are emphasized as a recrudescence from a past long since eradicated: "Das hatten wir doch alles schon einmal" ['We've had all that once before'] (313). While the increase in racist attacks since unification is undeniable, the historical leap from the years of Nazism to the period after 1989 suggests that racist attitudes, for example, were absent from GDR society.

Competing tensions between the protagonist's identification with, and distance from, the GDR become paramount in the last chapter, and are encapsulated by the repetition of the framing question of the autobiography at the end of the text:

Was ist aus unseren Hoffnungen von ehemals geworden? Waren wir doch bloß Phantasten? Realitätsferne Idealisten? Wir wollten den Wohlstand für alle, auch Gerechtigkeit. Was haben wir falsch gemacht, daß wir heute gezwungen sind, die Trümmer unseres armen gebeutelten Staates zu Grabe zu tragen? (344)

What has become of the hopes we once had? Were we simply just fantasists? Unrealistic idealists? We wanted prosperity for all, justice too. What did we do wrong that we are forced today to carry the remains of our poor, bankrupt state to its grave?

Such references portray, in their recourse to a unified collective, both a sense of victimhood and a lack of agency. The last sentence of the autobiography, which describes the unification of the two German states on 3 October, reiterates this feeling of loss: "Wir gleichen Waisen, die ihre Eltern durch Unfall verloren haben. Und die großspurige Bundesrepublik hat uns zwangsadoptiert" [We are like orphans who have lost their parents in an accident. And the pretentious Federal Republic has adopted us by force] (344). In positioning an all-encompassing East German community as children and personalizing history through a familial narrative, a power relationship that disparages the former socialist state is suggested.

Through the reference to an “Unfall” [accident] all historical responsibility, be it critical or supportive of the GDR state and the process of unification, is dismissed. The aim of the autobiography to understand historical processes through description of personal experience thus fails as personal involvement is finally removed from the historical context.

Yet, despite the fact that *Und außerdem* ends with the questions with which it started, the narrator refuses to give up her former complex identity. By refusing to integrate the post-unification period into the autobiographical narrative, past identities are strengthened. Through the memories of Nazism, the text emphasizes that the protagonist belonged to the founding generation of the GDR and as a result “positive, if not uncritical memories and years of struggle form the basis for an identity which resists assimilation into a new unified Germany” (Geisenhanslücke 2000, 84). Nevertheless, the text does not display the symptoms of Wolfgang Emmerich’s diagnosis of “furor melancholicus” (1996, 460). *Und außerdem* is not pervaded by feelings of self-hatred. While it is fixated on the former GDR as an object of loss, it cannot be categorized as a text of “Ostalgie”, if this concept is defined as “verspätet verblühende Heimatliebe” [belatedly fading love for the homeland] (Meyer-Gosau 2000, 6). The narrator has maintained a loyalty to the state, albeit a complex one, something which persists in retrospect and which, through her writing, has replaced the “great passion” of the introductory pages. Yet, at the same time, in a text seeking to emphasize East German identity, the shifting identifications of the protagonist suggesting resistance to, and distance from, the state undermine these very identities and bring into question the claims to a wider validity for her experiences. As has been shown above, the narrator is critical of the GDR and yet not of the protagonist’s position within it. Rather than self-hatred, there are numerous attempts at self-justification, bordering on hubris, which contradicts the often reiterated loss of ‘East German’ identity after 1989.

In the context of many “autobiographische Rechtfertigungsschriften” [autobiographical texts of justification] (Barner et al. 1994, 897) by former East Germans, Brüning’s text prioritizes the behaviour of those in power, rather than her own. In spite of the focus on the subject inherent to the genre of autobiography and the emphasis on the familial throughout the text, Brüning’s narrator does not redefine herself in the context of two German pasts from a “victor of history” to “victim of history”, when the history of the GDR is considered (compare von Ankum 1996, 43-45). Rendering herself as a victim of

the GDR regime would lead not only to a totalitarian equation with Nazism and a dismissal of East Germany in contradiction of her hopes for the future, but could also lead to the conclusion that she should have offered resistance. Instead of being portrayed as a victim of the GDR the protagonist presents herself instead as a victim of unification, a shift which allows her to preserve a positive East German identity. Nevertheless, by including elements of West German discourse contemporary to publication highly critical of the GDR, the narrator effectively undermines the identities the text otherwise wishes to prioritize.

Patterns of Reception

As is emphasized by the reviewers' comments included in Brüning's text, the reception of her work has always been varied. Ruth Eberlein's study traces patterns of this reception, describing how her texts were received critically in the 1950s and 1960s and often dismissed as "Unterhaltungsliteratur" [light fiction]. A change towards a more welcoming reception began in the 1970s and was followed by official recognition in the 1980s (Eberlein 1985, 229-30). Notwithstanding the vagaries of such criticism, the sale of over one and a half million copies of her texts has been the result of their identificatory potential.

For a writer who has been dismissed both as "[...] tedious and rightly neglected" (Schmidt 1992, 152) and "a loyal Party hack writer" (Rosenberg 1983, 89), the publication of her autobiography by three separate publishing houses, albeit two of them small, within four years is significant. The first of these, Elefanten Press, stressed both the temporal scope of the autobiography and the recurrent focus on women in Brüning's writings, as can be seen from the back cover of the 1994 edition:

Im Mittelpunkt ihrer Arbeiten standen meistens Frauen, so z.B. die Widerstandskämpferin Hilde Coppi, die berufstätigen Mütter ohne Männer nach dem verlorenen Krieg, die Studentinnen der Arbeiter-und Bauernfakultät, die Probleme von Ehe, Scheidung und Dreiecksverhältnissen, zuletzt auch das Schicksal der aus den Stalinischen Straflagern in die DDR heimgekehrten Kommunistinnen.

Women are usually at the centre of her works, for example the resistance fighter Hilde Coppi, the working mothers without husbands after the lost war, the female students at the Worker and Peasant Faculty, the problems of marriage,

divorce and eternal triangles, and finally also the fate of those female Communists who returned to the GDR from the Stalinist labour camps.

An accompanying biographical résumé stresses a lack of official recognition and her focus on “Themen des alltäglichen Lebens” [Themes from everyday life]. The style of the book is summarized in publicity material provided by the publisher as:

unspektakulär, aber lebhaft, sachlich klar, aber voller Witz und Anteilnahme, großzügig, mitunter drastisch und unbescheiden bis boshaft, aber voller tiefempfunderer Begebenheiten und Anekdoten.

unspectacular but lively, factually clear, but full of wit and sympathy, generous, from time to time graphic and impertinent to the point of being malicious, but full of heartfelt incidents and anecdotes.

Such themes are repeated to a certain extent in the reception of this edition of the book.

Several of the Western reviewers place Brüning’s text within a specific genre of unification literature. They emphasize its importance in contributing to East-West dialogue and understanding, and situate it alongside texts by Christa Wolf, Heiner Müller and Hermann Kant (n.a. 1994b; Breuer 1995). However, there is certainly a lack of the viciously gendered criticism that had been present in the period immediately preceding publication in the ‘Literature Debate’ of 1993. While the co-ordinates of reception changed very quickly during the first years following unification, it is still noticeable that the reviews from both East and West (albeit very few of them) are overwhelmingly positive, with even minor criticisms being ultimately reassessed. Brüning’s autobiography has, according to Ulrike Grohmer, “deutlich-aufklärerische Ambitionen” [clear ambitions to educate] (1994). The authenticity of the text is repeatedly stressed by reviewers from both East and West, and is linked to representativeness. Brüning is designated as a “Zeitzeugin” [contemporary eye-witness] (Fechner 1995), and her text is described as being one which contains characteristic traits of “das Frauenleben in diesem Jahrhundert” [woman’s life in this century] and which is an “außergewöhnliches Zeitdokument” [an exceptional document of its time] (Mittag 1994). Given this designation as an eye-witness, the gaps with respect to the Holocaust are significant.

While claiming that Brüning is a “Chronistin des Alltagsbewußtseins” [chronicler of everyday consciousness] and emphasizing the value of the text as an historical source, Dieter

Fechner comments on a tendency toward “eine gewisse romanhafte Gestaltungsweise” [a certain novelistic form] (1994). None of the reviewers consider the authorial shift from the fictional to the autobiographical genre, although many make links between her life story and her previous fiction. While the text is characterized as “bildhaft” [vivid] and “unterhaltsam” [entertaining] (n.a. 1994b) there is repeated reference to a self-effacing tone which is “weder selbstverliebt, noch experimentell ambitioniert” [never narcissistic nor experimentally ambitious], “kundig und sachlich” [knowledgable and factual], “ansprechend und nachhaltig überzeugend” [appealing and deeply convincing] (Fechner 1994), and “sachlich aber voller Anteilnahme” [factual but full of sympathy] (n.a. 1994a). A sense of honesty is repeatedly stressed, with the reviewers referring to Brüning’s “große Offenheit” [great openness] and “die menschliche Glaubwürdigkeit” [human credibility] (Mittag 1994). They claim that she writes “von der Seele” [from her soul] (Breuer 1995) and “scheut nicht Tabus” [does not avoid taboos] (Kreusel 1994). Marianne Schmidt reiterates through with reference to Christa Wolf: “Dank einer entwaffnenden Unbefangenheit in privaten wie in politischen Dingen entsteht dabei ein schillerndes, vielfältiges Bild von großer subjektiver Authentizität” [Thanks to a disarming uninhibitedness in private as in political matters, an enigmatic, diverse picture of great subjective authenticity emerges] (1994).

Several reviewers consider Brüning’s politics, stressing her divergence from official SED doctrine because of her “fehlende Klassenperspektive” [lack of class perspective]. Such divergence is interpreted positively, as is the fact that “sie weder ihre Erfahrungen mit dem anderen Geschlecht noch ihre politische Gutgläubigkeit in der Stalinzeit beschönigt” [she doesn’t gloss over her experiences with the opposite sex or her politically trusting nature during the Stalin era] (n.a. 1995).

The only negative sentiments are in Western reviews and are concerned with the voice of the narrating present. In discussing the “reflexive Ebene” [reflective level] of the text, Hubertus Breuer of *Die Welt* laments the “klischeehafte Bilder” [clichéd images] (1995). Gabriele Mittag, in contrast, suggests that the honesty displayed with regards to personal questions is not repeated in the political sphere, claiming that a “reflektierende Ebene fehlt” [reflective level is missing] (1994). A “Wunsch nach Straffung” [desire for succinctness] (von Gélieu 1994, 71) and a criticism of “die betuliche Erzählart” [fussy narrative style] (Kreusel 1994) are, however, set alongside

praise for detail. In contrast to the negative comments, East German Ursula Reinhold maintained six years later:

Aufschlußreich ist die Reflexion über den Zusammenbruch des Sozialismus, dem sie als ihrem Jugendideal treu geblieben ist. Offenkundig wird ein später Desillusionierungsprozeß, den sie in der Suche nach eigenen Selbsttäuschungen rekonstruiert. Sie stellt sich ihnen unerschrocken. (2002)

The reflection on the collapse of socialism, to which she adhered as an ideal from her youth, is instructive. A later process of disillusionment, which she reconstructs in the search for her own self-deceptions, becomes apparent. She faces the latter courageously.

Fundamental to the reception of Brüning's earlier literature was her antifascist resistance, particularly in *Damit Du weiterlebst*. Such themes continue to figure in the contemporary reception of her autobiography, with reviewers mentioning her life "als Illegale" [as an underground resister], and "im Bund" [in the Association]. In a television programme in 2001, which was primarily about her autobiography, Brüning's interview was entitled "Schreiben gegen Hitler" [Writing against Hitler], which once again prioritizes her identity as a resister and author.

While many reviewers stress Brüning's role as a mother, grandmother and great-grandmother, they do not consider how these roles are depicted in the text. Instead they stress the significance of common-place experiences in her fiction and emphasize that women were the main addressees of the text; this is also something that has been reiterated within the reception of Brüning's fiction, for example with Erich Siek writing of *Damit Du weiterlebst* that it "gehört [...] in jede Bücherei, besonders aber in die Hand der Frau" [belongs in every library, but particularly in the hands of women] (1950, 96). The relationship between the author and her readers which has similarly been stressed with regard to her fiction is frequently highlighted.

Agimos, the small firm that published the text in 1996, also republished *Damit Du weiterlebst* in 1996, as part of their agenda to publish "Bücher gegen das Vergessen" [Books against Forgetting]. Their programme is founded upon "[a]ussagekräftige Zeitgeschichte" [meaningful contemporary history] and, like the reviewers of the early edition, they emphasize that Brüning "setzte sich nie die parteipolitische Brille auf" [never put her party-political hat on]. On the third republication by dtv in 1998, there was little press attention. A single review by Erhard Schütz, in the East/West weekly *Freitag*, echoes earlier commentators: "Sie erzählt ein beeindruckend

wechselhaftes Leben und erzählt es beeindruckend klar und gerade. Eine dicht illustrierte Zeit- und Kulturgeschichte [...] [She tells of an impressively changeable life and tells it with impressive clarity and honesty. A densely illustrated contemporary and cultural history] (1998). Brüning herself was disillusioned with the reception of her book, maintaining that “wir ehemalige DDR-Autoren werden noch immer boykottiert und von den großen Blättern der alten Bundesländer nicht wahrgenommen” [we former authors of the GDR are still being boycotted and not taken seriously by the large newspapers of the former regions of the FRG] (Brüning, pers. com. 2000). Indeed, two thirds of the reviewers of the autobiography were by papers or journals in the East. Among the reviews in the Western papers, only *Die Welt* has a national circulation. Nevertheless, the reception of this later edition signifies a more tolerant attitude to East German authors; the dust cover contains a quote from Gisela Steineckert, an Eastern author known for her adherence to the official socialist discourse, who fell into particular disrepute after 1989 due to her adherence to the Party line (Emmerich 1996, 450). Steineckert reiterates a truth claim of the text (“Elfriede Brüning braucht keine Wende, um die Wahrheit zu schreiben. Sie hat es immer getan” [Elfriede Brüning doesn’t need unification to write the truth. She has always done that]). For their part, the publishers emphasize a generic female experience: “Ein Frauenleben – als Schriftstellerin im Deutschland des 20. Jahrhundert” [A woman’s life – as author in Germany during the 20th century]. Such sweeping gendered sentiments and generalizing cross-German tendencies within these reviews refuse to grant a recognition of individual or group experience, thus dismissing the many complexities within the text. Further consolidation of the positioning of inferiority in Brüning’s text is present, for example, in East German Monika Melchert’s assertion that the text is “ein wichtiger Baustein im höchstnotwendigen Prozeß unserer Vergangenheitsaufarbeitung” [an important stage in the highly necessary process of us working through the past] (1994). In thus using the very language previously connected with discussions of the Nazi past in West German hegemonic discourse and which pervaded the post-reunification context, Melchert situates Brüning’s text within a reductive and dismissive totalitarian narrative (see Silberman 1998, 28).

Conclusion: Complexities of Conformity and Resistance

Through the genre of autobiography, with its emphasis on the subject, Brüning has turned to focus on personal experiences which previously formed the backdrop of her fiction. The need for such a reassertion of subjectivity, as encapsulated in the dogmatic title, came at a time when “die Abwertung der DDR-Literatur war in vollem Gange” [the devaluation of GDR literature was in full swing] (Heukenkamp 1993, 29). Indeed, Brüning’s texts are now collected by the Rosa Luxemburg Foundation which preserves fictional works of the GDR “als Zeugen und Dokumente einer untergegangenen Kultur” [as witnesses and documents of a destroyed culture] (Ostholt 2002), many of which find no mention in bibliographies of the West. At the same time, through the emphasis on the first-person inherent in autobiography, the text “lead[s] the reader to identify with [a protagonist] who embod[ied] the dominant political discourse” (Hell 1997, 38) of the SED and yet who was also critical of it. Tensions arise in the narrative when the voice of the present narrator tries to emphasize her critical attitude as positive, while simultaneously claiming an identification with the state. An intended resistance to dominant, alienating, narratives about East German experiences clashes with the very inclusion of these within the text. A post-unification culture expecting justification and explanation on the part of East Germans is even encapsulated within the publishers’ framing of the autobiography: the climate of confession which Hannes Krauss has highlighted as prevailing in post-unification Germany with respect to GDR authors became part of the title, with the change from the first edition’s emphasis on the “notes of an author” to subsequent editions being marketed as “confessions of an eye-witness” (1993, 274). The latter reference to confession implies a need to communicate guilt.

While Brüning had previously written several autobiographical articles, some of which are reprinted verbatim as part of *Und außerdem*, she had never before felt it necessary to write her autobiography. As Ursula Steinhaußen has examined, the reasons she gave for this were founded in “Zweifel [...], ob die Ereignisse des eigenen Lebens bedeutsam genug waren” [doubts as to whether the events of her own life were significant enough]. In addition, she talked of the past as a time “die man zwar erlebt hat, deren Details einem aber im Laufe von Jahrzehnten entfallen sind” [which one had certainly experienced, but the details of which have been forgotten in the course of passing decades] (1984, 154). Since unification Brüning’s focus on writing autobiographical texts suggests that the

imperative to communicate has outweighed such modest doubts. In addition to *Und außerdem*, Brüning has published *Jeder lebt für sich allein: Nachwende-Notizen* [Everyone lives for themselves alone: Post-unification notes] (1999) and also focused on biographies of others, including *Kinder im Kreidekreis* [Children of the chalk circle] (1992) and *Gefährtinnen: Porträts vergessener Frauen* [Female companions: portraits of forgotten women] (2004). Eva Kaufmann describes such post-unification texts as those written “to represent the views of ordinary people who could not write for themselves” (1997, 215). Kerstin E. Reimann further claims that women authors first chose the genre of documentary literature in this period (2001, 225). This would seem to accord with Brüning’s assertion that “[i]n turbulenten Zeiten, in Umbrüchen, kann uns kein erfundenes Schicksal wirklich berühren. Man giert nach Fakten und Tatsachenberichten [...]” [in turbulent times, during upheavals, a fictional story can’t really touch us. One becomes greedy for facts and reports] (117).

Brüning’s autobiography is one of many books dealing with German unification and GDR history published in the four years since 1990. In a context of an increased interest in the lives of women in the GDR, her text has been rather neglected by literary critics. This follows a pattern visible in the reception of her fictional work: despite high sales figures, her literature is often not taken seriously (see Eberlein 1985, 16). Many autobiographies of the first years following unification were written by men, with women choosing other documentary forms, particularly diaries and essays (Reimann 2001, 231). Brüning’s choice of genre and the memories within it are significant. Considering the disparity between the popularity with the reading public and the lack of interest from literary critics, Brüning’s autobiography is one which challenges Frauke Meyer-Gosau’s assertion that “the more conventional the chosen form and the more traditional the perspective of the writer, the more reduced the reach of the text itself will be” (1998, 244).

Notwithstanding an imperative to investigate such texts, Axel Goodbody and Dennis Tate’s caveat remains important: “However urgent the need [has] become to establish a framework within which the achievements of GDR literature might be properly judged, it [is] not the moment to put its authors on pedestals as *moralische Instanzen*” [moral authorities] (1992, 2). A consideration of the frameworks within Brüning’s text has highlighted multiple contradictions in her self-understanding as an author, woman and antifascist. An examination of these contradictions necessitates an

awareness of the contemporary “Bermuda-Dreieck [Stasi, Totalitarismus und Kommandowirtschaft], in dem die Vergangenheit der ehemaligen DDR-Bürger/innen zu verschwinden droht” [Bermuda Triangle of Stasi, totalitarianism and planned economy in which the past of the former citizens of the GDR is in danger of disappearing] (Merkel 1994, 378). It must negotiate the danger that any investigation of East German antifascism risks carrying with it a diminishing of fascism and promoting debates of ‘normalization’ that became prominent during the 1980s ‘Historians’ Debate’ and which continued into the 1990s.

An analysis of the memories within *Und außerdem* highlights the prioritization of the familial sphere. Such a focus, which likewise figures prominently in Brüning’s fiction, has been criticized in the past. As women have often written about their lives through this sphere its role in women’s literature is undeniable. Nonetheless, the familial sphere has significant implications with regards to the memories of fascism. In “personaliz[ing] a specific socio-historical situation by illustrating its impact on the everyday life of her female protagonists” (Kuhn 1994a, 210), the text demands an examination of discourses within the familial sphere, particular those of gender and class. The protagonist’s relationship to her husband and to those around her illustrate various hierarchies of remembering, which allow a generic German victimhood to become prominent. Ambiguities in textual constructions of responsibility and resistance are variously emphasized or marginalized due to some events being passed over while others receive more detailed attention. At first glance, the definition of identity in terms of an East/West divide is less ambiguous, as shown through the depiction of the American and Russian liberators, and post-war West German society. However, this too is in fact more complex than first appears. Notwithstanding a repeated connection of West Germany with the fascist past, the narrator admits to inconsistencies in her attitude towards the FRG. Negative descriptions of a post-unification society and the implication of the rootedness of such problems in West Germany suggest a “continuing experience of the FRG as a reference culture” (Hogwood 2000, 54). Yet, alongside utopian socialist visions of the future is a hope for the unified Germany: “Es wird Jahrzehnte brauchen, bis aus den beiden Hälften ein Ganzes wird, das hoffentlich die positiven Merkmale beider Teile harmonisch in sich vereint” [It will take decades until both halves become a whole, which will hopefully harmoniously combine the positive characteristics of both sides within it] (283).

At the time of publication of her autobiography, Brüning wanted to make her voice heard. As such, she is like other GDR authors, including Christa Wolf, who see the writer's role in "Identitätsstiftung für das unglückliche, zerissene Volk" [establishing an identity for the unhappy, disunited nation] (Wolf cited in Skare 2001, 187). Given the swift republication of her text and the positive reception of it in the East, it would seem that Brüning's memories have indeed provided identificatory possibilities for some of her contemporary addressees. Notwithstanding the multiplicity of competing identities within the autobiography, and a context where East German identities "rissig und unverständlich geworden [sind]" [have become cracked and incomprehensible] (Emmerich 1992, 7), Brüning attempts to establish a broadly chronological, teleological progression of an antifascist identity of the past. A tension with this trajectory is shown through interventions of the voice of the narrating present, which suggest an "intricate pattern of conformity and resistance characterizing the GDR" (Hell 1998, 70). A detailed examination of such patterns avoids the danger of contemporary debates which, as Roswitha Skare has argued, look only for "culprits and victims" (2001, 125). A more differentiated approach, based on close readings of texts such as Brüning's, allows this dichotomy and such sweeping statements to be avoided.

Within Brüning's autobiography there is a tension between wanting to validate experiences through reference to a wider historical framework and asserting individual authenticity of experience. If, as Christine Cosentino suggests, the titles of post-unification narratives by East German authors are "eine Art Schlußwort zu [ihren] Leben in der DDR" [a sort of postscript to their lives in the GDR] (2001) then Brüning's title, *Und außerdem war es mein Leben*, must be seen as the defiant culmination of a narrative attempt to reassert her identity.

Brüning's narrative is framed by a question and yet it is not one of self-questioning. An unexamined self-definition as antifascist, dating from the late 1920s, was reinforced through the hegemonic political discourses of the GDR and persists in the immediate post-unification context. Reiterations of this antifascist identity have constantly recurred in the reception of Brüning and have been compounded by a lack of detailed literary analysis of her text. An examination of the memories of fascism upon which these identities were founded highlights a much more complex picture.

7. “To Write against Forgetting”: Grete Weil’s *Leb ich denn, wenn andere leben*

In response to a question from Carmen Giese in 1995 as to why she decided to write her autobiography, Grete Weil answered: “Vielleicht habe ich [...] das Gefühl, dass ich gewisse Dinge aus meinem Leben in meinen anderen Werken noch nicht klar genug gesagt habe” [Perhaps I have the feeling that I have not yet said certain things about my life clearly enough in my other texts] (Giese 1997, 212). This explicit aim to communicate is reiterated in the introductory “ein Wort vorab” [a word to begin with]. An imperative to write is encapsulated for Weil in the challenge to tell “wie es damals gewesen sei” [what it was like back then] (Weil 1998, 7).¹ This challenge indicates the reciprocity of the writing process, in so far as it needs an addressee willing to listen and an opportunity for a voice to be heard. In this chapter I will consider how the structure of Weil’s text communicates a particular understanding of the events of the past. I will examine how different genres within the autobiography engage with contemporary discourses about fascism, and how issues of identity and witnessing shape constructions of the past. I will consider how the autobiography, published by Nagel and Kimche in 1998 and reprinted by Fischer in 2001, is positioned within prominent debates about Nazism, and whether, as the accompanying publishing information claims, it is a text which contradicts many preconceived opinions about the past.

Grete Dispeker was born in Rottach-Egern, Bavaria to a wealthy Jewish family in 1906. Her father, an influential figure in his daughter’s life, was a lawyer. Grete married Edgar Weil in 1932 and, following the effects of the Nuremberg Laws, they fled to the Netherlands in 1937. Four years later Edgar Weil was arrested, deported to Mauthausen and murdered. Following resistance activities during her work with the Jewish Council at the Schouwburg in Amsterdam, Weil went into hiding and survived the rest of the war. In 1947 she returned to West Germany and began to confront her experiences of persecution in fictional writing. She later married her childhood friend Walter Jockisch. Following literary success for her fictional work during the 1980s, Weil died aged ninety-three on 14 May 1999.

¹ Further references in the text will be given to this edition. All translations are my own.

A Simplistic Triptych? The Structure of Weil's text

Leb ich denn, wenn andere leben [Can I live, if others live?] is divided into two parts, with twenty-four chapters in the first part and seventeen in the second. The second part includes a chapter containing Weil's play *Weihnachtslegende 1943* [Christmas Legend 1943] and concludes with a letter to Margarete Susman dating from 1947. Many reviewers claim that Weil's text has a simplistic structure. They comment that the author was ninety-two when it was published and argue either explicitly or implicitly that "die Form [mag] dem hohen Alter der Autorin geschuldet sein" [the form might be due to the old age of the author] (Grumbach 1998; Evans 2006, 258). In contrast to such interpretations, I argue that it is the very structure that makes the autobiography so powerful. The inclusion of three different dialogical genres within it encapsulates a way of remembering that emphasizes reciprocity. An implied need and involvement of the addressee and an emphasis on dialogue run throughout the text and are epitomized by the title; Weil's provocative question of *Leb ich denn, wenn andere leben* at once includes and excludes the addressee. The reciprocal nature of identity and the antagonistic relationship between Weil, as a survivor of the Holocaust, and her German interlocutors are combined in this rhetorical question.

From comments that Weil made about her work on the autobiography, which she began writing in 1993, it appears that it was originally to be divided into three parts: "Der erste Teil ist die Jugend, dann kommt der Krieg, dann kommt der Nachkrieg" [The first part is my youth, then comes the war, then the post-war period] (Giese 1998, 212). In an article accompanying an earlier publication of the 1947 letter to Susman in the *Süddeutsche Zeitung*, Hiltrud Häntzschel writes that the third part, "die Nachkriegszeit, wird nun dieser Brief einleiten" [the post-war period, will be introduced by this letter] (1994). This tripartite division of Weil's narrative, the triptych of experience which has been highlighted by Laureen Nussbaum and Uwe Meyer as framing Weil's previous literary work (1993, 156), collapses when the overall structure of the published autobiography is considered. Firstly, two chapters detailing events of the immediate post-war period precede the letter from 1947 but the letter itself ends the text. Secondly, each of the short chapters contains many references to future events both during and after fascism. The effects that fascism had on the people, places and attitudes that characterize Weil's childhood are repeatedly related to the narrator's present; a narrative style which Alexander von Bormann has called "doubling" in relation

to Weil’s fiction (1991, 245). Therefore, in contrast to Margot Kröger and Owen Evans who emphasize a chronological structure to the autobiography, I argue that the text is more complex (Kröger 2002, 77; Evans 2006, 258). Indeed, a synchronic structure reiterates the inseparability of past and present and reinforces the fact that the events of the Holocaust refuse closure.² The positioning of Weil’s letter to Susman at the end of the text emphasizes an ever-pervasive past in the present – with Weil asking the reader to consider the statements from 1947 as the ‘missing’ third part of the text.

The different genres within the autobiography encompass different forms of remembering, something addressed by the narrator in the introduction and which is related to a concept of truth:

Ein anderes Gefahrenmoment: Wie hält es die Autorin mit der Wahrheit? Ich bin eine äußerst unwillige und deshalb wohl auch schlechte Lügnerin. Was ich sage, soll stimmen. Doch inwieweit trägt die Erinnerung? Und so sollte man dem Lesenden wie sich selbst zugestehen, dass zu einer Autobiographie auch Dichtung gehört. (8)

Another moment of danger: What is the author’s attitude to the truth? I am an extremely reluctant, and therefore probably also a bad, liar. What I say should be correct. But to what extent is memory deceptive? And so one should admit to the readers as well as to oneself that poetry is also involved in an autobiography.

Like Elfriede Brüning, Weil begins by addressing both her motivation for, and the difficulties of, autobiographical writing. By raising questions about the “Gefahren einer Autobiographie” [dangers of an autobiography] (8) and the process of remembering, the narrator first insists on links to German culture, with the introductory comments bringing to mind Goethe’s autobiography *Dichtung und Wahrheit*. This link is strengthened by the title itself, a reference to Goethe’s *Buch des Unmuts* [Book of Sorrow], the seventh verse of which reads: “Und ich konnte sie nicht tadeln;/ Wenn wir andern Ehre geben,/ Müssen wir uns selbst entadeln;/ Lebt man denn, wenn andre leben?” (Goethe 1978, 43) [And I would not blame them either./ When we others honour give./ Our own dignity is lowered./ Can we live when others live? (Rogers 1890, 247)]. The poem was one in which, according to Erich Trunz, Goethe was writing to refute his critics. Trunz continues:

Die Haltung des Sprechenden ist abwechselnd zurückweisend, tadelnd, ironisch, gereizt [...]. Aus der allgemeinen Frage nach dem einzelnen und

² Weil herself has also denied a chronological structuring principle (Giese 1997, 212).

seiner Umwelt wird beim Künstler das Problem der Anerkennung und die Frage nach dem Sosein als Schicksal und der inneren Berechtigung seines Tuns. (1978, 581)

The attitude of the speaker is alternately dismissive, reproachful, ironic, irritated [...]. For the artist, the general question about the individual and his environment becomes the problem of recognition, the question about his being fated to be as he is, and about the inner legitimacy of his actions.

Weil's career, unlike Goethe's, was marked by a lack of recognition, yet a determination and a need to continue writing. A decisive change of the quotation in the title from the impersonal third person to the first person emphasizes both the autobiographical prominence of the individual and shifting borders of inclusion and exclusion. Renate Nagel-Kohler, Weil's editor, wrote to the author on 1 September 1997: "Ich finde die Abweichung vom Zitat durchaus vertretbar. Und es ist gewiss kein Zufall, dass Sie ursprünglich das Zitat in dieser Form erinnerten" [I think that the deviation from the quotation is perfectly defensible and it is certainly no coincidence that you originally remembered the quotation in this form].³ A description of the protagonist's Jewish ancestry immediately follows this introductory stress on German cultural ties, thus the autobiography begins by setting out the most significant parameters of the text – Weil's self-understanding as a German-Jewish author. Tensions between the elements of this identity that Weil defines, and has defined for her, run throughout.

Autobiographical Co-ordinates

The twenty-four chapters of the first part of the text provide 'snapshot' descriptions of the narrator's past, with chapter headings displaying individual, familial connections (for example, "Der Vater" [Father], "Die Mutter" [Mother], "Der Geliebte" [Lover]). These origins are emphasized through a subversion of the traditional autobiographical structure: the chapter "Geburt" [Birth] comes after five chapters focussing on other family members. Unlike the photographs interspersed within these chapters, the people, places and attitudes on which these short passages focus are unable to preserve their rarefied existence. Each of the chapters on the protagonist's father, mother and brother ends with their deaths and conveys a

³ Thanks are due to Dr. Nagel-Kohler for providing the author with a copy of this letter.

continued desolation at their absence. The depiction of these figures, who died of natural causes, is contrasted with the protagonist’s “erste Lieben” [first loves], whose deaths at the hands of others become precursors for Edgar Weil’s murder:

Ich hätte Lehren daraus ziehen sollen, aber ich begriff damals noch nicht, dass die Menschen Mörder sind, und es kam mir nicht in den Sinn, dass auch meiner großen erwachsenen Liebe Ähnliches widerfahren könnte. (46)

I should have learnt a lesson from it, but at that time I had not yet understood that people are murderers and it didn’t occur to me that a similar thing could happen to the great love of my adulthood.

Central to the first part of Weil’s autobiography is a consideration of her Jewishness, the extent of which she establishes in the chapters about her grandparents and father. The paradoxical situation of someone who acknowledges herself “vor aller Welt in meinen Büchern als Jüdin” [to the whole world as a Jew in my books] (21) and yet still repeatedly asks the question “Was ist das: ‘Jude’?” [what does it mean: ‘Jew’?] (77) is underlined by definition in terms of lack – of religious, territorial or linguistic affiliation. A lack of linguistic ties is encapsulated in the fact that the family give away an heirloom written in Hebrew because none of them can understand it, something which contrasts notably with the earlier references to the author’s familiarity with Goethe.

The importance of the protagonist’s father is shown not only in the primacy of his portrayal within the autobiography, but also through repeated emphasis on their closeness. This is a closeness that is also a prominent theme in Weil’s fiction (Wieskerstrauch 1988, 116). The horror of what was to befall the Jewish community is signified through the narrator’s description of his death as a mercy; he was never to know that a doctor refused to treat him because he was Jewish. Her father represents both ties to the Jewish community as a member of the local Jewish council, and also, as someone who had never attended a synagogue, distance from it. His assertion that it was not good for a Jew to hold an influential position suggests an awareness of the difficulties of acculturation in spite of his attempts to achieve it.

The significance of the family’s Jewish identity in relation to the fascist past is symbolized by the fact that the only thing with which the narrator can fill the concept of Jewishness is the certainty that it is “ein Todesurteil” [a death sentence] (77). The central chapter to the first part, entitled “Lebensgefährlich, Jüdin zu sein” [Life-threatening

to be Jewish], becomes a signifier of Weil's Jewish identity. This threat to life is reinforced by the fact that the narrator defines the death of her friend Lili as the most significant event of her youth. Lili's suicide, her death by gassing, provides a tragic foreshadowing of the Jewish fate under Nazism. It pre-empts the death of Tilly, with whom the protagonist stays during Lilli's funeral, and who was deported to Auschwitz and gassed.

Notwithstanding the repeated separation of the protagonist from a Jewish identity, the multiple references to the future events of fascism show that she could not escape its effects. Indeed, it is her ties to the "Schicksalsgemeinschaft der Juden" [common destiny of the Jews] (Koelbl, 1989, 256) which constitute her Jewish identity. While this was defined for her irrespective of her own self-understanding, it subsequently becomes a necessary part of survival in the post-Holocaust era and an integral part of her literary confrontation with the past: "Alle sagen es. Ich sage es selbst, sage es ohne zu zögern [...]. Ich bin Jüdin. Mache ich mir den Maßstab der Nazis zu eigen [...]?" [Everyone says so. I say it myself without hesitation. I am a Jew. Am I making the Nazi standard my own?] (74-75).

Alongside such an ambivalent delineation of Jewish identity is the construction of Germanness, as signified by two elements which are defined as absent from Weil's Jewishness: linguistic and spatial ties. The first of these is expressed as the protagonist's recourse to German literature and music, both of which serve as significant elements in her childhood memories and later become integral to the attempted reappropriation of Germanness at different times during her exile in Amsterdam. Goethe's literature and Wagner's opera, two of her father's passions, are as important as his love for the countryside and their mountain-walking and ice-skating excursions. Weil's relationship to Germany, her "Heimat" [homeland] (142), is encapsulated through her responses to the Bavarian landscape. The longevity of her attachment is underlined by the description of her as a child whose "Augen sahen als Erstes die geliebte Landschaft, Schönheit, nur Schönheit" [eyes saw the beloved landscape, beauty, only beauty, as the very first thing] (39). It is reiterated through the description of a scenery which she "später über alle Maßen liebte" [later loved beyond all measure] (40). Within the first three chapters there are repeated references to this "Heimat", which stretch beyond 1947 and pre-empt the protagonist's return to Germany after the war. Weil was previously reticent to use such a term, stating that it was only relevant "in einem sehr übertragenen Sinn" [in a very figurative way] (Weil-Jockisch 1985, 57). Indeed, as Franziska Meyer points

out, Weil did not use the term “Heimat” in her early post-war letters (2002, 37). But, by the 1990s, in an unpublished paper for the opening of a conference “Jüdische Kultur und Weiblichkeit in der Moderne”, Weil asserts more definitely: “Ich bin am Tegernsee geboren, mitten hinein in die oberbayerische Landschaft, die mir im wahrsten Sinn des Wortes Heimat, das heißt das Urvertraute wurde und noch heute ist” [I was born on the Tegernsee in the heart of the Upper Bavarian landscape, the landscape which for me became, and remains, the truest sense of the word Heimat, that is to say, something which has always been part of me] (Weil 1990, 1). It is also a phrase which was to become ever more frequent in her autobiographical summaries. In the context of repeated “trajectories of deterritorialization” (Zipes, 1994, 41; Broder 1994, 84) in contemporary German-Jewish literature, such insistence on “Heimat” is striking as a conscious demarcation from any notion of Diaspora. It is also a significant term of multiple and contentious meanings. In the late 1990s context of the publication of Weil’s text, it must be seen as engaging both with debates on definitions of national identity and understandings of the past. As Elizabeth Boa and Rachel Palfreyman have examined, discussion of “Heimat” can fall either side of the ‘Historians’ Debate’ as it contains both negative and positive elements (2000, 19). Often a delimiting and exclusionary concept, “Heimat” can also refer to “a place to which exiles look back with longing”, be a signifier of “a locus under threat”, or “represent an idea of loss” (Boa and Palfreyman 2000, 20, 172, 183). Given the protagonist’s experience as a victim and survivor of persecution, the use of “Heimat” is an attempt to recuperate a term used by the Nazis and by those who want to ‘normalize’ the German past by integrating it into her own life story. It is therefore significant that the protagonist’s imposed Jewish identity initially becomes prominent in the form of a barrier to the relationship with the Bavarian landscape, first demonstrated by the refusal to let her join the mountain club. Despite such exclusion, in an examination of the “Orte der Handlung” [Scenes of Action] (47), the narrator’s attachment to the places of her childhood and adult life is undiminished by the encroaching antisemitism:

Ein Ort, in dem man zu Hause ist, wirklich zu Hause, auch dann noch, als über dem Ortsschild ein Transparent mit der Aufschrift hängt: “Juden betreten den Ort auf eigene Gefahr”. Das Transparent macht die Menschen hässlicher, nicht den Ort. (50)

Somewhere where one is at home, really at home, even when a banner is hung above the place-name sign with the inscription "Jews enter at their own risk". The inscription makes the people more horrible, not the place.

Such a refusal to confuse place with people allows for the possibility, and retrospective justification, of her return to Germany after the war, to which there are repeated references. In a letter to Herr Escherig on 11 August 1980 Weil reiterates this distinction: "Oberbayern ist mein Land gewesen und geblieben, was wenig mit den Menschen, aber alles mit der Landschaft zu tun hat" [Upper Bavaria was and has remained my country, which has less to do with the people but everything to do with the landscape].⁴

Given this construction of Weil's German identity in the autobiography, Uwe Meyer and Dagma C.G. Lorenz's earlier readings of Weil's texts are no longer so appropriate: Meyer suggests that Weil did not take the landscape of her childhood as the focal point for her writing, but instead Auschwitz and Mauthausen (U. Meyer 1996, 151). Lorenz draws comparisons between Weil and Peter Weiss, pointing to the fact that Weiss identified more closely with Auschwitz than with his place of birth. She argues that Weil's self-understanding was similar (Weiss 1968, 27-36; Lorenz 1992, 149). However, through an emphasis on the territorial delineation of "Heimat" in her autobiography, Weil rejects the metaphor of Auschwitz as a key to her own self-understanding. She does not use the term Auschwitz at any point in her self-characterization. In contrast to earlier description that she is someone who is suffering from the illness Auschwitz (Weil 1989, 8), the author only talks about Auschwitz in the specific connection of those family members and friends who were murdered there. This change in self-understanding is arguably linked to a reconsideration of the act of witnessing, which I explore below. Weil reverses the pattern that has been detected in her fictional reworking of the experiences of the Holocaust through the genre of autobiography and its inherent focus on origin. As such it is the culmination of the on-going "Suche nach Orten" [search for places], which Irmela von der Lühe has characterized as recurrent in Weil's previous literature (1997, 322). A redefinition of her identity in favour of German rootedness is reaffirmed by the narrator of the present: "Ich liebte München und liebe es noch: seine gute Mischung aus nördlicher Rauheit und südlichem Glanz, ich mag die Menschen, ihren oft ins Grobe entgleisenden Charme, ihren Dialekt" [I loved Munich and still do; with its mixture of Northern roughness and Southern sparkle, I

⁴ Letter in Weil's Nachlass in the Monacensia Literaturarchiv, Munich.

like the people, their charm which can often slip into coarseness, and their dialect] (55). Such a positioning within a German collective accords with the narrator’s introductory linking of her experiences, which she feels are close to “den Menschen von heute” [the people of today] (8).

Close ties to a German collective are juxtaposed with the protagonist’s sense of alienation in exile, which equates to her relationship to the Jewish community. The impending dislocation and its lasting effects are encapsulated in repeated references to emigration, which becomes the focus of the second half of the text. In contrast to the depictions of Germany, the lack of positive memories of her city of exile, Amsterdam, causes the city to become a metaphor for continued suffering. The immediacy of this feeling is conveyed by the use of the present tense and a detailed focus on the events in the second part. The chapter titles reveal the different stages of the protagonist’s life in exile, and in their difference to those of the first part they reflect the protagonist’s progressive alienation from all significant elements of her youth.

Weil has previously emphasized the devastating effects of exile, remarking that emigration does not simply mean leaving your country but is actually the “Verlassen des ganzen Seins” [abandonment of your whole being] (Weil-Jockisch 1962, 29). This trauma has been a continued focus in her writing into the 1990s:

Emigration ist ein Sturz ins Bodenlose, ist nicht nur der Verlust der Heimat, der Landschaft, der Menschen, die den Alltag gestaltet haben, ist am allerschlimmsten der Verlust der Sprache. (Weil 1996, 17)

Emigration is a fall into the abyss. It is not only the loss of your homeland, of the landscape, of the people, all of which make up your everyday life, it is worst of all the loss of your language.

Linguistic ties thus are once again reiterated and as such “Sprache selbst wird zur Heimat” [language itself becomes one’s homeland] (Stern 2000, 88).

The generic nature of certain titles (“Krieg” [War], “Anfang der Deportationen” [The beginning of the deportations]) is juxtaposed with others which re-emphasize the individual (“Wie Neugierde Edgars Mutter rettet” [How curiosity saved Edgar’s mother], “Meine sterntragende Mutter” [My star-wearing mother]). As in Hilde Huppert’s text, these chapter headings show the systematic persecution and allow the author to deal with the events through distanced objectivization. The individuality of her experience is

something that Weil has repeatedly stressed in her previous writing, exemplified by her comment: “Ich biete an: meine Geschichte” [I offer up: my story] (1989, 132). Despite this, there has been a tendency in secondary literature to read her texts as representative, even to state that “es geht Grete Weil nicht um die Darstellung der eigenen Lebensgeschichte, sondern um die Geschichte der Verfolgung und Ermordung der europäischen Juden” [for Grete Weil it is not about the depiction of her own life story but the history of the persecution and murder of European Jews] (U. Meyer 1996, 36). On the contrary, Weil’s choice of the genre of autobiography, with its attendant emphasis on ‘I’, emphasizes the point she makes in the chapter called “Die Inventarisierung” [The Inventory]:

Dieses Buch ist die Geschichte meines Lebens und nicht die Geschichte der Vernichtung von über 100’000 [sic] holländischen Juden und der zahllosen, in die Niederlande geflüchteten Emigranten [...] Ich schreibe also nur das auf, was mich unmittelbar angeht, was ich selbst erlebt habe. (171)

This book is the story of my life, and not the history of the destruction of more than 100,000 Dutch Jews and of the numerous emigrants who fled to the Netherlands [...]. I am writing about only that which applies directly to me, what I experienced myself.

The insistence on individuality is juxtaposed with Weil’s description of herself belonging to the “Gemeinschaft des Leidens” [community of suffering] (74) and to the group of “Todgeweihte” [the doomed] (155). However, within this group she demonstrates that there are multiple Jewish experiences, epitomized by the “trennende Wand” [dividing wall] (170) of hostility that characterizes the relationship between Dutch and German Jews.

Individuality of experience does not, however, negate the authority to tell “wie es damals gewesen sei” [what it was like back then]. Indeed, it is seen instead as a marker of authenticity. This is linked to Weil’s self-understanding as an eye-witness of exile, something which she has as a central focus in her previous texts and reiterates in her autobiography: “Nach der Verfolgungszeit das Bedürfnis, davon zu erzählen. Zeuge zu sein. Weil so etwas nie mehr geschehen durfte” [After the time of persecution, I felt the need to talk about it. To be a witness. Because something like this must never happen again] (78). Thus, a programmatic claim to influence the future characterizes Weil’s act of witnessing. The personal imperative of communicating trauma is stressed along with an emphasis on present responsibility.

However, in her earlier writings, Weil has expressed a doubt about her ability to bear witness:

Über vierzig Jahre lang habe ich mir eingebildet, ein Zeuge zu sein, und das hat mich befähigt, so zu leben wie ich es getan habe. Ich bin kein Zeuge mehr. Ich habe nichts gewußt. Wenn ich Primo Levi lese, weiß ich, daß ich mir ein KZ nicht wirklich vorstellen konnte. Meine Phantasie war nicht krank genug. (Weil 1992, 102-3)

For more than forty years, I imagined I was a witness, and that has allowed me to live the way I have. I am not a witness any longer. I didn't know anything. When I read Primo Levi I know that I couldn't really imagine a concentration camp. My imagination was not sick enough.

In contrast to this, there is a reinstatement of the imperative to bear witness within the autobiography through her own voice and through the inclusion of others, suggesting an increased, not diminished, need to testify (compare Finnan 2000, 450). We find that the autobiography corroborates what Bernhard Setzwein has highlighted as being the central theme of Weil's work: “Zeugnis ablegen” [Bearing witness] (1990, 243). Nevertheless, it is clear that her own understanding of her ability to bear witness has changed. Therefore, notwithstanding the competing claims to her status as a witness, it is maybe surprising that Weil begins the second part of her text with a comparison between the lasting effects of her enforced emigration and “die Nummern im Arm der Auschwitzhäftlinge” [the numbers on the arms of the Auschwitz inmates] (127). However, this numeration represents not only the suffering in the camps but also the loss of identity – which Weil typifies as inherent to her experience of exile.

A sense of individuality also characterizes Weil's decision to resist. With hindsight she interprets this decision as based on the misunderstanding that her suffering was “ein schreckliches Einzelschicksal” [a terrible individual fate] (163). The present narrator admits that her hopeful attitude at that time was naive: “[...] ich fühle mich stark genug, alle Gefahren zu überstehen: Eine Gaskammer übersteht auch der Stärkste nicht, aber davon weiß man zu dieser Zeit noch nichts” [I feel strong enough to overcome all dangers. Even the strongest cannot overcome a gas chamber, but at this point in time I did not yet know about this] (165). Weil describes her work in the Jewish Council as an act of resistance and characterizes her involvement in terms of the personal aim of being able to save her mother. She denies feeling guilty about co-operating with the system, thus revising a comment made seventeen years earlier in which she expressed guilt for doing so (Weil 1981, 176). It seems that her

change in attitude towards her involvement was influenced by her reading of Primo Levi's powerful text. Levi has highlighted such involvement and the resultant feelings of guilt for the victims as being one of the most pernicious elements of the Nazi system of extermination (1995, 25). Weil denies this guilt in her autobiography, but her comment that "mir wäre wohler, ich wäre nicht dabei gewesen, wenn ich mir auch nichts vorzuwerfen habe" [I would feel better if I hadn't been there, even if I have nothing to reproach myself for], illustrates her ambivalence with regards to her memories about her work there. This is exemplified by the fact that the narrator states that since she has written about the work in the Council in such detail in *Meine Schwester Antigone*, she will not mention it further, and yet then goes on to describe the work, as if succumbing after all to a need to justify her actions. Such description includes not only the terrible process the workers were involved in, but also illustrates the benefits their actions had for the German population:

Wir vom Jüdischen Rat müssen [...] die Adressen derer [aufschreiben], die "abgeholt" werden, [und] ihre Hausschlüssel in Empfang nehmen [...]. Später wird man die betreffenden Wohnungen leer räumen und alles Brauchbare als "Spende" für die Ausgebombten nach Deutschland schicken. (179)

We at the Jewish Council had to write down the addresses of those who had been "taken away" and then take charge of their house keys. Later on the flats concerned would be emptied and all valuable items would be sent to Germany as a "donation" for those who had been bombed-out.

Significant in the description of the events at the 'collection point' is the way in which the Jewish victims are described. In an almost dispassionate tone, the narrator asserts:

Ebenso irritiert es mich, dass niemand weint. Warum? Ist es kein Grund zum Weinen, wenn man aus seiner Wohnung geholt und ins gräulich Ungewisse geschickt wird? Sind alle so tapfer oder alle so stumpf? Ich weiß es nicht. (168)

Likewise it irritates me that no one cries. Why? Isn't there reason to cry when you're taken from your home and sent off into a dreadfully uncertain future? Are they all so brave or their senses dulled? I don't know.

In a similarly scathing tone the narrator relates the "Dummheit" [stupidity] (173) of a woman convinced she will return from the East. Such comments prevent a heroicization of the victims and illustrate the protagonist's feeling of alienation from this group of Dutch, German and Polish Jews, which becomes united only in its naive belief that someone will come to their aid. However, such a

retrospective interpretation of their behaviour as naive rather than hopeful – which is how the protagonist’s own past behaviour is characterized in the present tense – illustrates the impossibility of being able “sich zurückzusetzen in den Zustand des Nichtwissens, Nichtbegreifens” [to put yourself back into the position of not knowing, not understanding] (109). Weil alludes to this several times in her autobiography and it is epitomized by her comment: “Wir glaubten an Schwierigkeiten, nicht an Vernichtung” [we thought there would be difficulties, not extermination] (1990, 1).

A critical portrayal of Jewish victims is also significant in the light of a German-Jewish literary context of the 1990s in which, it is claimed, that for Jewish authors negative Jewish figures are taboo (Reichmann 2000, 238). Eva Reichmann contends that contemporary publication conditions demand the construction of “den guten Juden, der verzeiht und nicht Menschen mit ganz normalen menschlichen Schwächen und Eigenschaften” [the good Jew who forgives and not people with quite normal human weaknesses and characteristics]. She adds, echoing Rafael Seligmann, that aggression and hatred are likewise taboo (Reichmann 2000, 238; Seligmann 1994, 173). Weil subverts these expectations threefold: through her critical depiction of the victims at the Schowbourg deportation point; through her portrayal of Vera; and through her depiction of her relationship with her grandmother, “O”:

ich hasste sie, hasste sie wirklich, stärker oder doch anders als ich später Hitler gehasst habe, denn der Hass auf Hitler war ein eher abstrakter, im Leiden meiner zerstörten Jugend zerfließender Hass. O aber hasste ich persönlich, von Mensch zu Mensch. (36)

I hated her, really hated her, more strongly, or a least differently, than I later hated Hitler; for the hatred of Hitler was more of an abstract, unfocussed hatred stemming from the suffering of my destroyed youth. But I hated O personally, person to person.

Previously, when pressed on the question of hatred, Weil has declared: “Ich bin einfach eine schlechte Hasserin” [I am simply a bad hater] (Koelbl 1989, 256). Here, the narrator directs hatred at the grandmother and indirectly at the distorted Jewish traditions she symbolizes. The “abstract” hatred of Hitler, linked to the destruction of the protagonist’s German identity, is not a hatred directed at Germany or the Germans. In refusing the imposed contemporary expectations of Jewishness, Weil destabilizes the binary constellation

of Jews and Germans, the nationalist, racist construction which was imposed by fascism (Adelson 1993, 93).

Notwithstanding Weil's rejection of hatred founded in a belief in collective German guilt, there are several points at which the relationship of the narrator to Germans in general is brought to the fore. It is a German who confronts the photographer-protagonist with the potentially lethal question "Sind Sie denn überhaupt rein arisch?" [Are you in fact a pure Aryan?] (134-35), but who, on receiving a negative reply, does not take the matter any further. It is also a German officer who is the first person to help her on her escape from the Schouwburg. Both cases illustrate blurred lines of involvement in the fascist system. In spite of repeated references to a lack of hatred being borne by the narrator for the German population, the narrator describes how the elderly protagonist was unable to stay in contact with a girl from school after the war, because "[sie] konnte nicht umhin, in dieser erwachsenen, recht reizvollen Frau das Kind mit dem Hakenkreuz zu sehen, das [sie] kränkte" [in this grown-up, charming woman she couldn't see past the girl with the swastika who insulted her] (76). There is also a hint of criticism of the well-disposed neighbour who sent Weil a letter that he had kept, "um seinen späten Abscheu vor den Ereignissen zu bekunden" [to attest to his belated disgust at events] (50). It was a letter which her father wrote to the Mayor in 1935 to protest about antisemitic graffiti.

Wider German experiences of the consequences of Nazism are similarly addressed through the narrator's reference to the bomb damage of Germany's cities, including Munich and Frankfurt. Previously, Weil has drawn parallels between the ruined cities and herself, explaining that "die Ruinen waren ein Spiegel" [the ruins were a mirror] (Weil-Jockisch 1985, 56), thus once again suggesting a closeness to the topography but not the people. While such references could suggest an identificatory sympathy with victims of bombing raids, the text stops short of any prioritization of these experiences and links them instead to the protagonist's personal history, to the places significant to her childhood. Unlike in Elfriede Brüning's text, there is no consideration of generic German experience. Similarly, while Stalingrad is mentioned it does not contribute to a discourse of the victimhood of soldiers, as it is undoubtedly a positive marker of change and the hope for liberation: "Das Blatt hat sich gewendet. Stalingrad war ein Anfang" [We had turned a corner. Stalingrad was a beginning] (228). Various figures and positions with respect to the fascist system, which become apparent when the depiction of the responsibility of the Germans is considered, are paralleled by a similar

spectrum of behaviour within the Dutch population. It is Dutch police officers who come to round up the protagonist, and Dutch neighbours who deny knowing who she is. Dutch civilians are responsible for the confiscation of her belongings, and yet, on leaving, one of them reassures her that better times are to come. A Dutch doctor certifies the perfectly healthy protagonist dangerously ill so that her mother can leave Germany, and the Dutch workers go on strike when the deportations start. In one of the text's rare generalizations, “(so sind die Holländer)” [the Dutch are like that] (180), the narrator refers to those Dutch who are prepared to hide Jewish citizens and in doing so save the lives of 20,000 people.

At the centre of these converging identities of Germanness, Jewishness and resistance is a concept of gender. In contrast to Margot Kröger's assertion that female conceptions of identity are subordinate within a German-Jewish dichotomy in Weil's text, it is my contention that gender is in fact an integral part of these identities (2002, 91-92). Weil's memories encapsulate the gendered constructs of Jewishness and Germanness as represented by her parents and also bring these prescribed gender roles into question.

The patriarchal constellations of the protagonist's family are signified through an emphasis on her father and grandfathers in the opening chapters. Alongside these, contemporary gender expectations are highlighted through the relationship between siblings, with the narrator remarking matter-of-factly that “zu jener Zeit ein Sohn einfach mehr galt als eine Tochter” [at that time a son was simply worth more than a daughter] (23). Similarly she states that her parent's acquiescence to her leaving school early “eigentlich einer Diskriminierung gleichkam, bei einem Sohn wäre es ausgeschlossen gewesen” [was actually tantamount to discrimination, because it would have been out of the question for a son] (53). In addition to the strong ties between father and daughter, the closeness between siblings is of utmost importance. It is her role as sister, rather than any other, which is the defining identity in her life.

Gendered inscription of contemporary German-Jewish identity on the male body is addressed within the text, with familial distance from Jewishness being reiterated through the fact that her brother was not circumcized. Female Jewish identity is likewise confronted through depictions of marriage and motherhood, notwithstanding the fact that for women there is no similar physical marker. Weil has previously referred to the physicality of the trauma of persecution through the metaphor of both “die Wunde” [the wound] and “die Krankheit” [the illness] Auschwitz (Weil 1989, 8; Eichholz 1988, 3458-60). While

these comparisons no longer predominate due to the change in her understanding of bearing witness, the body is still a source of Jewish identity for Weil in her autobiography.

Weil's depiction of her mother is central to the highlighting of gender concerns of the past and present, confirming Dagmar C.G. Lorenz's hypothesis that "by positioning [herself] as the daughter of a matriarch" the narrator can "[defy] the power structures of Jewish and Gentile culture" (1997, xix). Within the chapter entitled "Die Mutter" [The mother] an ambivalent relationship between mother and daughter is described: "Ich dachte oft, wie sehr könnte ich sie lieben, wenn sie bloß nicht meine Mutter wäre. Ich liebte sie trotzdem [...]" [I often thought how much I could love her if only she wasn't my mother. I loved her anyway] (22). The protagonist's mother is portrayed as someone who, notwithstanding dominant gender expectations which dictated that "ein Mädchen hatte zu heiraten" [a girl had to get married]), acquires a notable amount of independence and becomes "ein wirklicher Mensch" [a real person] (26). The gender identity of her mother thus embodies the tension between individuality, socially imposed expectations and traditional gender divisions, and as such is inherently contradictory. In accordance with her traditional position within the family, her mother is ignorant of financial issues. At the same time, however, she refutes any notion of female passivity through action within her own restricted sphere and directly confronts the feeling "daß [sie] einen Maulkorb tragen muß" [that she has to wear a muzzle] (24). The image of a physical restraint upon her body becomes simultaneously a prompt to resistance. Such restriction in an otherwise happy marriage is set against relationships of those around her, which illustrate different perspectives. Women's suffering is encapsulated in the story of Paula, who spent the night before her wedding outside on the balcony "in der Hoffnung eine Lungenentzündung davonzutragen" [in the hope of catching pneumonia] (57), through Walter's mother, who lived in an unhappy marriage "mit Walters starrem Vater" [with Walter's inflexible father] (71), through Edgar's mother, who spent her life with a man, "den sie nie gemocht hat" [whom she had never liked] (178), and through Lili, whose suicide stemmed from the antipathy of her "recht bürgerlich und altmodisch" [truly bourgeois and old-fashioned] (61) parents to her teenage boyfriend. The narrator gives voice to their stories through the perspectives of these women, whose physical acts illustrate both resistance to, and conformism with, detrimental expectations of gender.

The protagonist’s mother represents “an internal point of reference from which [she] derive[s] energy and inspiration” (Lorenz 1997, xii), something which is reiterated in the construction of the protagonist’s determined perseverance, a quality “das Mutter mir mitgegeben hat” [that mother gave to me] (30). The bond between the “tatkräftige Mutter” [energetic mother] (108) and child is, however, one of strength rather than affection: “Sie ist keine Zärtliche, ist nicht leicht zerstörbar, sie wird mir lange Zeit erhalten bleiben, und das ist gut” [She is not delicate, is not easily destroyed, she will last me a long time and that is good] (29). Notwithstanding this, the occasion of these thoughts, during an illness following an abortion, signifies for the first time the protagonist’s refusal to assume the role of motherhood. The trauma of the abortion is hinted at in its absence; the narrator does not mention it again.

Intersections of identities of class, ethnicity and gender are epitomized by the question of motherhood. This is made clear through the memories of the protagonist’s childhood in the narrator’s rhetorical question about the lack of her mother’s involvement in her early months (“war es in den ‘besseren Kreisen’ damals üblich, die Kinder nicht selbst zu stillen?” [was it usual in those days in the ‘better circles’ not to wean children yourself?] 40) and it later becomes prevalent in the protagonist’s consideration of her own maternalism:

Ich [wünschte] mir später im Grunde nie ein Kind, jedenfalls nicht mit der Intensität, mit der es wohl die meisten Frauen tun. Die Behauptung: ich kann in diesen Zeiten kein jüdisches Kind zur Welt bringen, war richtig, aber diente doch auch als Ausrede. (41)

Fundamentally, I never later wanted a child, at least not with the intensity that most women do. The claim: “I can’t bring a Jewish child into the world at a time like this” was true, but also served as an excuse.

This quotation illustrates not only the specific dangers facing women under fascism, but also the social expectations against which the protagonist had to justify herself. The contradiction between “ich hatte nie ein Kind” [I never had a child] (118) and “trotzdem habe ich [...] eine über alles geliebte Tochter” [nevertheless I have a daughter who is loved more than anything] (118), illustrates Weil’s later attitude as a mother towards her step-daughter. Such self-definition is seen as reaffirming the continuities of past and present, “von meinem ersten zum dritten Leben, von der Jugend bis in die Nachkriegszeit” [from my first to my third life, from my youth into the post-war period]

(123). The ties to the next generation reiterate the links to Weil's pre-fascism origins and provide a positive affirmation of her role as a beloved grandmother. Nevertheless, it is also possible to read the protagonist's refusal to have children after the end of fascism as an act of resistance. If, following Karen Remmler, the female Jewish body is viewed as "a site of remembrance" (1994, 188), then Weil's assertion "als deutsche Jüdin möchte ich nie wieder auf die Welt kommen" [I would not want to come back to earth as a German Jew] (Isani 1980), becomes a refusal to have Jewish children in the shadow of the Holocaust: a refusal to have children who would be defined by an identity which was imposed on their mother by the Nazis. In contrast to Hilde Huppert, who positioned herself as a mother to a new generation of young survivors in Israel in her literary confrontation with the trauma, Weil firmly rejects this role.

In an elaboration of her concept of a "motherland", Lorenz has included a discussion of Weil's fictional texts. If Weil's autobiography is examined from a similarly gendered perspective as a text "adopting a position with respect to [...] external constraints and [...] designing strategies to cope with them" (Lorenz 1997, 319), then it could be included in this elusive collective. However, two significant strands simultaneously militate against such inclusion. Firstly, Lorenz highlights a desire of the authors she examines "to redefine themselves as Jewish women" (Lorenz 1997, 323). Secondly, she looks at how the mother-child relationship is "configured as the smallest but most essential social unit" in their writings (Lorenz 1997, 324). On both of these counts, the various tensions within Weil's autobiography move away from the pattern detected in her earlier writings.

Gender undoubtedly plays a significant role in *Leb ich denn, wenn andere leben*. An awareness of possible negotiations of female identities and their communication through written language is suggested through a reference to Ingeborg Bachmann in the chapter "Vom Lesen" [Reading] (81). Weil has previously prioritized gender roles within her fiction, and Lorenz maintains that "from the beginning, she writes from a feminist perspective" (Lorenz 1997, 279). Weil herself ironically refused such a categorization in an interview with Anna Rheinsberg:

"Wenn es den Patriarchen nicht gelingt, die Welt zu vernichten, ist vorauszusehen, daß sich ungeheuer Neues durch die Frauen vollziehen wird!"
Und: "Doch Feministin, sehen Sie – Feministin bin ich eigentlich nicht [...]".
(1982, 31)

“If the patriarchs don’t succeed in destroying the world then it is foreseeable that a tremendous amount of new things will be achieved by women!” And: “But a feminist – well, I’m not really a feminist [...]”.

The tensions between identities of German, Jewishness and gender identified as running throughout the autobiographical text are also addressed in *Weihnachtslegende 1943* and in the letter to Margarete Susman. The different genres in these two parts of the autobiography engage with the historical contexts in which they were written and with the contemporary context of republication. The hybrid nature of the autobiography *Leb ich denn, wenn andere leben* emphasizes continuities in Weil’s depiction of the past spanning over fifty years.

Weihnachtslegende 1943

Weil’s explicit use of poetry within her autobiography, in the form of the play *Weihnachtslegende 1943* [Christmas Legend 1943], refers back to her introductory comments about the expectation of truth. Even this fictional chapter is, however, placed within a framework suggesting a certain authenticity:

Dabei habe ich das Stück, aus der Schouwburg kommend, mit heißem Herzen geschrieben, und noch heute ist es das einzige, was ich geschrieben habe, dem mir beim Vorlesen jedes Mal die Tränen kommen. (194)

I wrote the play on my return from the Schouwburg with an impassioned heart, and still today it’s the only thing I’ve written which makes me cry every time I read it aloud.

Given the context in which it was written, and its performance before those with whom Weil was in hiding in 1943, the fictional becomes a reaffirmation of her German identity, a site of resistance through her native language, which simultaneously questions this very notion. The play underlines the fact that Weil’s imperative of “schreiben, schreiben, schreiben” [write, write, write] (Rheinsberg 1982, 31) as a method of survival began in 1943 and has continued ever since. The inclusion of this play in *Leb ich denn*, which had not previously been published in Germany, is also symbolic of Weil’s contentious relationship with German publishers in the post-war period.

Weihnachtslegende 1943 marks the end of the war in the autobiographical narrative, but the content of the play ensures that this does not lead to a happy ending. The title and content of the play signify the converging relationships in Weil’s life of preconditioned

Christian customs and the murder of the European Jews. Traditional expectations of Christmas, encapsulated in the genre of the legend, are subverted. As in the Christian story, the play begins with the birth of a boy whose story becomes representative of a wider fate. However, the father figure is absent from the scene because he has been sent to Poland. Separation of the narrative into three distinct but intertwined stories reflects this separation of the couple. The narrative of the birth occurs in a barn, where a doctor and farmer are discussing the woman and her newly born son. A flashback to a theatre, the collection point for Jewish deportees, describes the pregnant woman and her husband watching a play. A worker persuades the woman to escape from the theatre as deportation would mean certain death. She flees, leaving her husband, but dies shortly after giving birth. The altered chronology of events, with the story of the birth enclosing the other two narratives, means that the opening question of “wird mein Kind leben?” [will my child live?] (196) becomes the Leitmotif of the text and ultimately remains unanswered.

The fictional reworking of the deportation of these Jewish victims allows Weil to confront questions about the actions of both perpetrators and victims. Underlying the portrayal of the different characters is the question of resistance. The figure of the mother represents the Jewish people, defining herself collectively as “wir” [we]. It is in her conversation with the doctor and worker that issues of passivity and defiance are raised. The worker’s claim that “Mut ist ein rarer Artikel heutzutage” [courage is a rare thing nowadays] (198) is both a comment on those who persecute the innocent, as symbolized by the woman and child, and also a comment about the victims themselves. This criticism is reiterated by the comments of the doctor:

Hast du auch schon gelernt, nach ihrem Mund zu reden. Sie sagen, das Weiße sei schwarz, und die ganze Welt spricht es ihnen nach, obwohl jeder mit seinen zwei Augen das Gegenteil feststellen kann. Am lautesten und heftigsten aber beteuern die Verfolgten selbst, dass sie schwarz sind. (199)

You have also already learnt to speak like them. They say that white is black and the whole world copies them, although everyone can see the opposite with their own two eyes. It is those who are persecuted themselves who declare the loudest and most vehemently that they are black.

In response, the woman situates her collective identity within the historical continuum of Jewish suffering, “Wir verstehn uns vortrefflich darauf, zu leiden und zu sterben” [we are very good at suffering and dying] (200), a trope which is repeated by a chorus of

deported Jews later in the text: “Immer geschlagen, gekreuzigt, verbrannt./ Sind wir Gottes liebste Kinder” [Always beaten, crucified and burned/We are God’s dearest children] (211). An understanding of sacrifice, where “auch das Weinen ist uns vergangen” [we can’t even cry any more] (200) is something from which Weil separates herself in the main body of her autobiography, where she meets collective suffering with a call for individual resistance. The recognition that this resistance came too late for the woman is paralleled with the same notion pervading Weil’s autobiography in the form of a rhetorical question of 1932: “Wer hätte ahnen können, dass es richtig gewesen wäre, am nächsten Tag Deutschland zu verlassen?” [who could have suspected that it would have been the right thing to do to leave Germany the next day?] (102) In the play, the mother’s death and that of the father become the subject of the repetitive lullaby of “vergiss es nicht, vergiss es nicht” [don’t forget, don’t forget] (198) in the same way that Weil’s autobiography remembers the dead; the imperative of remembering in this text from 1943 is echoed by Weil in her introductory intention of writing about “wie es damals gewesen sei” [what it was like back then].

The interspersing of the different narratives has the effect of confronting the couple at the collection point with their plight in a fictional form on the stage. In the same way that Weil’s audience of three watched the play in 1943, the fictional couple are confronted with an interpretation of their present. Given that the Nazis advocated such ‘entertainment’ in order to keep the deportees occupied and reduce the chance of resistance (Exner 1998, 58; U. Meyer 1996, 72), it becomes significant that the passive role of the victims in watching the play is negated by the actions of the woman who escapes. Her refusal to watch the events in which death has the main role corresponds to Weil’s own decision: “Ich werde ihnen auf keinen Fall freiwillig in die Hände laufen, werde – dies ein letzter Widerstand – um mein Leben kämpfen” [On no account will I voluntarily fall into their hands, I will – as a last show of resistance – fight for my life] (165). Although the woman ultimately dies in her revolt against the repeated call to be “vernünftig, immer vernünftig” [sensible, always sensible] (201) there is at least a possibility of her son surviving.

For the contemporary reader it becomes noticeable that the different voices within the play pre-empt certain discourses that prevailed in the immediate post-war period; discourses which engage with current debates on the role of the German army in the crimes against the Jews, and which have been addressed by Weil in her

earlier fiction (1982, 130-55). The chorus of the “Deutsche Wache” [German guard] is characterized by attempted justification:

Wir sind so schlecht nicht, wie wir scheinen,/ O merkt euch das./ Wir führen aus, was andre meinen./ Ganz ohne Hass [...] Wir schicken euch ins ferne Polen/ Ganz unbekannt./ Wir tun es, weil es uns befohlen/ Der Kommandant. (205-6)

We are not as bad as we seem./Take note./ We are carrying out what others believe./ Quite without hatred [...] We are sending you to distant Poland/ Quite unknown./ We are doing it because we have been ordered to/ by the Commandant.

Such sentiments are reiterated by the voice of Death: “Sie fühlen sich als Wächter degradiert,/ Doch tragens schweigend wie des Mannes Pflicht,/ Denn der Soldat erhebt die Stimme nicht” [They feel degraded as guards/ But bear it silently as is a man’s duty/ For the soldier does not raise his voice] (207). The representative voice of a German soldier at the Front has the refrain of “wir waren jung” [we were young], once again displacing responsibility onto those who deceived them. As I have reiterated throughout this study, the notion of the innocent German soldier as a victim of war has pervaded the politics of remembrance in West Germany since the 1950s. It has also been repeatedly challenged, not least in the controversy surrounding the exhibition of the crimes of the German Wehrmacht that circulated in Germany in 1997. The concept of being young enough to have experienced fascism, but not old enough to take responsibility for one’s actions has likewise been prevalent since the end of the war, as I have shown in the second chapter on Inge Scholl. Weil challenges these positions in the text through the juxtaposition of the narrative containing the voices of the chorus and the conversation of the two workers of the Jewish Council. The decision taken by one of the workers to help the woman escape is a recognition that for all behaviour “irgendwo liegen die Grenzen” [somewhere there are limits] (216). Questions of accountability as well as resistance hinge on individual responsibility, exemplified by the final comments of the play: “Friede auf Erden. Ja, aber keinen Tag früher, eh wir ihn uns nicht mutig selbst verdienen” [Peace on earth. Yes, but not a day sooner than we have courageously earned it ourselves] (227). Collectivity here suggests an appeal to contemporary readers, once again asserting the dialogical nature of the genre and the reciprocity of obligations in her memories of the past.

Weil’s notion of resistance is arguably linked to a positive redefinition of gender. In *Weihnachtslegende 1943*, the escape of the mother is significant not only in terms of her own positive action but also due to the fact that her giving birth specifically thwarts the fascist attempt to eliminate all Jewish life. As I have shown, however, Weil herself rejected such motherhood. The actions of the woman in the play are contrasted with a chorus of women lamenting “warum, warum, warum?” [why, why, why?] (217). Weil has previously defined herself as part of a collective of “unzählige Frauen” [countless women] who dissuaded their husbands from resistance before 1933, something for which she now feels guilty (Drambisch 1998). The contesting subject positions in *Weihnachtslegende 1943*, exemplified by the involvement of the Jewish Council, embody Weil’s position that “als Jüdin identifiziert sie sich als Opfer, als Überlebende empfindet sie sich als Mitschuldige” [as a Jew she identifies herself as a victim, as a survivor she feels herself an accomplice] (Weigel 1987, 299). In both cases, Weil is still suffering from identities imposed by the fascist state, against which the play militates.

Weil’s Letter from 1947

That Weil chooses, in 1998 as an author of ninety-two, ostensibly to end her autobiographical narrative in 1947 is illustrative of her prioritization of the events of this time and the sentiments in the letter. The letter is likewise a symbol of resistance, an affirmation of the ideas which led her to reject the fascist state’s labelling of her and instead to reclaim her German identity. The narrator has previously emphasized that it was her linguistic ties which made her decide to go back to Germany along with her attachment to her future husband, Jockisch. Within the letter there is similarly an emphasis on the primacy of language, in the form of dialogue.

In her introduction to the letter, the narrator considers once again this decision to return. The letter is an indirect confrontation with Margarete Susman, a contemporary Jewish voice, someone who was never to return to Germany. In taking issue with Susman’s text *Das Buch Hiob und das Schicksal des jüdischen Volkes* (1968) [The book of Job and the fate of the Jewish people], Weil emphasizes conflicting views about Jewishness and her own distance from Susman’s position. Of the letter, she writes:

Er [the letter] beantwortet authentisch die immer wieder an mich gestellte Frage, warum ich überhaupt und vor allem so bald nach Deutschland zurückgegangen bin, genauer jedenfalls als ich es heute aus dem Abstand von fast fünfzig Jahren tun könnte. (250)

The letter answers authentically, and in any case more precisely than I could do today looking from a distance of almost fifty years, why I returned at all, and above all so soon, to Germany.

The constant questioning of Weil's motives by reviewers and interviewers may also have led to her feeling a need to justify why she was writing her autobiography at all (Kröger 2002, 91). Thus, the letter, written so soon after 1945, is presented as conveying accurately the position Weil takes in 1998. Significantly, whilst Weil has previously addressed the fallacious nature of memory, the juxtaposition of the other autobiographical chapters in the text with the asserted authenticity of the letter does not bring into question the validity of her memories. The episodes in the main body of the text which the narrator says she is unable to describe are ones which have not been forgotten, but rather "verdrängt" [suppressed] (51, 103). Suppression, as well as remembering, has become a survival strategy. That one of these suppressed episodes was the writing of "'Judenschwein packe dich fort'" [Jewish bastards get lost] (50) on the pavement outside their house shows that the encroachment of antisemitism on her "Heimat" were not always as easily confronted as is suggested elsewhere. The letter to Susman perpetuates such an ambivalent relationship, as the repeated recourse within the autobiography to notions of a return to "Heimat" after the war is contradicted: "Ich habe die Heimat Deutschland verloren und keine andere dafür gefunden" [I lost my homeland, Germany, and never found another to replace it] (252). Instead of a German identity it is an identity as a European, a "Weltbürger" [citizen of the world] (252) which is stressed. Such comments from 1947 convey a more tentative understanding of "Heimat" than is present in 1998.

Many critics comment upon Weil's return to Germany after the war and interpret it as a conciliatory gesture. Indeed, as Franziska Meyer points out, the topic dominates the reception of Weil's texts into the 1990s (2002, 2). Arguably, the inclusion of the letter in the autobiography is an attempt to answer the repeatedly asked question of the untold narrative future, to reply to a question that, by being posed so constantly, undermines Weil's right to belong to a German "Heimat". The resulting monologue of justification within the dialogical genre of the letter, is framed as the decision "ja zum Leben

zu sagen” [to say yes to life] (251) and is paralleled by Weil’s own communicative agenda which involves “das Meine zu tun und zu versöhnen” [doing my bit towards reconciliation] (252).

Weil sees reconciliatory, as opposed to judgmental or pitying, dialogue as fundamental to her return to Germany. The belief in another Germany which did not succumb to fascism, as personified by her second husband Jockisch, forms the basis of Weil’s negation of theories of collective guilt (Liebs 1994, 296). A trust in the fact that there were people “die nicht in den dämonischen Kreis des Bösen miteinbezogen waren” [who were not drawn into the demonic circle of evil] (251) is seen by Weil as a necessity for survival in post-war Germany. In 1981 Weil maintained: “Wenn ich an eine Kollektivschuld geglaubt hätte, hätte ich mir das Leben genommen” [If I had believed in collective guilt I would have taken my own life] (cited in Braese 2001, 73). The belief that there were Germans who were not involved in supporting the Nazi state also becomes a prerequisite for dialogue. Yet the description of the intended subjects of this dialogue is significant. In the same way that Weil’s relationship to the Jewish community, as expressed in the letter, is one of “Fremdheit und Nähe” [strangeness and closeness] (Bormann 1991, 245), so too is her focus on a German addressee. A distancing reference to “dieses Volk” [this nation] (251) is followed by a willingness to talk to those “deutschen Menschen – nicht die Nazis, aber die unzähligen, aus Trägheit des Herzens Schuldiggewordenen” [German people – not the Nazis, but the countless who became guilty due to emotional lethargy] (252), who experienced fascism “ohne Schaden an ihrer Seele zu nehmen” [without damaging their soul] (254). In a reflection of her inability to remain friends with the woman who used to be a schoolgirl with a swastika, Weil searches only for those Germans who were not Nazis. In a tentative collective, the letter refers to the responsibility of “die Überlebenden” [the survivors]. From Weil’s earlier writing, we know that for her this includes Germans who had suffered, but were not perpetrators: “[Ich] erkannte, daß ich unter Menschen, die nichts mitgemacht hatten, nicht leben konnte” [I realised that I could not live among people who had not been through anything] (Weil-Jockisch 1985, 56). Such comments therefore raise the question as to how responsibility for what happened is allocated in the text. Walter Jockisch, “ein leidenschaftlicher Gegner des Regimes” [a passionate opponent of the regime], and the “wirkliche[r] Grund” [real reason] (255) for her return to Germany, was called up into the army and served in Norway; he thus participated in the regime while being against it. Such a distanced

involvement seems to have been significant for Weil, as she has previously referred to her experiences which Germans did not know about “obwohl alles in ihrem Namen geschehen war” [although everything happened in their name] (1996, 6).

Leb ich denn, wenn andere leben contains an edited version of the letter to Susman. In 1947 Weil’s original letter described the German population as “häßlich” [ugly] and referred to Germans whose “oft böse Gesichter die Züge tragen, welche Mord- und Zerstörungslust oder besser vielleicht die Gier nach Selbstvernichtung spiegeln” [often evil faces [...] that bear features which mirror murderous or destructive tendencies or, rather, the eagerness for self-destruction] (Häntzschel 1994). These comments emphasize what Weil has repeatedly reiterated – that from as early as 1941 there was, for her, a difference between ‘Nazis’ and ‘Germans’ (Weil-Jockisch, 1985, 56). The republication in 1998 of this letter from 1947, with its continued differentiation between Germans and Nazis, engages with the contemporary debate about claims of a collective, latent German anti-Semitism and the German population as “willing executioners” (Goldhagen 1999). The description earlier in the text of those members of the mountaineering club and school friends who rejected her as a child points to specific instances of antisemitism among the population, but they are never universalized. The omission of the anger inherent in the earlier version of the letter emphasizes a wider reconciliatory tone, a tone which, as I show, pervades the reception of the autobiography.

Due to the structuring of Weil’s autobiography, the chapters which precede the letter pre-empt a failure of the dialogue that was hoped for in 1947. This is suggested on two levels. Firstly, at specific points the narrator appeals to younger readers, rather than to those of her own generation. She stresses how important her visits to schools are and gives comfort to students who, like her, did not get very good grades. Such comments possibly stem from Weil’s admission that she found those of her own generation unwilling to listen:

Meine Altersgenossen mögen meine Bücher nicht. Sie verstehen auch nicht, daß man sich so entblößen kann. Meine Altersgenossen in Deutschland wollen auch sehr ungern ans Dritte Reich erinnert werden. (Wieskerstrauch 1988, 26)

My contemporaries don’t like my books. Nor do they understand how you can reveal yourself like that. My contemporaries in Germany really don’t like to be reminded of the Third Reich.

Secondly, in discussing the publishing history of her fictional texts, it is emphasized that discourses about the past belong to a permanently contested field and that dialogue, as an inherently reciprocal process, needs specific conditions under which it can occur. The narrator highlights the fact that while Weil’s first text written after the war, *Ans Ende der Welt*, was originally rejected by publishers in the Western Zone, it was published in East Berlin in 1949. In the context of the late 1940s where narratives by and about Jewish victims were marginalized within a hierarchical discourse in East Germany (as I have discussed in the chapter on Hilde Huppert), Weil’s first published text about the Holocaust clearly went against this trend. Such a statement also indicates that the contemporary view that there was a silence about the Holocaust in the immediate post-war period is problematic. Compare for instance the sweeping claim by Jack Zipes that

up until the showing of [...] Holocaust in 1979, German Jews had not made their presence felt in either West or East Germany. [...] There] had been an unspoken understanding among Jews and between Jews and Germans that it would be best to keep silent and blend in with the rest of the population [...]. (Zipes 1994, 17)

This assertion does not stand up in view of Weil’s repeated, and partly successful, attempts (along with those of many others) to make her voice heard. Similarly, in the context of the renewed theories of totalitarianism of the 1980s and 1990s, the reference to *Ans Ende der Welt* shows that sweeping generalizations about a lack of East German confrontation with the past are equally problematic.

Weil’s own opinion of the post-war situation in West Germany as one in which “Literatur über dieses Thema ist unerwünscht” [literature about this topic is unwanted] (239) is qualified by her comments about the diary of Anne Frank. As Stephan Braese has pointed out:

Insbesondere in Westdeutschland konnte hinfort kein autobiographischer oder autobiographisch geprägter Text von Seiten Verfolgter der Vernichtungspolitik erscheinen, der nicht unweigerlich in den Nachraum sprach, den das “Tagebuch” hinterlassen hatte – bestimmt vor allem durch charakteristische Erwartungen, die durch die als *konstitutiv* internalisierte “Auseinandersetzung” mit dem Zeugnis Anne Franks entwickelt worden waren. (2001, 192)

From now on, particularly in West Germany, no autobiographical text, or a text shaped by autobiography, written by victims of the policy of extermination, could appear which did not invariably speak into the space which the “diary” had left behind – determined above all by characteristic expectations which had

been developed through the *constitutively* internalized “confrontation” with the testament of Anne Frank.

Indeed, comparisons with Anne Frank are often made by critics of Weil’s work (Hildebrandt 1997, 211) and have also sometimes been prompted by Weil herself; in 1981 she referred to her second hiding place as being “neben dem Anne-Frank-Haus” [next to the Anne Frank House] (1981, 179). The description of the protagonist’s meeting with Mr Frank follows immediately after a discussion of the rejection of her work in West Germany. Such proximity reflects on the fact, as Braese indicates, that certain narratives have become canonical texts on the Holocaust, while others have not. As the narrator notes: “Ich ahne natürlich nicht, wie weltweit bekannt dieser Name bald sein wird” [I obviously don’t suspect how well-known throughout the world this name will soon become] (240). Franziska Meyer has highlighted the point that comparisons with Anne Frank have featured within the reception of Weil’s texts, readings which she argues are based on an “entlastende Fehlinterpretation” [exculpatory misinterpretation] of the concept of reconciliation in Grete Weil’s letter to Susman (2002, 17-21).

Although the letter is the final part of the autobiography, the voice of the present narrator intervenes following its conclusion. The last paragraph of the text refers to both a “Hoffnungsschimmer” [glimmer of hope] that the trauma of the past can be overcome and a rhetorical question signifying the very impossibility of this: “Glaubte ich 1947 wirklich an die Bewältigung dessen, was nie und nimmer zu bewältigen ist?” [Did I really believe in 1947 that things could be overcome that never ever can be?] Through a recourse to both “Jüdisch- und [...] Deutschsein” [Jewish- and Germanness] (255), the narrator comes full circle to situate herself back in the German tradition with which, through the citation of Goethe, the text began.

Reconciliatory Frames of Reception

Braese points out that the reception of Weil’s work is particularly important given that her texts pursue an “ausdrücklich auf das deutsche Publikum zielenden Erinnerungspoetologie” [a poetics of memory explicitly targeted at the German public] (2000, 601). The extent to which her reviewers recognize this is variable. While several comment on the different genres within the text, they rarely read them as a call for reciprocity, for the involvement of the reader: “Es handelt sich, [...] um einen wohlthuend, anspruchslosen, bescheiden

aufretenden Rückblick” [It is about an agreeably undemanding modest retrospective] (Baureithel 1998); “Grete Weil folgte keinem didaktischen Prinzip der Aufklärung, sondern dem inneren Drang des Schreibenmüssens” [Grete Weil is not following a didactic principle of enlightenment but her internal impulse of the need to write] (Fallend 1998). The reviewers see Weil’s memories as reflecting an internal questioning about identity, not as an engaging with past and present definitions. There is a noticeable emphasis on her Jewish identity, with Petra M. Rainer for example beginning her article with an insistence that Weil “ist als Jüdin aufgewachsen” [grew up as a Jew] (2002). Stephan Braese has examined how such a reception is noticeably different from the earlier reception of her texts, particularly in the 1960s, when Weil’s Jewish identity was not mentioned by critics (2002, 20-21). Although I would agree to a certain extent with Sander L. Gilman’s point that if the word “Jew” is never used, then the Nazis will have succeeded in eliminating all difference and Otherness, the reading of Weil’s text within a context of Jewish literature is equally problematic (see Steinecke 2002a, 12). While several reviewers refer to Weil’s German-Jewish or Jewish-German identity, only Kyra Stromberg is as insistent on Weil’s German identity as the author herself, emphasizing that she “sich nicht als deutsche Jüdin oder jüdische Deutsche verstand oder versteht” [she didn’t and doesn’t understand herself as German Jew or Jewish German] (1998). Questions of gender are omitted from all reviews except for that by Ulrike Baureithel, who attributes Weil’s more positive reception in the 1980s not only to a change in the way the past was being talked about but also to the fact that authors who had survived in exile were rediscovered by the women’s movement “als Gewährsfrauen und Identifikationsfiguren” [as sources of information and figures of identification] (1998). Baureithel advocates a gendered reconsideration of Weil’s fiction but does not comment on the prominence of such issues in the autobiography.

The result of such emphasis, marginalization and omission of identities within the reception of Weil’s act of remembering is that it centres on a re-imposition of a partially rejected Jewish identity along with a passive transferral of Weil’s memories, rather than an active dialogue with her German addressees. Braese has similarly highlighted how reviewers of Weil’s fictional texts have read her experience as individual and distanced themselves from it: “Viele Rezensenten [reagieren] mit einer Pathologisierung von [Weils] Schreiben mit dem strategischen Ziel der Einschränkung seiner Zuständigkeit für deutsche Leser” [many reviewers react by

pathologizing Weil's writing with the strategic aim of reducing its relevance for German readers] (2001, 601). This, even though, as Irmela von der Lühe has emphasized, Weil's texts began already in the 1950s to stress that Auschwitz "nicht nur ein Problem der Opfer ist" [is not only a problem for the victims] (1997, 329). In a continued discursive trend, reviewers of Weil's autobiography do not see her memories as part of a German experience. While they focus positively on her return to Germany, their distance from her Germanness reinforces a dichotomy between German and Jewish identity. In the context of the late 1990s, a "German fascination for things Jewish" (Zipes 1994, 41) meant an abstraction of such experiences from definitions of what it means to be German. The way in which the reviewers deal with her renewed claim to a German "Heimat" undermines her repeated attempts to belong. Phrases such as "was sie [die Familie] als 'Heimat' erfahren hatte" [what the family experienced as its 'homeland'] (Villain 1998) and that Weil "Deutschland als Heimat empfand" [felt that Germany was her homeland] (n.a. 1998) dominate the discussion of her work with the faint suggestion of self-delusion. These constructions deny her aim "dem toten Hitler beweisen, daß nicht er, sondern ich hierhergehörte [sic]" [of proving to the dead Hitler that I belonged here, not him] (Weil-Jockisch 1985, 57). In discussing Weil's return to Germany some of the reviewers' distorted understanding of Weil's aim of reconciliation comes close to fulfilling her fear "dass für die meisten [Deutschen] ein lebender Jude sechs Millionen toter Juden aufwiegt" [that for most Germans one live Jew offsets six million dead Jews] (244). In reducing Weil's specifically targeted aim for dialogue to a "Versöhnungsbereitschaft, die in ihrer Unbedingtheit bis heute überrascht" [preparedness to seek reconciliation, which surprises us still today in its unconditionality] (Rainer 2002), they remove the necessity of a reciprocal obligation on the part of her readers.

Despite Weil's insistence on individuality within collective suffering, her narrative is still often situated by the reviewers within a wider history of persecution. She is identified with the "Hunderttausende von deutschen Juden, die in den Konzentrationslagern den Tod fanden" [hundreds of thousands of German Jews who met their deaths in the concentration camps], that is, with people from whom Weil has explicitly distanced herself (Pluwatsch 1998). The reviewers do not read the text, and the different genres within it, as expressions of individual resistance or as engaging, as is explicitly stated on the dust jacket, with prevalent historical narratives: "Die Autorin [berichtet] nichts Neues vom Nazi-Terror" [the author doesn't report

anything new about the Nazi terror] (Mörchen 1998). Nevertheless, *Weihnachtslegende 1943* and the letter to Susman are seen as powerful additions, with the former being read both as an “unmittelbares Dichterzeugnis” [immediate piece of literary evidence (Mörchen 1998) and “als Dokument” [as a document] (Schirnding 1998).

Within fourteen positive reviews of Weil’s autobiography there is an emphasis on the authenticity of her memories. The style of *Leb ich denn, wenn andere leben* is described as “nüchtern und authentisch” [down to earth and authentic] (Grumbach 1998; Obermüller 1998), “einfach” [simple], “beinahe schwerelos” [almost weightless] (Mörchen 1998), “unsentimental” (Villain 1998; Obermüller 1998), “wahrhaftig” [truthful] and “karg” [bare] (Zetzsche 1998; Obermüller 1998). Hans Peter Gansner reiterates the general view: “Grete Weil [hat] ihr bedrohtes Leben in einem knappen, genau formulierten Stil zusammengefasst, ohne Schnörkel und Weichzeichner” [Grete Weil has summarized her imperilled life with a concise, precisely formulated style, without flourishes or a soft-focus lens] (Gansner 1999). An emphasis on Weil’s “truthfulness” and frequent reference to her role as an eye-witness serve to reduce the literary character of the text, as do references to a simplicity of style and the “Zerrissenheit” [disunity] of the narrative (Grumbach 1998). In the same vein, Christel Berger asserts that in *Leb ich denn, wenn andere leben* “sowohl die Folie der Literarisierung, aber auch das gefühlsbetonte Pathos sowie die Kommentierung oder bildhafte Verallgemeinerung wegfällt” [both the literary model and commentary or vivid generalization, and also the emotional pathos are absent] (1998). When the text was republished in 2001, the publishers seemed similarly intent on stressing that “[Weil] lässt [...] die Erinnerung nun unverschlüsselt sprechen” [Weil now allows memory to speak in uncoded terms] (Dönhoff 2002), a view more recently reiterated by Owen Evans, who writes of the text’s unemotional and detached tone (2006, 257, 260-64).

Only one of the reviews refers to the much-discussed German-Jewish symbiosis (Zetzsche 1998). In the context of the late 1990s, Karen Remmler maintains that:

die angehende Diskussion zum Inhalt einer deutschen ‘Leitkultur’ läuft parallel zu einer wachsenden Sehnsucht in der deutschen Öffentlichkeit nach einer kosmopolitischen Identität, die zum Teil die Romantisierung der sogenannten deutsch-jüdischen Symbiose berührt (Remmler 2002, 44).

the continued discussion about the content of a German 'Leitkultur' [a culture which exemplifies the positive elements of German life] runs parallel to a growing longing in the German public for a cosmopolitan identity, which coincides in part with a romanticization of the so-called German-Jewish symbiosis.

What the reviews of Weil's autobiography suggest, however, is that it is a text which refuses such romanticization. Instead, it falls more accurately into the similarly renowned "negative symbiosis", if this is understood as "as a relationship defined by permanent separation from, yet a simultaneous identification with, German culture" (Diner 1986, 9-20; Finnan 2000, 229). As "a continual reminder of the German past" (Bodemann 1994, 56), Weil's renewed residence in Germany and her published texts illustrate her resistance to a silence which would preserve "die gute Laune" [a good mood] and a "Glaube an die heile Welt" [belief in an ideal world] (241), but which also causes tensions for her own membership of a German community: for her addressees such a confrontational interlocutor is indeed "unbequem" [uncomfortable] (Nussbaum and Meyer 1993).

When Grete Weil died in 1999 many obituaries repeated the patterns of reception noted for her autobiography. In overviews of Weil's life, there was a recurrent focus on Jewish, not German, identity, and attempts to situate her as part of a Jewish collective. Her name, it is claimed, stood for "das jüdische Deutschland" [Jewish Germany] (Schröder 1999), her texts described "das Schicksal der Juden im und nach dem Zweiten Weltkrieg" [the fate of the Jews during and after the Second World War] (n.a. 1999) and "jüdisch[e] Schicksal[e] in unserem Jahrhundert" [Jewish fates in our century] (Räkel 1999). Her autobiography, it is argued, was "die ergreifendste Schilderung des Leidens [...], das einer deutschen jüdischen Frau in diesem Jahrhundert angetan worden ist" [the most powerful depiction of suffering that has been inflicted on a German-Jewish woman in this century] (Beckmann 1999) and it was Weil's "Jüdischsein, [das] in den dunkelsten Stunden wohl das Leben bewahrt [hat]" [Jewishness that protected her life in the darkest hours] (Baureithel 1999). By so prioritizing Weil's experiences of exile and, by implication, excluding those of the concentration camps, the emphasis is on a returning, reconciliatory figure rather than on someone who was able to bear direct witness to those who were murdered. Albert von Schirnding, in an article which makes reference to Anne Frank, comes to a similar conclusion: "Es ging [Weil] um Versöhnung" [For Weil it was about reconciliation] (Schirnding 1999). A focus on her feelings of guilt at survival, and a stress on the importance of *Meine Schwester Antigone*

and *Der Brautpreis*, all diminish the significance of Weil’s autobiography and its renewed appeal for dialogue. This is most visibly demonstrated when Alexander von Bormann writes of *Der Brautpreis* [The Bride Price]: “Ein Alterswerk, das Grete Weil selbst als einen Abschluss betrachtet hat, auch wenn noch einige Erzählungen und, 1998, ihre Autobiographie folgten” [One of her later works, which Grete Weil herself considered to be a conclusion, even though several short stories followed and, in 1998, her autobiography] (1999).

Conclusion: A Call for Dialogue

Since Lauren Nussbaum and Uwe Meyer wrote in 1993 that “in den akademischen Kanon wurden Grete Weil und ihr herausforderndes Werk bisher noch kaum aufgenommen” [Grete Weil and her challenging work have until now hardly been included in the academic canon], there have been several studies focussing on her fictional work. Nevertheless, her autobiography has received relatively little academic attention. In the context of a post-unification interest in the topic of “Jews in Germany” (Lubich 1997; Ochse 1994, 113), Weil’s autobiography and its reception are significant not least because of her particular positionality: most books now being written about themes of German- and Jewishness are by authors belonging to the second and third generations, not to the first. In addition, only a small fraction of Jewish citizens living in Germany today are of German origin (Bodemann 1994, 47). If, as Y. Michal Bodemann maintains, there is indeed a shift in contemporary Jewish writing with “Auschwitz being pushed to the sidelines, replaced, perhaps, by a historical cult around the old German Jewry” (1994, 56), then the emphases in Weil’s text, with its insistence on reciprocal remembrance, are significant.

Leb ich denn, wenn andere leben is part of a contemporary context in which controversies about the interpretation of the term German-Jewish literature still abound (Kilcher 2000, xiv). Although Weil does not explicitly refer to the contemporary political context in her text, it was published at a time when many identities were brought into question following reunification. As Katharina Ochse has remarked: “With the fall of the Wall in 1989, Germans gained unity – and at least the non-Jewish Germans lost their most defining Other. Thus, with unification the question of German identity was again on the agenda” (1994, 125). Given that much discussion on the reshaping of German

identities pivoted, and still pivots, on remembrance of the past, it is apparent that Jews were “von der Wende in besonderer Weise betroffen” [were affected in a particular way by unification] (Steinecke 2002b, 164). Weil’s autobiography necessarily engaged with these discourses. As an author whose writings wanted to “problematize the Holocaust in the present (rather than merely memorialize it)”, Weil was therefore “an uncomfortable reminder of cultural and political taboos in post-war Germany” within the constant debates on normalization (Adelsen 1997, 749). Weil’s definition of “Heimat” and her understanding of the responsibility of the German population for the rise of fascism must be seen with regard to her particular positionality – as a survivor. These understandings, which were necessary in order for her to be able to return to Germany in 1947, should now be seen as part of a debate on “Heimat” that “raises rather than answers questions” (Boa and Palfreyman 2000, 19). An examination of the reception of Weil is necessary, as Manuela Günther has emphasized, “when there persists a tendency [...] towards identification of the Jewish Other”, because “the texts of survivors are important in looking at how such labels reassert antisemitic prejudices” (1994, 446).

The structuring of Weil’s memories about her childhood and Nazism are contained within a framework which emphasizes notions of dialogue and resistance. The dialectical relationship of past and present constructs an interpretation of Weil’s past based on individuality of experience within an imposed collective suffering. This is reinforced through the choice of different genres within the text and through Weil’s questioning of the concepts of identity and witnessing. That Weil did not succeed in finding an active partner in the dialogue about the events of the past is suggested by an interpretation of the reviews and in the ‘missing’ third part of the autobiography itself. Nevertheless, her autobiography and her previous texts contradict assertions of a “dialogical vacuum”, of a “paucity of German-Jewish literary dialogue, especially in West Germany”, due to a missing Jewish partner (O’Dochartaigh 2000, vii). As Uwe Meyer has pointed out: “Die gesprächsbereite Schriftstellerin Grete Weil saß lange allein am Tisch des deutsch-jüdischen Gesprächs” [As an author ready for conversation Grete Weil has been sitting alone for a long time at the table of German-Jewish conversation] (1996, 165). A repeated insistence on a lacking Jewish interlocutor silences those very texts like Weil’s which are speaking (O’Dochartaigh 2000, vii). Braese maintains that:

Die Frist, in die die Autoren der ersten Generation gestellt waren: die Frist, in der die historisch singuläre Chance eines Gesprächs zwischen Deutschen und Juden unmittelbar zur NS-Epoche bestanden hatte, eines Gesprächs im Medium deutschsprachiger Literatur – diese Frist ist verstrichen. (2002, 28)

The deadline which confronted the authors of the first generation: the deadline which comprised of the historically unique chance of a conversation between Germans and Jews during the NS period, a conversation in the medium of German-language literature – this deadline has now passed.

Nevertheless, it is my contention that the republication and literary analysis of texts such as Weil’s provide the stimulus for further discussion, discussion which may yet fill the missing half of the dialogue.

Conclusion

Das, damit wird jeder Lese dieser Aufzeichnungen einverstanden sein, darf menschlichen Wesen nie wieder zustoßen! (Huppert 1990, 107)

Every reader of these notes will be in agreement that this may not ever happen to human beings again!

Hilde Huppert's final appeal to her reader highlights the agenda of communication common to all seven of these autobiographies. Each suggests an awareness of the power and limits of language to convey their memories. Each questions the process of remembering within the memories themselves. And each contains an imperative that the reader learns from the past for the present. It is therefore inevitable that through such communication the texts engage with discourses on the past prominent at the time of publication. As a result, republications face changed conditions of reception and later editions are often framed differently, as in the case of Langgässer, Huppert and Maschmann, or, in the case of Scholl and Huppert, substantively altered to take into account the present politics of remembering.

It is clear from the investigations of these texts that the positionalities of the author/narrator are fundamental to an interpretation of autobiography. Positionality often determines who has authority to speak, when and on behalf of whom. It does, as feminists have long insisted, matter who is speaking. Integral to this authority are constructions of victimhood, responsibility, and resistance. These publishing histories of these seven texts illustrate that such constructions are never static or homogenous. Negotiations of such concepts become part of the constantly shifting hierarchies of remembrance, which are in turn embedded in national and international political, ideological constellations.

Notwithstanding the diverse contexts of publication, there are certain themes which pervade these post-war memories. While it is not the aim of this conclusion to undermine the differentiated analysis preceding it, or to engage in generalization, it is nevertheless possible to draw out certain commonalities between the texts while remaining aware of their inherent tensions. Self-understanding as a victim of fascism is present, to a certain extent, in all seven texts. As such each must be situated within and against wider narratives of German victimhood which have prevailed, and still prevail, in the context of the three German states since 1949. However, differences are apparent in the autobiographies of those who chose to resist this victimhood from a position initially un-threatened by the Nazi regime, and for

whom this resistance subsequently became a fundamental, positive, part of their post-war identity, as for Kuckhoff and Brüning. For Huppert and Weil, who similarly chose to resist, but from a position where the alternative meant death, such resistance became tainted by a guilt at survival, a guilt encapsulated textually by gaps in their testimonies. For Langgässer, Brüning and Scholl, lacunae in their narratives highlight the ambiguous positionalities of those against the regime, but who, in the face of the fascist terror, withdrew into the illusory protection of the familial sphere; a sphere inextricably linked for Langgässer with her understanding of literature and Catholicism. For Scholl and Langgässer, their understanding and representation of specific events during Nazism involves a religious, Christian, interpretation. In their texts, Christian motifs of redemption have the effect of displacing responsibility and constructing themes of martyrdom and atonement, which marginalize Jewish experiences of persecution. Such marginalization is repeated within the reviews of the texts during the early 1950s in West Germany. As a perpetrator, Maschmann's all-pervasive understanding of her own victimhood necessitates an exclusion of the victimhood of those persecuted by the regime.

The position of the Holocaust within these memories is of primary significance for the narrator's understanding of the past and is often marked through reference to the stages of systematic persecution, particularly in 1935 and 1938, and through depiction of the deportations. Paradoxically, while the autobiographies of those targeted by the fascist racial laws have the Holocaust at their centre, both Huppert and Weil simultaneously emphasize the limits to their ability to bear witness to the persecution. Such a recognition contrasts with Maschmann's claims to the completeness of her account. Furthermore, as has been shown from the analysis of Maschmann's text and from the reception of Weil's, the fore-grounding of Jewish identity does not necessarily lead to a confrontation with individual victim experience. Examinations of definitions of Self and Other within the texts and their reception have highlighted how binary oppositions can maintain antisemitic stereotypes while claiming to dismantle them. Questions of alterity are significant in all the autobiographies, with the texts often presenting opposing selves as well as multiple Others in their negotiations of the past.

The distance from the events being described to the time of writing and publication is often addressed within the narratives. Huppert stresses the immediacy of her memories, yet, thirty years later, her son omits those elements which he feels were a result of the closeness to

the events, while still accentuating the contemporary value of the autobiography. Maschmann emphasizes that she needed a distance of twenty years before she could confront her involvement within the fascist system, yet an inclusion of reports written at the time within her autobiography suggests both a persisting identification with its ideologies and an attempt to justify her actions in the present. Kuckhoff's detailed narration, thirty years after the events, of the arrest, trial and execution of her husband contains a vividness encapsulated in the inclusion of their prison letters. These contrast with the otherwise accelerated political teleology of the autobiography. Weil's writing similarly focuses on two particular moments in time, including *Weihnachtslegende 1943* and the programmatic letter to Susman, to describe the continued pain of exile and persecution. Both convey the trauma very powerfully from a distance of fifty years. The hybrid nature of this text and others shows a persisting refusal to conform to the traditional expectations of the autobiographical form. Through the genre of autobiography, these authors have often sought to disrupt established conventions regarding memories of the past.

There are multiple voices, perspectives and identities within each autobiography. Dialectical relationships between the past and present within the memories are often renegotiated through different voices framing the texts. Whether it is an editorial voice readdressing the text for a new audience, an introductory or concluding voice suggesting specific interpretations of the text, or a new voice rewriting the memories, the identities of the protagonists are reinforced, reinvented or reworked according to contemporary memory discourses. The investigations of Huppert, Langgässer and Scholl particularly emphasize changing inscriptions of identities by voices other than those of the author.

Concepts of gender, that is, constructions of both femininity and masculinity, are fundamental to each of these autobiographies. The synchronic nature of many of the texts allows questions of women's position at the time of writing and in the past to become a central theme. While an increase in feminist studies of history, sociology and literature over the past thirty years has undoubtedly had an effect on women's preparedness to raise questions of gender, all of the texts published since 1947 have women's experiences at their core. Analyses of these experiences are still highly contentious, as particularly seen in the chapters on Huppert and Maschmann. An examination of women's experiences of persecution can avoid both the danger of pernicious comparisons among victims and the

valorizing of certain traits as essentially female by recognizing that women's experiences were fundamentally different to men's. The debate about women's involvement in the Nazi system, known as the 'Historikerinnenstreit', has shown that a recognition of patriarchal domination within the fascist state must be careful not to contribute to the very same tendencies it seeks to oppose by designating women as victims, a categorization which often tends towards refusing to imagine women as historical actors. These in-depth textual analyses show that there are some similarities in the portrayal of gender in terms of marginalization to dominant social norms. Nevertheless, examinations across different historical and political axes reiterate that it is impossible to speak of 'women's experiences of fascism' or a particular form of 'women's writing'.

Each of the texts negotiates the relationship of individual and wider experience. They frequently stake a claim to authenticity through representativeness and by presenting the protagonist as an identificatory figure. In Brüning and Kuckhoff's texts, it is childhood memories in particular which emphasize youthful traits in order to portray a teleological development of their political identities. For Maschmann and Scholl, memories of their early years include descriptions of naive enthusiasm for the Hitler Youth within a framework which exonerates them; while Scholl then decidedly stresses a distance from such enthusiasm, Maschmann reiterates it twenty years later. In Weil's childhood memories, it is the encroaching effects of antisemitism which become prominent. For Huppert, the horrific culmination of such racism is signified by the absence of pre-Holocaust life in her autobiography. The lack of her childhood experiences, which in most of the autobiographies build bridges to the reader, signify the limits of identification (Klein 1995, 284). Where early memories are present, the first suggestions of collective identities are made within them. Shifting patterns of identification with different groups are present in each text, with wider collectives being portrayed mainly positively in the case of Maschmann, Brüning and Kuckhoff, and negatively in the case of Scholl, Langgässer and Weil. In Huppert's narrative, the very nature of survival, along with the ties that bind to those who were murdered, leads to parallel definitions of collective and individual.

The extent to which the authors succeed in their identificatory appeal depends on the addressees of their texts. Such addressees are multiple and vary with the dates of publications and different editions of individual autobiographies. For all authors, such intended addressees are significant for the way in which they frame their

memories. For Huppert and Weil the addressees are of particular importance to the working through of the trauma, a process integral to their survival. It is in respect of these addressees that the depiction of gender norms proves challenging. Several of the texts address the collectives to which the protagonists wish to belong but which contain problematic gendered relationships. For Kuckhoff, gendered tensions within the resistance group are symptomatic of those within GDR society. In Maschmann's text, her claims to be part of the Hitler Youth generation are undermined by the exculpatory notions of gender. The reviewers of the texts often broaden textual claims of identification, including those of gender. Indeed, the reception often emphasizes an amorphous female experience and as a result eradicates historical specificity.

Appeals to addressees frequently contain assertions of the authenticity of the memories. At the same time, both Brüning and Weil question the role of 'fact' and 'fiction' in their discussion of what it means to write an autobiography. An imperative to write the 'truth' is particularly predominant in Huppert's text and is a defence against the incomprehensible scale of the persecution. The reviewers of all the texts stress, in turn, a truthfulness of the memories. The authors' status as 'Zeitzeuginnen' [witnesses of their time] is reiterated in the reception, and often accompanied by either a negation or marginalization of the aesthetic qualities of the texts. This reading of the autobiographies as documents rather than literature has important consequences. For Huppert, a marginalization of the literary form and interpretative qualities of the text continues an exclusion of the female voice from a canon of authoritative male authors on the Holocaust. In Scholl's case, the text has become part of canonical memories of youth opposition to fascism without a recognition of other prevailing emphases within her memories. As such, it has contributed to a masculinization of notions of German victimhood through an emphasis on soldiers and patriarchal figures of redemption. Langgässer's letters have been read as reflecting a natural, spontaneous, authentic female self. Such readings perpetuate essentializing gender definitions and the marginalization of the epistolary genre. The uncritical use of Maschmann's text has led to its frequent republication and use within historical accounts of the BDM's work, without a recognition of the persisting fascist frameworks it contains. Kuckhoff's text has been read as an account of resistance but the gendered tensions of the past and present have been obscured. Brüning's designation as an eye-witness has downplayed the competing identities and contradicting calls for

identification within her text. A focus on the 'factual' nature of the autobiographies has meant that the methods of representing these memories have not been connected to the textual reasons for writing – a division persists between content and form. The result is shown most acutely in the reception of Weil's autobiography, where the dialogical structure of her text, which is inherent to her communicative agenda, has been subsumed by a concentration on the alleged 'simplicity' of the narrative. In the context of contemporary postmodernism, with its acceptance of competing subject positions, it seems that there remains a fear of plurality when the fascist past is under discussion. A fear which, in the face of revisionist historians who would deny or 'normalize' the Holocaust, must not be underestimated. Neither should it be allowed, however, to obscure an analysis of texts such as these, which aim to further an understanding of the past through a consideration of a wider spectrum of behaviour and responses to the years of Nazism.

These analyses have shown how privileged autobiographical literary memories become part of institutionalized historical discourse. Their subsequent reading as historical documents is therefore maybe not surprising, but, as I have suggested in the chapters on Scholl and Maschmann, when such texts are canonized it becomes even more imperative to understand how the texts work and how they engage with and contest hegemonic historical and political narratives. A relatively recent paradigm shift from a concentration on the 'Erfahrungsliteratur' [literature of experience] of canonical male autobiographers to an inclusion of female texts within a broadly defined concept of 'Erinnerungsliteratur' [literature of memory] has, paradoxically, led to an attendant shift from reading the 'great' texts as literature to reading of autobiography as document. I hope to have contributed here to a recuperation of these women's texts as literature while recognizing their value as historical documents.

As refutations of certain often-repeated narratives about the years of Nazism, these autobiographies are significant. Firstly, Huppert, Kuckhoff and Weil challenge the assertion that there was no Jewish resistance to the fascist persecution. Not only through the repeated reference to the resistance group led by German-Jewish Herbert Baum, but also in their depiction of individual acts of resistance, the texts counter such a claim. In each of the autobiographies, including those of Huppert and Weil, the possibilities for individual action are clearly demarcated. While the scope of such possibilities was dependant on the position of the women with respect to the fascist state, the texts highlight the different decisions made. Secondly,

arguments of a pre-1979 silence about the events of the Nazi past in West Germany, and a lack of confrontation with the Holocaust in East Germany, are repeatedly contradicted on the basis of these individual stories and their attendant publishing histories. Such assertions are highly problematic because they silence those voices that were speaking in order to further contemporary political agendas. At no time has there been silence about the fascist past since 1945, as Robert G. Moeller has emphasized: 'Remembering selectively was not the same as forgetting' (1996, 1013).

When considering how certain memories have become part of hegemonic discourse, institutional support they received cannot be underestimated. The histories of the 'White Rose' and the 'Red Orchestra', and the vagaries of Huppert's publication history have demonstrated the importance of bodies such as the VVN, and those national and international prize-awarding bodies, whose decisions are not only of great significance for the authors themselves, but which serve to increase public awareness of certain narratives. Decisions to publish, republish, review and translate are examples of the material practices which fundamentally affect who is given the authority to speak on behalf of whom. Such practices are illustrative of the prevalent power relations within the respective societies under discussion. Re-reading texts such as these is a fundamental part of an active remembering, not a memorialization which can rarefy and atrophy and become a site of the very forgetting which it aims to work against. With their multiple and contested meanings, meanings which often seem to question the very view of the past which the authors hold themselves, autobiographical texts are fundamental to any attempts to increase an understanding of Nazism. As such, literary texts must not be seen in isolation from all other spheres of culture and politics.

While the seven autobiographies have been rooted in the historic context of their publication, the investigation has simultaneously shown how the memories are often subject to de-historicizing forces which distort the original imperatives of the authors. However, this is not to say that all seven texts are not of continued relevance to the current context. Against a backdrop of thousands of texts written about the Nazi past, these literary historical analyses focus on areas which are relatively under-explored: from a gendered approach to Holocaust memories; to a consideration of the female perpetrators of the regime; to a re-evaluation of resistance memories which have become canonical. In the latter case, it has been highlighted how, in both East and West Germany, commemoration of the resisters

murdered by the Nazi regime tended to exclude the resisters who survived. These analyses therefore contribute to both the further theorization of women's autobiographies and to an examination of previously marginalized perspectives on the past.

I have not attempted to periodize the post-war period on the basis of seven texts. The multiple contradicting tendencies within these analyses have shown the impossibility of doing so, and how such generic trends often silence those texts which challenge them. What can be highlighted, however, is a tendency in respect of the texts by those targeted by Nazism. From the first autobiography by Huppert in 1947 to the last by Weil in 1998, these two persecuted women have repeatedly asserted their intention to bear witness. With the republication of Huppert's text in West Germany in 1988, German readers were confronted with a text without the original calls for retribution and responsibility. When Weil's text followed in the reunified Germany, it too was read as one seeking reconciliation. Contemporary debates about German experiences of the bombing raids, the mass exodus of refugees from the East, and of the arrival of Soviet troops in Germany in 1945 have led to some to claim that the 'last taboo' on fascism has finally been overcome (Hage 1998, 2002). These texts stand as examples among many that such subjects were not taboo until the mid-1990s. While these 'rediscovered' experiences are certainly a necessary part of understanding the consequences of Nazism, the tendency to talk about German victims "ohne tatsächlich über den Nationalsozialismus zu sprechen" [without actually speaking about National Socialism] (Salzborn 2002) is one which must be unambiguously confronted. As Omer Bartov has emphasized, a blanket understanding of German victimhood relies on excluding the emotions of the Jewish victims, such as Huppert and Weil (2000, 31). All of these seven women have a past. Detailed examinations such as these can help us try to understand what they are telling us.

Works Cited

I. Published Primary Texts

- Adelsberger, Lucie. 1995. *Auschwitz: A Doctor's Story*. Boston: Northeastern University Press.
- Aicher, Otl. 1998. *Innenseiten des Krieges*. Frankfurt am Main: Fischer.
- Aichinger, Ilse. 1991. *Die größere Hoffnung*. Frankfurt am Main: Fischer.
- Aicher-Scholl, Inge. 1993. *Sippenhaft: Nachrichten und Botschaften der Familie in der Gestapo-Haft nach der Hinrichtung von Hans und Sophie Scholl*. Frankfurt am Main: Fischer.
- Alt, Karl. 1946. *Todeskandidaten: Erlebnisse eines Seelsorgers im Gefängnis München-Stadelheim mit zahlreichen im Hitlerreich zum Tode verurteilten Männern und Frauen*. Munich: Neubau Adolf Gross.
- Barthes, Roland. 1975. *roland BARTHES par roland barthes*. Paris: Seuil.
- Brüning, Elfriede. 1934. *Und außerdem ist es Sommer*. Leipzig: Staakmann.
- ___ 1936. *Junges Herz muß wandern*. Berlin: Schützen.
- ___ 1938. *Auf schmalem Land*. Leipzig: Staakmann.
- ___ 1950. *Damit Du weiterlebst*. Berlin: VVN.
- ___ 1952. *Vor uns das Leben*. Berlin: Das neue Berlin.
- ___ 1955. "Solidarität", in Karl Grünberg, ed. *Hammer und Feder: Deutsche Schriftsteller aus ihrem Leben und Schaffen*. Berlin: Tribüne, 28-43.
- ___ 1955. "Um uns wurde es immer leerer", in Karl Grünberg, ed. *Hammer und Feder: Deutsche Schriftsteller aus ihrem Leben und Schaffen*. Berlin: Tribüne, 35-43.
- ___ 1961. "Die Tür ist zu", in Ministerium für Kultur der DDR, ed. *Die Stimme der Künstler ruft nach Frieden: Eine Sammlung*. Berlin: Rütten & Loening, 40-41.
- ___ 1977. *Zu meiner Zeit: Geschichten aus vier Jahrhunderten*. Leipzig: Mitteldeutscher Verlag.
- ___ 1983. "Man nannte mich Agnes". *Neue deutsche Literatur* 31:4, 11-20.
- ___ [1989]. *Lästige Zeugen? Tonbandgespräche mit Opfern der Stalinzzeit*. Halle: Mitteldeutscher Verlag.

- ___ 1992. *Kinder im Kreidekreis*. Berlin: Dietz.
- ___ 1994. *Und außerdem war es mein Leben: Aufzeichnungen einer Schriftstellerin*. Berlin: Elefant Press.
- ___ 1995. "Brief vom 11. Januar 1993", in Richard A. Zipser, ed. *Fragebogen: Zensur: Zur Literatur vor und nach dem Ende der DDR*. Leipzig: Reclam, 74-76.
- ___ 1996. *Und außerdem war es mein Leben: Bekenntnisse einer Zeitzeugin*. Kiel: Agimos.
- ___ 1996. *Damit Du weiterlebst*. Kiel: Agimos.
- ___ 1998. *Und außerdem war es mein Leben: Bekenntnisse einer Zeitzeugin*. Munich: dtv.
- ___ 1999. *Jeder lebt für sich allein: Nachwende-Notizen*. Berlin: Dietz.
- ___ 2000. *Spätlese*. Berlin: Dietz.
- ___ 2004. *Porträts vergessener Frauen*. Berlin: Dietz.
- Edvardson, Cordelia. 1987. *Gebranntes Kind sucht das Feuer*. Trans. by Anna-Liese Kornitzky. Munich: Carl Hanser.
- Edvardson, Cordelia. 1997. *Burned Child Seeks the Fire: A Memoir*. Trans. by Joel Agee. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Feuchtwanger, Lion, and Arnold Zweig. 1986. *Lion Feuchtwanger. Arnold Zweig: Briefwechsel 1933-1958 Band I, 1933-1948*. Frankfurt am Main: Fischer.
- Goethe, Johann Wolfgang. [1811-1833] 1884. *Aus meinem Leben: Dichtung und Wahrheit*. Stuttgart: Cotta.
- ___ 1978. *Goethes Werke*. Ed. by Erich Trunz, Vol. 2. Munich: Beck.
- Huppert, Hilde. 1947. *Engpaß zur Freiheit: Aufzeichnungen der Frau Hilde Hupperts [sic] über ihre Erlebnisse im Nazi-Todesland und ihre wundersame Errettung aus Bergen-Belsen*, Manuskriptbearbeitung von Arnold Zweig. Bausteine der Wahrheit. Schriftenreihe zur deutschen Selbstkritik. 6. Folge. Fanara/Egypt: Tribüne [des deutschen Kriegsgefangenenlagers 380].
- ___ 1949. *Soutěskou k Svobodě. Náčrtky Hildy Huppertové o tom, co zažila v nacistických táborech smrti a o jejím zázračném vysvobození z Bergen-Belsenu, Zpracování a doslov Arnolda Zweiga* (Z rukopisného orig. přel. Erik Kolar). Prague: Mír.
- ___ 1978. *Jad Be Jad Im Tommy*. Tel Aviv: Moreshet Usifriat Poalim.
- ___ 1981. *De dood in de ogen*. Trans. by Annemiek Jansen. Amsterdam: De Boekerij.
- ___ 1988. *Hand in Hand mit Tommy: Ein autobiographischer Bericht; 1939-1945*. Trans. by Shmuel Huppert. St. Ingbert: Röhrig.
- ___ 1990. *Engpaß zur Freiheit: Aufzeichnungen der Frau Hilde Huppert über ihre Erlebnisse im Nazi-Todesland und ihre wundersame Errettung aus*

- Bergen-Belsen*, Manuskriptbearbeitung von Arnold Zweig. Mit einem Essay von Detlev Claussen. Ed. Heidrun Loeper. Berlin: Kontext, 1990.
- _____. 1997. *Hand in Hand mit Tommy: Ein autobiographischer Bericht; 1939-1945*. Trans. by Shmuel Huppert. St. Ingbert: Röhrig, 1997.
- Jens, Inge, ed. 1984. *Hans Scholl. Sophie Scholl: Briefe und Aufzeichnungen*. Frankfurt am Main: Fischer.
- Klüger, Ruth. 1995. *weiter leben: eine Jugend*. München: dtv.
- _____. 2003. *Landscapes of Memory: A Holocaust Girlhood Remembered*. London: Bloomsbury.
- Kuckhoff, Greta. 1946a. "Herz und Verstand: Die Frau von heute braucht einen klaren Kopf". *Die Frau von Heute* 15, 1.
- _____. ed. 1946b. *Adam Kuckhoff zum Gedenken: Novellen, Gedichte, Briefe*. Berlin: Aufbau.
- _____. 1947. "Zur Erforschung des deutschen Widerstandes". *Einheit* 2, 1168-1172.
- _____. 1948a. "Ein Abschnitt des deutschen Widerstands". *Die Weltbühne* 3, 59-63.
- _____. 1948b. "Ein klärendes Wort zu den überparteilichen Organisationen". *Die Weltbühne* 3, 158-161.
- _____. 1948c. "Rote Kapelle". *Aufbau* 4, 30-37.
- _____. 1969a. "Arvid Harnack". *Die Weltbühne* 24, 1411-1415.
- _____. 1969b. "Zur Kristallnacht November 1938". *Die Weltbühne* 24, 1449-1451.
- _____. 1969c. "Hans-Heinrich Kummerow". *Die Weltbühne* 24, 1516-1518.
- _____. 1969d. "Cato Bontjes van Beek". *Die Weltbühne* 24, 1653-1655.
- _____. 1970a. "Das letzte Lied". *Die Weltbühne* 25, 54-57.
- _____. 1970b. "Eva Maria Buch". *Die Weltbühne* 25, 205-207.
- _____. 1970c. "Der Kompaß". *Die Weltbühne* 25, 395-397.
- _____. 1970d. "Der Widerstand der letzten Tage". *Die Weltbühne* 25, 549-552.
- _____. 1972. *Vom Rosenkranz zur Roten Kapelle: Ein Lebensbericht*. Berlin: Neues Leben.
- _____. 1973. *Vom humanistischen Bildungsideal zum realen Sozialismus: Einige persönliche Gedanken*. Halle (Saale): Martin-Luther-Universität Halle-Wittenberg.
- _____. 1974. *Vom Rosenkranz zur Roten Kapelle: Ein Lebensbericht*. Frankfurt am Main: Röderberg.
- _____. 1993. "Der Prozeß gegen Eva-Maria Buch", in Kurt Schilde, ed. *Eva Maria Buch und die 'Rote Kapelle': Erinnerungen an den Widerstand gegen den Nationalsozialismus*. Berlin: Overall, 1993, 52-55.

- ___ 1997. "Greta Kuckhoff", in Ursula Reinhold and Dieter Schlenstedt and Horst Tanneberger, eds. *Erster Deutscher Schriftstellerkongreß, 4.-8. Oktober 1947*. Berlin: Aufbau, 155-156.
- "Gedenken: Greta Kuckhoff". 1982. *Sonntag*, 12 December.
- "Vom Rosenkranz zur Roten Kapelle: Auszug aus dem Buch von Greta Kuckhoff". 1973. *Universitätszeitung*, 19 January.
- Langgässer, Elisabeth. 1961. "Grenzen und Möglichkeiten christlicher Dichtung", in Wilhelm Hoffmann, ed. *Das Christliche der christlichen Dichtung: Vorträge und Briefe*. Olten: Walter, 28-45.
- ___ [1954] 1981. *...soviel berauschende Vergänglichkeit: Briefe 1926-1950*. Ed. by Wilhelm Hoffmann Frankfurt am Main: Ullstein.
- ___ 1997. "Schriftsteller unter der Hitlerdiktatur", in Ursula Reinhold, Dieter Schlenstedt and Horst Tanneberger, eds. *Erster Deutscher Schriftstellerkongreß 4. - 8. Oktober 1947*. Berlin: Aufbau. 136-141.
- ___ 1990. *Briefe 1924-1950*. Ed. by Elisabeth Hoffmann. Dusseldorf: Claassen.
- Levi, Primo. 1995. *The Drowned and the Saved*. Trans. by Raymond Rosenthal. London: Abacus.
- Maschmann, Melita. 1963. *Fazit: Kein Rechtfertigungsversuch*. Stuttgart: DVA.
- ___ 1964. *Ma jeunesse au service du nazisme*. Trans. by Anny Rouffet. Paris: Plon.
- ___ 1964. *Account Rendered: A Dossier on my Former Self*. Trans. by Geoffrey Strachan. London: Abelard Schuman.
- ___ 1979. *Fazit: Mein Weg in der Hitler-Jugend*. Munich: dtv.
- Mayer, Hans. 1991. *Erinnerung an eine DDR: "Der Turm von Babel"*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.
- Richter, Trude. 1990. *Totgesagt: Erinnerungen*. Halle: Mitteldeutscher Verlag.
- Rinsler, Luise. 1977. *Gefängnistagebuch*. Frankfurt am Main: Fischer.
- Rousseau, Jean Jacques. [1782, 1789] 2000. *Confessions*. Trans. by Angela Scholar. Ed. by Patrick Coleman. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Saint Augustine. [1465] 1992. *Confessions*. Ed. by James O'Donnell. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Scholl, Inge. 1951. "Menschen wie du und ich". *Deutsche Universitätszeitung* 14, 3-6.
- ___ 1952. *Die Weiße Rose*. Frankfurt am Main: Frankfurter Hefte.
- ___ 1955. *Die Weiße Rose*. Frankfurt am Main: Fischer.
- ___ 1956. *Die Weiße Rose*. Frankfurt am Main: Fischer.
- ___ 1973. *Die Weiße Rose*. Frankfurt am Main: Fischer.
- ___ 1983a. *Die Weiße Rose*. Stuttgart: Europäische Bildungsgemeinschaft.

- ___ 1983b. *Die Weiße Rose*. Frankfurt am Main: Büchergilde Gutenberg.
- ___ 1986. *Die Weiße Rose*. Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt.
- ___ 1990. *Die Weiße Rose*. Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt.
- ___ 1997. *Die Weiße Rose*. Frankfurt am Main: Fischer.
- Trepper, Leopold. 1975. *Die Wahrheit: Autobiographie*. München: Kindler.
- Weil, Grete. 1949. *Ans Ende der Welt: Erzählung*. Berlin: Volk und Welt.
- Weil-Jockisch, Grete. 1962. "Grete Weil-Jockisch", in Galerie Garuda, ed. *Reden bei Garuda 3*. Darmstadt: Garuda, 29-32.
- Weil, Grete. 1981. "Nicht dazu erzogen, Widerstand zu leisten", in Edith Laudowicz and Dorlies Pollmann, eds. *Weil ich das Leben liebe: Persönliches und Politisches aus dem Leben engagierter Frauen*. Cologne: Pahl-Rugenstein, 170-181.
- ___ 1982. *Meine Schwester Antigone*. Berlin: Volk und Welt.
- Weil-Jockisch, Grete. 1985. "Vielleicht, irgendwie....", in Marielouise Janssen-Jurreit, ed. *Lieben Sie Deutschland? Gefühle zur Lage der Nation*. Munich: Piper, 54-60.
- Weil, Grete. 1989. *Generationen*. Frankfurt am Main: Fischer.
- ___ 1992. *Spätfolgen*. Zürich: Nagel & Kimche.
- ___ 1995. *Der Brautpreis*. Frankfurt am Main: Fischer.
- ___ 1996. "Rede anlässlich der Verleihung der Carl-Zuckmayer-Medaille", in Der Ministerpräsident des Landes Rheinland-Pfalz, ed. *Grete Weil: Eine Würdigung*. Kaiserslautern: Verlag des Instituts für Pfälzische Geschichte und Volkskunde, 17-19.
- ___ 1998. *Leb ich denn, wenn andere leben*. Zürich: Nagel & Kimche.
- ___ 2001. *Leb ich denn, wenn andere leben*. Frankfurt am Main: Fischer.
- Wilkomirski, Benjamin. 1995. *Bruchstücke: Aus einer Kindheit 1939-1948*. Frankfurt am Main: Jüdischer Verlag im Suhrkamp.
- Zweig, Arnold. 1951. *Fahrt zum Acheron*. Berlin: VVN.
- ___ 1961. *Fahrt zum Acheron: Ein Bericht*. Ed. by Arnold Zweig. Berlin: Union.

II. Unpublished Primary Texts

- Brüning, Elfriede. Letter to the author, 22 September 2000.
- ___ Interview with the author, 21 November 2000, Berlin.
- Huppert, Hilde. Telephone conversation with the author, 13 March 2001.
- Huppert, Shmuel. Letter to the author, 12 February 2001. Including a letter from Elie Wiesel to Shmuel Huppert from 1978.
- Metelka, Torsten. Letter to the author, 21 February 2001.

- Nagel-Kohler, Renate. Letter to the author, 30 April 2001. Including a copy of a letter from Renate Nagel-Kohler (Nagel & Kimche) to Grete Weil: 1 September 1997.
- Sick, Thomas. Letter to the author, 11 September 2000.
- Scholl, Inge, 'Biographische Notizen'. Institut für Zeitgeschichte, Munich.
- Scholl, Robert, "Anmerkungen zu Christian Petrys Veröffentlichung über die Widerstandsgruppe 'Weiße Rose' in München". Institut für Zeitgeschichte, Munich.
- Weil, Grete. Letter to Herr Escherig: 11 August 1980. Grete Weil Nachlass, Monacensia Literaturarchiv, Munich Stadtbibliothek.
- ____ "Rede im Rahmen des Essener Symposiums Jüdische Kultur und Weiblichkeit in der Moderne". (11-17 December 1990).
- ____ Speech given at the Munich Stadtmuseum for the opening of the exhibition "Jüdische Portraits von Herlinde Koelbl". (2 February-1 April 1990).
- Zweig, Arnold. Letters to and from: Hilde Huppert; his secretary; Kultureller Beirat; Union Verlag; VVN. Stiftung Archiv der Akademie der Künste, Berlin, Arnold Zweig Archiv.

III. Secondary texts

- Adelson, Leslie A. 1993. *Making Bodies, Making History: Feminism and German Identity*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- Adorno, Theodor W. [1963] 1998. *Critical Models: Interventions and Catchwords*. Trans. by Henry W. Pickford. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Alberghini, Diana. 2000. "Re-defining the Role of the Intellectual and the Function of Literature: The Example of Helga Königsdorf", in Paul Cooke and Jonathan Grix, eds. *East Germany: Continuity and Change*. Amsterdam G.A.: Rodopi, 33-41.
- Andersch, Alfred. 1946. "Das junge Europa formt sein Gesicht". *Der Ruf* 1, 21-26.
- Ankum, Katharina von. 1996. "Victims, Memory, History: Antifascism and the Question of National Identity in East German Narratives after 1990". *History and Memory* 7, 41-69.
- Anz, Thomas, ed. 1995. *"Es geht nicht um Christa Wolf": Der Literaturstreit im vereinten Deutschland*. Frankfurt am Main: Fischer.
- Bahr, Ehrhard. 1977. "Metaphysische Zeitdiagnose: Hermann Kasack, Elisabeth Langgässer und Thomas Mann", in Hans Wagener, ed.

- Gegenwartsliteratur und Drittes Reich: Deutsche Autoren in der Auseinandersetzung mit der Vergangenheit*. Stuttgart: Reclam, 133-162.
- Barck, Simone. 1997. "Zeugnis ablegen: Zum frühen Antifaschismus-Diskurs am Beispiel des VVN-Verlages", in Martin Sabrow, ed. *Verwaltete Vergangenheit: Geschichtskultur und Herrschaftslegitimation in der DDR*. Leipzig: Akademische Verlagsanstalt, 259-291.
- Barner, Wilfried, et al. 1994. "Erzählprosa im letzten Jahrhundert der DDR", in Wilfried Barner, ed. *Geschichte der deutschen Literatur von 1945 bis zur Gegenwart*. Munich: Beck, 882-897.
- Bartov, Omer. 1998. "Defining Enemies, Making Victims: Germans, Jews and the Holocaust". *American Historical Review* 103, 771-816.
- _____. 1999. "Trauma and Absence", in Helmut Peitsch, Charles Burdett and Claire Gorrara, eds. *European Memories of the Second World War*. Oxford: Berghahn, 258-271.
- _____. 2000. "Germany as Victim". *New German Critique* 80, 29-40.
- Bauer, Yehuda. 2001. *Rethinking the Holocaust*. London: Yale University Press.
- Baumel, Judith Tydor. 1995. "Social Interaction Among Jewish Women in Crisis During the Holocaust: A Case Study". *Gender & History* 7:1, 64-84.
- Baureithel, Ulrike. 1998. "'Was ist das überhaupt: Jude?': In Fetzen gerissenes Talent. Die Schriftstellerin Grete Weil blickt zurück auf ein Jahrhundert deutsche Geschichte". *Freitag* 20 March.
- _____. 1999. "Meine Krankheit heißt Auschwitz: Die vergessenssüchtige Nachkriegsgesellschaft mit ihrer Schuld konfrontieren: Zum Tod der Schriftstellerin Grete Weil". *Der Tagesspiegel* 28 May.
- Becher, Johannes R. 1967. "Bericht über die Tätigkeit während meiner Reise vom 5. Juli bis 27. September 1933", in Deutsche Akademie der Künste zu Berlin, ed. *Zur Tradition der sozialistischen Literatur in Deutschland: Eine Auswahl von Dokumenten*. Berlin: Aufbau, 570-590.
- Beckmann, Gerhard. 1999. "Begreifen, was nie zu verstehen sein wird: Grete Weil ist tot". *Die Welt* 28 May.
- Beckmann, Heinz. 1963. "Bunte Blüten aus giftigen Wurzeln". *Rheinischer Merkur* 11 October.
- Behrend, Hanna, and Joan Ecklein, Frederike Hajek. 1991. "Antifascism in the Two Germanies: The Case for the GDR". *Radical America* 23:4, 65-79.
- Berger, Christel. 1998. "Anna Seghers und Grete Weil – Zeuginnen des Jahrhunderts". *Edition Luisenstadt* <http://www.luise-berlin.de/Lesezei/blz98_09/text02.htm> (14 January 2002).

- Biernat, Karl Heinz, ed. 1965. *Historiographie der Deutschen Demokratischen Republik über den deutschen antifaschistischen Widerstandskampf in den Jahren 1933 bis 1945: Überblicksanalyse über Veröffentlichungen aus den Jahren 1960-1965*. Berlin: Institut für Marxismus-Leninismus beim ZK der SED.
- Biernat, Karl Heinz, and Luise Kraushaar. 1972. *Die Schulze-Boysen-Harnack-Organisation im antifaschistischen Kampf*. Berlin: Dietz.
- Blöcker, Günther. 1954. "Berliner Briefe Elisabeth Langgässers", NWDR, 14 April 1954. Radio Transcript in Literaturarchiv Marbach, A: Langgässer, 70.3686.
- Bluhm, Lothar. 1992. "Elisabeth Langgässer: Briefe". *Wirkendes Wort* 42, 164-165.
- Boa, Elizabeth, and Rachel Palfreyman. 2000. *Heimat: A German Dream. Regional Loyalties and National Identity in German Culture 1890-1990*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bodemann, Y. Michal. 1994. "A Reemergence of German Jewry?", in Sander L. Gilman and Karen Remmler, eds. *Reemerging Jewish Culture in Germany: Life and Literature Since 1989*. New York: New York University Press, 46-61.
- Böll, Heinrich. 1967. *Aufsätze, Kritiken, Reden*. Cologne: Kiepenheuer & Witsch.
- Böltken, Andrea. 1995. *Führerinnen im "Führerstaat"*. Pfaffenweiler: Centaurus.
- Bolduan, Viola. 1979. "Radikale Sensibilität: Die Geistesverwandtschaft Elisabeth Langgässers mit Hildegard von Bingen". *Blätter der Carl-Zuckmayer-Gesellschaft* 5:1, 40-46.
- Bormann, Alexander von. 1991. "Der deutsche Exilroman in den Niederlanden: Formsemantische Überlegungen", in Sjaak Onderdelinden, ed. *Interbellum und Exil*. Amsterdam G.A.: Rodopi, 225-249.
- _____. 1999. "Vom niemals vergehenden Schmerz: Zum Tod von Grete Weil". *Neue Zürcher Zeitung* 28 May.
- Bracher, Karl Dietrich. 1963. "Wissenschaft und Widerstand: Das Beispiel der 'Weißen Rose'". *Aus Politik und Zeitgeschichte: Beilage zur Wochenzeitung das Parlament* 29, 3-16.
- Braese, Stephan. 2000. "Weil, Grete", in Andreas B. Kilcher, ed. *Metzler Lexikon der deutsch-jüdischen Literatur: Jüdische Autorinnen und Autoren deutscher Sprache von der Aufklärung bis zur Gegenwart*. Stuttgart: Metzler, 599-604.
- _____. 2001. *Die andere Erinnerung: Jüdische Autoren in der westdeutschen Nachkriegsliteratur*. Berlin: Philo.

- _____. 2002. "Überlieferungen: Zu einigen Deutschland-Erfahrungen jüdischer Autoren der ersten Generation", in Sander L. Gilman and Hartmut Steinecke, eds. *Deutsch-jüdische Literatur der neunziger Jahre: Die Generation nach der Shoah*. Berlin: Erich Schmidt, 17-28.
- Bremser, Horst. 1963. "Unbewältigte Vergangenheit". *Rheinische Post* 4 April.
- Breuer, Hubertus. 1995. "Auf der Suche nach einer verlorenen DDR". *Die Welt* 4 March.
- Breyvogel, Wilfried. 1991. "Die Gruppe 'Weiße Rose': Anmerkungen zur Rezeptionsgeschichte und kritischen Rekonstruktion", in Wilfried Breyvogel, ed. *Piraten, Swings und Junge Garde: Jugendwiderstand im Nationalsozialismus*. Bonn: Dietz, 159-201.
- Broder, Henryk M. 1994. "Heimat? No, Thanks!", in Elena Lappin, ed. *Jewish Voices, German Words: Growing up Jewish in Postwar Germany and Austria*. Trans. by Krishna Winston. Cincinnati: Catbird Press, 80-101.
- Brunnemann, Anna. 1911. "Die Frau als Briefschreiberin". *Kunstwart* 453-456.
- Burberg, K. 1952. "Arnold Zweig: Fahrt zum Acheron". *Die Tat* 19, 14.
- Caruth, Cathy. 1996. *Unclaimed Experience: Trauma, Narrative and History*. London: John Hopkins University Press.
- Claussen, Detlev. 1988. "Aufklärung in der Wüste". *Freibeuter* 39, 96-103.
- _____. 1997. "1947 Arnold Zweig begins work on Freundschaft mit Freud". Trans. by Todd Herzog and Hillary Hope Herzog, in Sander L. Gilman and Jack Zipes, eds. *Yale Companion to Jewish Writing and Thought in German Culture 1096-1996*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 671-676.
- Coburger, Marlies. 1994. "Die Frauen der Berliner Roten Kapelle", in Hans Coppi, Jürgen Danyel and Johannes Tuchel, eds. *Die Rote Kapelle im Widerstand gegen den Nationalsozialismus*. Berlin: Hentrich, 91-103.
- Coppi, Hans, and Jürgen Danyel. 1993. "Abschied von Feindbildern: Zum Umgang mit der Geschichte der 'Roten Kapelle'", in Kurt Schilde, ed. *Eva Maria Buch und die 'Rote Kapelle': Erinnerungen an den Widerstand gegen den Nationalsozialismus*. Berlin: Overall, 63-91.
- Coppi, Hans. 1994. "Rote Kapelle", in Wolfgang Benz and Walter H. Pehle, ed. *Lexikon des deutschen Widerstandes*. Frankfurt am Main: Fischer, 281-285.
- Coppi, Hans, and Jürgen Danyel, Johannes Tuchel, eds. 1994. *Die Rote Kapelle im Widerstand gegen den Nationalsozialismus*. Berlin: Hentrich.
- Cosentino, Christine. 2000. "Überlegungen zu Formen autobiographischen Schreibens in der östlichen Literatur der neunziger Jahre". *glossen* 12

- <<http://www.dickinson.edu/glossen/heft12/autobiographien.html>> (23 May 2001).
- Danyel, Jürgen. 1992. "Vom schwierigen Umgang mit der Schuld: Die Deutschen in der DDR und der Nationalsozialismus". *Zeitschrift für Geschichtswissenschaft* 40, 915-928.
- _____. 1993. "Die geteilte Vergangenheit: Gesellschaftliche Ausgangslagen und politische Dispositionen für den Umgang mit Nationalsozialismus und Widerstand in beiden deutschen Staaten nach 1949", in Jürgen Kocka, ed. *Historische DDR-Forschung: Aufsätze und Studien*. Berlin: Akademie, 129-148.
- _____. 1994a. "Die Rote Kapelle innerhalb der deutschen Widerstandsbewegung", in Hans Coppi, Jürgen Danyel and Johannes Tuchel, eds. *Die Rote Kapelle im Widerstand gegen den Nationalsozialismus*. Berlin: Hentrich, 12-38.
- _____. 1994b. "Zwischen Nation und Sozialismus: Genese, Selbstverständnis und ordnungspolitische Vorstellungen der Widerstandsgruppe um Arvid Harnack und Harro Schulze-Boysen", in Peter Steinbach and Johannes Tuchel, eds. *Widerstand gegen den Nationalsozialismus*, Berlin: Landeszentrale für politische Bildungsarbeit, 468-487.
- _____. 1995. "Die Opfer- und Verfolgtenperspektive als Gründungskonsens? Zum Umgang mit der Widerstandstradition und der Schuldfrage in der DDR", in Jürgen Danyel, ed. *Die geteilte Vergangenheit: Zum Umgang mit Nationalsozialismus und Widerstand in beiden deutschen Staaten*. Berlin: Akademie, 31-46.
- de Man, Paul. 1979. "Autobiography as De-Facement". *Modern Language Notes* 94, 919-930.
- Dempff, Anneliese. 1954. "Elisabeth Langgässers Briefe". *Zeitwende* 25:2, 352-353.
- Deutsche Akademie der Künste, ed. 1952. *Sinn und Form: Beiträge zur Literatur. Sonderheft Arnold Zweig*.
- Diner, Dan. 1986. "Negative Symbiose: Deutsche und Juden nach Auschwitz". *Babylon* 1, 9-20.
- _____. 1993. *Verkehrte Welten: Antiamerikanismus in Deutschland. Ein historischer Essay*. Frankfurt am Main: Eichborn.
- Dischner, Gisela, ed. 1984. *Eine stumme Generation berichtet: Frauen der dreißiger und vierziger Jahre*. Frankfurt am Main: Fischer.
- Dittgen, Andrea. 1988. "Das Leben der Kinder stand an erster Stelle: Eine Mutter erzählt von der Judenverfolgung". *Sonntagsgruß* 35, 10.
- Dodds, Dinah. 1994. "Women in East Germany: Emancipation or Exploitation?", in Elizabeth Boa and Janet Wharton, eds. *Women and*

- the Wende: Social Effects and Cultural Reflections of the German Unification Process*. Amsterdam G.A.: Rodopi, 107-114.
- Domansky, Elisabeth. 1992. "'Kristallnacht', the Holocaust and German Unity: The Meaning of November 9th as an Anniversary in Germany". *History and Memory* 4, 60-94.
- Dönhoff, Marion Gräfin. 2002. "Grete Weil". <http://www.s-fischer.de/sfischer/suche/home.htm> (15 May 2002).
- Donate, Claus. 1973. "'Deutsche Linke' am Kreuzweg: Aus den Lebenserinnerungen einer Widerstandskämpferin". *Die Zeit* 23 March.
- Donohoe, James. 1961. *Hitler's Conservative Opponents in Bavaria 1930-1945: A Study of Catholic, Monarchist and Separatist Anti-Nazi Activities*. Leiden: Brill.
- Dresden, Sem. 1995. *Persecution, Extermination, Literature*. Trans. by Henry G. Schogt. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Drewitz, Ingeborg. 1984. "'Die Sphären gerannen wie Molke': Elisabeth Langgässer gesehen von Ingeborg Drewitz". 21 July. Radio Transcript in Literaturarchiv Marbach, RFS: AA.
- Drewitz, Ingeborg. 1984. *Unter meiner Zeitlupe: Porträts und Panoramen*. Vienna: Europa.
- Dürsson, Werner. 1993. "Erfüllen im Scheitern: Die Schriftstellerin Elisabeth Langgässer", *Süddeutscher Rundfunk*, 10 October. Radio Transcript in Literaturarchiv Marbach, RFS: AA.
- Dumbach, Annette E., and Jud Newborn. 1989. *Wir sind euer Gewissen: Die Geschichte der Weißen Rose*. Stuttgart: Kreuz.
- Durham, Martin. 1998. *Women and Fascism*. London: Routledge.
- Eaglestone, Robert, and Susan Pitt. 1998. "The Good of History: Ethics, Post-structuralism and the Representation of the Past". *Rethinking History* 2:3, 309-312.
- Eberlein, Ruth. 1985. "Untersuchungen zur Darstellung der Persönlichkeitsentwicklung und des Ringens um Gleichberechtigung der Frau in den Büchern Elfriede Brünings und zu deren Aufnahme durch die Literaturkritik und die Leser der DDR 1950 bis 1983". Ph.D. diss. University of Magdeburg.
- Ebrecht, Angelika. 1990. "Brieftheoretische Perspektiven von 1850 bis ins 20. Jahrhundert", in Angelika Ebrecht et al., eds. *Brieftheorie des 18. Jahrhunderts: Texte, Kommentare, Essays*. Stuttgart: Metzler, 239-256.
- Ehrle, Peter Michael. 1994. "Einführung in den Vortrag", in Karlheinz Müller, ed. *Elisabeth Langgässer: Vortrag anlässlich der Ausstellungseröffnung Elisabeth Langgässer am 19. April 1994 in der Badischen Landesbibliothek*. Karlsruhe: Badische Bibliotheksgesellschaft, 1-4.

- Eichholz, Armin. 1988. "Wenn sie an meinem Herzen lecken könnten, wären sie vergiftet". *Börsenblatt* 93, 3458-3460.
- El Akramy, Ursula. 1997. *Wotans Rabe: Die Schriftstellerin Elisabeth Langgässer, ihre Tochter Cordelia und die Feuer von Auschwitz*. Frankfurt am Main: Neue Kritik.
- Eley, Geoff. 1992. "Nations, Publics, and Political Cultures: Placing Habermas in the Nineteenth Century", in Craig Calhoun, ed. *Habermas and the Public Sphere*. Cambridge MA: MIT, 289-339.
- Emmerich, Wolfgang. 1992. "Für eine andere Wahrnehmung der DDR-Literatur: Neue Kontexte, neue Paradigmen, ein neuer Kanon", in Axel Goodbody and Dennis Tate, eds. *Geist und Macht: Writers and the State in the GDR*. Amsterdam G.A.: Rodopi, 7-22.
- Emmerich, Wolfgang. 1996. *Kleine Literaturgeschichte der DDR*, erweiterte Neuauflage. Berlin: Kiepenheuer.
- Endres, Elisabeth. 1988. "'Denn das Heil kommt von den Juden': Vier Porträts von Elisabeth Endres. Nr. 2 Elisabeth Langgässer", *Süddeutscher Rundfunk*, 14 August. Transcript in Literaturarchiv Marbach, RFS: AA.
- Exner, Lisbeth. 1998. *Land meiner Mörder, Land meiner Sprache: Die Schriftstellerin Grete Weil*. Munich: A1.
- Ezrahi, Sidra DeKoven. 1982. *By Words Alone: The Holocaust in Literature*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- _____. 1996. "Representing Auschwitz". *History and Memory* 7, 121-154.
- Fallend, Karl. 1998. "'Meine Krankheit ist Auschwitz': Zäh und verbissen gegen das Vergessen anschreiben: Grete Weil". *Die Presse* 24 October.
- Faulenbach, Bernd. 1994. "Auf den Weg zu einer gemeinsamen Erinnerung? Das Bild vom deutschen Widerstand gegen den Nationalsozialismus nach den Erfahrungen von Teilung und Umbruch". *Zeitschrift für Geschichtswissenschaft* 42, 598-604.
- Fechner, Dieter. 1994. "Und außerdem war es mein eigenes Leben [sic]: Elfriede Brüning als Zeugin dieses Jahrhunderts". *Hallesches Tageblatt* 23 August.
- _____. 1995. "Zeitzeugin des Jahrhunderts: Elfriede Brüning 85". *Mitteldeutsche Allgemeine* 8 November.
- Felman, Yael S. 1992. "Whose Story Is It, Anyway? Ideology and Psychology in the Representation of the Shoah in Israeli Literature", in Saul Friedländer, ed. *Probing the Limits of Representation: Nazism and the "Final Solution"*. London: Harvard University Press, 223-239.
- Ferguson, Frances. 1981. "Interpreting the Self through Letters". *Centrum* 1:2, 107-112.
- Finck, Almut. 1999. *Autobiographisches Schreiben nach dem Ende der Autobiographie*. Berlin: Erich Schmidt.

- Finnan, Carmel. 2000. "Autobiography, Memory and the Shoah: German-Jewish Identity in Autobiographical Writings by Ruth Klüger, Cordelia Edvardson and Laura Waco", in Pol O'Dochartaigh, ed. *Jews in German Literature since 1945: German-Jewish Literature?*. Amsterdam G.A.: Rodopi, 447-462.
- Finney, Patrick. 1998. "Ethics, Historical Relativism and Holocaust Denial". *Rethinking History* 2:3, 359-370.
- Flicke, W.F. 1990. *"Rote Kapelle": Spionage und Widerstand. Die Geschichte der größten Spionage- und Sabotageorganisation im Zweiten Weltkrieg*. Augsburg: Weltbild.
- Fliedl, Konstanze. 1986. *Zeitroman und Heilsgeschichte: Elisabeth Langgässers Märkische Argonautenfahrt*. Vienna: Braumüller.
- Foitzik, Jan. 1994. "Gruppenbildung im Widerstand", in Hans Coppi, Jürgen Danyel and Johannes Tuchel, eds. *Die Rote Kapelle im Widerstand gegen den Nationalsozialismus*. Berlin: Hentrich, 68-78.
- Fraser, Nancy. 1992. "Rethinking the Public Sphere: A Contribution to the Critique of Actually Existing Democracy", in Craig Calhoun, ed. *Habermas and the Public Sphere*. Cambridge MA: MIT, 109-142.
- Gansner, Hans Peter. 1999. "Auschwitz und danach: Schreiben und lesen [sic] über und gegen Auschwitz heute. Eine Bücherschau", *Vorwärts* 11 June. <<http://pda.ch/vorwaerts/1999/2399kultur.html>> (10 April 2000).
- Geisenhanslücke, Achim. 2000. "Abschied von der DDR", in Heinz Ludwig Arnold, ed. *DDR-Literatur der neunziger Jahre*. Munich: Edition Text und Kritik, 80-91.
- Gelbin, Cathy. 1997. "A Quest for a Unified Self: Race, Hybridity, and Identity in Elisabeth Langgässer's *Der gang durch das ried*". *New German Critique* 70, 141-160.
- _____. 1998. "Es war zwar mein Kind, aber die Rassenschranke fiel zwischen uns". *Zeitschrift für deutsche Philologie* 117, 565-596.
- Gelbin, Cathy S. 2001. *The Indelible Seal: Race, Hybridity and Identity in Elisabeth Langgässer's Writings*. Essen: Die Blaue Eule.
- Géliu, Claudia von. 1994. "Ein Frauenleben dieses Jahrhunderts". *Berliner LeseZeichen* 3, 69-71.
- Gerhard, Ute. 1994. "Die staatlich institutionalisierte 'Lösung' der Frauenfrage: Zur Geschichte der Geschlechterverhältnisse in der DDR", in Hartmut Kaelble, Jürgen Kocka and Hartmut Zwahr, ed. *Sozialgeschichte der DDR*. Stuttgart: Klett Cotta, 383-403.
- Giachi, Arianna. 1954. "Meerflut unter dem Mond". *Die Gegenwart* 6, 180.
- Giese, Carmen. 1997. *Das Ich im literarischen Werk von Grete Weil und Klaus Mann: Zwei autobiographische Gesamtkonzepte*. Frankfurt am Main: Lang.

- Goldhagen, Danyel Jonah. 1999. *Hitler's Willing Executioners: Ordinary Germans and the Holocaust*. London: Abacus.
- Goldhorn, Wlodek. 1991. "Die zweideutige Erinnerung". *Kommune* 11, 42-45.
- Goldsmith, Elizabeth C. and Dena Goodman. 1995. 'Introduction', in Elizabeth C. Goldsmith and Dena Goodman, eds. *Going Public: Women and Publishing in Early Modern France*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1-9.
- Goodbody, Axel, and Dennis Tate. 1992. "Preface", in Axel Goodbody and Dennis Tate, eds. *Geist und Macht: Writers and the State in the GDR*. Amsterdam G.A.: Rodopi, 2-6.
- Goodman, Katherine. 1986. *Dis/Closures: Women's Autobiography in Germany between 1790 and 1914*. New York: Lang.
- Goodman, Katherine R. 1999. "Weibliche Autobiographien", in Hiltrud Gnüg and Renate Möhrmann, eds. *Frauen-Literatur-Geschichte: Schreibende Frauen vom Mittelalter bis zur Gegenwart*. Stuttgart: Metzler, 166-176.
- Grabowski, Stefan, and Valentin Tomin. 1967. *Die Helden der Berliner Illegalität: Reportage über den gemeinsamen Kampf deutscher und sowjetischer Antifaschisten*. Trans. by Gerhart Hass. Berlin: Dietz.
- Gräf, Dieter M. 1988. "Hilde Huppert: Hand in Hand mit Tommy. Ein autobiographischer Bericht 1939-1945". *Litfaß* 45 45, 12.
- Gravenhorst, Lerke. 1990. "Nehmen wir Nationalsozialismus und Auschwitz ausreichend als unser negatives Eigentum in Anspruch?", in Lerke Gravenhorst and Carmen Tatschmurat, eds. *Töchter-Fragen: NS-Frauen-Geschichte*. Freiburg: Kore, 17-37.
- Greulich, E. R. 1973. "Alltag des Widerstands". *Neue deutsche Literatur* 23:4, 154-157.
- Griesmayr, Gottfried, and Otto Würschinger, eds. 1980. *Idee und Gestalt der Hitler-Jugend*. Leoni am Starnberger See: Druffel.
- Groehler, Olaf. 1990. "Zelebrierter Antifaschismus". *Journal Geschichte* 5, 46-55.
- _____. 1993. "Der Holocaust in der Geschichtsschreibung der DDR", in Bernhard Moltmann et al., ed. *Erinnerung: Zur Gegenwart des Holocaust in Deutschland West und Deutschland Ost*. Frankfurt am Main: Haag + Herchen, 47-66.
- _____. 1993. "'Juden erkennen wir nicht an'". *Konkret* 3, 50-54.
- _____. 1994. "Der Umgang mit dem Holocaust in der DDR", in Rolf Steininger, ed. *Der Umgang mit dem Holocaust: Europa-USA-Israel*. Vienna: Böhlau, 233-245.

- Grohmer, Ulrike. 1994. "Acht Jahrzehnte erlebte Zeit: Buchpremiere mit Elfriede Brüning in der Berliner Stadtbibliothek". *Neues Deutschland* 7 March.
- Grumbach, Detlev. 1998. "'Daß Menschen Mörder sind, begriff ich nicht': 'Leb ich denn, wenn andere leben' – nüchtern und authentisch denkt die Schriftstellerin Grete Weil an die Zeit ihrer Emigration zurück", *Deutsches Allgemeines Sonntagsblatt* 8 May.
- Günter, Manuela. 1994. "Identität und Identifizierung: Einige Überlegungen zur Konstruktion des 'Juden' nach dem Holocaust", in Sander L. Gilman and Karen Remmler, ed. *Reemerging Jewish Culture in Germany: Life and Literature Since 1989*. New York: New York University Press, 435-446.
- Günther, Joachim. 1954. "Die Briefe Elisabeth Langgässers", *Süddeutsche Zeitung* 30 April.
- Häntzschel, Hiltrud. 1994. "Warum ich trotzdem in Deutschland lebe: Ein Brief aus dem Jahr 1947 an Margarete Susman". *Süddeutsche Zeitung* 16/17 June.
- Hage, Volker. 1998. "Feuer vom Himmel". *Der Spiegel*, <<http://www.spiegel.de/spiegel/0,1518,3250,00.html>> (12 January 1998)
- _____. 2002. "Unter Generalverdacht". *Der Spiegel*, <<http://www.spiegel.de/0,1518,191630,00.html>> (8 April 2002)
- Halbwachs, Maurice. [1950] 1992. *On Collective Memory*. Ed. and Trans. by Lewis A. Coser. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Hanser, Richard. 1982. *Deutschland zuliebe: Leben und Sterben der Geschwister Scholl; die Geschichte der Weißen Rose*. Trans. by Pietes Dörr. Munich: dtv.
- Hartinger, Walfried. 1976. "Die Fragen und Antworten unserer Literatur: Resultate und Probleme ihrer wissenschaftlichen Erfahrung", in Manfred Diersch and Walfried Hartinger, ed. *Literatur und Geschichtsbewußtsein: Entwicklungstendenzen der DDR-Literatur in den sechziger und siebziger Jahren*. Berlin: Aufbau, 5-50.
- Hartmann, Horst. 1973. "Zeugnis vom anderen Deutschland: Greta Kuckhoff legt ein sehr lesenswertes Buch vor". *Die Tat* 1, 14.
- Harvey, Elizabeth. 2003. *Women in the Nazi East: Agents and Witnesses of Germanization*. London: Yale University Press.
- _____. 2006. "Osteinsatz des Bundes Deutscher Mädel im Krieg", in Dagmar Reese, ed. *Die BDM-Generation*. Postdam: Verlag Berlin-Brandenburg. Forthcoming.
- Hautumm, Hans-Ludwig. 1964. "Das Selbstverständnis der Dichtung bei Elisabeth Langgässer". *Der Deutschunterricht* 16:5, 34-49.

- Heinemann, Elizabeth. 1996. "The Hour of the Woman: Memories of Germany's 'Crisis Years' and West German National Identity", *American Historical Review* 101, 345-395.
- Heinemann, Marlene E. 1986. *Gender and Destiny: Women Writers and the Holocaust*. London: Greenwood Press.
- Heinsohn, Kirsten, and Barbara Vogel, Ulrike Weckel, eds. 1997. *Zwischen Karriere und Verfolgung: Handlungsräume von Frauen im nationalsozialistischen Deutschland*. Frankfurt am Main: Campus.
- Heinz, Klaus Michael dir., 2000. Boulevard Bio, "Der widerspenstigen Zähmung: Schreiben gegen Hitler". 14 November. WDR.
- Heitzenröther, Horst. 1964. "Elfriede Brüning: Nachtgespräch". *Sybille* 4, 32-34, 53-55.
- Hell, Julia. 1992. "At the Centre an Absence: Foundationalist Narratives of the GDR and the Legitimatory Discourse of Antifascism". *Monatshefte* 84:1, 23-45.
- _____. 1997. *Post-Fascist Fantasies: Psychoanalysis, History, and the Literature of East Germany*. Durham N.C.: Duke University Press.
- _____. 1998. "Critical Orthodoxies, Old and New, Or the Fantasy of a Pure Voice: Christa Wolf", in Jost Hermand and Mark Silberman, ed. *Contentious Memories: Looking Back at the GDR*. New York: Lang, 65-101.
- Helm, Christian. 1961. "Ein beschwörender Ruf an die Menschheit", *Neue Zeit* 3 December.
- Herlemann, Beatrix. 1994. "Die Rote Kapelle und der kommunistische Widerstand", in Hans Coppi, Jürgen Danyel and Johannes Tuchel, eds. *Die Rote Kapelle im Widerstand gegen den Nationalsozialismus*. Berlin: Hentrich, 79-90.
- Herminghouse, Patricia. 1991. "Confronting the 'Black Spots of History': GDR Culture and the Legacy of 'Stalinism'". *German Studies Review* 14:2, 345-365.
- _____. 1999. "Schreiben in gewendeten Verhältnissen: Ostdeutsche Autorinnen in historischer Sicht", in Hiltrud Gnüg and Renate Möhrmann, eds. *Frauen-Literatur-Geschichte: Schreibende Frauen vom Mittelalter bis zur Gegenwart*. 2nd edn Stuttgart: Metzler, 477-495.
- Herzog, Bert. 1954/55. "Briefe der Elisabeth Langgässer". *Schweizer Rundschau* 54, 278-279.
- Hervé, Florence. 1995. "Zwischen Anpassung und Widerstand: Zur Lage der Frauen und zum Widerstand 1933 bis 1945", in Florence Hervé, ed. *Geschichte der deutschen Frauenbewegung*. Cologne: PapyRossa, 111-125.

- Hetmann, Frederik. 1987. *Schlafe, meine Rose: Die Lebensgeschichte der Elisabeth Langgässer*. Weinheim: Beltz und Gelberg.
- _____. 1999. *Schlafe, meine Rose: Die Lebensgeschichte der Elisabeth Langgässer*. Weinheim: Beltz.
- Heukenkamp, Ursula. 1993. "Konjunktur – und was danach?", in Karl Deiritz and Hannes Krauss, eds. *Verrat an der Kunst? Rückblicke auf die DDR-Literatur*. Berlin: Aufbau, 29-40.
- _____. 1996. "Jüdische Figuren in der Nachkriegsliteratur der SBZ und DDR", in Ursula Heukenkamp, ed. *Unterm Notdach: Nachkriegsliteratur in Berlin 1945-1949*. Berlin: Erich Schmidt, 198-203.
- _____. 2001. "Erfahrung nach dem Krieg: Autorinnen im Literaturbetrieb 1945-1950", in Christiane Caemmerer et al., eds. *Erfahrung nach dem Krieg: Autorinnen im Literaturbetrieb 1945-1950; BRD, DDR, Österreich, Schweiz*. Frankfurt am Main: Lang, 257-264.
- Heuser, Magdalene. 1996a. "Einleitung", in Magdalene Heuser, ed. *Autobiographien von Frauen: Beiträge zu ihrer Geschichte*. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer, 1-12.
- _____. 1996b. "Holocaust und Gedächtnis: Autobiographien, Tagebücher und autobiographische Berichte von verfolgten Frauen", in Ortrun Niethammer, ed. *Frauen und Nationalsozialismus: Historische und kulturgeschichtliche Positionen*. Osnabrück: Rasch, 83-99.
- Hilberg, Raul. 1988. "I was not there", in Berel Lang, ed. *Writing and the Holocaust*. London: Holmes & Meier, 17-25.
- Hildebrandt, Irma. 1997. "Antigone im Dritten Reich", in *Bin halt ein zähes Luder: 15 Münchener Frauenporträts*. München: Diederichs, 203-224.
- Hinck, Walter. 1991. "Mutter, geliebte, gehaßte Mutter: Elisabeth Langgässer in ihren Briefen". *Kölner Stadt-Anzeiger* 1 December.
- Höhne, Heinz. 1970. *Kenntwort: Direktor. Die Geschichte der Roten Kapelle*. Frankfurt am Main: Fischer.
- Hoffmann, Elisabeth. 1987. "Die geplante Briefausgabe der Elisabeth Langgässer: Ein Werkstattbericht". *Südwestfunk*, 12 April. Radio Transcript in Literaturarchiv Marbach, RFS: AA.
- _____. 1990. "Zur christlich-jüdischen Problematik bei Elisabeth Langgässer", in Karlheinz Müller, ed. *Elisabeth-Langgässer-Colloquium: Vorträge*. Darmstadt: zur Megede, 35-39.
- _____. 1993. "Jüdin-Deutsche-Katholikin: Fragen nach der Identität am Beispiel von Elisabeth Langgässer und Cordelia Edvardson", in Jutta Dick and Barbara Hahn, eds. *Von einer Welt in die andere: Jüdinnen im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert*. Vienna: Christian Brandstätter, 286-295.
- Hoffmann, Jens. 1963. "Hör' ich das Böse, denk' ich nicht hin!". *Christ und Welt* 12 April.

- Hoffmann, Wilhelm. 1960. "‘Sie wählte nicht den risikolosen Weg’: Erinnerungen an Elisabeth Langgässer", *Echo der Zeit* 31 July.
- _____. 1961. "Elisabeth Langgässer: Existentielles und dichterisches Welt-erlebnis". *Literaturwissenschaftliches Jahrbuch N.F.* 2, 145-171.
- Hogwood, Patricia. 2000. "After the GDR: Reconstructing Identity in Post-Communist Germany". *Journal of Communist Studies and Transition Politics* 16:4, 45-67.
- Holdenried, Michaela. 1995. "Einleitung", in Michaela Holdenried, ed. *Geschriebenes Leben: Autobiographik von Frauen*. Berlin: Erich Schmidt, 9-20.
- Holub, Robert C. 1984. *Reception Theory: A Critical Introduction*. London: Methuen.
- Honig, Werner. 1954. "Elisabeth Langgässer in ihren Briefen". *Weltstimmen* 23, 156-160.
- Horn, Klaus. 1964. "Kein Fazit". *Neue Gesellschaft* 11, 82.
- Horst, Eberhard. 1991. "Die Kerze brennt an beiden Enden: Mehr als ein bloßes Erinnern an eine große deutsche Dichterin: Elisabeth Langgässers 'Briefe 1924-1950'". *Die Welt* 16 March.
- Huber, Clara. 1986. '...der Tod...war nicht vergebens': *Kurt Huber zum Gedächtnis*. Munich: Nymphenburger.
- Huch, Ricarda. 1948/49. "Die Aktion der Münchener Studenten gegen Hitler". *Neue Schweizer Rundschau NF* 5 & 6, 283-296, 364-365.
- _____. 1971. "Die Aktion der Münchener Studenten gegen Hitler", in *Gedichte, Dramen, Reden, Aufsätze und andere Schriften: Gesammelte Werke*, Vol. 5, Cologne: Kiepenheuer & Witsch, 971-1011
- Huch, Ricarda, *In einem Gedenkbuch zu sammeln...: Bilder deutscher Widerstandskämpfer*. Ed. by Wolfgang M. Schwiedrzik. Leipzig: Leipziger Universitätsverlag.
- Hübner, Irene. 1982. *Unser Widerstand: Deutsche Frauen und Männer berichten über ihren Kampf gegen die Nazis*. Frankfurt am Main: Röderberg.
- Huppert, Shmuel. 1990. "From *Why Did This Happen To Us?* to *Hand in Hand With Tommy*: The Development of the Manuscript of Huppert, Published by Moreshet in Six Editions". *Yalkut Moreshet* 48, 161-172.
- Huppert, Shmuel Thomas. 1999. *Habe ich Anne Frank gesehen?* Trans. by Markus Lemke. Gerlingen: Bleicher.
- Huyssen, Andreas. 1995. *Twilight Memories: Marking Time in a Culture of Amnesia*. New York: Routledge.
- Ihlenfeld, Kurt. 1961. *Zeitgesicht: Erlebnisse eines Lesers*. Witten: Eckart.

- Isani, Claudio. 1980. "Opfer der Macht: Nazi Erinnerungen. Interview mit Grete Weil". *Der Abend* 15 November. Manuscript in Monacensia Literaturarchiv.
- Jaeger, Wolfgang. 1993. "50 Jahre 'Weiße Rose'", *Heidelberger Jahrbücher* 37, 183-190.
- Jahnke, Karl Heinz, ed. 1959. *Niemals vergessen: Aus dem antifaschistischen Widerstandskampf der Studenten Europas*. Berlin: Neues Leben.
- _____. 1962. "Erfüllt das Vermächtnis der Helden des antifaschistischen Widerstandskampfes – kämpft für die Überwindung des westdeutschen Imperialismus und Militarismus!", in Zentralrat FDJ, ed. *Wenn wir gemeinsam kämpfen, sind wir unüberwindlich*. Berlin: Junge Welt, 44.
- _____. 1965. "Zum antifaschistischen Widerstandskampf an der Münchener Universität in den Jahren 1942/43: Dem Andenken der Geschwister Scholl und ihrer Freunde aus Anlaß des 20. Jahrestages der Wiederkehr ihrer Hinrichtung durch die Hitlerfaschisten gewidmet". *Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift der Ernst-Moritz-Arndt-Universität Greifswald* 14, 329-338.
- _____. 1968. "Antifaschistischer Widerstand der Münchener Universität: Die Studentengruppe Scholl/Schmorrel", *Zeitschrift für Geschichte* 16:7, 874-883.
- Jolly, Margareta. 1995. "'Dear Laughing Motorbyke': Gender and Genre in Women's Letters From the Second World War", in Julia Swindells, ed. *The Uses of Autobiography*. London: Taylor and Francis, 45-55.
- _____. 1997. "Everyday Letters and the Literary Form: Correspondence from the Second World War". Ph.D diss. University of Sussex.
- _____. ed. 2001. *Dear Laughing Motorbyke: Letters from Women Welders of the Second World War*. London: Scarlet Press.
- Jung, Thomas. 1998. "Nicht-Darstellung und Selbst-Darstellung: Der Umgang mit der 'Judenfrage' in der SBZ und früheren DDR und dessen Niederschlag in Literatur und Film". *Monatshefte* 90:1, 49-70.
- Kahn, Siegbert. 1960. "Dokumente des Kampfes der revolutionären deutschen Arbeiterbewegung gegen Antisemitismus und Judenverfolgung". *Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Arbeiterbewegung* 3, 552-557.
- Kaplan, Marion. 1995. "Jewish Women in Nazi Germany Before Emigration", in Sibylle Quack, ed. *Between Sorrow and Strength: Women Refugees of the Nazi Period*. Washington: German Historical Institute and Cambridge University Press, 11-48.
- Kardorff, Ursula von. 1968. "Weil sie mit den Kommunisten sympathisierten?". *Süddeutsche Zeitung* 18 October.

- Karger, Ulrich. 2001. "Engpaß zur Freiheit". <<http://www.kontext.de/huppert.zweig.engpass.html>> (12 February 2001)
- Kaufmann, Eva. 1997. "Developments in East German Women's Writing Since Autumn 1989", in Chris Weedon, ed. *Postwar Women's Writing in German*. Oxford: Berghahn, 211-222.
- Kaufmann, Hans. 1981. "Veränderte Literaturlandschaft", in Hans Kaufmann, ed. *Tendenzen und Beispiele: Zur DDR-Literatur in den siebziger Jahren*. Leipzig: Philipp Reclam jun, 7-40.
- Keisch, Henryk. 1973. "Vom Rosenkranz zur Roten Kapelle". *Sonntag* 18 February.
- Kern, Erich. 1972. "Das Ende der Roten Kapelle in Berlin: So wurde Deutschland verraten". *Deutsche Nachrichten* 1/2, 7.
- Kilcher, Andreas B. 2000. "Einleitung", in Andreas B. Kilcher, ed. *Metzler-Lexikon der deutsch-jüdischen Literatur: Jüdische Autorinnen und Autoren deutscher Sprache von der Aufklärung bis zur Gegenwart*. Stuttgart: Metzler, v-xx.
- Kinz, Gabriele. 1990. *Der Bund Deutscher Mädel: Ein Beitrag zur außerschulischen Mädchenerziehung im Nationalsozialismus*. Frankfurt am Main: Lang.
- Kirchberger, Günther. 1987. *Die 'Weiße Rose': Studentischer Widerstand gegen Hitler in München*. Munich: Selbstverlag der Universität.
- Kircher, Hartmut. 1991. "Die Tragik der ersten Jahrhundert-Hälfte: Elisabeth Langgässers Briefe in zwei Bänden". *Kölner Stadt-Anzeiger*. 1 December
- Klein, Judith. 1995. "Am Rande des Nichts: Autobiographisches Schreiben von Überlebenden der Konzentrationslager: Jacqueline Soweria and Charlotte Delbo", in Michaela Holdenried, ed. *Geschriebenes Leben: Autobiographik von Frauen*. Berlin: Erich Schmidt, 278-286.
- Klönne, Arno. 1984. *Jugend im Dritten Reich: Die Hitler-Jugend und ihre Gegner; Dokumente und Analysen*. Dusseldorf: Diedrichs.
- Klüger, Ruth. 1996. "Zum Wahrheitsbegriff in der Autobiographie", in Magdalene Heuser, ed. *Autobiographien von Frauen: Beiträge zu ihrer Geschichte*. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer, 405-410.
- Kluke, Paul. 1949. "Der deutsche Widerstand: Eine kritische Literaturübersicht". *Historische Zeitschrift* 169:1, 136-161.
- Knobloch, Hans-Jörg. 2001. "Eine ungewöhnliche Variante in der Täter-Opfer-Literatur: Bernhard Schlinks Roman Der Vorleser", in Gerhard Fischer and David Roberts, eds. *Schreiben nach der Wende: Ein Jahrzehnt deutscher Literatur 1989-1999*. Tübingen: Stauffenberg, 89-98.
- Knoop-Graf, Anneliese. 1999. "'Das wird Wellen schlagen': Im Gedenken an Sophie Scholl", in Rudolf Lill, ed. *Hochverrat? Neue Forschungen zur 'Weißen Rose'*. Konstanz: Universitätsverlag, 41-64.

- Koelbl, Herlinde. 1989. *Jüdische Portraits: Photographien und Interviews*. Frankfurt am Main: Fischer.
- Köpke, Horst. 1963. "Das wußte der Führer nicht". *Die Welt* 1/2 May.
- Konstantin von Bayern. 1956. *Die großen Namen: Begegnungen mit bedeutenden Deutschen unserer Zeit*. Munich: Kindler.
- Koonz, Claudia. 1977. "Mothers in the Fatherland: Women in Nazi Germany", in Renate Bridenthal and Claudia Koonz, eds. *Becoming Visible: Women in European History*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 445-473.
- _____. 1986. "Das 'zweite Geschlecht' im 'Dritten Reich'", *Feministische Studien* 4:2, 14-33.
- Korn, Karl. 1950. "Satan und Gnade: Zum Tode Elisabeth Langgässers". *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung* 21 August.
- _____. 1954. "Briefe der Elisabeth Langgässer". *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung* 6 March.
- _____. 1988. *Rheinische Profile: Stefan George, Alfons Paquet, Elisabeth Langgässer*. Pfullingen: Neske.
- Kosta, Barbara. 1994. *Recasting Autobiography: Women's Counterfictions in Contemporary German Literature and Film*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Krauss, Hannes. 1993. "Verschwundenes Land? Verschwundene Literatur? Neue Bücher – alte Themen", in Karl Deiritz and Hannes Krauss, ed. *Verrat an der Kunst? Rückblicke auf die DDR-Literatur*. Berlin: Aufbau, 273-278.
- Kreuder, Ernst. 1950. "Nachruf auf Elisabeth Langgässer". *Jahrbuch Akademie der Wissenschaften und Literatur*, 143-147.
- Kreusel, Gert. 1994. "Brüning, Elfriede", *ekz-Informationsdienst*, 25.
- Kröger, Margot. 2002. "Konstruktionen von Identität in autobiographischen Texten von Jüdinnen: Ruth Elias, Ruth Klüger, Grete Weil, Naomi Bubis/SharonMehler, Laura Waco", in Ilse Nagelschmidt et al., eds. *Zwischen Trivialität und Postmoderne: Literatur von Frauen in den 90er Jahren*. Frankfurt am Main: Lang, 69-93.
- Krolow, Karl. 1954. "Elisabeth Langgässer: Die gesammelten Briefe". Hessischer Rundfunk, 14 April. Radio Transcript in Literaturarchiv Marbach, A: Langgässer, 70.3699.
- Krüger, Horst. 1954/5. "Dichtung unter dem Kreuz". *Eckart* 24, 78-79.
- _____. 1977. "Elisabeth Langgässer: Frühjahr 1946". *Frankfurter Anthologie* 2, 177-181.
- _____. 1981. *Spötterdämmerung: Lob- und Klagelieder zur Zeit*. Hamburg: Hoffmann und Campe.

- Krumrey, Marianne. 1981. "Monotonie oder Schöpfertum? Arbeit-Arbeiter-Arbeiterklasse in der Literatur", in Hans Kaufmann, ed. *Tendenzen und Beispiele: Zur DDR-Literatur in den siebziger Jahren*. Leipzig: Philipp Reclam jun., 41-77.
- Kühnrich, Heinz. 1992. "'Verordnet' – und nichts weiter? Nachdenken über Antifaschismus in der DDR". *Zeitschrift für Geschichtswissenschaft* 40, 819-833.
- Kuhn, Anna K. 1994. "The Gender Politics of the Christa Wolf Controversy", in Elizabeth Boa and Janet Wharton, eds. *Women and the Wende: Social Effects and Cultural Reflections of the German Unification Process*. Amsterdam G.A.: Rodopi, 200-215.
- Kuhn, Annette. 1994. "Die Täterschaft deutscher Frauen im NS-System – Traditionen, Dimensionen, Wandlungen", in Renate Knigge-Tesche, ed. *Frauen im Nationalsozialismus*. Wiesbaden: Hess. Landeszentrale für Politische Bildung, 6-31.
- Kuhrig, Herta and Wulfram Speigner, eds. 1978. *Zur gesellschaftlichen Stellung der Frau in der DDR*. Leipzig: Verlag für die Frau.
- _____. 1995. "'Mit den Frauen' – 'Für die Frauen': Frauenpolitik und Frauenbewegung in der DDR", in Florence Hervé, ed. *Geschichte der deutschen Frauenbewegung*. Cologne: PapyRossa, 209-248.
- Lang, Berel, ed. 1988. *Writing and the Holocaust*. London: Holmes & Meier.
- Langer, Lawrence L. 1975. *The Holocaust and the Literary Imagination*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- _____. 1998. "Gendered Suffering? Women in Holocaust Testimonies", in Dalia Ofer and Lenore J. Weitzman, eds. *Women in the Holocaust*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 351-363.
- _____. 2000. "Redefining Heroic Behaviour: The Impromptu Self and the Holocaust Experience", in Omer Bartov, ed. *The Holocaust: Origins, Implementation, Aftermath*. London: Routledge, 235-250.
- Laub, Dori. 1992. "Bearing Witness or the Vicissitudes of Listening", in Shoshana Felman and Dori Laub, eds. *Testimony: Crises Of Witnessing In Literature, Psychoanalysis, and History*. New York: Routledge, 57-74.
- Lehmann, Klaus. 1948. *Widerstandsgruppe Schulze-Boysen-Harnack*. Berlin: VVN.
- Leisner, Barbara. 2000. *"Ich würde es genauso wieder machen": Sophie Scholl*. Munich: List.
- Lejeune, Philippe. 1989. *On Autobiography*. Ed. Paul John Eakin. Trans. by Katherine Leary. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Liebs, Elke. 1994. "Eine jüdische Antigone". *Sinn und Form* 46:2, 291-298.
- Lipstadt, Deborah E. 1994. *Denying the Holocaust: The Growing Assault on Truth and Memory*. London: Penguin.

- Loewy, Hanno. 1999. "Saving The Child: The 'Universalisation' of Anne Frank", in Rachael Langford and Russell West, eds. *Marginal Voices, Marginal Forms: Diaries in European Literature and History*. Amsterdam G.A.: Rodopi, 156-174.
- Loewy, Ernst. 1983. *Literatur unterm Hakenkreuz: Das Dritte Reich und seine Dichtung. Eine Dokumentation*. Frankfurt am Main: Fischer.
- Lorenz, Dagmar C.G. 1992. *Verfolgung bis zum Massenmord: Holocaust-Diskurse in deutscher Sprache aus der Sicht der Verfolgten*. New York: Lang.
- Lorenz, Dagmar C.G. 1997. *Keepers of the Motherland: German Texts by Jewish Women Writers*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- Lubich, Frederick. 1997. "Jews in Germany Today – Contradictions in Progress". *glossen* 3, <<http://www.dickinson.edu/departments/germn/glossen/heft3/lubich.html>> (23 May 2001).
- Lühe, Irmela von der. 1997. "'Osten, das ist das Nichts': Grete Weils Roman *Tramhalte Beethovenstraat* (1963)", in Irmela von der Lühe and Anita Runge, eds. *Wechsel der Orte: Studien zum Wandel des literarischen Geschichtsbewußtseins*. Göttingen: Wallstein, 322-333.
- Majskij, Ivan M. 1967. *Memoiren eines sowjetischen Botschafters: I. M. Maiski*. Trans. by Leon Nebenzahl. Berlin: Das Europäische Buch.
- Mallmann, Klaus-Michael. 1995. "Zwischen Denunziation und Roter Hilfe: Geschlechterbeziehungen und kommunistischer Widerstand 1933-1945", in Christl Wickert, ed. *Frauen gegen die Diktatur: Widerstand und Verfolgung im nationalsozialistischen Deutschland*. Berlin: Hentrich, 82-97.
- Marcus, Laura. 1995. "The Face of Autobiography", in Julia Swindells, ed. *The Uses of Autobiography*. London: Taylor & Francis, 13-23.
- Martin, Elaine. 2000. "Victims or Perpetrators? Literary Responses to Women's Roles in National Socialism", in Elke P. Frederiksen and Martha Kaarsberg Wallach, eds. *Facing Fascism and Confronting the Past: German Women Writers from Weimar to the Present*. New York: State University of New York Press, 61-84.
- Martini, Winfried. 1966. "Durch Verrat fielen 200 000 deutsche Soldaten". *Die Welt* 27 October.
- Matz, Rose. 1951. "Christliche Motive bei Elisabeth Langgässer, Graham Greene, Gertrud von le Fort und George Bernanos". *Theologische Rundschau. Neue Folge* 19, 186-192.
- Melchert, Monika. 1994. "Lausige Zeiten, lästige Zeugen: Blick zurück nach vorn: Elfriede Brünig erinnert sich". *Junge Welt* 30 April.
- Meyer, Beate. 1999. *'Jüdische Mischlinge': Rassenpolitik und Verfolgungserfahrung 1933-45*. Hamburg: Döllig und Galitz.

- Meyer, Franziska. 1999. *“Avantgarde im Hinterland”*: Caroline Schlegel-Schelling in der DDR-Literatur. New York: Lang.
- _____. 2002. “Vom ‘Ende der Welt’: Grete Weils Rückkehr zu deutschen Lesern”, in Christiane Caemmerer et al., eds. *Erfahrung nach dem Krieg: Autorinnen im Literaturbetrieb 1945-1950. BRD, DDR, Österreich, Schweiz*. New York: Lang, 37-55.
- Meyer, Helmut. 1973. “Die frühen Erzählungen Elisabeth Langgässers: Dichtung zwischen Mythos und Logos”. Ph.D diss. Cologne University.
- Meyer, Uwe. 1996. *“Neinsagen, die einzige unzerstörbare Freiheit”*: Das Werk der Schriftstellerin Grete Weil. Frankfurt am Main: Lang.
- Meyer-Gosau, Frauke. 1998. “Outing to Jurassic Park: ‘Germany’ in Post-Wall Literature. An Essay Against Tiredness”, in Jost Hermand and Mark Silberman, eds. *Contentious Memories: Looking Back at the GDR*. New York: Lang, 223-246.
- _____. 2000. “Ost-West-Schmerz: Beobachtungen zu einer sich wandelnden Gemütslage”, in Heinz Ludwig Arnold, ed. *DDR-Literatur der neunziger Jahre*. Munich: Edition Text und Kritik, 5-12.
- Meyer Spacks, Patricia. 1986. *Gossip*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Mitscherlich-Nielsen, Margarete. 1983. “Antisemitismus – eine Männerkrankheit?”. *Psyche* 1, 41-53.
- Mittag, Gabriele. 1994. “Das eigene Leben nach Antworten befragt: Über die Erinnerungen Elfriede Brünings”. *Berliner Zeitung* 16 June.
- Mittman, Elizabeth. 1995. “Locating a Public Sphere: Some Reflections on Writers and Öffentlichkeit in the GDR”. *Women in German Yearbook* 10, 19-37.
- Moeller, Robert G. 1996. “War Stories: The Search For a Usable Past in the Federal Republic of Germany”. *American Historical Review* 101, 1005-1048.
- Mörchen, Roland. 1998. “‘Jude – was ist das?’ Neuerscheinungen von Primo Levi und Grete Weil”. *Jüdische Allgemeine Zeitung* 20 August.
- Moll, Christiane. 1994. “Die Weiße Rose”, in Peter Steinbach and Johannes Tuchel, eds. *Widerstand gegen den Nationalsozialismus*. Berlin: Landeszentrale für politische Bildung, 443-467.
- _____. 1999. “Alexander Schmorell im Spiegel unveröffentlichter Briefe”, in Rudolf Lill, ed. *Hochverrat? Neue Forschungen zur ‘Weißen Rose’*. Konstanz: Universitätsverlag, 129-160.
- Moser, Christoph. 1963. “Das politische Buch”, *Das Parlament* 24 April.
- Müller, Karlheinz. 1986. “Elisabeth Langgässer als Briefautorin”, in Karlheinz Müller and Wilhelm Solms, eds. *Über Elisabeth Langgässer: Beiträge aus Anlaß einer Ausstellung*. Marburg: Universitätsbibliothek, 44-52.

- _____. ed. 1990. *Elisabeth Langgässer: Eine biographische Skizze*. Darmstadt: Gesellschaft Hessischer Literaturfreunde.
- _____. 1994. *Elisabeth Langgässer: Vortrag anlässlich der Ausstellungseröffnung am 19. April 1994 in der Badischen Landesbibliothek*. Karlsruhe: Badische Bibliotheksgesellschaft.
- Niethammer, Ortrun. 1996. "Holocaust und Gedächtnis: Autobiographien von nationalsozialistischen Autorinnen", in Ortrun Niethammer, ed. *Frauen und Nationalsozialismus: Historische und kulturgeschichtliche Positionen*. Osnabrück: Rasch, 100-112.
- Nussbaum, Lauren and Uwe Meyer. 1993. "Grete Weil: Unbequem, zum Denken zwingend", *Exilforschung* 11, 156-170.
- Obermüller, Clara. 1998. "Dem Chaos abgerungen: Grete Weil hält Rückschau auf ihr Leben". *Die Weltwoche* 28 May.
- Ochse, Katharina. 1994. "'What Could Be More Fruitful, More Healing, More Purifying?': Representations in the German Media after 1989", in Sander L. Gilman and Karen Remmler, ed. *Reemerging Jewish Culture in Germany: Life and Literature Since 1989*. New York: New York University Press, 113-129.
- O'Doherty, Paul. 2000. "Die 'Judenfrage' in der DDR: Über die Diskrepanz zwischen Theorie und Praxis". *Monatshefte* 92:1, 68-77.
- O'Dochartaigh, Pol. 2000. "Introduction: German-Jewish Literature?", in Pol O'Dochartaigh, ed. *Jews in German Literature since 1945: German-Jewish Literature?* Amsterdam G.A.: Rodopi, i-x.
- Ofer, Dalia, and Lenore J. Weitzman, eds. 1998. *Women in the Holocaust*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Offers, K. 1965. "Wir lesen. Melita Maschmann: 'Fazit – Kein Rechtfertigungsversuch'". *Gleichheit* 1, 20-21.
- Ohff, Heinz. 1963. "'Eine Liebe, für die ich keinen Namen suchte': Melita Maschmanns 'Fazit' – Fragwürdige Bekenntnisse einer ehemaligen BDM-Funktionärin". *Der Tagesspiegel* 7 July.
- Olney, James. 1972. *Metaphors of Self: The Meaning of Autobiography*. Princeton N.J.: Princeton University Press.
- Ortner, Franz. 1954. "Wir greifen heraus: Elisabeth Langgässer an verschiedene Empfänger 1926-50. ...soviel berauschende Vergänglichkeit". 31 May. Radio Transcript in Literaturarchiv Marbach, A: Langgässer, 70.3716.
- Ostholt, Peter. <www.rosaluxemburgstiftung.de> (3 March 2002).
- Ott, Hugo. 1994. *Martin Heidegger: A Political Life*. Trans. by Allan Blunden. London: Fontana.
- Paepcke, Lotte. 1963. "Mit Sinnerfülltheit verwöhnt". *Frankfurter Hefte* 18, 49.

- Peitsch, Helmut. 1990. *“Deutschlands Gedächtnis an seine dunkelste Zeit”:* zur Funktion der Autobiographik in den Westzonen Deutschlands und Westsektoren von Berlin 1945 bis 1949. Berlin: Edition Sigma.
- _____. 1998. “Introduction”, in Helmut Peitsch, Charles Burdett and Claire Gorrara, eds. *European Memories of the Second World War*. New York: Berghahn, xiii-xxxi.
- Perrault, Gilles. 1969. *Auf den Spuren der Roten Kapelle*. Reinbek bei Hamburg: Rowohlt.
- Petry, Christian. 1968. *Studenten aufs Schafott: Die Weiße Rose und ihr Scheitern*. Munich: Piper.
- Pine, Lisa. 1999. “Girls in Uniform”. *History Today* 49:3, 24-29.
- Piontek, Heinz. 1954. “Langgässer, Elisabeth: ...soviel berauschende Vergänglichkeit”. *Welt und Wort* 3, 286.
- Pluwatsch, Petra. 1998. “Heimkehr in die deutsche Fremde: Eine Jüdin in Deutschland. Grete Weils Erinnerungen”. *Kölner Stadt-Anzeiger* 29 May.
- Pohlmann, Marianna. 1979. “Wer war Elisabeth Langgässer?”. *Die Presse* 10/11 May.
- Popular Memory Group. 1982. “Popular Memory: Theory, Politics, Method”, in Richard Johnson et al., eds. *Making Histories: Studies In History-Writing and Politics*. London: Hutchinson, 205-252.
- Porter, Charles A. 1986. “Foreword”. *Yale French Studies* 71, 1-14.
- Prümm, Karl. 1977. ““Die Zukunft ist vergeßlich”: Der antifaschistische Widerstand in der deutschen Literatur nach 1945”, in Hans Wagener, ed. *Gegenwartsliteratur und Drittes Reich: Deutsche Autoren in der Auseinandersetzung mit der Vergangenheit*. Stuttgart: Reclam, 33-68.
- Räkel, Marie-Elisabeth. 1999. “Antigone: Zum Tod von Grete Weil”, *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung* 28 May.
- Rahe, Thomas. 1993. “Jüdische Religiosität in den nationalsozialistischen Konzentrationslagern”. *Geschichte in Wissenschaft und Unterricht* 44:12, 87-101.
- Rainer, Petra M. 1998. “Rückkehr in das Land der Täter”. *Salzburger Nachrichten* 7 November <<http://www.salzburg.com/zeitung/98/11/07/kultur-22380.html>> (14 January 2002).
- Reese, Dagmar. 1981. “BDM – Zur Geschichte der weiblichen deutschen Jugend im Dritten Reich”, in Frauengruppe Faschismusforschung, ed. *Mutterkreuz und Arbeitsbuch: Zur Geschichte der Frauen in der Weimarer Republik und im Nationalsozialismus*. Frankfurt am Main: Fischer, 163-188.
- _____. 1989. *Straff, aber nicht stramm – herb, aber nicht derb: Zur Vergesellschaftung von Mädchen durch den Bund Deutscher Mädel im sozialkulturellen Vergleich zweier Milieus*. Weinheim: Beltz.

- _____. 1995. "The BDM Generation: A Female Generation in Transition from Dictatorship to Democracy", in Mark Roseman, ed. *Generations in Conflict: Youth Revolt and Generation Formation in Germany 1770-1969*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 227-246.
- Reich, Ines. 1994. "Geteilter Widerstand: Die Tradierung des deutschen Widerstandes in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland und der DDR". *Zeitschrift für Geschichtswissenschaft* 42, 635-643.
- Reichmann, Eva. 2000. "Jüdische Figuren in österreichischer und bundesdeutscher Literatur der 1980er und 1990er Jahre – der schwierige Weg jüdischer und nichtjüdischer Autoren aus dem mentalen Ghetto", in Pol O'Dochartaigh, ed. *Jews in German Literature Since 1945: German-Jewish Literature?*. Amsterdam G.A.: Rodopi. 237-250.
- Reimann, Kerstin E. 2001. "Sprachlosigkeit nach der Wende? Dokumentarisches Material von DDR-Autorinnen nach 1989", in Gerhard Fischer and David Roberts, eds. *Schreiben nach der Wende: Ein Jahrzehnt deutscher Literatur 1989-1999*. Tübingen: Stauffenberg 2001, 223-235.
- Reinhold, Ursula. 1996. "Elisabeth Langgässers Berliner Jahre: Christliches Weltbild und zeitgeschichtliche Erfahrung", in Ursula Heukenkamp, ed. *Unterm Notdach: Nachkriegsliteratur in Berlin 1945-1949*. Berlin: Erich Schmidt, 317-354.
- _____. 2000. "Dem alltäglichen Leben auf der Spur: Leben und Schreiben von Elfriede Brüning. Anlässlich ihres 90. Geburtstages am 8. November". *Berliner LeseZeichen* 11 <http://www.berliner-leserzeichen.de/lesezeichen/Blz00_11/text02.htm> (2 August 2002).
- Reiter, Andrea. 2000. *Narrating the Holocaust*. Trans. by Patrick Camiller. London: Continuum.
- Remmler, Karen. 1994. "Engendering Bodies of Memory: Tracing the Genealogy of Identity in the Work of Esther Dischereit, Barbara Honigmann, and Irene Dische", in Sander L. Gilman and Karen Remmler, eds. *Reemerging Jewish Culture in Germany: Life and Literature Since 1989*. New York: New York University Press, 184-209.
- _____. 1995. "Gender Identities and the Remembrance of the Holocaust". *Women in German Yearbook* 10, 167-187.
- _____. 2002. "Orte des Eingedenkens in den Werken Barbara Honigmanns", in Sander L. Gilman and Hartmut Steinecke, eds. *Deutsch-jüdische Literatur der neunziger Jahre: Die Generation nach der Shoah*. Berlin: Erich Schmidt, 43-58.
- Reppen, Konrad. 1987. "Das Wesen des christlichen Widerstandes", in Wolfgang Frühwald and Heinz Hürten, eds. *Christliches Exil und christlicher Widerstand*. Regensburg: Pustet, 13-19.

- Reuter, Elke, and Detlev Hansel. 1997. *Das kurze Leben der VVN von 1947 bis 1953*. Berlin: Edition Ost.
- Rheinsberg, Anna. 1982. "Würde und Widerstand". *Emma* 8, 29-31.
- Rickard, Katie. 2005. "Remembering the Weisse Rose: Myth, Memory, National Identity". Ph.D. diss. University of Bath.
- Riley, Anthony W. 1987. "'Alles außen ist innen': Zu Leben und Werk Elisabeth Langgässers unter der Hitler-Diktatur. Mit einem Erstdruck des frühen Aufsatzes 'Die Welt vor den Toren der Kirche' (um 1925)", in Wolfgang Frühwald and Heinz Hürten, eds. *Christliches Exil und christlicher Widerstand*. Regensburg: Pustet, 186-224.
- _____. 1992. "Elisabeth Langgässer: Briefe 1924-1950", *Seminar* 28:1, 79-83.
- Ringelheim, Joan. 1985. "Women and the Holocaust: A Reconsideration of Research". *Signs* 10:4, 741-761.
- _____. 1992. "Verschleppung, Tod und Überleben: Nationalsozialistische Ghetto-Politik gegen jüdische Frauen und Männer im besetzten Polen", in Theresa Wobbe, ed. *Nach Osten: Verdeckte Spuren nationalsozialistischer Verbrechen*. Frankfurt am Main: Neue Kritik, 135-160.
- _____. 1997. "Genocide and Gender: A Split Memory", in Ronit Lentin, ed. *Gender and Catastrophe*. London: Zed Books, 18-33.
- Rinser, Luise. 1960. *Der Schwerpunkt*. Frankfurt am Main: Fischer, 93-94.
- _____. 1975. "Der Brief des Schriftstellers". *Deutsche Akademie für Sprache und Dichtung: Jahrbuch*, 107-112.
- _____. 1979. "Elisabeth Langgässer", in Landesbank Rheinland-Pfalz, ed. *Personen und Wirkungen: Biographische Essays*. Mainz: Krach, 345-356.
- _____. 1980. "Im Scheitern ist Erfüllung: Die Schriftstellerin Elisabeth Langgässer starb vor dreißig Jahren". *Die Zeit* 25 July.
- _____. 1990a. "Elisabeth Langgässer", in Hans-Rüdiger Schwab, ed. *An den Frieden glauben: Über Literatur, Politik und Religion*. Frankfurt am Main: Fischer, 55-72.
- _____. 1990b. "Rede anlässlich der Verleihung des Elisabeth-Langgässer-Literaturpreises in Alzey am 27.2.1988", in Karlheinz Müller, ed. *Elisabeth Langgässer: Eine biographische Skizze*. Darmstadt: Gesellschaft Hessischer Literaturfreunde, 199-205.
- Ritter, Gerhard. 1956. *Carl Goerdeler und die deutsche Widerstandsbewegung*. Stuttgart: DVA.
- Ritter, Gerhard. 1963. "Erfahrungen und Erlebnisse". *Notizen* 7:46, 27-34
- Rittermann, Hans. 1955. "...so viel berauschende Vergänglichkeit: Briefe 1926-50". Sender Freies Berlin, 1 April. Radio Transcript in Literaturarchiv Marbach, A: Langgässer, 70.3715.

- Rock, David. 1997. "Christoph Hein und Jurek Becker: Zwei kritische Autoren aus der DDR über die Wende und zum vereinten Deutschland". *German Life and Letters* 50:2, 182-200.
- Rollett, Edwin. 1954. "Elisabeth Langgässer: ...soviel berauschende Vergänglichkeit". RAV AG Wien, 20 May. Radio Transcript in Literaturarchiv Marbach, A: Langgässer, 70.3719.
- Rosenberg, Dorothy. 1983. "On Beyond Superwoman", in Margy Gerber et al., eds. *The Conflict in GDR Culture and Society*. New York: Lanham, 87-199.
- Rosenhaft, Eve. 1990. "The Use of Remembrance: The Legacy of the Communist Resistance in the German Democratic Republic", in Francis R. Nicosia and Lawrence D. Stokes, eds. *Germans Against Nazism: Nonconformity, Opposition and Resistance in the Third Reich*, New York: Berg, 369-388.
- Rosenthal, Gabriele. 1987. "...Wenn alles in Scherben fällt...": *Von Leben und Sinnwelt der Kriegsgeneration*. Opladen: Leske + Budrich.
- Rosiejka, Gert. 1986. *Die Rote Kapelle: "Landesverrat" als anti-faschistischer Widerstand*. Hamburg: Ergebnisse.
- Rothfels, Hans. 1949. *Die deutsche Opposition gegen Hitler: Eine Würdigung*. Krefeld: Scherpe.
- Runge, Anita, and Lieselotte Steinbrügge. 1991. "Einleitung", in Anita Runge and Lieselotte Steinbrügge, eds. *Die Frau im Dialog: Studien zur Theorie und Geschichte des Briefes*. Stuttgart: Metzler, 7-11.
- Ryan, Mary P. 1992. "Gender and Public Access: Women's Politics in Nineteenth-Century America", in Craig Calhoun, ed. *Habermas and the Public Sphere*. Cambridge MA: MIT, 259-288.
- Sabrow, Martin, ed. 2000. *Geschichte als Herrschaftsdiskurs: Der Umgang mit der Vergangenheit in der DDR*. Cologne: Böhlau.
- Salzborn, Samuel. 2002. "Kollektive Unschuld", *Freitag* 26 April.
- Schaefer, Oda. 1970. *Auch wenn Du träumst gehen die Uhren: Erinnerungen*. München: R. Piper.
- Schäfer, Hans Dieter. 1990. "Lust und Tod in eins gesetzt: Morgen wäre Elisabeth Langgässer 70 Jahre alt geworden. Ein unerforschtes Kapitel deutscher Literatur", in Karlheinz Müller, ed. *Elisabeth Langgässer: Eine biographische Skizze*. Darmstadt: Gesellschaft Hessischer Literaturfreunde, 191-194.
- Schaumann, Caroline. 1999. "Women Revisit the 'Third Reich': Autobiographical Writings by Melita Maschmann, Christa Wolf, and Eva Zeller". *glossen* 6 <www.omega.dickinson.edu/glossen/> (2 June 2001).

- Schilde, Kurt. 1995. *Im Schatten der "Weißen Rose": Jugendopposition gegen den Nationalsozialismus im Spiegel der Forschung (1945 bis 1989)*. Frankfurt am Main: Lang.
- Schiller, Dieter. 1987. "Drama zwischen Gott und Satan: Auseinandersetzung mit dem Faschismus. Elisabeth Langgässer: 'Das unauslöschliche Siegel'", in Sigrid Bock and Manfred Hahn, ed. *Erfahrung Nazideutschland: Romane in Deutschland 1933-1945: Analysen*. Berlin: Aufbau, 412-465.
- Schirmbeck, Heinrich. 1977. "Das Dilemma Elisabeth Langgässers". *Frankfurter Hefte* 32, 50-58.
- Schirnding, Albert von. 1998. "Antigones Schwester: Grete Weil erinnert sich". *Süddeutsche Zeitung* 13 April.
- _____. 1999. "Überleben als Thema: Zum Tod der Schriftstellerin Grete Weil". *Süddeutsche Zeitung* 27 May.
- Schmidt, Marianne. 1994. "Kollidierende Wahrheiten: Erinnerungen von Elfriede Brüning". *Neues Deutschland* 15 March.
- Schmidt, Ricarda. 1992. "Im Schatten der Titanin: Minor GDR Women Writers: Justly Neglected, Unrecognised or Repressed?", in Axel Goodbody and Dennis Tate, ed. *Geist und Macht: Writers and the State in the GDR*. Amsterdam G.A.: Rodopi, 151-162.
- _____. 2000. "GDR Women Writers: Ways of Writing For, Within and Against Socialism", in Jo Catling, ed. *A History of Women's Writing in Germany, Austria and Switzerland*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 190-199.
- Schmitz, Anna Marie. 1963. "Das Fazit einer Führerin: Melitta [sic] Maschmanns Rechenschaftsbericht". *Stuttgarter Zeitung* 18 June.
- Schoepke, Karl. 1972. "Sie gehörte zur Roten Kapelle: Das kämpferische und hoffnungsvolle Leben der Antifaschistin und Buchhändlerin Eva Maria Buch". *Börsenblatt für den deutschen Buchhandel* 50, 943-945.
- Scholder, Klaus. 1963. "Zwanzig Jahre danach". *Notizen* 7:46, 48-50.
- Schramm, Wilhelm Ritter von. 1967. *Verrat im Zweiten Weltkrieg: Vom Kampf der Geheimdienste in Europa*. Dusseldorf: Econ.
- Schröder, Julia. 1999. "Wunde Auschwitz: Zum Tod der Autorin Grete Weil". *Stuttgarter Zeitung* 27 May.
- Schroeter, Sabina. 1994. *Die Sprache der DDR im Spiegel ihrer Literatur: Studien zum DDR-typischen Wortschatz*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Schüler, Barbara. 2000. "Im Geiste der Gemordeten...": Die "Weiße Rose" und ihre Wirkung in der Nachkriegszeit. Paderborn: Schöningh.
- Schütz, Erhard. 1998. "Langeweile, Lügen und Geschlechterkämpfe". *Freitag* 12 June.

- Schwerbrock, Wolfgang. 1980. "Literatur nach Auschwitz: Die Schriftstellerin Elisabeth Langgässer (1899-1950)". Hessischer Rundfunk, 21 October. Transcript in Literaturarchiv Marbach, RFS: AA.
- Seehaus, Gertrud. 1991. "Ein deutsches Schicksal: Die Briefe der Elisabeth Langgässer in zwei Bänden", Deutsche Welle, 4 July. Radio Transcript in Literaturarchiv Marbach, RFS: AA.
- _____. 1994. "Gläubiges Schreiben in der Zeit des Ungeistes". *Deutsches Allgemeines Sonntagsblatt* 4 November.
- Seewald, Berthold. 1992. "Zwischen Verhaftung und Tod: NS-Widerstandskämpfer oder Verräter? Der Spionagering 'Rote Kapelle'". *Die Welt* 31 August.
- Segev, Tom. 1991. *The Seventh Million: The Israelis and the Holocaust*. Trans. by Haim Watzman. New York: Henry Holt.
- Seiler, Bernd W. 1994. "Keine Kunst? Um so besser! Über Erinnerungsliteratur zum Dritten Reich", in Jörg Drews, ed. *Vergangene Gegenwart – gegenwärtige Vergangenheit: Studien, Polemiken und Laudationes zur deutschsprachigen Literatur 1960-1994*. Bielefeld: Aisthesis, 203-224.
- Seligmann, Rafael. 1994. "What Keeps the Jews in Germany Quiet?" in Sander L. Gilman and Karen Remmler, eds. *Reemerging Jewish Culture in Germany: Life and Literature Since 1989*. New York: New York University Press, 173-183.
- Setzwein, Bernhard. 1990. *Käuze, Ketzer, Komödianten: Literaten in Bayern*. Pfaffenhofen: Ludwig.
- Siek, Erich. 1950. "Damit Du weiterlebst". *Der Bibliothekar* 4, 96.
- Silberman, Marc. 1998. "Whose Story Is This? Rewriting the Literary History of the GDR", in Jost Hermand and Marc Silberman, eds. *Contentious Memories: Looking Back at the GDR*. New York: Lang, 1998, 25-57.
- Skare, Roswitha. 2001. "'Real life within the false one': Manifestations of East German Identity in Post-Reunification Texts", in Laurence McFalls and Lothar Probst, eds. *After the GDR: New Perspectives on the Old GDR and the Young Länder*. Amsterdam G.A.: Rodopi, 185-201.
- Smith, Sidonie. 1987. *A Poetics of Women's Autobiography: Marginality and the Fictions of Self-Representation*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Spelman, Elizabeth. 1990. *Inessential Woman: Problems of Exclusion in Feminist Thought*. London: The Women's Press.
- Soldat, Hans-Georg. 1997. "Die Wende in Deutschland im Spiegel der zeitgenössischen deutschen Literatur". *German Life and Letters* 50:2, 133-154.

- Steffahn, Harald. 1992. *Die Weiße Rose: Mit Selbstzeugnissen und Bilddokumenten*. Reinbek bei Hamburg: Rowohlt.
- Steinbach, Peter. 1989. "Die 'Rote Kapelle' – ein Vergleichsfall für die Widerstandsgeschichte". *Deutsches Allgemeines Sonntagsblatt* 1 September.
- _____. 1990. "Die 'Rote Kapelle' – ein Vergleichsfall für die Widerstandsgeschichte", in Evangelisches Bildungswerk, ed. *Die Widerstandsorganisation Schulze-Boysen-Harnack – "Die Rote Kapelle"*. Berlin: Evangelisches Bildungswerk, 79-85.
- _____. 1993a. "Die Rote Kapelle – 50 Jahre danach". *Zeitschrift für Geschichtswissenschaft* 41, 771-780.
- _____. 1993b. "'Erinnerung – aktives Gedenken': Annäherung an den Widerstand", in *Die "Weiße Rose" und das Erbe des deutschen Widerstands. Münchner Gedächtnisvorlesungen*. Munich: Beck, 132-151.
- _____. 1994. "Widerstand gegen den Nationalsozialismus", in Peter Steinbach and Johannes Tuchel, eds. *Widerstand gegen den Nationalsozialismus*. Berlin: Landeszentrale für politische Bildungsarbeit, 15-26.
- Steinecke, Hartmut. 2002a. "'Deutsch-Jüdische' Literatur heute: Die Generation nach der Shoah. Zur Einführung", in Sander L. Gilman and Hartmut Steinecke, eds. *Deutsch-jüdische Literatur der neunziger Jahre: Die Generation nach der Shoah*. Berlin: Erich Schmidt, 9-16.
- _____. 1995a. "Die Harnack/ Schulze-Boysen-Organisation". Gedenkstätte Deutscher Widerstand Berlin, Material 17.1, 5/95/3.
- _____. 1995b. "Die Harnack/ Schulze-Boysen-Organisation: Die Widerstandskämpferinnen". Gedenkstätte Deutscher Widerstand Berlin, Material 17.5, 5/95/2.
- _____. 2002b. "'Geht jetzt wieder alles von vorne los?': Deutsch-jüdische Literatur der 'zweiten Generation' und die Wende", in Sander L. Gilman and Hartmut Steinecke, eds. *Deutsch-jüdische Literatur der neunziger Jahre: Die Generation nach der Shoah*. Berlin: Erich Schmidt, 162-173.
- Steinhausen, Ursula. 1984. "Zwiespalt zwischen Leben und Schreiben: Elfriede Brünings 'Wie andere Leute auch', Mitteldeutscher Verlag, Halle-Leipzig". *Neue deutsche Literatur* 32:2, 154-157.
- Stephenson, Jill. 1982. "Middle Class Women and National Socialist 'Service'". *History* 67, 32-44.
- Stern, Frank. 1991. *Im Anfang war Auschwitz: Antisemitismus und Philosemitismus im deutschen Nachkrieg*. Gerlingen: Bleicher.
- Stern, Heiko. 2000. "Sprache zwischen Exil und Identität: Die Konstitution von Heimat durch Sprache bei Elisabeth Augustin", in Pol O'Dochartaigh, ed. *Jews in German Literature since 1945: German-Jewish Literature?* Amsterdam G.A.: Rodopi, 77-94.

- Stern, J.P. 1958. "The White Rose". *German Life and Letters* 11:2, 81-101.
- _____. 1991. "The White Rose", in Hinrich Siefken, ed. *Die Weiße Rose: Student Resistance to National Socialism 1942/1943. Forschungs-ergebnisse und Erfahrungsberichte. A Nottingham Symposium*. Nottingham: University of Nottingham Press, 11-36.
- Strobl, Ingrid. 1994. *Das Feld des Vergessens: Jüdischer Widerstand und 'Vergangenheitsbewältigung'*. Berlin: Edition ID Archiv.
- Stromberg, Kyra. 1998. "Der ungeheuere Verlust einer Lebensart". *Badische Zeitung* 3 June.
- Sturm, Vilma. 1963. "Fruchtbare Reue". *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung* 23 March.
- Stutz, Elfriede. 1957. "Über Elisabeth Langgässer". *Mädchenbildung und Frauenschaffen* 7, 103-116.
- Sugolowsky, Joseph. 1990. "Holocaust and Autobiography: Wiesel, Friedländer, Pizar", in Randolph L. Braham *Reflections of the Holocaust in Art and Literature*. New York: Columbia University Press, 131-146.
- Susman, Margarete. 1968. *Das Buch Hiob und das Schicksal des jüdischen Volkes*. Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder.
- Swindells, Julia. 1995. "Introduction", in Julia Swindells, ed. *The Uses of Autobiography*. London: Taylor and Francis, 1-12.
- Tantow, Lutz. 1988. "Kindheit im KZ: Lebensgeschichte einer Jüdin – im Saarland neu erschienen". *Saarbrückener Zeitung* 15 September.
- Tate, Dennis. 1997. "Günter de Bruyn: The 'gesamtdeutsche Konsensfigur' of Post-Unification Literature?", *German Life and Letters* 50:2, 201-213.
- Taterka, Thomas. 2000. "'Buchenwald liegt in der Deutschen Demokratischen Republik': Grundzüge des Lagerdiskurses der DDR", in Birgit Dahlke, Martina Langermann and Thomas Taterka, eds. *LiteraturGesellschaft DDR: Kanonkämpfe und ihre Geschichte(n)*. Stuttgart: Metzler, 312-365.
- Tauchel, Theodor. 1963. "Fazit – oder von Eichmann bis Maschmann". *Der Literat* 16 September.
- Taylor Allen, Ann. 1997. "The Holocaust and the Modernization of Gender: A Historiographical Essay". *Central European History* 30, 349-364.
- Thalman, Rita. 1988. "Frauen im Dritten Reich: Autobiographische Zeugnisse", in Gisela Brinker-Gabler, ed. *Deutsche Literatur von Frauen: Zweiter Band. 19. und 20. Jahrhundert*. Munich: Beck, 293-304.
- Theunissen, Gert H. 1949. "The Way Out of the Wilderness: Some Remarks on Present Day German Literature Provoked by Elisabeth Langgässer's Novel *Das Unauslöschliche Siegel*". *German Life and Letters* 2:3, 194-200.

- Timm, Angelika. 1997. *Hammer, Zirkel, Davidstern: Das gestörte Verhältnis der DDR zu Zionismus und Staat Israel*. Bonn: Bouvier.
- Tuchel, Johannes. 1993. "Die 'Rote Kapelle' im Widerstand gegen den Nationalsozialismus. Anmerkungen zum Forschungsstand 1993", in Kurt Schilde, ed. *Eva Maria Buch und die 'Rote Kapelle': Erinnerungen an den Widerstand gegen den Nationalsozialismus*. Berlin: Overall, 143-151.
- _____. 1998. "Weltanschauliche Motivationen in der Harnack/Schulze-Boysen-Organisation ('Rote Kapelle')". *Kirchliche Zeitgeschichte* 1, 267-292.
- Usinger, Fritz. 1954. "Langgässer: ...soviel berauschende Vergänglichkeit. Briefe 1926-1950". Baden-Baden, 2 May. Radio Transcript in Literaturarchiv Marbach, A: Langgässer, 70.3736.
- Verhoeven, Michael, and Mario Krebs. 1983. *Die Weiße Rose: Der Widerstand Münchener Studenten gegen Hitler. Informationen zum Film*. Frankfurt am Main: Fischer.
- Verner, Paul. 1954. "Die Geschwister Scholl", in Zentralrat der Freien Deutschen Jugend, ed. *Deutschlands Junge Garde: 50 Jahre Arbeiterjugendbewegung*. Berlin: Neues Leben.
- Villain, Jean. 1998. "Zeugin des schier Unsäglichen". *Neues Deutschland* 26/29 March.
- Vinke, Hermann. 1980. *Das kurze Leben der Sophie Scholl: Mit einem Interview von Ilse Aichinger*. Ravensburg: Maier.
- Vossler, Karl. 1947. *Gedenkrede für die Opfer an der Universität München*. Munich: Pflaum.
- Wall, Renate. 1995. *Lexikon deutschsprachiger Schriftstellerinnen im Exil: 1933-1945*. Freiburg: Kore.
- Wallace, Ian. 1991. "Deutscher Literaturstreit aus britischer Sicht". *Neue deutsche Literatur* 39:3, 150-155.
- Wallach Scott, Joan. 1988. "Gender: A Useful Category of Historical Analysis", in Joan Wallach Scott, ed. *Gender and the Politics of History*. New York, Columbia University Press, 28-50.
- Wallmann, Anneliese, ed. 1967. *Das Brandscheit: Ein Stück Wegs mit dem alten Gottesvolk; Dichtungen und Berichte*. Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt.
- Walser, Karin. 1984. "Frauen als Opfer: Heimliche Verleugnung des Geschlechtsunterschieds und Vermeidung der Auseinandersetzung mit weiblicher Macht", in Susann Heenen, ed. *Frauenstrategien*. Frankfurt am Main: Neue Kritik, 49-64.
- Wassermann, Annette. 1997. "Verrat einer Mutter: Eine Studie zu Elisabeth Langgässer". *Der Tagesspiegel* 7 December.
- Weedon, Chris. 1995. *Feminist Practice and Poststructuralist Theory*. Oxford: Blackwell.

- Wegner, Matthias. 1999. "Die Autorin der 'Stunde Null': Zum 100. Geburtstag von Elisabeth Langgässer". *Neue Zürcher Zeitung* 23 February.
- Wehinger, Franz Josef. 1994. "Eine Dichterin in den Politik-Verstrickungen ihrer Zeit". *Börsenblatt* 49, 30-31.
- Weigel, Sigrid. 1987. *Die Stimme der Medusa: Schreibweisen in der Gegenwartsliteratur von Frauen*. Dülmen-Hiddingsel: Tende.
- Weigel, Sigrid. 1995. "Der Ort von Frauen im Gedächtnis des Holocaust: Symbolisierungen, Zeugenschaft und kollektive Identität". *Sprache im technischen Zeitalter* 33:135, 260-268.
- Weisenborn, Günther. 1981. *Der lautlose Aufstand: Bericht über die Widerstandsbewegung des deutschen Volkes*. Frankfurt am Main: Röderberg.
- Weiss, Peter. 1968. "Meine Ortschaft", in *Atlas: zusammengestellt von deutschen Autoren*. Munich: dtv, 27-36.
- _____. 1981. *Die Ästhetik des Widerstands: Roman*, Vol. 3. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.
- Weitzman, Leonore J. and Dalia Ofer. 1998. "The Role of Gender in the Holocaust", in Dalia Ofer and Lenore J. Weitzman, eds. *Women in the Holocaust*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1-18.
- Weniger, Erich. 1954. "Die Weiße Rose". *Die Sammlung* 8:4, 161-166.
- Weyrather, Irmgard. 1981. "Jugend im deutschen Faschismus: Fünf Frauen schrieben ihre Erinnerungen". *Literatur und Erfahrung* 5, 75-90.
- Wickert, Christl. 1992. "Frauenwiderstand? Überlegungen zu einem vernachlässigten Thema am Beispiel Düsseldorfs und Essens", in Anselm Faust, ed. *Verfolgung und Widerstand im Rheinland und in Westfalen 1933-1945*. Cologne: Kohlhammer.
- Wieskerstrauch, Liz. 1988. "'Ich habe Auschwitz, wie andere Tb oder Krebs'". *Anschläge* 14, 22-26.
- _____. 1988. *Schreiben zwischen Unbehagen und Aufklärung: Literarische Portraits der Gegenwart*. Weinheim: Quadriga.
- Windaus-Walser, Karin. 1988. "Gnade der weiblichen Geburt? Zum Umgang der Frauenforschung mit Nationalsozialismus und Antisemitismus". *Feministische Studien* 6:1, 102-115.
- Wippermann, Wolfgang. 1981. *Die Berliner Gruppe Baum und der jüdische Widerstand*. Berlin: Informationszentrum Berlin, Gedenk- und Bildungsstätte Stauffenbergstraße.
- Wobbe, Theresa. 1992. "Das Dilemma der Überlieferung: Zu politischen und theoretischen Kontexten von Gedächtniskonstruktionen über den Nationalsozialismus", in Theresa Wobbe, ed. *Nach Osten: Verdeckte*

- Spuren nationalsozialistischer Verbrechen*. Frankfurt am Main: Neue Kritik, 13-44.
- Wohmann, Gabriele. 1963. "Zorn über BDM-Memoiren". *Süddeutsche Zeitung* 20 August 1963.
- Wulf, Joseph. 1989. *Kultur im Dritten Reich: Literatur und Dichtung. Eine Dokumentation*. Frankfurt am Main: Ullstein.
- Young, James E. 1988. *Writing and Rewriting the Holocaust: Narrative and the Consequences of Interpretation*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Zetzsche, Cornelia. 1998. "Land der Mörder, Land der Sprache: Zeugin des Schmerzes. Die Autobiographie der Grete Weil". *Der Tagesspiegel* 10 May.
- Zimmer Lauman, Angela G. 1994. "Elisabeth Langgässer (1899-1950) als christliche Dichterin und Schöpferin christlicher Frauengestalten". Ph.D diss. University of Maryland.
- Zimmermann, Annemarie. 1963. "Melitta [sic] Maschmann: Fazit". *Gewerkschaftliche Monatshefte* 7, 444-446.
- Zimmermann, Moshe. 1994. "Israels Umgang mit dem Holocaust", in Rolf Steininger, ed. *Der Umgang mit dem Holocaust: Europa-USA-Israel*. Vienna: Böhlau, 387-406.
- Zipes, Jack. 1994. "The Contemporary German Fascination for Things Jewish: Toward a Minor Jewish Culture", in Sander L. Gilman and Karen Remmler, eds. *Reemerging Jewish Culture in Germany: Life and Literature Since 1989*. New York: New York University Press, 15-45.
- Zweig, Arnold. 1998. *Bilanz der deutschen Judenheit 1933: Ein Versuch*. Berlin: Aufbau.
- [n.a.]. 1932. "Der Staat hat für die Hebung der Volksgesundheit zu sorgen durch den Schutz des Mutter und des Kindes." Programme der NSDAP, in *Nationalsozialismus und Frauenfragen: Material zur Information und Bekämpfung*. Berlin: [n.pub.].
- [n.a.]. 1950. "Elisabeth Langgässer". *Darmstädter Tageblatt* 16 October.
- [n.a.]. 1963a. [n.t.]. *Der Spiegel* 20 May.
- [n.a.]. 1963b. "Melita Maschmann: Fazit". *Konkret* 4, 10.
- [n.a.]. 1963c. "Melitta [sic] Maschmann: Fazit. Kein Rechtfertigungsversuch". *Schwarz auf Weiß* 6, 26.
- [n.a.]. 1969. "'Rote Kapelle' gegen braune Diktatur: Helden des deutschen antifaschistischen Kampfes". *Horizont* 44, 3-4.
- [n.a.]. 1972. "Vom Rosenkranz zur Roten Kapelle". *Sonntag* 27 August.
- [n.a.]. 1976. "Nur noch ein Gott kann uns retten". *Der Spiegel* 31 May.
- [n.a.]. 1982. *Überblicksanalyse: Biographische Literatur*. Leipzig: Urania.
- [n.a.]. 1983. *Frauen unterm Hakenkreuz*. Berlin (West): Elefanten Press.

- [n.a.]. 1987. "Die 'Rote Kapelle'", in *Der Deutsche Widerstand 1933-1945*. Informationen zur politischen Bildung 160.
- [n.a.]. 1994a. "Zeitdokument besonderer Art". *Märkische Oderzeitung* 6 October.
- [n.a.]. 1994b. "Elfriede Brünings Biographie: Schriftsteller-Leben". *Aachener Nachrichten* 25 June.
- [n.a.]. 1995. "Alltag Ost". *Emma* 3, 65.
- [n.a.]. 1998. "Eine Geschichte des Jahrhunderts: Eindrücklich. Die Erinnerungen der Grete Weil". *Die Presse* 21 April.
- [n.a.]. 1999. "Gestorben". *die tageszeitung* 28 May. <<http://www.taz.de/tpl/1999/05/28/a0074.nf/stext?Name=1s03757aaa&idx=1>> (29 July 1999).
- [n.a.]. Agimos. <<http://www.agimos.de/main/./der.htm>> (5 September 2000).
- [n.a.]. 1999. "Adam-Kuckhoff-Platz". *Edition Luisenstadt*. <<http://www.luise-berlin.de/Strassen/Bez11a/A32.htm>> (16 February 2001).
- [n.a.]. "Verbrechen der Wehrmacht: Dimensionen des Vernichtungskrieges". <<http://www.verbrechen-der-wehrmacht.de/>> (16 May 2002).
- [n.a.]. Das Adolf Grimme Institut. <<http://www.grimme-institut.de/scripts-/institut/institut.html>> (22 June 2002).