

GOOD BYE, LENIN! AUFWIEDERSEHEN GDR

On the Social Life of Socialism

*Daphne Berdahl*¹

In the seventeen years since its collapse, socialism has become the object of significant historical curiosity, memory making, and contestation. In addition to more public sites like the Museum of Communism in Prague (next to a McDonald's) or the Budapest Statue Park and House of Terror (to name just a few examples), the cultural landscape of post-Socialist memory also includes private exhibitions of Socialist material culture or Communist kitsch (depending on the context and the eye of the beholder) (Ten Dyke 2001; Berdahl 2005), published personal memoirs (Hensel 2002), mass-mediated images in film or television, commemorations, silences, and an ongoing dynamic between individual biographies and collective histories—between personal narratives and public re-presentations. Of course socialism was being remade into memory from the very beginnings of its end, as new histories were created out of unsanctioned memories of the past (Watson 1994), in emergent nationalizing projects (Wanner 1998), and in symbolic acts of legitimizing new states (Verdery 1999). In the realm of memory, then, socialism has had a complex and often unpredictable social life.

My aim in this chapter is to reflect upon the social life of socialism by focusing on memory and the present in a context with which I am most familiar: post-Wall Germany. In his work on commodities in cultural perspective, Appadurai has shown that the social life of things is subject to longer-term shifts in value and demand (Appadurai 1986). I am arguing that the same processual approach is relevant for understanding the production and circulation of historical memory: the social life of socialism has been, and continues to be, a process informed by large-scale political shifts, economic developments, and cultural dynamics.

My use of the concept of memory refers to practices, performances, representations, and other modes of shaping images of the past. Memory, although it may be a "reservoir" of history (Watson 1994), is not the same as history. Instead, history may be viewed as a particular configu-

ration of historical representation—usually in written or narrative form, including “official histories” of the Socialist states—that itself is open to questions of interpretation and interpretive authority (Cohen 1994: 130). Memory, on the other hand, is a more infinitely malleable, contestable, interactive, and social phenomenon. Produced and constructed on a variety of fronts, memory can be personal as well as public, individual as well as collective. Museums, commemorations, and monuments give an important physicality to memory, but they are not necessarily separate from history; indeed such representations may also entail in a dynamic relationship between both memory and history, between public and private. (See also Cohen 1994; Connerton 1989; Davis and Starn 1989; Huyssen 1995; Watson 1994.) Whether deployed strategically in everyday practices or constructed through mass-mediated narratives and images, memory puts the past into dialogue with the present. To what ends, we should then ask, and with what effects?

I attempt to address these and other questions through a reading of the wildly successful German film, *Good Bye, Lenin!*, released in 2003. I am an anthropologist with admittedly no training in film theory, so I ask for readers’ patience as I make my way through this analysis. But, I should add, as an anthropologist, this film is a kind of “in your face” ethnographic object that cannot be ignored. Its production and reception in a post-Wall Germany still fraught with East-West tensions both reflect and constitute historically specific negotiations, discourses, and debates about the meanings of memory, nostalgia, and the politics of the present. The film also represents the apex of the post-Socialist cultural phenomenon known in Germany as *Ostalgie*, to which I shall return later.

Virtually Existing Socialism

Good Bye, Lenin! is the story of an East German family during the tumultuous year of the *Wende* (“turning point,” the term used in referring to the events surrounding the fall of the Berlin Wall). The mother, Christiane, is a devout and active party loyalist who has been deeply committed to the Socialist state since the departure of her husband for West Germany in 1978. Eleven years later, in October 1989, she is on her way to celebrate the fortieth anniversary of the GDR with party dignitaries and observes her young adult son, Alex, clash with police during a prodemocracy protest march. The trauma of seeing her son among the demonstrators, combined with the shock of witnessing the brutality of the regime, causes her to have a heart attack and sends her into a

coma for the next eight months. While she is sleeping, the Berlin Wall falls, Eastern Germans embrace Western capitalism and consumerism, and Germany is catapulted toward reunification. Alex loses his job in the state-owned television repair service and begins selling satellite dishes, while his sister starts sleeping with a *Wessi* (West German) and abandons her studies in order to work at Burger King. When Christiane emerges from her coma, doctors warn her children that any unexpected shock could complicate her recovery and potentially prove fatal. Her son Alex thus resolves to recreate the GDR in her bedroom, concealing from his mother all the changes of the past eight months. Western-style Ikea furniture is hastily replaced with East German particleboard, Venetian blinds are pulled down and polyester curtains are put up, and the Socialist iconographic hero Che Guevara goes back up on the mustard-colored floral wallpaper. Within this seventy-nine-square-meter apartment, then, the GDR lives on.

Alex's efforts to make time stand still grow increasingly complicated as his bed-ridden mother's health improves. With East German products gone from the store shelves following the currency union in July of 1990 when West German companies took over distribution networks, he frantically searches for familiar goods, repackaging foodstuffs and refilling pickle jars from the recycling bin with Dutch imports to satisfy his mother's craving for Spreewald gherkins. He enlists friends and family members to participate in the lie: demanding that visitors wear Eastern German clothing, paying former pupils to perform pioneer songs for her birthday, and encouraging a neighbor to take dictations of *Eingaben* (legally sanctioned complaints) to state authorities, for which she had been well known before her illness. With the help of an aspiring West German filmmaker friend from his new job, Alex fabricates GDR newscasts for his mother to view on a TV that is linked to a VCR machine in an adjacent room.

The dizzying pace of change and a few puzzling encounters make it progressively challenging to continue his fantasy, but whenever his mother comes close to figuring out the truth, Alex invents a plausible explanation. The unfurling of a Coca-Cola banner on a nearby building that had been draped in a Communist Party red banner just months before—a powerful visual metaphor embodying the cultural and political upheaval—is explained in the next day's fake news bulletin as being a result of a recent discovery that the formula for Coke was actually an East German invention. The presence of Westerners in East Berlin is attributed to a decision by President Erich Honecker to grant asylum to those disillusioned with capitalism. With his filmmaker friend posing as the news anchor, the fictitious *Aktuelle Kamera* report explains:

Unemployment, dire prospects for the future, and the increasing electoral success of the neo-Nazi *Republikaner* have moved the clearly unsettled West German citizens to turn their backs on capitalism and attempt a new beginning in the worker and peasant state.

Several months into his charade Alex realizes that the fantasy is as much for himself as for his mother, admitting that "the GDR I created for my mother was increasingly becoming the GDR that I might have wished for myself."

Indeed, Alex ultimately rewrites the end of the Cold War, casting communism as the victor. In his final fake newscast, intended to put an end to his deception by informing his ailing mother that the border between East and West Germany is gone, Alex creates a narrative in which Erich Honecker resigns and his childhood hero, the cosmonaut Sigmund Jähn, assumes leadership of the party and the GDR. Alex solicits Jähn's help after a chance encounter with him (or a convincing doppelgänger) as a taxi driver one evening. While the GDR national anthem plays in the background, Jähn delivers his scripted speech in Sachsen dialect (which had become identified with Eastern Germans and mocked in the West) to the nation:

Dear citizens of the GDR: Once you have experienced the miracle of seeing our planet from the cosmos, you see things differently. ... When viewed from outer space, this is a very small country, and yet thousands of people have come to us in the past year. People whom we used to see as the enemy and who want to live with us today. ... Socialism means not to be fenced in. Socialism means approaching others, living with other people. Not only to dream of a better world, but to make it come true. I have thus decided to open the borders of the GDR.

The anchor's commentary is juxtaposed with well-known footage of 9 November, with Germans dancing on the Berlin Wall and climbing up the Western side:

In the first hours since the borders opened, thousands of citizens from the Federal Republic of Germany have already taken the opportunity to visit the German Democratic Republic. Many want to stay. They are searching for an alternative to the brutal struggle for survival in the capitalist system. Not everyone wants to participate in the addiction to career and the terror of consumerism. Not everyone is made for the elbow society. These people want a different life. They realize that cars, videorecorders, and televisions are not everything. They are prepared to build a different life with nothing but goodwill, determination, and hope.

Christiane dies three days after Germany is reunified, blissfully unaware, Alex believes, of the truth. In a small ceremony of family and

friends, her ashes are scattered over Berlin by the kind of rocket ship that Alex used to play with as a child, a fitting and proper sendoff for his mother, his childhood, and his country.

The Long Goodbye

After its premiere in February 2003, *Good Bye, Lenin!* quickly became one of the most successful films in German movie history, breaking box-office records and garnering multiple national and international awards. Crowds flocked to see it in East and West (unlike the 1999 GDR retro film *Sonnenallee*, which was popular in Eastern Germany but criticized in the West for glorifying the Socialist regime); theaters were packed and shows regularly sold out. Critics talked about its “cathartic release” and attempted to find meaning in its unprecedented success: for some, the passage of time had allowed for enough critical distance to produce a “requiem for the failed Honecker state” or a “dirge for the century of communism” (Von Vestenberg 2003). For others, the film’s success could be explained by an enduring nostalgia for the Socialist past, or *Ostalgie*, a term that plays with the German words for East, *Ost*, and nostalgia, *Nostalgie*. While these are important observations (and I shall return to them momentarily), they fail to capture the multiplicity of meanings underlying this film as a cultural document and cultural event.

To begin with, there are several recurring themes in the film that make it particularly effective and resonant across generational and East-West divides. A major motif involves the tensions and gaps between appearance and reality, between fact and fiction. This theme invokes a dominant discourse about socialism and its demise: socialism collapsed, goes this argument, because of this ever-widening gap. The film’s central premise of the fabricated GDR that Alex creates for his mother is echoed in parallel stories of family secrets and lies: toward the end of her life, Christiane confesses to her children that their father had not fled to the West for another woman, as they had been led to believe, but that his departure had been planned with the intention of having the family follow him as soon as possible. After he was gone, she tells them, she lacked the courage to go through with the plan; his unopened letters to the children are hidden behind a cupboard in the kitchen. Another layer of the confusion between appearance and reality comes at the end of the film when it is revealed that, unbeknownst to Alex, his mother is aware and deeply appreciative of his charade.

It is the film’s central premise, however, that begins to explain its resonance by allowing for different readings and receptions. On the

one hand, the GDR is nothing but a façade or a childhood fantasy—an interpretation that would arguably confirm many perceptions and stereotypes among Eastern but mostly Western Germans. On the other hand, the sense of promise and possibility contained in Alex's phantasmagorical recreation of a GDR that never existed accesses for many Eastern Germans shared sentiments of loss and longing in the context of the broken promises and disillusionments of reunification. With very few exceptions, this nostalgia did not reflect a longing to return to the GDR, but a sense of lost possibilities and critiques of the present.

Dominant discourses of East-West relations are most effectively addressed in the film, however, by not addressing them explicitly. Indeed, reunification is celebrated as a joyful moment, with a newly reconfigured family from East and West (including the father from West Berlin with whom Alex has made contact, and the West German boyfriend who is the father of Alex's sister's baby). In Alex's new workplace, sales teams consist of one Eastern and one Western German, and his filmmaker friend and *Aktuelle Kamera* accomplice is a coworker from the West.

More effectively, however, it is the narrative device of a subplot focusing on Alex's childhood idol, the cosmonaut Sigmund Jähn, and the metaphor of space travel that is subtly suggestive of East-West dynamics. Jähn had been the first German to travel in space, a battleground of the Cold War, aboard Soyuz 31. It is a moment that Alex characterizes as the "GDR attaining a world standard"; it is also a moment that Alex connects to his father's flight to the West, for he learns of his father's departure while watching television coverage of Jähn's historic flight in space. The analogy between the West and outer space would be recognizable to many Eastern Germans, for whom West Germany before 1989 seemed to be, in a common phrase, "as far away as the moon." It is no coincidence, then, that Jähn is the apparent taxi driver who takes Alex to his father's home in West Berlin. Similarly, Jähn answers Alex's question about what it was like "up there" by simply replying "really nice, only a long way from home," a description that would echo a widespread and frequently articulated sentiment among Eastern Germans about having "emigrated without leaving home."

A leitmotif connected to this subplot concerns the children's television bedtime character, the *Sandmann*. Jähn brings the *Sandmann* with him on his voyage and Alex sends him off into space in a homemade rocketship. The figure also makes an appearance when Alex shows up at his father's house unannounced and finds himself watching the show with his father's young children. For many Eastern Germans, the *Sandmann* is a potent symbol and cultural icon. Under socialism, East Ger-

man school children were frequently subjected to the “*Sandmann Test*” until it became legal to watch Western television in 1971. An artefact of the Cold War waged on the front of mass media, both East and West German television aired their own brief children’s show, *Der Sandmann*, before the evening news. Following the show, a clock would appear on the screen until the beginning of the news broadcast. The West German clock had small lines in place of numbers, the East German clock small dots. In school, teachers would ask children if the clock after their “Sandman” had dots or lines, thus forcing children to reveal unwittingly whether parents were watching Western television. After 1989 the East German Sandman was one of the few cultural and political institutions that didn’t lose out to Western forms, and there are few Eastern Germans who will not mention with pride that “our” Sandman prevailed if the subject arises.

This kind of shared, insider knowledge works effectively to produce feelings of solidarity and belonging among Eastern German audiences. The film’s attention to detail, ranging from East German products and repeated references to GDR consumer culture to party rhetoric and Socialist icons excludes any viewer—real or imagined—who has not experienced socialism. In a context where, almost overnight, the value of Eastern Germans’ cultural capital plummeted—or, as a GDR trivia game explained, around 50 percent of the knowledge East Germans acquired during the course of a lifetime was rendered useless through sudden and unforeseen events—the portrayal of everyday Socialist objects and practices produced a privileged knowledge for those in the know. Although critics may have hailed the film for uniting Easterners and Westerners in laughter, *Ossis* and *Wessis* were frequently laughing at very different things. When describing their reactions to the film, for example, Eastern Germans I talked to often spoke with pride about moments when *Wessis* were unable to appreciate the humor in particular cultural references. Laughter—who laughed and at what—emerged as an important gauge of a newly recognized cultural competence, and quickly became a key topic of postfilm discussions and discourses.

In order to understand the film’s resonance with Eastern German audiences, however, it is most critical to point out how *Good Bye, Lenin!* gives expression to the largely unacknowledged and forgotten experiences and memories of Eastern Germans during a period of dizzying change. The complicated and often contradictory feelings of euphoria, bewilderment, possibility, and loss are captured in the film’s careful attention to detail, ranging from the disappearance of *Spreewaldgurken* to billboards in which Trabants morph into Western cars. As one audience member remarked, “Hopefully our fellow citizens from the old federal

states [Western Germany] will also see this film in order to understand how it really was." Similarly, another commented: "A film for every *Ossi* and those who want to learn more about us." When asked about the fact that the director was a *Wessi*, Eastern Germans often replied that he had clearly done his "homework" and deserved to be an "honorary *Ossi*."

The re-presentation of GDR culture at the moment of its vanishing relates to another dominant theme and cultural meaning of the movie as a ritual of farewell (cf. Ivy 1995). There are many goodbyes in this film: to childhood, family secrets, fantasies, a mother, a state. All of these converge in the mother as symbol, whose ashes are rocketed into space during a rooftop ceremony at the end of the film. An earlier symbolic gesture of letting go occurs in a scene where Alex tosses 30,000 marks of his mother's Eastern German currency, now valueless and un-exchangeable because of a missed deadline, from the roof, like confetti in the wind.

The film's most memorable farewell is, to borrow a phrasing from Katherine Verdery, a "corpse on the move" (Verdery 1999). In this key scene, Christiane ventures out of her reconstructed GDR (while Alex is sleeping) into an entirely new world, full of Western neighbors, consumer goods, automobiles, and advertisements. The influx of Western capitalism and consumer culture is set against a backdrop of Socialist waste, signified by heaps of discarded GDR furniture. A bewildered Christiane wanders through this unfamiliar landscape and observes the torso of a Lenin statue, an icon familiar to most inhabitants of the former Eastern bloc, being transported by helicopter across the East Berlin skyline. Lenin floats by, hand extended in a gesture of both ephemeral greeting and long goodbye. As her frantic children rush to rescue their mother from possible injury as well as from the shattering of an illusion, Lenin vanishes into the sunset.

Katherine Verdery has written eloquently about the political symbolism of dead bodies in the post-Socialist period, arguing that reburials of particular human remains and the dismantling of iconic statues have been widespread and important "foundational acts of new states" (Verdery 1999: 21). The image of Lenin in the film partakes of and comments on this larger iconoclasm, invoking not only earlier foundational acts of the new state, but providing a powerful visual metaphor for saying goodbye to an old, and, in some cases virtually lingering one.

Indeed, as I mentioned earlier, one explanation for the film's unprecedented success is its cultural meaning as a sendoff—for an imagined GDR, I would add, in whatever form. The film's director, Wolfgang Becker, acknowledged in an interview that there had been no time for a

proper funeral for the East German state. Other critics have expressed the hope that the film will put an end to East-West divisions, finally bringing together what belongs together. The actress Katrin Saß, a former GDR film star who plays Christiane, similarly said: "One should see in *Good Bye, Lenin!* how actors from East and West tell a story about our history. Perhaps we will finally succeed in putting this era [of division] behind us" (Saß 2008). Indeed, this might have been part of the intention behind a collective viewing of the film by 180 members of the German parliament, a "work outing" (*Betriebsausflug*) characterized by a headline in *Der Spiegel* as "The Bundestag Bids Farewell to Lenin" (Der Spiegel 2003).

Actually Existing Postsocialism

The cultural practices surrounding the film have not just been about saying goodbye, but are also about an *Aufwiedersehen* in the literal sense of the word (see you again). The premiere and success of *Good Bye, Lenin!* unleashed a new wave of *Ostalgie* throughout post-Wall Germany. Keeping with its tagline, "The GDR lives on," theaters across Eastern Germany were decorated with GDR paraphernalia. National and multinational movie theater chains featured displays of GDR memorabilia—old East German newspapers, party medallions and certificates, consumer goods—and often included a small living area (10 square meters) of "GDR." Theater employees and audience members donned young pioneer scarves, Free German Youth shirts, or NVA uniforms and were encouraged to bring in East German souvenirs; during the first week of the film's showing a theater in Berlin accepted admission in now defunct Eastern marks. A theater entrance in Leipzig was adorned with a Lenin bust from a building at the old trade fair (Messe), on loan from the collection of a *Wessi* who normally has it sitting in his garden alongside other objects of the vanished state.

In the aftermath of *Good Bye, Lenin!*'s success, *Ostalgie* has become an even more widespread merchandizing industry. *Ostalikers*, as practitioners of *Ostalgie* are called, can now rent out the film set and throw an *Ostalgie* Party. Local, national, and international retail businesses as well as Internet sites feature a seemingly endless supply of books, games, music, and other mementos, including a "GDR in a box" kit to "help you discover the *Ossi* in yourself," complete with Mocca-fix, plastic chicken egg-cups, and a *Neues Deutschland* newspaper. In the summer of 2004, *Ostshows* premiered on six major television networks featuring ice-skating princess Katarina Witt wearing a Free German

Youth shirt, a parade of Trabant cars, Communist Party songs and slogans, and other cultural references. For a brief period, there was serious discussion of building a GDR theme park in Eastern Berlin, complete with grumpy guards, Socialist songs piped throughout the park, and of course spluttering Trabant cars. *Ostalgie*, then, in its many manifestations, meanings, and practices, has become a highly visible cultural phenomenon in the actually existing post-Socialist landscape.

To dismiss this as history returned as farce, however, would ignore the historically specific cultural contexts and asymmetrical relations of power in which many such practices have emerged. As I have argued elsewhere, earlier forms of *Ostalgie* that emerged in the mid-1990's—including a reinvention, reproduction, and mass merchandising of East German products, and the collecting, cataloging, and "museumification" of GDR everyday life—captured feelings of profound loss, longing, and displacement in a period of intense social discord. *Ostalgie* in this sense echoed Kathleen Stewart's definition of nostalgia: "a cultural practice, not a given content. ... In positing a 'once was' in relation to a 'now,' it creates a frame for meaning, a means of dramatizing aspects of an increasingly fluid and unnamed social life" (Stewart 1988: 227).

While earlier sentiments and practices that transformed Socialist rhetoric and symbols into nostalgic icons endure, *Ostalgie* in its current incarnation is frequently dominated by a certain cynicism, irony, and parody. There is widespread awareness reflected in discourses about *Ostalgie*, for example, of the ironic fact that the bust of Lenin is now an "advertising gag" for the film, that many of these East German products are now often produced by Western German firms, sold by Western German Internet businesses, or stocked by Wal-Mart. In its hypercommercial and self-parodying form, then, current practices of *Ostalgie* celebrate and naturalize capitalism as the inevitable outcome of socialism's demise.

Quite predictably, the film *Good Bye, Lenin!* and the subsequent *Ostalgie* boom have reignited familiar debates about the meanings, memories, and representations of the Socialist past. One of the principal criticisms of *Ostalgie* is that it provides a means of eliding questions of complicity, responsibility, and accountability in relation to a burdened GDR past—in other words, that it glorifies what had been a brutal regime. While these observations raise legitimate concerns about representations of the past and thereby contribute to ongoing debates about historical memory, dismissals and attempts to belittle *Ostalgie* may also be viewed as part of a larger hegemonic project to devalue Eastern German critiques of the politics of reunification. More generally, the allegations of "mereness" and accusations of neglect, as well as the culturally

specific practices of *Ostalgie*, both reflect and constitute struggles over the control and appropriation of historical knowledge, shared memories, and personal recollections—all of which interact in highly complicated ways (cf. Lass 1994).

The anthropologist Caroline Humphrey has recently asked whether the category “postsocialism” still makes sense given the diverse range of post-Socialist contexts and trajectories (Humphrey 2001). It’s a reasonable question, and something people like us should probably think about. Like Humphrey, though, I would argue that the category retains its usefulness for a number of reasons, particularly as long as the Socialist past remains a prime reference point for many people in their own personal histories and memories as they struggle to make sense of the present. The category will remain compelling, it seems to me, as long as socialism continues to have an active social life that people engage and make meaningful in cultural practices and productions.

But it remains important for another, perhaps more pressing, reason; postsocialism, with its implicit temporal positioning of relating to the present in terms of the past, offers the possibility of positing socialism in relation to its world-historical Other: capitalism. Katherine Verdery has argued that “the context in which we should assess postsocialism’s emerging forms is—far more than before—the international one of global capital flows” (Verderey 1999: 25). I would expand on this insight to suggest that it also works the other way around: postsocialism’s “emerging forms” provide a means of assessing and critiquing global capitalism.

This brings us, in a rather roundabout way, back to the topic of memory, nostalgia, and the present. For it is in the realm of memory—whether through routine cultural practices like the consumption or display of East German things or mass-mediated representations—that capitalism’s world-historical Other (socialism) is given meaning and significance, even if a parodied one. The various domains in which memory is produced, negotiated, and deployed can be where capitalist forms and practices are both contested *and* affirmed.

In a rich essay on millennial capitalism, John and Jean Comaroff aim to interrogate “the experiential contradictions at the core of neoliberal capitalism,” suggesting that that many of these contradictions are most visible in “so-called postrevolutionary societies” (Comaroff and Comaroff 2000: 298). They continue by noting that “a good deal is to be learned about the historical implications of the current moment by eavesdropping on the popular anxieties to be heard in such places” (299). Following their lead, in addition to the fieldwork I have conducted in different regions of the former GDR, I also attempted a form of “eavesdropping”

in its postmodern version: by “lurking” on Internet bulletin boards and discussion groups focusing on themes of *Ostalgie* and German-German relations. In a lengthy Internet forum devoted to the film, located on the *Good Bye, Lenin!* website (www.good-bye-lenin.de), I “overheard” mostly enthusiastic reviews of the film as well as predictable debates about the phenomenon of *Ostalgie*. There were also voices like “Eike,” articulating a minority but not uncommon sentiment:

The fall of the Wall that was staged for the mother’s benefit at the end of the film is exactly what I might have wished for myself. . . . Whoever criticizes the GDR for being oppressive and undemocratic has NOT TRULY lived and worked in capitalism.

Other postings expressed similar reactions: “I could have cried during Sigmund Jähn’s speech,” one contributor wrote, “it really spoke to me”; or, “The perspective of a society with no ‘terror of consumerism’” or “Elbow society broadens one’s horizons, especially now when capitalism isn’t functioning very well any more.”

Such are the contexts, large and small, for the production and circulation of historical memory. My suggestion for thinking about the role of memory in the post-Socialist present calls for us to think out of what Bruce Grant has called the “Socialist–post-Socialist box” and engage with larger theoretical debates about the meanings of the market, the contradictions of millennial capitalism, the cultures of neoliberalism, among other topics (Grant 2006). Following the social life of socialism through its various forms, uses, and trajectories has the potential of illuminating these and other phenomena. As one instantiation of socialism’s social life, *Good Bye, Lenin!* as a mass-mediated history of the present has contributed to the construction of cultural realities that themselves are a function of the political landscape they inhabit and reproduce.

Notes

1. We are grateful to Matti Bunzl for polishing and editing this posthumous chapter.

References

- Appadurai, Arjun, ed. 1986 *The Social Life of Things: Commodities in Cultural Perspective*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Berdahl, Daphne. 2005. "Expressions of Experience and Experiences of Expressions: Museum Representations of GDR History." *Anthropology and Humanism* 30 (2): 156–70.
- Cohen, David William. 1994. *The Combing of History*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Comaroff, Jean, and John Comaroff. 2000. "Millennial Capitalism: First Thoughts on a Second Coming." *Public Culture* 12 (2): 291–343.
- Connerton, Paul. 1989. *How Societies Remember*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Davis, Natalie Zemon, and Randolph Starn, eds. 1989. *Memory and Counter-Memory*. Theme Issue of *Representations* 26 (1).
- Grant, Bruce. 2006. "Cosmopolitan Baku." Paper presented at the conference "Post-Communist Nostalgia." University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 7–8 April.
- Hensel, Jana. 2002. *Zonenkinder*. Reinbek bei Hamburg: Rowohlt.
- Humphrey, Caroline. 2001. "Does the Category 'Postsocialist' Still Make Sense?" In *Postsocialism: Ideals, Ideologies, and Practices in Eurasia*, ed. C. N. Hann, 12–15. London: Routledge.
- Huyssen, Andreas. 1995. *Twilight Memories: Marking Time in a Culture of Amnesia*. New York: Routledge.
- Ivy, Marilyn. 1995. *Discourses of the Vanishing: Modernity, Phantasm, Japan*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Lass, Andrew. 1994. "From Memory to History: The Events of November 17 Dis/membered." In *Memory, History, and Opposition under State Socialism*, ed. Rubie Watson, 87–104. Santa Fe, NM: School of American Research.
- Saß, Katrin. 2008. *Interview mit Katrin Saß*. Electronic document, <http://www.good-bye-lenin.de/int-sass.php>, accessed 21 February.
- Der Spiegel*. 2003. "Der Bundestag nimmt Abschied von Lenin." *Spiegel Online*, 3 April. Electronic document, <http://www.spiegel.de/kultur/gesellschaft/0,1518,243206,00.html>, accessed 21 February 2008.
- Stewart, Kathleen. 1988. "Nostalgia: A Polemic." *Cultural Anthropology* 3 (3): 227–41.
- Ten-Dyke, Elizabeth. 2001. *Dresden: Paradoxes of Memory in History*. London: Routledge.
- Verdery, Katherine. 1999. *The Political Lives of Dead Bodies*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Von Vestenberg, Nikolaus. 2003. "Kinder haften für ihre Eltern." *Der Spiegel*, 24 March: 114–16.
- Wanner, Catherine. 1998. *Burden of Dreams: History and Identity in Post-Soviet Ukraine*. College Park: Pennsylvania State Press.
- Watson, Rubie, ed. 1994. *Memory, History, and Opposition under State Socialism*. Santa Fe, NM: School of American Research.