
A house divided against itself cannot stand...

I do not expect the Union to be dissolved — I do not expect the house to fall — but I do expect it will cease to be divided.

Abraham Lincoln

June 16, 1858

Home: Domicile and Environment

Home is a concept for many people that hinges on a few key ideas and more often than not has an incredible impact on how individuals view and understand the world around them. A safe and stable home often creates a sense of security even when one is not in the dwelling proper, while an unsafe or unstable home can cause anxiety and uncertainty for one’s future and well-being. Though these apply not only to the home proper, perhaps best understood as the dwelling or house, but also to the environment around the home and the community, landscape, and mood that make up that environment. However, what is the effect on the individual or group when a home is radically changed or destroyed? The destruction of a dwelling by disaster or conflict is undoubtedly a traumatic experience and can cause immeasurable stress on an individual, their family and friends, as well as on their economic security and well-being. Yet, if one expands this to examine the destruction of the environment around the home the stress of safety and security are joined by a question of identity and of how the individual should understand themselves in a home that no longer resembles that which they consider to be home. This environmental destruction of the concept of home can be examined in the now defunct German Democratic Republic (GDR or East Germany), as the destruction of the physical and metaphysical home was a reality of the total-war of World War Two and the political restructuring that followed. Yet perhaps more telling about the human relationship to their “home” is the identity conflict which followed the collapse of the communist dictatorship of the GDR and the eventual reunification of the two Germanies under the auspices of the Federal Republic of Germany (FRG or West Germany).

This article aims to briefly explore the relationship between the socio-political and economic environment and identity by understanding the concept of “home” as an idea that transcends the dwelling space proper and rather encompasses those natural and constructed organs which influence and shape humanity.
Building a Home for Socialism

The GDR was officially formed on October 7, 1949, most likely as a reaction to the constitutional elections conducted in the West (Niven and Thomanek, 2001). Yet at this time the country did not yet have the dividing structure which would be the catalyst for the development of two different cultures, or at the very least pseudo-identities. Following the Wirtschafts Wunder (economic miracle) in the 1950s, during which the FRG’s economy almost completely recovered from the devastation of the war, the East German economy was still struggling. Leaving the East German population to either consign themselves to years of economic uncertainty, or flee to the West and rebuild their lives in an environment of socio-political freedom and economic strength. In order to combat those fleeing to the West, on August 13, 1961, GDR General Secretary Walter Ulbricht ordered the building of a wall along the lines of demarcation in both Berlin and along the GDR’s borders with the FRG. This project was an attempt to keep a work-force in the state and defend the legitimacy of the GDR. The Wall’s construction was overseen, interestingly enough, by future General Secretary Erich Honecker. Following Honecker’s rise to power in January 1971, the GDR began taking major steps to define its own identity, separate from that of the Wall. This was epitomised by Honecker’s, and his wife Margot’s, plan to teach “Marxism in action” (Childs, 1985). This change in the education system was the root cause of the identity crisis which would strike the GDR leading up to, and directly following the collapse of the SED (Sozialistische Einheitspartei Deutschlands, Socialist Unity Party of Germany), the ruling party, in the East. This identity crisis was the result of the GDR’s education system, which aspired to develop a perception of “Germany” which inherently and irreversibly revolved around the GDR.

For Honecker the East German political elite, developing this separate Marxist identity within the GDR would be a means for them to legitimize and separate themselves from their more successful and prosperous western cousins. It was employed as a means to develop a home and identity group which pitted itself against the FRG and the wider Western World. This curriculum of “Marxism in Action,” developed within the Education Act of 1965, was intended to develop feelings of pride in socialist Germany while at the same time foment a deep hatred to those who stood counter to the principles of the proletariat revolution (Childs, 1985). While it is debatable as to whether this shift was ultimately a success, it does underline the importance of the education in formulating the environment around us. This titanic endeavour was not just an attempt to distinguish the GDR from the West and create a sense of state pride, but also to inform national conscience and attempt to subvert a sense of German Volk that had existed for nearly one century. This, in turn, informed the perception of the wider home environment of the community, state, and nation. Yet, this educational shift may have also offered some early influence which led to the protests that plagued the GDR in the latter days of 1989 which contributed to Honecker’s removal from power. Along with attempting to teach an “us versus them” mentality, with regards to socialism and its opponents, “Marxism in action” wanted to eliminate idle thought and translate that into tangible socio-political action.

Cracks in the Foundation

By 1989 the situation in the GDR had devolved to the point that demonstrations were popping up all over the country. Spurred and influenced by the Leipzig Monday Demonstrations, these marches sought to draw attention to the brutality of the East German regime, as well as call for greater democratisation of the East German political structure. On October 9th in desperate attempt to maintain con-
trol, Honecker ordered the mobilisation of GDR troops and nearly brought a Tiananmen Square style massacre to Europe. Luckily this ill-advised action was countermanded by local officials (Millar, 1989). Due to his rash action Honecker was removed from office and replaced with the more moderate Egon Krenz, yet even this massive political shakeup would prove ineffective in maintaining the status quo in the GDR. Less than a month after Honecker’s forced retirement, the GDR Politburo resigned on November 7th and only two days later, on November 9th 1989, the Berlin Wall fell (Childs, 2001). This period known as the Wende, or turning point, began a period of attempted reform by the GDR government, this was one of the demands of the demonstrations for many must have represented an uncertain but hopeful future in their larger home environment. However, for others home was not the GDR, rather the entirety of Germany and reunification would be a means to repair or rebuild their metaphysical concept of a German home. This feeling of German Volk and the economic stability and certainty that accompanied reunification eventually led to the two states to be reunited on October 3rd 1990.

Following the Wende, East Germans began to second-guess their enthusiastic support for reunification. With the whole of the GDR absorbed by the West, their economic system, as well as the humanist nature which many in the East believed came with socialism, were overwhelmed by the capitalist influx from the West. In short, the East German home that many had identified with and come to associate with themselves was no longer a reality. This was especially obvious for easterners in 1991 when the unemployment rate, new for East Germany, skyrocketed following FRG companies buying GDR companies and dismantling them. GDR factories rivalled those in the West. Western companies recognised how GDR facilities could help their production in the West. FRG companies then bought those facilities which they deemed useful, dismantled them, transported what they wanted back West, and used the machinery in their own factories. This all took place with little to no regard for the jobs of the East Germans who worked in those GDR factories. This left many East Germans without jobs, but also without anywhere to get a job. In only six months from July of 1990 to January of 1991 unemployment in the former GDR jumped from 272,000 people all the way to 757,200 people. According to an April 1991 U.S. News and World Report, “By the end of 1991, according to some estimates, more than half of all eastern Germans will be unemployed and only 20 percent of the businesses from the old Communist regime will be operating.” (Baer, 1998). This massive shift in employment and industrial production also affected perception of home in the form of economic security. Many unemployed East Germans were forced to seek financial assistance or travel vast distances to find work in the West. If a home is a physical representation of security for an individual, a modern castle if you will, then the inability to maintain that home calls that security into question. A castle may offer defence from enemies, but the inability to keep the castle stocked with provisions undermines its security from within. A similar process took place for many Germans, while social safety nets kept people from starving their castles foundation was nonetheless compromised.

This destruction from the inside out was not just the result of the failing economy of the GDR prior to the Wende, but also a result of concerted efforts by the West German government who managed the state-owned assets of the former GDR. In an effort to privatise and revitalise GDR industry, the Treuhandanstalt (or Treuhand) was formed as a trust organization to manage the process of moving one of the largest East Bloc economies into the free market. One of the legal mandates charged to the Treuhand was also the establishment of a strong job market in the East. Yet, this mandate, worked into the Unification Treaty under article 25, did not offer the guarantee of employment opportunities. This lack of guaranteed jobs was further exacerbated by the governments limited influence over these institutions after privatisation had been accomplished (Cassel, 2002). Because of these shortcomings unemployment ballooned from effectively 0% in 1989 to around 30% by the end of 1991. This trans-
lates into 4.9 million East Germans struggling with unemployment and the dangers associated with such in a free market economy (Sinn and Sinn, 1992). This was also exacerbated by how the Treuhand went about privatising the GDR economy. In order to create an easy framework of managing the thousands of state owned firms, the Treuhand divided these firms into three primary categories: firms deemed to be profitable with little or no interference by the Treuhand, firms seen as having potential but treated with a “wait and see” attitude, and firms that were deemed too costly to build up and better suited to liquidation (Allen, 1993). Those firms that were privatised were also often passed on to West German and foreign investors rather than the individuals who had been running the firms during the GDR era. While management buy-outs did take place they were often far outweighed by East German companies being purchased and managed by those from elsewhere whose interest in these firms were often purely economic in nature (Allen, 1993). The collapse of the East German state began the erosion of a sense of security for many East Germans, however, the transfer of ownership and agency in the East German "home" further intensified this cognitive dissonance between the hopes for a united German home and the reality of building such.

Old House, New Home

Effects of reunification were fairly obvious politically and economically, but on the personal level many, especially those who had been involved with the SED felt as if their work had meant nothing. An East German named Walter, interviewed by social scientist Dr. Hans Baer following the Wende, reflected on what it all meant to him. Walter felt a sense of worthlessness as all of his work with the Party seemed for naught. For Walter, what became fundamental towards forming his opinion regarding reunification was a policy at Humboldt University (where Walter worked) known as Abwicklung (unraveling). Abwicklung was a process of reducing the state and the people of East Berlin, and East Germany, down to their most basic form. This was in an attempt to reconnect them with the historical identity of a united Germany, as well as a way, as Walter saw it, to throw off the vestiges of a socialist Germany and have the people of the GDR “become” West Germans. Keeping with the common theme of “home” this Abwicklung attempted to tear the East German identity and environmental understanding of home down to its foundations after which they could then build a copy of the West German concepts of home and identity on its foundations. Walter was asked by the university to do “house cleaning” within his ethnography department and eventually even he was asked to leave because of his ties to the SED. At the time of the interview, 1991, Walter believed that the FRG had bought the GDR in what he called a “clean sale.” What he meant by this was that the FRG had no interest in perpetuating GDR brands, or even allowing the differences in culture to persist. In small ways Walter tried to counter this by purchasing as many eastern goods as he could (Baer, 1998). In that way he could win a small victory, and though this took place only shortly after reunification, East Germans trying to purchase what is specifically “East” can still be seen today.

This shifts the discussion from the more environmental impacts on home to those of a more domestic nature. While the environment and special proximity most certainly influences the concept, and understanding, of home and identity, it is in the domestic sphere that these influences are truly boiled down to their essence and can be most readily identified. It is in these objects and consumables that East Germans began to bring into their homes that one can begin to explore how the understanding of home and identity was affected by reunification. For this exploration, it is especially helpful to look at the advent and rise of Ostalgie. Ostalgie, or nostalgia for the East, began to creep into the public sphere in the early 1990s and has continued to increase as people search for reminders of a home that is distinctly East German home. This desire for reminders of a time, place, and concept, that no longer existed gave rise to the demand and production of various products, including media, which hearkened
back to a time before reunification. This nostalgia for the East German past has even increased as the
time between the GDR and the present widens especially followed the success of films such as Good
bye, Lenin! (a popular film depicting life during the Wende) and a huge surge of TV shows in the early
2000s which highlighted and occasionally made satire of life in the GDR. Though this was not the first-
time TV had focused on the GDR, it was the first time that the GDR was used as light entertainment in-
stead of a documentary subject. The typical model for these shows degraded everything which was a
reality for people in the GDR. It includes famous East Germans discussing the “good old days” of so-
cialism, some happy-go-lucky games in which the Wessi attempts to guess GDR facts from the Ossi,
and, of course, a random Trabbi. However, these shows have come under a lot of fire for being inaccu-
rate, and portraying the GDR in such a way that detracts from the reality that was East Germany.
Some of this criticism has even come from those who participated in perpetuating nostalgia. For ex-
ample, the co-writers of the popular film Sonnenallee, which was based in the Sonnenallee area of East
Berlin, criticized the “GDR TV shows” because they were not made by or for Eastern Germans, but
rather produced and marketed towards those in the West. Even a small number of West Germans
agreed with this criticism. The director of ZDF’s (Zweites Deutches Fernsehen, Second German TV Sta-
tion) Ostagie Show, Martin Keiffenheim, suggested that the media needs to move away from a focus
on the Stasi files or the “economy of shortages” and focus more on the everyday life that many GDR
citizens experienced (Cooke, 2005).

Along with the present focus on shows which depict life in the former GDR, directly after the Wende
there was another move away from the West. This was, however, a consumer attempt at Ostalgie.
Throughout the Honecker era, information about the plethora of goods available in the West, made the
disparity of wealth in the East obvious to the people of the GDR. The post-Wende influx of goods
caused reunification to not mark so much the dissolution of the Stasi police state, as the battle be-
tween the plenty of the West German consumer system and the scarcity of the East German system. It
was also the pervasiveness of the FRG consumer culture that further defined the two. Many in the East,
especially following the collapse of the Wall, were encouraged by western brands to “Test the West.” Yet,
following reunification, consumers in the East, in an attempt to maintain their identity, be-
gan to increase their demands for GDR products. It was products such as Rotkäppchen Sekt and Club
Cola, which allowed East German consumers to differentiate themselves, and their culture, from that
of the FRG (Cooke, 2005). This use of food and drink as a defining factor and even reminder of home is
something that is fairly congruent across time, space, and cultures. While a common, and perhaps
overdone, trope, the idea of something being like ‘mother’s cooking,’ ‘home-style,’ or ‘homemade’ is
perhaps not inaccurate as a means to understand the close connection between food and drink and
one’s concept and understanding of identity and home. The resurging demand for these products in
Germany also highlights how the redefinition, or perhaps destruction, of the GDR concept of home has
influenced the desire to reconnect to this Eastern home. Yet the desire to reconnected and remember
a divided house is not always shared by all.

A House Divided

Despite reunification and attempts to design a common home and congruent identity Germany in the
1990s had become increasingly disunited. With the rise of Ostalgie it has become increasingly obvious
that a gap has grown between Wessis and Ossis. After the fever of reunification abated in the early
1990’s a sense on both sides of the metaphysical wall that there was no “One Germany” increased.
Only a few short years after East Germans enrolled in speech classes in attempts to cast off their ca-
cophonic accents in favor of western sounding High German, people on both sides became increas-
ingly disillusioned with the other. One West Berliner named Friedhelm Motzki, in frustration with his Eastern sister-in-law, spouted, “You’ve been Germans for three years now – how long will it take before you catch on?” (Heneghan, 2000). For pollsters these sentiments were all too real among the populous. In a 1990 poll taken by the Allensbach Institute of whether Wessis and Ossis agreed with the slogan “We are one people,” 54% of those in the west agreed and 45% of those in the east agreed. However, the same poll taken in 1994 showed that while 47% of westerners still agreed with the slogan, the number in the east had plummeted to a mere 28% (Heneghan, 2000). This division within the nation and even within individual domiciles shows that while the attempt to rebuild the “German house” was at the minimum successful in brining two homes and identities under one roof, the differences established and fermented during division were not as easily overcome as the political division itself.

How can one understand this radical shift in sentiment following unification, as well as the ever-increasing pride in the former GDR of their communist past? This examination has thus far attempted to look at the ideas of home and the environment that makes up the wider home as having a significant impact on identity and feelings of belonging. Yet, perhaps the best model for understanding how all of this is taking place is to put the GDR within the context of a colonized nation. Rather than attempting to find a common home for East and West German identities one can seek to understand this belonging, or lack thereof, as a forced living arrangement with many of the negative connotations associated with such an organisation. One can see that both sides dealt with one another as the “other.” They even had differing names, which took on different meanings, namely Ossi and Wessi.

So, it is easy to see that they clearly dealt with the other in an “orient-type” fashion. This meant that both sides used the other in a way which defined what they were not. This is the same model used during colonialism to define the hierarchy of races. The FRG had used the GDR to define itself as not communist, not poor, as well as being civilized. At the same time, the GDR had used the FRG to show that they were not capitalist, not greedy, and not self-serving. This problem was exacerbated by the absorption of the GDR by the FRG. Many West Germans saw the GDR as a newly-freed colonial nation, one that was no longer under the yoke of Soviet oppression; but many East Germans felt reconquered by western neo-colonial powers. Historian Paul Cooke suggested that this is a way which the FRG can distance itself from its own dictatorial past, by portraying the GDR as an “Orient”, this way the FRG could also further enforce its democratic character. Yet, all of this was done at the expense of the reality of life in the GDR (Cooke, 2005). This concept of colonisation is not quite as simple as one would traditionally understand colonisation, namely as the forced occupation or annexation of one land over another, but rather the socio-political inequality of one group over another. This concept is best summarised by Fritz Vilmar and Wolfgang Dümcke who argue, “Colonisation means, at its core, the economic and cultural dominance of one social structure in relation to another.” (Dümcke and Vilmar, 1996). So, while the two Germanies sought to rebuild their divided house and find common ground as to what being German meant, the socio-political realities of the reunification process and the disparate economic situation between the two states resulted in a situation which brought the security and understanding of the East German home and identity into contention with the “New” German understanding of the same concepts.

If one examines and understands “home” as both an environmental and domicile space, where does that leave East Germans whose security in their domicile was oft threatened by reunification, and whose wider environment was radically changed in a physical and metaphysical sense; in as much as the land was there but the GDR as an entity had ceased to be. For one East German, this lack of place and confusion of identity left her essentially homeless. Jana Hensel experienced the Wende as a teenager and has since 1989 struggled with reconnecting with and redefining her memory of the GDR and her place in a reunified Germany. In her memoir, After the Wall, Jana recounts her confusion.
as to the gravity of the Monday Demonstrations which she had attended with her mother, as well as her difficulty adjusting to life after the wall. For Jana, her memories of her home and childhood in Leipzig often came into conflict with the world which she saw around her when she came back to the city of her upbringing. She recounts how she would make a frame with her fingers and attempt to find a building or a scene which she could relate to and associate with her childhood, though often in vain (Hensel, 2002). Perhaps due to a combination of architectural change and memorial dissonance, Jana struggled to connect the environment which made up her home with any feeling or memory of home she had from her childhood.

In a later section, she describes an experience that she shared with her West German friend, Jan. While attending a football match at Berlin’s Olympic Stadium, Jan explains to Jana how he found the discussion of the East-West divide quite overdone and often irrelevant. How did it relate to him, his memories, or his definition of home? Yet, during the same encounter that Jan criticizes the East’s focus on a distinct historical memory and understanding of its now defunct home, he, after living in Berlin for near a decade would still root for his home team of Cologne. To Jan, and many people, their home is a natural and immutable part of their lives and identities (Hensel, 2002). Yet for Jana and many other East Germans their home had in fact mutated. No longer did the environment that they associated with home resemble that of their memories. In East Germany, the physical home had been remodeled and the metaphysical home had been reframed to support a common German memory and history. Due to these shifts, “home” for many East Germans the concept and understanding of home, as well as the effect that home has on forming one’s identity, was more ethereal than natural.

Is Anyone Home?

Fully understanding the concept home and its effect on an individual or even a community is a difficult endeavour as the both meaning and impact vary on an individual and community basis. For Germany, this getting to the heart of this relationship is made even more difficult by Germany’s divided past, in which the two rival states attempted to build two distinct variations of the German “home” and an accompanying self-understanding. For West Germans, the home changed little between 1945 and the present. The environment surrounding the home was stable and changed gradually along with the culture inhabiting it. East Germany, was not as fortunate. The authoritarian nature of the SED dictatorship permeated the environment surrounding the domicile, and the domicile itself, creating a lack of security for many within and without their homes. Following the collapse of this police state and German reunification, the socio-political realities that constituted the East German home were replaced with the western counterparts. This created a disconnect of what actually constituted the home and what it meant to be an East German. While this cognitive dissonance has slowly dissipated over previous two decades, there remains an entire generation whose identity and concept of home has vanished alongside the wall that had once divided their new “home.”
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1. “Trabbi” is short for Trabant, an iconic East German car.
2. “Other” refers to a historical method developed by Edward Said called Orientalism, which postulates that European societies use the “Orient” as a means of understanding themselves. Europeans define a different people as “other” and use that idea of other in order to define and understand themselves. It was often employed by colonial powers by over generalizing a people or race in order to better understand both parties.