

DO NOT REMOVE

RESEARCH
AND
STUDY OF
THE GERMAN
DEMOCRATIC
REPUBLIC

*A Survey of Work in
The United States
&
The Federal Republic of Germany*

GERMAN ISSUES • 3

ZK COPY

American Institute for Contemporary German Studies
The Johns Hopkins University

RESEARCH
AND
STUDY OF

■

THE GERMAN
DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC

■

*A Survey of Work in
The United States*

&

The Federal Republic of Germany

■

GERMAN ISSUES 3

The following survey of research and study of the German Democratic Republic conducted in the United States and the Federal Republic of Germany derives from five presentations at a workshop organized by American Institute for Contemporary German Studies on November 4, 1985. Both the workshop and the subsequent publication were supported in major part by grants from the Ministry for Inner-German Relations, Bonn.

The Institute wishes to express its deep gratitude for this support and for the active interest in the project taken by Minister Heinrich Windelen and Burkhard Dobiay, his staff advisor. Ministerialrat Peter Dietrich of the Ministry was extraordinary helpful in making arrangements for participation in the workshop by German scholars.

The five papers vary widely in approach, but there is unanimity among them on the need for more work comparing the GDR with East European countries and the Soviet Union. On the American side, an absence of controversy among scholars is noted, a consensus that makes Thomas Baylis feel uncomfortable. Both he and Patricia Herminhouse provide broad reviews of American scholarship and specific recommendations on new approaches and topics deserving more attention. Observing that writers often are the most sensitive seismographs of East German political and social changes, Professor Herminhouse urges more collaboration between U.S. social scientists and humanists working on the GDR.

Doris Cornelsen concentrates upon institutions where research on the East German economy is conducted and journals where it is published. Gert-Joachim Glaessner provides us with a detailed critique of how concepts and approaches to communist and GDR studies and research have developed since the 1950s, tracing the succession of schools of thought that were determinant at various times. Friedrich-Christian Schroeder adopts a somewhat similar approach for his review of the study of East German constitutional, criminal, and other law. He points out the continuing influence of implied or direct comparison with Soviet law and regrets that experts on West German law have almost completely abandoned a field which continues to occupy a leading position in research on the GDR in the Federal Republic.

The Institute is pleased to present this, the third paper in its series GERMAN ISSUES, as part of its effort to familiarize Americans with postwar German history, politics, economics, and with literature and culture in a political and social context.

August 1986

R.G. Livingston
Acting Director

Thomas A. Baylis <i>U. S. Research—A Critical Assessment of the Social Sciences</i>	1
Patricia Herminghouse <i>Studying GDR Literature in the U.S.—A Survey</i>	14
Doris Cornelsen <i>Economic Research in the Federal Republic</i>	35
Gert-Joachim Glaessner <i>Social Science Research in the Federal Republic— Methodological and Conceptual Problems</i>	48
Friedrich-Christian Schroeder <i>West German Study of the GDR Constitution, Law, and State</i>	68

Copies of this paper may be ordered at the current price of \$5.00 per copy from the American Institute for Contemporary German Studies, 1755 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W., Suite 750, Washington, D.C. 20036. Discount rates available for bulk orders.

Orders can still be filled for the first two papers in this series. They are *West Germany, East Germany and the German Question—Five Lectures* (\$7.50) and *The Federal Republic—An Integral Part of the Western World* by Richard Löwenthal (\$5.00).

Patricia Herminhouse is the Karl F. and Bertha A. Fuchs Professor of German Studies at the University of Rochester. She is the co-editor of *Literatur and Literaturtheorie in der DDR* (1976) and *DDR Literatur der 70er Jahre* (1983), as well as the founder and editor of the *GDR Bulletin* (1974-83).

Tom Baylis is Associate Professor of Political Science at the University of Texas at San Antonio. He is the author of *The Technical Intelligentsia and the East German Elite* (1974) and editor of *East Germany, West Germany, and the Soviet Union; Perspectives on a Changing Relationship* (1986).

Doris Cornelsen directs the research division for the GDR and East European Industrialized Countries at the *Deutsches Institut für Wirtschaftsforschung* in West Berlin. The Institute is one of the leading institutions of the Federal Republic for empirical research on the GDR.

Gert-Joachim Glaessner is Professor of Political Science at the Free University, Berlin. An associate for many years at the University's *Zentralinstitut für sozialwissenschaftliche Forschung*, he is author of *Herrschaft durch Kader* (1977) and *Sozialistische Systeme* (1982).

Friedrich-Christian Schroeder is Ordentlicher Professor at the University of Regensburg and Director of the *Institut für Ostrecht* at the University of Munich. A member of the Research Advisory Council of the Federal Ministry for Inner-German Relations, Bonn, he has published extensively on Soviet law and on the law and constitution of the GDR.

ASSESSMENT OF THE SOCIAL SCIENCES

Thomas A. Baylis

Like the German states prior to 1870, American studies of the German Democratic Republic can be said to be numerous but fragmented and to vary widely in importance. We have some reason to be pleased when we look at the quantity of English-language materials now available on the political, social, and economic system of the GDR. We have fewer grounds for satisfaction when we consider the quality of this work. If we use as a standard the best studies in political science and the other social sciences on the Soviet Union and Western Europe, it is apparent that the English-language scholarship on the GDR is often disappointing. This is a demanding criterion, and my purpose is not to denigrate what has been done to date. However, the time is appropriate for us to raise our aspirations.

American students of the GDR are fortunate in having available a substantial body of careful, detailed scholarship on the GDR coming from the Federal Republic, specialists on other East European states having nothing comparable. We are less fortunate in the fact that work done in the GDR itself on its own political system is meager in its information value and analytically rarely goes much beyond self-congratulation. Although the situation in the other social sciences is somewhat better, we suffer a disadvantage in this respect compared to our colleagues who study Hungary, Poland, or Yugoslavia.

But given the work being done in the Federal Republic, it is important to ask what it is that American and other English-speaking scholars can contribute to GDR studies that is in any way distinctive. The answer is one that for many will have a familiar ring. Americans ought to be providing studies which are more genuinely *comparative* and informed by the theoretical perspectives and methodological approaches that constitute much of the strength and are responsible for much of the reputation of the American social sciences. When we look at what Americans have actually written on the GDR, however, we find only a small number of studies that are in fact comparative, utilize sophisticated methodologies, or reflect broad theoretical concerns. There are, to be sure, some compelling institutional and other practical reasons for these deficiencies.

The Record to Date

First, however, let me briefly survey what has been done by Americans and other authors writing in English. (I make no pretense to completeness here; I have, for example, neglected publications that appeared prior to 1970 and for the most part ignored the considerable number of dissertations dealing with the GDR.) It is only natural that there should be some sizeable gaps in the literature, given the comparatively small number of scholars engaged in GDR studies (and the still smaller number for whom the GDR is their primary research interest). To the extent that such gaps are covered by West German scholarship, they are in any case less important.

We now have a number of good surveys of East German politics and society, including recent ones by Scharf (1984) and Childs (1983) and one that has just been published by Krisch (1985). There are only two or three anthologies devoted to East German politics and society, and more often than not the GDR is still omitted in anthologies dealing with Eastern Europe as a whole. We do not have an overall history of the GDR (not in German, either, to my knowledge, except for official East German accounts), although Martin McCauley's 1979 historical study of the SED covers much of the ground that a more general history would. We do not have a book-length analytical or organizational study of the party comparable to the West German studies by Förtsch (1969) or Neugebauer (1979). There are, however, at least two substantial books by Americans on the early history of the GDR (Krisch 1974; Sandford 1983).

Americans have perhaps given more attention to East-West German relations, the GDR's foreign policy, than to any other subject. In addition to Soviet policy, than to any other subject. In addition to James McAdams' (1985) recently-published book, Melvin Croan, Michael Sodaro, Angela Stent, Ronald Asmus, and Henry Krisch have written extensively on this subject. In spite of the energetic scholarship of Dale Herspring (e.g., 1973) and, earlier, Donald Hancock (1973), we have less on the East German military, although Norman Naimark has undertaken an intriguing examination of East German "militarism." I would judge the situation to be less satisfactory on the GDR's role in the Warsaw Pact (see, however, Moreton 1978), and still less so on its role in the CMEA. There appears to be growing interest in the questions of

GDR nationalism and national identity, but thus far no substantial English-language publications since Gebhard Schweigler's (1975).

A number of Americans are working on one aspect or another of the East German economy (Bryson, Collier, Stahnke, Parsons, Garland, Francisco, Baylis), not all of them economists. Also, many of the books and articles of the *Deutsches Institut für Wirtschaftsforschung* (West Berlin) have been translated. The most serious limitations on this work are imposed by the seeming reluctance of the GDR authorities to provide extensive and reliable data—in some cases, it appears, even to their own economists. We have two highly illuminating works on the GDR's industrial and environmental policies (Holmes 1981, DeBardeleben 1985), both of them comparative with the Soviet Union. We also have studies of consumption (Bryson 1984) and of technological change in the GDR (Bentley 1984), as well as Granick's comparative study of industrial management (1975).

Domestic governmental structures and mass organizations have not been extensively studied by Americans, although the West German literature fills in some of the gaps. The anti-institutional (as well as anti-historical) bias that accompanied the "behavioral revolution" and the rather fleeting triumph of systems theory and functionalism in American political science have probably left their mark here. There are unpublished dissertations on the trade unions and the FDJ available through University Microfilms. Except for a scattering of articles on the social courts, and—in a different vein—Amnesty International reports on political prisoners, I have not been able to find much in English on the GDR's legal and judicial systems, or on the important role played by legal theory (see, however, Markovits 1978).

Anita Mallinckrodt (1984) lists only four American sociologists working on the GDR, which helps to explain the relative paucity of studies on East German society. There are two important exceptions: the numerous studies that examine East German social problems through its literature—which may, in fact, be the most fruitful way of approaching them at present—and studies dealing with the position of women (notably Rueschemeyer 1981, Shaffer 1981). There is also some interest in East German youth, especially in connection with the unofficial peace movement and as a literary theme. The publicity accorded the peace movement and the Luther year is also responsible in considerable measure for the attention given to the place of religion in the GDR

(Goeckel 1984). With the exception of my own work (1974), not much attention has been paid to East German elites and social structure, nor is there much in the area of industrial sociology (here, however, both the East German and West German literature is comparatively strong.)

If we look at the interrelated subjects of socialization, mass communications and propaganda, and education, we find a scattering of articles and several books (e.g., Klein 1980); Mallinckrodt's valuable studies of the GDR's internal and external communications have mostly appeared in German (but see the chapter in Starrels and Mallinckrodt 1975), and Hanhardt's earlier articles on political socialization seem to have remained in lonely isolation. The content and social role of ideology itself, one of my own interests, is also a central concern of DeBardeleben's previously-mentioned book. It is worth underscoring that none of the 238 scholars listed in Mallinckrodt's directory appears to be a psychologist, and the rather considerable GDR literature in this area seems scarcely to have been touched by Americans.

As in other areas in the social sciences, there is some tendency for studies of the GDR to follow the headlines: hence the prodigious number of articles on the unofficial peace movement, East-West German relations, and political and literary dissent. Some of these are penetrating and informative, others—too many—are superficial; the latter are often written by authors whose interest in the GDR must be described as rather casual. Surprisingly, the scholarly English-language literature on one well-publicized area of GDR life, sports, seems extremely scanty, in spite of its obvious importance in political socialization and the building of a GDR national consciousness.

Academic fashions in American political science—I can't speak with much confidence about other fields—seem to be only rather dimly, or at least very belatedly, reflected in GDR studies. There are now a number of what might be described as "policy studies" for the GDR, several of them cited above, and some growing interest in questions of international political economy as they affect the GDR. I am not aware of any efforts to test rational choice models with data from the GDR, although there may well be some. In this sense GDR studies, like studies of other Eastern European polities and the Soviet Union, remain far from the cutting edge of political science; there has never, to my knowledge, been an article in the *American Political Science Review* devoted in any substantial part to the GDR. Whether that should be a matter of deep

regret is, of course, a question of taste.

To sum up—in spite of the numerous gaps I have cited, the sheer quantity of English-language writing on the GDR and the range of subjects dealt with is rather imposing—more so, I suspect, than many of us realized at least until recently, and certainly vastly greater than it was only a decade ago. To be sure, much of what has been published has appeared in relatively obscure places and is difficult to find except in the very largest libraries. It is not always clear that the authors of much of this work have had any contact with others working in related areas or are even aware of their existence. And, as I suggested at the outset, the quality of the work is—to use the customary polite expression—uneven.

A Brief Sociology of American GDR Studies

The reasons for this situation are, I think, familiar to most Americans in the field. Most fundamental is the academic reward system. As Henry Krisch has rather brutally reminded us, the object of our scholarly ardor is simply "small potatoes" both in international politics and in the social science professions. There are no university chairs in East German studies, to my knowledge—there are precious few even in East European politics, apart from the USSR—and "Central European" politics or society is an all but unknown academic category. Those looking for jobs, bucking for tenure, or seeking scholarly reputations must combine their interest in the GDR with—and more often than not subordinate it to—some broader and more saleable specialization. Federally funded university centers for Slavic and East European studies and many publications for that area have tended to see the GDR as at best marginal to their concerns and thus undeserving of any commitment of resources. Those interested in East Germany are themselves divided between those who come to it from a primary interest in West Germany and those whose orientation is to Eastern Europe and the USSR.

The consequence of this is that students of East German affairs tend to feel isolated. Geographically, we are unusually widely dispersed, and no single broad national professional association—the American Association for the Advancement of Slavic Studies, the American Political Science Association, the German Studies Association—brings the majority of us together at its annual meetings. There has been until

recently no national newsletter for social scientists interested in the GDR, and there is no major English-language journal where scholars can expect to find articles on the GDR with any regularity. The annual conferences on the GDR at Conway, New Hampshire have proven to be an important meeting ground for a number of American students of the GDR with their West German counterparts and an occasional East German visitor, and the annual volumes coming from the meetings (Gerber 1981-1985) are also useful. But in both cases the emphasis has been more on literary than on social science topics. There are no research libraries with comprehensive, up-to-date collections of English language, West German, and East German periodicals and books on the GDR that provide a natural magnet for students of the country. Most of us rely on occasional trips to Germany, plus whatever we can get hold of here. But support for such travel is meager, and competition for the small number of IREX grants is intense: West German funding agencies that support research by foreigners in the Federal Republic often appear reluctant to fund work on the GDR. Nor have the ACLS or the national Council on Soviet and East European Studies been willing to give much, if any, support to GDR conferences or research projects.

Then, of course, there is the whole range of problems presented by the reluctance of the GDR government to reveal too much about itself to Western scholars. The incompleteness and notorious unreliability of many GDR statistics, the unavailability of important publications outside the country, the virtual impossibility of doing systematic and confidential interviewing in the GDR, the denial of access to many officials who fall under the *Kontaktverbot*, the quixotic treatment sometimes accorded visiting scholars, and the official sensitivity to the investigation of most contemporary political and social topics all present obstacles to successful research. While some of these obstacles exist in all communist countries, the situation in the GDR appears to be markedly inferior to that in Hungary, Yugoslavia, or even post-martial law Poland.

Under these circumstances it is not surprising that many able scholars do not choose to pursue a potential interest in the GDR or that others who have worked on it find their attention easily diverted elsewhere. There are modest indications, however, that some of the circumstances listed are beginning slowly to change for the better. For this, we may have to thank Erich Honecker's new *Westpolitik*, which has stimulated a marked expansion of American interest in the GDR and

may ultimately, if indirectly, broaden the opportunities for foreign social scientists to carry on research there. It is in this hopeful light that I now turn to my recommendations for future American work on the GDR.

Comparative Studies

The many fine, detailed studies of GDR institutions and areas of policy carried out by West German specialists have been indispensable to the work of English-language scholars, who have by and large approached East German subjects with a broader brush. But both West German and American studies have tended to treat GDR problems as if they existed in isolation from developments elsewhere in the Soviet bloc. We know, in fact, that the GDR often closely follows Soviet precedents, sometimes proudly proclaiming that fact, sometimes not. We know that East European governments often undertake similar policy changes, buttressed by virtually identical ideological justifications, within a few months of one another. We also know that there is an extensive and institutionalized pattern of consultation and cooperation between the East European and Soviet parties, governments, their agencies and subdivisions, and other institutions, and that there is a conscious ideological commitment to the close coordination of policies among them. At the same time, we recognize that there are significant innovations, or deviations that have been undertaken by individual members of the bloc in certain policy areas. Even when overtly similar policies are adopted, their timing and the details of their implementation may bring about significantly different results. Finally, we are aware that the Soviet Union exercises a powerful influence over East German policy decisions, but the precise nature and extent of this, and the limitations upon it are much less clear.

All of these facts point to the importance of viewing the GDR in a comparative Soviet and East European context. It is important for us to understand when the GDR is innovating and when it is mimicking; when the GDR follows the example of one of its neighbors, it is important to know which one in what area and to ask why. For example, at this particular moment comparisons between the GDR and Hungary, on such matters as economic reform and political leadership practices, might prove especially rewarding. Moreover, when the GDR seems to be following its own frequent injunction to "learn from the Soviet Union,"

it is important to ask whether it is, indeed, the substance of policy or only the rhetoric that is being adopted—and what this tells us about the actual nature of the Soviet-East German relationship.

Significant work continues to be done in the Federal Republic on the Soviet Union and the other East European states, but studies of the GDR seem to proceed largely in isolation from it. There are institutional and, I suspect, ideological reasons for this, having to do with the tendency to view the GDR as *Inland* rather than *Ausland*.

In the United States, the home ground of comparative political studies, one would think that the inhibitions would be fewer. But here, too, there are institutional barriers to be overcome, as well as linguistic ones; not many of us can claim simultaneous fluency in German and, say, Hungarian or Romanian. One promising avenue to pursue here might be collaborative research with specialists on other East European societies; another might be convention panels and conferences devoted explicitly to two- or three-country comparisons. This, by the way, strikes me as an area in which existing Soviet and East European studies centers and external funding agencies could be extremely helpful.

One type of comparative research that has not suffered from neglect—certainly not in the Federal Republic and to a lesser extent here—has been that involving East and West Germany, with the three volumes edited by Peter Ludz representing something like a landmark. Apart from their political *rationale*, the value of these studies is unquestionable for those interested in the degree to which characteristic problems and responses of advanced industrial societies can override ideological differences, even if one is not a naive adherent of some form of convergence theory. The advantage that common historical experiences and a common pre-1945 culture gives to GDR-FRG comparisons is mitigated by the greater ambiguity it introduces for those seeking to explain contemporary East-West similarities and divergences. Thus it might also be useful to undertake what has rarely been done—although Bradley Scharf's book and his subsequent research on social policy are very suggestive along these lines—by comparing the GDR to other Western countries closer to it in size or in level of economic development.

The GDR and Quantitative Social Science

The use of highly sophisticated techniques of data gathering and

analysis and of mathematical modelling, for good or ill, has progressed a long way on its march through the social science disciplines, but it has left East German studies all but untouched. I am not one of the more qualified persons to speak authoritatively on these approaches. But my personal view is that, however illuminating in many areas, they have often suffered (a) from being applied to data too soft and unreliable to bear their weight, and (b) from the creation of models so abstracted from political, social, or economic reality that they become distorting mirrors for those attempting to understand that reality.

Having said that, I nevertheless would assert that Americans, if they utilized these techniques and models with prudence and a clear understanding of their limitations, could make a significant contribution in applying them to the GDR. My impression, at least in political science, is that the flurry of interest of a few years ago (Fleron, ed., 1971) in applying to communist systems such techniques as content analysis, the statistical analysis of elite social background data, the use of budgetary data and aggregate population statistics, and so on, has waned and that the results to date have been somewhat disappointing. The aforementioned problems of data availability impose particular difficulties for students of the GDR. But Anita Mallinckrodt's studies have given us some sense of the sorts of things that are possible in studying the East German system. Moreover, the possibility of improvements in the political climate (and the GDR's growing involvement in capitalist markets and the international financial system) persuading the SED one day to ease its data restrictions leads me to believe that the effort is still well worth pursuing.

The GDR and Social Theory

Finally, I would like to urge that more studies of the GDR be placed within the broad context of contemporary social theory. The choice of the appropriate body of theory will depend, of course, upon the particular subject matter and the intellectual commitments of the author. In the American study of comparative and international politics, I find particularly encouraging the allied attempts to ground political analysis in broad historical patterns of development and to examine domestic institutions, processes, and policies in the framework of the international economic, political, and social system. These tendencies have been

variously reflected in a concern with cycles of historical change, an emphasis on the state as an "autonomous historical actor, a focus on the domestic constraints and opportunities imposed by the world economy, and a concentration upon neocorporatist structures and patterns of policy-making. Much of this writing takes at least some vague inspiration from Marxism, although much less of it is Marxist in any narrow sense. There is a certain irony to the fact that, in spite of the admiration with which Rudolf Bahro's *Die Alternative* is viewed in the United States, few if any American social scientists have made serious use in their own studies of his corruscating utopian Marxist critique of the GDR's "real existing socialism."

Many other bodies of theory, not always so fashionable, also suggest themselves, and nothing like a comprehensive listing is possible here. Theories of social structure and elites, including theories of the role of intellectuals such as those of Konrad and Szelenyi (1979) of "post-industrial society," of political culture, of deviance and social control, of cognitive dissonance—each of these examples would seem to be applicable to GDR problems, and indeed some of them have been employed, albeit in modest ways. I hesitate even to suggest any economic theories, but the Hungarian Janos Kornai's *Economics of Shortage* seems on its face to be particularly relevant to the GDR. The point I wish to make is not to recommend any particular theory but to urge that we place our studies of the GDR in a framework that makes them more visibly relevant to studies of social processes in other settings: that would enable us to argue that the findings of many studies of the GDR have an importance going well beyond its own boundaries.

Conclusion: In Search of Controversy

Some years ago Norman Naimark published an article entitled "Is it True What They're Saying about East Germany?" in which he suggested that much of what American specialists had written about the country was in fact less than the whole truth, or at least was excessively credulous in accepting the GDR's official account of itself. The article aroused a storm of indignation among those criticized, including myself. In the interim, however, Naimark has apparently become more properly socialized, or at least better at keeping his disruptive opinions to himself. What is striking about this brief outburst is that it is the only example

I can recall of serious scholarly controversy breaking out among American students of the GDR, one or two acidic book reviews by Melvin Croan excepted.

I think this degree of scholarly consensus should make us all a little uncomfortable. For West German scholars, among whom scholarly debate has sometimes turned into bitter factionalism, the absence of serious dispute must appear downright eerie. I do not suggest that we follow the West German example, much less that we take sides in their disagreements. But I do think that the presence of civilized but genuine intellectual controversy is one indicator of the vigor and promise of a field of research; it bespeaks a critical and demanding spirit and a fundamental seriousness among its scholars. This is not an injunction for American students of the GDR to go out and savage one another; it also is not a Kurt Hager-like call for a *schöpferische Meinungsstreit* where the bounds of *Schöpfertum* are all too clearly marked out by official orthodoxy. Rather, it is a suggestion for a more exacting evaluation of our own work than in the past, as we seek to strengthen its comparative dimensions and theoretical foundations.

REFERENCES

- Asmus, Ronald D., "The Dialectic of Detente and Discord: The Moscow-East Berlin-Bonn Triangle," *Orbis* 28 (Winter 1985), pp. 743-774.
- Bahro, Rudolf, *Die Alternative: Zur Kritik des real existierenden Sozialismus* (Köln: Europäische Verlagsanstalt, 1977).
- Baylis, Thomas A., *The Technical Intelligentsia and the East German Elite* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1974).
- Bentley, Raymond, *Technological Change in the German Democratic Republic*. (Boulder, Colo.: Westview Press, 1984).
- Bryson, Philip J., *The Consumer under Socialist Planning. The East German Case* (New York: Praeger, 1984).
- Childs, David, *The GDR: Moscow's German Ally* (London: George Allen & Unwin, 1983).
- Croan, Melvin, *East Germany: The Soviet Connection*. The Washington Papers, Vol. 36 (Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, 1976).
- DeBardeleben, Joan, *The Environment and Marxism-Leninism* (Boulder, Colo.: Westview, 1985).

Fleron, Frederic J., Jr., ed., *Communist Studies and the Social Sciences* (Chicago: Rand McNally, 1971).

Fortsch, Eckart, *Die SED* (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer Verlag, 1969).

Gerber, Margy, ed., *Studies in GDR Culture and Society* (Washington, D.C.: University Press of America, 1981-1985).

Goeckel, Robert F., "The Luther Anniversary in East Germany," *World Politics*, 37 (October 1984), pp. 112-133.

Granick, David, *Enterprise Guidance in Eastern Europe* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1975).

Hancock, M. Donald, *The Bundeswehr and the National People's Army*. Monograph Series in World Affairs (Denver: University of Colorado, 1973).

Hanhardt, Arthur M., Jr., "Political Socialization in the German Democratic Republic," *Societas* 1 (Spring 1971), pp. 101-121.

Herspring, Dale R., *East German Civil-Military Relations* (New York: Praeger, 1973).

Holmes, Leslie, *The Policy Process in Communist States* (Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, 1981).

Klein, Margaret Siebert, *The Challenge of Communist Education: A Look at the German Democratic Republic* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1980).

Konrad, György and Ivan Szelenyi, *The Intellectuals on the Road to Class Power* (New York: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich, 1979).

Kornai, Janos, *The Economics of Shortage*. 2 vols. (Amsterdam: North Holland Publishers, 1981).

Krisch, Henry, *The German Democratic Republic: The Search for Identity* (Boulder, Colo.: Westview, 1984).

_____, *German Politics under Soviet Occupation* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1974).

Ludz, Peter C., ed., *Materialien zum Bericht zur Lage der Nation* (Bonn-Bad Godesberg: Heger, 1971, 1972, 1974).

McAdams, A. James *East Germany and Detente* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985).

McCauley, Martin, *Marxism-Leninism in the German Democratic Republic* (London: Macmillan, 1979).

Mallinckrodt, Anita M., *Research on the GDR "auf Englisch"* (Washington, D.C.: Mallinckrodt Communications Research, 1984).

Markovits, Inga, "Socialist vs. Bourgeois Rights—An East-West Ger-

man Comparison," *University of Chicago Law Review*, 45, 1978.

Moreton, Edwin A., *East Germany and the Warsaw Alliance* (Boulder, Colo.: Westview Press, 1978).

Naimark, Norman (1979), "Is it True What They're Saying about East Germany?," *Orbis* 22 (Fall 1979), pp. 549-577.

Rueschemeyer, Marilyn, *Professional Work and Marriage: An East-West Comparison* (London: Macmillan, 1981).

Scharf, C. Bradley, *Politics and Change in East Germany: An Evaluation of Socialist Democracy* (Boulder, Colo.: Westview Press, 1984).

Schweigler, Gebhard Ludwig, *National Consciousness in Divided Germany* (London: Sage Publications, 1975).

Shaffer, Harry G., *Women in the Two Germanies* (New York: Pergamon Press, 1981).

Sodaro, Michael J., "External Influences on Regime Stability in the GDR: A Linkage Analysis," in Michael J. Sodaro and Sharon Wolchik, eds., *Foreign and Domestic Politics in Eastern Europe in the 1980s* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1983), pp. 81-108.

Stahnke, Arthur A., "The Economic Dimension and Political Context of FRG-GDR Trade," in U.S. Congress, Joint Economic Committee, *East European Economic Assessment*, Vol. 1 (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1981).

Starrels, John M. and Anita Mallinckrodt, *Politics in the German Democratic Republic* (New York: Praeger, 1975).

Stent, Angela, "Soviet Policy in the German Democratic Republic," in Sarah Meikeljohn Terry, ed., *Soviet Policy in Eastern Europe* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1984).

STUDYING GDR LITERATURE IN THE U.S.—A SURVEY

Patricia Herminghouse

Before attempting to describe the current state of GDR literary research in the United States, some background on the academic context in which these studies are carried on may be in order. Among the nearly 1,900 American colleges and universities,¹ there are—according to figures reported in the most recent *Monatshefte* survey—only some 267 German programs which award the bachelor's degree. Among these departments are 62 which grant master's degrees and another 62 which also award the Ph.D.² Thirty-eight of these Ph.D. departments report being able to support dissertation-level research on GDR literature; but in practice, only about 20 departments have produced all of the approximately 35 Ph.D.s granted in this area in the last decade, with no single institution granting more than three such degrees in this period.³ After a slow start in the late 1960s and early 1970s, the tempo of Ph.D.-level research on GDR literature picked up in the mid-1970s, probably in conjunction with the attention being paid to Willy Brandt's *Ostpolitik* and the establishment of U.S. diplomatic relations with the GDR. Since then the tempo has remained relatively steady with the production of three to four dissertations on GDR literature every year, at least until 1984–85 when only one was reported to the *Monatshefte* survey. Given the smallness of the numbers involved, it is hard to attach particular significance to this single number, especially since the author is aware of a larger number of dissertations in progress or near completion. Closer analysis may indeed actually suggest a small increase in the proportion of dissertations devoted to GDR literature, since the annual total of dissertations in German has declined from a high of more than 100 before 1980 to around 80 in recent years and only 64 in 1984–85.⁴

Regardless of what these statistics might suggest, graduate students continue to report being discouraged by their departments from working on GDR literature. In addition to being counseled not to become identified with a field still considered outside the mainstream and sometimes politically suspect, the students are warned that it is difficult to obtain grants to support research in this area, both during the disser-

tation period and in the critical pre-tenure years of their professional life. In some ways, the very availability of funding from the Federal Republic for American Germanists may have an inhibiting effect: although there is no hard evidence to support most of their fears, American professional organizations and educational institutions as well as individuals looking to the generosity of West German funding may be tempted to engage in a kind of self-censorship on certain topics which they fear could be perceived as giving the "other Germany" too much visibility or legitimacy. Given the concurrent absence of significant East German support, some of this apprehension about the material consequences of being identified with GDR studies may be understandable.⁵

The CIES/Fulbright program in Eastern Europe, which includes Yugoslavia, Poland, Romania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and the Soviet Union, does not include the GDR, leaving IREX as the major resource for the few literary scholars who can obtain some share of the total 60 "man-months" available each year for American scholars to work in the GDR. The US-GDR exchange is, according to IREX, its most over-subscribed program, with strong competition among scholars from many disciplines besides German literature for the few places available. Many American scholars report going to the GDR with no institutional or organizational backing or funding and carrying on their research programs at their own expense, or, in the case of a few, attempting to pursue it through archives and centers in the FRG.

All told, organized financial support for Americans working on GDR literature is extremely limited, leading those in the field either to make their peace with working under non-supportive circumstances or to switch to less problematic areas. Even when they are not overtly discouraged, literary scholars can hardly be encouraged by the difficulties encountered in obtaining GDR materials in most American libraries; limited accessibility makes their research efforts more labor intensive and slower than would be the case with topics where source materials are more readily available.

While the production of Ph.Ds in GDR literature may offer a crude gauge of the level of research activity in this area, a survey of scholars currently active in the field indicates no necessarily direct connection between having written a dissertation on GDR literature and developing a professional reputation as a GDR "specialist." Many of those most active in the field were not trained in GDR literature and, conversely,

many of those who have completed a dissertation in this area do not appear to have found academic employment in the field. Since most German departments are unlikely to feel that they can afford to have more than one GDR specialist, scholars work in relative isolation.

This isolation is compounded by the somewhat anomalous situation of all aspects of GDR studies vis-a-vis most interdisciplinary programs in either Western or Eastern European studies. By reason of its political system and alignment with the Warsaw Pact, the GDR does not economically and politically fit well into programs focused on Western Europe; yet its historical and cultural tradition, as well as its language, are not those of the other nations which are the object of Eastern European studies.⁶ When the opportunities for humanists and social scientists to engage in fruitful long-term collaboration are so limited, it is not surprising that thus far no university has emerged as the recognized leading institutional base for GDR studies in this country. What good "German" studies programs do exist focus primarily on West Germany.

How important, then, is the GDR in the hierarchy of literary specialties in the U.S.? Here, too, a recent *Monatshefte* report offers some interesting insights from a survey of department chairpersons about priority considerations in their hiring plans. In terms of dissertation specialties, GDR literature rated first among the fields to have emerged more recently (such as women's studies, ethnic studies, film, and the like), as opposed to the more traditional period specialties (where modern literature in a broader sense ranks first). Even when rated against traditional fields, GDR literature was given fourth priority (along with exile literature and medieval literature), ranking just after 18/19th and 19/early 20th century literature. Of course, as the authors are quick to point out, there is a significant correlation between the importance departments assign to a given field and their own capabilities to support research in this field.⁷

Having produced a dissertation on a GDR topic is in itself no predictor of a new Ph.D.'s success or failure in a fiercely competitive job market, given the fact that American departments today tend to attach much greater value to overall scholarly potential and to factors such as diversity, flexibility, interdisciplinary orientation, and teaching ability than to specific field orientation.⁸ In a job description, GDR literature is only occasionally asked as a "field"; even the few literary scholars in this country for whom GDR literature is their primary research interest do not work exclusively in this area. In fact, the American tendency

to regularly diversify one's scholarly repertoire has led a number of scholars to look at GDR literature in terms of methodologies or thematic interests which prevail in their overall research orientation, usually paying attention primarily to qualities in the literature and authors of the GDR quite apart from the socio-historical context in which they exist. In this respect, Anita Mallinckrodt's useful survey of English-language research on the GDR⁹ may be unintentionally misleading: Of the total number of 74 American GDR literature researchers listed, only slightly more than half appear to be actually active in the field or to have carried out the research which they some years ago reported as "pending."

These statistics illustrate my perception that, in the context of American higher education, GDR literary research plays a role which must be called marginal. While I have not attempted to contact everyone involved in the field, the figures cited above would indicate a total community of researchers of well under 100, given the overlap between some of the 40 who completed dissertations and the 40-50 who can currently be classified as "active."

Publication

Unlike in the social sciences, publication of monographs on GDR literature by American presses has been relatively rare. Two of the earliest dissertations on drama and poetry (whose authors no longer appear to have academic positions) did appear in American university presses.¹⁰ But although American scholars have tended to work primarily in the prose genres, a book on GDR prose has yet to appear in an American press (although the author is aware of some work currently under consideration). Most of the approximately 20 book-length publications by American-based scholars have appeared in the Federal Republic. This may in part reflect the number of German-born scholars working in the U.S. who prefer to reach a wider audience in their native language; just as likely it represents a realistic assessment of publication chances in this country for anything perceived to be as esoteric as GDR literature. Since language does not pose the problem for literary scholars that it may for social scientists, both American and German-born scholars working in the U.S. have published most of their monographs in European presses, in Switzerland, the Netherlands and, of course, West Germany.¹¹ In addition, American and German scholars (both East and

West) regularly appear together in anthologies both here and abroad.¹²

While the wider reception accorded research published in West Germany is an advantage to American-based Germanists, the attendant lack of resonance in their own country is also problematic. Among other things, it may work against interaction with American social scientists in the same field: Outside of noting what appears in our major professional journals, American literary scholars tend to look to European sources for monographic publications on the GDR. Although a number of literary scholars in this country with whom I talked seemed generally informed about East and West German social science research, fewer were aware of the work of their colleagues on this side of the Atlantic.

This situation may be at least partially remedied if the new monograph series *DDR-Studien/GDR Studies*, to be edited by Richard Zipser, succeeds in attracting scholarship in English or German on a wide variety of topics including the concerns of both humanists and social scientists—history, politics, foreign policy, cultural policy, international relations, economic history, education, geography, philosophy and religion, popular culture, art and architecture, music and musical life, theater, and contemporary topics of general interest are among the rubrics he hopes to attract to the series, in addition, of course, to literature. However, with the exception of the *GDR-Bulletin* which is actually a newsletter and not a scholarly journal, the United States does not have any central organ for publication of GDR research such as the French *Connaissance de la RDA*, the British *GDR Monitor*, or the West German *Deutschland Archiv* or *Jahrbuch zur Literatur der DDR*. While I have often argued with conviction that this country does not need any more journals for German literary scholarship, including one devoted to the GDR, a strong case could be made for a truly interdisciplinary journal of GDR studies similar to the *German Studies Review*, with an editorial board drawn from various fields of the social sciences and the humanities. Such a publication would be a significant step toward overcoming some of the diffusion now characterizing American GDR-related research.

Regarding the publication of GDR scholarship, it should also be added that there is no evidence that the major journals for German studies in the United States have been anything but receptive to articles on GDR literature. Both comments from editors as well as scholars publishing in the field indicate that there is little problem in getting good research published in most mainstream journals. The problem, from

the viewpoint of editors, seems to be the rather narrow range of topics which are repeatedly submitted, often by authors just entering the field who do not recognize how many studies have already been done, for example, on the theme of self-realization in the works of Christa Wolf.

Exchange of Information

Since American social scientists sometimes articulate the perception that they are outnumbered by the literary scholars working on the GDR, the above statistics, along with a current overview of the field of GDR literary studies, seem worth noting. For instance, compared to social scientists, who had produced significant work on the GDR even before the events of 1972–74 which gave literary research its impetus,¹³ American literary scholars got a relatively late start in their efforts to explore the terrain of the GDR.¹⁴ Aware of the amount of work that needed to be done as well as the scarcity—often the non-existence—of resources, literary researchers seem, however, to have been quicker than social scientists to organize forums for the exchange of information and research.

Already in 1973, *Dimension*, the bi-lingual literary magazine of the University of Texas at Austin, published a special GDR issue under the guest editorship of writer-in-residence Günter Kunert. Described as a “panoply of writers of the DDR. . . presented with pleasure to a new readership around the world,”¹⁵ it was soon followed by another special issue on the GDR, this time published by the newly founded *New German Critique* at the University of Wisconsin. Announcing that the time had come to end the “problematic silence about socialistic developments in the GDR,”¹⁶ its editors also offered a critical working bibliography meant as “a tool for course work and independent study groups.”¹⁷ The first major conferences on GDR literature were also held in the US in 1974, first with a few papers presented at a regional meeting of the American Association of Teachers of German in Connecticut and a few weeks later at the Second International Symposium on German literature at Washington University in St. Louis.¹⁸ The dialogue begun at this conference was continued in seminars at the 1974 meeting of the Modern Language Association and at special sessions at subsequent annual meetings of that organization, until the MLA became unwilling to support the seminars.¹⁹

The *GDR Bulletin*, published at Washington University since 1975, was itself a product of needs expressed by literary scholars in the first MLA session. With no outside support except funding from the university, it has served for ten years as a vehicle for exchange of information and communication for some 600 readers. Although its mailing list indicates an international circulation from New Zealand to Poland, it also makes clear that there are large regions of the United States where no one appears to need or want information about the GDR. The year-to-year survival of the *Bulletin* depends upon continuation of a very modest level of funding for its production costs by the university and the willingness of a group of graduate students—many of them on a one-year exchange from the Federal Republic—to carry the entire burden of planning, typing, assembling, and mailing each issue. The recently announced reduction of the *Bulletin* to only two issues a year is an understandable reflection of the difficult circumstances under which it has been maintained.

An examination of the early issues of the *Bulletin* also indicates how far the profession has come in a decade of GDR research. Lists of bookstores, libraries, and archives where GDR books could be located, useful addresses, information on organizing study trips and obtaining visas were passed on in its pages, in addition to notices of conferences planned, GDR scholars visiting in the U.S., forthcoming publications, bibliographies, and book reviews.²⁰

Although the MLA seminars have faded away, the continuity which they once provided exists today primarily at the Conway conferences. The first was also organized in 1974 by Christoph Schmauch, director of the World Fellowship Center at Conway, New Hampshire, albeit on a much more limited scale than the present multi-disciplinary conferences organized by Margy Gerber. Although the Conway meetings began primarily among humanists, they have become both interdisciplinary and international. A glance at the call for papers, the conference program, or the published proceedings in recent years reveal a new organizational mode in which American and European scholars, both in literature and the social sciences, organize panels and seminars designed to bring a variety of perspectives to bear on common topics, such as environmental questions, changing perceptions of history, patterns of male and female identity. The organizers have been quite successful in securing the participation of scholars from the GDR. Participa-

tion by other European scholars, particularly West German social scientists, has also increased significantly.²¹ Conspicuous by their absence or minimal representation remain East German creative writers, for whom the logistics of travel seem fraught with particular difficulties, and—somewhat more inexplicably—American social scientists, who seem uninterested in the interdisciplinary approach. Literary scholars, excluded from the recently established GDR Studies Association of the social scientists, are able to attend and participate in such West German conferences as the *DDR-Forschertagung* and appear to be doing so in somewhat increasing numbers.

The Conway conference also reflects the financial constraints with which American scholars of the GDR have to contend—not only do most participants pay the modest cost of the week-long conference from their own funds but they also contribute to the travel costs of those GDR participants for whom funding cannot be obtained from other sources, such as IREX. Despite or because of its rustic atmosphere and less formal organization, Conway offers special advantages: 1) the pace and timing of the meeting allow adequate time for informal discussion and contact between researchers in often disparate fields; 2) because US-GDR relations are less marked by ambiguities and anomalies, GDR scholars are ready and able to attend and participate—within the severe constraints imposed by financing their travel. Thus Conway, in addition to being the focus of American research, has become a place where East and West Germans can participate on an equal footing and where interactions not possible in their respective countries can take place. Proceedings of all conferences since 1980 are published annually in *Studies in GDR Culture and Society*.

It is also perhaps worth noting for those not familiar with American German departments that teachers of language and literature are also charged with teaching *Landeskunde*. However, until the era of *Ostpolitik* and related changes in US-GDR diplomatic relations, the study of "German" *Landeskunde* was equated almost exclusively with the study of West Germany. For example, in the fly-leaf maps which were typical of language textbooks, East Germany existed quite literally only as a grey area in the shadow of the Federal Republic, with no indication of its rivers or topographical features, regions or cities, except possibly Berlin, encircled with a symbolic bit of barbed wire.²² This state of affairs led Frank Hirschbach to report in 1974 that American German language textbooks

“either do not mention the GDR at all or else in a stepmotherly fashion in one chapter.”²³ While the situation has improved considerably, Renate Voris in the 1980s, referring to more recent textbooks and revisions of those which Hirschbach had criticized in the mid-70s, still points out “how the picture of the GDR is manipulated in these texts through the use of cliches, stereotypical details and images and through half-truths, which tell us more about the subject, the author, than about the object, the GDR, and only reconfirm old, established ways of thinking in the consciousness of American students of Germany instead of negating or slowly reducing them.”²⁴

The dismal (under) representation of the GDR was addressed in part by a ferment of curricular activity in the mid-1970s. By the time of the 1977 *Monatshefte* survey of GDR courses in American German departments,²⁵ about 140 programs reported offering GDR-related courses; most often they included the GDR in a somewhat larger context; i.e., post-war German culture, modern literature, East-West comparisons, and the like. In addition, approximately 25 institutions—mostly the larger universities—reported special courses devoted entirely to GDR literature. Recent conversations with colleagues in the field suggest that the number of such courses is declining, whether because of fading interest, the generally more conservative atmosphere of both national and academic politics, or the loss to the profession of some of the younger scholars who developed such offerings. The decline may even be explained, as several persons indicated, by a growing unwillingness of a better informed faculty to continue ghettoizing the whole of GDR literature into a single course rather than including it appropriately within other larger contexts, such as the question of modernism, problems in literary history, contemporary drama and theater.

Until the publication of Margy Gerber and Judith Pouget’s most useful bibliography,²⁶ the relative inaccessibility of GDR literature in English translation has also been an obstacle to developing courses for students unable to read German. Nonetheless, although Gerber and Pouget document the translation of approximately 1,250 titles by 129 authors through 1983,²⁷ the disappointing fact is that most of what has been translated is poetry.

With the exception of a few authors whose works have been translated almost in their entirety—the editors mention Peter Huchel, Johannes Bobrowski, Christa Wolf, Günter Kunert, Reiner Kunze—“some

well-known writers are strangely under-represented: for example, none of the novels of Hermann Kant have been translated into English; only one of the plays of Volker Braun; and only a few of the plays of Peter Hacks.”²⁸ In addition to the dearth of translations of novels and plays, the editors also point out that, in general, selections for translation come predominantly from authors who are published in the West, either in *Lizenzausgaben* or as dissidents. Despite visits to the US and tours by writers of the stature of Günter Kunert, Christa Wolf, Irmtraud Morgner, Morgner, Hermann Kant, Helga Schütz, and Jurek Becker, it almost seems that until some GDR writer is awarded a Nobel prize, GDR authors are apt to remain relatively unknown and unrecognized in the United States. For the educated American reading public, writers from the Federal Republic, the Soviet Union, and such East European countries as Czechoslovakia, Poland, and Yugoslavia are both more familiar and much more readily available in serious bookstores. This is unfortunately also true for the splendid collection of films from the GDR, which has been shown with relatively little resonance to the same film audiences who have responded positively to other foreign series. If my experience with academic colleagues is any barometer of non-Germanist attitudes, GDR literature can be said to lack the same legitimacy among informed American readers as the state does among the general public. The “other Germany” is seen as a state with little distinct identity apart from its reputation as a particularly questionable element of the Soviet satellite system, and by inference its literature lacks in intrinsic value. This perception represents a serious obstacle, too, for researchers who need to obtain positive readers’ reports on grant proposals; many scholars also regard it as a major problem in efforts to obtain funding from institutions such as the National Endowment for the Humanities, with its reputed emphasis on the “canon” of humanistic texts.

Pluralistic Research

Having thus attempted to delineate the status of GDR studies in American German departments, what can we now say about the nature of research on GDR literature in the United States? To begin with, it shows a high degree of pluralism regarding methodologies, political orientation, and focus of interest. Since this research is carried on only by individuals and not within any formal organizational context, the

field is not characterized by a great deal of factionalism or ideological confrontation. "Everyone just researches away," and, while taking cognizance of work done by others in the field, few scholars are presently in a position to engage in active collaboration with one another. The physical distances separating them and the lack of institutional backing or funding tend to obstruct easy communication, although some informal networks for exchange of difficult-to-obtain materials do exist. Without frequent travel to Europe, it is difficult for researchers to stay abreast of recent publications, both of literature *per se* and of literary criticism which appears outside the main journals. The fact that research on GDR topics is so labor-intensive may also explain why more scholars have not entered the field and why, with few exceptions, American research tends to focus on major figures, images, and themes rather than on more general developments which are difficult to grasp in isolation. The increasing tendency of American social science to pursue quantitative, theoretical models rather than area-focused studies—a trend which has posed problems for younger social scientists wanting to pursue GDR-related research—also poses formidable obstacles for literary scholars interested in teaching or researching the GDR in a broader context.

I began my preparation of this survey with the intention of offering a report which would delineate major directions and unique contributions of American research on the literature of the GDR. But in the course of examining bibliographies and listing titles, research projects, and proposals, it became obvious that the discipline is still too young and fragmented to permit safe generalizations about any uniquely American epistemology and methodology. If anything, its distinctive quality should probably be sought somewhere in the realm of American pragmatism, that tendency to emphasize empirical facts and actual events rather than being preoccupied with creating a theoretical framework into which they can be cast. But at this point we do not have a comprehensive, current bibliography of research which would enable us to reflect systematically on approaches and methods as well as the content of the American contribution.

One might assume that in this field, above all others, major differences in national history and identity, as well as the socio-cultural and institutional context in which GDR literature is examined, would produce major differences in the character of American and West German

research. But this does not seem self-evident. The fact that the West German publishing industry is the major channel by which GDR literature is transmitted to the US, as well as that by which much US research on this literature is disseminated, seems to minimize the differences between national approaches. This has been particularly evident since the Biermann affair, which tended to focus American attention on the large group of writers, most of them now living in the West, who have made the best seller lists as dissident writers. There is no doubt that the sequence of events involving Wolf Biermann and some of his critical colleagues—and the sensational publicity surrounding them—effected a change in the American image of GDR literature. In contrast to a decade ago when almost all of GDR literature was *terra incognita*, American Germanists of the mid-80s are much more likely to be familiar with many of the names of GDR writers who publish in the West (including some of those who continue to write and publish in the GDR itself, most notably Heiner Müller and Christa Wolf), of whom it is often asserted that they can no longer be considered "just" GDR writers.

Quite apart from special attention attracted by the marketing of works which encounter difficulties with publication in the GDR, or at least attest to imperfections of its political system, the American Germanist's view of GDR literature has been influenced by the mere question of availability—work published by major houses in the FRG is quite simply more readily available than that from the GDR itself where it is out-of-print too quickly to be reliably available on this side of the Atlantic. Hans-Jürgen Schmitt's list of GDR-authored books available in the Federal Republic even before the 1970s surge of American interest (to which may be added those texts readily available in West German paperback anthologies) accounts for most of the authors who first became familiar to US Germanists and their students—books published in both states (by Franz Fühmann, Christa Wolf, Johannes Bobrowski, Hermann Kant, Sarah Kirsch, and Günter de Bruyn) and those which appeared only in the West (by Wolf, Bobrowski, Fritz Rudolf Fries, Wolf Biermann, Reiner Kunze, and Günter Kunert²⁹) were the ones which we could count on as being available for assigned readings in those early courses which introduced GDR literature to the majority of younger scholars working in the field today. Of course, our own concerns as middle-class American literature scholars also explain why some kinds of writing—dealing with issues of women and youth, the literary heritage, the Holocaust, the

environment, to name just a few—attract more attention than others focusing, for example, on problems in industry and agriculture, living conditions, travel and exploration.

If one tries to describe an American branch of GDR literary research, its distinctive qualities must be sought in our institutional, disciplinary, and professional context, which I have attempted to sketch above. While the lack of institutional support brings with it financial and logistical hardships, it has also meant that American literary research is less likely to suffer from factionalism and turf fights. Valid differences in the interpretation of single phenomena do exist, but they are much less pronounced today than in the early years, when some recriminations did fly back and forth between left and right factions, particularly in connection with the MLA seminars. Critical and uncritical Marxists alike, accused of naive admiration of the GDR, soon lost their illusions; the conservative faction, suspected of trying to save the GDR from itself, soon—with a few exceptions—abandoned its cold-war stance toward the state that, in their opinion, was never meant to be. Although changes in the general political tone of the country do affect the climate in which we work, they are not as threatening as they would be if the fortunes and finances of the discipline were among the central concerns of the state here. American researchers of the GDR have little cause to spend time worrying about losing forms of support which they have never had.

But there are also a few less dubious advantages enjoyed by American Germanists. Foremost is the apparently greater opportunity to visit archives, libraries, and research centers in the GDR. Most active American literary scholars maintain personal contacts with both creative writers and practitioners of literary criticism in the GDR and often have the opportunity to discuss their current projects with them, both in the GDR and when East Germans are allowed to travel in this country. The very fact that there are established, formalized channels—IREX, the various writer-in-residence programs, the increasing number of US-GDR university exchanges, and the new fellowships for graduate students sponsored by the *Liga für Völkerfreundschaft*—may put American scholars in a better position to offer balanced interpretations of some aspects of GDR culture than West German colleagues, for whom personal contacts are much more problematic. The very fact that American scholars are in some ways outsiders to the German-German problem may enable them to worry less, for example, about the thorny question of whether

there are one, two, or four German literatures and to focus attention in more positive ways on both the common historical tradition as well as the divergent lines of development in contemporary culture, East and West.

Research Needs

Rather than seeing itself as a impecunious subsidiary of West German research, American literary scholarship might give more thought to its own potential for mediation between the two cultures, beginning with a common data base of all texts by authors whose writing, regardless of where it is published, reflects their own self-identification, positive or negative, as GDR writers. The potential for a comparative analysis of themes, topics, and metaphors in the literature of both German states is also evident, particularly when it relates to topics from their common culture heritage, such as recently revised attitudes toward various periods of literary history, Martin Luther, the National Socialist past, and soon the 750th anniversary celebrations of Berlin in 1987. There is still a need for a comprehensive study of the unique cultural and literary system of the GDR, one which would offer a balanced assessment of its situation between its Western European heritage and the continuing influence of German literature published in the German-speaking states of Western Europe on the one hand, and on the other, its integration into the Soviet sphere of influence and organizational forms in Eastern Europe.

Although we have made great strides since recognizing in the 1970s that GDR literature should not be studied in isolation and that we needed a knowledge of social structures and political processes in the GDR in order to deal adequately with it, "Biermann und die Folgen," as the whole complex of cultural-political events of the late 70s is often termed, seems to have ushered in a change of paradigm in American GDR research. Many literary researchers who, correctly or incorrectly, regarded themselves as unprejudiced explorers of undiscovered literary terrain, suddenly found themselves thrust into an oppositional posture for which their assumptions about the development of relations between literature and politics in the GDR had hardly prepared them. In 1977, one of the earliest researchers on GDR literature put it well:

"The subject [GDR literature], thanks to all of our efforts, is academically sound and relatively secured. Enervating as it is to all of us, the current wave of political repression and denial of human rights in Eastern Europe, but especially in the Soviet Union and the GDR, should motivate each of us to reconsider our perspective on the subject. It is clear that we still don't come close to understanding the cultural political game in the GDR, its rules, its functional parts, its range of flexibility. A year ago, when Heiner Müller and others were freely and candidly discussing the potential of GDR culture with us on our campuses, most of us would have predicted a much different scenario for the GDR's cultural arena than the abject reality with which we are faced today. This indicates to me that we, as an academic group, are still very weak in two major areas. First, we must do much better in gathering and distributing pertinent information, and second, we must develop more incisive methodologies, particularly in the sociology of literature, to come to terms with GDR literature and cultural policy. We must learn to understand and explain the rules of the GDR's particular game much more conclusively than we have done. If we don't we will again be forced to sit silently and dumb-founded in the face of every unexpected policy shift in the GDR."³⁰

In the attempt to locate GDR literature in its socio-political context and to find answers to the challenges which this statement poses, literary scholars have from the beginning drawn upon the social sciences. Although some of their attempts to use not only the data but also the methods of the social scientists may be regarded as insufficiently sophisticated, they cannot be dismissed as irrelevant. Meanwhile, as some areas of the social sciences seem to be moving into "interpretative" modes of dealing with their subject matter, it would seem time to undertake a more formal exploration of possible avenues of cooperation between the disciplines. What are our joint concerns? How do our value systems compare? In what areas of mutual concern should complementary research be developed?

It no longer seems necessary to emphasize the centrality of literature in the political culture of the GDR, but a full understanding of its function depends on many factors outside the literary process. While literary scholars can readily recognize the importance attached both to the production and reception of literature in the hierarchical, bureaucratically controlled literary system of the GDR, we do not presently have all the necessary tools by which to gauge parameters in the political and economic spheres which affect the functioning of this literary system.

We urgently need a functional analysis of the total literary system, extending from the Central Committee of the SED through the Ministry for Culture, with its *Hauptverwaltung Verlage und Buchhandel*, to the Writer's Union, publishers, book sellers and libraries, to say nothing of individual writers and readers.

On the other hand, it is often the writers who are the most sensitive seismographs of social and political change in the GDR, responding and often articulating challenges to outmoded patterns of behavior, as well as drawing attention to social and political conditions which have not yet been addressed anywhere else in the public sphere. Even texts not set in the present can offer a penetrating critique of the contemporary scene, albeit one which may be accessible only to the reader familiar with the historical-cultural tradition in which it operates. Recognizing that shifts in themes and styles may signal an attempt to influence policy and policy-makers in the GDR some American scholars have learned to pay close attention to literature and literary criticism which *does* appear in the leading journals and publishing houses of the GDR. We need a paradigm which takes into account the circuitous route past cultural and political decision-makers to which literature in the GDR is subject. It is this which gives it a special significance for readers inside and outside the GDR—quite different from the best-seller phenomenon in the West—and so likewise the need for careful investigation.

The mode in which GDR literature is studied has also shifted within the last decade. Naive notions of how texts represented the official cultural-political line have given way to recognition of the need for a much more differentiated model which would enable us to examine the function of literature within a system much more complex than has generally been assumed. This model must take into account the peculiar situation of the GDR vis-a-vis the advanced industrial societies of the West, with which it shares not only common problems but a common language, and the East European political system, with its particular economic system, ideologies, political institutions, and tensions, in which the GDR is a mature partner. A careful and comparative analysis of this context may also yield more satisfactory insights into the ways in which the identical literary text may be received in apparently contradictory ways by readers in differing political systems. Although we tacitly acknowledge it, we have not studied analytically the way in which the reception of a GDR author in the West, the publicity which attends any

work identified as critical or "dissident," itself affects the status of that author and his/her work in the GDR.

In addition to urging better collaboration between social scientists and humanists, it may also be appropriate to emphasize the importance of a solid knowledge of East European culture and language, particularly Russian, to sustain research of truly comparative dimensions. At present only a handful of Germanists have enough fluency in Russian to use it in their research; those who train the coming generation of scholars in this area need to remedy this deficit.

As a literary scholar, I am prepared to argue that the truth of subjective experience which the literary artist attempts to embody in his or her text has a validity which is separate but equal to the truths of statistical abstraction and "objective" historical accounts. Unlike other data (including the results of research projects and internal debates) which never enter the public sphere, literature is readily available for examination and analysis. If one accepts the Brechtian thesis that the function of art is to change society, then a study of the complex mechanisms by which literary artists undertake their reckoning with society may yield new perspectives not congruent with some of our original assumptions. If we want to understand the way in which GDR literature not only reflects but actually helps to shape the social, political, and cultural goals of the society in which it is produced, we will need more than the familiar tools of our own discipline to set the literary lens in sharpest focus.

NOTES

1) The U.S. Department of Education National Center for Educational Statistics reports a figure of 1,887 for the academic year 1982-83. Reprinted from *Digest of Education Statistics*, in *Standard Education Almanac 1984-85*, 17th ed., ed. Gerald L. Gutek. (Chicago: Marquis Who's Who, 1984), p. 298.

2) *Monatshefte*, Vol. 77, No. 3 (Fall, 1985), p. 345.

3) Of these, the University of Wisconsin currently has the longest history of Ph.D. research on GDR literature. Although Indiana University produced a number of dissertations in the early years of American research in this area, in recent years more dissertations appear to be coming from the University of Minnesota. A number of GDR dissertations are currently in progress at Ohio State University, as well.

4) *Monatshefte*, Vol. 77, No. 3 (Fall, 1985), p. 347.

5) GDR support available to American scholars thus far includes a number of *Freiplätze* for faculty and graduate students attending the Internationale Hochschulferienkurse, participation in the IREX exchange, and, most recently, a number of year-long graduate fellowships at East German universities provided through the Liga für Völkerfreundschaft.

6) Cf. Michael Sodaro's wry comments when reviewing two recent studies of the GDR for the *Slavic Review*: "When books concerning East Germany are up for evaluation in a journal calling itself the *Slavic Review*, it is safe to assume that somebody is having an identity crisis. . . . And while the judgments of the editorial boards of scholarly journals are invariably unimpeachable, one may legitimately inquire where the GDR 'fits in' among studies of contemporary Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union." Review of David Childs, *The GDR: Moscow's German Ally* (London, Boston, and Sydney: George Allen and Unwin, 1983) and Karl Wilhelm Fricke, *Die DDR-Staatssicherheit: Entwicklung, Strukturen, Aktionsfelder* (Köln: Verlag Wissenschaft und Politik, 1982) in *Slavic Review* (Spring, 1985), pp. 159-162.

7) Valters Nollendorfs and Carol A. Arness, "Graduate Programs: Looking Together Toward the 1990's," *Monatshefte*, Vol. 76, No. 3 (Fall, 1984), p. 327.

8) *Ibid*, p. 323.

9) Anita M. Mallinckrodt, *Research on the GDR "auf Englisch"* (Washington, D.C.: Mallinckrodt Communication Research, 1984).

10) John Flores, *Poetry in East Germany. Adjustments, Visions and Provocations 1945-1970* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1971); H.G. Huettich, *Theater in the Planned Society. Contemporary Drama in the German Democratic Republic in its Historical, Political and Cultural Context* (Chapel Hill: Univ. of North Carolina Press, 1978).

11) Lowell Bangerter, *The Bourgeois Proletarian: A Study of Anna Seghers* (Bonn: Bouvier, 1980); Ute Brandes, *Zitat und Montage in der neueren DDR-Prosa* (Bern: Peter Lang, 1983); Christine Cosentino and Wolfgang Ertl, *Zur Lyrik Volker Brauns* (Königstein/Ts.: Athenäum, 1984); Wolfgang Ertl, *Stephan Hermlin und die Tradition* (Bern: Peter Lang, 1977); Wolfgang Ertl, *Natur und Landschaft in der DDR: Walter Werner, Wulf Kirsten und Uwe Gressmann* (Stuttgart: Hans-Dieter Heinz, 1982); Margret Eifler, *Dialektische Dynamik. Kulturpolitik und Aesthetik im Gegenwartsroman der DDR* (Bonn: Bouvier, 1976); Jay Rosellini, *Volker Braun* (München:

C.H. Beck, 1983); Judith Scheid, *Zum Drama in der DDR: Heiner Müller und Peter Hacks* (Stuttgart: Klett, 1981); Marc Silberman, *Literature of the Working World. The Industrial Novel in East Germany* (Bern: Peter Lang, 1976); Marc Silberman, *Zum Roman in der DDR* (Stuttgart: Klett, 1980); Marc Silberman, *Heiner Müller* (Forschungsbericht) (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1980); Alexander Stephan, *Christa Wolf* (Forschungsbericht) (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1980); Alexander Stephan, *Christa Wolf* (München: C.H. Beck, 1979); Arlene Akiko Teraoka, *The Silence of Entropy or Universal Discourse. The Postmodernist Poetics of Heiner Müller* (Bern: Peter Lang, 1985); Reinhard Zachau, *Stefan Heym* (München: C.H. Beck, 1982); and, most recently, the three-volume edition *DDR-Literatur im Tauwetter* (Bern: Peter Lang, 1985), edited by Richard Zipser in collaboration with Karl-Heinz Schoeps.

12) Among these are *Studies in GDR Culture and Society, Proceedings of the International Symposium of the German Democratic Republic*, edited annually by Margy Gerber et al since 1981 and other collections, such as *DDR-Roman und Literaturgesellschaft, Amsterdamer Beiträge zur neueren Germanistik*, Bd. 11/12, 1981; *Literatur und Literaturtheorie in der DDR*, ed. P.U. Hohendahl and P. Herminghouse (Frankfurt: Suhrkamp, 1976) and *DDR-Literatur der siebziger Jahre*, ed. Hohendahl and Herminghouse (Frankfurt: Suhrkamp, 1983).

13) Cf. the useful reports published in *Deutschland Archiv* by Peter C. Ludz, "DDR-Forschung und vergleichende Deutschlandforschung in den USA," Heft 2/1970; Melvin Croan, "Zur Lage der DDR-Forschung in den USA," Heft 2/1976; and Anita M. Mallinckrodt, "DDR-Forschung in englischsprachigen Ländern," Heft 7/1985.

14) Theodore Huebner's brief and superficial survey, *The Literature of East Germany* (New York: Frederick Ungar, 1970) was the only book-length study available when American interest in GDR literature began to rise in the 1970s.

15) A. Leslie Willson, "Perspective: How It Came to Be," *Dimension*, Special Issue 1973, p. 8.

16) *New German Critique* No. 2 (Spring, 1974), p. 2.

17) *Ibid.*, p. 126.

18) Many papers presented at this conference were included in the volume *Literatur und Literaturtheorie in der DDR*, edited by the conference organizers.

19) Although the MLA seminars have faded away, special sessions

continue to take place at various other regional meetings and national conferences, as at the American Association of Teachers of German, the Kentucky Foreign Language Conference, the German Studies Association (formerly Western Association for German Studies), and the regional MLA meetings.

20) The demand for basic information at a time when US-GDR diplomatic relations had just begun was such that the editor felt compelled to announce at the beginning of its second year that "Although every attempt is made through the *Bulletin* to meet the needs of those interested in research or teaching on GDR topics, it is not possible to comply with personal requests for topical bibliographies or course outlines, dissertation advice, fellowship information, or publication opportunities, to name a few of the more common problems. . . . Others, such as funding for conferences and symposia, special GDR publications, individual and group travel, are unfortunately beyond our range of competence—as is political information, visa advice, travel planning and organizing lecture tours." Vol. II, Nr. 1, p. 1.

21) At the 1985 conference, for example, the program included 18 literary scholars (14 from the U.S.; 4 from Europe) and 21 persons from non-literary, primarily social science, fields (16 from Europe, 5 from the U.S.).

22) One interesting exception to this general pattern was an intermediate reader, *Osten und Westen*, edited by Stefan Grunwald (New York, Chicago, San Francisco, Atlanta: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1970). Although not entirely unbiased in its presentation, the book offered selections by Peter Hacks, Anna Seghers, Karl-Heinz Jakobs, and Willi Bredel.

23) Frank Hirschbach, "Teaching GDR Literature," *Die Unterrichtspraxis*, Vol. 7, No. 2 (1974), p. 68.

24) Renate Voris, "Freiheit oder Sozialismus: Zum Bild der DDR in neueren amerikanischen Textbüchern für den Deutschunterricht," *Die Unterrichtspraxis*, Vol. 14, No. 1 (1981), p. 35.

25) *Monatshefte*, Vol. 69, No. 3 (Fall, 1977), pp. 320-336.

26) Margy Gerber and Judith Pouget. *Literature of the German Democratic Republic in English Translation. A Bibliography* (Lanham, New York, London: University Press of America, 1984).

27) *Ibid.*, p. 3.

28) *Ibid.*, p. 5.

29) Hans-Jurgen Schmitt, "Von den 'Mutmassungen' zu den 'Neuen Leiden'. Zur Wirkungsgeschichte der DDR-Literatur," in *Hansers Sozialgeschichte der deutschen Literatur vom 16. Jahrhundert bis zur Gegenwart*. Bd. 11: *Die Literatur der DDR*, hg. H.-J. Schmitt (München: Carl Hanser Verlag, 1983), p. 24f.

30) H.G. Huettich, "Letter to the Editor," *GDR Bulletin*, Vol. III, No. 1 (1977), p. 2.

FEDERAL REPUBLIC

Doris Cornelsen

GDR research is a relatively young field in the Federal Republic of Germany, but it already has generated heated debates on methods and aims.¹ They result from the particular situation in divided Germany, the East-West conflict, and the close proximity of scholarly to political problems in this area of research. But the phase of self-reflection is now over, and there has long been general agreement that in GDR research, as in any other field, a clear distinction must be drawn between factual statements and value judgements, and that all statements must be checked and verifiable. It is also agreed that there are three main tasks for GDR research:

a) Scholarly Work

The scholar's task is to research the economy of a different political and social system. The subject chosen for analysis should widen our knowledge and throw light on a hitherto dark area. Since the "different system" is the other German state, there is especially great interest in the FRG in description, analysis, and interpretation which is as exact as possible. A differentiated analysis of the GDR should also provide a basis for comparison with the FRG, its achievements, and problems, and so should make a contribution to assessing developments in both German states since 1949.

b) Information

The public at large still has a considerable information gap, but the demand for information has increased greatly. People want to know about the development, efficiency, and problems of the GDR economy, the difference between socialism in the GDR and the capitalist market economy of the FRG. Therefore, GDR research should provide factual information and material suitable for research and teaching purposes (particularly in schools, universities and colleges of education) and for use in political education work and by the media as well.

c) Political Work

The picture that emerges from GDR research also provides a direct or indirect general orientation for political and administrative work in the FRG. Information and analyses based on solid research are also essential prerequisites for political decision-making and judgment. In that context, analyses of the GDR's various external relations (its integration in Comecon, East-West cooperation, and inner-German trade) are important.

Within this framework, the individual subject areas in GDR research evolve either from the special interests of the research workers, the area in which the institution is working, or from commissions, i.e., assignments—for example, the "Material for the Report on the State of the Nation (*Materialien zum Bericht zur Lage der Nation*) compiled in 1971, 1972, and 1974 for the Federal Ministry of Inner-German Relations to provide a comparison of the two German states.

FRG Institutions Engaged in Economic Research on the GDR

The research institutes in the Federal Republic of Germany in which the GDR economy is the main field of work, or one aspect of a broader range of subjects are listed in an Appendix to this chapter.² The list is intended as a quick survey and provides only a rough outline of the main areas of work—for instance, as publications only series published by the institutions themselves. More detailed information can be obtained directly from the various institutes, and the Information Office for GDR Research (*Informationsstelle für DDR-Forschung*) at the *Gesamtdeutsches Institut-Bundesanstalt für gesamtdeutsche Aufgaben* will also prove very helpful. There follows an account of research on the GDR at the German Institute for Economic Research (DIW), where I have been for some years and now head the department "GDR and the East European Industrial Countries."

Research at DIW

In early years economic research on the GDR was largely conditioned by the existence of the Advisory Council on Questions Relating to the Reunification of Germany (*Forschungsbeirat für Fragen der Wiedervereinigung Deutschlands*) at the Federal Ministry of Inner-German Affairs, set up by order of the Ministry in 1952. When it was founded, the Advisory

Council was also instructed to work out proposals should Germany be reunited. That task subjected the Advisory Council to strong criticism, particularly in later years. It must be said, however, that over the course of time the Council concentrated more on its other work, i.e., reporting, analyzing, and interpreting the economic and social development of the GDR.

In 1975 the Advisory Council was dissolved. During its existence it had provided a huge range of material. Some of the results of its work are contained in five Activity Reports,³ which, as a whole, give an account of economic and social developments in the GDR up to 1969. Better known is its series "Economy and Society in Central Germany" (*Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft in Mitteldeutschland*) in which altogether ten volumes appeared between 1964 and 1975.

DIW, the *Deutsches Institut für Wirtschaftsforschung* in West Berlin, has the longest tradition of GDR research. It is one of the five major economic research institutes in the Federal Republic of Germany, and its GDR research started soon after the end of the war when it began analyzing the problems of the occupation zones.

DIW was founded in 1925 as the *Institut für Konjunkturforschung*, with its tasks outlined in Paragraph 2 of its statutes: "The Institute is to exclusively and directly serve non-profit and scientific purposes, and its task is to observe and research economic developments at home and abroad, publish the results of its work where possible, and support the administration, research, and the economy by making reports and assessments."

DIW is financed through contracted work (30%) and from public grants (70%), which are given in equal shares by *Land* Berlin and the Federal Government.

At present it employs a staff of about 200, around 100 of whom are research workers (mainly economists, with some trade specialists, political scientists, sociologists, engineers, mathematicians, and agricultural experts). It has ten specialized departments—seven concentrate on analysis and forecasting of economic developments in the FRG, and three on regional and country studies.

The department "GDR and East European Industrial Countries" was created in 1967—against the background of increasing economic and political integration of the GDR into the East European economic area—by merging two formerly independent departments. It at present has

a staff of 18, ten of whom are research workers.

The Institute's tasks leave sufficient scope for the researchers to set their own priorities and develop their own views. The cooperation between all the research departments guarantees scholarly standards, ensures further qualification, and prevents academic isolation, which is particularly important in specialized country research. By statute, DIW's president and departmental heads are jointly responsible for direction of the research. Before a report is handed over or a publication released, the work is subjected to critical assessment by the president and the committee of departmental heads. Standing editorial conferences have been set up for the weekly reports. There the research approach, methods, and results are discussed, not only with colleagues in the department but in many cases with other interested staff members, as well. DIW holds symposia on major special themes, to which research workers from outside the Institute may be invited, and these also provide a forum for discussion.

Organizational and financial independence are particularly important for the work of my department since GDR research suffers from a particularly wearisome lack of data. The research thus entails constant observation, documentation, and archive work (in other words, uninterrupted financial support) and involves constant assessment and control, i.e., possibilities available in the Institute as a whole. Finally, all work on the GDR requires good staffing with appropriate technical personnel (statisticians familiar with the delimitation problems, archivists, programmers, and secretaries accustomed to specialized terminology).

The work of the department includes:

- Continuous and comprehensive basic research, which is descriptive and analytical in orientation. Necessary material and data are systematically and constantly supplemented and brought up to date. The results—reports on the current economic situation in the GDR and the other Comecon countries and reports on special themes—are published mainly in weekly DIW reports. Longer articles appear in DIW's quarterly reviews.
- Topical research, which is limited in time. This also requires systematic data collection. The choice of topic emerges partly from the particular interests of individual members of the staff and partly from commissions, for example from individual government ministries. The results of the work are published in research

reports, DIW special issues, and as contributions to structural research.

- As part of the general information work of the Institute, two general studies on the GDR economy have now been published.⁴ They are intended to give the public at large an overall picture of the economic system and its development, within the Comecon framework as well, in a readable style with an analytical intent.

Thematically the work of the department covers main areas of economic research on the GDR.⁵ It is carried out by individual staff members who have specific fields in which they have already published longer studies, team work for contract research projects, and special working groups which have done all the more recent major studies.

For collection of material, the GDR/East European department is the only one in the Institute to have two archivists of its own. Given the current data situation, the archives are essential to research, and they are now changing over to more modern methods of collection and access. In 1979 we systematically began building up an industrial archive, including assessments of the regional East European press and a large number of specialized periodicals. The three statisticians each have individual special fields, and team work is frequent as well. Data processing in DIW is both centralized (in a central data-processing department) and decentralized (with programmers in the individual departments); this ensures further training and consultation and at the same time constant contact with the work of the departments.

The cooperation within the Institute proved particularly valuable in the production of material for the "Report on the State of the Nation" in 1971. Chapter III (Production and Productivity, excl. Agriculture), IV (The Main Infrastructure Elements), V (Incomes and Consumption, Cost of Living) and parts of Chapter I (Comecon, Intra-German Trade) were prepared by 12 research workers from various departments—GDR and East European Industrial Countries, National Accounts, Economic Production Factors, Industry, Mining and Energy, and Transportation.

Other Institutes

Among the other major economic research institutes in the FRG only the *HWWA-Institut für Wirtschaftsforschung* in Hamburg has a specialized GDR research department. The work of that Institute traditionally con-

centrates on world economic problems and on economic development in the FRG and its worldwide integration. Of six research departments, one—Socialist Countries and East-West Economic Relations—examines domestic and external economic development and the economic systems in the socialist countries of Eastern Europe. GDR research is a sub-section of this. A study "The Economic Situation in Eastern Europe at the Turn of the Year" (*Die wirtschaftliche Entwicklung in Osteuropa zur Jahreswende*) appears regularly as a HWWA report.

A special feature of HWWA is its Information Center, which has a staff of more than 100. It not only supplies the research departments with material but is also open to the public. The library is one of the largest specialized libraries in Europe.

An important factor in the early development of GDR research was establishment of the East European Institute (*Osteuropa-Institut*) at the Free University of Berlin in 1951. Part of the university, the Institute is engaged in teaching as well as research, both including the GDR. A special feature is inclusion of trade studies, unrepresented in other institutes in the FRG.

After the Inner-German Ministry's Advisory Council was dissolved in 1975, some of the research staff moved to the newly created Research Unit for Economic and Social Studies on Germany as a Whole (*Forschungsstelle für gesamtdeutsche wirtschaftliche und soziale Fragen*) located in West Berlin. An academic institution, by statute its purpose is to engage in research into the economic and social developments in the GDR in comparison with those in the FRG within the framework of the two systems. The work is now divided into three fields of research: The Economic System, which deals with problems in the structure and development of the economy as a whole; Sectoral Problems in system and development; and Management and Operational problems. Major areas of research are the economic system, foreign trade, agriculture, and data-processing in the GDR. The results have been published since 1974 in a series "FS-Analysen. Dokumentation-Analyse-Information." Every November since 1975, the Forschungsstelle has organized a symposium on the GDR economy which is attended by most of the West German research workers engaged in this field and some from abroad. Special subjects are dealt with in colloquia and discussions.

The Federal Institute for East European and International Studies (*Bundesinstitut für ostwissenschaftliche und internationale Studien*) in Col-

ogne also has a broad research program. It studies politics, society, the economy and ideology in Eastern Europe, with particular attention to the Soviet Union. Although the GDR and its economic development thus is the concern of only a sub-section of the Institute, it nevertheless has produced a number of publications on the GDR.

The Research Unit for Comparative Studies on Economic Steering Systems (*Forschungsstelle zum Vergleich wirtschaftlicher Lenkungssysteme*) at the University of Marburg was founded in 1954. It concentrates on two aspects—basic research into the general economic order (in continuation of the theory on the general order by Walter Encken and K. Paul Hensel) and the analysis and comparison of specific economic systems. Main interests, apart from the market economy system in the FRG, are various forms of central planning and market socialism in the GDR and East European countries. Questions of coordination, innovation, growth and adjustment capacity, stabilization, and social benefits in different economic systems are a main focus of attention. The work is published in comparative studies of economic systems and monographs, and the "Marburg School" of comparative studies in economic systems has become well-known. In addition, for about the last 15 years the *Forschungsstelle* has held a research seminar every spring in Raden (South Tyrol) which lasts several days and is devoted to the comparison of economic and social systems.

The GDR Research Group and Archives (*Arbeitsbereich DDR-Forschung und -Archiv*) at the Central Sociological Research Institute (*Zentralinstitut für sozialwissenschaftliche Forschung*) of the Free University of Berlin focuses mainly on analysis of changes in the structure and institutional organizations of the political and social systems in the GDR. Socio-political studies predominate. Where the economy is concerned, the main attention is to social policy and the social structure.

The Social Science Institute (*Institut für Gesellschaft und Wissenschaft*, or IGW) of Erlangen-Nuremberg is the research institute attached to the German Society for the Study of Current Affairs (*Deutsche Gesellschaft für zeitgeschichtliche Fragen*). It is engaged in research focused especially on the development of science, research, and technology in the GDR. The main interest is the relation between science and social development, political goals, and structures. The work consists mainly of medium-range projects and flow analyses. One of the projects concerns GDR energy policy, another the study of economics in the GDR. This

Institute has a large number of publication series, an extensive program of events, and a large documentation and information center.

The *Gesamtdeutsches Institut—Bundesanstalt für gesamtdeutsche Aufgaben* in Bonn is an official body using research methods. One of its aims is to offer its library and archives to further GDR research. One of the Institute's departments collects and evaluates material on the economy in the GDR, and especially in recent years a number of major studies have been published on economics in both German states.

So far, West German universities have not been greatly engaged GDR studies or research. The Report on the State of GDR and Comparative German Studies (*Gutachten zum Stand der DDR- und vergleichenden Deutschlandforschung*) of 1978 states that there is not enough interest in this field to guarantee steady and systematic progress. Nevertheless, GDR research of high quality is being done at some universities because individual scholars have the interest and enthusiasm.

Communication on GDR Research (The Economy)

The main organs of communication on GDR research in the narrower sense are periodicals, especially *Deutschland Archiv*, conferences and symposia, and the *Informationsstelle für DDR-Forschung*.

—The periodical *Deutschland Archiv* provides information on the GDR and policy problems involving the two German states in the form of analyses, reports, and discussion forums, book reviews, and a regular chronicle. Its work is of very great value. The periodical is all the more important since it gives young scholars an opportunity—hard to find elsewhere in the FRG—to publish their work.

—Each of the GDR research conferences held annually since 1967 in the week after Whitsun (formerly in Tutzing and Lerbach and now Bonn-Röttgen) has a broad framework. In addition to discussion on research results, the conferences help to establish contact among GDR researchers and to familiarize specialized journalists, civil servants, and politicians with the questions, problems, and results of GDR research.

—At the symposia in Berlin, which are also held every year, at the end of November, special problems of the economic and social situation in the GDR are discussed. The symposia are organized by the *Forschungsstelle für gesamtdeutsche wirtschaftliche und soziale*

Fragen. Members of the staff of DIW in Berlin and the *Institut für Gesellschaft und Wissenschaft* (IGW) in Erlangen regularly participate. The main aim is to promote—through lectures and discussion—the exchange of experience among scholars in this field.

—The Society for Research on Germany (*Gesellschaft für Deutschlandforschung*) was founded in 1978 at the initiative of a number of researchers. Its concern is inter-disciplinary cooperation on comparative research concerning both German states, and it holds a wide range of conferences, the papers for which are published. They almost always include economic studies.

—In 1978 the Federal Ministry for Inner-German relations set up the Information Office for GDR Research (*Informationsstelle für DDR-Forschung*) at the *Bundesanstalt für Gesamtdeutsche Aufgaben* in Bonn to concentrate the information and documentation of GDR research in one place. The Office has now published a number of catalogues of current projects in this field. It also publishes information on university research facilities, projects, and classes concerning the GDR.

Results

Extensive and detailed literature on the GDR economy is now available in the Federal Republic of Germany, and this aspect of the GDR has certainly been most widely researched and reported on. That applies to the economic policy pursued in the GDR, as well as to its system and development. There are a large number of accounts of many different phases of GDR economic policy and the structure of the system; there also are a number of empirical and analytical studies on aspects of developments in industry, agriculture, and foreign trade. There are empirical statistical studies also on the development, use, and distribution of the gross national product. Of particular importance here are comparisons of the standard of living in the GDR and the FRG.

Systematic and independent comparative studies did not begin until relatively late. The real pioneer research work in comparisons between the two German states was done in the material on the State of the Nation (1971, 1972 and 1974), referred to earlier. This concentrated on comparison of mainly quantitative data in various social, economic, legal, and educational areas, with the economy being covered in the 1971 and

1974 reports. The work is fundamental and remains an important orientation for comparison of the two German states and for GDR research as a whole. Later work on a comparison of the systems and individual sectors in the economy followed, but here in particular there is much scope for further development, especially in methods and systems.

The Current Situation

In 1985 the Federal Ministry for Inner-German Relations decided to again fund a project for gathering information on the state of the nation focused on the economy. This is to be a quantitative study, continuing the comparative analysis made in 1971 and 1974; it is to give as extensive a comparison as possible of the situation then and now and provide an overview of interim developments. A commission (*Wissenschaftliche Kommission zur Begleitung der Materialien zum Bericht der Lage der Nation im geteilten Deutschland* 1986) was formed, under the chairmanship of Professor Karl C. Thalheim, to advise the Minister and make proposals for the research.

It was decided that the new material should not only continue the quantitative analysis of the earlier study, but also include an institutional section giving an account of the economic systems of the two German states. According to the discussions so far, this institutional part is to include the following:

- general economic conditions in the FRG and GDR;
- the emergence and development of the two systems;
- the interdependence of the political and economic orders;
- the market economy and economic policy steering in the FRG;
- planning and steering in the GDR;
- the individual areas for action in each state;
- money and credit in the two systems;
- public finance as an element in the systems; and
- the foreign trade systems.

The empirical part will have the following chapters which take up the earlier material:

- production factors;
- education and training, R & D;
- production and productivity;
- incomes and the cost of living;

- public budgets, social security;
- foreign trade; and
- trade between the two German states.

The assignments for the institutional part have been given to various scholars, and the *Deutsches Institut für Wirtschaftsforschung* has been commissioned to do the empirical work. The project is to be finished in 1986.

NOTES

1. See the discussions in *Deutschland Archiv*, especially 1968, 1970, and 1973.
2. See "Gutachten zum Stand der DDR- und vergleichenden Deutschlandforschung, Arbeitskreis für vergleichende Deutschlandforschung" (Chairman: Peter C. Ludz), March 1978.
3. *Tätigkeitsbericht* 1952/53; 1954/56; 1957/61; 1961/65; 1965/69.
4. *Handbuch DDR-Wirtschaft*, 4th revised and enlarged edition 1984. English edition: *Handbook of the Economy of the German Democratic Republic*, Saxon House, England 1979. And *DDR und Osteuropa. Wirtschaftssystem, Wirtschaftspolitik, Lebensstandard. Ein Handbuch*, Opladen 1981 (English version in preparation).
5. See the Department's prospectus.

Institutions Engaged in GDR Research in the FRG

Institution	Address	Director or Head of Department	Main area of research	Research staff	Publication series
Abteilung "DDR und östliche Industrieländer" (Deutsches Institut für Wirtschaftsforschung DIW)	Königin-Luise-Str. 5 1000 Berlin 33	Dr. Doris Cornelsen	The economic system and economic developments in the GDR	10	Wochenbericht des DIW; Economic Bulletin; Vierteljahrsheft des DIW; Sonderheft des DIW; Strukterheft des DIW; Konjunkturpolitik
Abteilung "Sozialistische Länder und Ost-West-Wirtschaftsbeziehungen" (HWWA—Institut für Wirtschaftsforschung—Hamburg)	Neuer Jungfernstieg 21 2000 Hamburg 36	Dr. Klaus Bolz	The economic system, internal and external development of East European countries, incl. the GDR	(Whole department: 6-7)	Wirtschaftsdienst; Intereconomics; Finanzierung und Entwicklung; Konjunktur von morgen; Weltkonjunkturdienst; Monographie
Abteilung "Wirtschaftswissenschaft" (Osteuropa-Institut der Freien Universität Berlin)	Garystr. 55 1000 Berlin 33	Dr. Erich Klinkmüller	Economic problems in the Comecon countries, incl. the GDR	(Whole department: 13)	Berichte des Osteuropa-Instituts an der Freien Universität Berlin
Bundesinstitut für ostwissenschaftliche und internationale Studien	Lindenbornstr. 22 5000 Köln 30	Dr. Heinrich Vogel	Politics, society and the economy in Eastern Europe, incl. the GDR	(Whole Institute: 25)	Berichte des Bundesinstituts Dokumentationsstelle
Forschungsstelle für gesamtdeutsche wirtschaftliche und soziale Fragen	Stresemannstr. 90 1000 Berlin 61	Prof. Dr. Karl C. Thalheim	Economic system and development, enterprise operations in the GDR	6	FS-Analysen
Forschungsstelle zum Vergleich wirtschaftlicher Lenkungssysteme (Universität Marburg)	Barfüssertor 2 3550 Marburg/Lahn	Prof. Dr. Alfred Schüller	Basic research on the theory of the system, comparison of systems	5	Schriften zum Vergleich von Wirtschaftsordnungen
Gesamtdeutsches Institut. Bundesanstalt für gesamtdeutsche Aufgaben—BfgA. (Bundesminister für innerdeutsche Beziehungen)	Adenauerallee 10 5300 Bonn 1	Detlef Kühn	Department II: Collection and evaluation of data on the GDR, incl. the economy, labour, social affairs, food	(Whole department: 18)	Analysen und Berichte; Informationsstelle für DDR-Forschung; Dokumente zur Deutschlandpolitik
Institut für Gesellschaft und Wissenschaft IGW (an der Universität Erlangen-Nürnberg)	Aussere Brucker Str. 33 8520 Erlangen	Dr. Clemens Burrichter	GDR research, incl. R & D economics	(Whole Institute: 17)	Analysen und Bericht aus Gesellschaft und Wissenschaft (abg); IGW-Informationen; IGW-Referatedienst; Dokumentations- und Informationszentrum (DIZ)
Zentralinstitut für sozialwissenschaftliche Forschung. Arbeitsbereich DDR-Forschung und -Archiv. (Freie Universität Berlin)	Babelsberger Str. 14-16 1000 Berlin 31	Dr. Hartmut Zimmermann	GDR political and social system, incl. social policy, political economy	(Whole section: 10)	Schriften des Zentralinstituts für sozialwissenschaftlich Forschung der Freien Universität Berlin

FEDERAL REPUBLIC—METHODOLOGICAL AND CONCEPTUAL PROBLEMS

Gert-Joachim Glaessner

Writing in the weekly *Die Zeit* of April 28, 1967, Ernst Richert,¹ the real founder of GDR studies in political science, asked whether the GDR was becoming a *terra incognita* in the social sciences. He feared that in one or two years there would hardly be anyone "who can make a significant contribution to assessing and synthesizing events in the GDR." Things did not turn out that badly. Instead, in the mid-1970s, in the wake of detente, the opening up of relations between the Federal Republic and its eastern neighbors and, importantly, the debate within the "new left," a real GDR "boom" developed from which GDR studies also benefited.

And what became of the optimistic expectations articulated that same year, 1967, by Peter Christian Ludz at the first GDR studies conference in Tutzing? Public interest in the GDR indeed increased in the following years; financial support for GDR studies was considerably expanded; access to information was improved. The field of GDR studies could—to cite Ludz—contribute to "weakening taboos and eliminating ideology in political decisions and to making them more rational;" it largely ceased to be preoccupied with merely criticizing the GDR and reoriented itself toward—still guided by certain values—understanding the "immanent dynamic of government, economy, and society" in the GDR.²

On the other hand, the expansion of GDR studies in the direction of comparative analyses, which Ludz also urged, has largely been unrealized, and its predictive power is extremely limited (the same is true of other disciplines). On the whole, then, the results are not so bad. However, in my view, we cannot be content with the current state of GDR studies.

Rather, it seems to me that Richert's warning is applicable again today—there is no lack of interest in GDR problems, but the interest in solid and differentiated scholarly analysis seems to be declining. Once again there are powerful voices calling for condemnation rather than

analysis without preconceptions, or—to recall again Richert's language—many contemporaries are not concerned about understanding the GDR better as it exists but "as it should be from the perspective of the Federal Republic." The—understandable—rejection of a system that does not reflect our conceptions of freedom and democracy prevents an analytical approach. GDR studies cannot fulfill such demands without becoming ridiculous and degenerating into a mere propaganda instrument. These contextual factors have to be borne in mind even considering the significance of GDR studies' tasks.

Another problem is that there exists a common image neither of the GDR nor of "GDR studies" as a distinct discipline. Both the variety of political, ideological, and theoretical positions, as well as the particular disciplinary orientations of GDR researchers, result in a multiplicity of approaches, research interests, methodologies, and findings, which can be presented and evaluated here only in a simplified and schematic fashion. Thus, I would like to examine GDR studies from three perspectives:

- the concepts and approaches of communist studies, as well as their application to GDR research;
- the particular conditions of research on the GDR in political sociology in the Federal Republic; and
- finally, some of my own thoughts on the further development of the political sociology of the GDR.

My basic argument is the need for a greater integration of GDR studies with comparative communist studies. As a brief preliminary justification of this thesis, I would like to say that while I consider the isolation of GDR studies from the general study of communist systems extraordinarily problematical, I have no illusions about the possibility of overcoming the separation which has produced a double dilemma:

- GDR studies is only very incompletely aware of the results of West German "East European studies" and even less of communist studies in the Anglo-Saxon countries, which, in turn, hardly pay any attention at all to GDR studies.
- The long-running controversy over the relative advantages and disadvantages of country and regional studies as opposed to comparisons within and between systems has had, as far as I can see, no effect on GDR studies. It has thus far been unable to absorb positive impulses from the now widespread critique of exaggera-

ted notions of the fruitfulness of studies with a "cross-national approach"; it has not re-examined its own self-conception as an area study which is also a "system science."

—Only a comparative perspective can prevent system-related developments from being interpreted as particular features of an individual country, for example, the GDR, or particular national and cultural features being overemphasized instead of being understood in their relationship to system characteristics.

A further preliminary comment pertains to institutional bases—there are not very many research institutes in the Federal Republic that contribute to the study of political sociology of the GDR. First and foremost there is the Central Institute for Social Science Research at the Free University of Berlin, which can be considered the center of research in political sociology on the GDR. In addition, a number of GDR specialists teach in the faculty of Political Science at the same university.

Other disciplines also make important contributions to the political sociology of the GDR, particularly in the *Arbeitsbereich Geschichte und Politik der DDR* in Mannheim, the *Deutsches Institut für Wirtschaftsforschung* in Berlin, and the *Institut für Gesellschaft und Wissenschaft* in Erlangen.

The principal institutional problem, in my opinion, is the fact that there are only a few institutes *continuously* doing work related to the GDR. The social scientists who teach at universities are compelled to concentrate on discussions within their particular scientific community and so necessarily engage in GDR studies as a sideline.

Continuous research on the GDR is endangered today more than ever because its results receive almost no recognition within its social science disciplines (political science and political sociology) in the Federal Republic. This causes problems, particularly for younger social scientists. Since the universities themselves can hardly be expected to provide support for GDR studies, only outside support can improve the situation, i.e., support for research projects and also for continuity in GDR studies.

The Development of Communist Studies in the Federal Republic

What is a communist system? Steven White poses this question in an article in the journal *Studies in Comparative Communism* in 1983.³ It

is an astonishing question after about 40 years of systematic study of communism. Twenty or 30 years ago, White notes, it was relatively easy to identify communist systems—they represented the Soviet model of Leninist one-party rule with a centralized economy and an obligatory ideology.

Today it is much more difficult to make clear and unambiguous statements, for the communist states are no longer a monolithic bloc. The "cracks in the monolith," which Karl Deutsch noted at the beginning of the 1960s, have become larger. Moreover, the spread of communist and socialist governments and liberation movements in the "Third World" has significantly altered the phenomenon of communism.

The increasing fragmentation and diversity of communist states have made it rather difficult to determine what might properly be called a communist system. This development has been accompanied by a fragmentation and differentiation of theoretical concepts about communist studies. The "totalitarianism" approach that was the predominant analytical concept of the 1940s and the 1950s has been replaced by a multiplicity of "modern" approaches that attempt to apply further developments in social science to the analysis of communism.

The starting point for rejection of the totalitarianism concept was not only growing criticism in the early 1960s of its political function as an instrument of ideological conflict in the cold war period, but above all its analytical deficiencies. These were evident, *inter alia*, in its inability to grasp the dynamic processes of social and political change in Soviet type socialist states; as an analytical concept it was essentially limited to describing static political and economic system elements regarded as necessary and unchanging (e.g. Carl Joachim Friedrich⁴ or in the "central planning" approach); "movement" was conceived only as a permanent process of realizing totalitarian goals which, as Hannah Arendt formulated it,⁵ undertook to implement supposed laws of nature or society by means of terror.

After most researchers abandoned, or at least revised, the concept of totalitarianism, research in the Federal Republic and the Anglo-Saxon countries developed in different directions, regarding both the definition of the object of research and the methods used.

The focus in the Federal Republic has remained "area studies" (i.e., investigations of individual social systems such as the Soviet Union or the GDR), and a much-criticized isolation of special fields ("East Euro-

pean studies" or "GDR studies") from the basic academic disciplines has developed. The focus in the Anglo-Saxon countries has been on comparison of socialist systems ("comparative communism"), based on the widespread view that this is the only way to develop a general theory of socialist or communist systems. It is no accident that many Anglo-Saxon collective volumes under the rubric "comparative communism" turn out, upon closer appraisal, to be merely a collection of individual country studies written by authors with particularly intensive knowledge of individual countries and regions.⁶ A further difference should be noted. The development of theory, in particular the inclination to model-building characterizing North American social sciences, has also taken place in research on socialist systems—and in part been shaped by it—while in communist studies in the Federal Republic such theory has not played such an important role. In short, the following phases in the development of models and approaches can be distinguished:

1. Beginning in the late 1940s, the totalitarianism approach, containing both ideological and analytical elements, was dominant.
2. In the mid-1950s came the idea, particularly through the work of Barrington Moore, that traditional and technocratic impulses emanating from society and/or the development of forces of production were increasingly conflicting with the revolutionary ideology of communist parties and so could lead to a relatively open development of these systems.
3. The discovery of national "communisms," and later the attempt to compare communist systems, broke with the idea that these systems were uniform and that analysis of the Soviet Union could be a substitute for research on individual socialist states. Both perspectives focused on differences and on specific characteristics of the individual systems. This "comparative perspective" was associated with the attempt to study socialist systems in the general context of comparative politics. Robert Tucker's formula, according to which socialist systems were "movement regimes," and the concept of "mobilization regimes" put forward by David Apter greatly influenced and shaped the analysis of socialist systems.
4. Since the mid-1960s this trend has increasingly prevailed. Social scientific approaches and theories were absorbed and further

elaborated by communist studies. For example there was the interest group approach of Gordon Skilling; the participation theory approaches of Jan Triska and Theodore H. Friedgut; the organizational approach and the theory of bureaucracy of Alfred G. Meyer and others; the theories of social change, modernization, and political development by Samuel P. Huntington, John H. Kautsky, Chalmers Johnson, and others; and the industrial society approach and convergence theory of David Lane, Daniel Bell, Herbert Marcuse, Zbigniew Brezinski, and Huntington.

This does not, however, mean to imply that the "traditional" approaches are obsolete; a number of authors still adhere to the concept of totalitarianism (e.g. Leonard Schapiro). The attempt has also been made to combine a number of approaches. (Thus the following overview of analytic concepts of the 1970s is greatly simplified in that it does not consider multiple inter-relationships between individual approaches and concepts.)

5. The year 1968 marked the beginning of a renaissance of Marxist approaches in the social sciences. Since Marxist communist studies had always seen their task as one of reflecting on the potential for a socialist transformation of western capitalist countries in the light of "real socialism," the break with the social consensus by part of the young generation in western democracies and the military oppression of the reform experiment in Czechoslovakia gave new impulses to critical analysis of communism based on Marxist premises.

In this period Eurocommunist ideas were influential, i.e., left deviations from the official lines of Moscow-oriented communist parties and in particular the analyses of critical East European social scientists. Thus the thematic foci of the late-1960s debate included questioning of the historical development of the Soviet Union, the "essence" of Soviet-type socialism, the bureaucracy, and the possibility or impossibility of development toward socialism/communism in these countries.

6. Since the end of the 1970s, there has been a rebirth of the totalitarianism concept but no new methodologies or models that go beyond those of the 1950s.⁷ Representatives of this approach oppose the communist studies mainstream which stresses the

potential for change in communist systems and their growing adaptability without denying their dictatorial character. Instead, advocates of the totalitarian concept maintain that the mainstream approach accepts too much of the viewpoint and self-interpretation of communist systems; thus their favorite target is the "critical-immanent method" which, they claim, fails to take into account the fundamental difference between communist and democratic systems.

The Modernization Paradigm and its Critics

As suggested above, communist studies of the 1960s and 1970s were dominated by the paradigm of modernization. It was the "Sputnik Shock" which stimulated the change from totalitarianism to modernization as a paradigm for communist studies. But this new perspective in the development of social science thinking undoubtedly also had immanent roots—the time of its origin and its influence in the political arena grew out of objective international and internal social changes at the beginning of the 1960s. The following examples suggest that political and social context:

- A certain consolidation of the socialist states internally and the Soviet bloc was reached, but "cracks in the monolith" (Karl W. Deutsch) and tendencies toward polycentrism also were evident. The Sino-Soviet conflict became an open one in 1962.
- The emergence of the new nation states of the Third World changed power relations and hence the context of the East-West conflict. The revolution in Cuba became a model for liberation movements in the Third World.
- The two superpowers reached a point at which partial interest accommodation became mutually advantageous. Military confrontation began to be regarded, in part as a consequence of the Cuba crisis, as a threat to mankind.
- The European spheres of influence of the two superpowers, defined since about 1957, were "sealed" on the 13th of August, 1961 with the Berlin Wall. This partial "solution" of the Berlin problem eliminates a recurrent crisis situation and perpetuates the division of Germany.
- Within West Germany, the GDR became a fact that no longer could

be denied; thoughtful and far-sighted observers called for *de facto* recognition of the GDR.

- Domestic problems and antagonisms surfaced in West Germany, and in 1966/67 a major economic downturn hit the Federal Republic, undermining the naive belief that it was the best of all possible worlds.
- Finally, the Federal Republic was unable in the long run to avoid seeing that there were not only enemies and opponents to the east of its borders but also states with which one had to deal politically rather than merely moralizing about them. Moreover, the moral question—in light of the German past—was not as unambiguous as it had hitherto been regarded. Willy Brandt's kneeling at a monument at the Warsaw ghetto had become politically possible. That it did is one of the few fortunate turns of events in recent West German politics.

In that context of GDR studies in the Federal Republic, it was the late Peter Christian Ludz who was the leading figure in application of Anglo-Saxon concepts to the political sociology of the GDR. Ludz incorporated various elements of middle-range theories into his analysis.

Central to his political sociology was the concept of conflict. Ludz did not use it in a structural-functionalist sense as "dysfunctional" and threatening to destroy societal structures, but, relying on American authors such as Raymond Mack, Richard Snyder, and Louis Coser, as a "positive" factor preventing the disintegration of society. All forms of social change, in his opinion, led to role and norm conflicts. They have, however, another dimension in the socialist systems that is different from that in bourgeois democracies—the political goals of the party initiate a social dynamism which exacerbates the general conflict between traditional, ideological norms and those produced by social change. Thus the political core of the old norm system is called into question. Ludz incorporated central axioms of U.S.-American social science theories into GDR studies without, however, developing them systematically. Still, he made a major contribution to the reorientation of GDR studies in the Federal Republic.

Ludz also played a principal role in introducing modernization theory and the theory of industrial society into GDR studies. Like the majority of his American colleagues, he saw a contradiction that cannot be resolved—the requirements of modern industrial society com-

pelled the GDR, in Ludz's opinion, to adjust to these conditions if it wanted to survive as a system. Adjustments were not only necessary in the area of economics, politics, and administration, but particularly in the areas of science and education, since the old dogmas were no longer suitable to explain economic and social tendencies towards change in an highly industrialized socialist society. For all proponents of this concept, science and education were the keys to modernization of society.

"Adjustment," however, also means that there must be a general tendency toward modernization that is the same for all social systems. And it means implicitly that the western industrial societies are better able to fulfill these conditions than are the communist states. This simplified view of tendencies toward transformation in highly industrialized Soviet type societies has not been criticized only by Marxists.

The thesis that the course and forms of social evolution are unilinear and that political development is a direct consequence of economic and social tendencies toward transformation has been increasingly criticized. Representatives of the political culture approach have emphasized especially the manifold and diverging influences of national, religious, cultural, ethnic influences etc. on societal development. They have also demonstrated the limitations of an analysis concentrating exclusively on the structure and functioning of the economic and political-administrative system and omitting consideration of the aforementioned factors. We are compelled, then, to ask: What good are macroconcepts such as "modernization" and "industrial society" for a political sociology of communist systems? What do they contribute to "area studies"/GDR studies?

Ludz, who was the strongest advocate of incorporating modernization and industrial society approaches, noted a new constellation shortly before his death. With respect to modernization theory approaches as a basis for comparative studies, he observed that the ever-increasing international and domestic linkages and tempo of development of societal processes necessitated new theoretical conceptions. As a universal concept (supposedly applicable to all states and societies independent of their concrete situation and of their specific tradition and based on the idea of an evolutionary historical progress) it needed modification and specification in order to be fruitful for communist and GDR studies.⁸ After nearly 20 years in which this modernization concept had

shaped research in the field, that was a rather negative balance.

It would be false, however, to conclude from this criticism that the question of the modernity of GDR society should be discarded. The modernization approach is certainly not suitable to serve as a macro-model explaining all societal and political developments in socialist societies. Concrete conditions of development in the individual socialist countries are too different for that. No single general concept could embrace all these differences. Nevertheless, modernization theory, the concept of "political development" and "industrial society," could serve as meaningful heuristic concepts (not as models for global analysis) when based on understanding of the general and historically specific contexts of socialist systems in individual countries. A second prerequisite for critical utilization of these approaches would be abandonment of an assumption which they propogate—that there is a general, universal path to modernity for which the developed capitalist countries are the model. (This is similar to the orthodox Marxist-Leninist expectation of a world modeled after the Soviet Union, which has particularly shaped "imperialism studies" and developmental theory to date in socialist countries.)

The Special Situation of GDR Studies in the Federal Republic

As indicated, the influence of the conceptions of modernization and industrial society on GDR studies in the Federal Republic has been significant, although these approaches have not received systematic treatment. It must also be explained why GDR studies abandoned the "successful" (and politically useful) instrument of totalitarianism theory without adopting any comprehensive new conception.

I surmise that the change of paradigms in GDR studies was based only secondarily on considerations immanent to the development of social science. Rather, the abandonment of the concept of totalitarianism and the dissemination of modern theoretical approaches was, as noted earlier, based on international and domestic social changes beginning in the 1960s—a certain consolidation of socialist countries, construction of the Berlin Wall, recognition that the GDR would continue to exist for a long time and was beginning to develop its own social and economic basis, etc.

In this context, GDR studies was not successful in developing

independent theoretical contributions for the analysis of communism. In the commendable effort to overcome the isolation of West German social sciences from international developments, foreign approaches were simply copied. Analytical approaches and concepts—and also rapidly changing “fads”—were adopted and propagated as patent medicines. The critical reception of these approaches was neglected. Thus, for example, Ludz, who probably followed the developments in the United States with the greatest intensity, displayed a certain eclecticism in adopting individual approaches as well as failing to adequately relate them to the analysis of empirical data.

Despite the efforts of Ludz and others to free GDR studies from its isolation vis-a-vis the academic social science disciplines, GDR studies have remained at the periphery of social science activity. The *Materialien zum Bericht zur Lage der Nation* (edited by Ludz)⁹ and the *DDR-Handbuch*, of which the 3rd edition was recently published (edited by Hartmut Zimmerman),¹⁰ had a considerable positive political impact at the beginning of the 1970s. Both publications, which represent a stocktaking of GDR studies, made essential contributions to clarifying the image of the GDR in the Federal Republic.

However, since this time a new tendency has appeared, which is not without problems. Research in the 1970s, rejecting the concept of totalitarianism and its emphasis on the political system, neglected the political core of socialism in the GDR—party and state—and instead focused further on differentiated analyses of social change. Thus since the middle of the 1970s, no new major studies have appeared which examine the *political* system of the GDR and its tendencies towards persistence and change.¹¹ The results are much more favorable when one considers the analysis of *societal* change in the GDR. Here there are studies on changes in social structure, on participation,¹² educational policy,¹³ and a policy analysis that summarizes developments in the GDR in the 1970s.¹⁴

Moreover, when one considers the themes on which western observers, as well as Marxist-Leninist sociology in the socialist countries, have focused in recent years, these major changes can be identified, all relating to scientific-technical developments:

- the consequences of scientific-technical progress, of changes in industrial work, the effects of new technologies on working conditions and work organization, qualification requirements, and at-

titudes of workers;¹⁵

- changes in social structure as a result of changed socio-economic conditions and the influence of scientific-technical changes on all aspects of life, particularly the work process, the ideological problematic of the leading role of the working class in a world increasingly dominated by science and technology—*inter alia*, the “dialectic of the decreasing distance between the working-class and the intellectuals” (Manfred Loetsch);¹⁶
- the effects of scientific-technical developments on new social groups (e.g. youth who do not yet or retired persons who no longer participate in the work process) and on the structure and function of the family;
- the consequences of science and technology on individual policies concerning the organization of the planning process, agricultural policy, regional planning, cultural, and health policy, etc; and
- the effects of social and political changes on people’s thinking and behavior.¹⁷

While I, too, consider these to be central themes of every analysis of Soviet type socialist systems, I am also of the opinion that there are omissions in the current discussion. For instance, the above are general themes, independent of a particular system, which however have a different significance in different systems—for example, changes in social structure or questions of planning. Thus they are questions pertaining specifically to the structure of the countries of “real socialism,” for their solution is closely related to the inherent capacity of these systems to cope with the problems they face. Yet the question of the political, economic, and ideological basis of “real socialism” clearly is no longer the focus of interest, i.e., bluntly formulated, there is hardly any attempt at a political sociology of the Soviet type socialist countries.

One central task of the political sociology of the GDR, therefore, is not to lose sight of the core of the socio-political system in whatever more differentiated approaches and research may be undertaken. A solid investigation of the processes of social change and various policies is indispensable, but political sociology must also constantly be aware of the systemic context. Policy-making in the GDR is more than a technical-organizational process determined by economic factors; it is always the execution of the will of the vanguard party which, despite many experiences of the inadequacy of its own analysis, has not abandoned its

claim to determination of the long-term goals of society.

Thus I think it is necessary, wherever possible, to link the analysis of (a) the socio-political system, (b) the life world (Habermas), and (c) the social and political conflicts in GDR society:

- (a) The socio-political systems of "real socialism" represent distinctive societies, one among other possibilities for the organization of highly industrialized societies with similar problems. They differ in their long-term goals. The comprehensive regulatory goal is more than totalitarian arbitrariness; it is the product of a view of society that consciously—i.e., in a planned fashion—strives toward the goal of a future harmonious communistic society.

(The goal of planning is to link the socio-political system with the life world; the aim is to prevent any divergence of the economic, political, and social spheres, the emergence of a private-individual sphere, and any displacement of problems from one area to another. All areas of society are thus the object of planning.)

The goals and functional conditions of the political-administrative system can be understood only when one takes into consideration this—even though contradictory—amalgam of the political system and society and does not merely undertake a purely political analysis. This also includes inquiring into the consequences of efforts at comprehensive political regulation and the possible and permitted freedom for independent articulation and organization of autonomous societal interests.

- (b) The central fields of analysis of the GDR in political sociology, in addition to analysis of the socio-political system and its goals, are the investigation of work life, leisure, culture, and social relations—the life world. Here observers must avoid projecting their own social experience and norms uncritically onto the GDR's social system. The frequent tendency to contrast achievements of the GDR's citizens to those of the system itself and to analyze their everyday situation only in terms of "overcoming the division of Germany," ignores the reality of life in the GDR. Life there is shaped by other work relations, forms of leisure, social relations, and forms of interest articulation and by 40 years of different social and political experiences. This reality cannot be understood by using a preconceived normative evaluative

schema but only by a readiness to analyze an unfamiliar reality without preconceptions. This means including in the analysis economic goals, notions of the just distribution of goods and of social homogenization, as well as efforts to cope with their social, cultural, and ecological consequences.

- (c) Every society produces its own social and political conflicts. The concrete forms of conflict within the society and their significance beyond it cannot be grasped if they are primarily or exclusively seen through the political and ideological lenses of a quite different system of norms. These problems and conflicts are also not exclusively caused by a lack of participation of the members of society or by shortcomings in political structures which, due to their comprehensive regulatory orientation, only allow participation in the context of largely prestructured goals. Since the society in the GDR is an extremely dynamic socio-political system, this dynamic is itself a source of entirely new problems. A static concept of analysis—on the one side a ruling party elite and on the other suppressed masses—does not do justice to these factors and to the manifold process of social differentiation.

Perspectives on a Political Sociology of the GDR

The development of political sociology in GDR studies since the early 1960s shows that new theoretical and conceptual approaches are required. While an impressive collection such as the new *DDR-Handbuch* clearly shows that our knowledge of the socio-political system of the GDR has made extraordinary strides, what is lacking is a conceptual basis. The political sociology of Otto Stammer, Max Gustav Lange, and Ernst Richert in the 1950s must be continued. Their work, for example, on changes in social structures¹⁸ always considered the mutual interrelationship of the societal and political systems. The rediscovery of these classic studies in political sociology indicates a growing awareness in the social sciences that social analysis without deep understanding of history and politics is not very fruitful.

What is needed for GDR studies is concentration on the long-neglected analysis of the structural prerequisites of socialist systems (i.e., the specific relationship of society, politics, and economics and the functional conditions of party rule) and on investigation from this stand-

point of the new conflicts and problems of GDR society.

Both the analysis of current problems in socialist countries, as well as conflict and problem areas that shape society in the long run, cannot avoid dealing with the structural prerequisites of socialist systems, their social and political goals, their ideas of the planned development of society according to certain historical laws, their conception of rules, and their specific historical conditions and cultural traditions which affect the process of constructing "real socialism." Nevertheless, such a perspective which attempts to take systemic, regional, and historic peculiarities seriously cannot at the same time lose sight of the fact that the problem areas mentioned are also general problems of industrial societies. In light of the world-wide crisis of economic growth threatening all industrialized societies in their present form, the *de facto* subordination of politics to a growth-oriented economy is becoming more and more problematic.

Changed conditions require that we again raise the question of the possibilities for political action. In a society which is not only reaching the limits of growth but also experiencing increased social differentiation and diversification of social processes and structures, the party which is the center of action in the GDR must be politically and ideologically relegitimated. It must, if its leading role is not to be basically revised, "prove" politically and practically that it is able to formulate the goals for further social development, to transform them into concrete policies, and to realize them. What is involved here is the functional role of the party in the political system as the promoter of further social change. As we have long been aware, this functional role of the party has changed since the beginning of the 1960s.¹⁹

One of the aspects determining relationships between individual institutions and organizations of the GDR's political system (party, state, mass organizations, economy) is so-called institutionalization and formation. This refers to the fact that the party has felt (and still feels) compelled to design institutions based on certain functions and to subject their method of operation to formal (bureaucratic) rules. Most important are the tools of transmission (unions, mass organizations, "citizen" parties), as well as the tools of transformation (the state and economic apparatus). These groups were delegated specific tasks and responsibilities. This, in turn, led to another aspect, the increased differentiation within the organizational framework, as well as to various specialized assignments. The customary forms of organization and decision-

making structures were not adequate to deal with the distinct problems of a highly industrialized society because they were oriented toward partisan or political criteria. Rationalization and execution, therefore, were also necessary. These concepts involve adaptation of the criteria for political and social affairs to the newly changed conditions. All of these developments finally forced the party to find and set valid and lasting rules and modes of procedure, leading to an increase in the role of law and legal processes. This fourth aspect resulted in extensive consequences for the power structure, human social relationships, citizen participation in economic, political, social, and cultural processes, and especially for the planning and control system.

The consequences of this four-fold development can be surveyed at various social levels. For instance, they can be recognized on the *structural* level as transforming the structure and function of society's political organization, its economic system, and the organization of the planning and control of the economy. On the level of *action*, changes in forms and methods of political and economic administration and control may be discerned. On the *legitimation* level, corporative and technocratic elements have used changing forms and methods to replace terror and extreme authoritarianism. Participation and mobilization are being applied in positive respects, as long as they remain within the framework of an initiator's conception. Moreover, there is a tendency to gain legitimation through achievements rather than through political means.

These factors are all expressions of a political system that, in spite of all tendencies toward change, still suffers from a lack of democratic substance. Instead of a society of equals (as owners of the means of production) and the promised expansion of individual civil rights through basic social rights, a bureaucratically controlled society developed in which the Marxist-Leninist party autocratically determines the goals and path of societal development. Political sociology of the GDR must focus its analysis on this "bureaucratic form of social integration." That does not mean relapsing into old errors and viewing society as manipulated at will by the party. Rather, it is a question of the interrelationship between formulation of political goals by the party, bureaucratic implementation of these goals, and the social processes that are thereby initiated and advanced.

Proceeding in this way analytically has definite advantages. For instance, the question of structural prerequisites of socialist systems is

linked to positive aspects of political sociology as practiced by Otto Stammer and others in the 1950s, without their totalitarianism theory biases. In addition, the question of the relationship between politics and economics and of power and rule is the question of the system-specific conditions under which all social problems in these countries should be resolved. Moreover, the processes of institutionalization, differentiation, rationalization, and increasing "legalization" are global phenomena found in every system. They are characteristic of all modern societies, as Max Weber emphasized. With this approach, the specific features of this process under the conditions of "real socialism" can be clarified. And, finally, the approach presented offers a method of analyzing the question of the political instrumentalities used to react to system-specific and also more general problems.

Comparative Communism: Problems and Perspectives

Influenced by British and American discussions, communist studies in the last two decades has—at least in its intent—been comparative research. The emphasis in this period has shifted from East-West (i.e., between or *inter-system*) comparisons in the tradition of "comparative politics" or *inner-system* comparisons whereby the result usually has been highly descriptive country or area studies which provide the basis for the comparisons.

Comparative politics offers a number of advantages but also entails significant methodological problems, most evident in East-West studies. The comparison of political systems, state structures and functions, parliaments and the roles of parties, interest organizations, and mass organizations, as well as the normative and legal basis of a society, compels us to consider whether these institutions, organizations, and legal regulations are directly comparable or whether in fact they have quite different tasks and functions in the different systems.

More promising is the comparison of problem areas, such as the questions of economic growth, environmental protection, urban planning, etc. In this case we are dealing with symmetrical problems that to a significant extent are the result of the concept of continuous growth favored by both systems.

What is involved is the analysis of symmetrical problems in an asymmetrical political, economic, social, and ideological context. Research

suffers from the fact that either it gives a one-sided emphasis to the symmetrical aspect—treating it in isolation, for example, as often in research shaped by modernization theory—or else badly neglects this aspect, as in the case of totalitarianism theory, which focuses on the political and ideological superstructure. An urgent task of research is the integration of these two perspectives.

Some of these problems do not occur in inner-system comparisons. Nevertheless, to avoid creating the false impression of a monolithic bloc, consideration must be given to significant differences in levels of development, industrialization, culture, tradition, and political culture in the socialist countries of Eastern Europe (USSR, GDR) and particularly in developing socialist countries such as China, Vietnam, Korea, or Cuba. Influenced by systems theory, these problems have been relatively neglected in the discussion of system comparisons.

In the Federal Republic, the call for comparative analysis of socialist systems and for East-West comparisons came most importantly from Peter Christian Ludz; it has been carried on only by Klaus von Beyme with a comprehensive study of *Economics and Politics in Socialism*.²⁰

Despite all methodological problems, only a comparative perspective on socialist systems enables us to make general theoretical statements. Country studies alone are insufficient. The dilemma in every comparative investigation is that the detailed empirical analysis is the job of specialists who know "their" country but beyond that possess only a general knowledge of other socialist countries. Since long-term research projects including a number of country specialists and different academic disciplines do not exist, or at best are only now coming into being, empirical comparisons of socialist systems usually are limited to parallel presentation of facts that, in fortunate cases, are structured by a common approach.

In face of these problems, a reasonable research strategy seems to be one which (a) provides, continues, and intensifies empirically based area studies; (b) more strongly than hitherto focuses on new and old conflict and problem areas in these countries with special regard for their social origins and consequent political responses, complementing the highly-developed system analysis through a more intensive policy analysis; and, finally (c) carries out country and area studies within a comparative perspective, with an awareness that the common features of Soviet type systems are as great as their differences.

1. E. Richert, "Wissen was 'druben' ist. Wer kümmert sich bei uns noch um die DDR-Forschung?," *Die Zeit*, April 28, 1967, p. 31.
2. P.C. Ludz, "Situation, Möglichkeiten und Aufgaben der DDR-Forschung," *SBZ-Archiv*, Vol. 20 (1967), No. 20, p. 324.
3. Stephen White, "What is a Communist System?," *Studies in Comparative Communism*, Vol. 16 (1983), No. 4, p. 247.
4. Cf. C.J. Friedrich/Z.K. Brzezinski, *Totalitarian Dictatorship and Autocracy* (Cambridge, Mass. 1956).
5. H. Arendt, *The Origins of Totalitarianism* (New York 1951, new ed. 1973).
6. Cf. D.F. Triska/P.M. Cocks, eds., *Political Development in Eastern Europe* (New York/London 1977); F.J. Fleron Jr., ed., *Communist Studies and Social Sciences: Essays on Methodology and Empirical Theory* (Chicago 1969); an exceptional case is the book of K.v. Beyme, *Ökonomie und Politik im Sozialismus. Ein Vergleich der Entwicklung in den sozialistischen Ländern* (München/Zürich 1975).
7. In more detail, G.-J. Glaessner. *Sozialistische Systeme. Einführung in die Kommunismus- und DDR-Forschung* (Opladen 1982).
8. P.C. Ludz, "Comparative Analysis of Divided Germany: Some Problems and Findings in Theory and Methodology," *Studies in Comparative Communism*, Vol. 12 (1979), No. 2-3, p. 144.
9. Cf. *Bericht der Bundesregierung und Materialien zur Lage der Nation*, ed. Bundesministerium für innerdeutsche Beziehungen, 1971, 1972, 1974.
10. Cf. *DDR-Handbuch*, ed. Bundesministerium für innerdeutsche Beziehungen; scientific direction, Hartmut Zimmerman, 3rd ed. (Köln 1985).
11. Cf. G.-J. Glaessner, *Herrschaft durch Kader, Leitung der Gesellschaft und Kaderpolitik in der DDR am Beispiel des Staatsapparates* (Opladen 1977); G. Neugebauer, *Partei und Staatsapparat in der DDR. Aspekte der Instrumentalisierung des Staatsapparates durch die SED* (Opladen 1978).
12. K. Belwe, *Mitwirkung im Industriebetrieb der DDR. Planung—Einzelleitung—Beteiligung der Werk tätigen an Entscheidungsprozessen des VEB* (Opladen 1979).
13. Cf. G.-J. Glaessner/I. Rudolph, *Macht durch Wissen. Zum Zusammenhang von Bildungspolitik, Bildungs-System und Kaderqualifizierung in der DDR. Eine politisch-soziologische Untersuchung* (Opladen 1978).

14. Cf. K.v. Beyme/H. Zimmerman, eds., *Policymaking in the German Democratic Republic* (New York 1984).

15. Cf. F. Klinger, "Bedingungen, Formen und Praxis betrieblicher Partizipation im System der Planung und Leitung in der DDR zwischen 1945 und 1962," Diss., rer. pol., Freie Universität Berlin 1983; "Wissenschaftlich-technische Revolution in der DDR. Studien zur Entwicklungs- und Problem- geschichte des gesellschaftlichen Konzepts der SED seit Mitte der fünfziger Jahre," phil. Diss., Freie Universität Berlin 1981.

16. Cf. G. Erbe. *Arbeiterklasse und Intelligenz in der DDR. Annäherung von Produktionsarbeiterschaft und technischer Intelligenz im Industriebetrieb?* (Opladen 1981).

17. C. Lemke. *Persönlichkeit und Gesellschaft. Zur Theorie der Persönlichkeit in der DDR* (Opladen 1980).

18. Cf. M.G. Lange/E. Richert/O. Stemmer, "Das Problem Der Neuen Intelligenz in der Sowjetischen Besatzungszone. Ein Beitrag zur politischen Soziologie der kommunistischen Herrschaftsordnung," *Veritas Justitia Libertas. Festschrift zur 200- Jahr-Feier der Columbia University, New York*, überreicht von der Freien Universität Berlin und der Deutschen Hochschule für Politik Berlin, (Berlin 1954) pp. 191.

19. Cf. P.C. Ludz: *The Changing Party Elite in East Germany* (Cambridge, Mass./London 1972).

20. Cf. K.v. Beyme. *Ökonomie und Politik, op. cit.*

WEST GERMAN STUDY OF THE GDR CONSTITUTION, LAW, AND STATE

Friedrich-Christian Schroeder

In 1979 the Federal Ministry for Inner-German Relations donated the Ernst Richert Prize for special achievements in the field of GDR research and comparative studies on the two German states. Three of the hitherto five prize winners have been jurists. This indicates the leading position of studies on state and law (*Staat und Recht*) within the GDR research field in the Federal Republic of Germany. In addition, within research on the USSR, studies about Soviet law also hold a leading position. This is an interesting parallel to American research on Soviet law, which is also central to American studies on the Soviet Union. Moreover, that sociologists and political scientists have taken an interest in investigating Soviet state and law is noteworthy. Apparently, then, state and law do offer a particularly favorable context for East European studies.

Development

It must be admitted, though, that it took time for state and law research on the GDR to reach its leading position within West Germany's GDR studies.

1. Period of Typification—1945 to late 1950s

During the first several years after World War II the primary goal was to describe the many negative aspects of state and law in the Soviet Occupation Zone not as single cases but as a system. *Injustice as a System* was the title of a four-volume collection of documents, which remains an excellent source of information.¹ Furthermore, the development of state and law in the Soviet Occupation Zone was generally seen within the concept of law based on the doctrines of Marx, Engels, Lenin, and Stalin. In the following years, studies frequently described the law of the Soviet Occupation Zone as a realization of Marxist doctrines, without elucidating problems.

To promote research on state and law in the GDR, an institution composed mainly of jurists who were former residents of the GDR was founded in West Berlin. The Investigating Committee of Free Jurists

(*Untersuchungsausschuss Freiheitlicher Juristen*) co-operated closely with the Federal Ministry for Inner-German Relations. Many documents were obtained from the GDR by conspiracy, and a member of the Committee was kidnapped by the NKVD in West Berlin, never to reappear.

Since the legal codifications of the German *Reich* still remained effective in the FRG, West German textbooks on state and law for many years after the end of the war continued to treat the law of the Soviet Occupation Zone as a mere annex.

Despite the extremely negative image of the GDR's state and law during this period and despite the fact that Nazi concentration camps were used by communists until 1950, hardly any attempt was made to suggest a parallel between the legal order of the Soviet Occupation Zone and that of National Socialism, i.e., application of the totalitarianism concept to the Soviet Occupation Zone. The only attempt² in that direction remained almost completely unnoticed and met with sharp criticism.³

Soon after the end of World War II, high quality research on East European law developed in the Federal Republic of Germany. This was mainly due to efforts of the "three great M's"—Reinhart Maurach, Walter Meder, and Boris Meissner and their institutes located in West Berlin, Munich, Kiel, and Cologne. Yet it is interesting to note that all this research did not include state and law in the GDR.

This neglect probably was related to the view that developments in the Soviet Occupation Zone were mere adaptations of the Soviet model and thus not interesting enough for separate research. For example, a book was published with the characteristic title *The Development of Soviet Criminal Law and its Influence on Adjudication in the Soviet Occupation Zone*.⁴ Moreover, West German politicians and public opinion refused to acknowledge the division of Germany. As a result, integration of GDR research into East European research was strictly avoided. Financial grants to support GDR research in West Germany have always been—and still are—handled by different institutions than those for East European studies. Congresses and volumes of collected writings generally avoid consideration of the GDR as a part of "Eastern Europe."

(As a matter of fact, during West German preparations for this conference at the American Institute for Contemporary German Studies the question arose whether or not the World Congress for Soviet and East European Studies, then being held in Washington, was the right

place to introduce West German research on the GDR to American scholars. Some feared that doing so would bolster an American conception of the GDR as part of Eastern Europe. These concerns were put aside only because it was felt that integration of GDR topics within the World Congress would not acknowledge the GDR as part of "East Europe," but instead their inclusion could take advantage of connections between GDR and East Europe research and studies, as well as the presence at the Congress of numerous experts with whom one could exchange ideas.)

The dimensions of this problem, however, exceed the FRG's relationship to the GDR. Especially the Poles are upset at being an object of "East European studies." Such problems could be avoided, though, if the terms "communist" or "communist-governed states" were used instead of the geographical term "East Europe."

2. *Beginning of Critical Analysis—Late 1950s*

Toward the end of the 1950s, the image of GDR state and law studies changed drastically. Ernst Richert's book *Macht ohne Mandat* (Power Without Mandate) supplied important and fundamentally new perspectives. He showed that the political system of the GDR was not at all a realization of the ideas of Marx, Engels, Lenin, and Stalin, but that these ideas had undergone modifications as a result of the requirements of real life.

Soon thereafter Siegfried Mampel published a comprehensive commentary on the Constitution of the GDR.⁶ In various respects, this book was symptomatic for the situation of research on GDR state and law in the Federal Republic of Germany in those days—it was entitled *The Constitution of the Soviet Occupation Zone of Germany (Die Verfassung der sowjetisch besetzten Zone Deutschlands)*. To use the term "GDR" was then considered treacherous in West Germany, and all means were used to deny the autonomy of the GDR. Yet it was felt that there were good reasons to record the view that the GDR was neither German nor democratic nor a republic. It seemed somewhat grotesque, however, that a commentary on the constitution of a political entity should give that legal code a different name. The annotations to the constitution are another quite revealing characteristic of this publication, for any commentary on legislative act accords a certain importance to the annotated legal norm. But this, exactly, was not the case with the GDR Constitu-

tion as commented by Mampel. Nevertheless, in this special kind of presentation, he once again affirmed the leading role of East European law studies in the Federal Republic of Germany. Obviously, the model for Mampel's commentary on the GDR Constitution had been the commentary on the Soviet Constitution by Reinhart Maurach.⁷ Though wrongly presented, Mampel's commentary contained a lot of valuable and useful information on the law of the GDR. In general, this period was characterized by an intense interest by West German law experts in the law of the GDR.⁸

3. *Comparative Studies—1968–1975*

A new approach to research on GDR state and law in the Federal Republic of Germany resulted from the efforts of the GDR to create its own codifications for important fields of law—Family Law in 1966, the Penal Code, the Code of Criminal Procedure and the Regulatory Offences Act in 1968, as well as the new constitution in 1968. Now it became increasingly important to find out how far the new law of the GDR had drifted away from the law of the Federal Republic of Germany—in other words, the new point of interest was German-German law comparison. This problem soon became the subject of much research.⁹ This period reached its peak in the early 1970s when scientific surveys on law¹⁰ were added to the federal government's traditional State of the Nation report concerning problems of German unity. On 360 large-sized pages, printed in double columns, this survey presented a comprehensive comparison of the laws of West and East Germany.

The term "Comparative Studies on Germany," dating back to this period, is a clever combination of two different points of view. Acknowledging, on one hand, the existence of two different objects of comparison, it suggests, on the other hand, the continuity of Germany as a whole.

Nevertheless, this survey and some other publications influenced by it stimulated much controversy, for they used the "immanent description" approach of political scientist Peter Christian Ludz. His method was to describe and assess the phenomena of the GDR in relation to its own systemic aims and ambitions.¹¹ The method earned sharp rebuke for an alleged lack of discrimination and for soft-pedaling, or even justifying, conditions in the GDR. It was not by mere chance that Ludz was assigned extensive research projects when the Social-Liberal administra-

tion in Bonn signed the Basic Treaty between the FRG and the GDR.

4. Present Situation

Explicit inner-German comparisons on state and law have today receded into the background. But even when studies on state and law abandon explicit comparisons they are always based on detailed knowledge of FRG law. This, in turn, greatly influences the studies and often transforms them into implicit comparisons.¹²

There have often been complaints that there is no special chair for GDR studies and GDR law studies in the Federal Republic of Germany. Yet, in some respects, this turned out to be an advantage for it forced inner-German comparative approaches within other disciplines. Unfortunately, however, concentration of West German law experts on GDR law has been almost completely abandoned.

Furthermore, nearly all the GDR state and law researchers in the Federal Republic of Germany are disciples of the "three great M's." This implies that they are also experts on Soviet law. While explicit comparisons of GDR and Soviet law are rare,¹³ Soviet law is implicitly considered, and striking coincidences or differences usually are mentioned.

Institutions and Scholars

The most important institutions for research on GDR state and law in the Federal Republic of Germany are:

- Gesamtdeutsches Institut
Bundesanstalt für gesamtdeutsche Aufgaben in Berlin (West)
Fehrbelliner Platz 3
1000 Berlin West

In particular, this institute publishes a chronicle entitled "Development of Law in the GDR" ("Die Rechtsentwicklung in der DDR") in the journal *Recht in Ost und West*. Since it is involved in the care of ex-GDR inmates, the institute possesses numerous court decisions and other documents.

- Osteuropa-Institut
Free University of Berlin
Garystrasse 55
1000 Berlin West 33

In this institute, research work on state and law in the GDR is done mainly by Professors Mampel, Roggemann, and Westen.

- Institut für Ostrecht
University of Cologne
Ubierring 53
5000 Köln 41

The institute includes a department for GDR law where especially Professor Brunner is working on the subject.

- Lehrstuhl für Strafrecht, Strafprozessrecht und Ostrecht
University of Regensburg
Postfach 3 97
8400 Regensburg
(Prof. Dr. Friedrich-Christian Schroeder)

- Institut für Völkerrecht
University of Göttingen
Nikolausberger Weg 9c
3400 Göttingen
(Prof. Dr. Zieger)

Standard Publications and Aids

Standard works on GDR law studies include:

- Materialien zur Lage der Nation* (Information appended to the report on the State of the Nation); still useful although outdated.
- Einführung in das Recht der DDR* (Introduction to the Law of the GDR) by Georg Brunner, 2nd ed. 1979.
- Kommentar zur Verfassung der DDR* (Commentary on the Constitution of the GDR) by Siegfried Mampel.
- A comprehensive study on criminal law is provided in *Das Strafrecht des realen Sozialismus. Eine Einführung am Beispiel der DDR* (Criminal Law of Real Socialism: An Introduction Based on the GDR Example) published by Friedrich-Christian Schroeder.

Another important aid is the loose-leaf compilation of *Gesetze der DDR* (Laws of the GDR), founded by D. Müller-Römer and published by E. Lieser-Triebnigg.

The most important journal to report on GDR state and law studies is *Recht in Ost und West* (Law in East and West) which includes the chronicle "Die Rechtsentwicklung in der DDR" (Development of Law in the GDR)

mentioned above. Articles on state and law in the GDR are also published by the journals *Deutschland Archiv* and *Jahrbuch für Ostrecht*.

An important critical bibliography is given in the chapter on law in "Gutachten zum Stand der DDR- und vergleichenden Deutschlandforschung" (Report Concerning the Situation of GDR- and Comparative German Studies) of 1978.¹⁴

Important Recent Publications

To the studies mentioned above, the following important publications of recent years should be added:

H.J. Brandt: *Die Kandidatenaufstellung zu den Volkskammerwahlen der DDR. Entscheidungsprozesse und Auswahlkriterien*, 1983 (*The Designation of Candidates for Election to the Chamber of Deputies: Decision-Making Process and Selection Principles*).

This book is characteristic of the diminished importance of criticism from the Western point of view. It is not interested, for instance, in the well-known fact that the GDR's Chamber of Deputies is significantly less legitimated by democratic principles and has only few functions compared to Western parliaments. Instead, the study concentrates on functions which actually exist, are different, and of importance. Brandt examines how the holders of these functions, i.e., the Deputies, are designated. The study combines normative, political, and empirical-sociological methods.

O. Luchterhandt: *Der verstaatlichte Mensch. Die Grundpflichten des Bürgers in der DDR*, 1985 (*The Nationalized Person. Basic Duties of GDR Citizens*).

The interesting aspect of this volume is its new thesis and verification thereof—the impossibility for communist-governed states to withdraw from the worldwide debate on civil and human rights of recent years. One of the instruments developed to restrict and take the edge off civil rights was introduction of civil duties. These have to be observed before civil rights are granted. Luchterhandt shows that the civil duties are not a restriction of civil rights but are the primary principle. Civil rights can only be realized within the framework of these duties. Thus no "legal status" exists for the GDR citizen but only a "status of duties." Especially remarkable is Luchterhandt's proof of this

model's continuity from National Socialism back to the political ethics of Prussia.

Desiderata

Finally, I would like to suggest subjects for future research. In my opinion, studies on the extent to which the institutions of state and law in the GDR are accepted by the GDR public should be given top priority. For this purpose, the experiences of the many former GDR citizens who have recently moved to the Federal Republic should be taken into account.

In the field of normative studies, more intensive research on the extent of Soviet law reception and on the degree of GDR autonomy in finding its own solutions would be desirable, although necessary definitions for criteria of this kind are still to be developed.¹⁵

In this context, comparison between the state and legal systems of the GDR and of East European countries other than the Soviet Union could be extremely important. It would be very interesting to know, for example, whether the reception of Soviet law and the extent of its reception differs in other East European countries.

NOTES

1. Gesamtdeutsches Ministerium, ed., *Unrecht als System* (Bonn, 1952, 1955, 1958, 1962).
2. Federal Ministry for Inner-German Relations, ed., *Partei-Justiz. Eine vergleichende Dokumentation über den nationalsozialistischen und den kommunistischen Rechtsmissbrauch in Deutschland 1933–1963* (Bonn).
3. J. Baumann, "Zweimal totalitäre Justiz," *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, November 24, 1964.
4. Ed. by the "Königsteiner Kreis"—Vereinigung der Juristen, Volkswirte, Beamten aus der Sowjetischen Besatzungszone (Society of Jurists, Economists, and Officials from the Soviet-Occupied Zone).
5. 1958, 2nd ed. 1963.
6. *Die Verfassung der Sowjetischen Besatzungszone Deutschlands*, 1962; 2nd edition, 1966. Later: *Die sozialistische Besatzung der Deutschen Demokratischen Republik*, 1972; 2nd edition, 1982.

7. *Handbuch der Sowjetverfassung*, 1955. New edition *Handbuch der Sowjetverfassung*, M. Fincke, ed., 1983.

8. H.H. Jescheck, *Strafrecht und Strafrechtsanwendung in der sowjetisch besetzten Zone Deutschlands*, 1962; *Lage des Rechts in Mitteldeutschland* (Lectures at the University of Freiburg), 1965; E.W. Böckenförde, *Die Rechtsauffassung im kommunistischen Staat*, 1967; Eser, *Gesellschaftsgerichte in der Strafrechtspflege*, 1970; O. Mieke, *Die Schuldfähigkeit Jugendlicher im Strafrecht der Deutschen Demokratischen Republik*, in: G. Grünwald et al., ed., *Festschrift für Friedrich Schaffstein zum 70. Geburtstag*, 1975, pp. 353ff. The textbook by H.H. Jescheck, *Strafrecht*, 1969, contains a special chapter on the criminal law of the GDR.

9. Among others: F.-C. Schroeder, "Die neuere Entwicklung der Strafgesetzgebung in Deutschland," *Juristenzeitung* 1970, p. 393ff.; *Gibt es noch ein deutsches Strafrecht? Ein Vergleich der Strafrechtsreform in beiden Teilen Deutschlands*, Königsteiner Kreis 1971, pp. 1ff.; *Die Strafgesetzgebung in Deutschland. Eine synoptische Darstellung der Strafgesetzbücher der Bundesrepublik Deutschland und der Deutschen Demokratischen Republik*, 1972; G. Brunner, *Kontrolle in Deutschland. Eine Untersuchung zur Verfassungsordnung in beiden Teilen Deutschlands*, 1972; H. Roggemann, *Die Verfassung der DDR. Entstehung, Analyse, Vergleich, Text*, 1970. H.-H. Mahnke, "Menschen- und Grundrechte in beiden Teilen Deutschlands," in *Vereinte Nationen* 17 (1969), pp. 1ff. E. Richert, "Bürger und Staat im Grundgesetz und in der DDR-Verfassung," *Deutschland Archiv*, 1968, pp. 593ff; P. Romer, "Die Grundrechte in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland und in der DDR," in A. Hartmann u.a. *BRD—DDR. Vergleich der Gesellschaftssysteme*, 1971. Also see the valuable series "Die DDR—Realitäten, Argumente" of the Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung with many single issues.

10. Drucksachen des Deutschen Bundestages Nr. VI/3080.

11. Ludz changed the description of this method several times. Due to the critical attacks, he finally wanted his method to be seen as an "immanent-critical approach" (*Die DDR zwischen Ost und West*, 1977, S. 27). Compare V. Gransow, *Konzeptionelle Wandlungen der Kommunismusforschung. Vom Totalitarismus zur Immanenz*, 1980, pp. 158ff.

12. See also F.-C. Schroeder, *Das Strafrecht des realen Sozialismus. Eine Einführung am Beispiel der DDR*, 1983, p. 10.

13. Mainly in F.-C. Schroeder, "Das Strafrecht der DDR und der Sowjetunion—Ein Beitrag zur Meso-Rechtsvergleichung," *Zeitschrift für*

die gesamte Strafrechtswissenschaft, Vol. 91 (1979), p. 1065ff. Furthermore: F.-C. Schroeder, "The Penal Law of the GDR—German or Soviet Law?," Lecture at Rutgers University, October 28, 1985.

14. This report has not been published. However it is available to scholarly institutions.

15. Basic approaches have been made in: F.-C. Schroeder, *Das Strafrecht der DDR und der Sowjetunion* (annotation no. 12), pp. 189ff.; see also: *Das Strafrecht des realen Sozialismus* (annotation 11), pp. 194ff.