

Susan C. Anderson

**Unification and Difference
in German Post-Wall Cinema**

This article explores representations of unification in Margarethe von Trotta's *Das Versprechen* (1995), Wolfgang Becker's *Good Bye Lenin!* (2003), Yüksel Yavuz's *Aprilkinder* (1998), and Fatih Akin's *Im Juli* (2000). It investigates the ways these films reveal a shift of perspective on the meaning of East-West unity in post-wall Germany. It first analyzes von Trotta's and Becker's approaches to unification by probing the images of division and similarity that they create or question. It next addresses Yavuz's darker view of impulses towards unification. It then considers how Akin's film moves ideas of unity into a European context and then dismantles them.

A new concept of identity that would allow us to live together without having to sacrifice difference and personality on the altar of identity would need to have gaps through which what is different and foreign could come and go. Identity would then not manifest itself as hegemony.¹

Reflections in German film on unification and its consequences have until recently largely ignored the heterogeneity of German society and focused on the concerns of mainstream Germans from the German Democratic Republic (GDR) and West Germany. This focus overlooks cultural differences in both formerly separate societies as well as the presence of different ethnic and cultural groups within Germany today that belong in neither of the former 'halves.' The Berlin Wall played a central role in maintaining the notion of the two halves, for it both divided and united. It divided geographically and politically, but it also offered a unifying ideal to the citizens on each side by emphasizing a collective identity based on being different from and better than those on the other side, especially with regard to the legacies of the Holocaust. Both East and West German concepts of collective identity depended on characterizing the other group as the heirs of the Nazi era. Dominic Boyer, for instance, contends that the division allowed Germans on either side of the Wall to regard those on

the other side as possessing authoritarian proclivities, as representing a national-cultural past against which to measure their ideal of serving as representatives of a future, more democratic German identity.² Andreas Huyssen characterizes the notion of East/West difference as also marking different those on the same side of the Wall who appeared to be aligned with those on the other side. For example, West German conservatives regarded the left as identifying with GDR socialist ideals, and East German officials accused dissidents of being inimical to socialism.³ Any difficulties that an eastern or western German had in developing a sense of belonging were ascribed to 'that other German: the other German as thief of one's own potential identity.'⁴ In Huyssen's words:

National identity was always fractured in this way, and it remains to be explored to what extent the success of denationalization in both Germanys was fueled by such subterranean conflicts that destroyed older forms of national identity as much as they added another chapter to the history of German self-hatreds.⁵

Huyssen calls for the democratic left to take the lead in fashioning a new national discourse. This discourse would build on the productive moves towards a national identity 'that the democratization of Germany, indissolubly coupled with the recognition of a murderous history, has already given the new Germany.'⁶ Boyer, on the other hand, points to the difficulties in creating such a discourse by arguing that western Germans regard themselves as the only ones capable of managing the future of Germany.⁷

Unification has confounded the function of East/West difference by creating one official set of Germans as heir to the crimes of the Nazi past. As a result, former East and West Germans seek to resurrect the differences they projected onto each other or to transfer those differences to others living in Germany, such as immigrants, as an avoidance measure. Boyer traces the phenomenon of 'Ostalgie,' or nostalgia for an idealized GDR past, to this longing for difference, especially among West Germans. 'Ostalgie' serves the desires of western Germans to claim a future 'free from the burden of history' because nostalgia for certain aspects of the GDR makes it appear as if eastern Germans are still mired in an authoritarian past.⁸ Joseph F. Jozwiak and Elisabeth Mermann, by contrast, assert that both East and West German interest in 'Ostalgie' is 'an expression of the destabilizing juncture between the old and the new, between a stable and

recognizable past in a well-defined nation state and a presently evolving culture that is in search of foundational myths.⁹ Yet both they and Boyer limit themselves to addressing the concerns of mainstream citizens of eastern and western Germany. Huysen broadens the investigation of the effect of unification on notions of difference by claiming that unification displaces what he characterizes as German self-hatred onto foreigners, 'the new thieves of German identity.'¹⁰ He advocates a concept of nation that would 'emphasize negotiated heterogeneity rather than an always fictional ethnic or cultural homogeneity.'¹¹

Annette Seidel Arpacı proposes recognition of 'parallel memory' as one means of fostering heterogeneous concepts of nation. 'Parallel memory' is a mediated form of memory that would allow migrants in Germany to be receptive of the cultural trauma linked to Nazi Germany and of their 'own ethnicized and precarious place.'¹² Hindering such efforts to rethink national identity is a residue of the notion that some kind of cohesive collective identity exists or could exist. In keeping with this notion, the Wall represented a lost homogenous identity that could one day be regained. This identity would arise from a synthesis of the undifferentiated concepts of East and West, propagated in official discourse. In the ironic words of the narrator in Margarethe von Trotta's film *Das Versprechen*, as long as the Wall stood, it allowed Germans to believe in the illusion that all that divided the German people was the Wall. Thus when the Wall fell this illusion contributed to the national unification process. Andreas Glaeser explains furthermore that the notion of the essential unity of the German people supported the 'organizational form in which unification proceeded' and helped political unification occur with such speed.¹³ The immediate euphoria after the fall of the Wall led East Germans to accept 'everything Western as a norm to which everything Eastern as deviant from this norm had to aspire.'¹⁴

Immigrants in the West were prone to accept the view of West German identity constructs as superior to those of former GDR citizens. As the research of Nevim Çil reveals, many of the younger generation of Turkish heritage in the Federal Republic of Germany regarded themselves as part of the 'Mehrheitsgesellschaft' into which the new Germans from the East would have to assimilate.¹⁵ This illusion of multicultural identity, which mainstream western Germans did not share, soon contributed to a loss of orientation following the

‘Wende.’ In contrast to the sentiments of younger Turks in Germany, Zafer Şenocak claims that the Wall strengthened the feeling among mainstream Germans that their culture was at the center of the world and that it differed from the cultures of all the so-called foreigners living there. This cultural center expanded to include Germans from the former German Democratic Republic, although, as noted above, Germans from the West still claim dominance in this cultural center. Nevertheless, as Özlem Topcu, notes, unification redefined the distinction between ‘wir’ and the Other, pushing, for example, Turkish immigrants further to the margins as part of an undifferentiated group of Others.¹⁶ Unification made the younger generation into ‘Turks’ for the first time, excluding them from the popular slogan ‘Wir sind das Volk.’¹⁷ Yet the fall of the Wall has also opened possibilities that call this center into question. In Şenocak’s words, ‘Auf die Ränder kommt es angeblich an, auf die Verschränkungen an den Rändern, mit Knotenpunkten, die unseren guten alten Zentren den Rang ablaufen.’¹⁸ Precisely these margins highlight the complexity of issues surrounding German unification, a complexity that is emerging more and more in German cinema.

This chapter will explore representations of unification in four films made in Germany since 1990: Margarethe von Trotta’s *Das Versprechen* (1995), Wolfgang Becker’s *Good Bye Lenin!* (2003), Yüksel Yavuz’s *Aprilkinder* (1998), and Fatih Akin’s *Im Juli* (2000). It will compare the first two, which question unification but still operate within a framework of ideal, albeit inaccessible, wholeness, with the latter two, which attempt to redefine the discourse of unity. Directors such as von Trotta and Becker have evoked the GDR as the embodiment of broken promises, deceptive memories, and nostalgic longing, in the form of love stories set in Berlin. The division between East and West Germans plays a central role in these films. They work in the tradition of Peter Schneider’s stories of Wall jumpers and of his claim that a ‘Mauer im Kopf’ is hindering unification.¹⁹ For instance, *Das Versprechen* presents divided Germany as a pair of separated lovers, whose incompleteness is exacerbated by their idealistic attachments to the promise of socialism or capitalism. Unification in this film does not promise to overcome political and social differences. *Good Bye Lenin!* suggests that nostalgia for the GDR is an attempt to maintain a sense of identity while confronting the absorbing power of political unification. Yet the difference the film celebrates shares

many similarities with the West German culture from which it seeks to distance itself. Both films work within a nostalgic discourse that, as Julia Hell and Johannes von Moltke contend, responds to unification with afterimages of imagined utopias from the past.²⁰ They also participate both in upholding an 'image of Western normality,' as John Davidson notes about the position of foreigners and 'Ossis' in post-'Wende' film,²¹ and in interrogating the validity of that normality.

These retrospectives of divided Germany employ the Berlin Wall as a key metaphor of that division and make little reference to Germany's diverse cultural landscape in their efforts to question the notion of unity because they focus on mainstream representatives of East and West Germany. They implicitly uphold the hegemony of identity to which Şenocak and Bülent Tulay refer in the epigraph above. On the other hand, directors such as Fatih Akin and Yüksel Yavuz have created films about Turkish immigrants in post-Wall Germany and their interactions with each other and with other Germans. Unification between East and West Germany seems to play almost no role in these films; they present convergences between Turks and Germans in a supposedly united Germany as different ways to think about bringing together the East and the West. Yavuz's *Aprilkinder* demonstrates the difficulties of intercultural encounters as it investigates pressures to assimilate and different reactions to those pressures. It conjures up notions of unity but then shows their inadequacy to address cross-cultural conflicts. Akin's *Im Juli* plays with German stereotypes of the exotic East to posit a process of facing and working through stereotypes as a means of achieving cultural harmony. A closer analysis will show how the films represent competing discourses: one of wholeness and resolution versus one of incompleteness and paradox. These films reveal a shift of perspective on the meaning of East-West unity in post-Wall Germany: von Trotta's and Becker's probing of images of division and similarity that they create or question; Yavuz's darker view of impulses towards unification; and Akin's link between German concepts of Eastern Europe and German views of Turkey, which moves ideas of unity into a European context and then dismantles them. Varying shots that suggest division (walls), resemblance (similar set-ups in different frames), connection (bridges, sewers, staircases), and unity (circles, embraces) reveal all four films' efforts to articulate post-Wall encounters that are productive without dissolving tensions.

Unification implies transformation; out of two or more parts, a new whole emerges, transcending the differences that preceded it. This transcendence may also have a coercive basis with one part absorbing the differences of the other parts. Wholeness then becomes not a merging of equals but a hierarchical reconstitution. This reconstitution in the German context echoes the pre-Wall sentiments in each Germany that it was the 'better Germany.'²² Indeed, as Boyer points out, persistent emphasis on East/West differences leaves little room to challenge the fact of that difference.²³ Peter Schneider wrote in 1988 with regard to the potentially transformative aspect of unification, 'Jedes System stellt sich als Metasystem dar, das die Lösung aller Widersprüche des anderen Systems verheißt.'²⁴ Tensions between former East and West Germans attest to the consequences of one system assuming the role of meta-system in an attempt to incorporate the other. As Schneider's novel *Der Mauerspringer* (1982) demonstrates, there is a 'disease of comparison' that hinders efforts to overcome differences, for each side competes with the other to be the 'better' system. The need to compare helps maintain the notion of unification as representing a superior system able to merge other discrete systems into it. Yet Schneider's novel also shows how conflicts within each system undermine unifying efforts.²⁵

The value placed on unification derives from a German intellectual tradition that considers organic wholeness as the perfect condition. Helmut Müller-Sievers in an essay on the occasion of the tenth anniversary of the fall of the Berlin Wall characterizes post-Wall German culture as continuing to work within a cultural paradigm informed by Johann Wolfgang von Goethe and Wilhelm von Humboldt's notions of culture, poetics, and politics as organically interrelated. In keeping with this tradition, the discourse around German unification is imbued with references to 'growing together' and becoming whole. It values reconciliation, organic integration, and harmony, as Müller-Sievers notes. Willy Brandt's assertion on 10 November 1989, 'What belongs together now grows together,' illustrates the persistence of this discourse.²⁶ Yet, this paradigm binds German culture to the past, to leveling differences, and to excluding elements that cannot be seamlessly integrated. Such a paradigm is anachronistic in today's Germany. Müller-Sievers proposes instead a forward-looking cultural politics whose 'guiding question would not be how to integrate foreign elements but how to keep their conflicts productive.'²⁷ He

calls for cultural debates that would 'ask which conflicts it [Germany] can bear and which conflicts threaten to undermine the very possibility of conflict.'²⁸ Such debates would question moves to portray unity as a natural state of affairs.

Wholeness implies parts that can be harmoniously integrated, that share some commonalities in order to fit together. In keeping with the discourse of wholeness, the division of Germany as something unnatural underlies director von Trotta's and screenplay co-writer Peter Schneider's approach to these questions, which finds expression in their recourse to the trope of male and female torn apart in *Das Versprechen*. Yet the film also casts doubt on political unification as the antidote to the anxieties of separation. GDR socialism appears as the catalyst for rupturing unity, represented by the two parallel stories of young lovers Sophie and Konrad and Barbara and Harald. The pain of separation implies that the differences that the Wall ostensibly cements exist on the surface of some kind of basic desire to converge. The film then probes the nature of these differences and desires for oneness, beginning with scenes of division and ending with moves towards reconnection. *Das Versprechen* starts with news footage of the Berlin Wall going up, with scenes of separated families crying and waving handkerchiefs at each other, of an East German soldier jumping over barbed wire to get to the West, of a woman dangling from a window and then falling into the arms of West Germans below waiting to catch her. German society appears as a family torn asunder. This documentation of the Wall's effects immediately precedes a sequence showing Sophie and Konrad's separation, offering the couple as representatives of the division of East and West. East Berlin is the site of the break between two political systems and between people who desire to be together.

The newsreel footage suggests that overpowering forces in the GDR, although with the complicity of the West, are the cause for the division of Germany, which, in turn, is the root of German suffering and anxiety represented by Sophie and Konrad's long separation. The unnaturalness of this separation contrasts with the story's first scene of unity: Sophie and Konrad, clasped in tight embrace on the dance floor as others twist and jump around them to American music played by an East German band. Sophie's first words to Konrad, 'Es geht los,' as she pulls away from him, signal both the beginning of the narrative and the beginning of their separation, for they will not embrace again

until 1968 in Prague. The lure of Western culture, the promise of a better society in East Germany, and the East German power apparatus keep them apart, which is apparent in the next scenes showing Sophie, Konrad, and their three friends leaving the dance and attempting to escape through the sewers to the West. Konrad, who is left behind after he trips over his shoelace, falls, and loses valuable time, promises to follow the others as soon as the East German soldiers patrolling the streets go by, but his fear of the authorities, and his father and sister's unexpected appearance at the scene, persuade him to stay. The recurring motif of Konrad's untied shoelaces implies a persistent divisive undercurrent to overt efforts to unite. His torn allegiances to his family and to his girlfriend, to duty and to desire, unravel him. By contrast, unity leads the others to the West. Two of the friends put their hands together to try to create a complete map of the sewer system to guide them. Each of them has only a part of a map, but together they have enough to lead them to where they want to go. By having them first mistake West Berlin for East Berlin when they emerge from underground, the film suggests that East-West differences are superficial, a matter of driving a Ford instead of a Trabant, for example, thus furthering the view of an essential unity that the Wall is obscuring and that the West fosters.

Yet the film also shows the consequences of the division as an increasing inability to see and to communicate from the same perspective. The division appears to fragment an otherwise unified way of seeing. In the case of Sophie and Konrad, political difference affects personal desires for unity. As the narrative develops, the concept of discrete halves that will fit back into a whole dissolves. The scene of Konrad in the watchtower peering through binoculars at Sophie, for instance, who is on the other side of the Wall peering up at him through binoculars, shows a difficulty to perceive the other clearly after only a relatively brief time apart. The vertical and horizontal distances the watchtower and the Wall create nevertheless allow glimpses of the other at this early stage of division. The rest of the film traces the growing differences and suffering arising from separation – each lover crying alone, attempts to reunite that do not work out – interrupted by one happy time in a place that is not German, but is set in the city of Prague in 1968. Division appears repeatedly in the film as the result of external factors that prevent the fulfillment of natural inclination, that is, Sophie's and Konrad's love for each other,

which suggests the desire of East and West Germans to unite. The apparent utopia of the Prague Spring, where Sophie becomes pregnant, offers a neutral ground to reunite, but circumstances, in the form of Russian tanks, drive them apart again. A sign of the confusion that the division of the two ostensible halves is prompting emerges from the sequence in which Konrad and Sophie each wait for the other in Prague under a lantern sculpture, unaware that there are two identical lanterns at two different spots in the city. As each waits alone by a lantern, the camera zooms outward and circles it (counterclockwise around Konrad, clockwise around Sophie), showing how each sculpture appears complete. Yet their settings, or contexts, make them differ. Sophie and Konrad are deceived by their belief in a notion of identity based on a common way of perceiving, for each interpreted the location of the meeting place differently. Indeed, even the descriptions they received about the sculptures, that they portray three instead of four women, were faulty. The intact lantern sculptures dispense with the notion that Sophie and Konrad represent two halves. They are two separate entities, like the sculptures.

Much emphasis in the film, however, is given to the differences among East Germans, thereby offering a counterpoint to the implication in Sophie and Konrad's story that they represent a thwarted unity. Schneider's belief in the powerful 'Mauer im Kopf' extends here from a split between East and West to segmentation within the East. As the film develops, it casts doubt on the idea of East and West as two stable halves. The East turns out to be a fragmented concept, and divisions multiply. Konrad's autocratic father, pacifist sister, rebellious brother-in-law, opportunistic colleague, and cynical boss all reveal contradictory and competing notions of what an East German is. The love story about Harald and Barbara, Konrad's brother-in-law and sister, who is a Lutheran minister trying to change the corrupt GDR system from within, contrasts with that of Konrad and Sophie. Harald and Barbara's union as a couple in the GDR does not bring about harmony or even common views. Barbara draws parallels between her religious views and her concept of humane socialism, both of which she hopes will spread in the future. Harald, by contrast, uses religious symbolism, for example, by enacting the crucifixion on the anniversary of the Berlin Wall, to criticize living conditions in the GDR. The division this couple represents is an internal one, one that challenges the concept of political unification as the solution to

difference. Harald does not share Barbara's faith in socialist ideals; he rather focuses on the corrupt realities of socialism as it actually exists. He, too, appears in scenes with shots of walls and other barriers: in prison before his expulsion to the West, outside Sophie's closed apartment door, caught between walls as he tries to slip back into the GDR. By having him killed as he crosses the Wall back into East Berlin on his attempt to return to Barbara, the film demonstrates a more nuanced view of unification than the Konrad/Sophie pairing seems to imply. Overcoming external obstacles does not necessarily result in unity. Indeed, the belief that it will can be fatal. Konrad and Sophie's goal of being together in the West gradually loses meaning in the course of their long separation. For Barbara and Harald, however, death occurs as Harald defies division. Neither East nor West serves as a site of harmonious merging.

Although presented as opposites, the two parts of Berlin and its inhabitants also share similarities. On the one hand, the depiction of the West corresponds to clichés of capitalistic decadence. West Berlin, as in so many films about the division, appears as glitzy and full of consumer delights, such as the cars and clothes Sophie and her friends acquire and further symbolized by Sophie's apprenticeship as a fashion designer in her aunt's business. Typical of East German stereotypes about the Federal Republic of Germany (FRG), Harald, after being expelled from the GDR and entering West Berlin for the first time, encounters a run-down train station peopled with drug addicts and beggars. On the other hand, scenes of both West and East present open spaces and sunlight: Sophie's meetings with her friends from the East, Sophie's work as a tour guide, Konrad's talks with Harald, his mentor Lorenz, and his wife, Elizabeth. They also show confinement: prisons in the East, Sophie crying in a dark dressing room, the stairwell of Sophie's apartment building. Images of connection, however, highlight the fragility of moves towards unity in either direction. For instance, the shots of trains traversing a bridge leave unclear from which point the train starts and at which point it will arrive. Sophie and Konrad's son, Alexander, throwing a ball over the Wall and receiving it back from an unknown East German border guard could signal mutual rejection because each throws the circular symbol of unity away. However, it could also show a wish to share the idea of unity. Indeed, Jenifer K. Ward maintains that Alexander is the figure who promises to create a new Germany.²⁹ His and Sophie's relation-

ship with the French journalist Gérard, Sophie's work leading a group of Japanese tourists through West Berlin, the man with a foreign accent who gives Konrad information about how to escape to the West in the early part of the film, and the scenes in Prague are the only references to dimensions of 'German' culture that go beyond the film's concentration on ethnic Germans. However, friendly as Alexander and his mother are towards these others, the non-Germans are relegated to the background and eventually vanish from the story. The final scene on the bridge with Konrad and Sophie separated by masses of East and West Berliners going in two directions leaves open to which goal the crowds are headed. The fall of the Wall has brought East and West Germans into closer proximity, but their differences remain.

The film concentrates on the longing for unity to question its possibility. For example, the shots of Sophie and Konrad's embraces in Prague are framed by a moving camera that circles the couple as if in a dream. Their exaggeratedly enacted run up the stairs in the hotel both represents unity through the analogy of the circle and calls that unity into question by emphasizing it as a contrivance. The circle as image of completion or disrupted completion recurs throughout the film, for example, in the form of the round manhole-covers detached from their proper resting place as Sophie and her friends escape to the West or the ball that Alexander throws over the Wall. Sophie and Konrad's potential unification in the final scene, prompted by their son Alexander's urging them both to the bridge on November 9th, is all the more in doubt as it dispenses with circular images. The camera switches back and forth between shots of Sophie and Konrad headed in opposite directions before catching sight of each other. The film ends with Konrad calling out to Sophie over a mass of people. She turns to look at him with an inscrutable expression, and the frame freezes. Their 'unnatural' separation has resulted in such a deep rift that the natural child, the symbol of their oneness, cannot bring them together again. Division between East and West appears so powerful that the individual can do little but react to it. The desire for unity, as the hope that propels individuals to endure suffering while separated, has succumbed to the forces of power politics. Yet even by discounting the possibility of seamlessly integrating East and West, the film remains enmeshed in the discourse of unity. Not achieving unity still rests on an idea of unity.

The conflation of notions of unity and disunity emerges pointedly in a scene in which Konrad's daughter, Lena, attempts to get her half-brother Alexander to laugh at a joke about numbers. In the joke two zeroes see an eight in the desert, and the one zero remarks to the other zero that the eight is stupid for wearing a belt in such heat. The implication is that they view the eight as one of them, a zero that is artificially constricted, creating two smaller zeroes out of one. Taking off the belt would be a smart move, allowing the eight to become whole again and relieving its apparent discomfort. Yet Lena has trouble telling the joke, and Alexander does not understand it. By having the two half-siblings miscommunicate over a story idealizing wholeness as merely the removal of external barriers, the joke scene demonstrates the idea of unity as nothing more than a perspective that determines perception. The two zeroes cannot see the eight as anything but a deficient version of themselves. They cannot recognize it as a different but intact entity. Likewise, *Das Versprechen* shows how desires for completion are always caught up with ingrained perceptions and these perceptions in turn link division with pain. It does not offer a way out of this trap.

Becker's *Good Bye Lenin!* approaches the issue of unification between East and West as something undesirable. The notion of bringing two halves together becomes instead the idea of one part consuming the other and the other resisting this absorption. Resistance depends on seeing the former GDR as a unified entity. Much of the film centers on maintaining the illusion of GDR unity in the face of unification's force to destroy that illusion. The focus of the illusion is a childlike faith in the achievability of the ideals of East German society, as the beginning scenes of Alex's childhood show, especially the shots of the German and Russian cosmonauts as a team breaking records in space. The division of Germany in this film, as symbolized by the family, seems to allow for more harmonious relationships, for Alex's dissatisfied father flees to the West, while Alex, his mother, and sister, Ariane, remain in the East. Division is thus not the separation of two halves but the ejection of unruly elements from the controlled unity of the GDR, or so it appears. Division results in an ever more tightly enforced illusion of unity as evidenced in the mother's efforts to banish any desire for joining the father. Instead of trying to reunite the family, the mother creates a world in which the father no longer has a role. She unifies the family without him in her

ostensible struggle to help the GDR attain its socialist ideals. Thus there is no overt longing to overcome the separation between East and West. There is rather a reluctance to converge. The film presents the supposed cohesion of the GDR through a series of fictional home movies and flashbacks to Alex's childhood, in which the family overcomes the adversity of the father's departure and the mother's nervous breakdown to emerge as committed supporters of GDR socialism. Alex's later participation in demonstrations for freedom to travel outside the GDR represents his tentative attempt to separate from the illusion of the GDR for which his mother stands. The mother's sudden appearance and collapse at the sight of her son's challenge to the utopian dream she embodies distracts him from his efforts to rebel. Her fragility also signals that there are problems with that ideal, for, in the words of Jennifer Creech, 'she is the site of social contradictions, the embodiment of conflict between socialist ideals, and real existing socialism.'³⁰

Unification in this film unleashes anxiety over the loss of faith in GDR socialism and provokes in Alex a longing to return to an uncomplicated past where mother and children worked to make real their society's utopian dreams. The possibility of unification causes the mother to become gravely ill, and it threatens to expose her lie to her children about her husband's flight to the West. This fabrication is connected to her transformation into an overly dedicated supporter of the GDR. Alex's smaller deception thus exposes this greater one, challenging the unity the mother represents. The film's ironic tone criticizes the nostalgia for a socialist ideal of community that never existed in the GDR. Alex's growing obsession with maintaining his subterfuge also reveals authoritarian tendencies, such as his compelling all around him to play along with the charade. Boyer sees this residue of authoritarianism as demonstrating the West German film's complicity in disseminating the idea that former East Germans are unsuitable to be equal partners in forging a common future for unified Germany. They are made to bear the burden of the totalitarian past from which West Germans would like to dissociate themselves.³¹

Alex's nostalgic rewriting of history, according to which disenfranchised West Germans flee in droves to the East, is also an attempt to defer acknowledgment of the reality of West German absorption of the GDR into its consumerist system, represented by such ubiquitous brand names as Coca-Cola and Burger King. In fact, the fictionalized

version of the latter of these two conglomerates propels the plot towards its eventual climax of disillusionment. While unification was linked to dashed hopes for transcending differences in *Das Versprechen*, in *Good Bye Lenin!* it is a consuming force that threatens identity. Alex recreates the GDR as much to shield his sense of self as to protect his sick mother from shock at finding out that the Wall fell while she was in a coma. This microcosm of the GDR helps maintain the notion of the FRG as dangerous Other, about to destroy the unique nature of the GDR. The film uses contrasting and exaggerated shots to illustrate alleged differences, such as the pornographic video Alex sees upon entering West Berlin or his imagination of his father as a wealthy and obese person devouring a huge hamburger. These East German stereotypes in turn point to West German stereotypes of East Germans as unable to see beyond their ideological prejudices.

The motif of consumption further stresses the difference between the FRG and the GDR. Alex's fantasy world is propped up by putting West German food into East German containers, thereby switching the direction of consumption. Perhaps the strongest metaphor of consumption is Alex's sister Ariane's new job at a Burger King in West Berlin. With a Burger King uniform and a new boyfriend she met there, Ariane becomes a stereotype of the Americanized West in general. And only by selling hamburgers does she see the lost father, ordering from the drive-through, which initiates the eventual unification of the family, an event that is far from joyful. The western economic system appears threatening in this film, spreading its brand names all over the East, so that East becomes indistinguishable from West. Roger Cook argues that the film presents the persistent 'German longing for a premodern, Biedermeier-like withdrawal into an idyllic domestic sphere' to escape the forces of globalization.³² Yet Alex's resistance merely replicates this process in the opposite direction.

Indeed, the film's parallel scenes suggest that there are more similarities than differences between East and West. These scenes contradict Alex's increasing focus on the uniqueness of the former GDR, of its essential difference from the West, as he seeks to maintain a sense of identity that rests on an opposition between East and West. For instance, shots of Ariane and her boyfriend in their Burger King uniforms evoke images of GDR children in their 'Freie Deutsche Jugend' (FDJ) uniforms. Seán Allan claims that the film compares changing ideologies to changing uniforms.³³ The red banner promot-

ing Coca-Cola evokes memories of red banners in praise of Lenin. The West seems to offer advertising slogans and consumer products as substitutes for socialist propaganda. As Allan remarks, both East and West use the same rhetorical strategies.³⁴ One could interpret the film as showing the erasure of both East and West Germany by globalized American consumerism. Individual efforts can postpone such transformations only for a short while. The gradual erosion of differences between East and West prepares the way for the final scene where a reunited family shoots the deceased mother's ashes aloft. This parodies the space flight at the beginning that symbolized the special nature of the GDR's difference from the West. This concluding merging of East and West suggests that the mother's delusional view of the GDR was a key impediment to unification.

Yet these delusions also help resist the West's gobbling up of the East, including its absorption of the Russian nurse Lara. As the border between the two Germanys disappears, the difference that Lara represents also dissolves as she helps nudge Alex into breaking with his fantasies of the past and embracing a future in an ostensibly united Germany, in a Germany that will offer him new opportunities he was denied in the past.³⁵ Lara is confidently in place in the new Germany and sees through Alex's efforts to hold on to the past, a past closely allied with the Soviet Union before Gorbachev's reforms. Her relationship with Alex contrasts with the earlier 'cosmic marriage between the Sandmann and Mascha.'³⁶ This is a relationship that seeks grounding in the present instead of the future. As the story develops, the reformed perspective she reveals gradually replaces the ideals of the mother. She often appears in conjunction with the mother, either nursing her or sitting with her or appearing in parallel scenes, as in a shot of Lara sleeping as Alex departs, which cuts to a shot of the mother, Christiane, sleeping as Alex arrives. Lara represents a new kind of Russian, one who encourages connection to the West.

This Russian figure serves as a helper to unification and perhaps creating new ideas, rather than as an enforcer of division related to an anachronistic utopia. This role also makes Lara an aide to the West's overtaking of the GDR. She contradicts Alex's lies and eventually enlightens the mother by whispering to her in the background about the stories that Alex has been inventing, so that only Alex remains with delusions that he must bring into concert with the reality of unification. As the difference between East and West blurs, so too does the

difference between German and Russian. The film traces a movement from the assertion of difference between East and West Germans to a denial of that difference as they both intermingle. It also negates other cultural differences, for despite her accent Lara appears more and more like the Germans around her. Alex eventually transfers his belief in the illusion his mother represented to a belief in the new world indicated by Lara, ignoring her difference. As Şenocak explains with regard to the blindness of those who see culture only from their own point of view:

This dissolution of boundaries on our part makes us strong and often arrogant as well. We no longer perceive the other even though he stands before us. If the other wants to communicate with us, he must make our language his own. He must choose concepts that he has not developed.³⁷

The discourse of unification that this film explores simply excludes other types of difference in its celebration of unification between stereotypes of East and West Germans. Lara's voice recedes into the background in this new world.

Von Trotta's and Becker's films attempt to reorient German cultural discourse away from facile notions of unity, but their efforts retain residues of these notions. The unattainability of unification in *Das Versprechen* does not negate its power to shape perceptions and expectations. *Good Bye Lenin!*'s resistance to wholeness posits a manner of merging that recognizes rather than consumes difference, a manner that is disappearing as the East dissolves into the West. Yet that difference also makes East Germans appear unprepared for a common future because of their focus on their troubled past. Only the figure of the Russian Lara hints at other ways of imagining unification. These ways acknowledge cultural conflict, as Lara's outsider perspective challenges Alex's fuzzy memories and delusional moves but also supports him in his efforts to maintain his difference. However, as Jozwiak and Mermann contend, this nostalgia also creates 'a communal/national past that functions as a mode of resistance to the Western take-over of power.'³⁸ This resistance to Western power can also be extended to include western German resistance to the engulfing forces of American-influenced global consumerism – thus the sentimentality in Becker's film, which Kapczynski claims helps to perpetuate the nostalgia it criticizes.³⁹

Other filmmakers go further in showing that unification is a matter beyond a narrow focus on mainstream East and West German citizens. They focus on the ways that ideas of unity relate to Germany's immigrant and minority populations. As Leslie Adelson writes with respect to the Turkish residents of Germany, for example, '[t]he "wall in the head" between East and West Germans has a lesser known cousin, a sturdy wall of symbolic bricks between Germans and resident Turks.'⁴⁰ Such cultural disjunctures challenge calls for cultural unity and desires for integration. Similar to Müller-Sievers' proposal to eschew moves towards cultural reconciliation in favor of dealing productively with conflicts, Şenocak dismisses efforts to fit cultural differences into a whole, which depend on repressing conflict and difference. He asks, for example:

But what happens when this ordering system fails? When the individual fragments can no longer be accommodated into a personally structured form? When the hard break lines become festering interfaces, the pain unbearable, the wounds incurable? The collision of contradictory worlds necessitates a translating power whose aim is not the leveling of differences but the transfer of different interpretations.⁴¹

Şenocak refers to fragmented cultural entities that are collected into an 'amalgamation,' which provokes a state of exhaustion and 'makes the call to unity dangerously attractive and a rigid modernity, which demands differentiation and individualization, ineffective.'⁴² His solution is to start an inner dialogue⁴³ and to jettison our notion of 'culture' in order to recognize the Other in his/her otherness.⁴⁴ Adelson refers to Şenocak's ideas in her rejection of intercultural encounters that fix different cultures 'as utterly different cultures.' She calls for greater attentiveness to the cultural work going on within German culture, work that Turco-German literature is helping to shape.⁴⁵ She advocates 'an epistemological reorientation to which migrants' literature contributes at a crucial juncture in an uncharted German present.'⁴⁶ Yavuz and Akin are also working towards this reorientation.

Aprilkinder presents one way of moving beyond the discourse of unification. Turkish and Kurdish working-class immigrants and German lower-class citizens struggle to make a life for themselves on the edges of mainstream German society. Both groups face obstacles to achieving their goals, but there is little constructive exchange between them. Their depiction dispenses with notions of cultural harmony in united Germany by centering on instances of fragmentation, with any

moves to overcome cultural differences thwarted. It expands the focus from Berlin to other parts of Germany, in this case, Hamburg, placing unification and integration into a broader German context. Yavuz portrays a Kurdish immigrant family from Turkey with different members assimilated into mainstream German culture to different degrees. The film criticizes the efforts of immigrants to maintain a distinct identity through isolationism within a very different dominant culture.

In tracing the doomed love story between the oldest son in the Kurdish family and a German prostitute, the film questions the moves of both Kurds and Germans to create a sense of identity in opposition to an Other that is not as stable as their stereotypes of it. Both the older son, Cem, and his German lover, Kim, share aspects that make them different from the cultures that have marginalized them. They are in low-wage positions that earn them little respect, and even scorn. Cem works in a German sausage factory; Kim is a sex worker in a brothel that caters to Turkish clients. The similarity of their names signifies parallels between their figures. Shots of them meeting in staircases, including their first and last meetings, point to their in-between status and their moves towards bridging Kurdish and German cultural differences. When they first meet, Kim leads Cem upstairs to her room. By having him ascend into the domain of a marginalized German, the film suggests the difficulties migrants face when trying to leave their place at the edge of society. Both Kim and Cem remain down and out for much of the film. Cem's parents, however, represent immigrants determined to create a better future for their children. They are blind to the problems their isolation from Germans causes their children, but within their community, they have a respected status. Thus Kim's intercultural relationship with Cem could be a move up for her, for she lacks a support network and eventually loses her job. Although she is part of the dominant German ethnic group, her status is closer to that of the Turkish and Kurdish immigrants who are her clients. Kim's efforts to enter Cem's world fail, however. And his efforts to move up in the German world also lead him nowhere. The scene where they run across a bridge and hop into a taxi expresses their conflict. The bridge suggests connection, but once in the taxi, the conversation stresses the chasm between them. Kim does not understand Turkish and thus does not know that the taxi driver, who recognizes Cem, reminds him of his upcoming arranged marriage, a marriage that Cem never mentions to Kim.

Their final scene together, in the staircase leading up to Cem's family's apartment, shows Kim's failure to enter Cem's world. The parents do not allow her to enter the apartment, and Cem later does not take her up to meet them. The relationship with Kim is too dangerous for the Kurdish son's sense of self, for it would cause a rift in his relationship with his parents and in his sense of duty toward his cousin. His acceptance of his parents' wishes to marry someone he barely knows terminates the moves towards intercultural connection that his German lover has made. Kim descends the stairs, giving up her attempts to be part of Cem's world. The film presents Turkish and Kurdish immigrants both as fragmented and as holding onto traditional notions of community, notions that underlie their reluctance to intermingle with Germans. Kim reflects Cem's marginalized standing in German society, a standing that would change little were he to enter into a serious relationship with her.

In contrast to the ups and downs of the staircase scenes, the film evokes hopes for unity through dance scenes. Cem first encounters Kim as she dances in circles to a song on a jukebox with lyrics that repeat 'turn around and around, and it's always been the same. We are human [...].' The words' emphasis on common humanity as a unifying force contrasts with the cultural and ethnic distance between Cem and Kim. When the two later go to a disco, Cem is not at first allowed inside, most likely because he is Kurdish. When he later enters, Kim is dancing alone, and he watches but does not dance with her. He leaves the disco, drunk and alone, aware of the differences that divide him from her. He does not dance until the final scene, that of his wedding, when he unveils his wife and both dance as the camera spins faster and faster in a circle to Turkish and Kurdish music. Christina Kraenzle interprets this scene as expressing 'Cem's disorientation and panic at the realization that any possibility of a life outside of tradition and family duty has been foreclosed.'⁴⁷ However, he also accedes to this foreclosure by rejecting Kim. The unity to which this film's circularity refers is that within the Kurdish community in Germany. Unification between East and West in this film of united Germany occurs between an immigrant worker in western Germany and his new bride from a Kurdish village in eastern Turkey. The dizzying effects of the Turkish wedding contrast with the leisurely pace of the film's first shot, that of a German street. The migrant culture has moved inside, turned in on itself, and withdrawn from any interaction with German culture. As

the camera pans over the guests, viewers recognize them as the various characters from throughout the film, all of whom exist on the social fringe.

United Germany appears in this film as based on the accentuation of difference to the extent that those members of the different group, either the Turkish and Kurdish working class or the German underclass, appear to share a collective identity. Yet the film shows through the different immigrant siblings and their friends how illusory this identity is. It rests on stereotypes of the Other, such as the notion that German women are immoral, and of oneself as part of a greater Kurdish community, in which all take care of each other. Cem's mother illustrates the latter by her insistence that Cem marry his cousin to rescue her from the dangers of civil war. However, Mehmet's, the middle brother's, sexist and domineering stance towards the sister, Dilan, as well as his drift towards a criminal milieu, the mother's vain efforts to control her children's activities, and Mehmet's critique of Cem's work belie the illusion of group identity. Kraenzle argues that the 'vigilant control of national, ethnic, and sexual boundaries' in this film can be viewed 'as an expression of a nostalgic desire for a rootedness and fixity that does not exist.'⁴⁸ As Cem, the older son, attempts to break through stereotypes and connect with Kim as simply another person, he runs the risk of losing his sense of difference and a position of respect within the hierarchy of his family. By openly acknowledging the commonalities between himself and his lover, he would also have to acknowledge both of their positions near the bottom of a hierarchical German society. This 'collision of contradictory worlds'⁴⁹ cannot recover by means of the potential translating power of Cem's and Kim's affection for each other, because their similarities interfere with their efforts to create a better life for themselves. Their positions as objects of exploitation result, in Kraenzle's view, in 'a shared condition which temporarily draws characters together, but ultimately fails to create opportunities for lasting alliances.'⁵⁰ Thus the common humanity evoked in the jukebox song proves to be subordinate to the harsh economic and social situation that both links them and repels them from each other.

A greater focus on encounters among Turks and Germans as a European issue appears in Akin's *Im Juli*. This film revolves around a German and Turkish couple in post-Wall Germany, each of which becomes separated. Only a journey to the East brings them together,

suggesting, as Barbara Kosta notes, 'new coordinates in the formation of German identity.'⁵¹ In this case, union between German and Turk, or rather the German man finding and claiming the Turkish woman as his love, is thwarted by his journey through a menacing eastern Europe and the appearance of the Turkish woman's boyfriend. Both Turks and Germans end up with partners like themselves, but in a different place, Istanbul, which seems more modern and thriving than Hamburg. This place change calls into question both the desire for the exotic East and the fear of the dangerous East in constructing a German identity that pushes immigrants into the role of Other. *Im Juli* presents Eastern Europe as a nightmare that must be overcome before reaching an understanding of Turkish difference and its links to concepts of Germanness. The path to this understanding leads across a series of borders, which stage a number of confrontations between the German protagonist and representatives of points East. Daniel's misadventures include being drugged and robbed by a truck driver from the former Yugoslavia, shot at by a Hungarian farmer, and forced to bribe a Romanian border guard. As Oya Dinçer Durmus explains:

Akin [...] 'does not like borders'; yet, his artistic productions examine the very borders which certainly serve to separate; but the same borders may also be perceived as meeting places; it is this double function of the borders that Akin has been exploring in his films.⁵²

The meetings between Daniel and various Eastern European characters help him to change his ways of seeing the East and to progress on his journey. He learns to deal constructively in resolving his conflicts with them, for example, by demonstrating to the farmer that he means no harm but is seeking a ride to Budapest. The blindness signaled by his broken glasses near the beginning of his journey develops into a new way of seeing beyond stereotypes.

Fears about Eastern Europe as an intensification of anxieties about the former GDR directly affect perceptions about other cultures, especially about Turkey. The journey to Istanbul goes through Eastern Europe, as the two German figures, Daniel and Juli, as well as the two Turkish figures, Isa and Melek, travel east. The catalyst for the trip, Daniel's desire to find Melek again in Istanbul, is based on his longing for the exotic, and his scary trip toward that goal betrays his fear of it. He must contend with both extreme views of the orient before he can unite with the woman he imagines is his destiny. This involves sur-

viving a serious of dangerous situations in increasingly strange locales. Indeed, prejudices about Eastern Europe displace fears of Turkey, which appears enchantingly alluring like the painting of the bridge over the Bosphorus in the Turkish diner in Hamburg where Daniel and Melek converse. Distorted views of both Turks and Eastern Europeans prevent clear views of either. Daniel sets off after an idealized Turkish woman and hitches a ride with a Turkish man, who appears to be a criminal. Daniel later mixes Melek, his German friend, Juli, and Luna together in a hallucinatory haze. In the words of Şenocak: 'We no longer perceive the other even though he stands before us.'⁵³ Yet the film ends up bringing together Germans and Turks in a friendship among equals of different backgrounds rather than as a merging of lovers into one amorphous whole.

The problem of unification becomes much more complex in this film, which reveals its transcultural dimension, linking unification to Şenocak's focus on the margins of German culture and society. Important to note, however, is that Melek arrives from Berlin, site of the fall of the Wall. Thus Daniel's interest in Melek links German unification with the attempt to bring together a Turk living in Germany and a German. The path towards unity is convoluted, eventually unraveling the illusion of fixed cultural identity with which the film begins. The obstacles to a harmonious relationship between Turks and Germans are the stereotypes western Germans have about Eastern Europe. These prejudices create a series of frightening encounters on the journey from Hamburg to Istanbul. These encounters are the mirror opposite of the idealized, eroticized view of Turkey that propels the main protagonist towards the East. The film continues Akin's exploration of intercultural encounters and concepts of identity. As Durmus contends about Akin, '[h]is cinema demonstrates his belief that, in today's world, identities, individual and cultural/national, are not static. They are constantly remade as people experience cross-cultural relationships.'⁵⁴

Akin criticizes a German tendency to overlook Turks except when they mirror a desired German self-image. He uses images of the sun and moon, both signaling potential unity because of their circularity but also possessing different qualities and inhabiting different spaces and temporalities, to move beyond the idea of the Other as merely a reflection. Danger and misguidance seem connected to the symbol of the moon; enlightenment appears linked to the sun. Yet both Juli and

Melek are connected to the sign of the sun, a parallel that causes initial confusion. The closer Daniel gets to Istanbul, the closer he and Juli become, until they separate because of his fixation on Melek. This separation from Juli is accompanied by a solar eclipse and Daniel's chance encounter with Isa, who will help direct him back to Juli. Isa is Melek's boyfriend, and at film's end, Daniel and Juli reconnect, as do Isa and Melek. Both the eclipse and Daniel's earlier adventure with Luna redirect his journey and his ideas about others. Melek diverts the two German lovers from each other, and only finding Melek again reunites the two. The story is not a simple case of two sets of partners starting out with the 'wrong' person and changing to the 'right' one. Akin's structuring of Turkish/German relationships is not symmetrical as there is always something interrupting the symmetry. Isa and Melek, moon and sun, alter Daniel's ways of seeing, for nothing is as it seems. By pairing German with German and Turk with Turk in sunny Istanbul, as opposed to moonlit Hamburg, where desire was both misdirected and poised to embark on a journey to new knowledge, the film presents German fascination with Turks as blinded by misperceptions. Germans are able to achieve enlightenment only by casting off conventional ways of thinking through progressive exposure to the complexity of the East – symbolized by passing through Hungary, Romania, and Bulgaria on the way to Turkey. Daniel reaches Istanbul at noon, in full sunlight, and the final shot shows the four friends driving over the bridge, connected but different.

Unification between East and West is a phantom ideal in Akin's film, because the East can mean so many things, as can the West. Turks are also part of Hamburg, but by depicting Turkish immigrants in the shadows while Daniel and Melek are out together, Akin emphasizes that they are only on the margins of Daniel's consciousness. He needs to explore these margins in order to mature. Kosta remarks that the film 'acknowledges the significance of Turkey in the formation of contemporary German identity.'⁵⁵ The union of Daniel with Juli and Isa with Melek, however, also suggests a division between Turk and German that cannot be transcended by pairing a German figure with a Turkish figure. *Im Juli* exposes differences much more complicated than the opposition between GDR and FRG, or between immigrant and native, which a discourse of transcendence – even failed transcendence – cannot encompass. Thus Akin's film, with its plethora of contradictions, challenges the very validity of a

focus on dissolving contradictions in order to achieve unity, a focus that blocks the protagonist from perceiving alternatives at the margins.

The four films all grapple with the question of how to connect relationships between East and West to the idea of unified Germany. They partake in what Hell and von Moltke designate as the 'Unification Effect,' that is, 'the shifting ground on which cultural and political interventions have taken place' and 'the changing stakes that these interventions have had to confront.'⁵⁶ One attempt to sidestep the conflicts that arise when bringing together disparate cultures and histories is the subordination of differences to a universalizing concept of common humanity. Common humanity appears in *Das Versprechen* and *Aprilkinder* at first to be an antidote to the separating forces of geo-political or cultural differences. As the films develop, however, they reveal tensions and varied ways of seeing that erode the notion of a basic human identity, much less an essential German identity. Unification as an intercultural goal disintegrates through the different cinematic explorations of it. Its power to affect intercultural encounters persists, however, in the disappointment over its lack in *Das Versprechen*, in the fear of its absorptive force in *Good Bye Lenin!*, or in the frustration over its insufficiency to foster cross-cultural ties in *Aprilkinder*. Unity's inadequacy as a concept in these films also challenges the primacy of West German culture as the intended embodiment of unified Germany. *Im Juli* differs by presenting the process of attaining unity as overcoming a series of obstacles that succeeds in an unexpected way. Each of the stages towards the goal results in a shift of perception that increasingly changes the contours of the goal. When the two German figures join together in the East and then ride off with the Turkish characters, the film proffers a notion of productive convergence that is constantly under negotiation, rather than the stability of transcendent unity, as a model for intercultural relationships in the new Germany.

Notes

¹ Zafer Şenocak and Bülent Tulay, 'Germany – Home for Turks? A Plea for Overcoming the Crisis between Orient and Occident', in: Leslie A. Adelson, trans. and ed., *Atlas of a Tropical Germany: Essays on Politics and Culture, 1990-1998*, Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2000, pp. 1-9 (here: p. 5).

² Dominic Boyer, 'Ostalgie and the Politics of the Future in Eastern Germany', *Public Culture*, 18:2 (2006), 361-81 (here: p. 370).

³ Andreas Huyssen, 'Nation, Race, and Immigration: German Identities after Unification', in: Huyssen, *Twilight Memories: Marking Time in a Culture of Amnesia*, New York: Routledge, 1995, pp. 67-84 (here: p. 81).

⁴ Ibid.

⁵ Ibid.

⁶ Ibid., p. 84.

⁷ Boyer, 'Ostalgie', p. 373.

⁸ Ibid., p. 363.

⁹ Joseph F. Jozwiak and Elisabeth Mermann, "'The Wall in Our Minds?'" Colonization, Integration, and Nostalgia', *Journal of Popular Culture*, 39:5 (2006), 780-95 (here: p. 787).

¹⁰ Huyssen, 'Nation, Race', p. 81.

¹¹ Ibid., p. 73.

¹² Annette Seidel Arpacı, 'National Memory's *Schlüsselkinder*: Migration, Pedagogy, and German Remembrance Culture', in: Stuart Taberner and Paul Cooke, eds., *German Culture, Politics, and Literature into the Twenty-First Century: Beyond Normalization*, Rochester, NY: Camden House, 2006, pp. 105-19 (here: p. 108).

¹³ Andreas Glaeser, 'Why Germany Remains Divided', in: Sander L. Gilman and Todd Herzog, eds., *A New Germany in a New Europe*, New York: Routledge, 2001, pp. 173-97 (here: p. 174-5).

¹⁴ Ibid., p. 176.

¹⁵ Özlem Topcu, "'Es geht auch uns an,'" *Die Zeit Online*, 11 November 2009, at: <http://www.zeit.de/2009/46/Buecher-machen-Politik-Aussenseiter> (accessed 6 February 2010).

¹⁶ Ibid.

¹⁷ Ibid.

¹⁸ Zafer Şenocak, 'Perspektiven der Mitte: Oder wo steht Deutschland auf der Welt?', in: Şenocak, *Zungenentfernung: Bericht aus der Quarantänestation*, Berlin: Babel, 2001, pp. 64-6 (here: p. 66).

¹⁹ Peter Schneider, *Der Mauerspringer: Erzählung*, Darmstadt: Luchterhand, 1984, p. 102.

²⁰ Julia Hell and Johannes von Moltke, 'Unification Effects: Imaginary Landscapes of the Berlin Republic', *Germanic Review*, 80:1 (2005), 74-95 (here: p. 91).

²¹ John E. Davidson, *Deterritorializing the New German Cinema*, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1999, p. 163.

²² Boyer, 'Ostalgie', p. 371.

²³ Ibid.

²⁴ Peter Schneider, 'Berliner Geschichten', in: Schneider, *Deutsche Ängste: Sieben Essays*, Darmstadt: Luchterhand, 1988, pp. 6-18 (here: p. 10).

²⁵ Susan C. Anderson, 'Walls and Other Obstacles: Peter Schneider's Critique of Unity in *Der Mauerspringer*', *German Quarterly*, 66:3 (1993), 362-71 (here: p. 366).

²⁶ Willy Brandt, 'Berlin City Hall Speech', in: Harold James and Marla Stone, eds., *When the Wall Came Down: Reactions to German Unification*, New York: Routledge, 1992, pp. 42-5 (here: p. 43).

²⁷ Helmut Müller-Sievers, 'The Humboldt-Goethe Complex', in: Gilman and Herzog, eds., *A New Germany*, pp. 89-95 (here: p. 94).

²⁸ Ibid., p. 95.

²⁹ Jenifer K Ward, 'German-Germanness: On Border, Hybridity, and Sameness in Margarethe von Trotta's *Das Versprechen*', in: Carol Anne Costabile-Heming, Rachel J. Halverson and Kristie A. Foell, eds., *Textual Responses to German Unification*, New York: deGruyter, 2001, pp. 225-32 (here: p. 230). For an analysis of the film's evocation of residues of Germany's fascist past see John Blair, 'Madness and Bliss as Ideological Categories in Margarethe von Trotta's *The Promise*', *JAISA*, 7:1-2 (Autumn 2001-Spring 2002), 91-101. For a discussion of the film's melodramatic elements see Kristie A. Foell, 'History as Melodrama: German Division and Unification in Two Recent Films', in: Costabile-Heming, Halverson and Foell, eds., *Textual Responses*, pp. 233-52. For an examination of the film's representation of gender roles see Eva Kuttnerberg, 'Teaching Foreign Cultural Literacy with Margarethe von Trotta's *Das Versprechen*', *Die Unterrichtspraxis*, 36:2 (2003), 135-44.

³⁰ Jennifer Creech, 'A Few Good Men: Gender, Ideology, and Narrative Politics in *The Lives of Others* and *Good Bye, Lenin!*', *Women in German Yearbook*, 25 (2009), 100-26 (here: p. 115).

³¹ Boyer, 'Ostalgie', pp. 376-8.

³² Roger F. Cook, 'Good Bye, Lenin!: Free-Market Nostalgia for Socialist Consumerism', *Seminar*, 43:2 (2007), 206-19 (here: p. 218). James M. Skidmore argues that such longing demonstrates the film's participation in the cinematic genres of the nostalgic tale and of the tale of a village struggling against the forces of modernism in his essay 'Good-bye Reality, or the Seduction of Nostalgia: Genre and the Cultural Imaginary in *Good Bye, Lenin!* and *La Grande Séduction*', in: Wolfram R. Keller and Gene Walz, eds., *Screening Canadians: Cross-cultural Perspectives on Canadian Film*, Marburg: Universitätsbibliothek Marburg, 2008, pp. 119-31.

³³ Seán Allan, 'Good Bye Lenin!: Ostalgie und Identität im wieder vereinigten Deutschland', *German as a Foreign Language*, 1 (2006), 46-59 (here: p. 53).

³⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 54.

³⁵ Matthias Uecker, 'Fractured Families – United Countries? Family, Nostalgia, and Nation-Building in *Das Wunder von Bern* and *Goodbye [sic] Lenin!*', *New Cinemas: Journal of Contemporary Film*, 5:3 (2007), 189-200 (here: p. 196).

³⁶ Allan, 'Good Bye Lenin!', p. 51.

³⁷ Zafer Şenocak, 'The Concept of Culture and Its Discontents', in: Adelson, trans. and ed., *Atlas of a Tropical Germany*, pp. 43-8 (here: p. 44).

³⁸ Jozwiak and Mermann, "'The Wall in Our Minds?'"', p. 790.

³⁹ Jennifer M. Kapczynski, 'Negotiating Nostalgia: The GDR Past in *Berlin Is in Germany* and *Good Bye, Lenin!*', *Germanic Review*, 82:1 (2007), 78-100 (here: p. 89).

⁴⁰ Leslie A. Adelson, 'Coordinates of Orientation: An Introduction', in: Adelson, trans. and ed., *Atlas of a Tropical Germany*, pp. xi-xxxvii (here: p. xxii).

⁴¹ Zafer Şenocak, 'Between the Sex Pistols and the Koran', in: Deniz Göktürk, David Gramling and Anton Kaes, eds., *Germany in Transit: Nation and Migration, 1955-2005*, Berkeley: University of California Press, 2007, pp. 236-9 (here: p. 238).

⁴² *Ibid.*, p. 239.

⁴³ *Ibid.*

⁴⁴ Şenocak, 'The Concept of Culture', pp. 47-8.

⁴⁵ Leslie A. Adelson, 'Against Between: A Manifesto', in: Göktürk, Gramling and Kaes, eds., *Germany in Transit*, pp. 265-70 (here: p. 268).

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 269.

⁴⁷ Christina Kraenzle, 'At Home in the New Germany? Local Stories and Global Concerns in Yüksel Yavuz's *Aprilkinder* and *Kleine Freiheit*', *German Quarterly*, 82:1 (2009), 90-108 (here: p. 96).

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 104.

⁴⁹ Şenocak, 'Between the Sex Pistols', p. 238.

⁵⁰ Kraenzle, 'At Home in the New Germany?', p. 97.

⁵¹ Barbara Kosta, 'Transcultural Exchange: Fatih Akin's Crossing the Bridge: The Sound of Istanbul (2005)', in: Steven D. Martinson and Renate A. Schulz, eds., *Transcultural German Studies/Deutsch als Fremdsprache: Building Bridges/Brücken bauen*, New York: Lang, 2009, pp. 239-47 (here: p. 243).

⁵² Oya Dinçer Durmus, 'Fatih Akin's Cinema: A World without Borders', *TRANS: Internet-Zeitschrift für Kulturwissenschaften*, 16 July 2006, at: http://www.inst.at/trans/16Nr/06_1/durmus16.htm (accessed 6 February 2010).

⁵³ Şenocak, 'The Concept of Culture', p. 44.

⁵⁴ Durmus, 'Fatih Akin's Cinema'.

⁵⁵ Kosta, 'Transcultural Exchange', p. 242.

⁵⁶ Hell and von Moltke, 'Unification Effects', p. 81.