

German Delegation in the International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance (IHRA) **Country report Germany June 2012**

2013, 29 S.

urn:nbn:de:0111-opus-84333



Nutzungsbedingungen / conditions of use

Gewährt wird ein nicht exklusives, nicht übertragbares, persönliches und beschränktes Recht auf Nutzung dieses Dokuments. Dieses Dokument ist ausschließlich für den persönlichen, nicht-kommerziellen Gebrauch bestimmt. Die Nutzung stellt keine Übertragung des Eigentumsrechts an diesem Dokument dar und gilt vorbehaltlich der folgenden Einschränkungen: Auf sämtlichen Kopien dieses Dokuments müssen alle Urheberrechtshinweise und sonstigen Hinweise auf gesetzlichen Schutz beibehalten werden. Sie dürfen dieses Dokument nicht in irgendeiner Weise abändern, noch dürfen Sie dieses Dokument für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, aufführen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.

We grant a non-exclusive, non-transferable, individual and limited right to using this document.
This document is solely intended for your personal, non-commercial use. Use of this document does not include any transfer of property rights and it is conditional to the following limitations: All of the copies of this documents must retain all copyright information and other information regarding legal protection. You are not allowed to alter this document in any way, to copy it for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the document in public, to perform, distribute or otherwise use the document in public.

Mit der Verwendung dieses Dokuments erkennen Sie die Nutzungsbedingungen an.
By using this particular document, you accept the above-stated conditions of use.

Kontakt / Contact:

peDOCS
Deutsches Institut für Internationale Pädagogische Forschung (DIPF)
Mitglied der Leibniz-Gemeinschaft
Informationszentrum (IZ) Bildung
Schloßstr. 29, D-60486 Frankfurt am Main
E-Mail: pedocs@dipf.de
Internet: www.pedocs.de

International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance (IHRA)¹

Country report Germany June 2012

All 31 countries that are members of the IHRA have committed themselves to submit a brief survey, outlining their respective situation of the development of dealing with the Holocaust as concerns the fields of research, remembrance and education. The German delegation in the IHRA was one of the first to be asked to meet the obligation to report.

German Delegation in the IHRA, Berlin 2013

¹ <http://www.holocaustremembrance.com/>

1. General Activities

a – Are there any developments in politics or government that have had a substantial impact on the activities related to the Stockholm Declaration over the last five years?

The relevance of memorial sites relating to the Nazi era and documentation centres for Holocaust education and remembrance is unquestioned in German politics. The updated Policy Paper on Memorial Sites (Fortschreibung des Gedenkstättenkonzepts²) of 2008 provides predictable resources for the continued existence and work of these institutions.

On a visit to Israel in January 2012 the German Foreign Minister pledged one million euros annually for the next ten years to support the Yad Vashem memorial. The funding will primarily provide targeted support to the field of general archival and educational work and for translations of archival and educational material into German.

The Federal Republic of Germany also contributes financially to the maintenance of the Auschwitz-Birkenau State Museum (Stiftung Auschwitz-Birkenau) in Poland.

In November 2011 the Bavarian Minister of Education and his Israeli counterpart signed a memorandum of cooperation, which was co-signed by the chairman of Yad Vashem since it places great emphasis on the field of Holocaust education. Bavaria is not the only one of the 16 German Länder to have signed such an agreement, thus establishing a stable framework for continued development in all areas of this field.

b – Are there any societal developments that have had a substantial impact on the activities related to the Stockholm Declaration over the last five years?

The threat of neo-Nazi activity has recently been receiving renewed attention in the aftermath of the discovery that a series of ten murder cases had been perpetrated by an extremist right wing terrorist group calling itself NSU, National Socialist Underground (Nationalsozialistischer Untergrund). In collaboration with a wider support network, the group had managed to stay underground for more than a decade. They had killed small business owners with a migrant background and one police officer in various German cities. The findings about this terrorist group revealed a new dimension of right-wing extremist violence in Germany which had until then been unknown to the authorities and society at large. As one of the consequences, a ban on the far-right NPD, National Democratic Party (Nationaldemokratische Partei Deutschlands) has again come under discussion.

c – What has been the biggest achievement over the last five years?

After the inauguration of the central German Memorial to the Murdered Jews of Europe (Denkmal für die ermordeten Juden Europas) in 2005, one of the main achievements in the field of Holocaust education and remembrance was the opening in 2010 of the new Topography of Terror Documentation Center (Stiftung Topographie des Terrors) on the redesigned historic site which had been the headquarters of the Reich Security Main Office (Reichssicherheitshauptamt).

There are other significant initiatives under way, e.g. the Munich Documentation Centre for the History of National Socialism (NS-Dokumentationszentrum München – Lern- und Erinnerungsort zur Geschichte des Nationalsozialismus) on the historic site of the former Nazi party headquarters (Braunes

² The text offers an English translation for the German names and terms, even though sometimes no official English name exists.

Haus), opening in 2013 (<http://www.ns-dokumentationszentrum-muenchen.de/centre>) and the Submarine Bunker “Valentin” (Denkort Bunker Valentin) memorial in Bremen (<http://www.denkort-bunker-valentin.de/>).

An extraordinarily important project is the ongoing work of editing primary sources on the persecution of Jews in Europe 1933-1945. The Federal Archives (Bundesarchiv, Koblenz), the Institute for Contemporary History in Munich (Institut für Zeitgeschichte, München), the Historical Seminar of the University of Freiburg (Historisches Seminar der Universität Freiburg), and the Chair for the History of Eastern Central Europe (Lehrstuhl für die Geschichte Ostmitteleuropas) at the Free University Berlin (Freie Universität Berlin) have been engaged in the project since 2004. Sixteen volumes are planned in total; five have already been published.

(See Annex 3.)

d – What is the main challenge/objective for the future?

One of the main problems affecting Holocaust education, remembrance and research is that funding is increasingly provided on a project-by-project basis and therefore limited to a certain period of time. It has therefore become very difficult to establish new initiatives permanently. This becomes evident from the efforts undertaken to maintain www.lernen-aus-der-geschichte.de, the successful website on learning from history, on the basis of temporary funding. This cannot secure the permanent availability of this important tool in Holocaust education, combating antisemitism³ and fighting right-wing extremism.

The decision taken by the European Parliament and supported by the OSCE Parliamentary Assembly to establish 23 August as the European Day of Remembrance for Victims of Stalinism and Nazism has met a mixed response and may further complicate Holocaust education and remembrance. Professor Yehuda Bauer, the Honorary Chairman and former Academic Advisor of the ITF, has pointed in a memorandum to the difficulties and disadvantages of such a memorial day and analysed the thinking behind it. However, efforts to revise the decision have so far been inconclusive. Dealing appropriately with the two different dictatorships of German and European history remains a real challenge.

(See Annex 1.)

e – Were there or are there expected to be any serious obstacles when implementing the Stockholm Declaration or relevant decisions by the ITF Plenary?

No.

2. Holocaust Research

a – Is access to archives (public or private) guaranteed? Has the situation improved over the last five years? If not, where are the problems and how can they be solved?

Access to public archives has been facilitated. Generally, access to public archives has improved in recent years. The opening of the International Tracing Service, ITS (Internationaler Suchdienst) archive in Bad Arolsen has had a tremendous impact on research, especially since digitalization and indexing made research much easier. Online information about archives should be improved – better

³ We suggest writing the term antisemitism in one word. It only stands for hostility and hate against Jews and has nothing to do with an often assumed linguistic background, e.g. the Semitic languages. If a hyphen is used (Anti-Semitism) people tend to argument that people who speak Semitic languages could never hold antisemitic feelings because they see themselves also as “Semites”, e.g. people of Arab descent.

documentary inventories, more detailed file descriptions etc. – to facilitate effective use of archives and files. Fees for copies should be reduced. The funding of archives should be updated.

Oral history: Access to video testimonies has considerably improved in recent years. The Free University Berlin (Freie Universität Berlin) provides access to the Visual History Archives of the University of Southern California Shoah Foundation Institute; access is now also possible via the Technical University Berlin's (Technische Universität Berlin) Center for Research on Antisemitism (Zentrum für Antisemitismusforschung) and the Historical Seminar of University of Leipzig (Historisches Seminar der Universität Leipzig), and researchers can furthermore consult the Oral History collection at the Documentation Center of the Topography of Terror Foundation (Stiftung Topographie des Terrors), Berlin, which also provides access to the Refugee Voices Archive of the British Association of Jewish Refugees, AJR, and the online archive on forced labour "Zwangsarbeit 1939-1945. Erinnerungen und Geschichte". The Foundation Memorial to the Murdered Jews of Europe (Stiftung Denkmal für die ermordeten Juden Europas) holds and publicly presents videos (with transcription and annotation) from Yale University's Fortunoff Video Archive for Holocaust Testimonies. This archive also includes interviews from the University of Potsdam's Archive of Memory (Erinnerungsarchiv der Universität Potsdam), the Documentation and Cultural Centre of German Sinti and Roma in Heidelberg (Dokumentations- und Kulturzentrum deutscher Sinti und Roma, Heidelberg), and other collections.

Some of the private archives held by German companies are still subject to restrictions or complete blocks on access.

(See Annex 2.)

b – To what extent is research on the Holocaust and related issues supported by the government? Has there been an increase/decrease in funding?

There are no specific government-funded programmes at the federal or the Länder level which are explicitly dedicated to funding research on the Holocaust and related issues. In a number of Universities and institutes, the Holocaust is dealt with in the framework of contemporary history. In addition, many German foundations have funded research projects in this field and continue to do so.

(See Annex 3.)

There seems to be a trend among foundations – including the foundations of the German political parties – to concentrate more on totalitarianism and on German history after 1945, in particular the history of the GDR, but there are no reliable data yet confirming this impression.

c – What are the main Holocaust research topics in your country? Are there any special university programmes or professorships dedicated to the Holocaust and related issues? Has there been an increase or decrease in the number of programmes or professorships?

In the past decade there has been a shift from a relatively perpetrator-focused view, towards research into structural issues, especially social history and everyday history (Alltagsgeschichte), which tends to give more consideration to individual accounts by victims and witnesses (as evidenced by the increased number of oral history projects). In recent years the memory and historiography of the Holocaust (rather than its history per se) has received increasing attention. This involves looking at what or how much ordinary Germans knew about the persecution of Jews at the time, Holocaust literature (e.g. Arbeitsstelle Holocaust-Literatur, Justus Liebig University Giessen), the reception of Holocaust history, as well as the politics of remembrance and collaboration.

Court cases regarding compensation claims have triggered particular interest in the history of the ghettos.

There is no *specific* university programme or professorship and no *specific* university institute focused on Holocaust studies and related issues exclusively. A decrease in Holocaust-related programmes has been discernible at historical institutes in recent years. University courses on contemporary history continue to include elements on National Socialism and the Holocaust.

(See Annex 4.)

The Center for Research on Antisemitism of the Technische Universität Berlin will offer a master's programme on the Holocaust, Jewish history and related topics starting in the winter term of 2012. Furthermore the American Touro College offers a Master of Arts in Holocaust Communication and Tolerance in Berlin.

The Workshop on the History of the Concentration Camps, which first gathered in 1994 as the independent initiative of graduate students and doctoral candidates, has in recent years evolved into an important international and interdisciplinary conference. Almost every year, independently organized meetings are held at various locations with a growing number of participants – usually in connection with specific memorial museums.

(For a list of publications and selected conferences as well as the summary of a symposium on the subject, see Annex 4, 4a und 4b.)

d – Has any research been done on issues of Jewish property and restitution?

Researchers such as Prof. Constantin Goschler at the Ruhr-University of Bochum (Ruhr-Universität Bochum) and others have been focusing on restitution issues and the practical implementation of restitution laws for some years.

There are still issues under discussion. To prepare for court cases, research has been conducted into the early forms of persecution to which Jews were subjected from 1933 and into loss and damages incurred during this period. Ongoing legal cases involve assessing whether persecution existed before 1935 or not.

Germany's central office for the documentation of lost cultural property (Koordinierungsstelle Magdeburg) runs a Lost Art Internet Database. It was jointly set up by the Federal Government and the Länder and registers cultural objects which were relocated, moved or seized, especially from Jewish owners, as a result of persecution during the Nazi dictatorship and the Second World War. (<http://www.lostart.de/Webs/EN/Aktuelles/Index.html>)

The Degenerate Art Research Institute (Forschungsstelle Entartete Kunst) was founded at the Free University Berlin (Freie Universität Berlin) in 2002. An equivalent institution has existed at University of Hamburg's History of Art department (Universität Hamburg, Institut für Kunstgeschichte) since April 2004. Since 2008, the Provenance Research Unit at the Institute for Museum Research of the National Museums in Berlin (Staatliche Museen zu Berlin – Stiftung Preußischer Kulturbesitz) has been supporting public museums, libraries and archives in Germany in their search for cultural property lost primarily from Jewish ownership as a consequence of Nazi persecution. Provenance research is funded through a decentralized, application-based system by the Federal Government Commissioner for Culture and the Media (Der Beauftragte der Bundesregierung für Kultur und Medien). (See the website of the Bureau for Provenance Investigation and Research (Arbeitsstelle Provenienzforschung), <http://www.arbeitsstelle-provenienzforschung.de>)

e – How is research being used by governments or NGOs?

NGOs such as memorial museums make intensive use of the results of academic research and integrate them in their educational work and exhibitions.

Government representatives and ministry employees refer to research and contact experts on the Holocaust and related issues whenever specialist knowledge is needed for political or diplomatic purposes. As demonstrated by the German Government's response to the major interpellation of 14 December 2011 on handling Nazi history, attention is paid to the results of historical research into the political handling of the past ("Vergangenheitspolitik" as investigated by Norbert Frei, for example). A number of ministries have commissioned academics to conduct research into the Nazi era, among them the Federal Foreign Office. The subject is also being broached by the Federal Ministries of Finance, Justice, and Economics and Technology, which have launched pertinent research projects. (<http://dipbt.bundestag.de/dip21/btd/17/081/1708134.pdf>)

In early 2012, the Parliament (Landtag) of the Federal State of Lower Saxony published an investigation into the Nazi past of Landtag Members.

(The full text of the report is available in German: http://www.landtag-niedersachsen.de/download/29627/Bericht_Historische_Kommission.pdf)

3. Holocaust Education

a – What has been the main development in Holocaust education in your country in the past five years?

Most history teachers consider the Holocaust extremely if not uniquely important as a topic. New materials for teaching the Holocaust and other Nazi crimes increasingly make use of modern media and survivor testimonies and try to connect the historical events to current issues.

There has been a rise in the attention being paid to the cultural and social diversity of the students in German classrooms and among groups visiting memorial sites. New educational strategies and materials are being developed to meet these challenges and seek to take into account the diverging interests of a pluralistic cultural heritage – while simultaneously trying to avoid “culturalism”.

However, the Nazi period is perceived less and less as contemporary history. Since the history of the Cold War and the former German Democratic Republic, GDR (Deutsche Demokratische Republik, DDR) has gained more significance, the phrase “two German dictatorships” is more often used in public discourse, referring to the Nazi regime and the GDR. While educators working at memorial sites related to Nazi crimes do not deny that both regimes were dictatorial, placing them at the same level might, from their perspective, imply a (unintended) trivialization of the Holocaust and other mass atrocities perpetrated by the Nazis.

b – What are the three major obstacles to teaching and learning about the Holocaust in your country?

Since the Nazi period does still receive a lot of media coverage, many students consider themselves well informed about all topics related to it. However, the knowledge that they have attained in this way is often insufficient or distorted. There is therefore a need to address and clear up misconceptions and to motivate these students to study the Holocaust. This can present a great challenge for teachers.

Following changes to the school systems in Germany, most students now attend secondary school one year less than before. In consequence, teachers could feel that there was less time and fewer opportunity for excursions to historical sites. Holocaust education is also affected by structural changes in school curricula. Generally the curricula emphasize the acquisition of skills rather than prescribing the content of lessons. Curricula, however, still do specifically mention the Holocaust to make sure that it will be taught. It is indeed taught in history lessons and sometimes in lessons on German literature, whereas curricula for lessons in politics nowadays seldom refer to Nazi crimes, which used to be an important topic in such courses.

In most German Länder, in-service teacher training has room for improvement. It has become much more difficult for teachers to attend training except during vacations or weekends. There is a growing discrepancy between the great amount of teaching material for Holocaust education and the time teachers can afford to spend acquainting themselves with this material.

c – Have changes occurred in recent years as a result of membership in the ITF? Have any programmes or projects made use of advisory papers by the ITF or the EWG?

ITF membership has considerably extended the international network of professionals in the field and inspired discussion on educational challenges. Educational strategies used to be limited to a specifically German perspective when it came to teaching the history of Nazi crimes. International ties have significantly contributed to a broader view and a mutual knowledge-sharing process among educators from various countries.

It is difficult to discern any direct influence of ITF membership or ITF advisory papers on teaching in German schools.

d – Have any studies/surveys been conducted to assess the effectiveness of Holocaust education?

There is no German equivalent of the term “Holocaust education”. Educational programmes in Germany usually do not address the Holocaust alone, but deal with it in a broader context of Nazi history. Having said that, several studies can be mentioned that provide relevant information on the effectiveness of this teaching:

- a study by the Social Psychology chair of Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität in Munich (Lehrstuhl für Sozialpsychologie der Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München): “Current challenges in teaching about the Holocaust and National Socialism” (“Holocaust Education: Wie Schüler und Lehrer den Unterricht zum Thema Nationalsozialismus und Holocaust erleben”),

- a study by the Education department of Goethe University in Frankfurt am Main (Fachbereich Pädagogik der Goethe Universität Frankfurt am Main): “Paradoxes of moral-educational communication in the classroom and in extracurricular learning”, (“Schule und Nationalsozialismus. Anspruch und Grenzen des Geschichtsunterrichts“),

- a book recently edited by researcher Bert Pampel, containing empirical studies on learning at memorial sites.

(See Annex 4a.)

Most studies aim to explore particular questions in depth. There is no broad survey on the effectiveness of Holocaust education in Germany.

e – What problematic historical issues are still under discussion and how do these discussions influence teaching and learning about the Holocaust?

Problematic historical issues have been sparking controversy in German society for decades. They implied discussions in schools and other educational institutions providing many learning opportunities. Though facing the heritage of the Holocaust is still challenging for German society, it is now accepted

that the Holocaust was committed with the participation of many of Germany's institutions and tacitly supported by large parts of German society. There is a broad consensus that the Holocaust must be studied and its victims commemorated. Paradoxically, this consensus may impact on the relevance of the topic in public discourse. Efforts in Holocaust education could therefore be seen as more necessary than ever.

f – To what extent and in what ways is your country's own national history integrated into the teaching of the Holocaust?

It goes without saying that the Holocaust is a part of German history. The European dimension of the Holocaust is often not sufficiently addressed. Lessons usually focus on the persecution and violence faced by Jews in Germany. It is a great challenge for German teachers to teach the broader implications of the Holocaust in the European context without diminishing the responsibility of German perpetrators.

4. Holocaust Remembrance: Historic and Memorial Sites

a – Have there been any changes in the laws or regulations regarding historical sites and memorials?

There have been no fundamental changes in legislation in recent years. At the federal level, the Policy Paper on Memorial Sites has been updated and adopted by the German Government on 18 June 2008. (For the full text, see http://www.bundesregierung.de/Content/DE/_Anlagen/BKM/2008-06-18-fortschreibung-gedenkstaettenkonzepion-barrierefrei.pdf?__blob=publicationFile)

Some Länder have made changes in their legislation governing who is responsible for memorial sites, but these have tended to be of an organizational rather than programmatic nature. In 2007, the Government of Saxony-Anhalt established a foundation which encompasses all the region's memorial sites relating to Nazi crimes and the era under the GDR regime.

(See Germany's answer to Question 1d under General Activities, 23 August)

b – What are the main developments in how memorials and museums are presented in the country and in society?

Germany's already numerous documentation centres and memorials to the victims of Nazism have been added to in recent years. Since 2005, the memorial sites marking former concentration camps in what used to be West Germany have opened new permanent historical exhibitions (e.g. Bergen-Belsen, Neckarelz, Neuengamme and Wewelsburg) and collections documenting post-liberation history, as at Flossenbürg in 2010. A number of new memorial sites were established in 2011, such as a memorial to the former concentration camp at Esterwegen and the documentation centre Topf & Sons (Topf & Söhne) – Builders of the Auschwitz Ovens in Erfurt. There are plans for others, like the Submarine Bunker "Valentin" (Denkort Bunker Valentin) memorial in Bremen-Farge, which will document submarine construction and various forms of forced and concentration-camp labour, and yet others are being radically transformed, such as the Ravensbrück Memorial Museum (Gedenkstätte Ravensbrück); the site of the Jewish horticultural school and later Gestapo base in Hannover-Ahlem; and a former POW and satellite concentration camp at Neuengamme – to name but a small sample.

Responsibility for cultural affairs is decentralized in Germany. Any summary rendered in the space available here must therefore be less than complete, making it difficult to gain a unified impression of the memorials situation. On the one hand, the German Government has taken over funding the memorial sites of former concentration camps in what used to be West Germany, which means their

finances have increased considerably. On the other hand, most existing memorial sites, particularly smaller ones, remark they have to make do with ever more limited resources. Some have even suffered cuts in public funding. Even in cases of funding remaining stable, rising costs lead inevitably to reductions in what can be offered to visitors. There is a perceived gap between expectations towards the memorials to the victims of Nazism – in terms of preventing right-wing extremism, racism and antisemitism – and the resources placed at their disposal.

Special emphasis can be placed on the involvement of civil society in the work of memorial sites and the degree of exchange and collaboration they engage in, which compares well to levels of internal cooperation in other countries. In seven German Länder, memorial sites and initiatives have joined forces to form associations. Nationwide coordination is undertaken by the Topography of Terror Foundation (Stiftung Topographie des Terrors). Seminars, specialist publications, online information and frequent coordination meetings serve as a basis for specific exchange.

There has been further work done to develop Germany's memorial sites as historical museums with special additional functions, such as commemorating the victims and caring for the survivors of Nazi persecution and their families. The institutions have gained considerably greater knowledge of historical events. Large numbers of eye-witness reports and video interviews have been produced, and there have been many donations of personal objects which belonged to those persecuted. Professional knowledge and exhibition experience have also grown, while well-developed practice has become established in educational activities.

In this context, survivors and the act of remembering what happened to them are of special significance. As time passes, subsequent generations have fewer and fewer opportunities to engage with those who lived through Nazi persecution – while the extraordinary historical source that eye-witnesses represent becomes ever more important. In recent years, Germany's memorial sites have been comprehensively collecting and developing evidence provided by those persecuted. Their reports and documents are put to public use in many different ways, on the basis of intense museological and pedagogical discussions. One can draw the - slightly generalized - conclusion that Germany's memorial sites and documentation centres now, for the first time, have the wherewithal to depict the history of Nazi persecution comprehensively – from the perspective of the various groups targeted and using original materials provided by the survivors themselves.

Visitors' interests and levels of prior knowledge have become more diverse in recent years. The memorial sites have responded by gearing their content more specifically towards the different groups. Differentiation of this nature will continue to grow in importance, both within Germany itself and in dialogue with groups of visitors from abroad.

However, further improvements to existing practice and the extensive training already involved, in terms of the core skills covered by memorial sites, call not only for academic expertise and civic commitment but also for support from the public purse. The last few years have seen somewhat ambivalent developments in this area as depicted above. Particularly smaller institutions feel little time and resources for, in particular, archiving and collating documents as well as collecting and safely storing objects donated by survivors, endangering the objects itself.

Moreover, from the point of view of the memorial sites, there are still large gaps in visitors' knowledge of the history of Nazi persecution. Although visits to memorial sites are an obligatory element of many school curricula, no established structures are in place to govern the relations between schools and memorial sites regarding content. Teacher training in its current form offers future teachers few chances to familiarize themselves with the many educational possibilities and unique characteristics provided by memorial sites as extramural places of learning. The memorial sites themselves can exert no direct influence on these circumstances, which nonetheless already hinder the dialogue- and sustainability-based educational work they are trying to do.

c – Has there been a significant increase or decrease in interest in historical sites and memorials?

As a rule, Germany's memorial sites are registering continually rising visitor numbers. For memorial sites which are known around the world, this is primarily true with respect to visitors from abroad. These sites label each exhibition at least in German and English. Over and above this, they offer guided tours and day-long projects in Hebrew, Turkish and many other languages.

Regionally significant memorial sites are also increasingly seen more as institutions of cultural history. The many memorial sites embedded in local and regional communities, in conjunction with high levels of civic involvement, have enhanced public awareness of the effects Nazism has had and is having to this day. This is to be seen as great service to society and an important contribution to a democratic, pluralistic culture of commemoration.

d – Are there official commemoration days or ceremonies for other dictatorships, wars, or similar historical events in the country? How do they refer to the Holocaust?

Commemorative events take place on a large scale on 27 January, on memorial sites as well as elsewhere – in the German Parliament (Bundestag), Regional Parliaments and schools. The focus is on various groups of victims to the Nazi terror. By promoting the involvement of young people in particular, educational work aims to encourage them to address the subjects in question as independently as possible. A number of other commemorations are regularly used as opportunities for educational activities and public events. These anniversaries mark, for example, the liberation of the various camps, the beginning of World War II on 1 September, the Pogrom (“Kristallnacht”) on 9 November and the Wannsee Conference on 20 January.

(Concerning the establishment of the European Day of Remembrance for Victims of Stalinism and Nazism, see Question d under General Activities and Annex 1.)

5. Holocaust Denial and Other Hate Crimes and Their Relation to Antisemitism

a – Has there been an increase/decrease in Holocaust denial and/or antisemitism in your country? Could you give an explanation for this increase/decrease?

Antisemitism: General

In November 2008 the National Parliament (Bundestag), decided to install an Independent Panel on Antisemitism (Unabhängiger Expertenkreis Antisemitismus). The Panel started its work in July 2009 and provided the Bundestag with its first commissioned report on the forms, conditions and prevention of antisemitism in Germany (“Antisemitismus in Deutschland. Erscheinungsformen, Bedingungen, Präventionsansätze”), in November 2011. The Panel decided unanimously that the report should focus on mainstream society and its possible affinity to antisemitic attitudes. Surveys⁴ undertaken in the last two decades revealed latent antisemitic attitudes in approximately 15 to 20 percent of the population in

⁴ Andreas Zick, Beate Küpper. Antisemitische Mentalitäten. Bericht über Ergebnisse des Forschungsprojekts Gruppenbezogene Menschenfeindlichkeit in Deutschland und Europa. Universität Bielefeld, 2010/11. (“Antisemitic mentality”; no English version available to date). Details from the report on antisemitism: http://www.bmi.bund.de/SharedDocs/Downloads/DE/Themen/Politik_Gesellschaft/EXpertenkreis_Antisemitismus/bericht.pdf?__blob=publicationFile. No English version available to date.

Germany⁵. In this respect, data collected in periodical surveys have remained approximately constant over the last twenty years.

(See Annex 5 for more detailed results.)

Holocaust Denial

A law against Holocaust denial (Section 130 (3, 4) of the Criminal Code) has been in force in Germany since 1985. Yet criminalization of Holocaust denial is controversial among jurists.

The law and its possible consequences have a deterrent effect and lead to self-censorship in people connected to the relevant extremist scene. They use codes to sidestep such statutory offences. Online, right-wing extremists and Islamists use foreign servers to evade criminal prosecution.

There have been no significant changes in the figures of Holocaust denial in Germany.

(See Annex 7 for examples of legal proceedings against Holocaust deniers.)

b – Has there been an increase in hate crimes in your country?

Statistics showing the total number of reported cases of right-wing hate crime for the 2005-2011 period:

2005: 3988

2006: 4813

2007: 4295

2008: 4358

2009: 3981

2010: 3305

2011: 3554

(See Annex 5 for statistics of antisemitic crime and right-wing politically motivated crime.)

The collation of these statistics is at times criticized – especially with regard to the victims of right-wing violence – in as much as discrepancies occur between governmental data and figures published by non-governmental sources or research undertaken by particular journalists. In the vast majority of cases, any statistical differences can be traced to the collating parties' **differing parameters** for classifying politically motivated crime.

For example, on the basis of official statistics, the German Government counted 60 deaths between 1990 and 2011 (including former mentioned NSU-victims after case-review), whereas NGOs listed 181 persons as having been killed by right-wing extremists between 1990 and 2011. All data, including those of NGOs, are part of a fundamental review by authorities initiated in the aftermath of the discovery of the NSU; until now only in a very few instances official statistics had to be corrected.

(See Annex 6 for an explanation of the methodology.)

Overall, racially motivated violent crimes or/and crimes connected with right-wing extremism have risen app. 22.7 % from 2010 to 2011⁶.

⁵ Statistics do not comprise “Latent anti-Semitic attitudes” in a separate way. Europe-wide opinion polls and surveys of different origins place Germany somewhat in the middle-field among European states.

⁶Federal Ministry of the Interior, press release, May 2012:

<http://www.bmi.bund.de/SharedDocs/Pressemitteilungen/DE/2012/05/politisch-motivierte-kriminalitaet-2011.html?nn=109632>

c – Have there been any developments in content and methods of Holocaust denial based on statistics/reported crimes?

There have been no new developments in the last five years. The use of codes to evade prosecution as well as subtle forms of trivialization and comparison with other crimes against humanity have been in evidence for a long time.

d – Have there been any changes in societal responses to Holocaust denial and antisemitism based on media?

Serious media – newspapers, radio and TV – are sensitized to any possible forms of Holocaust denial and tend to attach importance to cases of it, as do a broad variety of NGOs engaged in this field. The Federal Agency for Civic Education (Bundeszentrale für politische Bildung) and the corresponding agencies and centres at the Länder level provide dossiers and material on antisemitism and Holocaust denial for educators – principally on the web – in order to counteract/prevent such attitudes. The web is also used by many other NGOs to provide the public with information on such issues.

e – Have there been any developments in governmental responses to Holocaust denial and antisemitism?

In 2006 the German Government responded to the challenges of antisemitism by creating a position at the Foreign Office for a Special Representative for Relations with Jewish Organizations and Issues relating to Antisemitism.

Under the chairmanship of Brigitte Zypries, Minister of Justice at the time, the 27 EU Justice Ministers initiated a Framework Decision on Racism and Xenophobia during a meeting in Luxembourg in 2007, which was adopted during the French Presidency. According to the Decision, racist and xenophobic propaganda which disturbs the public peace can incur a penalty of up to three years in prison throughout Europe.

As mentioned above, the Federal Parliament (Bundestag) installed an Independent Panel on Antisemitism in 2009. Its work has the unequivocal support of the Federal Ministry of the Interior. The Panel provided the Parliament and the German Government with its 212-page report on the current situation of antisemitism in Germany in November 2011 (http://www.bmi.bund.de/SharedDocs/Downloads/DE/Themen/Politik_Gesellschaft/Expertenkreis_Antisemitismus/bericht.pdf?__blob=publicationFile). Although the Parliament decision of 2008 indicates that there should be periodic reports, it is not yet clear whether and how the Panel will be asked to continue its work.

Annex 1

26 January 2009 “The Survivors’ Bequest”

Preserve Remembrance – Conserve Authentic Places – Assume Responsibility

We, the undersigned, survivors of German concentration camps, women and men, represent international prisoner committees of the concentration camps and their sub-camps. We remember our murdered families and the millions of victims who were killed in these places of ashes. Their persecution and murder, for racial, political, religious, social, biological and economic reasons, and a criminal war took the world to the brink of disaster and left behind an appalling toll.

Following our liberation, we pledged to build a new world of peace and freedom: we became involved, in order to prevent any repetition of these incomparable crimes. Throughout our lives we have borne witness; throughout our lives we have made every effort to inform young people about our experiences, about what we encountered, and about the causes.

Precisely for this reason, we are exceedingly pained and angered to recognize today: the world has learned too little from our history. Precisely for this reason remembrance and commemoration must remain the equal task of both citizens and states.

Today the former camps are stony witnesses: they are scenes of the crimes, international cemeteries, museums and places of learning. They are evidence against denial and the playing down of facts, and they must be preserved throughout time. They are places of scientific research and educational commitment. Looking after the educational interests of the visitors must be sufficiently ensured.

The incomparable crimes against humanity inflicted by the National Socialists – and above all in this context, the Holocaust – were carried out under German responsibility. Germany has done much to come to terms with its history. We expect that the Federal Republic and its citizens will continue honouring their responsibility with special commitment in the future as well.

But Europe also has its task: instead of asserting our ideals for democracy, peace, tolerance, self-determination and human rights, history is too often used to sow discord between human beings, groups and peoples. We object to the comparative assignment of blame, to the creation of hierarchies in the experiences of suffering, of competition between victims and to the confusion of historical phases. For this reason we endorse the words of the former President of the European Parliament, Simone Veil, when she addressed the German Parliament in 2004 and appealed for the transmission of memory: “Europe should recognize and stand by its mutual past as a whole, with all the bright and dark sides; every member state should know about its mistakes and failures, and acknowledge they are at peace with their past, so that they can be at peace with their neighbours.”

Our ranks are thinning. In all areas of our associations, at national and international level, people are coming to our side to preserve remembrance: they are giving us faith in the future, they are carrying on our work. The dialogue that was begun with us must be continued with them. They need the support of state and society for this work.

The last eye witnesses appeal to Germany, to all European states and to the international community, to continue preserving and honouring the human gift of remembrance and commemoration into the future. We ask young people to carry on our struggle, against Nazi ideology and for a just, peaceful and

tolerant world, a world that has no place for anti-Semitism, racism, xenophobia and right-wing extremism.

This is our bequest.

Berlin, 25 January 2009

Noach Flug (Jerusalem)

International Auschwitz Committee

Sam Bloch (New York)

World Federation of Bergen-Belsen Associations

Bertrand Herz (Paris)

International Buchenwald Committee

Max Mannheimer (Munich)

International Dachau Committee

Uri Chanoch (Jerusalem)

International Dachau Sub-Camps Committee

Jack Terry (New York)

International Flossenbürg Committee

Albert van Hoey (Brussels)

International Committee Mittelbau-Dora

Robert Pinçon (Tours)

International Neuengamme Committee

Annette Chalut (Paris)

International Ravensbrück Committee

Pierre Gouffault (Paris)

International Sachsenhausen Committee

International Sachsenhausen Committee

Former Inmates of the
Sachsenhausen Concentration Camp
from

Austria
Belarus
Belgium
Czech Republic
Denmark
France
Germany
Hungary
Israel
Italy
Kazakhstan
Luxembourg
Netherlands
Norway
Poland
Russia
Spain
Ukraine
United Kingdom

President:
Roger Bordage

11 November 2011

Dear Mr President and Members of the European Parliament,

In our capacity as presidents of the international committees of former inmates of the German concentration camps and death camps, we hereby present you with the Survivors' Bequest we drafted on 27 January 2009 to mark the Day of Remembrance for the Victims of National Socialism. On that occasion, we handed our statement to the President of the German Bundestag and Germany's Federal President personally. Since then, our Survivors' Bequest has also been received by the political representatives of a number of other countries as well as the United Nations.

As representatives of the last eye-witnesses of the Nazi reign of terror, in recognition of the major significance of European unification in protecting peace, human rights and democracy, and with great respect for the representatives of the European institutions, we ask you to work to ensure that the memory of the incomparable crimes committed by the Nazis and their accomplices remains neither forgotten nor distorted.

The unification of Europe in freedom and democracy, achieved after the Iron Curtain was dismantled by its populations' peaceful revolution, freed people's memories from ideological and political constraints. As a result, previously suppressed and concealed crimes are being uncovered to this day, victims who had been forgotten or hidden are publicly honoured, the graves of the dead are being turned into dignified places of rest, the survivors are experiencing a delayed wave of recognition, and perpetrators are still being brought to justice after decades. Today, the plurality of memories in Europe can be freely expressed.

As victims of Nazism who have made crucial contributions to ensuring that memories in Europe are passed on, we too support the efforts by the new EU member states to make their experiences a fully integrated part of Europe's collective memory. No-one would seek to deny that the millions who fell

victim to Stalinist terror and other state crimes have the same right to be commemorated and remembered as the victims of Nazism.

We therefore find regrettable all attempts to contrive a uniform European memory by means of political decisions taken by parliaments and governments. We cannot accept politically motivated interpretation and guidelines disfiguring or silencing either the freedom we have regained to express diverse memories or the subjective truth of individual experience.

Correspondingly, we reject any attempt to render equal or homogenize the varied memories that exist. That is why we are categorically against the introduction of a collective “Day of Remembrance for the Victims of All Totalitarian and Authoritarian Regimes”. As exemplified by the choice of date – 23 August, the anniversary of the Hitler-Stalin Pact – such attempts at homogenization result in dubious forms of historical relativism. Historical events are removed from their contexts; causes and effects become confused. This day of remembrance does not serve to bring the various memories of war and terrorist regimes into dialogue. Quite the contrary, it entrenches discord, tears open old wounds and is leading to fresh conflict and confrontation. This is not a worthy way for a free and pluralist Europe to commemorate in the sense described in our Survivors’ Bequest the millions who have fallen victim to state crime.

As representatives of the last survivors, we therefore call on the parliamentary and administrative representatives of the European Union to accept and promote Europe’s memory of the victims of state crime, in all its contradiction, uniqueness and diversity, in order to ensure that the memory is properly passed on.

Yours sincerely,

Roger Bordage (Paris)
International Sachsenhausen Committee

Annette Chalut (Paris)
International Ravensbrück Committee

Henri Goldberg (Belgium)
International Auschwitz Committee

Dr Dénes György (Hungary)
International Bergen-Belsen Committee

Bertrand Herz (Paris)
International Buchenwald Committee

Working Group of the
Memorials to the Victims of National Socialism
in Berlin and Brandenburg

The Chairman
Prof. Günter Morsch
c/o Stiftung Brandenburgische
Gedenkstätten
Heinrich-Grüber-Platz 3
16515 Oranienburg
sekretariat@stiftung-bg.de
0 (049) 3301810912

Open Letter

addressed to

Matthias Platzeck
Minister-President of Brandenburg
Heinrich-Mann-Allee 107
14473 Potsdam

and to

Klaus Wowereit
Governing Mayor of Berlin
Senate Chancellery
Jüdenstr. 1
10178 Berlin

19 January 2012

Re: Introduction of a European Day of Remembrance for the Victims of All Totalitarian and Authoritarian Regimes on 23 August

Dear Minister-President,
Dear Governing Mayor,

At an extraordinary session convened on 13 January 2012, the members of the Working Group of the Memorials to the Victims of National Socialism in Berlin and Brandenburg – representing victims associations, interest groups, the memorials to the victims of Nazism in both Berlin and Brandenburg, the Central Council of Jews in Germany, and the American Jewish Committee – debated the proposal based on European Parliament decisions to institute an amalgamated day of remembrance in all countries for “the victims of all authoritarian and totalitarian regimes”. The intention is to mark this day every 23 August, as the day on which the Hitler-Stalin Pact was signed in 1939. A number of governments, institutions, memorial sites commemorating victims of Communist persecution in Europe, and other supporters are backing the proposal, to which end they have set up a Platform of European Memory and Conscience.

We, the members of the Working Group, in close liaison with the Central Council of Jews in Germany and the American Jewish Committee, unanimously and categorically reject that proposal. We ask the Land Governments of Berlin and Brandenburg not to join these initiatives to institute this day of remembrance, but to reject them and counteract them in both their Länder as well as at the national and European levels.

In making our plea, we would refer the Land Governments primarily to the enclosed Survivors' Bequest, which was drawn up by the presidents of Holocaust and concentration-camp survivors associations and presented to the President of the German Bundestag and the Federal President on 27 January 2009. We would also refer to a letter in which the survivors association presidents address the same matter to the Members of the European Parliament and the European Commission and which was delivered personally to Viviane Reding, Vice-President of the European Commission, in Brussels on 11 November 2011. That correspondence is also appended here.

We share the concerns so emotively expressed by the Holocaust and concentration-camp survivors, and we join them in rejecting the remembrance-day plans:

- The homogenized commemoration of “the victims of all authoritarian and totalitarian regimes” sought after by the initiators of this remembrance day leads to unhistorical comparisons and relativism.
- Instituting this day of remembrance will therefore not contribute to reconciliation and harmonious dialogue among victims, their families, various population groups and states; it will instead entrench discord, tear open old wounds and lead to fresh conflict and confrontation.
- It goes without saying that we not only recognize the suffering of the millions who fell victim to the Communist reign of terror but also support the aim of instituting an international day of remembrance for them. Whether 23 August is a suitable date is a matter to be decided not by governments and parliaments but first and foremost by those who suffered under Communist dictatorships not only while the Hitler-Stalin Pact was in place – from 1939 until 1941 – but at least from the October Revolution in 1917 until the 1989/90 peaceful revolutions in Europe.

It pains us that the voices of those who survived the Nazi reign of terror are seemingly hardly heard anymore. We are devastated and ashamed to see the bitterness being felt as a result by many victims of Nazi persecution, especially at a time when our eye-witness connection to that period of history is sadly coming to an end. Soon, in Germany and in many other countries, we will once more be commemorating the victims of Nazism on the anniversary of the liberation of Auschwitz concentration camp. The memorial events of 27 January present a good opportunity to call attention to the Bequest of the last survivors of the Holocaust and the Nazi reign of terror and to lend our voices to their appeal, part of which states that instead of asserting our ideals for democracy, peace, tolerance, self-determination and human rights, history is too often used to sow discord between human beings, groups and peoples. We object to the comparative assignment of blame, to the creation of hierarchies in the experiences of suffering, of competition between victims and to the confusion of historical phases.

We, the members of the Working Group of memorials in Berlin and Brandenburg, agree unconditionally with the wishes, warnings and demands thus expressed by the survivors. We hope that you, Minister-President, Governing Mayor, will in that same spirit also take up the torch of the Bequest of the Holocaust and concentration-camp survivors association presidents.

Yours sincerely,

Prof. Günter Morsch

The Working Group of the Memorials to the Victims of National Socialism in Berlin and Brandenburg comprises the following institutions, victims associations and interest groups:

Active Museum of Fascism and Resistance in Berlin

Anne Frank Zentrum

Berlin-Schöneeweide

Memorial and Place of Encounter Bonhoeffer-House

Association of People Persecuted by the Nazi Regime, Berlin

Canisius-Kolleg (CK) and the Berlin Jesuit Community

German-Russian Museum Berlin-Karlshorst

Nazi Forced Labor Documentation Center

Memorial and Place of Encounter

Brandenburg Havel Memorial

Gedenkstätte Deutscher Widerstand – German Resistance Memorial Center

Memorial to the Köpenick Week of Blood, June 1933

House of the Wannsee Conference – Memorial and Educational Site

Köpenick Local History Museum

Jewish Community of Berlin

Jewish Museum Berlin

Karmel Regina Martyrum

Association of German Sinti and Roma Berlin-Brandenburg

Regional Centre for Civic Education Berlin

Lesbian and Gay Federation Berlin-Brandenburg

State Institute for School and Media Berlin-Brandenburg

Ravensbrück Memorial Museum

Brandenburg Memorials Foundation

Annex 2

There are deficiencies in the accessibility of archives held by private persons and German businesses. Some archives have been opened for individual researchers who have been asked to write the history of the family or company in question. Some of the big German companies have provided, if not free access, at least some access to historians and academics tasked with writing the history of their activities during the Third Reich (including Dresdner Bank, Deutsche Bank, Commerzbank, Volkswagen, Diehl and Quandt/BMW). Some, such as Daimler Benz, are exemplary in providing unrestricted access; others declare that all of their archives were destroyed due to bombings in the latter part of the Second World War. It is difficult to verify these allegations.

Annex 3

Some Holocaust-related projects have been funded by the Federal Cultural Foundation (Kulturstiftung des Bundes), e.g. the interview project of the Foundation Memorial to the Murdered Jews of Europe (Stiftung Denkmal für die Ermordeten Juden Europas) and the nine-volume series on the concentration camps published by the Center for Research on Antisemitism at the Technical University Berlin (Zentrum für Antisemitismusforschung, Technische Universität Berlin) (“Der Ort des Terrors”, edited by Wolfgang Benz/Barbara Distel, 2005-2009), which is focused on the camps and covers the Holocaust itself only in part. The German Research Foundation (Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft) (58% funded by the German Government) has provided grants to finance a series of individual projects and help with printing costs for researchers studying Holocaust-related issues.

An important role in this field of project funding is played by the Foundation Remembrance, Responsibility and the Future (Stiftung Erinnerung, Verantwortung und Zukunft). (<http://www.stiftung-evz.de/eng/about-us/foundation-evz-the-first-decade/>)

One of the main projects is the ongoing edition and publication of primary sources on the persecution of Jews in Europe between 1933 and 1945 (Die Verfolgung und Ermordung der europäischen Juden durch das nationalsozialistische Deutschland 1933-1945), which the Historical Seminar of the University of Freiburg (Historisches Seminar der Universität Freiburg) began in 2004. It will in the end encompass 16 volumes; the fifth was published in 2012.

Annex 4

At a symposium on “The History of National Socialism and the Holocaust? Emphasis in academic teaching” held in Dachau in October 2011, Prof. Andreas Wirsching, director of the Munich Institute for Contemporary History (Institut für Zeitgeschichte, München), presented the initial results of an ongoing study on quantitative aspects of academic teaching about the Holocaust, in which he compares the relevant courses offered at universities in southern Germany from 1995 until the 2011 summer term. He has found a quantitative increase in engagement with the Nazi period in general, but not in study of the Holocaust. In his examination of the German tradition of research into these areas, Wirsching stated that those academics who did specialize in Holocaust research were few and far between.

4a. Selected Publications on the Holocaust and Related Issues of recent years

Andrej Angrick/Peter Klein, Die ‚Endlösung‘ in Riga, Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft 2011

Anita Awosusi/Andreas Pflock, Sinti und Roma im KZ Natzweiler-Struthof: Anregungen für einen Gedenkstättenbesuch. Geschichte, Rundgang, Biografien, Informationen, Heidelberg: Dokumentations- und Kulturzentrum Deutscher Sinti und Roma 2006

Frank Bajohr/Dieter Pohl, Der Holocaust als offenes Geheimnis. Die Deutschen, die NS-Führung und die Alliierten, München: C. H. Beck Verlag 2006 (Frank Bajohr/Dieter Pohl, Massenmord und schlechtes Gewissen: Die deutsche Bevölkerung, die NS-Führung und der Holocaust, Frankfurt a. M.: Fischer Taschenbuch 2008

Frank Bajohr/Michael Wildt (eds.), Volksgemeinschaft: Neue Forschungen zur Gesellschaft des Nationalsozialismus, Frankfurt a. M.: Fischer Taschenbuch 2009

Natalja Basic/Lars Breuer/Nicole Burgermeister/Claudia Lenz (eds.), Der Krieg der Erinnerung: Holocaust, Kollaboration und Widerstand im europäischen Gedächtnis, Frankfurt a. M.: Fischer Taschenbuch 2007

Angelika Benz, Der Henkersknecht: Der Prozess gegen John (Iwan) Demjanjuk in München, Berlin: Metropol Verlag 2011

Wolfgang Benz/Barbara Distel (eds.), Der Ort des Terrors. Geschichte der nationalsozialistischen Konzentrationslager, 9 volumes, München 2005-2009

Wolfgang Benz, Die 101 wichtigsten Fragen. Das Dritte Reich, München: C. H. Beck 2007

Wolfgang Benz, Der Holocaust, München: C. H. Beck 2008

Wolfgang Benz/Brigitte Mihok, Holocaust an der Peripherie: Judenpolitik und Judenmord in Rumänien und Transnistrien, 1940-1944, Berlin: Metropol Verlag 2009

Wolfgang Benz, Wie wurde man Parteigenosse?, Frankfurt a. M.: Fischer Taschenbuch 2009

Wolfgang Benz, Vorurteil und Genozid. Ideologische Prämissen des Völkermords, Wien: Böhlau Verlag 2010

Wolfgang Benz, Der ewige Jude: Metaphern und Methoden nationalsozialistischer Propaganda, Berlin: Metropol Verlag 2010

Wolfgang Benz (ed.), Handbuch des Antisemitismus. Judenfeindschaft in Geschichte und Gegenwart, Berlin, vol. 1-4, Berlin: de Gruyter 2008 et seq. (vol. 5-7 will follow in the next two years)

José Brunner/Constantin Goschler/Norbert Frei (eds.), Die Globalisierung der Wiedergutmachung: Politik, Moral, Moralpolitik, Göttingen: Wallstein 2012

Eckart Conze/Norbert Frei/Peter Hayes/Moshe Zimmermann, Das Amt und die Vergangenheit: Deutsche Diplomaten im Dritten Reich und in der Bundesrepublik, München: Karl Blessing Verlag 2010

Christoph Dieckmann, Deutsche Besatzungspolitik in Litauen 1941-1944, Göttingen: Wallstein Verlag 2011

Dan Diner, Gegenläufige Gedächtnisse. Über Geltung und Wirkung des Holocaust, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht 2007

Bernward Dörner, Die Deutschen und der Holocaust: Was niemand wissen wollte, aber jeder wissen konnte, Berlin: Propyläen Verlag 2007

Tobias Ebbrecht, Geschichtsbilder im medialen Gedächtnis: Filmische Narrationen des Holocaust, Bielefeld: Transcript 2011

Michael Elm/Gottfried Köbler (eds.), Jahrbuch zur Geschichte und Wirkung des Holocaust: Zeugenschaft des Holocaust: Zwischen Trauma, Tradierung und Ermittlung: 2007 von Fritz Bauer Institut, Frankfurt a. M.: Campus Verlag 2007

Udo Engbring-Romang, „Mit einer Rückkehr ist nicht mehr zu rechnen ...“: Die Verfolgung der Sinti und Roma in Mannheim, Ostfildern: Thorbecke Verlag 2010

Matthias Felsch, „Aktion T4“: Die erste Phase der Euthanasie im Nationalsozialismus, München: Grin Verlag 2009

Karola Fings/Ulrich Friedrich Opfermann, Zigeunerverfolgung im Rheinland und in Westfalen 1933-1945: Geschichte, Aufarbeitung und Erinnerung, Paderborn: Schöningh 2012

Norbert Frei, 1945 und wir: Das Dritte Reich im Bewußtsein der Deutschen, München: Deutscher Taschenbuch Verlag 2009

Norbert Frei/Ralf Ahrens/Jörg Osterloh/Tim Schanetzky, Flick: Der Konzern, die Familie, die Macht, München: Karl Blessing Verlag 2009

Norbert Frei/Tim Schanetzky, Unternehmen im Nationalsozialismus: Zur Historisierung einer Forschungskonjunktur, Göttingen: Wallstein Verlag 2010

Norbert Frei/Wulf Kansteiner (eds.), Den Holocaust erzählen: Historiographie zwischen wissenschaftlicher Empirie und narrativer Kreativität, Göttingen: Wallstein Verlag 2012

Manfred Gailus/Armin Nolzen, Zerstrittene »Volksgemeinschaft«: Glaube, Konfession und Religion im Nationalsozialismus, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht 2011

Robert Gerwarth/Udo Rennert, Reinhard Heydrich: Biographie, München: Siedler Verlag 2011

Constantin Goschler/Norbert Frei/José Brunner (eds.), Die Praxis der Wiedergutmachung: Geschichte, Erfahrung und Wirkung in Deutschland und Israel, Göttingen: Wallstein Verlag 2009

Waltraud Häupl, Spuren zu den ermordeten Kindern und Jugendlichen in Hartheim und Niedernhart: Gedenkdokumentation für die Opfer der NS-Euthanasie, Wien: Böhlau Verlag 2012

Geoffrey Hartman/Aleida Assmann, Die Zukunft der Erinnerung und der Holocaust, Konstanz: University Press 2011

Christian Hartmann/Johannes Hürter/Peter Lieb/Dieter Pohl, Der deutsche Krieg im Osten 1941-1944: Facetten einer Grenzüberschreitung, München: Oldenbourg Wissenschaftsverlag 2009

Dörte Hein, Erinnerungskulturen online: Angebote, Kommunikatoren und Nutzer von Websites zu Nationalsozialismus und Holocaust, Konstanz: Uvk 2009

Armin Heinen, Rumänien, der Holocaust und die Logik der Gewalt, München: Oldenbourg Wissenschaftsverlag 2007

Klaus-Dietmar Henke (ed.), Die Dresdner Bank im Dritten Reich. München: Oldenbourg Wissenschaftsverlag 2006; vol. 1: Johannes Bähr, Die Dresdner Bank in der Wirtschaft des Dritten Reichs. Unter Mitarbeit von Ralf Ahrens, Michael Schneider, Harald Wixforth und Dieter Ziegler; vol. 2: Dieter Ziegler, Die Dresdner Bank und die deutschen Juden. Unter Mitarbeit von Maren Janetzko, Ingo Köhler und Jörg Osterloh; vol. 3: Harald Wixforth, Die Expansion der Dresdner Bank in Europa. Unter Mitarbeit von Johannes Bähr, Jörg Osterloh, Friederike Sattler und Dieter Ziegler; vol. 4: Klaus-Dietmar Henke, Die Dresdner Bank 1933-1945. Ökonomische Rationalität, Regimenähe, Mittäterschaft

Raul Hilberg/Udo Rennert, Die Quellen des Holocaust. Entschlüsseln und Interpretieren, Frankfurt a. M.: Fischer Verlag 2009

Johannes Ibel, „Einvernehmliche Zusammenarbeit?“. Wehrmacht, Gestapo, SS und sowjetische Kriegsgefangene, Berlin: Metropol Verlag 2008

Peter Klein, Die »Gettoverwaltung Litzmannstadt« 1940-1944. Eine Dienststelle im Spannungsfeld von Kommunalbürokratie und staatlicher Verfolgungspolitik, Hamburg: Hamburger Edition 2009

Jan Knittermeier, Sinti und Roma: Vergessene Opfer?: Entschädigungspraxis und Bürgerrechtsbewegung in der Bundesrepublik, München: Grin Verlag 2010

Werner Konitzer/Raphael Gross, Moralität des Bösen: Ethik und nationalsozialistische Verbrechen (Jahrbuch zur Geschichte und Wirkung des Holocaust, Fritz Bauer Institut, Frankfurt a. M.: Campus Verlag 2009

Denise Kouba, Die vergessenen und verdrängten Opfer von Auschwitz: Sinti, Roma und Zeugen Jehovas im Konzentrationslager Auschwitz, München: Grin Verlag 2008

Edward Kossoy, Holocaust und Wiedergutmachung: Erinnerungen eines jüdischen Anwalts, Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft 2012

Angela Kühner/Phil C. Langer/Robert Sigel/Gudrun Brockhaus/Daphne Cisneros/Heiner Keupp/Holger Knothe, Holocaust Education: Wie Schüler und Lehrer den Unterricht zum Thema Nationalsozialismus und Holocaust erleben, München: Lehrstuhl für Sozial-psychologie der Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München 2007

Daniel Levy/Natan Sznajder, Erinnerung im globalen Zeitalter: Der Holocaust, Berlin: Suhrkamp Verlag 2007

Peter Longerich, „Davon haben wir nichts gewusst!“. Die Deutschen und die Judenverfolgung 1933-1945, München: Pantheon Verlag 2007

Peter Longerich, Heinrich Himmler: Biographie, München: Pantheon Verlag 2010

Peter Longerich, Joseph Goebbels: Biographie, München: Siedler Verlag 2010

Klaus M. Mallmann/Andrej Angrick/Jürgen Matthäus/Martin Cüppers (eds.), Die „Ereignismeldung UdSSR“ 1941: Dokumente der Einsatzgruppen in der Sowjetunion, Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft 2011

Klaus M. Mallmann/Andrej Angrick (eds.), Die Gestapo nach 1945: Konflikte, Karrieren, Konstruktionen, Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft 2009

Wolfgang Meseth/Matthias Proske/Frank-Olaf Radtke (eds.), Schule und Nationalsozialismus. Anspruch und Grenzen des Geschichtsunterrichts, Frankfurt am Main: Wissenschaftliche Reihe des Fritz-Bauer-Instituts 11, Campus Verlag 2004

Dan Michman/Udo Rennert, Angst vor den „Ostjuden“: Die Entstehung der Ghettos während des Holocaust, Frankfurt a. M.: Fischer Taschenbuch 2011

Bert Pampel, Erschrecken – Mitgefühl – Distanz. Empirische Befunde über Schülerinnen und Schüler in Gedenkstätten und zeitgeschichtlichen Ausstellungen, Leipzig: Leipziger Universitätsverlag 2012

Kristin Platt, Bezweifelte Erinnerung, verweigerter Glaubhaftigkeit. Überlebende des Holocaust in den Ghattorenten-Verfahren, München: Wilhelm Fink Verlag 2012

Dieter Pohl, Die Herrschaft der Wehrmacht. Deutsche Militärbesatzung und einheimische Bevölkerung in der Sowjetunion 1941-1944. München: Oldenbourg 2008

Dieter Pohl, Verfolgung und Massenmord in der NS-Zeit 1933-1945, Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft 2008

Polizei.Gewalt. Bremens Polizei im Nationalsozialismus, Senator für Inneres und Sport der Freien Hansestadt Bremen 2011

Hanns-Fred Rathenow/Birgit Wenzel/Norbert H. Weber, Handbuch Nationalsozialismus und Holocaust: Historisch-politisches Lernen in Schule und Lehrerbildung, Schwalbach/Ts.: Wochenschau-Verlag 2012

Kathrin Reichelt, Lettland unter deutscher Besatzung 1941-1944: Der lettische Anteil am Holocaust, Berlin: Metropol Verlag 2011

Petra Rentrop, Tatorte der „Endlösung“: Das Ghetto Minsk und die Vernichtungsstätte von Maly Trostinez, Berlin: Metropol Verlag 2011

Martin Sabrow/Norbert Frei (eds.), Die Geburt des Zeitzeugen nach 1945, Göttingen: Wallstein 2012

Tobias Schmidt-Degenhard, Vermessen und Vernichten. Der NS-„Zigeunerforscher“ Robert Ritter, Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag 2011

Karl Schneider, Polizeibataillone aus Bremen: Ein Beitrag zur Bremer Polizeigeschichte von 1918 bis nach 1945: Bremer Polizeibataillone und der Holocaust, Essen: Klartext-Verlagsges. 2011

Joachim Scholtyseck, Der Aufstieg der Quandts. Eine deutsche Unternehmerdynastie, München: C. H. Beck Verlag 2011

Annegret Schüle, Industrie und Holocaust: Topf & Söhne – Die Ofenbauer von Auschwitz, Göttingen: Wallstein Verlag 2010

Thomas Stöckle, Grafeneck 1940: Die Euthanasie-Verbrechen in Südwestdeutschland, Bebenhausen: Silberburg Verlag 2012

Tödliches Mitleid. NS-„Euthanasie“ und Gegenwart: Fachtagung vom 24. bis 26. November 2006 im Deutschen Hygiene-Museum, Arbeitskreis zur Erforschung der nationalsozialistischen „Euthanasie“ und Zwangssterilisation, Münster: Verlag Klemm & Oelschläger 2007

Herbert Uerlings/Iulia K. Patrut, ‚Zigeuner‘ und Nation: Repräsentation – Inklusion – Exklusion, Frankfurt a. M.: Peter Lang Verlag 2008

Stefanie Westermann, Richard Kühl und Tim Ohnhäuser (eds.), NS-„Euthanasie“ und Erinnerung. Vergangenheitsaufarbeitung – Gedenkformen – Betroffenenperspektiven, Münster 2011

Michael Wildt, Geschichte des Nationalsozialismus, Stuttgart: UTB 2007

Michael Wildt, Volksgemeinschaft als Selbstermächtigung. Gewalt gegen Juden in der deutschen Provinz 1919 bis 1939, Hamburg: Hamburger Edition 2007

Hubert Wolf, Papst und Teufel. Die Archive des Vatikan und das Dritte Reich, München: C. H. Beck Verlag 2008

Numerous eyewitness reports

4b. Selected Conferences from 2006-2012

Der Vernichtungskrieg gegen die Sowjetunion und die Wannsee-Konferenz am 20. Januar 1942. 20-21 January 2012, Berlin

12. Dachauer Symposium zur Zeitgeschichte. Der Holocaust in der deutschsprachigen Geschichtswissenschaft: Bilanz und Perspektiven. 30-31 October 2011, Dachau

Den Holocaust erzählen? Historiographie zwischen wissenschaftlicher Empirie und narrativer Kreativität. 9-11 June 2011, Jena

Gender and Race in Nazi Medicine. 7th European Summer School Ravensbrück. 28 August - 2 September 2011, Ravensbrück

Kolloquium zur Geschichte der Waffen-SS. 6-7 May 2011, Würzburg

Die Welt der Lager: Ausgrenzung, soziale Kontrolle und Gewalt in transnationaler Perspektive. A private conference run by the Berlin Colloquia on Contemporary History in collaboration with the Hamburg Institute for Social Research and the Einstein Forum. April 2011, Potsdam

Early Historians – on the Origins of Jewish Holocaust Research. An almost exclusively English-language conference at the Simon Dubnow Institute and attended by a small gathering of specialists. 18 June 2010, Leipzig

11. Dachauer Symposium: Die Kirchen und die Verbrechen im nationalsozialistischen Staat. 14-15 May 2010, Dachau

Der Ort des Terrors. Nationalsozialistische Zwangslager. Strukturen und Regionen – Täter und Opfer. 27-28 September 2010, Berlin

Die weltanschaulichen Grundlagen des Nationalsozialismus – Ursprünge, Gegenentwürfe, Nachwirkungen. 19-21 February 2010, Königswinter

Hitler und die Deutschen. Volksgemeinschaft und Verbrechen. 26-28 November 2009, Berlin

10. Dachauer Symposium: Öffentliche Erinnerung und Medialisierung des Nationalsozialismus: Eine Bilanz der letzten 30 Jahre. 9-10 October 2009, Dachau

Der Eichmann-Prozess in internationaler Perspektive: Auswirkung, Entwicklungen und Herausforderungen. 24-26 May 2011, Berlin

56. Bundesweites Gedenkstättenseminars in Osnabrück: Den Besucher im Blick. Bildungsarbeit mit Erwachsenen in Gedenkstätten. 5-8 October 2011, Osnabrück

55. Bundesweite Gedenkstättenseminar: Die SS in Forschung, Bildung und Medien. 23-25 June 2011, Wewelsburg

Orte – Dinge – Spuren. Der Umgang mit den materiellen Zeugnissen in Gedenkstätten für Opfer des Nationalsozialismus. 24-26 November 2011, Berlin

Jüdische Perspektiven auf die Jahre der „forcierten Auswanderung“ bis zur Ghettoisierung und Deportation der Juden aus dem Deutschen Reich (1938/39-1941). 17-19 May 2009, Hamburg

Die Polizei im NS-Staat. 13-15 May 2009, Münster

Das „Reichskommissariat Ostland“. Tatort und Erinnerungsobjekt: Konstruktionen. 28-30 May 2009, Flensburg

Scham und Schuld. Geschlechter(sub)texte der Shoah. 14-15 November 2009, Berlin

„Arisierung“. Die wirtschaftliche Existenzvernichtung der Juden in der NS-Zeit. 20 June 2008, Cologne

"Der Holocaust im transnationalen Gedächtnis". 1. Internationale Konferenz zur Holocaustforschung 11.12. 2006, Berlin.

"Täterforschung im globalen Kontext". 2. Internationale Konferenz zur Holocaustforschung 26.-29. Januar 2009, Berlin

"Helfer, Retter und Netzwerker des Widerstands". 3. Internationale Konferenz zur Holocaustforschung 27./28. Januar 2011, Berlin

"httpasts://digitalmemoryonthenet". Internationale Konferenz zum Thema „Erinnerungskulturen online“, 14.-16. April 2011, Berlin.

Annex 5

In the press coverage which followed the publication of the report, journalists gave this special attention and emphasized it as a dramatic new development; however, this was in reality not the case. The Federal Ministry of the Interior, based on the data provided by the Länder Criminal Police Offices (Landeskriminalämter, LKAs), provides annual statistics of criminal and violent acts and divides the

results into different perpetrator profiles. The following data show that 90% of such acts are committed by people with a background of right-wing extremism, while only some are committed by people of the extreme left-wing scene and 3% to 6% are ascribed to “foreigners” – a difficult category which gives no clear definition or differentiation between various migrant backgrounds.

The Federal Ministry of the Interior, based on statistics from the Länder Criminal Police Offices (Landeskriminalämter) , published the following figures for violent and criminal acts connected with right-wing extremism. Approximately 8000 to 10,000 of the total are propaganda offences.

Total figures for politically motivated crime (right-wing), 2005-2011:

2005: 15,914
 2006: 18,142
 2007: 17,607
 2008: 20,422
 2009: 19,468
 2010: 16,375
 2011: 16,873

Antisemitic Criminal Acts

Year	Politically motivated crime: right-wing	Politically motivated crime: left-wing	Politically motivated crime: foreigners	Politically motivated crime: other	Total
2001	1629	2	31	29	1691
2002	1594	6	89	82	1771
2003	1226	6	53	59	1344
2004	1346	4	46	53	1449
2005	1682	7	33	26	1748
2006	1662	4	89	54	1809
2007	1561	1	59	36	1657
2008	1496	5	41	17	1559
2009	1520	4	101	65	1690
2010	1192	1	53	22	1268
2011	1188	6	24	21	1239

Antisemitic Violent Acts

Year	Politically motivated crime: right-wing	Politically motivated crime: left-wing	Politically motivated crime: foreigners	Politically motivated crime: other	Total
2001	27	0	1	0	28
2002	30	1	7	1	39
2003	38	0	7	1	46
2004	40	1	3	1	45
2005	50	1	3	2	56
2006	44	0	7	0	51
2007	61	0	3	0	64
2008	44	2	1	0	47
2009	31	0	9	1	41
2010	31	0	6	0	37
2011	26	1	2	0	29

The higher figures for antisemitic criminal acts (a high percentage of them are verbal acts) in 2002, 2006 and 2009 directly show what an impact radicalization of the Middle East conflict has on such threats against Jewish institutions and individual Jews. In 2002, media coverage of the events in the refugee camp of Jenin and accusations that the Israeli Defence Forces had committed a massacre there resulted in a wave of antisemitism in all European countries, including Germany. The Lebanon War

had an impact in 2006, and in 2009 the Gaza War produced similar results. Reliable media in Germany tend to be relatively balanced in their reporting on Israel and the conflict. Nonetheless, with some exceptions, the coverage of the ongoing conflict has an impact on antisemitic attitudes – which are usually latent but do in extremist circles exacerbate such threats. The high figures for 2005 are directly connected to an increase in criminal acts by right-wing extremists generally (2004: 12,051; 2005: 15,361), and this is also reflected in the data for antisemitic criminal acts.

Annex 6

Police statistics have introduced a separate category for xenophobic crimes in 1992, and another for antisemitic crimes in 1993. The internationally applied term “hate crime” has been used by the German police to categorize certain criminal acts since 2001. Hate crime as well as xenophobic and antisemitic criminal acts have since then been understood as elements of politically motivated crime.

The police statistics system which Germany has put in place for recording politically motivated crime since 2001 makes it possible to collate data in a number of different dimensions. In particular, a crime can be logged not only under the heading denoting the main motivation ascribed to it. For example, one and the same incident can be registered as xenophobic, antisemitic and racist crime.

For police statistics of politically motivated crimes, the decisive factor is the motive behind the crime – with the exception of classically defined crimes against national security, which are always understood as politically motivated. The possible motives of the perpetrator are to be established by assessing all the circumstances of the actual act and his attitude. Categorizing crimes solely on the basis of motivations leads, among other things, to incidents being logged as, for instance, xenophobic even where the perpetrator was mistaken in thinking that the victim had a migrant background or belonged to a particular faith –

or

where the perpetrator carried out the crime using xenophobic language against a person whom he or she knew not to have a migrant background or belong to the faith he or she despised (for example, referring to a nationality or religion in conjunction with an offensive term).

A number of journalists have in the past compiled lists of people killed by right-wing extremist violence. According to the authors (see p. 4 of the newspaper DER TAGESSPIEGEL of 22 September 2000 for example), these lists include cases in which the murderer was known to belong to the far-right scene and no other motive could be established.

This approach fails to take account of the following:

Persons from the far-right scene who are known to engage in criminal activity are often shown to have impressive careers in non-politically motivated crimes as well. For example, 50.5% of those investigated in connection with right-wing politically motivated crimes in 2010 were already known to the police for their involvement in other categories of crimes. If membership of a particular political group were taken as sufficient cause to categorize a crime as politically motivated, waiving the need for the motive itself to be political, ordinary criminal acts would end up being counted as politically motivated.

The public is not always informed immediately of everything the police know about a crime which may be relevant to its categorization – if for no other reason than to avoid jeopardizing on-going investigations. This applies particularly to incidents where the perpetrator and the victim knew each other beforehand and not one motive but an amalgamation of several can be ascribed to the crime.

Notwithstanding the above, the police do follow up any indications received from non-state sources that a crime they are investigating may be politically motivated, and, if it meets the relevant criteria, it is recorded as such in police statistics.

Annex 7

In February 2005, Yeni Akit Ltd., the publisher of the European edition of the Turkish-language daily Anadolu Vakit in Germany, was banned by the Federal Minister of the Interior for denying the Holocaust and disseminating antisemitic propaganda. The Association for the Rehabilitation of Those Prosecuted for Holocaust Denial (Verein zur Rehabilitierung der wegen Bestreitens des Holocaust Verfolgten) was banned by the Minister of the Interior in April 2008.

The Higher Regional Court of Nuremberg (Oberlandesgericht Nürnberg) decided in February 2012 that the court case against Holocaust denier Bishop Richard Williamson had to be reopened due to procedural defects. This conclusion was reached in a process review, citing the fact that the criminal prosecution matters adopted in 2009 were not sufficiently clearly described.

In November 2011, the Federal Constitutional Court (Bundesverfassungsgericht) overturned the previous judgment in a case where a neo-Nazi had given a barkeeper a whole package of documents with right-wing extremist content. The judges gave particular weight in their decision to the issue of whether the accused wanted to distribute the documents. According to the law – as interpreted by the judges – “not the content of an opinion as such, but only the manner of communication” is relevant. This decision was heavily criticized by the press.