

die Auswirkungen des Konzepts der *captive nations* auf die Selbstwahrnehmung der Osteuropäer als „captive slaves“ (S. 118). Diesem Gedanken folgend war die Interpretation des Erlebten durch die Brille westlicher Totalitarismustheorien auch ein Weg, um eigene politische und moralische Zugeständnisse an das System zu rechtfertigen. Angst war ein Faktor, der für die Mitarbeiter der Rundfunksender als Beweggrund für das Verhalten der Befragten ebenso schwer zu verifizieren war wie für die Autorin selbst. Dasselbe gilt jedoch auch für die Motive hinter den Narrativen in den untersuchten Interviews. Man mag deshalb an mancher Stelle einwenden, dass die Studie allzu sehr auf eigenen Hypothesen aufbaut und sich Spekulationen über die Vorstellungswelten der Bevölkerung in den „Volksdemokratien“ hingibt, die vielleicht doch einer breiteren Quellengrundlage bedürften. Ein ausführlicheres Endkapitel, das die losen Fäden der in den Teilkapiteln entwickelten, unbestritten interessanten Ansätze verknüpft, wäre ebenfalls wünschenswert gewesen. Dennoch ist das Buch ein wichtiger Beitrag zu aktuellen Debatten um transnationale Verknüpfungen im Kalten Krieg, in denen die Ära zwischen 1948 und 1956 etwas aus dem Blick geraten ist. Die Analyse der politischen Kultur des Kalten Krieges liefert Antworten auf die Frage, warum sich antikommunistische Akteure auch nach Beginn des Tauwetters lange schwertaten, einen nuancierten Blick auf die sozialistischen Lebenswelten zu entwickeln, und hinterfragt Sprache und Weltsicht des Kalten Krieges selbst, deren Nachhall auch innerhalb der historischen Forschung viel zu selten thematisiert wird.

Wien

Lars Fredrik Stöcker

**Die Entschädigung von NS-Zwangsarbeit am Anfang des 21. Jahrhunderts.** Bd. 2: Transnationale Opferanwaltschaft. Das Auszahlungsprogramm und die internationalen Organisationen. Hrsg. von Constantin Goschler. Wallstein-Verl. Göttingen 2012. 260 S., Ill., graf. Darst. ISBN 978-3-8353-1085-8.

The question of financial compensation for the victims of forced labor in Nazi Germany and German-occupied Europe has ceased in the last decade to be a sensitive political problem. With the passing away of the last living forced laborers the question becomes more and more historical. Four volumes edited by Constantin Goschler, with the second volume under review here<sup>1</sup>, present the compensation activities of the Remembrance, Responsibility and Future Foundation (Stiftung Erinnerung, Verantwortung und Zukunft; EVZ) and how they were accepted by the compensated victims in different countries.

The foundation was founded in the year 2000 and operated its compensation programs until 2007. Its budget was approximately 5.2 billion euros. Over that period the foundation compensated 1.66 million people. After the compensation program had been terminated, a team of scholars under Constantin Goschler, professor at Ruhr University, started research on how the compensation packages had been distributed and how the forced laborers perceived them. The outcomes of that research have been published in four volumes.

The publication reports set out in detail how different aspects of the compensation for forced labor functioned, what the extent of the compensation was and what form it took. There are a few aspects which are criticized throughout the whole book. First of all, this process of compensation has often been seen as a symbolic gesture by the victims and as a “fig leaf” for German industry and/or government. This symbolic gesture also seems to have been devaluated because of the bureaucratization of the compensation process which made it less acceptable, sometimes traumatic or even controversial for the victims. High

<sup>1</sup> Vol. 1: Die Stiftung: Der Abschluss der deutschen Wiedergutmachung?, Göttingen 2012; vol. 3: Nationale Selbstbilder, Opferdiskurse und Verwaltungshandeln: Das Auszahlungsprogramm in Ostmitteleuropa, Göttingen 2012; vol. 4: Helden, Opfer, Ostarbeiter: Das Auszahlungsprogramm in der ehemaligen Sowjetunion, Göttingen 2012.

rates of rejected applications, problems with acceptance of non-typical cases, and forcing the victims to prove their eligibility for the compensation programs widely devaluated the symbolic capital of the whole program.

The second volume focuses on the role of international organizations in the process of allocating compensation. The financial means were delivered by the German government through EVZ. The foundation cooperated closely with local partner institutions which were responsible for on-site organization in different regions. Benno Nietzel and Patrice G. Poutrus not only analyze the compensation program but they also put it into a broader context of a long cooperation between the Jewish Claims Conference (JCC) and the German government. The JCC did not accept the compensation money as the final step in the process of compensation for the victims. They saw it only as one of many programs administered by the JCC. Because of the special role played by the JCC, relations with EVZ have not been easy and have been characterized by frequent problems and conflicts. Thus, the knowledge and activities of JCC provided important feedback for EVZ and influenced the whole process of compensation as well as the work of other partner organizations.

The compensation for the 'rest of the world' was administered by the International Organization for Migration (IOM). Compensation was a completely new field of activity for the IOM, which had to develop its own procedures and methods to realize this new task. Doing so has not been easy, as Paul Erker points out: "the history of the financial compensation for the forced labour is therefore always a history of ambivalence, contrariness and indissoluble strain relations between political demands, moral aims, juridical rigorism and bureaucratic efficiency" (p. 194). This has a special meaning if we consider that nearly three-quarters of the applications received by the IOM were rejected because of different, sometimes artificial and doubtful, procedures and regulations.

The volume contains two more papers. The first one by Paul Weindling about compensation for 'other personal injuries', which has been understood, for example, as forced experiments on human beings or physical child abuse. The author criticizes the process of compensation in this area because of the lack of scientific research before the process started, which made eligibility for the program for many applicants impossible. He sees this aspect of compensation as an attempt to grant immunity for German industry, especially the pharmaceutical industry, and to protect it from other legal and moral claims.

The last and the shortest paper, written by Ilka Quindeau, presents the questions surrounding the mental issues of the victims. The author claims that victims suffering from psychological stress could not receive compensation. In such cases, compensation is important above all for the perpetrators, but for the victims the most important element is recognition of their suffering; thus, financial compensation is seen as symbolic for this recognition. Consequently, the mechanics of the compensation process are also important, regardless of the compensation being granted. One of the main problems, according to Quindeau, is the situation in which victims have to prove their eligibility for compensation, as recognition of the events should be the initiative of the perpetrator and should not require proof from the victims.

Berlin

Dominik Pick