

Clear wording or “historical” euphemisms? Conceptual controversies surrounding the naming of national socialist memorial sites in Germany

Introduction

This article addresses questions about the words used in Germany today to negotiate the national socialist past. The principal focus of this discussion will be the memorial sites and places of remembrance that have been re-designed and re-named in many places, in particular since the 1989/1990 Reunification. Knowing that language and language use play a central role in the interpretation of history, intense debates have been held regarding these (re-)designing and naming processes. This article will focus on the two main opposing positions at the core of this debate: one demands an explicit naming of events – along with the corresponding assumption of responsibility for them – the other supports the usage of what are, in my opinion, unclear language and naming practices. As an introduction to this discussion, I would like to draw attention to the fact that both clarity and ambiguity were central to national socialist language policies, and later to those of the Allied Forces: one characteristic of so-called “NS-Deutsch” (National Socialist German) is its usage of deceptive obfuscation, which can be observed particularly in their prolific usage of euphemisms. In contrast, the Allies attempted to promote explicit speech practices as a measure of language policy during the denazification efforts after the German capitulation in 1945. Following that introduction, I would like to investigate how explicitly the history of National Socialism is being discussed in Germany today. The debates about the naming of the most renowned memorial sites and places of remembrance over the last decades have demonstrated that people are still struggling for clear wording. A central issue in these debates is the particular representation of history – a representation that has been criticized for using linguistic means to equate the national socialist system with that of the German Democratic Republic (GDR), commonly known as East Germany in the English speaking world. Against this background, there is currently an ongoing struggle concerning the naming of the memorial at the site of the former *Jugendkonzentrationslager und*

*spätere Vernichtungsstätte*¹ Uckermark (Youth Concentration Camp and Later Extermination Site at Uckermark). This memorial site is not counted among the principal German memorial sites – it is one of the sites of national socialist crimes whose existence has been suppressed. The more general public only became aware of it through the political efforts of survivors and their relatives, as well as those of an anti-fascist, feminist initiative. The opposition of clarity and ambiguity is also a central point of contention in the debate surrounding this memorial site, and more specifically: how national socialist euphemisms are handled. Finally, it must be stated that language is much more than an instrument of communication that supposedly conveys neutral, objective statements. The interpretation of the national socialist past is a contested domain in Germany – as is the language in which it is negotiated.

The Usage of Euphemisms as Part of a Cover-Up

There was certainly an awareness of the power of language at the foundation of language policy decisions made during the era of National Socialism. Various investigations into the use of language in Germany during that time period have been conducted – the most well-known of which is Victor Klemperer's *LTI. Notizbuch eines Philologen*, which was first published in 1947.² There were also people living in exile, Allied “language experts” or other observers outside of Germany who spoke of a “Nazi-Sprache” long before the end of the war, and who described the changes that they had observed in the German language during National Socialism.³ While those discussions often propose the untenable view that the German population was the victim of linguistic manipulation, the descriptions do provide good insight into the national socialist usage of language; the features that are described refer to all levels of linguistic expression. For this article however, I would like to focus on one characteristic in particular – and certainly the most well-known one: namely, the usage of euphemisms. Or, more broadly speaking: language as a means of cover-up.

Euphemisms are used to sugarcoat something which is disagreeable, to make it less offensive or to disguise it. They therefore quickly became an important component of “NS-

Deutsch”, particularly in regards to terminology surrounding the policy of extermination. There are innumerable examples of this: “Arisierung”, “Euthanasie”, “Protektorat”, “Liquidation”, “Sonderbehandlung”, “Evakuierung”, “in den Osten schicken”, etc. An important characteristic of “NS-Deutsch” is therefore its concealment of the real meanings of words – and it is primarily the disagreeable side of reality that disappears behind such vague terminology. These camouflage words are often commonly known words which are then given a new meaning: “Rasse” and “Hygiene” become “Rassenhygiene”, “Verfall” and “Kunst” become “Verfallskunst”.⁴ Their precise meaning can only be derived from the concrete usage context – and it is that ambiguity which provides the camouflage.

The Allies also understood the power of language: After the defeat of national socialist Germany, they included language as a focus in their attempts at “Entnazifizierung”. There were a variety of language policies and language-regulating measures taken in all four of the occupied zones. Public, or official names (for example, street names) were changed, school books were revised, and newspapers and magazines’ use of language was monitored. That was, however, no simple task during the chaotic post-war years. For that reason, national socialist terms or symbols in school books, or place names and descriptions on maps, which were reminiscent of “Großdeutschland” were often just blacked out.⁵ However, regardless of the difficulties observed in the concrete implementation of such measures, they do clearly indicate the extent to which the occupying Allied powers considered language and language use to be a significant factor. Aware of the powerful effect of language, the Allied Control Council announced censorship ordinances that were explicitly directed against the usage of obfuscating language in April 1946: “Für die schriftliche Kommunikation galt die Auflage, dass die Texte einfach zu verstehen sein sollten (...) und Fachwortschatz auf ein Minimum begrenzt werden sollte.”⁶ Thus, National Socialism’s broad usage of euphemisms was supposed to be countered by the explicit naming practices introduced within the framework of the Allied occupying force’s re-education program.

In Reunified Germany: Clear Wording for One's Own History?

What came of that desire for clarity? What words are used to speak about the national socialist past in Germany today? Is a spade actually called a spade these days? Those kinds of questions became particularly important again in the course of the 1989/1990 Reunification process. For, although the allied “Siegermächte” had in the meantime become friendly nations, some of the governmental heads remained skeptical about the German Reunification efforts⁷ – Margaret Thatcher⁸ and François Mitterand surely being the best-known examples. International reporting from that time period also demonstrates the linguistic dimension to the link between those concerns and Germany's national socialist past: “Etikettierungen von Kohls Verhalten als Zeichen einer ‘großdeutschen Arroganz’ in den dänischen Medien, die Heraufbeschwörung eines ‘Vierten Reiches’ in der britischen *Times* sowie in der französischen Presse unübersetzt verwendete Begriffe wie ‘Reich’, ‘Anschluss’ oder die im Zusammenhang mit Kohls Zehn-Punkte-Plan gewählte Formulierung ‘Blitzangriff’ zeigen dies deutlich.”⁹ Germany was, however, dependent upon the support of those governments – for that reason, German foreign policy has made every effort since the 1990s to diffuse any concerns about a re-strengthening of Germany. During a time of racist and anti-Romany motivated persecutions, arson attacks and pogrom-like assaults of refugee residences, which sometimes lasted for days and in which several people were murdered¹⁰, it was necessary to promote a positive image of Germany. The principle, larger National Socialism memorial sites played an important role in those efforts, as did the language chosen to communicate the events of the past to visitors. In order to investigate how explicitly the national socialist past is talked about in Germany today, I would like to turn to a discussion of the memorial sites: both in regards to those principal memorial sites “of exceptional national and international significance”¹¹, as well as to the memorial for the Former Youth Concentration Camp and Later Extermination Site at Uckermark. The former were radically re-designed in the course of Reunification – remembrance had a new political orientation. The process has been accompanied by lengthy, broad and heated debates about how this past should be handled – and a major aspect of those discussions was and is the language

that is used to speak about that past. This re-orientation of (official) remembrance constitutes the background for the current discussions surrounding the naming of the memorial for the Former Youth Concentration Camp and Later Extermination Site at Uckermark; a camp that is counted as one of the many disowned sites of national socialist atrocities.

Example 1: The memorial sites “of exceptional national and international significance” and the Federal Memorial Sites Concept

As was the case with many other places of remembrance, the official, federal National Socialism memorial sites in Germany were often hard-fought for by survivors and their relatives, as well as by the family members of those murdered. Their demands for the dignified treatment of their place of suffering, for the appropriate memorialization of those who were murdered, and for accountability were often met with refusal. Nevertheless, many survivors remained active in the memorial institutions in both German States and reported from their perspective on the terror that they had experienced, advocating tirelessly for “Nie wieder!”. In the GDR, the Ministry of Culture was responsible for the administration of the so-called “Nationale Mahn- und Gedenkstätten”, the national memorial and remembrance sites, up until its dissolution. They were also seen as part of the cultural and educational policy in the Federal Republic of Germany (commonly known as West Germany), although the respective federal states were exclusively responsible for them.

As mentioned above, in the course of the Reunification efforts, it became especially clear how important it was for Germany to show the world that they had dealt with their own past. For that reason, the principle National Socialism memorial sites were put into the spotlight: They were no longer just for the local school children to visit, but were now representative places of international importance. They now became the so-called “poster-children”, demonstrating the success of Germany’s “Vergangenheitsbewältigung”. In the process, the responsible parties also

changed: As of the beginning of the 1990s in the Federal Republic of Germany, it was no longer the respective federal states alone which were responsible for the memorial sites. The conceptual framework of the main, larger memorial sites such as Dachau, Bergen-Belsen, Buchenwald or Ravensbrück now became an important state affair. Its basis was a new, nationally uniform concept for memorial sites, which included the regulation of funding allocation (the so-called *Bundesgedenkstättenkonzept*, Federal Memorial Sites Concept). Closely linked to that however, was the thematic orientation of the sites. In regards to the question of an adequate representation of the past – as well as to an appropriate usage of language – a decades-long debate broke out: The Federal Memorial Sites Concept was only approved by the Federal Cabinet in June 2008, after a debate lasting over fifteen years, and it remains controversial to this day. During the process, survivor associations either left the negotiations in protest or were not even included in the discussions concerning the re-designing of the larger concentration camp memorial sites. Their critical voices and those of others went unheard during the reorganization, despite numerous formal objections. Their perspective (and therefore their voice and language) had no place in this re-writing of history.¹²

So what are the main points of dispute? From what perspective, for what purpose and in what language is the national socialist past negotiated? The line of attack is made clear in the following citation. It is taken from the introduction to a draft of the Federal Memorial Sites Concept initiated by the CDU representative and ex-GDR civil rights activist Günther Nooke, and submitted by the CDU/CSU parliamentary group on June 17, 2004:

“(…) Förderung von Gedenkstätten zur Diktaturgeschichte in Deutschland – Gesamtkonzept für ein würdiges Gedenken aller Opfer der beiden deutschen Diktaturen. Der Bundestag wolle beschließen: I. Der Deutsche Bundestag stellt fest: Zu den konstitutiven Elementen des wiedervereinten Deutschlands gehört das

Gedenken an die Opfer der beiden totalitären Diktaturen des 20. Jahrhunderts: Nationalsozialismus und Kommunismus. Beide sind Bestandteile der deutschen Geschichte. Sowohl die nationalsozialistische Herrschaft von 1933 bis 1945 als auch die kommunistische Diktatur von 1945 bis 1989 sind Kapitel unserer Nationalgeschichte. (...)”¹³

This example clearly shows the direction planned for the official remembrance culture and policy in reunified Germany: a second “totalitäre Diktatur”, namely, Communism, is set alongside National Socialism. For it is not only the future development of remembrance sites concerning National Socialism which are being negotiated in this concept draft; it also includes the conceptual framework of sites at locations of past repression in the Soviet Occupation Zone (SOZ), or what later became the German Democratic Republic. Under the combined label of “Diktatur”, all of the historical-political differences between the two eras seem to disappear. The draft of the text cited above was rejected; however, even if a few paragraphs were changed in the aftermath of protests (which is how a comment on the singularity of the *Shoah* ended up being inserted into the new draft, for instance), on the whole, the text’s orientation remains unchanged: In the final version, there are more than seven pages on the GDR, as opposed to less than two pages on the topic “Gedenkstätten und Erinnerungsorte zur NS-Terrorherrschaft”.¹⁴ This emphasis alone demonstrates “(...) dass die Aufarbeitung des Nationalsozialismus gegenüber der DDR-Aufarbeitung in gewisser Weise als *erledigt* angesehen wird.”¹⁵ The image of the “kommunistische Diktatur” which stands in opposition to an “antitotalitärer Konsens” also continues to be depicted through language.¹⁶

One of the “Gedenkstätten für die Opfer von Krieg und NS-Gewaltherrschaft”¹⁷, promoted by the Federal Memorial Sites Concept, is the Neue Wache war memorial in Berlin. It is a visible example of the efforts to establish a unifying historical narrative under the label of “Totalitarismus”: In the former GDR, the Neue Wache had been the “Mahnmal für die Opfer des Faschismus und Militarismus” since 1960. As part of its redesign in 1993, it became the “Zentrale Gedenkstätte der

Bundesrepublik Deutschland für die Opfer von Krieg und Gewaltherrschaft". This reorientation – made obvious just by looking at the effacing character of the new nomenclature – was accompanied by a long series of debates and protests, primarily by associations made up of the victims of National Socialism. As in the case of the critical discussions around the Federal Memorial Sites Concept, criticism was directed at the relativization of National Socialism through its equation with other repressive regimes, as well as at the blurring and distortion of historical facts, instead of clearly naming those responsible, the causes and the consequences. The journalist Claudia Krieg examines a further aspect in regards to this discussion: "(...) Die kommunistische Diktatur hat begrifflich die nationalsozialistische Diktatur abgelöst und zu einer allgemeinen 'Schreckensherrschaft' werden lassen. Von dieser waren auch die Deutschen (vor allem) betroffen, das wird allgemein so verhandelt. Die NS-TäterInnenenschaft bleibt seit über 60 Jahren hinter 'Terror' und 'Schreckensherrschaft' verborgen. [Kulturstaatsminister, SD] Neumann deklariert damit erneut die NS-Deutschen zu einem Kollektiv von 'Beherrschten'."18 Along these lines, the Neue Wache memorial site is no longer dedicated to the victims of fascism; the inscription on the memorial plaque next to the entrance could not have been formulated more generally. Perpetrators are not named, and the commemoration is undifferentiated: First the fallen are mentioned, then the victims of war and displacement and finally those who were murdered during the era of National Socialism – although the latter is not named as such, instead, the rather vague term "Gewaltherrschaft" is repeated here. Only once do you see the words "totalitäre Diktatur": "Wir gedenken aller Frauen und Männer, die verfolgt und ermordet wurden, weil sie sich totalitärer Diktatur *nach 1945* widersetzt haben."19 What they are referring to here is the GDR. An article from March 13, 2013 in the *Berliner Zeitung* demonstrates the direction that this development could take: The author discusses a corresponding re-dedication under the title "Die Neue Wache als Denkmal für DDR-Opfer?" In the article, Hubertus Knabe, the director of the Berlin-Hohenschönhausen Stasi Memorial, complains that "Man gedenkt in Berlin so vielen Opfergruppen, aber ausgerechnet den Opfern des Unrechtssystems, dem weltweit die meisten Menschen zum Opfer fielen, gedenkt man

nicht.” Within that particular context, it is obvious that he is talking about the GDR. And Rainer Wagner from the *Union der Opferverbände kommunistischer Gewaltherrschaft* (UOKG) demanded a warning inscription be included at the Neue Wache as a reminder. He argues: “Diesen Weg, den Kommunismus nämlich, darf man nie wieder einschlagen.”²⁰ National Socialism is no longer included in any of those considerations.

I have attempted to provide brief insight into the current political-linguistic tendencies in Germany around the topic of National Socialism. Up until now, there has been no broad, explicit naming of national socialist crimes (and thus the assumption of responsibility) in the country of the perpetrators. After a period of tabooification and silence, it appears as though Germany’s history of the 20th century is omnipresent. However, instead of emphasizing the uniqueness of the German extermination campaign as such, uncritical parallels between National Socialism and the “DDR-Regime” are drawn.²¹ Under the label of totalitarianism and dictatorship, this equalization makes fundamental differences disappear. The meanings are shifted, and the result is irritation and confusion. The overall picture is not characterized by clear lines (of nomenclature), but seems to be painted with watercolors that are no longer clearly distinguishable from one another – a similar blurring effect found with the usage of euphemisms. If, however, the respective characteristics of National Socialism and the political system of the GDR were clearly named, then it would be simply impossible to equate the two. Instead, the “de-naming” detour, using ambiguous terms such as “Gewaltherrschaft”, makes it possible to gradually invest them with different meanings.

This social climate is the background for the current debate surrounding the naming of the memorial site of the Former Youth Concentration Camp and Later Extermination Site at Uckermark. In the following section, I will provide a brief outline of those discussions.

Example 2: The naming of the memorial at the Former Youth Concentration Camp and Later Extermination Site at Uckermark

After a good deal of struggle, some memorials and places of remembrance of national socialist crimes have been constructed in Germany – nevertheless, there are still innumerable locations of national socialist terror whose existence has been denied. Initiatives for the remembrance of these sites came into existence, however, and continue to do so. Many have the aim of creating some form of memorialization at those locations; others are using other forms of remembrance or actions to bring attention to the history of National Socialism or to the continuities which still reach through into the present day. They often work closely with survivors and/or their relatives. In addition to remembrance, central themes include political demands such as the persecution of perpetrators or “Entschädigung” for survivors.²² Some antifascist initiatives have been founded in recent years which focus on the memorialization of the victims of neo-Nazis.²³

The site of the Former Youth Concentration Camp and Later Extermination Site at Uckermark is one of those locations where national socialist criminal activities have been denied – they are often described as “vergessene Lager” (euphemistic once again). It is located about 80 kilometers north of Berlin, right next to the Ravensbrück Memorial Site. While the remembrance and memorial site for this former women’s concentration camp was already inaugurated in 1959 and is funded through the Federal Memorial Sites Concept, no attention was paid to the existence of the neighboring former youth concentration camp for many years.²⁴

The Youth Concentration Camp at Uckermark was created between 1942 and 1945; according to estimates, about 1,000-1,200 girls and young women were imprisoned there. A 1937 ordinance in the name of “vorbeugende Verbrechensbekämpfung” enabled the random criminalization of girls as so-called “Asoziale” and their imprisonment in concentration camps. Some survivors, who were stigmatized as “asozial” or “sexuell verwahrlost” report upon how they

continued to face discrimination even after 1945 – and for that reason, they did not tell their stories for a long time.²⁵ There were prisoners who were Slovenian partisans, young women from the socialist workers' movement, as well as fans or supporters of the "Swing-Jugend". Some young Sinti and Roma women and girls as well as other people who were persecuted on the basis of racism were also imprisoned in the Youth Concentration Camp at Uckermark.²⁶ While it existed, the camp was called "Jugendschutzlager", making it sound like something harmless. In winter 1944/1945, a part of the Uckermark Camp was altered in order to function as an extermination site. The resistance fighter, ethnologist and Ravensbrück survivor Germaine Tillion reports that mass murder was perpetrated there: By means of starvation, poisoning and firing squad, and as a result of hours-long roll calls conducted in the freezing cold, after the prisoners had been forced to give up their warm clothes.²⁷ The survivor Janina H. described the same situation in a later trial.²⁸ Moreover, Tillion reported that 50 to 60 women were taken every evening to be murdered in the Ravensbrück gas chambers. The exact number of prisoners murdered between January to April 1945 is unknown, but it has been estimated that about 5,000 women were killed.²⁹

Since the mid-1990s, the survivors' association *Lagergemeinschaft Ravensbrück/Freundeskreis e.V.* (referred to subsequently as LGR/F)³⁰ and a self-organized feminist, anti-fascist network that eventually became the *Initiative für einen Gedenkort ehemaliges KZ Uckermark e. V.* (referred to subsequently as the *Initiative*)³¹, committed themselves to the remembrance of the site of this camp. Their lengthy efforts appear to have been worth it: They were successful in raising awareness about the history of the camp through diverse, public-oriented actions and through working on the former site of the camp itself.³² Their work has made it possible to get closer to the goal of creating a dignified memorial at this location. The number of people engaged in the remembrance of those who agonized in this camp has increased greatly in recent years, and there have been many controversial debates about the current and future design of the memorial site.³³ Since 2011, interested individuals, groups and institutions have been meeting together as part of the so-called Uckermark Working Group to work on a concept for the future memorial site and its

conversion. The Uckermark Working Group is not a hierarchically organized, institutionalized structure, but rather an open committee. Just from looking at the composition of the Uckermark Working Group, it is clear how diverse the positions are from which people are negotiating and speaking.³⁴ There are self-organized political activists, relatives of the survivors, representatives of a major, federal memorial site (the Ravensbrück Memorial Site), local interest groups, the mayor of the city of Fürstenberg (which owns the former camp site), as well as the consistent participation of relevant Land ministers.

One of the main topics of debate concerning this future memorial site is its name – in other words, it is a debate about language, about the words used today to negotiate the national socialist past in Germany. As a part of that process, the usage of euphemisms has once again become a main focus. Why, however, is this debate only being held now? Did the site not have a name up until now? Although the literature on the Uckermark camp is not very comprehensive, its appellation is inconsistent even within that manageable amount of documentation. It changes depending on the perspective of the individual(s) speaking about the camp – or rather: the camps – for, due to the camp being transformed into a site of targeted extermination in the winter of 1944/45, we must speak here of two types of camps – and also name them. In his article, “*Uckermark*” *benennen oder die “Mühe des Begriffs”*, Matthias Heyl gives a good summary of the names used to refer to the Uckermark camp (or camps).³⁵ For the period in which it was a youth concentration camp, he makes use of the appellations from the era of National Socialism that make it sound less harmful than it really was, namely, “Jugendschutzlager” and “Jugenderziehungslager”, claiming them to be “zeitgenössisch”. Heyl then classifies the camps so named as part of the national socialist concentration camp system.³⁶ He subsequently provides a detailed description of the different appellation practices used by authors who have published on the subject. The difference often lies solely in the placement of the quotation marks, which are supposed to mark national socialist euphemisms: either the camp and the location are written in quotation marks, or only the term

“Jugenschutzlager”, or neither.³⁷ Heyl also mentions the established appellations “Mädchenkonzentrationslager” or “Jugendkonzentrationslager”, but criticizes them, claiming that they are not historical and that the term “Konzentrationslager” is in and of itself a euphemism.³⁸ We know from survivors’ reports that the youth concentration camp was generally called “youth camp” by the prisoners themselves – and by that I also mean the “Ravensbrückerinnen”. That appellation comes from the structuring of the Ravensbrück camp complex, to which the women’s camp, the men’s camp, the Siemens camp and the youth camp belonged. In contrast, there is no known historical appellation for the extermination site established there between January and April 1945 to my knowledge – at least not from the side of the perpetrators. However, former Ravensbrück or Uckermark prisoners do not only speak of a “Jugendlager”, but also of a “Vernichtungslager”.³⁹ In the literature on the subject, one can find appellations such as “Sterbezone”⁴⁰, “Sterbe- und Selektionslager”⁴¹ or “Todeszone”⁴², but also the term “Vernichtungslager”⁴³.

Therefore, a variety of terms are used for both camps, and people use varying appellations interchangeably within an individual text when speaking about “Uckermark” (Erpel, see above). When particular terms are used within running text, it can easily be managed by explaining what is meant by the changing terminology – in an overall context, nomenclature such as “Jugendlager” can be clearly classified, for example – however, as a stand-alone, detached appellation of a memorial site, that would no longer be the case. In both the literature and in the Uckermark Working Group, they often discuss the issue of an appropriate name for the Uckermark Camp memorial site alongside the topic of euphemisms and their trivializing effect, that is, in this case, their ability to make something appear less harmful than it actually is; the controversial aspect of those discussions is how those euphemisms should be handled. In general, a name is made up of one or a few words. A name provides an image of what something is; it creates a picture in the mind; it “sticks”. The translation scholar Susanne Göpferich writes, “Wir ‘haben einen Begriff’ (eine Vorstellung) von etwas und benutzen Benennungen, mit denen wir diese Vorstellung zum Ausdruck bringen, mit

denen wir sie versprachlichen.”⁴⁴ To this effect, what “Uckermark” is called is extremely formative in terms of the image that is conjured up about what this camp actually was.

Broadly speaking, there are two contrasting positions by the most visible actors in the debate about the naming of this site: the *Lagergemeinschaft Ravensbrück/Freundeskreis e.V.* and the *Initiative für einen Gedenkort ehemaliges KZ Uckermark e. V.* represent one of these, and the institution of the Ravensbrück Memorial Site the other. The former are demanding that there be a clear and unambiguous naming of the events that took place there, while the federal memorial site representatives are advocating for the adoption of the national socialist euphemism as the historical nomenclature. As there is no such historical nomenclature for the camp’s second phase, the memorial site institution uses the term “Sterbe- und Selektionslager”, which to my knowledge has never been used as part of the name of the former camp, but rather only included as part of written texts on the subject. In the following section, I will outline the different positions.

The LGR/F and the *Initiative* currently use the name “Jugendkonzentrationslager und späteres Vernichtungslager Uckermark”. At the same time however, the naming of the camp is understood as a process; the debates on the subject are transparent and publicly accessible on their website: “Die von uns gewählte Bezeichnung des Lagers als ‘ehemaliges Jugendkonzentrationslager für Mädchen und junge Frauen‘ und nicht der früher viel verwendete Begriff ‚Mädchenkonzentrationslager‘ ist das Ergebnis einer Diskussion mit der Lagergemeinschaft Ravensbrück/ Freundeskreis e.V. aus dem Jahre 2006. In dieser Diskussion wurde übereinstimmend entschieden, zukünftig diesen Begriff zu verwenden, um den Zusammenhang mit den anderen Jugendkonzentrationslagern in Moringen und Lodz zu verdeutlichen und der Tatsache zu entsprechen, dass auch vereinzelt Jungen hier inhaftiert gewesen sind.”⁴⁵ Moreover, the *Initiative* consistently points out the importance of its recognition as a concentration camp for the survivors – as it was in 1970 in the Federal Republic of Germany (cf. electronic Bundesanzeiger AT65 1970

V5) and in 1972 in the German Democratic Republic: That recognition was necessary in order to be able to even apply for “reparations” – even though those applications were unsuccessful in most cases.⁴⁶ Members of the *Initiative* also emphasize that unambiguously naming the site as a concentration camp also signifies a recognition of the injustices perpetrated upon the prisoners in “Uckermark”. Taking up a clear position is important to the *Initiative*, especially considering that the situation is such that many of the survivors continued and continue to suffer under the “asozial” stigma, based on the widespread concept that they basically bear the blame for their admittance into a kind of re-education institution. For that reason, it also wants to support those survivors who to this day are still struggling for the explicit naming of this site as a concentration camp. One of these individuals is Maria Potrzeba, who spoke to that point on a radio show on WDR5 on 09/16/2012: “Ich habe gehört, dass aus ‘Uckermark’ auch eine Gedenkstätte werden soll und dass man das als ‘Jugendschutzlager’ bezeichnen will. Das darf nicht sein! Das ist kein ‘Jugendschutzlager’ gewesen. Es war wirklich kein Schutz! Es war Hunger, es war Strafe, es war Verachtung.”⁴⁷

The *Initiative* also makes it possible to trace the search for an appropriate name for the camp’s second phase. Based on the wishes of the survivors, it erected and dedicated a memorial stone that it had made for the prisoners of the camp at the celebration of the 64th anniversary of the liberation held in April 2009. They say the following about its inscription: “Die Inschrift des Gedenksteins stellte uns vor einige Schwierigkeiten. Eine Inschrift kann nur sehr verkürzt darstellen, was wirklich hier geschah. Zudem war dieser Ort ja nicht nur Konzentrationslager sondern ab Anfang 1945 auch Vernichtungslager. Um dieses Lager jedoch gegenüber den Vernichtungslagern im Osten abzugrenzen haben wir vom Netzwerk uns entschieden ‘späteres Vernichtungslager’ als Begriff zu benutzen. Bewusst entschieden haben wir uns gegen den Begriff ‘Sterbelager’(...). Der Begriff ‘Sterbelager’ erweckt bei uns den Anschein, als wären hier Menschen zum friedlichen Sterben hergeschickt worden statt systematisch ermordet zu werden.”⁴⁸ However, the debate surrounding the current name has yet to come to an end, as the following reference is

found on the *Initiative*'s website (excerpt): "Seit einiger Zeit diskutieren wir (...) über die Bezeichnung Vernichtungslager für die Monate Januar bis April 1945 im Konzentrationslager Uckermark. Häufig gibt es den Einwand, die Bezeichnung würde das KZ Uckermark Orten und Geschehen wie in Belzec, Sobibor, Auschwitz u. a. Vernichtungslagern gleichsetzen. Wir wollten den Unterschied durch den Zusatz *späteres* Vernichtungslager deutlich machen, ausdrücken, dass das Lager kurz vor Kriegsende zu einem Ort des Massenmords umfunktioniert wurde. (...) Wir möchten mit einer Bezeichnung nicht verharmlosen oder verschleiern, was in den letzten Monaten vor der Befreiung dort geschehen ist. (...) Das Lager [wurde] nicht zum Hospiz, sondern zum Ort gezielter Vernichtung. Wir suchen nach einer Bezeichnung, die den systematischen und willkürlichen Mord an tausenden Menschen deutlich macht und die trotzdem die oben genannten Einwände berücksichtigt. Wir sind im Diskussionsprozess, Beiträge zu diesem Thema sind uns sehr willkommen."⁴⁹ The *Initiative* is thus leading a very open debate about the naming of the memorial site, and invites participation in the discussion – although their process is in no way arbitrary: They explicitly state their goal of clarity and unambiguity, and the usage of euphemisms is rejected due to their consistently trivializing effect.

In contrast, the Ravensbrück Memorial Site institution uses the euphemistic, historical nomenclature for the Uckermark Camp, namely "Jugendschutzlager Uckermark", enclosed in quotation marks for the most part. At the same time, the memorial institution's representatives are well aware of the effect of euphemisms – as are the other identifiable participants in the discussion. That point is made especially clear in Matthias Heyl's above-cited text; written by an individual who has represented the institution in discussions with the Uckermark Working Group as the Director of the Ravensbrück Memorial Education Department. One of Heyl's fields of expertise as an educationist is "education after/about Auschwitz". By no means is anyone alleging that this usage of euphemisms is in order to conceal something – so how do he and the memorial site institution justify their naming practices?

I would like to answer this question with the help of the “Besucherleitsystem” that the Ravensbrück Memorial Site has developed over the last years and to which Heyl refers in his article.⁵⁰ The visitor wayfinding system is meant to make it easier for visitors to orient themselves at the site: Historical places are marked and briefly described on informational signs. Areas which belong to the historical camp complex, but not to the memorial site, are also included in this wayfinding system – Stele 35, for example, provides information about the Uckermark camp. This stele also exclusively uses the name “Jugendschutzlager Uckermark” (in quotation marks); the title makes no reference to the camp’s second phase. Only in the column’s brief text can one read of its later use as a “Sterbe- und Selektionslager” (without quotation marks), for which the English translation of the text actually reads “camp for dying prisoners”. Heyl formulates his concerns (and therefore also those of the memorial site institution?), that he purports to address with his naming practice, in the following way: “Dass in dem Text des Besucherleitsystems der Gedenkstätte zum ‘Jugendschutzlager Uckermark’ die historischen Termini ‘Jugenderziehungslager’ und ‘Jugendschutzlager Uckermark’ – in Parenthese (also in Anführungszeichen) gesetzt – verwendet werden, versucht der Notwendigkeit Rechnung zu tragen, nationalsozialistische Begriffe in ihrer euphemistischen Position ebenso zu dekonstruieren wie in dem, was sie eben doch über ihre nationalsozialistische, ideologische Rahmung auszusagen wissen. Die Begriffe ganz zu bannen, indem man sie gar nicht verwendete, funktionierte nicht, nähme uns sogar Anlass und Gelegenheit, sie zu dekonstruieren.”⁵¹ A few paragraphs previous, Heyl wrote that it was “notwendig und unabdingbar, die ‘Mühe des Begriffs’ auf sich zu nehmen – und das heißt, die Begriffe gerade dort, wo sie verharmlosend sind, als Deckbegriffe zu dekonstruieren und sichtbar zu machen. Hier hilft Konkretion, Darstellung dessen, was sich hinter dem Begriff tatsächlich verbirgt oder dahinter verborgen wurde.”⁵² Heyl and the memorial institution’s editorial staff reject the name “Jugend-KZ” because, on the one hand, to them it seemed to be “als nachträgliche Bezeichnung problematisch”, and on the other hand, because the term “Konzentrationslager” was itself a euphemism. As far as their own retroactive naming of the camp’s second phase as “Selektions- und Sterbelager”, there

was no detailed explanation of the choice other than a short remark saying that it was based on the historian Bernhard Strebel's formulation.⁵³

Conclusion

If the positions in the discussion concerning the naming of the Memorial Site of the Former Youth Concentration Camp and Later Extermination Site at Uckermark are compared, then one comes to an almost surprising conclusion: The goals appear to be the same! All participating actors are aware of the effect of euphemisms, all reject that effect; all appear to be more concerned with clarity, or "Konkretion". However, the directions they choose to take in their search for the appropriate nomenclature differ: the Lagergemeinschaft Ravensbrück/Freundeskreis e.V. and the Initiative für einen Gedenkort ehemaliges KZ Uckermark e. V. are looking for a name which would provide the most clarity, as well as visibility, to both of the camp's phases. They are open to criticism, and call on others to take part in the search and engage in the discussions together. The *Initiative* does not "ban" national socialist euphemisms, as Heyl suggests in the above citation – it names and discusses them, but in the body of the text rather than in the title. In contrast, the Ravensbrück Memorial Site institution already attempts "Dekonstruktion" in its naming of the Uckermark camp: The quotation marks are supposed to quasi "unmask" the national socialist euphemism. However, even Heyl, as their representative, must point to the body of the text or even to the Ravensbrück Memorial Site's main exhibition for a deeper discussion.⁵⁴

At the beginning of this article, I discussed how powerful language and language use is for the construction of our perception of reality. Armed with that knowledge, many euphemisms were used as camouflage words during the era of National Socialism. Later, those expressions were supposed to be replaced with clarity during the Allied Forces efforts at denazification. Unfortunately, those efforts were not very successful: I have attempted to demonstrate with the use

of a few examples how the dominant representation of history in Germany is not characterized by a clear description of facts, but rather by vagueness. The fundamental differences between National Socialism and the political system in the GDR disappear behind such fuzzy terms as “tyranny” and “totalitarianism”.

Precisely in view of the above outlined functions of euphemisms, and the very real consequences of their usage, one must in conclusion ask why they should be held to – especially in the context of memorial and remembrance politics. Why reproduce names which serve to cover-up, if we are committed to the critical spirit of the Enlightenment? Why does the Ravensbrück Memorial Site institution determinedly hold on to this national socialist euphemism in their naming of the Uckermark camp? As we have seen, it is not based on any desire to sugarcoat the truth. Neither can ignorance be alleged, as the institution is well aware of the effects of particular language use: on the recognition of the injustices perpetrated upon the prisoners (or lack thereof), on reparation demands (or lack thereof), on the persecution of the perpetrators (or lack thereof), or on the work to raise awareness among youth. No, the memorial institution also wants to encourage a discussion about language and its effect. However, the arguments provided for the usage of national socialist terminology as a name for the Uckermark camp are not convincing. Even Heyl himself clearly demonstrates in his article that he is aware that what is actually meant by the usage of particular euphemisms can only be inferred from the concrete context – but a name is more often than not heard or read in isolation, without any such clarifying context – and quotation marks used for the purpose of “deconstruction” and “Darstellung dessen, was sich hinter dem Begriff tatsächlich verbirgt oder dahinter verborgen wurde”⁵⁵ are certainly insufficient. The quotation marks are not heard in spoken language, and what remains is simply the national socialist euphemism – and its effect; the image that it creates in our minds, the concept that it communicates to us about what it is supposed to be.

As mentioned above, Heyl and the Ravensbrück Memorial Site institution argue as part of their opposition to the proposal of the title “Jugendkonzentrationslager” that “Konzentrationslager” is itself a euphemism. That is true. That term has been used for prisoner camps worldwide at different times; it is in and of itself very unspecific and is definitely often used in a diminishing way, trivializing the harm suffered there. However, in this case the term is used in a clear context so that its meaning is no longer arbitrary. *In and of itself*, “Konzentrationslager” does remain a euphemism, but in the context of National Socialism, it has lost its masking effect. It stands much more clearly for the terrible cruelty which it is meant to name. The image of a national socialist concentration camp is surely clearer than that of a “youth *protection* camp” (protection for whom, by whom, from whom?). For that reason, the naming of the camp as a “Konzentrationslager” also plays a central role for survivors who are struggling for recognition of the suffering that they experienced there: on a legal, societal and therefore also quite personal level.

I find the critical discussion of “Jugendkonzentrationslager” as a “nachträgliche Bezeichnung” confusing – is it not about naming things by their names, instead of reproducing “NS-Deutsch”? In his article, *Kristallnacht: Murder by Euphemism*, Rabbi Benjamin Blech writes the following:

“*Kristallnacht* is German for ‘the night of crystal.’ And 70 years after the horrible events of 1938 should have given us by now sufficient perspective to expose the lie of a horrible WMD – Word of Mass Deception – that epitomizes the key to the most powerful methodology for murder perfected by the Nazis. How, after all, were the Nazis able to commit their crimes under the veneer of civilized respectability? (...) They glorified the principle of murder by euphemism. (...) We must pledge never again to allow evil to enter our lives disguised as the good and the noble.”⁵⁶

Although the above citation refers to a different, specific euphemistic appellation (*Kristallnacht*), Rabbi Blech’s criticism of the usage of euphemisms is transferable to other examples.

The debate surrounding the naming of the Memorial Site of the Former Youth Concentration Camp and Later Extermination Site at Uckermark is not over. As far as I am concerned, the usage and reproduction of national socialist euphemisms (within inaudible and non-self-explaining quotation marks) is wrong, regardless of any good intentions. That suggested naming also leaves the camp's second phase invisible. The name "Jugendkonzentrationslager", however, clearly denotes what "Uckermark" was – and already in the name. Finding appropriate words to name the camp's second phase in the title is no easy feat, and the discussion participants are still in the midst of that process; a process which may never come to an end either. However, perhaps it is less about perfect solutions, and much more about starting a conversation with one another and engaging together in a collaborative, critical discussion.

In addition, it is also a matter of an individual's position, and for what or for whom that individual feels a sense of responsibility. In Germany, many who investigate how people use language to speak about national socialism are the descendants of perpetrators, and/or were socialized in a perpetrator context. That affects our perspective, the "glasses" through which we see the world. In that regard, Karin Doerr and Kurt Jonassohn make a thought provoking observation in their article, *The Persistence of Nazi German*:

"The use of inappropriate vocabulary is noticeable in many other German publications on the subject, as for example in German school books. (...) Although clearly stating their rejection of the Nazi period, these German authors are unable to find a neutral language and a compassionate tone in their dealings with Nazi atrocities. Very few scholars have remarked on this phenomenon, such as Walter F. Renn and Elisabeth Maxwell. Both associate this use of the Nazi language with siding with the perpetrator instead of showing an understanding for the side of the victims and survivors of the Holocaust. They warn about continuing the use of Nazi

terminology, particularly euphemisms, such as *Endlösung* instead of ‘destruction or mass murder of the European Jews.’”⁵⁷

Although we are certainly incapable of simply taking off our “glasses”, we could attempt to look over the rims. A good place to start would be to listen to and also empower the perspectives of survivors.

Translation into English: Jessica Ring, Subtext Network Berlin/Seattle

Source:

Degen, Sylvia: *Clear Wording or "Historical" Euphemisms?* In: Davies/Hammel (eds.): *New literary and linguistic perspectives on the German language, National Socialism, and the Shoah.* Translation: Jessica Ring. Rochester: Camden House, 2014. P. 25-41.

-
- ¹ The naming of the memorial site is still in process (see below). My choice of the words “later extermination site” is an attempt to make the camp’s second phase visible already in its title – without minimizing it, nor equating it with extermination camps in German-occupied Poland. The naming *Vernichtungsstätte* is also being discussed in the *Initiative für einen Gedenkort ehemaliges KZ Uckermark e.V.*, an initiative created to work towards the creation of a memorial space at the former Uckermark concentration camp.
 - ² Victor Klemperer, *LTI: Notizbuch eines Philologen* (Leipzig: Reclam, 1980).
 - ³ Cf. Dirk Deissler, *Die entnazifizierte Sprache: Sprachpolitik und Sprachregelung in der Besatzungszeit* (Frankfurt am Main: P. Lang, 2004), 31.
 - ⁴ Cf. Cornelia Schmitz-Berning, *Vokabular des Nationalsozialismus* (Berlin; New York: de Gruyter, 1998)
 - ⁵ Cf. *Ibid.*, 98.
 - ⁶ *Ibid.*, 92.
 - ⁷ Cf. Carsten Volkery, “Die Deutschen Sind Wieder Da!,” *SPIEGEL ONLINE*, accessed September 10, 2009, http://einestages.spiegel.de/static/topicalbumbackground/4941/_die_deutschen_sind_wieder_da.html.
 - ⁸ Cf. Oliver Das Gupta, “Deutsche Einheit: Für Thatcher war Deutschland eine gefährliche Kröte,” *sueddeutsche.de*, accessed September 10, 2009, <http://www.sueddeutsche.de/politik/deutsche-einheit-fuer-thatcher-war-deutschland-eine-gefaehrliche-kroete-1.28579>.
 - ⁹ Torben Fischer and Matthias N Lorenz, eds., *Lexikon der “Vergangenheitsbewältigung” in Deutschland: Debatten- und Diskursgeschichte des Nationalsozialismus nach 1945* (Bielefeld: Transcript, 2007), 273.
 - ¹⁰ Cf. AutorInnenkollektiv Autofocus Videowerkstatt, *The Truth Lies in Rostock - Die Wahrheit liegt (lügt) in Rostock* (Germany, UK, 1993), accessed September 10, 2013, http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=4gboC2bsv8w&feature=youtube_gdata_player.
 - ¹¹ BT-Drs. 16/9875, “Drucksache Des Deutschen Bundestags 16/9875 vom 19. Juni 2008: Unterrichtung durch den Beauftragten der Bundesregierung für Kultur und Medien - Fortschreibung der Gedenkstättenkonzeption des Bundes - Verantwortung wahrnehmen, Aufarbeitung verstärken, Gedenken vertiefen” (Deutscher Bundestag, June 19, 2008), p.3, accessed January 10, 2014, http://www.bundesregierung.de/Content/DE/_Anlagen/BKM/2008-06-18-fortschreibung-gedenkstaettenkonzeption-barrierefrei.pdf;jsessionid=F6A9E62A423D83CA6C683433CCB1D644.s4t1?__blob=publicationFile&v=3.
 - ¹² Cf. Sylvia Degen and Claudia Krieg, “Offenes Gedenken auf dem Uckermark-Gelände: Erinnerungsarbeit, politische Auseinandersetzung und Kritik der Nutzbarmachung von Geschichte zur nationalen Identitätsbildung im vereinten Deutschland,” in *Unwegsames Gelände: Das Jugendkonzentrationslager Uckermark - Kontroversen um einen Gedenkort* (Gütersloh: Fördergemeinschaft wissenschaftlicher Publikationen von Frauen, 2013).
 - ¹³ BT-Drs. 15/3048, “Drucksache des Deutschen Bundestages 15/3048: Förderung von Gedenkstätten zur Diktaturgeschichte in Deutschland – Gesamtkonzept für ein würdiges Gedenken aller Opfer der beiden deutschen Diktaturen” (Deutscher Bundestag, April 5, 2004), p.1, accessed January 10, 2014, <http://dip21.bundestag.de/dip21/btd/15/030/1503048.pdf>. (Bold type is taken from the original)

-
- ¹⁴ Cf. BT-Drs. 16/9875
- ¹⁵ Werner Nickolai, *Gedenkstättenpädagogik und Soziale Arbeit* (LIT Verlag Münster, 2013), 261. (Emphasis is taken from the original)
- ¹⁶ Cf. BT-Drs. 16/9875
- ¹⁷ Presse- und Informationsamt der Bundesregierung, “Gedenkstätten für die Opfer von Krieg und NS-Gewaltherrschaft,” *Die Bundesregierung - Staatsminister für Kultur und Medien Bernd Neumann*, accessed February 5, 2013, http://www.bundesregierung.de/Webs/Breg/DE/Bundesregierung/BeauftragterfuerKulturundMedien/aufarbeitung/gedenkstaettenfoerderung/gedenkstaettensopfer/_node.html.
- ¹⁸ Claudia Krieg, “Neuaufgabe der Totalitarismustheorie: Zum Erinnerungsdiskurs und dem neuen Bundesgedenkstättenkonzept,” *Standpunkte* 19 (November 2008), p. 6, accessed January 10, 2014, http://www.rosalux.de/fileadmin/rls_uploads/pdfs/Standpunkte/Standpunkte_0819.pdf.
- ¹⁹ Luisenstädtischer Bildungsverein e.V., “Neue Wache,” *Berlin von A Bis Z*, accessed January 10, 2014, <http://www.luise-berlin.de/berlinaz/indexabz.htm>. (Emphasis SD)
- ²⁰ Knabe and Wagner in: Elmar Schütze, “Zentraler Gedenkort: Die Neue Wache als Denkmal für DDR-Opfer?,” *Berliner Zeitung*, March 13, 2013, accessed January 10, 2014, <http://www.berliner-zeitung.de/berlin/zentraler-gedenkort-die-neue-wache-als-denkmal-fuer-ddr-opfer-,10809148,22092170.html>.
- ²¹ Cf. Fischer and Lorenz, *Lexikon der “Vergangenheitsbewältigung” in Deutschland*.
- ²² Cf. Susanne Lenz, “Aktionsbündnis plant Proteste zur Aktionärsversammlung von Siemens: Entschädigung ehemaliger Zwangsarbeiter gefordert,” *Berliner Zeitung*, August 2, 1997, accessed January 10, 2014, <http://www.berliner-zeitung.de/archiv/aktionsbuenndnis-plant-proteste-zur-aktionaeersversammlung-von-siemens-entschaedigung-ehemaliger-zwangsarbeiter-gefordert,10810590,9236572.html>.
- ²³ See: Günter-Schwanneke-Gedenkinitiative, <http://guenterschwanneke.blogspot.eu/kontakt>. Or: Initiative für ein aktives Gedenken, <http://www.aktivesgedenken.de>.
- ²⁴ Cf. Katja Limbächer, Maike Merten, and Bettina Pfefferle, *Das Mädchenkonzentrationslager Uckermark* (Münster: Unrast, 2005).
- ²⁵ Cf. Chris Rotmund, “Fürsorge als Ausgrenzung: Das Konzentrationslager für Mädchen und junge Frauen Uckermark” (thesis, Hochschule für Angewandte Wissenschaften, 2006), p. 39, accessed January 10, 2014, http://www.gedenkort-kz-uckermark.de/assets/downloads/2006_rotmund-diplomarbeit.pdf.
- ²⁶ Cf. Martin Guse, “Das Jugend-KZ Uckermark – 1942 bis 1945” *Bundeszentrale für politische Bildung*, accessed November 3, 2013, <http://www.bpb.de/geschichte/nationalsozialismus/ravensbrueck/60709/jugend-kz-uckermark?p=1>.
- ²⁷ Cf. Germaine Tillion and Anise Postel-Vinay, *Frauenkonzentrationslager Ravensbrück* (Lüneburg: zu Klampen, 1998), 274, 297, 299).
- ²⁸ Cf. Bernhard Strebel, *Das KZ Ravensbrück: Geschichte eines Lagerkomplexes* (Paderborn: F. Schöningh, 2003), 471.
- ²⁹ Initiative für einen Gedenkort ehemaliges KZ Uckermark e.V., “Reader for the International Antifascist Feminist Working Camp at the Site of the former Youth Concentration Camp Uckermark 2009,” accessed January 10, 2014, http://www.gedenkort-kz-uckermark.de/assets/downloads/baucamps/2009_Reader_baucamp.pdf.
- ³⁰ See: Lagergemeinschaft Ravensbrück/ Freundeskreis e.V., “Wir über uns,” accessed January 16, 2014, <http://www.lg-ravensbrueck.de/>.
- ³¹ See: Initiative für einen Gedenkort ehemaliges KZ Uckermark e.V., “Gedenkort ehemaliges KZ Uckermark,” accessed January 16, 2014, <http://www.gedenkort-kz-uckermark.de/>.
- ³² For example, they constructed historical place markers and informational signage on the formerly completely unmarked site.
- ³³ Cf. Forschungswerkstatt Uckermark, ed., *Unwegsames Gelände: Das Jugendkonzentrationslager Uckermark - Kontroversen um einen Gedenkort* (Gütersloh: Fördergemeinschaft wissenschaftlicher Publikationen von Frauen, 2013).
- ³⁴ Currently the participants – alongside the *Initiative* – are representatives of survivor associations such as the *Lagergemeinschaft Ravensbrück/Freundeskreis e. V.* or the *Vereinigung der Verfolgten des Naziregimes/Bund der Antifaschistinnen und Antifaschisten (Landesverband Brandenburg)*, the *Internationalen Freundeskreis Ravensbrück e. V.*, the *Fürstenberger Förderverein Ravensbrück e. V.* and the *Mahn- und Gedenkstätte Ravensbrück*. In addition, representatives from the city of Fürstenberg as well as the responsible county and federal offices regularly take part in the meetings.
- ³⁵ Matthias Heyl, “Uckermark‘ Benennen Oder Die ‘Mühe Des Begriffs,’” in *Unwegsames Gelände. Das Jugendkonzentrationslager Uckermark - Kontroversen Um Einen Gedenkort*, ed. Forschungsgruppe Uckermark (Gütersloh: Fördergemeinschaft wissenschaftlicher Publikationen von Frauen, 2013), 61–72.
- ³⁶ Cf. *Ibid.*, 62.
- ³⁷ Cf. *Ibid.*, 64.
- ³⁸ Cf. *Ibid.*, 64.
- ³⁹ Cf. Strebel, *Das KZ Ravensbrück*, 460. Or my personal conversations with the survivors Irma Trksak and Esther Bejarano, 2013/2014.

-
- ⁴⁰ Christa Schikorra, *Kontinuitäten der Ausgrenzung: 'asoziale' Häftlinge im Frauen-Konzentrationslager Ravensbrück* (Berlin: Metropol, 2001), 193.
- ⁴¹ Strebel, *Das KZ Ravensbrück*, 459.
- ⁴² Simone Erpel, *Zwischen Vernichtung und Befreiung: Das Frauen-Konzentrationslager Ravensbrück in der letzten Kriegsphase* (Berlin: Metropol, 2005), 80.
- ⁴³ Simone Erpel, "Das 'Jugenschutzlager' Uckermark als Vernichtungslager," in *Das Mädchenkonzentrationslager Uckermark*, 2nd ed. (Münster: Unrast, 2005), 215–233.
- ⁴⁴ Susanne Göpferich, *Interkulturelles Technical Writing: Fachliches adressatengerecht vermitteln - Ein Lehr- und Arbeitsbuch* (Tübingen: G. Narr, 1998), 177.
- ⁴⁵ Initiative für einen Gedenkort ehemaliges KZ Uckermark e.V., "Gedenkort ehemaliges KZ Uckermark."
- ⁴⁶ Cf. Initiative für einen Gedenkort ehemaliges KZ Uckermark e.V., "Rede Befreiungsfeier April 2009," accessed January 10, 2014, http://www.gedenkort-kz-uckermark.de/assets/downloads/berichte/2009_RedeBefreiungsfeier.pdf.
- ⁴⁷ Potrzeba in: Monika Mengel, "Maria Potrzeba, Überlebende: Im Mädchen-KZ Uckermark," *Erlebte Geschichten* (WDR 5, September 16, 2012), accessed January 10, 2014, <http://www.wdr5.de/sendungen/erlebtegeschichten/potrzebamaria102.html>.
- ⁴⁸ Initiative für einen Gedenkort ehemaliges KZ Uckermark e.V., "Rede Befreiungsfeier April 2009."
- ⁴⁹ Initiative für einen Gedenkort ehemaliges KZ Uckermark e.V., "Gedenkort ehemaliges KZ Uckermark." (Emphasis SD)
- ⁵⁰ Cf. Heyl, "Uckermark' Benennen Oder Die 'Mühe Des Begriffs.," 70.
- ⁵¹ Ibid.
- ⁵² Ibid., 63.
- ⁵³ Cf. Ibid., 71.
- ⁵⁴ Cf. Ibid.
- ⁵⁵ Ibid., 63.
- ⁵⁶ Benjamin Blech, "Kristallnacht: Murder by Euphemism," *Aish.com*, August 11, 2008, accessed January 10, 2014, <http://www.aish.com/ho/i/Kristallnacht-Murder-by-Euphemism.html>.
- ⁵⁷ Karin Doerr and Kurt Jonassohn, "The Persistence of Nazi German," *Montreal Institute for Genocide and Human Rights Studies: MIGS Occasional Paper*, April 1999, accessed January 10, 2014, http://migs.concordia.ca/occpapers/n_german.html.