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“We Could Smell That He’s Stasi...”
Power and Justification Strategies of the Stasi in Music Life in the GDR and in Swedish-German Music Contacts
By Petra Garberding

Justification of the political-operational necessity of recruiting
The political-operational necessity of the [candidate’s] advertising lies in the concrete political-operational situation within the group of people responsible for the musical life of the GDR. […] It is of particular importance that the candidate has extensive connections in the area of operations, which can be used for the acquisition of information about the aims and intentions of the leading personalities of musical life in Sweden, the Federal Republic of Germany and Austria; this is important for the MfS, because it opens opportunities for compiling information from other ranges of the economic and social life of these states through the circle of acquaintances of the candidate’s extensive contacts with leading representatives of the monopoly capital. […]¹

This quotation is an example of the motivation for the choice of the musicologist Gerd Schönfelder (1936–2000) as an unofficial employee (inoffizieller Mitarbeiter, IM) of the Stasi (Ministry for State Security of the GDR, MfS or Stasi). Schönfelder, who had an extensive network in musicians’ circles in Sweden, West Germany and Austria, and who was also a respected musicologist during the GDR era, seemed to the Stasi staff to be a suitable person to “enlighten” the GDR authorities about the conditions in musical, social and economic life in these states, to use Stasi terminology. I will return to Schönfelder later in this article.

The aim of this article is to give an insight into the influence of the Stasi on musical life in the GDR and on musical relations between the GDR and Sweden. How did the Stasi exercise power, how was this power justified and what can the exercise of power tell us about ideas regarding music and politics? On the basis of some concrete examples I want to show how the Stasi’s exercise of power was vindicated, accepted and challenged and what consequences it could have for those affected.

Central concepts of this article are power and “orders of justification” (Rechtfertigungsordnungen). This discourse model was elaborated by the Frankfurt School of Critical Theory and has been developed further by the research association “Normative Orders” (Forst & Günther 2010).²

By linking the concepts of power and orders of justification, one seeks to make clear how power functions as a system of legitimization of social rules, norms and institutions (Forst & Günther 2010:2). This concept of power has in common with Michel Foucault’s concept of power that it is understood as a social phenomenon that can be both oppressive and productive, as well as the idea of power as something discursively constructed that operates in cognitive space (Forst 2015:74). Forst and Günther, however, are of the opinion that Foucault’s concept of power is nevertheless too much about presenting power as negatively connoted – as a power that tends to limit and constrain subjects – rather than illustrating the freedom of subjects to reject or accept the justifications for the exercise of power by others (Forst 2015:74; Forst & Günther 2010:3). Therefore their theoretical model strongly emphasizes power as “the ability to bind others by reasons (justifications)” (Forst 2015:98). It is also about analysing the discursive space “in which claims of justification can be raised, contested, and defended, that is, a discursive space in which the participants can carry out their struggles for normative orders as a dispute over justifying reasons” (Forst & Günther 2010:3). Forst and Günther’s model is
well suited for this study to reveal strategies for the justification of power and to show how the Stasi succeeded – or failed – in combining music and politics in its own sense.

It is also about analysing the discursive space “in which claims of justification can be raised, contested, and defended, that is, a discursive space in which the participants can carry out their struggles for normative orders as a dispute over justifying reasons” (Forst & Günther 2010:3).

Forst distinguishes four forms of power: 1. “Noumenal power”: Power as “the capacity of person A to influence person B so that he or she thinks or acts in a way that goes back to A’s influence, which must be intentional in nature, otherwise one would speak only of effect and not of power” (Forst 2015:97). The point here is to use justification narratives to convince person B to accept the power of A as legitimate. When person B accepts the justification strategies of A as meaningful, Forst speaks of “noumenal power”. It is important that noumenal power describes the power relations between equal persons and is based on free will. Person B can reject the justification strategies of person A without suffering disadvantages; this form of power is exercised between “free actors” (Forst 2015:60). The aim here, however, is also to make “invisible exercise of power” visible (Forst 2015:59).

2. By coercion or subjugation (Beherrschung) Forst means asymmetrical conditions that generate a justification space that is based on certain “not well-founded legitimizations”: Person B does not accept the reasons of person A. Person A maybe speaks here of a “God-intentioned” or unchangeable order or “the space of justifications is ideologically sealed” (Forst 2015:97). Here there is often illegitimate coercion.

3. When specific forms of exercising power are part of social or political relations, which conforms to a special order in a society, Forst speaks of domination (Herrschaft). Here, too, there is often illegitimate coercion.

4. Violence is another asymmetrical form of power where physical coercion exists. Here the person exercising power is in principle powerless, strictly speaking, since the ruled have not accepted the justifications of power and the person exercising power is now resorting to physical methods of coercion. According to Forst, “Power is the ability to bound others by reasons; it is a core phenomenon of normativity” (Forst 2015:98). As we will see, all these forms of power existed in the GDR.

The material for this article comes from Swedish and German archives, including the archives of the Federal Commissioner for the Records of the State Security Service of the former German Democratic Republic (der Bundesbeauftragte für die Unterlagen des Staatssicherheitsdienstes der ehemaligen Deutschen Demokratischen Republik, MfS or Stasi), and the archives of the Royal Academy of Music in Stockholm (Kungliga Musikaliska Akademien, KMA). The author also conducted 13 interviews with contemporary witnesses. In this article, two of these informants, who were themselves affected by the Stasi or who got to know IM of the Stasi, have their say. The contemporary witnesses quoted by name in this article were able to read and comment on the
quotations from the interviews before publication. The article is part of the research project “Between East and West: Ideology, Aesthetics and Politics in the Music Relations between Sweden and the GDR 1949–1989”, which runs until 2020 and is carried out by the author together with the historian Henrik Rosengren and the musicologist Ursula Geisler; it is financed by the Baltic Sea Foundation at the Södertörn University in Sweden.

The article is a contribution to research on music as a cultural, social and political phenomenon. It is about studying music and musical creation in the field of tension between societal norms and values, as well as social and economic conditions. The focus is usually not on music per se, but rather on the social conditions for musicians, music critics, composers, musicologists and others (see, among others, Dankič 2019; Fredriksson 2018; Arvidsson 2014; Arvidsson 2008).

This article is also a contribution to research on music and music politics in the GDR. There are already a number of studies on various musical actors and areas in the GDR, but so far little research on international contacts in music and on the methods of power of the Stasi on music life in the GDR (Garberding 2020; Garberding, Geisler & Rosengren 2019; Bernhard 2018; Kelly 2019; 2014; Bretschneider 2018; Rosengren 2018; Noeske & Tischer (eds.), 2010; Klingberg 2000). The existing studies are mainly written from musicological perspectives; this article would like to examine the topic of the Stasi’s power methods in music life and in Swedish-German contacts from an ethnological perspective.

Stasi as “Shield and Sword of the Party”

During the GDR era (1949–1989), the Stasi described itself as the “shield and sword of the party” (Heidemeyer 2015: 10).

The task of the Stasi was to secure the SED’s monopoly of power in the state and to expose and ward off attempts to influence and penetrate presumed enemies in good time. In addition, the Stasi operated so-called “counterintelligence”, placing its own spies in strategically important places, who in turn reported to the Stasi. In addition, telephones and apartments were bugged and postal traffic within the GDR and between the GDR and abroad were controlled (Münkell 2015; Polzin 2015).

For Sweden, the GDR was an important trading partner and political and cultural contact. As Birgitta Almgren, professor emerita of German Studies, points out, GDR authorities regarded Sweden as an alliance-free state, which was described as a “focus country” (Schwerpunktsland) and interpreted as an important gateway to Western Europe (Almgren 2011:41; 2009: 15). The GDR regime’s plan was to create a positive opinion of the GDR in Western Europe through friendly links and trade agreements between the GDR and Sweden. Almgren has shown how there were different views of the GDR in Sweden: there were those who judged the GDR positively and interpreted it as a model for modern socialist politics, for instance in culture and education, but there were also those who were critical of the GDR and decried it for lacking freedom of speech and travel (Almgren 2009).

My research in the Stasi archives in Berlin also shows that the Stasi was con-
stantly trying to expand its influence in Sweden and how it was trying to gain insight into Swedish cultural life. This also applies to Swedish musical life.

Choosing the “Right” People
The introductory quotation to this article illustrates how important it was for the Stasi to select the “right” people for its work. A crucial source of information for the Stasi were the so-called “unofficial employees” (GI, *geheimer Informator* [the term until 1968] and IM (*inoffizieller Mitarbeiter* [the designation as of 1968, *BStU 2015:36, 43*]). Their task was to gather information about people, opinions, events and so on in order to help the Stasi protect the GDR against alleged enemies (Gieseke 2011:112–116).

By attempting to gain knowledge about the political views of individuals as early as possible, the Stasi wanted to prevent new rebellions, demonstrations and any opposition activity that could call the power of the SED into question (Florath 2015:40–41). As the German historian Bernd Florath aptly describes it, the IM organization of the Stasi illustrates the state’s fear of its own fellow citizens (Florath 2015:41). German research shows how extensive and comprehensive the monitoring apparatus of the Stasi was, considerably more so than in the other Eastern European countries (Gieseke 2011; Münkel ed. 2015). For example, shortly before the collapse of the GDR, 91,000 people were employed by the Stasi, and they received information from twice as many IMs. The IMs came from all groups in society and from all age groups. About half of the IMs were also members of the SED (Florath 2015:40).

The Stasi recruited its IMs by first having them monitored by other IMs in order to determine whether they were suitable for IM activities. Here the political attitude of the candidate was examined, his/her relationship to the GDR, to socialism and to the SED. But the candidate’s lifestyle was also important, his/her work, family situation, the networks, contacts with the West and engagement in trade unions, associations and in their neighbourhood (Florath 2015:40–47). If a candidate was not positive about working for the Stasi, the Stasi could put the candidate under pressure (Jahn 2014; Almgren 2011).

If a candidate had contacts in the West, the employees of the Stasi investigated to what extent these could be used to the advantage of the Stasi. My studies in Stasi’s archives have shown that in the field of music, the Stasi tried to recruit IMs who were considered particularly professional and respectable by their colleagues, who had a successful career and played an important role in their field. Experts in their field were particularly popular, but they should not be too specialized (Garberding 2020; Garberding, Geisler & Rosengren 2019).

Once the Stasi had found a suitable candidate, Stasi’s employees tried to recruit this person as an IM. For the IM, working with the Stasi could mean many advantages, such as facilitating their further career and greater freedom to travel. IMs also received financial compensation for their work, but usually not large sums. If someone had committed him- or herself as an IM, it was usually impossible to end the cooperation without getting into difficulties (Florath 2015:50). This is corroborated not only by numerous eyewitness ac-
counts and previous research, but also by numerous television films about life in the GDR, such as *Weissensee, Germany 1983*, and *Das Leben der Anderen*.

“K. Bergman” and “John”: “Enlightener” in Musicology

If the selected candidate had agreed to cooperate, he/she normally had to sign a “declaration of commitment” in which he promised to keep his cooperation with the Stasi secret under all circumstances. In her dissertation on the Stasi at the University of Jena, the historian Katharina Lenski has clearly shown how important the silence about any cooperation with the Stasi was; she also speaks here of “circles of silence” or a “silent community” (Lenski 2015:521).

One example of a declaration of commitment is the letter of commitment signed by the musicologist Alfred Brockhaus, who worked for many years at the Institute for Musicology at the Humboldt University (HUB) Berlin, in the 1970s and 1980s as head of the musicology department. Brockhaus received his doctorate in 1962 with the thesis *The Symphony of Dmitri Shostakovich* and in 1969 he was appointed professor of musicology at the HUB. Brockhaus was formally recruited as a “secret informer” (GI) in East Berlin back in 1957, but he did not make his written commitment until three months later:

I, Heinz Alfred Brockhaus, born on 12.8.1930 in Krefeld […] voluntarily commit myself to cooperate with the Ministry of State Security. I will keep this cooperation secret from anyone.

I will sign my written reports with the name K. Bergmann. I am aware that if I break this obligation I may be held responsible under the laws of the GDR. So far I have not been contacted or recruited by any other department.

Berlin, 27.2.1958, Alfred Brockhaus.

According to files in the Stasi archive, Brockhaus had already been prepared to provide the Stasi with information in November 1957. It was the Stasi’s practice to first let possible candidates for cooperation pass a kind of test in order to convince the Stasi of their suitability. Brockhaus had to visit and report about a music arrangement in West Berlin for his “rehearsal”. In the summer of 1957 he gave his report to a Stasi employee in a café in East Berlin. His report convinced the Stasi of his suitability, as he not only fulfilled the assignment, but even more thoroughly than expected wrote about a group of students whom he suspected of working with an opposition group, the Young Community (*Junge Gemeinde*, Klingberg 2000:197). In connection with his recruitment, he was commissioned to contribute to the “Enlightenment of the Institute of Music History” (Klingberg 2000:200). This formulation shows how Stasi’s employees defined their work. They did not interpret their mission, as we do today, as a kind of spying and denunciation. Rather, they saw themselves as employees who were supposed to protect the East German state by helping to achieve “clarity” about the political views and activities of individuals, groups and institutions. From a discourse-analytical perspective, one can speak here of a threat topos, a “locus terriblis” (Wodak 1998:85), which laid the foundation for cooperation with the Stasi. One speaks of a “locus terriblis” when an idea of an existential threat exists and one has to defend oneself in time against an enemy. In the case of the Stasi employees, they learned that one had to protect one’s own state against “foreign powers”, such as the capitalist countries.
In order to clarify whether a threat was present or not, the Stasi needed information from persons who had insight into certain groups, organizations or institutions and had certain networks at their disposal. In the Stasi files, the term “enlightenment” is often used to refer to the gathering of information about suspected opponents of the regime. “Enlightenment” is usually seen as a positive word, and in Stasi’s usage it can also be interpreted as a word that illustrates how the Stasi and its IM perceived their work as something important and constructive (see Almgren 2009:448f.).

One year after his recruitment in 1958, Brockhaus was promoted to Secret Main Informator (GHI, *geheimer Hauptinformator*, BStU 2015:36). Now he also assumed responsibility for supervising other IMs, many of whom were students at the Faculty of Philosophy (Klingberg 2000:202). The meetings with the other IMs were often held in Brockhaus’s office, but according to Brockhaus this became “more and more difficult” for him because he was “rarely alone” (ibid.). An example of one of “Bergmann’s” collaborations with Stasi is his report to his Stasi contact in 1962:

He [Bergmann] reported the following about the Institute of Musicology: There is now a real conception that some students want prove that music has to be apolitical, that music has nothing to do with society. They continue to demand that modern western music be taught and performed at our institution. The following students belong to it: Spokesman [name] 3. Study year. [Name], [name] and [name]. [Name] said the following: What can be reflected in our music? Only fear and terror. […] [Name] says, ideological things are decisive, that’s the trouble with us. If you don’t join in, you’re drilled until it fits.

The GHI estimates that [name] is a distinct enemy. In a seminar presentation with Prof. [Ernst Hermann] Meyer, the student [name] said: “She quoted an essay: ‘Science must abstain from any political comment.’”

The student [name] said to this student [name] that she should only pay attention that she instead of Adolf [Hitler] does not say Walter [Ulbricht]. (Underlining in the original.)

While the students quoted here thought that music and politics should have nothing to do with each other, the interpretation and reporting of the GHI shows that these views challenged the official discourse in the GDR, in which music was supposed to express a certain political ideology. The students were opposed to a discourse order in which the political worldview is prescribed by the state and in which the interpretation of musical expressions is also to be determined. This report to the Stasi shows how the discursive space in musicology at the HUB should be designed according to the official authorities of the GDR: Any questioning of the official discourse on music as an expression of a certain (socialist) ideology should be documented and then so-called “measures” (*Maßnahmen*) taken. As Klingberg has shown, for several of the above-mentioned students the measures meant that an academic career in the GDR was made more difficult or even denied. They had problems getting suitable housing, received lower salaries than their colleagues, and some left the GDR for good (Klingberg 2000:201–202). Concepts such as the “enlightenment of conditions in musicology at the HUB” legitimized the exercise of power by the Stasi through its GHI Brockhaus. So he saw it as his task to expose critics and hand them over to the Stasi. By naming the quibbling students, power could be exercised at the individual
level, and individuals could be controlled and persecuted. The power factor was further strengthened by secretly controlling the students – from today’s point of view a human rights violation. In this case one can first speak of power in the form of subjugation – when the students were unknowingly intercepted, and their opinions were presented to the Stasi – and then of a form of violence, when the denounced students were subjected to so-called “countermeasures”, such as not getting an apartment or employment.

From 1962 onwards, there are no further reports in Brockhaus’s Stasi files. In 1969 it was announced that his professional career and his work at the HUB took so much time that he could no longer be “used” as GHI (Klingberg 2000:207). But in 1979 Brockhaus was recruited again, and this time as IMS “John”. As an IMS, he had the task of “politically-operatively penetrating and securing an area of responsibility” (politisch-operative Durchdringung und Sicherung eines Verantwortungsbereiches, BStU 2015:44), and as one of these areas the Stasi had designated the Association of Composers and Musicologists of the GDR (Verband der Komponisten und Musikwissenschaftler der DDR, VKM). The VKM was the main organization for musical life in the GDR and was founded in 1962 by the composer Hanns Eisler. The Council was superior to all other music organizations and was accepted as a member of the International Music Council of UNESCO in 1966. Numerous international connections were maintained through the VKM, including to Sweden.

The GDR authorities were not satisfied with the development in the VKM. In 1983, “John” reported that there was an influential group of people in the VKM who were not in accord with the party line and who advocated an “ideological coexistence” between West and East German musicology. Another problem were “church-pacifist” tendencies in the VKM, which were expressed, among other things, by the fact that composers used texts by Italian and French writers that could be interpreted as “church-pacifist” statements. The Stasi had this problem confirmed by another employee, Gerd Schönfelder (see below). “John” sent along a list of names which included the musicologist Ingeborg Allihn, who also had contacts in Sweden. Allihn was the editor of the VKM journal Bulletin and “John” regarded her contacts with the West and to the church as a problem.

“A is Politically behind the Fence”

During a conversation with me, the German musicologist Ingeborg Allihn said that she was not surprised when she read in her Stasi file that the supervisor of her doctoral thesis, Alfred Brockhaus, had reported on her as IM “John” of the Stasi. She and her friends had long had a suspicion. “We could smell, he’s Stasi,” she said. During the GDR period, she and her friends were often fairly certain who worked for the Stasi. When she read her Stasi files after the fall of communism, her suspicions were confirmed in all cases. When I met Mrs Allihn for a conversation in Berlin, I had been allowed to read some parts of her Stasi files with her consent. I wanted to talk to her about her contacts with Swedish music life and her trouble with the Stasi. Ingeborg Allihn came into contact with Swedish colleagues, among
others Sven-Erik Bäck and Eskil Hemberg, through her work for the VKM and her *Chamber Music Guide* (*Kammermusikführer*, Allihn, ed., 1997). In the early 1980s, by invitation of the VKM, she travelled to Sweden to collect material and find authors for the chapters on Nordic composers in the Chamber Music Guide. She also travelled from Sweden to Oslo at the invitation of the Nordic Music Council to take part in a music conference. From then on she remained in contact with Swedish colleagues, especially with Eskil Hemberg, who visited her several times in the GDR.12

She reported to me that her supervisor Alfred Brockhaus had actually not been particularly interested in her doctoral thesis. She now believes that it may have been advantageous for her that Brockhaus told the Stasi about her, that she was “politically behind the fence” and had church connections. This would have had the advantage that the GDR authorities regarded her as “lost” – she could not be used for political purposes. One problem, of course, was that she couldn’t pursue an academic career at university for this reason, but she thinks she was lucky because she could work for the VKM, both with the *Bulletin* and with the *Chamber Music Guide*. In our conversation she particularly praised the then head of the VKM, Vera Reiner, as an important pillar in her career: Reiner had repeatedly held her “protective hand” over her. Thanks to Reiner, Allihn probably had relatively large freedom in her work with the *Bulletin*. But the *Bulletin* also meant many contacts with colleagues in West Germany and Western Europe, which of course was a thorn in the side of the Stasi. But after the fall of communism these were exactly the contacts that helped Allihn to survive, since several valuable employment opportunities were offered her from West Germany. Thanks to them, the transition after the fall of communism was relatively unproblematic for her.

Allihn’s report can be interpreted as an example of a narrative in which Allihn – looking back on the events – positions herself not merely as a victim of the Stasi. Instead, she describes her own position in its complexity: On the one hand, through her work for the VKM she was a target for Brockhaus’s negative reporting to the Stasi; on the other hand, it was precisely this work for the VKM that gave her employment and relative freedom in the GDR. Her report also makes it clear how, on the one hand, international cooperation could allow a certain amount of freedom, but, on the other hand, could lead to even more intensive scrutiny by the Stasi. It is also interesting to see how certain persons who presided over international bodies and did not accept Stasi methods weakened the Stasi’s power potential and how this clearly called its legitimacy into question.

But Brockhaus wasn’t the only one who reported on Allihn. In the GDR era, Allihn was aware that, as a single mother, she could easily be pressured by the authorities, because they could always have threatened to take her children away. “Thank God this never happened”, she said in our conversation. But she also told me about an experience when she was particularly afraid. An important contact for her in Sweden was, as I mentioned, Eskil Hemberg, who was chairman of the Swedish Composers’ Association (*För-
**Gerard Schönfelder** was a German musicologist who had grown up and worked in

*eningen Svenska Tonsättare, FST* at the time. Hemberg often travelled to the GDR and was very interested in the musical life of the GDR. Allihn often acted as his “companion” on behalf of the VKM, which meant that she helped him to get access to concerts, museums, restaurants, etc.13

Once, when Hemberg was in the GDR to visit the Dresden Music Festival, Gottfried Scholz, then director of the Vienna Musikhochschule, was also there. Allihn was to look after the guests. When she and the guests had accepted Vera Reiner’s invitation to dinner, the musicologist and director of the Dresden Academy of Music, Gerd Schönfelder, was also present (see below about Schönfelder). During their talk, Scholz invited Allihn to visit him and his wife in Vienna. Allihn: “And then I saw his [Schönfelder’s] face, and it was clear to me that he would do anything to prevent that.” When she came to her hotel in the evening, she had a message that she should be at the Stasi the next morning at 7.00 o’clock. A colleague offered to take her there and wait outside for her. She also received a call from Vera Reiner, who was aware that Allihn was going to the Stasi, and Reiner advised her to say as little as possible.

“Really, it was like a crime thriller,” Allihn said. She had rarely been so afraid. When she came to the Stasi the next morning, she was told that she had been charged with allegedly passing on internal information to Western colleagues. That was a serious accusation. Allihn denied everything and got away with a warning. When she was back in Berlin, Vera Reiner said that the charges were not only against her, but also against the VKM. Reiner went to the Stasi in Dresden to find out who had reported on Allihn and the VKM. There she could read the notification and saw the signature of the person who had done the denouncing; she recognized Gerd Schönfelder’s writing. Allihn: “Then the VKM never sent Schönfelder anywhere again.” She also learned at that time that Schönfelder and his wife had recently been in Vienna for 14 days on behalf of the VKM. “From that hour on, Schönfelder was dead to me,” said Allihn. Today she is certain that she was simply lucky that the Stasi in Dresden had treated her so “benevolently”. It could have ended very badly for her.14

Schönfelder illustrates here how an IM on the one hand establishes good relations with a national and international organization (VKM) in order to then use them for monitoring on behalf of the Stasi. Schönfelder here represents two different orders of power, which he combines as an IM: On the one hand the noumenal power, in which his colleagues in the VKM trusted him as a musicologist and respected colleague, regarding this exercise of power as justified (they let him travel to Vienna on behalf of the VKM). On the other, there is power as a form of subjugation (with a threat of violence in the background) in which he controls the same organization as an IM and reports to the Stasi on behaviour as he regards as harmful to the state. These combinations of different power exercises were characteristic of the conditions in the GDR.

**Gerd Schönfelder and the Royal Academy of Music in Stockholm**15

Gerd Schönfelder was a German musicologist who had grown up and worked in...
the GDR. During the 1970s he was employed at the University of Leipzig and the Music Academy (Musikhochschule) in Dresden, from 1972 as Vice-Rector and 1980–1984 as Rector. In 1984 he became head of the Semper Opera in Dresden.16 In 1961 he became a member of the SED, in 1973 of the Central Music Commission (Zentrale Kommission Musik) of the Cultural Association of the GDR (Kulturbund der Deutschen Demokratischen Republik). As of 1969 he was a member of the VKM and was also active on the board.17

In 1976 Schönfelder was invited to Sweden by the Swedish Composers’ Association to represent the VKM. The invitation came from Eskil Hemberg, who was the chairman at the time. After this trip there were regular connections between Schönfelder and Swedish musical life, among others with Hemberg, the composer Jan Carlstedt, Hans Åstrand (the Permanent Secretary of the KMA) and Per Skans from Radio Sweden.18 Schönfelder’s collaboration with Åstrand resulted, among other things, in the jointly published book *Principle truth principle beauty: Contributions to the aesthetics of modern Swedish music (Prinzip Wahrheit Prinzip Schönheit: Beiträge zur Ästhetik der neueren schwedischen Musik, 1984).*

In February 1979, Schönfelder was granted permanent status as a so-called travel cadre (Reisekader) to what were termed non-socialist foreign countries.19 His wife was also active as a travel cadre and could often travel abroad with her husband.20 This meant that it became much easier for him to travel and that he was considered politically reliable by the GDR authorities. In order to become a travel cadre, one had to show the regime one’s “political utility” (Hedin 2005:289). Only those GDR citizens who were classified as politically reliable could become travel cadres. The political loyalty was determined through a process in which the Stasi had surveys carried out on the person in question at his/her workplace and in his/her residential area. They also examined the family and kinship relationships of the person, their political attitude and contacts in the West (Hedin 2005:294–299).

Within the travel cadre system, there were also various gradations, depending on the assessment of the travel cadre’s political loyalty and political influence. For example, there were travel cadres who were allowed to enter and leave the country without applications for their trips, while others still had to submit applications. There were travel cadres who were allowed to take their spouses with them, while other couples were not allowed to travel together, because despite their status as travel cadres they were observed with certain mistrust by the GDR authorities.21

As a travel cadre, Schönfelder undertook to accept and obey directives from the Ministry of Culture. Within 14 days of returning home, he had to send in a report in which he gave an account of how he had followed the directives on his trip. According to sources in the Stasi archives, a “permanent contact” with Schönfelder was established at the beginning of the 1980s.22 At that time he had become known to the Stasi as a very reliable travel cadre and his extensive and well-formulated reports were highly appreciated. In a 1981 report, for example, he categorized his Swedish music colleagues according to their sympathies for the GDR and divided them into GDR sympathizers, crit-
ics and enemies. This report was highly appreciated by the Stasi. In Sweden, Schönfelder collaborated with colleagues in musicology; among other things, he produced analyses of Swedish musical works, provided assistance with preparing musicological conferences and helped Radio Sweden with the production of programmes on East Asian culture, especially music theatre.

In 1981 the KMA wanted to thank Schönfelder for his work in Swedish musicology by giving him a Volvo. Hans Åstrand, KMA’s permanent secretary at the time, wrote to the “responsible authorities” in Sweden and the GDR asking them to respect KMA’s decision to donate a car to Schönfelder. The car was to be a thank you for Schönfelder’s important work for the Academy, which he did in the form of lectures, discussions, scientific support and participation in conferences; all this commitment was difficult to measure in money, according to Åstrand. But a letter from the regional administration in Dresden to the Stasi shows that Schönfelder stated that he received the car because his own car had been destroyed in an accident. When he told his Swedish hosts, they decided to give him a Volvo in gratitude for his work. In a letter to the customs in the GDR in 1982, Schönfelder thanked them for having been allowed to import the car. Among other things, he wrote that he had not been able to refuse the car “for political reasons”. He had accepted the car on the advice of the GDR ambassador Kiesewetter, because a rejection would have been seen as an insult to the Swedish king. One of my interviews with contemporary witnesses shows that Schönfelder was extremely pleased with the Academy’s gift and that the Volvo meant a lot to him. It is also well-known today that in the GDR the party elite drove Volvos: the Volvo was a symbol of status and power.

In the GDR, most citizens received a car only on application and after a long waiting period, and then mostly a Wartburg or Trabant. “Western cars” were mainly driven by politicians or people with high social status. Car brands clearly marked class affiliation in a state that liked to present itself as classless. For example, the Stasi always examined what kind of car a citizen drove (Münkel 2015). Schönfelder therefore had to justify his gift from the KMA to the GDR authorities so that they would not become suspicious and so that he would not jeopardize his freedom to travel or even be deprived of his car and see it collected as state property. Although Schönfelder had apparently been very happy about the gift, he was not allowed to show the GDR authorities his pleasure with the car. Instead, he presented the car as an imposed gift that he had to accept for “political reasons”. But a gift always obliges one to give something in return, as the French sociologist Marcel Mauss (2002) has stated. Because a gift always establishes a relationship between the donor and the recipient, the recipient is expected to give a counter-gift in the future. From this point of view, the gift of the KMA can also be interpreted as an obligation of Schönfelder: the KMA hoped that he would continue to make his services available to them in the future – which he did.

In February 1983 Schönfelder was recruited as an IMS by the Stasi. As mentioned above, the designation IMS means
an unofficial employee at the Ministry of State Security with a specific area of responsibility. In 1984 he was upgraded to IMB status. This designated an unofficial co-worker, who was to work more specifically with control and defence against enemies or potential enemies (inoffizieller Mitarbeiter der Abwehr mit Feindverbindung bzw. zur unmittelbaren Bearbeitung im Verdacht der Feindtätigkeit stehenden Personen, BSTU 2015:43). Schönfelder was advertised as IMS and later as IMB in order to “utilize” his extensive contacts with musical figures in West Germany, Austria and Sweden to “gain information about the aims and intentions of the leading personalities of musical life in Sweden, the Federal Republic of Germany and Austria for the MfS”.

Although Schönfelder was regarded as politically reliable according to his Stasi files, he was not easy to recruit for cooperation with the Stasi. He himself cited his high workload as a reason. His Stasi files show that the Stasi visited him several times to recruit him, which finally succeeded in February 1983. In this recruitment, Lieutenant Greif of the Stasi had used the “recruiting legend” as a method, which was quite common among Stasi recruiters. The recruiting legend was a narrative in which the person to be recruited was portrayed as extremely important for the development or safe-keeping of the state. In doing so, the recruiter, if possible, referred to an earlier successful activity of the person to be recruited in order to convince them of their great importance for the state. In Schönfelder’s case, Greif mentioned Schönfelder’s reports on Sweden’s work for a nuclear-weapon-free zone in Europe; this was something of particular interest to the Stasi. As a travel cadre, Schönfelder had described this work in Sweden in a report about his trip to Sweden in 1981.

The recruitment of new IMs by the Stasi can be described as a combination of noumenal power in connection with a threat of subjugation. Noumenal power was important in Stasi’s recruitment methods. As previous research has shown, the Stasi can be described as making use of a “professionalization of denunciation” (Florath 2015:42). In the early years of the GDR, the SED had established that voluntary reports by fellow citizens on political opposition were not always reliable and could also be based on resentment and conflicts between individuals. For this reason, the IM system of state security was continually expanded and professionalized in the 1960s (ibid.). This professionalization can also be described as a strategy of justification, since it was always a question of justifying the secret surveillance of political views as indispensable to the state – so that the state could survive and people could gradually be drawn into the new political system. In its 1979 guidelines, for example, the Stasi emphasized the importance of recruiting IMs, who would join of their own free will and appealing to the personal willingness of individuals. A dilemma for the Stasi was that it was difficult for party members to monitor their fellow human beings, as their party membership was often known and it was often difficult for these people to inspire confidence in others. As a result, the Stasi tried to recruit more and more people who were not known to be close to the party or who were not party members (Florath 2015:42).
According to Florath, the Stasi often managed to use partial agreements with the IM candidates to persuade them to cooperate. Frequent narratives were for example that the Stasi asked for help in investigating crimes, that the Stasi offered support in the candidate’s professional careers, promised them trips to the West or even exploited a previous piece of misconduct in order to recruit a candidate for the purpose of making amends. But fear of the power of the Stasi also led many candidates to commit themselves (Florath 2015:47).

It was precisely this combination of voluntarism and coercion that characterized the Stasi. In the case of Stasi’s recruitment strategies, it becomes clear that an important narrative in recruiting new IMs was that of political and social engagement, which can be interpreted as an expression of noumenal power. This was a reason that many IM candidates could certainly consider acceptable. Another justification narrative was that of the threatened state, which had to be protected. Noumenal power, however, could very quickly turn into coercion, even when the IM candidate was just “offered” help with his/her professional career or travel abroad when he volunteered as an IM. A rejection of these “offers” could already be interpreted by Stasi’s employees as criticism of the state, but did not necessarily have to be.

According to his Stasi contact Uwe Greif, Gerd Schönfelder became an IM out of “political conviction”. Greif:

It can be said that the IM itself has an interest in a close and trusting cooperation with the MfS. He has recognized that socialism in the GDR and internationally can only be reliably protected from internal and external enemies through the use of conspiratorial tools and methods in connection with the other prerequisites. The IM represents consistent political-ideological positions. He is a convinced communist and internationalist, which he does not reveal in every case.  

In Greif’s description of Schönfelder, Schönfelder accepted the then common narrative of the threatened state, which also had to be protected through “conspiratorial tools and methods”. Schönfelder is also clearly presented as a “convinced communist and internationalist” and therefore as a suitable IM. He was given the alias “Hans Mai”.

According to Rainer Forst, any political normativity claims legitimacy, that is, that the political order can be justified and that these justification narratives are accepted by those living in that order (Forst 2015: 187). But the mere fact that the Stasi wanted to keep its surveillance methods secret shows that it was aware of the problem, that such methods basically violate democratic rules. In a genuine democracy, these monitoring principles should have been openly discussed and decided by a parliament. In the GDR, as in the Soviet Union, however, an important discourse was that people must first learn socialism and not always know what is good for them – but what the state knew (Jarausch 1999). Starting from Forst’s ideas about democracy and justification narratives, it can be said that in the GDR the discourse of education to socialist people divided fellow citizens into different groups – those who felt these methods were justified and those who rejected them as an encroachment on personal freedom. There were also problems when the secret surveillance strategies could suddenly be exposed. I will come back to that in a moment.
One of Schönfelder’s most important tasks as IMS “Hans Mai” was to observe musical life in Sweden, West Germany and Austria. He was supposed to gather information about “the aims and intentions of leading personalities of musical life in these countries”, because this opens up opportunities to obtain information from other areas of the economic and social life of these countries, as through the candidate’s circle of acquaintances there are extensive contacts to leading representatives of monopoly capital.

Here it becomes clear how Schönfelder’s contacts to “leading personalities in musical life” were to be used for political purposes: Music was to be used here as a way to spy on social, political and economic activities in the above-mentioned countries.

But one of the first orders for the Stasi was to be executed by Schönfelder in Norway. Here he was commissioned to observe the celebrations on the occasion of the 100th anniversary of the Norwegian Music Academy (Musikkhøgskole) in Oslo. Among other things, the Stasi wanted to learn more about the political and social development, about the participation of West German citizens in the celebrations and, further, to gain information about former GDR citizens. Schönfelder stayed in Norway from 26 September to 3 October 1983 and wrote a detailed report after his return home. Due to lack of space, the report cannot be described and analysed in more detail here. But in summary it can be said that Schönfelder emphasized the great interest of his Norwegian colleagues in music exchange with the GDR and their great respect for the cultural work in the GDR. But he criticized, among other things, that 98 per cent of the students at the conservatory would be unable to find work after their studies because there were not enough permanent positions. He was also of the opinion that musical life in Norway would develop better if the Norwegians realized that successful cultural work was not just about professionalism and the right people, but about socialist cultural policy. Cultural life in Norway, as in other capitalist states, was too much determined by problems of profitability. According to Schönfelder, the “only efficient authority” in Norway in the musical field was the Oslo Philharmonic, whose “artistic level”, however, did not or only rarely come close to that of the Dresden Philharmonic.

And how did Schönfelder report on Sweden? For reasons of space, only one example can be given here. The Stasi was particularly interested in the KMA in Stockholm. In 1984, the same year that Schönfelder was promoted to IMB, he was elected as the first East German representative to the academy in December. The Stasi took his election as an opportunity to give them questions about KMA as a directive, before he went to Sweden:

What is the current attitude of academy members towards the GDR?
What expectations are placed on further cooperation with the GDR in the cultural field?
What role is Prof. Schönfelder to play in this?
What is the attitude of the academy members towards Prof. Schönfelder as a communist?
What material remuneration will result from the election to the Royal Swedish Academy?
What rights and duties does an academician have?
What are the Academy’s national and international objectives?
What funds are allocated to the Academy?
How are the interests of right-wing bourgeois forces perceived?
How and through which persons are the interests of the USA and other reactionary systems enforced?
Where are the starting points for the penetration into the conspiracy of Western secret services recognizable?
In particular, all findings in connection with the awarding of Nobel Prizes are significant.

In addition, the Stasi wanted information about the political and economic situation in Sweden, wanted to know to what extent one could recognize a right-wing orientation in Swedish politics and how long the “opportunistic tendencies” in Swedish politics should be maintained. It also wanted more information about Hans Åstrand, Per Skans and Eskil Hemberg in order to “further clarify the personality profile”. The questions show that the employees of the Stasi did not have particularly good knowledge of KMA and that they apparently assessed its influence on Swedish cultural life as being greater than it actually was. They also seem to have confused KMA with the Swedish Academy.

Before I go into Schönfelder’s answers to these questions, I would like to briefly report on his election to the KMA. The choice of Schönfelder for the KMA was not entirely self-evident, as sources in the KMA archives and contemporary witness reports show. In 1984 he was proposed by the composers Jan Carlstedt, Eskil Hemberg and Ingvar Lidholm, and the musicologists Bo Wallner and Gunnar Larsson, whose proposal was based on Schönfelder’s commitment to Swedish music in the GDR and his important contribution to musicology through the publication *Prinzip Schönheit Prinzip Wahrheit*. They also described him as an important musicologist, humanist and Swedish bibliographer. However, he received only 24 out of 44 votes in the election. This distribution of votes allows us to assume that Schönfelder’s election was not entirely self-evident and that not all of the members of the KMA supported him. From today’s perspective it is surprising that several people who supported Schönfelder’s election to the KMA have been central figures in Swedish musical life. This raises the question – which cannot be answered here: Why did these people support Schönfelder’s election to the KMA?

Erik Lundkvist, a Swedish organist who gave concerts in the GDR for the Institute for National Concerts (*Institutet för Rikskonsert*, it existed from 1968 to 2010) and who has been a member of the KMA since 1983, said in an interview with me that he and several of his colleagues in the KMA were surprised at the choice of Schönfelder: “Why was he elected? A cultural personality of the GDR? […] We were never properly told who he was, we knew too little about him.”

But even when Schönfelder was elected to the KMA in 1984, there was apparently a suspicion that Schönfelder came to Sweden not only for scientific reasons. Schönfelder’s Stasi contact Uwe Greif reported to the Stasi that Schönfelder had told him that before his election to the KMA he had “been questioned by the deputy president [Claude Génetay]”. Greif:

He [Schönfelder] was confronted with the fact that the Swedish Academy had information that he was on a “secret service mission of the Ministry of State Security”. This allegation was vigorously rejected by the IM. The Swede’s question whether he [Schönfelder] could also take his oath on this was of course answered in the affirmative by the IM.
According to Greif, Schönfelder had held back in Sweden because of this mistrust and had not fulfilled “his tasks”. His Swedish colleague Hans Astrand was of the opinion that this suspicion could be connected with the fact that someone in Dresden, where Schönfelder had just become head of the Semper Opera, was resentful about the appointment and now tried to defame him. KMA seems to have believed Schönfelder’s statement and apparently did not pursue the issue any further at that time; Schönfelder was elected as a new foreign member.

But what answers did the Stasi receive to its questions about the KMA? Because Schönfelder had not answered the questions in his conversation with Greif, he wrote a report for the Stasi in January 1985. Among other things, he reported that the academy pursued a strict policy of neutrality at national and international level. He also mentioned that “material remuneration” by the KMA was “only” settled to the extent that the KMA paid him twice a year for the trip to Stockholm, provided him with a free guest apartment during his stays in Sweden and paid daily expenses. According to Schönfelder the aim of the KMA was:

… to uphold cultural values and, above all, to develop the tremendous work of increasing the cultural demands and the cultural level of the population and, by raising this level, to paralyse the Americanization of Europe. He [no name mentioned here] told me very clearly that these are clear alliances that point them to us. Various things that we have done here, for example, are adopted by them, such as music for children, child class work, in order to direct people from the outset towards a culturally high level of education.

In this report, the cooperation between the KMA and the GDR is justified by a narrative of the “locus terriblis”: the image of a threat is constructed, against which joint action must be taken (Wodak et al. 1998: 85). It was important to create “alliances” with like-minded partners, which also is a kind of unification strategy in the critical discourse analysis: Two individuals or groups must work together to fight a common enemy (Wodak et al. 1998:84). The “alliance” with important partners such as the GDR is legitimized as an effective strategy against the aforementioned threat to Sweden by Americanization. According to Schönfelder’s and his informant’s description it is necessary to raise the cultural level of the population in order to counteract Americanization. What is meant by Americanization here remains vague and is not explained in detail. One interpretation might be that the informant of the KMA assumed that he/she and Schönfelder had a similar idea of the problems with Americanization, for example, the threat that other, new musical styles posed to the position of classical music in society.

According to Schönfelder’s informant at the KMA, it is important to start cultural work with the citizens as early as possible. The term “child class work” (Kinderklassenarbeit) can have two different meanings here: (1) musical education at school, and (2) creating class consciousness in children. The description remains vague here, and it is possible that both are meant. Here the GDR becomes an important role model for this child class work. This narrative also points to Sweden’s great interest in the East German education system and state cultural work in the GDR. As the previous research on the contacts between Sweden and the GDR shows, many Swe-
dish politicians regarded GDR’s school system with “one school for all” and the state-financed cultural policy as a model (Almgren 2016:110ff.; Almgren 2009; Abraham 2007).

However, it was difficult for Schönfelder to identify the “right-wing bourgeois forces”:

It is always very difficult to safeguard the interests of the right-wing forces, because they never expose themselves in such a way. When you are in their apartment, they make each other bad and when they sit opposite each other at the banquet, they say the most beautiful and kind things to each other. So the party principle is not the same there as in West Germany. It is very difficult to recognize right-wing forces, but there are some. They expose themselves like this Wel n, Karl-Erik [sic!] did, who has publicly opposed the GDR with all these insinuations such as freedom, humanity, etc., which are idiotic. He is also a member of the academy and stayed away on the day of my election. He was also one of those who spoke against it for two years. But he was also one of those to whom the GDR gave an international career.

He was one of the organists who came to the GDR and played at big music festivals here like Händelfestspiele, Musiktage, Biennale, etc. Now he is no longer coming, I have already clarified that with the GDR Artist Agency [Künstleragentur der DDR]. It was this person of all people who used this opportunity to carry out a subliminal propaganda over the years.  

Here Schönfelder tried to fulfil his task, to identify his opponents and the potential enemies of the GDR and to make them “harmless”. One can also speak here of the “art of distribution”, as Michel Foucault calls it (Foucault 2003:143). The aim is to place different individuals in closed milieus, to monitor and control them and to classify them according to a certain system and to grant them some freedom of action – or not. Schönfelder’s aim was to classify individuals according to sympathies and antipathies towards the GDR. He describes here how the members of the KMA take on different roles in private and in the more public milieu of the KMA. However, these differences can also be interpreted as showing that Schönfelder had the confidence of the members whom he was allowed to visit at home and who complained to him about colleagues in the KMA.

The Swedish composer and organist Karl-Erik Welin is positioned as an enemy in several places in Schönfelder’s Stasi files. Since Welin publicly opposed the GDR, Schönfelder had the GDR Artist Agency arrange for him not to be allowed to travel to the GDR. One can also speak here in Forst’s words of subjugation and oppression. Welin did not accept the official justification strategies of the GDR authorities and could therefore not be influenced by GDR propaganda. In principle, the removal of Welin from the GDR points to a kind of powerlessness on the part of the GDR authorities: Noumenal power could not be exercised here – i.e. Welin could not be persuaded to respect the GDR of his own free will. Therefore one had to limit his mobility and not let him enter any more.

Interviews with contemporary witnesses showed that Schönfelder’s colleagues in Sweden wondered why he could come to Sweden so often, but they did not suspect that he might have worked for the Stasi. Erik Lundkvist, for example, reported to me that he wondered why Schönfelder was allowed to leave the GDR so often. Later he understood that Schönfelder had to have a kind of “mission”. At that time he thought that it had to
be observations of the Swedish military or something similar. The then permanent secretary of the KMA, Hans Åstrand, had introduced Lundkvist to Schönfelder. They became friends, and Schönfelder visited him several times at home. Lundkvist describes Schönfelder as a “super-intelligent person” and says that it was very interesting to talk to him. In retrospect, he also finds it interesting that Schönfelder often criticized the GDR and was very open with his criticism.

At that time, Lundkvist had no way of knowing that this was a common strategy for the Stasi staff; they had learned to make personal contacts with those whom they observed. They were often very social and friendly and could speak on many different subjects – they learned this during their training with the Stasi. Birgitta Almgren, in her studies on the contacts between the GDR and Sweden, has shown how Stasi’s employees were expected to create trust by “covertly” expressing “political views”. The GDR authorities knew that not many Swedes liked to discuss politics and therefore recommended not expressing political views directly (Almgren 2009:206). Stasi employees learned systematic strategies to make personal contacts with “key people” and they practised certain argumentation techniques to give a positive picture of the GDR and to avoid difficult situations. Sometimes it could even be an advantage if a Stasi agent criticized the GDR in order to try to get his counterpart on his side (ibid.).

Ingeborg Allihn also told me that her West German colleagues were amazed at how “courageous” Schönfelder was when he dared to criticize the cultural policies of the GDR and Eastern Europe. She believes that it must have been very difficult for foreign colleagues to understand this, because it had already been difficult for the East Germans themselves. “You must have grown up here [in the former GDR] and developed a sensibility for that… that you can say I smell it, he can’t help it, he is Stasi…”. As mentioned above, she meant that East Germans could “smell” who the Stasi was. But in Schönfelder’s case it was difficult because he was very skilful.

Today one might ask why the suspicion that Schönfelder could work for the Stasi was not pursued further in Sweden after 1984. The question is still difficult to answer. But the suspicion arose again in the end of 1989, when Schönfelder was in Sweden and suddenly had to go back to the GDR. In December 1989, the musicologist and journalist Carl-Gunnar Åhlén wrote articles in which he pointed out that Schönfelder had worked for the secret police of the GDR. Even at that time there did not seem to have been any discussion in Sweden and not even in 1994, when Åhlén and the journalist Stefan Koskinen took up the subject again. Up until today there has been little discussion of this topic. But that is the subject of another article.

**Music and Politics: Strategies of Justification and Power**

According to the historian Jens Gieseke, many former unofficial employees of the Stasi today justify themselves by saying that this is certainly difficult to understand today, but that the main reason for their Stasi cooperation was their political conviction. Basically, they believed in the “good core of the socialist idea”, “in the legitimacy of protection from operations...
of enemy powers”, in the “desire to impart better knowledge of the opponent” and “to do something for the interstate or intrasocietal ‘peace’” (Gieseke 2011:126). This shows that the Stasi’s justification narratives from the GDR era are still being updated. On the other hand, as Gieseke also emphasizes, other studies have shown that there were also many Stasi employees motivated by personal advantages and career opportunities (Gieseke 2011:127–128).

The historian Ilko-Sascha Kowalczuk emphasizes that in the GDR all citizens had some kind of relationship with the Stasi. Thus there were those who had committed themselves to the service of the Stasi – voluntarily or not – and who were closely interwoven with it both professionally and politically. Then there were also those who were disappointed in the political development of the GDR and hoped for reforms to come through the Stasi apparatus. A third group were critics and opposition members who suffered under the Stasi’s ruling mechanisms (Kowalczuk 2015:73–75).

In this article I have given examples of various justification narratives and power strategies of the Stasi. Frequent justifications of Stasi employees in promoting new IMs were the narratives of the “enlightenment” of political positions of individuals, groups and institutions or the construction of so-called legends in which personal or professional merits of the candidate were presented as indispensable for the protection of the state from enemies. Other justifications that could motivate people to volunteer were support for professional careers, the possibility of getting a place for their children at university or finding an apartment.

As in other professions, the careers of musicologists, music administrators, composers and musicians have been influenced by the presence of the Stasi. Stasi staff members received many benefits, were given desirable positions in the academies, and were able to exert strong pressure on others. Those who refused to participate in the Stasi were not party members or expressed opposition were marginalized and discriminated against (Halbrock 2015:77). As I have shown, however, international contacts or even mere interest in them could also be problematic. Of particular interest here are international organizations such as the VKM, which had a high status in the GDR and internationally and was vital for international cooperation. If such organizations had leaders who did not accept the noumenal power of the Stasi, they could conquer certain power areas themselves and protect their employees against forms of coercion or violence by the Stasi.

Stasi’s power methods and justification strategies moved constantly between noumenal power, subjugation and physical and mental violence. It was precisely this mixture of different power methods and justification strategies that made the Stasi so unpredictable and difficult to assess. As Kowalczuk notes, this was precisely the intention of the Stasi. An important principle of rule was to intimidate people and repress individuality (Kowalczuk 2015:69). In my opinion, on the other hand, an important principle of the Stasi was also to emphasize and use individuality, for example when new candidates were to be recruited. The story of the consequential individual, who has already done important things for the state in the past and who is
therefore needed in the future to protect the state, was an important narrative of the exercise of noumenal power. These different perspectives fit in a state that is described in different studies as a “welfare dictatorship” (Jarausch 1999:60) and a “participatory dictatorship” (Fulbrook 2005:12): Emancipatory and egalitarian goals were combined with a repressive, dictatorial practice. On the one hand, the individual was expected to be committed to society, on the other hand he/she was clearly expected to subordinate him- or herself to the collective.

When the state of the GDR finally disappeared after 1990, the ways in which power was exercised and the justification narratives changed radically. Now it was up to the Stasi employees of the time to reposition and legitimize themselves, and as for the victims, it was up to them to come to terms with their own past, to demand justice. And they too had to reorient themselves. There has not as yet been much research done on this subject, and even less on the influence the Stasi has had in other states, such as Sweden. Also still missing is a discussion of how the Stasi’s power and justification strategies can have influenced cultural life in other states and how this issue could be addressed in our time.
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Notes

2 “Normative Orders” is an association of researchers from various social sciences and humanities disciplines, including European Ethnology. The association was founded at the University of Frankfurt am Main in 2010, and it sees it as its mission to investigate how political, economic, legal, religious and social orders change, how different power structures develop from this, and how these in turn influence power structures and life chances, on both a national and a transnational level. See also: https://www.normativeorders.net/de/ (visited May 2, 2020).

3 For more information about the Stasi and its history, see among others Münkel (ed.) 2015, Gieseke 2011, Almgren 2011. See also: https://www.bstu.de/informationen-zur-stasi/themen/was-war-die-stasi/ (visited May 2, 2020).

4 In 1969 the academies in the GDR were reorganized and from that year on the Institute for Musicology was transformed into a scholarly department (WB) Musicology in the new Institute “Aesthetics/Art Science” (IÄK) (Klingberg 2000:196).

5 BStU, MfS, AIM 4952/89 C, pp. 81–82, 88.


Berlin, den 27.2.1958, Alfred Brockhaus."


Der GHI schätzt ein, daß [Name] ein ausgeprochener Feind ist.

In einem Seminarreferat bei Prof. [Ernst Hermann] Meyer sagte die Studentin [Name]: Sie zitierte einen Aufsatz: ‘Die Wissenschaft muß sich jeglicher pol. Stellungnahme enthalten.’

Der Student [Name] sagte zu dieser Studentin [Name], sie solle nur aufpassen, daß sie statt Adolf [Hitler] nicht Walter [Ulbricht] sagt."

Note: [Name]: due to the protection of personal rights, I was not allowed to know the names of these persons in the file.

8 BStU, MfS, AIM 4952/89 C, pp. 2–3. See also Klingberg 2000:210 and BStU 2015:44.
9 BStU, MfS, AIM 4952/89, Part II, pp. 48–49.
11 BStU, MfS, AIM 4952/89, Part II, p. 2. “A. is politically behind the fence” can be interpreted as a metaphor, with which “John” wants to say that “A.” [Ingeborg Allihn] is on the wrong side politically, i.e. not in line with the party.

12 Interview with Ingeborg Allihn, June 18, 2018.
13 Allihn emphasized in our conversation that she did not have to report about him to the GDR authorities.
14 Interview with Ingeborg Allihn, June 18, 2018.
15 Some parts of this section about Gerd Schönfelder, the Stasi and the KMA have already been published in a Swedish article, but with a focus on the person of Schönfelder and his role in the KMA (Garberding/Geisler/Rosengren 2019).
21 An example is Erich Stockmann, professor of musicology, and his wife Doris Stockmann, associate professor of musicology. They were considered politically unreliable and were not allowed to travel together. BStU, MfS, HA VIII, Nr. 2656, pp. 166, 168; BStU, MfS HA XVIII AP 51144/92. See also Garberding (forthcoming), 2020.
23 Ibid.
3etra *arEerding, "e &oXld SPell 7hat +e¶s Stasi«´


31 BStU, MfS, ZAIG, Nr. 26648, pp. 47–49.


34 BStU, MfS, BV Dnd, AIM 3242/90, I, Vol. 1, p. 393. German original: “Es ist einzuschätzen, daß der IM selbst Interesse an einer engen und vertrauensvollen Zusammenarbeit mit dem MfS hat. Er hat erkannt, daß der Sozialismus in der DDR und auch international nur durch die Anwendung konspirativer Mittel und Methoden im Zusammenhang mit den anderen Voraussetzungen zuverlässig vor inneren und äußeren Feinden zu schützen ist. Der IM vertritt konsequente politisch-ideologische Positionen. Er ist überzeugter Kommunist und Internationalist, was er nicht in jedem Fall offenbart.”


44 Interview with Erik Lundkvist, March 2, 2018.


46 Ibid.


senarbeit, um den Menschen gleich von vornherein in der Erziehung auf ein kulturell hohes Niveau hinzulenken.”


Er war einer der Orgelspieler, die in die DDR kamen und zu großen Musikfestspielen hier spielten wie Händelfestspiele, Musiktage, Biennale usw. Jetzt kommt er nicht mehr, das habe ich schon bei der Künstleragentur erläutert. Ausgerechnet dieser Mensch hat diese Möglichkeit dort genutzt, um eine unterchwellige Propaganda zu betreiben, über Jahre hinweg.”

50 Interview with Erik Lundkvist, March 2, 2018.

51 Interview with Erik Lundkvist, March 2, 2018.

52 Interview with Ingeborg Allihn, June 18, 2018. German original: “Da musste man schon hier aufgewachsen sein und eine Sensibilität dafür entwickelt haben…, dass man sagen kann, ich rieche das, der kann nicht anders, der ist Stasi…”
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