

# A (Peaceful) Revolution, Refolution, or a Turning Point? The Fall of the Berlin Wall as a Cause of Terminological Turmoil

Damir Velički

Faculty of Teacher Education, University of Zagreb

## Abstract

*In recent German history, several events unfolded on 9 November with far-reaching consequences. Some of them, like the fall of the Berlin Wall, symbolize the end of the Cold War and of Germany divided. In addition to political implications, the fall of the Berlin Wall, or the events that preceded and followed it, also caused dilemmas on whether it was a (peaceful) revolution, (just) a turning point, or a refolution – pressure from below and reforms from above. The paper analyses events prior to and following the fall of the Berlin Wall, as well as the terms used for them in basic programs of the parties represented in the 19th electoral term of the Bundestag and the curricula of different school subjects in German states. It is concluded these parties use different terms for the events of 1989/90 on the territory of the former GDR, in accordance with their ideological positions, and that the events are inconsistently described in the curricula. The character of events was a revolutionary one, as they thoroughly changed the social and political relations in the GDR in a very short time. Despite this, the phrase “peaceful revolution” is still not present in the German language as a widespread, general term, but the rather vague “turning point” or “reversal” is more common.*

**Key words:** curriculum; Germany; history; parties; reunification.

## Introduction: November 9 in recent German history

The ninth day of the month of November holds a special place in German history. The events of that day in 1848, 1918, 1923, 1938, and 1989 had far-reaching consequences for Germany. Some of them also signify landmarks of almost epic proportions in world history. In the nineteenth century, on 9 November 1848, Robert Blum was shot dead in

Vienna. He was a German politician and one of the left-wing leaders in the National Assembly in Frankfurt. His execution was a landmark, or the beginning of the end of the 1848/49 revolution in the countries of the German Confederation (Siemann, 1985). In the first half of the twentieth century, during the German November Revolution of 1918/19 – which, according to some authors, significantly contributed to the fall of the Weimar Republic and the rise of National Socialism, due to the role of German Social Democrats, which allowed for the old German political elite to stay in power (Haffner, 2002) – on 9 November 1918, Chancellor Max von Baden proclaimed the abdication of Emperor Wilhelm II. On the same day, just two hours apart, Philipp Scheidemann and Karl Liebknecht declared the German Republic. Without consulting Friedrich Ebert, who had been appointed Chancellor by Prince Max von Baden earlier that day, Philipp Scheidemann gave an improvised speech from a Reichstag window, in which he declared Germany a republic (*deutsche Republik*). A little while later, Karl Liebknecht declared the free Socialist Republic of Germany (*freie sozialistische Republik Deutschland*). These events preceded the formation of the Weimar Republic whose first president was Friedrich Ebert. The Weimar Republic was under severe pressure since its first declaration and had to cope in an extremely unstable political situation. There was, for example, the Kapp Putsch of 1920 and the workers' uprising in Saxony and Thuringia in 1923. One of the events, or coups, which foreshadowed the significant strengthening of the National Socialist movement, and made Hitler's name widely known to the public, happened in 1923, again on 8 and 9 November. On 8 November 1923, Hitler carried out a coup in the *Bürgerbräukeller* Pub. Together with General Erich Ludendorff and their supporters, he announced the beginning of a “national revolution” and the overthrow of the Berlin Government. The planned march on Berlin, however, never occurred, as the rebellion was crushed in Munich the following day, on 9 November. After the incident, Hitler was sentenced to a five-year imprisonment, of which he only served less than nine months, in privileged conditions (Fleischmann, 2015). Fifteen years later, in the night between 9 and 10 November, Nazi violence erupted against Jews, resulting in “burned down synagogues, the public abuse of Jews, and the destruction and looting of Jewish properties” (Benz, 2000, p. 141). On the basis of Nurnberg Laws from 1935, Jews in Germany had already lost their civil rights three years prior, and were abused and persecuted. However, the events of 9–10 November 1938 “signify an abrupt change in state actions, from the legislative and administrative discrimination of the Jewish minority, to brutal violence” (Benz, 2000, p. 140).

The terms for the three events just mentioned, when observed from the historical and political perspective, are not controversial. The speeches and appearances by Philipp Scheidemann and Karl Liebknecht, despite some differences in content and goals, were both proclamations of a republic. German historiography, as well as history schoolbooks (RAAbits Realschule Geschichte, 2011) and student dictionaries ([www.lernhelfer.de](http://www.lernhelfer.de)), call it the two proclamations of the republic (*doppelte Ausrufung der Republik*). As far as

the event of 1923 in Munich is concerned, there is no doubt it was a coup, or an attempt to violently take over the government, disregarding the democratic procedure. The Nazi violence against Jews in the night of 9–10 November 1938, is called the Crystal Night (*Kristallnacht*) in Croatian, and it is the term most widely used in Croatian history books and encyclopedias (Erdelja & Stojaković, 2011; www.enciklopedija.hr). The adjective *crystal* is generally explained by the fact that thousands of home and shop windows were smashed in the night, which is why glass shards covered the streets of German cities. However, in Germany, from the late eighties onward – due to criticisms that the term *Kristallnacht* is cynical, euphemistic, and too tame, having come from the linguistics of National Socialism – the terms *Reichspogromnacht* and *Pogromnacht* have been used more consistently (Eitz & Stötzel, 2007).

The fourth event that also occurred on 9 November is the fall of the Berlin Wall in 1989. The Berlin Wall might be the most significant symbol of the Cold War, a symbol of geopolitical and ideological division of Europe and Germany. The former German Democratic Republic authorities dubbed it the Antifascist Protection Rampart (*antifaschistischer Schutzwall*), a defense measure against the external enemy. The night between 9 and 10 November 1989, when the German Democratic Republic yielded to insistent pressure by its citizens to open the border toward the Federal Republic of Germany, is remembered in history and the German language as *Mauerfall*, or the Fall of the Wall. However, the term for events that preceded and followed remains controversial and is a subject of many scientific and professional discussions. Was it a revolution – and, if so, should the revolution necessarily be accompanied by the adjective “peaceful” – or a reformation, the pressure exacted from below and reforms applied from above? The term was coined by British historian Timothy Garton Ash (1999) to describe the events surrounding the fall of communist regimes in East European countries, especially Poland and Hungary. Or is the most appropriate term for the process really *Wende* (reversal, turning point), the one that has finally become commonly used in Germany, and a part of the Standard German Language, denoting great and radical political and social changes that occurred in 1989 in the German Democratic Republic? In summary, the events in the German Democratic Republic of 1989/90, along with their expected political implications, also began a discussion on the content of these events. A question emerged on whether it was a revolution or not, and along with it linguistic dilemmas on the most adequate term.

## **1989 – A turning point or a revolution?**

At the end of a press conference on 9 November 1989, whose beginning promised little respite from the usual boredom, Günter Schabowski, a member of East German Politburo, accepted a reporter’s question on the expected timeframe for the implementation of the new provision that allowed for more liberalized travel to the west for citizens of East Germany. He never suspected that his answer of “immediately” would start an avalanche that would result in the fall of the Berlin Wall just several hours later.

Although his rash answer was not in line with the Politburo's conclusions, either in its extent or the time of entry into force, it made history and led to the opening of the heavily guarded border between East Germany and West Berlin. Nevertheless, the fall of the Berlin Wall was still not an unexpected event. Many others preceded it, in which people of East Germany expressed their displeasure with the conditions in the GDR. The fall of the Berlin Wall was the crucial moment towards the reunification of two Germanies. It can also be considered the moment when the reunification entered its second phase. The first phase focused on social and political changes in the GDR, while the second phase was characterized by steps that resulted in the formal reunification.

The participants in the protests in the former GDR did not use the term revolution. In oppositional circles they mostly used renewal (*Erneuerung*), often stressing that it was a peaceful, or amicable (*friedlich*) renewal: "Our country needs a peaceful democratic renewal" (*Bürgerbewegung Demokratie Jetzt*, 1989, p. 20). The GDR political establishment brought to the political discussion the term *Wende* (reversal, turning point), not having in mind the sociopolitical change, but the steps which the SED party needed to take in order to consolidate its power. In his public announcement in the media, on 18 October 1989, Egon Krenz said that "today's session of the Central Committee marks the beginning of the turning point (*Wende*)" (*Neues Deutschland*, p. 4). His emphasis was on the political and ideological offensive by his party. It should be noted that the term *Wende* was connected to desirable social reforms even prior to Krenz's announcement. An East German writer, Volker Braun, wrote a poem with the same title in 1988, alluding to Gorbachev, or his Perestroika and Glasnost. As far as the phrase *peaceful revolution* (*friedliche Revolution*) goes, most sources agree it was first used by the contemporary Mayor of West Berlin, Walter Momper, on 10 November 1989, when he mentioned the latest developments in the GDR while congratulating "the citizens of the GDR on a peaceful and democratic revolution" (Lindner, 2014). Two days later, the phrase *a peaceful revolution* appeared in the message of *Neues Forum* to the public, "Citizens of the GDR! Your spontaneous and fearless expressions of free will have started a peaceful revolution throughout the country, bringing down the Politburo and tearing at the Wall" (*Initiativgruppe Neues Forum*, p. 132). That the revolution was a peaceful one was also acknowledged in late 1989 by Helmut Kohl in his public address in Dresden. Describing the recent events, he emphasized his "recognition of and admiration for the peaceful revolution" (*Presse- und Informationsamt der Bundesregierung*: 22/12/1989, p. 1261). A little while later, *Allianz für Deutschland*, which included *Demokratischer Aufbruch*, the East German CDU and the DSU, used the slogan "Party of the Nonviolent Democratic Revolution" to describe itself on the posters for the upcoming elections (*Demokratischer Aufbruch*, 1990). Inasmuch, *a peaceful revolution* quickly entered the vocabulary of politicians and political parties, although not the general language use. Turning point, reversal – or *Wende* – has remained the term that "the majority of East Germans consider the best description of the profound changes occurring in the Fall of 1989" (Jesse, 2009,

p. 29). The term *Wende*, meaning a reversal or turning point, is vague in its content, however, and does not have specific enough connotations. It allows for a variety of interpretations: Was the main cause of these events the collapse, or weakness, of the old political establishment? Or was the crucial point the strength and determination of opponents to the regime? When describing events in the GDR in 1989/90, scientific literature prefers the term (peaceful) revolution. The rest of the paper will examine the connotations of the term *revolution*, as well as what prerequisites an event should fulfil to be described as such.

## Aspects of the (peaceful) revolution in the German Democratic Republic

Many theorists have devoted their thought to revolutions. Karl Marx is probably the best-known one, while among the many in the twentieth century we may single out Hanna Arendt (1963). Considering the opus and significance of only these two authors, a comprehensive scrutiny of all aspects of a revolution would undoubtedly reach encyclopedic proportions. Having in mind the focus of this paper, we will limit ourselves to aspects of the (peaceful) revolution on the GDR territory in 1989/90. Since we are discussing terminology, we shall first consider linguistic explanations. When the term “revolution” comes up, an average reader will spontaneously think about Robespierre, the Jacobins, or, in a word, violence that was an intrinsic part of all “classical revolutions”, the best example of which is the French Revolution of 1789. Moreover, if we consider the linguistic interpretation of the term in different languages, we notice that violence, or the adjective “violent”, is an integral part of most definitions. Croatian language portal ([hjp.znanje.hr](http://hjp.znanje.hr)) defines revolution primarily as a “sweeping change in political, social and economic relations, brought about in a violent manner [the French Revolution, the October Revolution]”. German Duden also says it is a “violent turnabout”, or “an attempt at a violent turnabout” ([www.duden.de](http://www.duden.de)). English dictionaries, such as the Oxford one, also use the adjective *forcible* in its definition of revolution ([en.oxforddictionaries.com](http://en.oxforddictionaries.com)), while the Collins Dictionary says revolution is a successful attempt by a large group of people to change the political system of their country by force ([www.collinsdictionary.com](http://www.collinsdictionary.com)). It is interesting to note that in Russia, a country which is often cited as an example of revolutionism (the October Revolution), Ozhegov’s dictionary of the Russian language defines revolution as a “thorough turnabout in the life of a society, which brings about the removal of a previous social and political system, and its replacement with a new government”, but force or violence is not mentioned (С.И. Ожегов, Н.Ю. Шведова Толковый словарь русского языка, [www.classes.ru/all-russian/russian-dictionary-Ozhegov-term-29908.htm](http://www.classes.ru/all-russian/russian-dictionary-Ozhegov-term-29908.htm)). In France, another country which is often mentioned in the context of revolutions, there are several definitions, depending on the source. Le Petit Robert dictionary (2013) does not mention force or violence when defining revolution, but says it is a “a set of historical occurrences within a larger community (often a nation),

in which a group of rebels manages to come into power, leading to significant (political, economic, and social) changes in society.” According to Larousse ([www.larousse.fr](http://www.larousse.fr)), another French dictionary which is more popular and more widely used – being also called the family dictionary – revolution is “a sudden and violent change in a political and social structure of a state...”

However, despite the linguistic interpretations, we can agree that “the amount of blood spilled cannot be a measure of the normative idea of a revolution” (Klaehr, 2009). It is therefore necessary to include other aspects in the analysis of the term “revolution”. Damm and Thompson (2009) developed a model for the classification of political conflicts that includes the analysis of three dimensions. The first dimension is the number of participants: whether it is a small-scale action, or events that include a large number of people, all the way to the majority of a population. The second dimension is the level or organization: from spontaneous events without a central coordination, to those fully organized. The third dimension is that of violence, from its complete renunciation to a deliberate and planned infliction. In short, authors conclude that, unlike classical revolutions which are violent and massive, events in the GDR in 1989 are an example of a “peaceful and spontaneous revolution” (Damm & Thompson, 2009, p. 32). If it had indeed been a revolution, it would appear “necessary to apply as an analytical category the term democratic revolution” (*ibid.*, p. 33), since the participants of the crucial moment were the people of East Germany. Democratic revolution (Thompson, 2000, 2004; Conze et al., 2009), as one of the terms used in the analysis of a thorough social change, connotes that the aim of the revolution is democratization, which leads to the overthrow of a non-democratic regime. It also clarifies the main participant in the revolution, which is *demos*, and not just a small group of revolutionaries.

The East German revolution of 1989 (let us keep the term for now) was democratic insofar as its main drivers were the people, and not someone representing them. Ash’s term *refolution* cannot be used “for the former GDR as well, because there were no attempts at reforms, and the country succumbed to the actions of its own citizens” (Grix, 2002, p. 60). Kocka (2001, p. 171) also says that “the ‘revolution from above’ followed only after the GDR regime collapsed, and supplemented the ‘revolution from below’, meaning that we are dealing with two phases in the structural downfall of the GDR, which can jointly be described as the 1989/90 revolution.” Incidentally, another important characteristic needs to be pointed out, which is the nonviolence of the people. The regime was ready to respond by force to the demonstrations, such as those in Dresden in October 1989, but despite the conflict between the demonstrators and the police, violence did not escalate or result in human casualties. Demonstrators predominantly believed they should avoid all actions that could be used as an excuse for the use of force by the police. The regime was forced to retreat before the civil protests, disobedience, principles – all practices vividly described by Gandhi’s contemporary Richard B. Gregg (1935), and later by Gene Sharp (1973; 2010), calling them the

political *Jiu-jitsu*. One characteristic of the said martial art is the use of the opponent's force against themselves. In a political context, the actions of nonviolent activists reveal their opponent in the worst possible light, the violence of repression becomes obvious, and this leads to a shift in discernment, and thereby to changes and shifts of power, which favor the nonviolent faction. Obviously, we cannot disregard the many factors – both domestic and foreign policies, and economic influences – that paved the way for the collapse of the GDR. However, the mass and nonviolent pressure by the people certainly accelerated the collapse of the East German regime in the Fall of 1989. Most German political scientists and historians agree that these events in the GDR should be called a revolution (Hollitzer, 2004; Rödder, 2009; Schuller, 2009; Vollnhals, 2011; Winkler, 2013). Since “the old order had been incapable of action, it was delegitimized and morally compromised..., and in just several months the civic movement replaced old structures, values, and ideas, so that the public space was left almost entirely changed – what, then, speaks against the term *revolution*?” (Kowalczyk, 2009, p. 540). Indeed, the results of the mass movement in the former GDR must be measured by the irreversibility of the new facts that came into being, which completely changed the social and political relations, and for which the term *revolution* is more appropriate than the vague terms such as *turning point*, or *reversal* (*Wende*).

The paper will further exemplify how German political parties, in accordance with their ideological stances, perceive and name the events of 1989/90 on the GDR territory, and what the events are called in the curricula of different school subjects in contemporary Germany.

## **The perception of 1989/90 events: Analysis of German parties' basic programs, and the curricula of school subjects**

The subject of analysis are basic programs of political parties which are a part of the 19th electoral terms of the German federal parliament – the Bundestag, and the curricula of school subjects. We shall begin with party programs, which are of great significance to a political linguist. Political linguistics deals with the language of politics, since language is not only one of the tools of politics, but a prerequisite that makes it possible (Girnth, 2002). Party programs put significant emphasis on terminology, or wording, which become *Commitments*. Their function is to form aims and convictions on the inside, and to propagate political views on the outside. In addition, political language, which encompasses discussions of politics – both in the public and private discourse, the media, and the language of politics itself – by politicians and parties (Burkhardt, 1996) is simultaneously a reflection of the speaker's (ideological) worldview. An argument on a political position is simultaneously an argument on words, a semantic conflict (Felder, 2011). Therefore, the party program analysis will focus on the terms *Wende*, and *friedliche Revolution*, or which parties, and to which extent, use these terms. Another issue is whether they consider that the period prior

to and following the fall of the Berlin Wall is considered (just) a reversal, or a series of revolutionary events. Since all programs analyzed were written after 1990, we do so on the assumption that all basic programs of parties in the 19th electoral term of the Bundestag address the events which led to the reunification of the two German countries, due to their crucial importance for Germany.

We will begin with the CDU and CSU parties, which won the greatest number of seats (246) at the parliamentary elections in October 2017. The basic program for the CDU party, *Freiheit und Sicherheit. Grundsätze für Deutschland*, approved in December 2007 in Hannover, is 121 pages long and is divided into eight chapters. The phrase peaceful revolution (*friedliche Revolution*) appears three times. The first time it says that the 1989 *friedliche Revolution* is “a part of the CDU identity” (*Freiheit und Sicherheit*, 2007, p. 5), and stresses how it managed to overcome, or repress the Communist dictatorship of the GDR. *Friedliche Revolution* is mentioned for the second time in Chapter Four, where its great importance is mentioned in the context of prevailing over the SED dictatorship (*ibid.*, p. 43). The third time it is mentioned in the following wording, “with the national uprising on 17 June 1953, and especially with the peaceful revolution of 1989, the citizens of the former GDR (...) created the preconditions for the reunification of Germany” (*ibid.*, p. 70). The term *Wende* is not mentioned at all in the CDU party program. In addition, there is a clear distinction when describing events in the period between the formation and the collapse of the GDR; the events of 1953 are described as a national uprising, and those of 1989 as a peaceful revolution. The program of the CSU party *Die Ordnung. Grundsatzprogramm der Christlich – Sozialen Union*, 42 pages long, never mentions the events in the Fall of 1989 at all. In a single instance it says that the CSU “fought for a united Europe and the reunification of Germany” (*Die Ordnung. Grundsatzprogramm der Christlich-Sozialen Union*, 2016, p. 2).

The basic program of the SPD party, *Hamburger programm. Das Grundsatzprogramm der SPD*, from 2007, mentions peaceful revolutions in a single sentence, but in plural form, and stresses that they “overcame the division of Europe into East and West” (*Hamburger Programm. Grundsatzprogramm der Sozialdemokratischen Partei Deutschlands*, 2007, p. 8). No additional attention is given to events in the former GDR. The term *Wende* is not applied either, and although revolutions are mentioned several times in the text, they relate to the French Revolution and the 1848 Revolution (*ibid.*, pp 12, 14).

In their 2012 program *Verantwortung für die Freiheit. Karlsruher Freiheitsthesen der FDP für eine offene Bürgergesellschaft*, German Liberals (FDP) mention revolutions several times, but in the context of a communication revolution (*Verantwortung für die Freiheit. Karlsruher Freiheitsthesen der FDP für eine offene Bürgergesellschaft*, 2012, p. 63), or a digital revolution (*ibid.*, p. 66). Peaceful revolution is mentioned once, in the Afterword, where it says that the previous program, from 1997 in Wiesbaden, was also inspired “by the liberation movements of our eastern neighbors and the peaceful revolution of 1989” (*ibid.*, p. 115).



The program of the most recent party currently represented in the Bundestag, Alternative für Deutschland (AfD), under the name *Programm für Deutschland. Das Grundsatzprogramm der Alternative für Deutschland*, was passed in 2016. The AfD mentions the term revolution in its program without giving it an adjective and says that the party “in the tradition of both the 1848 and the 1989 revolutions, articulates through civil disobedience the will for the completion of national union in freedom...” (*Programm für Deutschland. Das Grundsatzprogramm der Alternative für Deutschland*, 2016, p. 6). The term *Wende* is only present in the compound *Energiewende* (*ibid.*, pp. 80, 95).

The basic party program of the Bündnis 90/Die Grünen party was adopted in March 2002 and covers 190 pages. The term *Wende* appears several times in the text, but never to describe the events of 1989. Instead, it is mentioned in the context of agrarian reforms (*Die Zukunft ist grün. Grundsatzprogramm von Bündnis 90/Die Grünen*, 2002, p. 55), or energy sources (*ibid.*, p. 32). Peaceful revolution does not get a mention either, and the events of 1989 are mentioned by the Green Party in passing, in a single sentence, where they are called *Umwälzung*, a thorough change, fundamental transformation, or an upheaval (*ibid.*, p. 21), enriching the discussion on the terms for events of 1989/90 with another one.

Die LINKE party – which has changed several names since the reunification of two German countries, at which time it was called the PDS (*Partei des demokratischen Sozialismus*) – is the actual successor of the East German SED party. Die LINKE party program, adopted in Erfurt in October 2011, mentions the term revolution several times, but not once is it tied to the context of the events of 1989. The program mentions civil revolutions of 18th and 19th centuries, which “were aimed at freedom, equality, and brotherhood against religious dogma and aristocratic privileges” (*Programm der Partei DIE LINKE*, 2011, p. 9), as well as the German revolution of 1918/19, which was suppressed “by the Social Democratic leadership” (*ibid.*). When describing the 1989 events, the adjective peaceful (*friedlich*) is mentioned, but not to describe the noun *revolution*. Instead, it says that “in the Fall of 1989, parts of the civic movement in the GDR, among others the reformists from the ranks of the SED, advocated for a peaceful, democratic, social, and ecological awakening (*Aufbruch*), and a political change towards a better socialism. However, in 1990 the project failed.... The democratic awakening in the east created only accession, and a social fall-down, which was painful for many people” (*ibid.*, pp. 12, 13). It needs to be mentioned that the noun *Aufbruch* has several meanings in the German language, from departure or setting off, to (spiritual) awakening or becoming conscious. In the basic program of Die LINKE party, it is also emphasized that the party “connects the political experiences of the German Democratic Republic and the Federal Republic of Germany” (*ibid.*, p. 9). Furthermore, Die LINKE party uses the noun *Ostdeutschland* (East Germany) six times in the text of its program, all in the context of conditions in the east part of Germany after the reunification. Duden says that the noun means “the eastern part of Germany”, but the

same one was previously applied, although in unofficial linguistic use, for the GDR. It is of some interest to note that the basic programs of the other left-wing parties, Bündnis 90/Die Grünen and the SPD, also explicitly mention *Ostdeutschland* – the Green Party seven times, and the SPD once – while the CDU, the CSU, the FDP and the AfD do not do so in their basic programs.

As far as curricula of different school subjects is concerned, it should be mentioned that the school system in Germany is under the jurisdiction of federal states. This means that curricula differ between the states, and there are also differences noticeable in the names of school subjects. Generally speaking, the GDR events of 1989/90 are mentioned and covered in all types of schools in History classes (most often in the ninth or tenth year). However, depending on the state, they also appear in the curricula of the German Language, Catholic and Evangelical RE, Ethics, and Civic Education (*Politische Bildung*). A peaceful revolution, “friedliche Revolution”, is not mentioned each time, and occasionally it appears in quotation marks, or other terms are used. Igel (2007) says that “friedliche Revolution” is mentioned in the curricula of school subjects in eleven German states, along with the terms: revolution (*Revolution*), democratic revolution (*demokratische Revolution*), collapse (*Zusammenbruch*), overthrow (*Umsturz*), or turning point (*Wende*), before which an adjective is often used: peaceful (*friedlich*), nonviolent (*gewaltlos*), or national (*national*). Revolution is often spoken about in connection to the French Revolution, or the 1848 events in Germany, and occasionally the events of 1989/90 in the GDR are also mentioned. Interestingly, these events are a topic of discussion in RE classes (especially Evangelical ones in the state of Nordrhein-Westfalen), where the role of church is discussed, while Ethics classes use the peaceful revolution as an example of non-violent conflict resolution. Nevertheless, taken in entirety, the dictatorship and the development of oppositional movement in the former GDR are neither systematically nor sufficiently dealt with, or covered (Arnsward, 2004).

## Conclusion

During the 1990 debate on the date which would be a suitable national holiday for the “new”, reunified Germany, one of the proposals that came up was 9 November, the day when the Berlin Wall fell. However, it is also the date on which other events, described in the first part of this paper, took place in Germany – events significant for German history, such as the Crystal Night. Therefore, the date chosen to commemorate the reunification was not as historically loaded 3 October, on which the GDR acceded to the territory governed by the Basic Law in 1990. Nevertheless, events just prior to and following the fall of the Berlin wall are still differently perceived and named.

In summary, we may conclude: Firstly, the analysis of basic programs of parties in the 19th electoral term of the Bundestag shows that the perception of and terminology for events in the former GDR depend on the place on the left–right political axis. The right-wing populist AfD party calls these events a revolution. Christian Democrats and

Liberals use the adjective “peaceful” to describe the revolution. Social Democrats, on the other hand, do not mention the GDR events directly, but in the span of a sentence mention peaceful revolutions, which have overcome the division of Europe, in the plural. The further left from the center we incline, the less these events are called a (peaceful) revolution. Bündnis 90/Die Grünen stress they were a thorough change, a fundamental transformation, or an upheaval (*Umwälzung*), while Die LINKE calls them a (spiritual) awakening or becoming conscious. We may therefore agree with the following claim, “Definitions create realities. Those who define things, take a single aspect, out of many, which they consider important” (Greiffenhagen, 1980, p. 12). At the same time, the 1989/90 events in the GDR are also unevenly covered in the curricula of school subjects in German schools. Events are given different names, which often but not exclusively include the peaceful revolution. Different syllabi also focus on the competencies that students should acquire, but there is no mention about how these events ought to be addressed, or which level of importance they deserve. Inasmuch, an event of epic proportions, not just for Germany but the entire world, is being reduced to a historical note which must be taught, although the scope and depth of how the topic is covered can vary significantly.

Secondly, the collapse of the GDR was not brought about just because the old political elite was weakened, but also because of the pressure by the opponents of the regime. Despite this, and despite the fact that social and political relations on the GDR territory were changed within a very short time frame – so that political scientists and historians generally agree a revolution occurred – the phrase a (peaceful) revolution has still not entered the general linguistic code of the German language. Duden, an absolute authority on the German language, after a thorough and attentive examination process, explicitly states in the entry for *die Wende* (turning point, reversal) that it is, among other meanings, a great political and social turning point which occurred in the GDR in 1989. After the reunification, many other phrases and sayings became common in the German language, which incorporate the word *Wende* (turning point, reversal): before or after the turning point (*vor* or *nach der Wende*). Social research has also established phrases such as *Nachwendegeneration* (Haag, 2016) – the generation following the turning point, or *Wendekind* – the child of the turning point, to denote all those born in the GDR between 1975 and 1985, or “those who experienced a double socialization, one in the conditions of the socialist planned economy, and the other in a democratic market economy” (Lettrari et al., 2016, p. 9). From a linguistic perspective, as one of the key events in German history, the Berlin wall, or its fall, has also found a firm place in the collective German mind. Thus, Duden says that the noun *Wall* (*Mauer*), without the “Berlin” apposition, is not just a general building structure made of stone and mortar, but is also “an edifice that the GDR had erected in Berlin on 13 August 1961, and which politically divided Berlin”. *After the Wall* (*nach der Mauer*), for example, means “after the opening of the border between the GDR and the Federal Republic”. The reunification of the two German countries has left an indelible trace on

the division of Germany into the so-called old and new states: *Alte Bundesländer* (old states) are those from West Germany, the states which belonged to the FR of Germany before the German reunification, while *neue Bundesländer* (new states) are those from East Germany, or those that were created by German unification from administrative units – districts on the territory of the former GDR (Velički, 2015).

Finally, the term *turning point* or *reversal* was introduced to political language by the political establishment of the GDR, which did not have in mind the thorough social and political changes, but the steps which the SED party needed to take to remain in power. The term turning point is not an appropriate one for the comprehensive changes in the former GDR, although it is this suggestive term that has been accepted into the general linguistic usage in the German language. Therefore, we may note an almost paradoxical situation: Germans in the former GDR managed to overthrow a loathed regime by way of a (peaceful) revolution, but the general term for these events, which entered the German lexis afterwards, is turning point, or reversal (*Wende*) – a term coined by the communist party, which was overthrown, and which, moreover, implied by the term something fundamentally different; namely, their own ideological offensive, necessary for them to stay in power. Every change in society leaves traces in the language, but language also has its own rules how it changes and becomes enriched. Despite the opinion of scientists and some politicians, who prefer to talk about the peaceful revolution in the former GDR, a significant number of Germans still refer to the events just prior to and following the fall of the Berlin Wall, which enabled the reunification of the two German countries, as a turning point or reversal. A contributing factor to these terminological inconsistencies is the fact that the curricula of school subjects in Germany give different names to these events.

## References

- AfD (2016). *Programm für Deutschland. Das Grundsatzprogramm der Alternative für Deutschland*.  
Arendt, H. (1965). *Über die Revolution*. Piper.  
Arnswald, U. (2004). Zum Stellenwert der DDR-Geschichte in schulischen Lehrplänen. *Aus Politik und Zeitgeschichte. Beilage zur Wochezeitung Das parlament*, 41/42, 28 – 35.  
Ash, T. G. (1999). *We the People: The Revolution of '89 Witnessed in Warsaw, Budapest, Berlin and Prague*. Penguin.  
Benz, W. (2000). *Geschichte des Dritten Reiches*. C.H.Beck Verlag.  
Bündnis 90/Die Grünen (2002). *Die Zukunft ist grün. Grundsatzprogramm von Bündnis 90/ Die Grünen*.  
Bürgerbewegung Demokratie Jetzt (1989). *Aufruf zur Einmischung in eigener Sache. Temperamente. Blätter für junge Literatur*, Oktober 1989.

- Burkhardt, A. (1996). Politolinguistik. Versuch einer Ortsbestimmung. In H. Diekmann-Shenke, & J. Klein (Eds.), *Sprachstrategien und Dialogblockaden. Linguistische und politikwissenschaftliche Studien zur politischen Kommunikation* (pp. 75 – 100). De Gruyter. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110812534.75>
- CDU (2007). *Freiheit und Sicherheit. Die Grundsätze für Deutschland. Das Grundsatzprogramm*.
- Collins Dictionary (n.d.). <https://www.collinsdictionary.com>
- Conze, E., Gajdukowa, K., Koch - Baumgarten, S. (ur.) (2009). *Die demokratische Revolution 1989 in der DDR*. Köln-Weimar-Wien: Böhlau Verlag. <https://doi.org/10.7788/boehlau.9783412334949>
- CSU. 2016. *Die Ordnung. Grundsatzprogramm der Christlich-Sozialen Union*.
- Damm, M., & Thompson, M. R. (2009). Wende oder friedliche Revolution? Ungleiche Deutungen einer historischen Zäsur. *Totalitarismus und Demokratie. Zeitschrift für internationale Diktator- und Freiheitsforschung*, 1, 21–35. <https://doi.org/10.13109/toede.2009.6.1.21>
- Demokratischer Aufbruch (1990). Der Wahlkampf hat begonnen! [http://www.deutscheeinheitleipzig.de/ausstellung/hausderdemokratie/dokumente/da/1\\_Allianz.pdf](http://www.deutscheeinheitleipzig.de/ausstellung/hausderdemokratie/dokumente/da/1_Allianz.pdf) [2.4.2014].
- Die LINKE (2011). *Programm der Partei DIE LINKE*.
- Duden (n.d.). <https://www.duden.de>
- Eitz, Thorsten & Stötzel, G. (2007). Wörterbuch der „Vergangenheitsbewältigung“. *Die NS – Vergangenheit im öffentlichen Sprachgebrauch*. Georg Olms Verlag.
- Erdelja, K., & Stojaković, I. (2011). *Koraci kroz vrijeme 4. Udžbenik povijesti za četvrti razred gimnazije*. Školska knjiga
- FDP (2012). *Verantwortung für die Freiheit. Karlsruher Freiheitsthesen der FDP für eine offene Bürgergesellschaft*.
- Felder, E. (2011). Diskursanalyse von politischer Sprache. In Bundeszentrale für politische Bildung/bpb (Ed.), *Dossier Sprache und Politik*. <http://www.bpb.de/politik/grundfragen/sprache-und-politik/42740/diskursanalyse?p=all> [12.06.2018].
- Fleischmann, P. (Ed.) (2015). *Hitler als Häftling in Landsberg am Lech 1923/24. Der Gefangenen-Personalakt Hitler nebst weiteren Quellen aus der Schutzhaft-, Untersuchungshaft- und Festungshaftanstalt Landsberg am Lech*. Schmidt Verlag.
- Girnth, H. (2002). *Sprache und Sprachverwendung in der Politik. Eine Einführung in die linguistische Analyse öffentlich-politischer Kommunikation*. Niemeyer. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110946659>
- Gregg, R. B. (2007) (1935). *The Power of Non – violence*. Read Books.
- Greiffenhagen, M. (1980). Einleitung. In M. Greiffenhagen (Ed.), *Kampf um Wörter? Politische Begriffe im Meinungsstreit* (pp. 9 – 37). Carl Hanser Verlag.
- Grix, J. (2002). Revolution and transformation in East Germany. Revisiting the dominant paradigms. In J. Leonhard, L. Funk (Ed.), *Ten years of German unification: transfer, transformation, incorporation?* (pp. 56 – 68). University Birmingham Press.
- Haag, H. (2016). Nachwendegeneration: Weitergabe von Transformationserfahrungen. Die DDR im Gedächtnis der Nachwendegeneration. In A. Lettrari & Ch. Nestler & N. Troi-Boeck (Eds.), *Die Generation der Wendekinder. Elaboration eines Forschungsfeldes* (pp. 89 – 107). Springer VS. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-658-11480-0\\_7](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-658-11480-0_7)

- Haffner, S. (2002). *Der Verrat: Deutschland 1918/1919*. Verlag 1900.
- Hollitzer, T. (2004). 15 Jahre Friedliche Revolution. *Aus Politik und Zeitgeschichte*, B 41/42, 3 – 7.
- Hrvatska enciklopedija (n.d.). [www.enciklopedija.hr](http://www.enciklopedija.hr)
- Hrvatski jezični portal (n.d.). <http://hjp.znanje.hr>
- Igel, O. (2007). *Die friedliche Revolution in den Lehrplänen*. Bundesstiftung zur Aufarbeitung der SED-Diktatur.
- Initiativgruppe Neues Forum (1990). Die Mauer ist gefallen. *taz DDR-Journal zur Novemberrevolution*. Berlin 1990.
- Jesse, E. (2009). Eine Revolution stürzt das SED-Regime. In Konrad-Adenauer-Stiftung; D. Schipanski & B. Vogel (Eds.), *Dreißig Thesen zur deutschen Einheit* (pp. 23 – 33). Herder.
- Klaehr, A. (2009). *Der Herbst 1989 – eine Revolution?* <http://www.kritische-ausgabe.de>
- Kocka, J. (2001). Reform and Revolution: Germany 1989 – 1990. In R. Rürup (Ed.), *The Problem of Revolution in Germany 1789 – 1989* (pp. 161 – 179). Berg.
- Kowalczyk, I.–S. (2009). *Endspiel. Die Revolution von 1989 in der DDR*. C.H. Beck Verlag. <https://doi.org/10.17104/9783406618543>
- Larousse (n.d.). <https://www.larousse.fr>
- Le Petit Robert (2013). *Dictionnaire alphabetique et analogique de la langue française*. Redaction dirigee par A. Rey. Le Robert.
- Lernhelfer (n.d.). <https://www.lernhelfer.de>
- Lettrari, A., Nestler, C. & Troi-Boeck, N. (ur.) (2016). *Die Generation der Wendekinder. Elaboration eines Forschungsfeldes*. Springer VS. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-658-11480-0>
- Lindner, B. (2014). Begriffsgeschichte der Friedlichen Revolution. Eine Spurensuche. *Aus Politik und Zeitgeschichte*, 24–26.
- Neues Deutschland*. 19.10.1989.
- Oxford Dictionaries Online (n.d.). <https://en.oxforddictionaries.com>
- Ожегов, С.И. (n.d.). *Шведова Толковый словарь русского языка*. <http://www.classes.ru/all-russian/russian-dictionary-Ozhegov-term-29908.htm>
- Presse- und Informationsamt der Bundesregierung. 22.12.1989. *Rede des Bundeskanzlers vor der Frauenkirche in Dresden, Kundgebung am 19. Dezember 1989*. Bulletin 150–89 vom 22.12.1989.
- RAAbits Realschule Geschichte (2011). Raabe Verlag.
- Rödder, A. (2009). *Deutschland einzig Vaterland. Die Geschichte der Wiedervereinigung*. C.H. Beck.
- Schuller, W. (2009). *Die deutsche Revolution 1989*. Rowohlt.
- Sharp, G. (1973). *The Politics of Nonviolent Action. Part 3 : The Dynamics of Nonviolent Action*. Porter Sargent.
- Sharp, G. (2010). *From Dictatorship to Democracy. A Conceptual Framework for Liberation*. The Albert Einstein Institution.
- Siemann, W. (1985). *Die deutsche Revolution von 1848/49*. Suhrkamp. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-349-26910-5>
- SPD (2007). *Hamburger Programm. Grundsatzprogramm der Sozialdemokratischen Partei Deutschlands*.

- Thompson, M. R. (2000). Demokratische Revolution statt Kulturkampf. Eine Erwiderung auf HuntingtonsThesen. *Internationale Politik*, 4, 47–54.
- Thompson, M. R. (2004). *Democratic Revolutions. Asia and Eastern Europe*. Routledge.
- Velički, D. (2015). *Njemački u politici. S njemačko-hrvatskim rječnikom političke terminologije i tumačenjem odabranih pojmova političkoga sustava Njemačke i Austrije*. UFZG.
- Vollnhals, C. (2011). *Jahre des Umbruchs. Friedliche Revolution in der DDR und Transition in Ostmitteleuropa (Schriften des Hannah-Arendt-Instituts für Totalitarismusforschung. Band 43)*. Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht. <https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666369193>
- Winkler, G. (2013). *Die friedliche Revolution und ihre Ergebnisse 1989 bis 2013. Angleichung ohne Ende!?*. SFZ.

---

**Damir Velički**

Faculty of Teacher Education

University of Zagreb

Savska cesta 77, 10000 Zagreb, Croatia

[damir.velicki@ufzg.hr](mailto:damir.velicki@ufzg.hr)

# (Miroљjubiva) revolucija, refolucija ili preokret? Pad Berlinskoga zida kao uzrok i terminoloških previranja

---

## Sažetak

*Devetoga studenog u novijoj njemačkoj povijesti odigrali su se događaji koji su imali dalekosežne posljedice za Njemačku, a neki od njih, poput pada Berlinskoga zida, simbol su završetka hladnog rata i podjele Njemačke. Osim političkih implikacija, pad Berlinskoga zida, odnosno događaji koji su mu prethodili i uslijedili, uzrokovali su i nedoumice radi li se o (miroљjubivoj) revoluciji, (samo) o preokretu ili pak o refoluciji – pritisku odozdo i reformama odozgo? U radu se analiziraju događaji uoči i nakon pada Berlinskoga zida, njihovi nazivi u temeljnim programima stranaka zastupljenih u 19. sazivu Bundestaga te u kurikulumima nastavnih predmeta u njemačkim pokrajinama. Zaključuje se da stranke različito nazivaju zbivanja 1989./90. godine na području bivšeg DDR-a, i to s obzirom na svoje ideološke pozicije te da se ta zbivanja vrlo neujednačeno opisuju i u kurikulumima nastavnih predmeta. Ti su događaji imali revolucionarni karakter, budući da su u vrlo kratkom roku potpuno promijenjeni društveni i politički odnosi na području DDR-a, ali usprkos tome sintagma miroљjubiva revolucija ipak nije ušla u raširenu opću jezičnu uporabu u njemačkom jeziku, već se uvriježio sadržajno neodređeniji pojam preokreta, tj. obrata.*

**Ključne riječi:** kurikulum; Njemačka; povijest; stranke; ujedinjenje.

## Uvod – 9. studenoga u novijoj njemačkoj povijesti

Deveti dan mjeseca studenoga u njemačkoj povijesti zauzima posebno mjesto. Događaji toga dana 1848., 1918., 1923., 1938. te 1989. godine imali su dalekosežne posljedice za Njemačku, a neki od njih označavaju i gotovo epohalne prekretnice svjetske povijesti. U devetnaestom stoljeću, 9. 11. 1848. u Beču je ubijen Robert Blum, njemački političar i jedan od vođe ljevice u frankfurtskoj Nacionalnoj skupštini. Njegovo pogubljenje označava prekretnicu, odnosno početak kraja revolucije 1848./49. u zemljama Njemačkog saveza (Siemann, 1985). U prvoj polovici dvadesetoga stoljeća, tijekom Novembarske revolucije 1918./19. u Njemačkoj, koju neki autori zbog uloge njemačkih socijaldemokrata koji su dopustili da stara njemačka politička elita ostane na vlasti, označavaju događajem koji je značajno pridonio propasti Weimarske



Republike i usponu nacionalsocijalizma (Haffner, 2002), devetoga studenog 1918. godine državni kancelar Max von Baden proglasio je abdikaciju cara Wilhelma II. Istog su dana Philipp Scheidemann i Karl Liebknecht gotovo istodobno, s razmakom od dva sata, proglasili Njemačku Republiku. Philipp Scheidemann je, ne dogovorivši se prethodno s Friedrichom Ebertom kojemu je toga dana princ Max von Baden ustupio dužnost državnoga kancelara, u improviziranom govoru proglasio s prozora Reichstaga njemačku Republiku (*deutsche Republik*). Karl Liebknecht je pak malo kasnije proglasio slobodnu socijalističku Republiku Njemačku (*freie sozialistische Republik Deutschland*). To su bili događaji koji su prethodili stvaranju Weimarske Republike čiji je prvi predsjednik bio Friedrich Ebert. Weimarska Republika bila je od proglašenja izložena velikim pritiscima, a politička situacija u njoj u prvih je nekoliko godina bila izuzetno nestabilna. U tom kontekstu možemo spomenuti primjerice Kappov puč 1920., ustanke radnika u Saskoj i Tiringiji 1923., a jedan od događaja, odnosno pučeva koji je nagovijestio ozbiljno jačanje nacionalsocijalističkoga pokreta i učinio Hitlerovo ime poznatim široj javnosti, odigrao se 1923. godine, i to opet 8. i 9. studenog. Hitler je 8. studenoga 1923. izveo puč u pivnici *Bürgerbräukeller*, kada je zajedno s generalom Erichom Ludendorffom i pristalicama objavio izbijanje „nacionalne revolucije” i svrgnuće vlade u Berlinu. Do planiranoga marša na Berlin ipak nije došlo jer je pobuna sljedećega dana, 9. studenoga, ugušena u Münchenu. Hitler je nakon toga osuđen na pet godina zatvora, ali je u zatvoru proveo svega nepunih devet mjeseci, i to u privilegiranim uvjetima (Fleischmann, 2015). Petnaest godina kasnije, u noći s 9. na 10. studenoga 1938. u Njemačkoj je došlo do nacističkoga nasilja prema Židovima u kojem su „gorjele sinagoge, Židovi javno zlostavljani, židovska imovina uništavana i pljačkana” (Benz, 2000, str. 141). Židovima su u Njemačkoj još tri godine ranije, temeljem Nürnberških zakona iz 1935. godine, oduzeta građanska prava te su zlostavljani i proganjani, ali događaji 9./10. studenog 1938. „označavaju naglu promjenu državnog djelovanja od legislativne i administrativne diskriminacije židovske manjine u brutalno nasilje” (Benz, 2000, str. 140).

Nazivi prethodno opisanih triju događaja, ako ih promotrimo s povijesno-politološke perspektive, nisu sporni. Govori i nastupi Philippa Scheidemann i Karla Liebknechta, usprkos međusobnim sadržajnim razlikama i različitim ciljevima, bili su proglašenje Republike, a taj se događaj u njemačkoj historiografiji i njemačkim udžbenicima povijesti (RAAbits Realschule Geschichte, 2011) i školskim leksikonima (<https://www.lernhelfer.de>) naziva i dvostrukim proglašenjem Republike (*doppelte Ausrufung der Republik*). Što se tiče događaja u Münchenu 1923. godine, nesporno je da se radilo o puču, odnosno o pokušaju nasilnoga preuzimanja državne vlasti mimo demokratske procedure. Nacističko nasilje protiv Židova u noći s 9. na 10. studenoga 1938. u hrvatskom se naziva Kristalna noć (*Kristallnacht*), a ta se sintagma najčešće koristi i u hrvatskim udžbenicima povijesti i enciklopedijama (Erdelja i Stojaković, 2011; [www.enciklopedija.hr](http://www.enciklopedija.hr)). Atribut *kristalna* u pravilu se objašnjava činjenicom da je u toj noći razbijeno na tisuće prozora i izloga, zbog čega su krhotine stakla prekrile ulice njemačkih gradova. U Njemačkoj se pak, zbog kritika da je pojam *Kristallnacht* ciničan,

eufemističan, previše bezopasan te da potječe iz nacionalsocijalističke jezične uporabe, upotrebljavaju od kraja osamdesetih godina uglavnom pojmovi *Reichspogromnacht* i *Pogromnacht* (Eitz i Stötzel, 2007).

Četvrti događaj koji se odigrao također 9. studenoga je pad Berlinskog zida 1989. godine. Berlinski zid mogli bismo označiti kao najznačajniji simbol hladnog rata, simbol geopolitičke i ideološke podjele Europe i Njemačke koji je vlast u bivšoj Njemačkoj Demokratskoj Republici nazivala antifašističkim obrambenim zidom (*antifaschistischer Schutzwall*), mjerom obrane protiv vanjskoga neprijatelja. Noć 9. na 10. studenoga 1989. kada je u Berlinu Njemačka Demokratska Republika pod velikim pritiskom građana otvorila granicu prema Saveznoj Republici Njemačkoj ušla je u povijest i u njemački leksik kao *Mauerfall*, pad Zida, ali naziv za događaje koji su tome prethodili i uslijedili još je i danas sporan i predmetom je brojnih znanstvenih i stručnih diskusija. Je li se radilo o revoluciji, odnosno moramo li revoluciji obvezno pridodati atribut 'miroljubiva' ili o refoluciji, pritisku odozdo te reformama odozgo, pojmu kojim je britanski povjesničar Timothy Garton Ash (1999) okarakterizirao događaje i pad komunističkih režima u zemljama istočne Europe, posebice Poljskoj i Mađarskoj? Je li ipak najprikladniji pojam za taj proces doista *Wende* (obrat, promjena, preokret, prekretnica), pojam koji je naposljetku u Njemačkoj i ušao u opću jezičnu uporabu i u leksik standardnoga njemačkog jezika sa značenjem velikih i radikalnih političkih i društvenih promjena 1989. godine u Njemačkoj Demokratskoj Republici? Ukratko, događaji u Njemačkoj Demokratskoj Republici 1989./90., osim dakako političkih implikacija, uzrokovali su i raspravu o sadržaju tih događanja, otvorilo se pitanje je li se radilo o revoluciji ili ne, a s time u vezi pojavile su se i jezične nedoumice oko adekvatnoga naziva.

## Godina 1989. – preokret ili revolucija?

Kada je član istočnonjemačkoga politbiroa Günter Schabowski na kraju, kako se na početku činilo, još jedne dosadne konferencije za tisak 9. 11. 1989. godine na pitanje novinara kada stupa na snagu nova odredba o liberalizaciji putovanja na zapad istočnonjemačkih građana, odgovorio „odmah”, nije ni slutio da je time pokrenuo lavinu koja će nekoliko sati kasnije dovesti do pada Berlinskoga zida. Tako je njegov ishitren odgovor, iako nije odgovarao zaključcima politbiroa, ni po opsegu, ni po vremenu stupanja na snagu, ušao u povijest i doveo do otvaranja strogo čuvane istočnonjemačke granice prema Zapadnom Berlinu. Međutim, pad Berlinskoga zida dakako ipak nije bio događaj koji je nastupio sasvim neočekivano. Njemu su prethodili brojni događaji kojima je istočnonjemačko stanovništvo iskazivalo svoje nezadovoljstvo prilikama u DDR-u. Pad Berlinskoga zida bio je prijeloman trenutak na putu prema ujedinjenju dviju njemačkih država. On bi se istovremeno mogao označiti i trenutkom kada je proces ujedinjenja ušao u drugu fazu. U središtu prve faze bilo je pitanje društvenih i političkih promjena u DDR-u, dok je druga faza bila obilježena koracima koji su rezultirali i formalnim ujedinjenjem.

Sami ih akteri protestnih zbivanja u bivšem DDR-u u to vrijeme nisu nazivali revolucijom. U opozicijskim krugovima bilo je najčešće riječi o obnovi (*Erneuerung*), ali

se često naglašavalo da se radi o mirnoj, odnosno miroljubivoj (*friedlich*) obnovi: „Našoj zemlji potrebna je miroljubiva demokratska obnova” (Bürgerbewegung Demokratie Jetzt, 1989, str. 20). Sam politički vrh DDR-a u političku je diskusiju unio izraz *Wende* (obrat, promjena, preokret, prekretnica), ali pritom nije mislio na društvenopolitičke promjene, nego na potrebne korake koje mora poduzeti stranka SED, kako bi osigurala svoju vlast. Egon Krenz je u obraćanju javnosti putem medija 18. 10. 1989. izjavio da „s današnjom sjednicom Centralnoga komiteta započinjemo preokret (*Wende*)” (Neues Deutschland, str. 4), istaknuvši pritom prije svega stranačku političku i ideološku ofenzivu. Pritom valja istaknuti da se pojam *Wende* i prije Krenzove izjave dovodio u vezu sa željenim društvenim reformama. Istočnonjemački pisac Volker Braun napisao je 1988. godine pjesmu istog naslova, aludirajući pritom na Gorbačova, tj. *perestrojku* i *glasnost*. Što se tiče sintagme *miroljubiva revolucija* (*friedliche Revolution*), većina izvora se slaže da je tu sintagmu prvi put upotrijebio ondašnji gradonačelnik Zapadnoga Berlina Walter Momper, kada je, opisujući razvoj događaja u DDR-u, 10. 11. 1989. godine čestitao „građankama i građanima DDR-a na miroljubivoj i demokratskoj revoluciji” (Lindner, 2014). Dva dana kasnije sintagma *miroljubiva revolucija* pojavljuje se i u poruci koju je *Neues Forum* uputio javnosti: „Građani i građanke DDR-a! Vaša spontana i neustrašiva izražavanja volje u cijeloj su zemlji pokrenula miroljubivu revoluciju, srušila politbiro i probila Zid” (Initiativgruppe Neues Forum, str. 132). Da se radi o miroljubivoj revoluciji krajem je 1989. godine, obraćajući se javnosti u Dresdenu, izjavio je i Helmut Kohl, kada je, opisujući protekle događaje, istaknuo „priznanje i divljenje toj miroljubivoj revoluciji” (Presse - und Informationsamt der Bundesregierung: 22. 12. 1989, str. 1261). Nešto kasnije se *Allianz für Deutschland*, koja je uključivala *Demokratischer Aufbruch*, istočnonjemački CDU i DSU, na svojim predizbornim plakatima opisivala kao „stranka nenasilne demokratske revolucije” (*Demokratischer Aufbruch*, 1990). Utoliko je *miroljubiva revolucija* vrlo brzo ušla u rječnik političara i stranaka, ali ne i u široku jezičnu uporabu. Preokret, promjena ili obrat, dakle pojam *Wende* do danas je ostao pojam koji „za većinu istočnih Nijemaca najbolje opisuje korjenite promjene jeseni 1989. godine” (Jesse, 2009, str. 29). Sam pojam *Wende* kao obrat ili promjena sadržajno je neodređen, nema specifičnu konotaciju. On, naime, otvara prostor za različite interpretacije: radi li se o događajima kojima je presudni uzrok bio slom odnosno slabost stare političke elite ili je pritom bila ipak presudna snaga i odlučnost protivnika režima? U znanstvenoj se literaturi, kada se opisuju događaji u DDR-u 1989./90. godine, preferira pojam (miroljubiva) revolucija. Koje su pak konotacije pojma *revolucija*, odnosno koje bi pretpostavke neki događaji morali imati da bi se opisali kao revolucija, promotrit će se u nastavku rada.

## Aspekti (miroljubive) revolucije u Njemačkoj Demokratskoj Republici

Mnogi su se teoretičari bavili revolucijom, vjerojatno najpoznatiji od njih je Karl Marx, a od teoretičara 20. stoljeća možemo, između brojnih drugih, istaknuti Hannu

Arendt (1963). Utoliko bi, a s obzirom na opus i značenje samo navedenih autora, sveobuhvatan pogled na promišljanja o svim aspektima revolucije, poprimio upravo enciklopedijske razmjere. Ograničimo se stoga, a što i jest u fokusu ovoga rada, na aspekte (miroljubive) revolucije na području DDR-a 1989./90. godine. Pritom, budući da je riječ o terminologiji, krenimo od lingvističkih tumačenja. Kad se spomene pojam 'revolucija', prosječnom čitatelju spontano pada na pamet primjerice Robespierre, jakobinci, jednom riječju nasilje koje je bilo neodvojivi dio svih „klasičnih revolucija”, od kojih kao najbolji primjer možemo istaknuti Francusku revoluciju 1789. godine. Uostalom, ako pogledamo lingvistička tumačenja u brojnim jezicima, onda uočavamo da je nasilje, odnosno atribut „nasilan/nasilni” sastavni dio većine definicija. Hrvatski jezični portal (hjp.znanje.hr) revoluciju definira primarno kao „korjenitu promjenu u političkim, društvenim i ekonomskim odnosima, izvedenu nasilnim putem [Francuska revolucija; Oktobarska revolucija]”, njemački Duden također navodi da se radi o „nasilnom preokretu, odnosno „pokušaju nasilnog preokreta” (www.duden.de). Rječnici engleskog jezika, primjerice Oxford dictionary također u definiciji revolucije koristi pridjev *forcible* (<https://en.oxforddictionaries.com>), Collins dictionary ističe kako je revolucija uspješan pokušaj velike grupe ljudi da promijeni politički sustav zemlje, i to *by force* (<https://www.collinsdictionary.com>). Interesantno je spomenuti da se u Rusiji, zemlji koja se često navodi kao primjer revolucije (Oktobarska revolucija), u Ožegovom rječniku ruskog jezika revolucija definira kao „korjeniti preokret u životu društva, što dovodi do uklanjanja prethodnog društvenog i političkog sustava i uspostave nove vlade”, ali se sila odnosno nasilje ne spominje (С.И. Ожегов, Н.Ю. Шведова Толковый словарь русского языка, <http://www.classes.ru/all-russian/russian-dictionary-Ozhegov-term-29908.htm>). U Francuskoj, također zemlji koja se najčešće spominje u kontekstu revolucije, postoji, ovisno o izvoru, nekoliko definicija revolucije. Tako rječnik francuskoga jezika Le Petit Robert (2013), u definiciji revolucije ne spominje silu tj. nasilje, nego ističe da se radi o „skupu povijesnih događaja unutar veće zajednice (često nacije), tijekom kojih jedan dio pobunjene skupine uspije zauzeti vlast, a u društvu pritom dođe do dubokih promjena (političkih, gospodarskih i društvenih).” Prema Larousseu (www.larousse.fr), drugom francuskom rječniku koji je popularniji u široj primjeni i upotrebi, a zovu ga još i obiteljskim rječnikom, revolucija je „iznenadna i nasilna promjena u političkoj i društvenoj strukturi jedne države...”

Međutim, unatoč ovim lingvističkim tumačenjima, možemo se složiti s tvrdnjom da „prolivena krv ne može biti mjerilo normativnog pojma revolucije” (Klaehr, 2009). Utoliko je u analizi pojma revolucije potrebno uzeti u obzir i druge aspekte. Damm i Thompson (2009) razvili su model za klasifikaciju političkih konflikata koji obuhvaća analizu triju dimenzija. Prva dimenzija je brojnost sudionika, radi li se o akcijama malog broja ljudi ili pak o događajima u kojima sudjeluje velik broj ljudi, sve do prevladavajućega dijela ukupnoga stanovništva. Druga dimenzija analize je stupanj organizacije, od potpuno spontanih, bez središnje koordinacije, do potpuno organiziranih. Treća dimenzija je dimenzija nasilja, od potpunoga odricanja istog pa sve do njegove svjesne i ciljane uporabe. Autori, sažeto prikazano, dolaze do

zaključka da su, za razliku od klasičnih revolucija koje imaju karakteristike nasilnih masovnih pokreta, zbivanja u DDR-u 1989. godine primjer „miroljubive i spontane revolucije” (Damm i Thompson, 2009, str. 32). Da se radilo doista o revoluciji, čini se „neophodnim primijeniti kao analitičku kategoriju i pojam demokratske revolucije” (ibid., str. 33) budući da je akter u odlučujućem trenutku bilo istočnonjemačko stanovništvo. Pojam demokratske revolucije (Thompson, 2000, 2004; Conze i sur., 2009), kao jedan od pojmova koji se koristi u analizi korjenitih društvenih promjena, sadrži u sebi konotaciju da je cilj revolucije bila demokratizacija, što dovodi do smjene nedemokratskoga režima, ali i pojašnjava i glavnog aktera revolucije, a to je *demos*, a ne samo mala skupina revolucionara.

Revolucija (ostanimo zasad pri tome terminu) u Istočnoj Njemačkoj 1989. godine utoliko je bila demokratska jer je glavni pokretač bio narod, a ne netko u ime naroda. Ashov se pojam *refolution* ne može upotrijebiti „i za bivši DDR, jer nije bilo pokušaja reformi, a država je pala na koljena djelovanjem vlastitih građana” (Grix, 2002, str. 60). I Kocka (2001, str. 171) ističe da je „revolucija odozgo” uslijedila tek nakon pada režima u DDR-u i samo je nadopunila ‘revoluciju odozdo’, odnosno da je riječ o dvije faze strukturnoga sloma DDR-a koji se zajedno mogu opisati kao revolucija 1989./90.” Istovremeno treba istaknuti još jedno bitno obilježje, a to je nenasilje od strane naroda. Režim je na demonstracije, primjerice one u Dresdenu u listopadu 1989. godine, bio spreman odgovoriti silom, došlo je do sukoba demonstranata i policije, ali ne i do eskalacije nasilja s ljudskim žrtvama. Među demonstrantima prevladavalo je mišljenje da treba izbjegavati sve korake koji bi mogli poslužiti kao izlika za uporabu sile od strane policije. Režim je bio prisiljen na popuštanje civilnim protestom, neposluhom, načelom, dakle postupcima koje su vrlo slikovito opisali Gandijev suvremenik Richard B. Gregg (1935), a kasnije i Gene Sharp (1973; 2010), nazvavši ih političkim *jiu jitsuom*. Naime, jedna od karakteristika navedene borilačke vještine sastoji se i u tome da se snaga protivnika upotrijebi protiv njega samoga. U političkom kontekstu, nenasilni aktivisti svojim postupcima otkrivaju protivnika u najgorem mogućem svjetlu, nasilje represije postaje bjelodano, što pak dovodi do pomaka u mišljenju, a potom i do promjena i pomacima u moći koji pogoduju nenasilnoj skupini. Dakako da ne treba smetnuti s uma brojne druge, unutarjno- i vanjskopolitičke i ekonomske faktore koji su utrljali put slomu DDR-a. Međutim, masovni i nenasilni pristisak od strane naroda zasigurno je ubrzao slom istočnonjemačkoga režima u jesen 1989. godine. Većina se njemačkih politologa i povjesničara slaže da se navedeni događaji u DDR-u nazovu revolucijom (Hollitzer, 2004; Rödder, 2009; Schuller, 2009; Vollnhals, 2011; Winkler, 2013). Budući da je „...stari poredak bio nesposoban djelovati, bio delegitimiran i moralno kompromitiran, ... a u samo nekoliko mjeseci građanski je pokret odstranio stare strukture, vrijednosti i ideje te u javnom prostoru gotovo ništa nije bilo kao prije, što onda govori protiv pojma *revolucija*?” (Kowalczyk, 2009, str. 540). I doista, rezultati masovnog pokreta u bivšem DDR-u moraju se mjeriti ireverzibilnošću stvorenih činjenica kojima su u potpunosti promijenjeni društveni i politički odnosi, za što je od

sadržajno neodređenih pojmova *preokret*, tj. *obrat* (*Wende*), prikladniji pojam *revolucija*.

U nastavku ćemo vidjeti kako njemačke stranke, a s obzirom na svoje ideološke pozicije, percipiraju i nazivaju zbivanja 1989./90. godine na području DDR-a te kako se ti događaji nazivaju u kurikulumima nastavnih predmeta u Njemačkoj.

## **Percepcija zbivanja u DDR-u 1989./90. godine – analiza temeljnih programa njemačkih stranaka i kurikula nastavnih predmeta**

Predmet analize bit će temeljni stranački programi, i to programi stranaka koje se nalaze u 19. sazivu njemačkoga saveznog parlamenta – *Bundestaga* te kurikuli nastavnih predmeta. Krenimo od stranačkih programa koji su za politolingvistiku izuzetno bitni. Pod tim pojmom podrazumijevamo dio lingvistike koja se bavi političkim jezikom, budući da je jezik ne samo jedan od instrumenata politike, nego uvjet koji ju omogućuje (Girnth, 2002). Stranački programi, naime, veliku pažnju poklanjaju terminologiji, odnosno formulacijama, oni su utoliko *Commitments*, njihova funkcija sastoji se u tome da prema unutra formuliraju određene ciljeve i uvjerenja, a prema van propagiraju vlastita politička stajališta. Osim toga, politički jezik, a pod time podrazumijevamo govorenje o politici – u javnim i privatnim diskusijama, medijima te jezik politike – političara i unutar stranaka (Burkhardt, 1996), jest istovremeno i odraz (ideološkoga) gledanja na stvari samog govornika, a svađa oko političkih sadržaja jest istovremeno i svađa oko riječi, semantička borba (Felder, 2011). Utoliko su u fokusu interesa analize stranačkih programa pojmovi *Wende*, tj. *friedliche Revolution*, odnosno pitanje koje stranke i u kojoj mjeri upotrebljavaju ove termine, polaze li od toga da se, kad je riječ o razdoblju uoči i neposredno nako pada Berlinskoga zida, doista radilo (samo) o obratu ili pak o revolucionarnim zbivanjima? Pritom se krenulo od pretpostavke da se u svim temeljnim stranačkim programima stranaka zastupljenim u 19. sazivu *Bundestaga*, i s obzirom da su svi analizirani programi pisani nakon 1990. godine, nalazi osvrt na događaje koji su doveli do ujedinjenja dviju njemačkih država, upravo zbog njihove, za Njemačku, epohalne važnosti.

Krenut ćemo od stranaka CDU i CSU koje su na saveznom parlamentarnim izborima u listopadu 2017. osvojile najviše mandata (246). Temeljni program stranke CDU, *Freiheit und Sicherheit. Grundsätze für Deutschland*, donesen u Hannoveru u prosincu 2007. godine, obuhvaća 121 stranicu i podijeljen je u osam poglavlja. Sintagma miroljubiva revolucija (*friedliche Revolution*) u njemu se pojavljuje tri puta. Prvi put kada se navodi da je *friedliche Revolution* 1989. godine „dio identiteta CDU-a” (*Freiheit und Sicherheit*, 2007, str. 5) te se ističe kako je ona svladala odnosno nadjačala komunističku diktaturu DDR-a. *Friedliche Revolution* drugi se put spominje u četvrtom poglavlju kada joj se pripisuje veliko značenje u kontekstu prevladavanja SED-diktature (*Freiheit und Sicherheit*, 2007, str. 43), a treći put se spominje kada se navodi da su „s narodnim ustankom 17. lipnja 1953, a posebice s miroljubivom revolucijom 1989. godine građani u bivšem DDR-u (...) stvorili preduvjete za ponovno ujedinjenje Njemačke” (*Freiheit*

und Sicherheit, 2007, str. 70). Pojam *Wende* se u programu CDU-a uopće ne spominje. Osim toga, vidljiva je jasna distinkcija između opisa događaja u DDR-u u razdoblju od nastanka pa do sloma DDR-a; zbivanja 1953. opisana su kao ustanak naroda, a zbivanja 1989. kao miroljubiva revolucija. Program stranke CSU, *Die Ordnung. Grundsatzprogramm der Christlich – Sozialen Union*, u četrdeset i dvije stranice teksta ni jednom se ne osvrće na zbivanja u jesen 1989. godine. Samo se jednom ističe kako se CSU „borio za ujedinjenu Europu i ponovno ujedinjenje Njemačke” (*Die Ordnung. Grundsatzprogramm der Christlich-Sozialen Union*, 2016, str. 2).

Temeljni program stranke SPD, *Hamburger programm. Das Grundsatzprogramm der SPD* iz 2007. godine, u jednoj rečenici spominje miroljubive revolucije, i to u pluralu, ističući kako su „prevladale podjelu Europe na Istok i Zapad” (*Hamburger Programm. Grundsatzprogramm der Sozialdemokratischen Partei Deutschlands*, 2007, str. 8). Posebnog osvrtu na događaje u bivšem DDR-u nema. Pojam *Wende* također se ne spominje, a revolucije se još nekoliko puta spominju u tekstu, ali se odnose na Francusku revoluciju i Revoluciju 1848. godine (*ibid.*, str. 12, 14).

Njemački liberali (FDP) u svojem programu *Verantwortung für die Freiheit. Karlsruher Freiheitsthesen der FDP für eine offene Bürgergesellschaft* iz 2012. godine revoluciju spominju nekoliko puta, ali u kontekstu komunikacijske revolucije (*Verantwortung für die Freiheit. Karlsruher Freiheitsthesen der FDP für eine offene Bürgergesellschaft*, 2012, str. 63), odnosno digitalne revolucije (*ibid.*, str. 66). Miroljubiva revolucija spominje se jednom, i to u pogovoru, kada se navodi da je i prethodni program iz Wiesbadena 1997. godine bio inspiriran „oslobodilačkim pokretima naših istočnih susjeda i miroljubive revolucije 1989. godine” (*ibid.*, str. 115).

Program najmlađe stranke trenutačno zastupljene u *Bundestagu*, stranke Alternative für Deutschland (AfD), pod nazivom *Programm für Deutschland. Das Grundsatzprogramm der Alternative für Deutschland* donesen je 2016. godine. AfD u programu spominje pojam revolucije, ne dodaje joj nikakav atribut te ističe kako stranka u tradiciji „obje revolucije od 1848. godine i 1989. građanskim protestom artikulira volju da se dovrši nacionalno jedinstvo u slobodi...” (*Programm für Deutschland. Das Grundsatzprogramm der Alternative für Deutschland*, 2016, str. 6). Pojam *Wende* spominje se samo kao dio složenice *Energiewende* (*ibid.*, str. 80, 95).

Temeljni stranački program stranke Bündnis 90/Die Grünen donesen je u ožujku 2002. godine i obuhvaća 190 stranica. Pojam *Wende* pojavljuje se nekoliko puta u tekstu, ali ni jednom kao opis događaja 1989. godine, nego se spominje u kontekstu agrarnih reformi (*Die Zukunft ist grün. Grundsatzprogramm von Bündnis 90/Die Grünen*, 2002, str. 55), ili pak u području energetike (*ibid.*, str. 32). Miroljubiva revolucija također se ne spominje, a Zeleni događaje 1989. godine spominju vrlo šturo, samo jednom rečenicom, a nazivaju ih *Umwälzung*, dakle temeljnom promjenom, korjenitim preobražajem odnosno prevratom (*ibid.*, str. 21), i time diskutiraju o nazivu za događaje 1989./90. u bivšem DDR- u obogaćuju za još jedan pojam.

Stranka Die LINKE, iako je od ujedinjenja dviju njemačkih država kada se zvala PDS (*Partei des demokratischen Sozialismus*) nekoliko puta mijenjala ime, zapravo je

stranka sljednica istočnonjemačke stranke SED. Program stranke Die LINKE, donesen u listopadu 2011. u Erfurtu, nekoliko puta spominje pojam revolucije, ali ni jednom u kontekstu događaja 1989. godine. U programu se spominju građanske revolucije u 18. i 19. stoljeću koje su „težile slobodi, jednakosti i bratstvu protiv religioznih dogmi i privilegija plemstva” (Programm der Partei DIE LINKE, 2011, str. 9), te revolucija 1918./19. u Njemačkoj koja je ugušena „uz pomoć socijaldemokratskog vodstva” (ibid.). U opisu događaja iz 1989. godine spominje se pridjev miroljubiv (*friedlich*), ali ne kao atribut imenici *revolucija*, nego se navodi da su se „dijelovi građanskog pokreta DDR-a, među njima i reformisti unutar SED-a, zalagali u jesen 1989. godine za miroljubivo, demokratsko, socijalno i ekološko buđenje (*Aufbruch*) i političku promjenu prema boljem socijalizmu. Ali 1990. godine taj projekt nije uspio. ... Iz demokratskog buđenja na istoku nastalo je samo pristupanje i za mnoge ljude bolan socijalni pad” (ibid. str. 12, 13). Valja napomenuti da imenica *Aufbruch* u njemačkom jeziku ima nekoliko značenja, od polaska, kretanja pa sve do (duhovnoga) buđenja, osvješćivanja. U temeljnom programu stranke Die LINKE također se ističe da stranka „povezuje politička iskustva Njemačke Demokratske Republike i Savezne Republike Njemačke” (ibid., str. 9). Nadalje, stranka Die LINKE u tekstu programa šest puta upotrebljava imenicu *Ostdeutschland* (Istočna Njemačka), i to kada se govori o prilikama na istoku Njemačke i nakon ujedinjenja. Ta imenica, prema *Dudenu*, znači ‘istočni dio Njemačke’, ali to je ujedno i imenica koja se i ranije, doduše u neslužbenoj jezičnoj uporabi, upotrebljavala za DDR. Interesantno je spomenuti da i ostale dvije stranke lijevoga spektra, dakle Bündnis 90/Die Grünen i SPD, u svojim temeljnim programima izrijekom također spominju *Ostdeutschland*, Zeleni ukupno sedam puta, a SPD jednom, dok CDU, CSU, FDP i AfD u svojim temeljnim programima to ne čine.

Kada je pak riječ o kurikulumima nastavnih predmeta, valja istaknuti kako je školstvo u Njemačkoj u nadležnosti saveznih pokrajina. To znači da se kurikuli razlikuju od pokrajine do pokrajine, a vidljive su, između ostaloga, i pojedine razlike u nazivima nastavnih predmeta. Generalno gledajući, zbivanja u DDR-u 1989./90. spominju se i obrađuju u svim vrstama škola u nastavi povijesti (najčešće u devetoj ili desetoj godini školovanja), ali i, ovisno o pokrajini, u nastavi njemačkoga jezika, katoličkom i evangeličkom vjeronauku, etici, obrazovanju za demokratsko građanstvo (*Politische Bildung*). Miroljubiva revolucija, „friedliche Revolution” ne spominje se svugdje, ponegdje se stavlja u navodne znakove, odnosno upotrebljavaju se drugi pojmovi. Igel (2007) ističe kako se „friedliche Revolution” koristi u kurikulumima nastavnih predmeta u jedanaest njemačkih pokrajina, a osim toga govori se o revoluciji (*Revolution*), demokratskoj revoluciji (*demokratische Revolution*), slomu (*Zusammenbruch*), prevratu (*Umsturz*), preokretu (*Wende*), ispred kojeg pak često stoji i neki atribut: miran (*friedlich*), nenasilan (*gewaltlos*), nacionalan (*national*). O revoluciji se često govori kada se obrađuje Francuska revolucija ili pak zbivanja u Njemačkoj 1848. godine, pa se spominju i zbivanja u DDR-u 1989./90. Zanimljivo je i spomenuti da se navedena zbivanja tematiziraju i na satima vjeronauka (naročito evangeličkoga u pokrajini



Nordrhein-Westfalen), pri čemu se govori o ulozi crkve, a u nastavi etike miroljubiva revolucija primjer je nenasilnoga rješavanja konflikata. Međutim, sveukupno gledajući, diktatura i razvoj oporbenih pokreta u bivšem DDR-u se nesustavno se i nedovoljno tematiziraju i obrađuju (Arnswald, 2004).

## Zaključak

Kada se 1990. godine u Njemačkoj vodila rasprava koji bi datum bio prikladan za nacionalni praznik „nove“, ujedinjene Njemačke, jedan od prijedloga bio je 9. studenoga, datum pada Berlinskoga zida. Međutim, toga su se datuma u Njemačkoj odigrali još neki, za njemačku povijest bitni i u prvom dijelu rada opisani događaji, a jedan od njih je i *Kristalna noć*. Stoga je kao datum praznika odabran povijesno neopterećeni datum, treći listopada, datum kada je 1990. godine DDR pristupio području vladavine Temelnog zakona. Međutim, događaji neposredno prije i poslije pada Berlinskoga zida i danas se različito percipiraju i nazivaju različitim imenima. Zaključno se može istaknuti sljedeće: kao prvo, analiza temeljnih programa stranaka koje su zastupljene u 19. sazivu *Bundestaga* pokazuje da percepcija i imenovanje zbivanja u bivšem DDR-u ovisi o mjestu u spektru lijevo-desno na kojem se stranke nalaze. Desno-populistička stranka AfD naziva te događaje revolucijom, demokršćani i liberali dodaju revoluciji atribut miroljubiva, socijaldemokrati ne spominju direktno zbivanja u DDR-, nego u jednoj rečenici spominju u pluralu miroljubive revolucije koje su prevladale podjelu Europe. Što se više udaljavamo lijevo od centra, događaji se više ne nazivaju (miroljubivom) revolucijom. Bündnis 90/Die Grünen ističu da se radilo o temeljnoj promjeni, korjenitom preobražaju odnosno prevratu (*Umwälzung*), a Die LINKE te događaje naziva (duhovnim) buđenjem, osvješćivanjem. Utoliko se možemo složiti s tvrdnjom da „Definicije stvaraju realnosti. Tko definira, iz mnoštva mogućih aspekata uzima upravo onaj koji mu se čini važnim.“ (Greiffenhagen, 1980, str. 12). Istovremeno se zbivanja u DDR-u 1989./90. neujednačeno obrađuju i u kurikulumima nastavnih predmeta u njemačkim školama. Ti se događaji nazivaju različitim imenima, vrlo često, ali ne i isključivo, miroljubivom revolucijom. I u njemačkim nastavnim programima u fokusu su kompetencije koje bi učenici trebali steći, ali nije opisano na koji način bi se konkretni događaji trebali obraditi niti koju bi im važnost trebalo dati. Utoliko je zapravo epohalan događaj ne samo za Njemačku, nego i za svijet, sveden na natuknicu koja se dakle mora obraditi u nastavi, ali opseg i dubina obrade teme mogu jako varirati. Kao drugo, do sloma DDR-a nije došlo samo zbog slabosti stare političke elite, nego i zbog pritiska protivnika režima. Usprkos tomu, kao i činjenici da su u vrlo kratkom roku potpuno promijenjeni društveni i politički odnosi na području DDR-a, te da se politolozi i povjesničari uglavnom slažu da se radilo o revoluciji, sintagma (miroljubiva) revolucija ipak nije ušla u opću jezičnu uporabu u njemačkom jeziku. Duden, kao apsolutni autoritet za njemački jezik, kao rezultat vrlo temeljnoga i pomnoga procesa istraživanja njemačkog jezika, pod lemom *die Wende* (obrat, preokret) izrijekom navodi, između ostaloga, da se radi o velikom političkom

i društvenom preokretu 1989. godine u DDR-u. Nakon ujedinjenja u njemačkom su se jeziku ustalile brojne ostale izreke i fraze u kojima se pojavljuje riječ *Wende* (obrat, preokret): prije tj. poslije preokreta (*vor* tj. *nach der Wende*), a čak su se u društvenim istraživanjima uvriježili i pojmovi *Nachwendegeneration* (Haag, 2016) - generacija poslije preokreta i *Wendekind* - dijete preokreta, a odnosi se na sve koji su rođeni u DDR-u u razdoblju od 1975. do 1985. godine, dakle na „one koji su iskusili dvostruku socijalizaciju, u uvjetima socijalističko-planske i demokratsko-tržišne privrede” (Lettrari et al., 2016, str. 9). I Berlinski zid, odnosno njegov pad, i jezično gledano, kao jedan od ključnih događaja njemačke povijesti, našao je svoje čvrsto mjesto u kolektivnoj svijesti Nijemaca. Tako Duden bilježi da imenica *Zid* (*Mauer*), bez atributa *berlinski*, nije samo općenito građevinska konstrukcija od kamena i žbuke, nego je i „građevina koju je DDR 13. 8. 1961. podigao u Berlinu i koja je politički podijelila Berlin”, a primjerice *nakon Zida* (*nach der Mauer*) znači „nakon otvaranja granice između DDR-a i Savezne Republike.” Ujedinjenje dviju njemačkih država ostavilo je neizbrisiv trag i u podjeli Njemačke na tzv. stare i nove pokrajine; *alte Bundesländer* (stare pokrajine) su zapadnonjemačke pokrajine, pokrajine koje su prije njemačkoga ujedinjenja bile u sastavu SR Njemačke, a *neue Bundesländer* (nove pokrajine) su istočnonjemačke pokrajine, dakle one koje su nastale njemačkim ujedinjenjem iz upravnih jedinica - okruga na području bivšeg DDR-a (Velički, 2015). Kao treće, sam pojam *obrat*, tj. *preokret* zapravo je sam politički vrh DDR-a unio u političku diskusiju, ali ne misleći pritom na korjenite društveno-političke promjene, nego na korake koji bi omogućili stranci SED da ostane na vlasti. Sveobuhvatnost promjena u bivšem DDR-u nije primjereno opisati samo obratom, ali unatoč tome upravo je taj pregnantan pojam ušao u široku jezičnu uporabu u njemačkom jeziku. Stoga možemo uočiti gotovo paradoksalnu situaciju: Nijemci u bivšem DDR-u uspijevaju srušiti omrznuti režim i to putem (miroljubive) revolucije, a nakon toga u leksik njemačkoga jezika kao raširen pojam za te događaje ulazi pojam *obrat*, tj. *preokret* (*Wende*), dakle upravo onaj koji je skovala komunistička stranka koja je zbačena s vlasti, i koja je, štoviše, pod tim pojmom podrazumijevala nešto sasvim drugo, odnosno vlastitu ideološku ofenzivu koju valja poduzeti s ciljem ostanka na vlasti. Svaka promjena u društvu ostavlja tragove i u jeziku, ali jezik ima svoje zakonitosti kojim se mijenja i obogaćuje. Unatoč mišljenju znanstvenika i dijela političara koji preferiraju govoriti o miroljubivoj revoluciji u bivšem DDR-u, velik dio Nijemaca događaje neposredno prije i poslije pada Berlinskoga zida koji su i omogućili ujedinjenje dviju njemačkih država ipak naziva obratom, tj. preokretom. Toj terminološkoj neujednačenosti sigurno pridonosi i činjenica da se i u kurikulumima nastavnih predmeta u Njemačkoj navedena zbivanja različito imenuju.