

# Fashioning a New Brand of “Germanness”: The 2006 World Cup and Beyond

KATRINA SARK *McGill University*

Since reunification, and particularly since the FIFA World Cup in Germany in 2006, Berlin city marketing, museum exhibitions, and displays of public art have all reflected a discourse on new national identity formations that previously could only be found in political media or academic discourses. Berlin’s numerous marketing campaigns have restructured its image as an open city. Messages such as “be open, be free, be Berlin!” circulate throughout the city, encouraging its inhabitants and visitors to see Berlin in a new, creative, entrepreneurial, and liberal light. Leaving behind the negative stereotypes of its historical past, Berlin has been reinvented by politicians (Mayor Klaus Wowereit and the Berlin Senate), city planners, marketing strategists, filmmakers, and curators. Urban culture is in many ways propelled by public events and celebrations, like the 2006 FIFA World Cup or the twentieth anniversary of the fall of the Berlin Wall (the *Mauerfall*) in November 2009. Not only high culture was given a boost: in the months leading up to the *Mauerfall* anniversary, most museums, galleries, and exhibition facilities offered some kind of display or presentation on the theme of the Wall. At the same time, pop culture, music, film, and fashion also played an active role in the international spotlight. Berlin city planners and marketers know how to navigate and steer public consciousness. Personal histories of the Wall were collected and retold. Collective, self-reflexive, and cultural contemplations took place on widely engaging public levels – artists, writers, politicians, and regular people became involved in public debates and contributed their points of view on reunification.

This article will examine this path of collective national and civic identity construction in different cultural and medial spheres by looking at exhibition practices and urban branding campaigns. During the 2006 World Cup, the question of what and who constituted the new (reunited) Germany had been posed to an unprecedented degree (since reunification) across all spectrums of discourses. An exhibition at the German Historical Museum displayed artefacts from 1,000 years of German history – similar to the “What Is German” exhibition at the German National Museum in Nürnberg. A display of public art dedicated to German achievements in the arts and science guided the tourists along the “Walk of Ideas” past all the main tourist sites in Berlin. All these exhibitions and practices addressing “Germanness” placed the question of national identity on display. A similar spur to public contemplation of national identity swirled around the

celebrations of the twentieth anniversary of the fall of the Berlin Wall in 2009. Events such as the U2 band's free concert at the Brandenburg Gate, various Wall-oriented exhibitions at almost all Berlin museums, film screenings, gallery exhibitions, art installations such as the *Temporary Art Gallery* at Schlossplatz in the shape of the former Palace of the Republic, and finally the spectacular fall of 1,000 domino pieces along the stretch of the former Wall from Potsdamer Platz to the Reichstag, all commemorated the beginning of a new chapter in German history. As studies on national identity and patriotism have shown, "the reunification of the two German States and the process of European integration into the European Union have given a new dimension to public discussions of German national identity" (Blank and Schmidt 289). Examining a variety of media discourses: authoritative and institutional, as well as journalistic discourses in the popular press, this article places the 2006 FIFA World Cup as a pivotal time in renegotiating Germany's public image.

A first step is to differentiate between conceptions of national, social, and cultural identity. While national identity is usually tied to symbols of a particular nation that has been identified as an imagined community (Anderson 1991), social identity is a collective identity that can be tied to various societal subgroups within a national or transnational milieu. In the German context, the concept of cultural identity (tied to the term *Kulturnation*) is often prevalent because it allows for a collective identity to be based on shared values such as cultural heritage, language, and the literary, artistic, and scientific achievements of a nation (rather than militaristic nationalism). This attempt to shift the conception of German national identity towards common cultural values of the nation is a left-liberal project of the post-1945 intellectuals that culminated in the 1968 generation. Today, in the context of a reunified Germany, this shift continues to evolve in ways that should be examined in detail across different spheres of cultural production and communication. Collective identity formation has been described as "the defining of borderlines between in-groups and out-groups" (Giulianotti, qtd. in Inthorn 155). Collective identity is a concept grounded in classic sociological constructs: Émile Durkheim's "collective conscience," Karl Marx's "class consciousness," Max Weber's *Verstehen*, and Ferdinand Tönnies's *Gemeinschaft*, all of which address "the 'we-ness' of a group, stressing the similarities or shared attributes around which group members coalesce" (Cerulo 386). Political scientist Leonie Huddy provides a useful overview of contemporary identity studies:

Postmodern theorists in the humanities have challenged traditional conceptions of identity by arguing that the fixed subject of liberal humanistic thinking is an anachronism that should be replaced by a more flexible individual whose identity is fluid, contingent, and socially constructed (Butler, 1990; Novotny, 1998; Villancourt Rosenau, 1992; Young, 1997). Social scientists have also intensified their longstanding interest in the concept of identity in recent years (Jenkins, 1996). Sociologists have pondered and explored the tension between

individual identity and the constraints of social structure (Giddens, 1991; Jenkins, 1996; Stryker, 1980). Anthropologists have examined the cultural expressions of identity, its meanings, and how it is maintained at group boundaries (Barth, 1969; Cohn, 1986). (Huddy 127).

Most recent studies on identity also point out the impact of new communication technologies on formations of identity. New communication technologies “locate the self in new hybrid arenas of action; they mesh public and private, beckon new types of performances, and form new collective configurations” (Cerulo 397). Communication media directly impact identity-building interaction (Cerulo 399). One example of this impact is the media coverage of international sporting or cultural events, such as the World Cup. Alan Tomlinson and Christopher Young’s collection of essays, *German Football* (2006), explores the significance of soccer in German sporting and cultural life and argues that soccer has emerged as a major focus for the expression of a coherent national identity. Because national sporting events give their spectators the sense of belonging to a wider imagined community (Anderson), they create a sense of a “homogenous nation, united not only in support of the national team but also by a shared national character, [which] emerges in the process of the construction of different, contrasting and potentially conflictual national cultures” (Inthorn 156). This homogeneity is often a constructed narrative that taps into the nation’s cultural values and that can serve to hide social tensions and divisions. Tomlinson and Young explain,

Staging international sporting events has long been a means of making wider political and economic points. Germany is no exception. The Olympics in 1936, the Munich Olympics in 1972 and the 1974 World Cup each asserted the new role of a peaceful Germany in the world order. The 2006 World Cup [was] yet another opportunity to present yet another new Germany. This Germany is acutely aware of its increasing ethnic diversity, its European connectedness and commitments, and its own internal postunification obligations. (xiv)

The construction of media narratives are simultaneously forging the cultural and political discourses of a nation and are themselves a product of these discourses. In the media coverage of the World Cup, German national identity was constructed through references to national culture, history, and character (Inthorn 165). This collective search for a new German identity, facilitated by an international sporting event that placed Germany in the global spotlight not only in connection to soccer, had been brewing for decades yet crystallized in the public domain only as 2006 drew near.

In the context of national advertising campaigns announcing to their audience of eighty-two million, “You are Germany!” as well as parliamentary debates on citizenship laws, the discrepancies in what or who constitutes the new German identity after reunification came to the fore and crystallized around the time of the 2006 World Cup. The spur of international attention on the not-so-newly reunited nation called for self-reflexivity and self-reinvention on an

unprecedented scale. “Only in Berlin can our nation rediscover itself,” claimed the cultural minister, Michael Naumann, on 26 June 1991 when the *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung* questioned the choice of Berlin as the capital of the newly united country. Berlin is a unique place where the gap between East and West (if not yet disappearing) is being consciously worked through; as such, it has played a vital role in the quest to renegotiate German identity. Reunification is barely apparent in a place like Munich, for example, where it has made its presence felt only in the inflated prices, the reduced social services, or some nasty remarks by the taxpayers and politicians. However, it is much more noticeable in the former East German states, with large construction projects taking place and shopping centres opening up. Still, reunification can be most distinctly witnessed in Berlin. It was not surprising that, just in time for the World Cup, the German Historical Museum in Berlin launched its new permanent exhibition on the 1000-year history of the Germans, attempting to create “critical self-awareness” and “self-affirmation” for the country (Ottomeyer 172). Leading this collective identity search, Berlin writers, curators, and filmmakers have been continuously building bridges and negotiating polarities (past and future, east and west, conservative and liberal) in an attempt to answer the question that has once again become so vital to the national sense of self: namely, what does it mean to be German in a reunified Germany?

The present-day “new” Germany consists of former East Germans, former West Germans, immigrants in various stages of becoming new Germans or not interested in becoming Germans, and a new *Wendegeneration* of Germans born in, or growing up in, a reunited Germany. Whatever the precise agenda behind the government strategy (which exploded in the German media in the months leading up to the World Cup) to tell all these people that “they are Germany,” there appears to be an acknowledgement from the politicians that Germany is becoming a deeply pluralistic society, quite different from that of the Adenauer and even Kohl eras. The year 1998 was a turning point in German history. A political changing of the guard not only brought the liberal SPD back into office but also marked a generational shift as well, with Gerhard Schröder being the first chancellor not “scarred by the Nazi era and the war” (Palmer 26). Schröder initiated reforms, broke with the unconditional support of US policies by refusing to support the Iraq war, and encouraged a “normalization” of German national identity. Moreover, 1998 was the year of the final move of the German government from Bonn to Berlin. Perhaps not coincidentally it was also the year when Tom Tykwer’s *Lola* made her symbolic run through Berlin and, consequently, the cinema screens of the world. Much was made of Berlin’s image as the “workshop for reunification” (Sinka 189), in order to remind the rest of Germany of its new role. Metaphors depicting Berlin as *Baustelle*, for instance – that is, Berlin as the nation’s largest construction site – ran through the media. In the 1990s it became commonplace to label the post-Wall Berlin as “das Neue Berlin” with “new” capitalized, referring to the advertising slogan introduced in May 1998 by the marketing agency Partners for Berlin (Sinka 187). The slogan

“Neue Strategien für Berlin” was immediately utilized in posters for the German postal and railroad systems and in those of the Berlin fire department and police. In an attempt to lure more business investors to the city, Partners for Berlin launched its marketing campaign in 2000 with five slogans, each meant to spotlight the attractive future of the capital: “Hauptstadt,” “Kreative Stadt,” “Kulturmetropole,” “Lebenswerte Stadt,” and “Ost-West-Metropole” (Sinka 189). A billboard consisting of collages was designed for each slogan, thereby constructing marketable identities and at the same time mythologizing the city. Berlin has a rich tradition of individual projections by eighteenth-, nineteenth-, and twentieth-century statesmen and writers (the most famous and internationally renowned perhaps being John F. Kennedy’s claim “Ich bin ein Berliner!” and the most recent being Barack Obama’s speech in front of the Victory Column in July 2008) who have left their marks on the history of the city. However, a new concept was needed to commemorate a new political and cultural beginning in German history.

The sociologist Heinz Bude attempted to capitalize on the new energy and generate this new concept. His 2001 study claims that Germany has been waiting for a new generation to replace that of 1968. When they came of age in the late sixties, these children of the Second World War embodied the revolutionary spirit of reforms. Now, however, they have reverted to conservative stagnation (Bude 13). The goal of the new generation, according to Bude, is to make room for future development (51). Building on the term *Berlin Republic*, invented by Johannes Gross in 1995 to signal the inner changes that would occur as a result of the Bonn government moving to Berlin, Bude coined the term *Generation Berlin* in June 1998 to define the inhabitants of the new *Mitte* district of the New Berlin (Sinka 192). Influenced by the same Volkswagen Golf ads of the nineties that had inspired Florian Illies’s *Generation Golf* (2000), Bude’s *Generation Berlin* was “not based on age or even commonality of experience – such as participation in a significant historical event or societal movement – but attitude [that] qualifies one as a member” (Sinka 194). Bude was convinced that the move to Berlin would signify a completely new chapter in German history. Society, he believed, was ahead of its politicians. The New Berlin would therefore be shaped not by its politicians but by the newcomers comprising the *Generation Berlin*. While the representatives of the 1968 generation dominated the political centre stage, the generation of people born between approximately 1960 and 1970 was waiting in the wings, ready to appropriate the Berlin Republic (Sinka 192).

For Bude the change of generations was also a matter of coming to terms with history. The representatives of *Generation Berlin* no longer turned to the German past as a reference point for decisions about the future. The new generation, without personal memories of 1945 or 1968, had its own experience in the new “Erregungssphären” of knowledge, power, and money (Sinka 66). Thus Bude believed that in a “post-ideological world,” activism occurs not in politics or the arts but in the business sector. In August 1998, Bude coined the term *unternehmerische Einzelne* to describe the representatives of *Generation Berlin*

(Sinka 194). In August and September 1998, *Der Tagesspiegel* newspaper ran a series on the representatives of *Generation Berlin* on a weekly basis, highlighting Berlin inhabitants, such as cultural manager Anja Follmer (who assists artists and firms in forming sponsorship partnerships), the publisher Christoph Links (who founded his own publishing company in Berlin), Sebastian Turner of the advertising agency Scholz & Friends (responsible for advertising campaigns during the German World Cup), and Tom Tykwer (director and cofounder of the production company X-Filme). Bude hoped that the members of *Generation Berlin* would also assume political influence in the new Berlin Republic, but the rhetoric of new beginnings had soon run its course. The city no longer fed on expectations of the new, as the many empty offices in the centre of Berlin signified (Sinka 200). The project of the New Berlin and the New Germany were moved to the back seat, and the country focused on the economic and social problems of Schröder’s second term.

October 2005, however, marked another changing of the guard, although with some hesitation. At first, Schröder was replaced by Angela Merkel’s coalition government, and the issues of Germany and Berlin were reopened for negotiations in light of the largest international event to be staged in post-Wall Berlin, the 2006 FIFA World Cup. The world cup hosted by Germany, with its highly celebrated final game in Berlin, catalysed an acceleration of German cultural self-reflexivity, as well as international reflections on the country’s representations abroad. Not since reunification in 1990 had Germans been so open about displaying their national symbols. The streets were awash with German flags, displayed in shop windows and cafes, hanging from balconies, attached to cars, and painted on people’s faces. As Germany and the international soccer community celebrated Europe’s favourite sport, the world was watching, and that created a particularly acute national self-consciousness. As *Spiegel* journalist Dirk Kurbjuweit sarcastically expressed it in his article on the opening ceremony in Munich on 9 June 2006,

Was die deutsche Identität ist, wissen Ausländer genau. Deutsch zu sein heißt, Lederhosen zu tragen und sich tanzend auf die Schenkel zu klopfen. So haben sie es am Freitag bei der Eröffnungsfeier der WM wieder sehen können. Niemand in Australien oder in den Vereinigten Staaten musste verstört vor dem Fernseher sitzen. Aber wer Deutscher ist und nicht bayerisch, sah sich in dem Getümmel auf dem Platz nicht vertreten. (22)

This critique illustrates the cultural fragmentation in Germany that re-emerged on the front pages of the nation’s newspapers during the world cup, presented by a journalist who refuses to be identified as a *Lederhosen*-wearing Bavarian. During that time, Kurbjuweit was one of many journalists posing the question about what it means to be German and what it symbolizes to others. The issue of German identity came to the fore in the months leading up to the world cup in most major public debates, focusing specifically on the issue of questionnaires for potential citizens, the integration of immigrants, and necessary

reforms of immigration laws, as well as the student violence in a Neukölln school, where eighty percent of the students are of non-German background (Kurbjuweit 22). It appeared, as Kurbjuweit asserted, as if Germany wanted to work through all open questions and present itself with a clear identity to guests from all over the world just in time for the world cup (23). Those who watched the opening ceremony, he explained, got the impression that nothing is clear. Germany cannot present itself because it still does not know what it is (23). The government was taking the lead in presenting Germany to its guests from the best possible side. Security was on high alert; the military, even if in a very limited capacity, was standing by; and guests were instructed to avoid sketchy (eastern) parts of Germany for fear of outbreaks of racist violence, which would be an unforgettable disgrace (perhaps stirring anxious flashbacks to Munich in 1972). For the German public, however, the world cup contributed very little to the quest for national identity, since the majority of people (as demonstrated in numerous interviews), despite their colourful black-red-gold gear, claimed to associate themselves strictly with the excitement of the sport, refusing any link to national pride – as Boaz Beer’s 2008 documentary *Who Is Deutschland?* has shown. Whether the world cup also contributed very little to the project of reunification, as Kurbjuweit claims, being a product of the West and taking place mostly in former West German stadiums (25), remains questionable. Leipzig was the smallest of the twelve stadiums, with its capacity of 44,199 seats; it lies on the timely completed direct rail route that connects it with major cities like Berlin and Frankfurt, which perhaps explains why more former East German cities did not assist in hosting the games. The fact that all these questions and debates surfaced daily is already an indication that the world cup contributed to discourses of national identity, even if by way of soccer. As Jürgen Klinsmann, the coach of the 2006 national team, stated in a *Spiegel* interview, a (fourth) victory at the World Cup would give Germany the chance to show the world “who we actually are. We have the opportunity to invent Germany anew; to create a brand” (Leinemann 65). National identity as a branding strategy in a new media- and marketing-driven globalized society takes Bude’s call for a generational shift to a new economic and cultural level. When even soccer players publicly express interest in their country’s redefinition, it becomes apparent that the project of the New Germany is under way. This of course calls to mind the 1954 “Miracle of Berne” – the victory of underdog West Germany over Hungary in the world cup final – which was “not simply a much-needed boost to the national psyche. It was also the formative moment in the transformation of the game from its base in regional, local culture towards an institutionalized national phenomenon, which found its culmination in the inaugural season of the *Bundesliga* in the 1963–64 season” (Tomlinson and Young xii).

The presentation of Germany to international tourists and media as *Land der Ideen* encouraged German self-reflexivity and identity formation through marketing strategies. The project of image-making for the whole country and its new capital was initiated by the *Bundespräsident*, Horst Köhler, and entrusted to the

marketing company Scholz & Friends that designed the *Land der Ideen* campaign for the German government. German achievements, as milestones and ideas, were displayed in Berlin’s city centre with the “Walk of Ideas” project. According to its brochure, the initiative was called into being by the German public and private sectors, with the aim of establishing Germany as an up-to-date cosmopolitan and innovative host country in the year of the World Cup. The project included 365 landmarks all around Germany that portrayed the imagination of the nation, sculptures around Berlin’s *Mitte* to demonstrate German inventions, and information brochures at the embassies and Goethe Institutes around the world inviting “die Welt zu Gast bei Freunden.” According to marketing chief Turner, without the world cup a campaign of this magnitude would have been unaffordable (29). The Berlin campaign contained a boulevard of six large sculptures, symbolizing German cultural, technological, medical, and scientific achievements: a gigantic stack of books with the names of Goethe, Schiller, Hesse, and other notable writers, strategically placed at Bebelplatz, across from the Humboldt University – the very place where the Nazi book-burning took place; musical notes at the Gendarmenmarkt in front of Schinkel’s concert hall; Einstein’s formula  $E = mc^2$  in front of the Altes Museum; a large aspirin pill at the Reichstag; enormous soccer shoes at the new Hauptbahnhof; and an oversized car at the Brandenburg Gate – all dispersed along the tourist-packed stretch from the newly completed main train station to the then half-demolished Palace of the Republic. The foyer of the German Historical Museum also served as the info point along the “Walk of Ideas” tour through Berlin and featured a display of “100 Masterminds of Tomorrow – Shaping the Future in the Land of Ideas.” It showcased promising individuals of the future, young talents and creators in the arts, culture, science, and society. The patron of the project, President Horst Köhler, remarked, “To me, this stands for curiosity and experimentation. In all walks of life, it stands for courage, creativity and a desire for the new without doing away with the old.” While Berlin was refreshing its image by posing as the land of ideas, student demonstrations began to take place in Wiesbaden and Hamburg against the new university tuition hikes. Students with slogans on their T-shirts asking, “Waren wir nicht mal ein Volk der Dichter und Denker?” pointed to the fact that the ongoing transformation of the German secondary education system affects liberal arts students particularly adversely: precisely these students comprise that next generation anticipated by Bude and others. They will be responsible for carrying out that “future development” for which Bude wanted to make room. More than anyone else, they will be members of *Generation Berlin*, living in the Land of Ideas. The message “Du bist Deutschland!” was primarily directed to the younger generation because they will embody the New Germany – neither East nor West, neither Nazi nor socialist, communist, or capitalist: not divided, but new.

In the summer of 2006, Berlin welcomed the masses of tourists and international soccer fans with an enormous fan mile stretching through the Tiergarten (from the Brandenburg Gate to the Victory Column); large screens set up in public squares, cafes, and restaurants; and various entertainment programmes



between the games. In addition to the “Walk of Ideas,” those interested in a deeper exploration of Germanness could visit the exhibition of historical time capsules at the German Historical Museum. Hans Ottomeyer, the museum director, stated, “Das Museum soll ein Ort der Selbstvergewisserung sein. Hier liegt unser visuelles Gedächtnis. Gezeigt werden Objekte, an denen sich Geschichte kristallisiert” (168). When asked whether the exhibition is meant to be seen as a type of self-celebration, Ottomeyer replied, “Ja, sicher. Die Deutschen galten über Jahrhunderte als die Philosophen und mehr noch als die Handwerker Europas” (168). This self-celebration is a very new enterprise for Germans. The plan to create a national historical exhibition goes back to 1987, before the fall of the Wall, when Helmut Kohl gave the orders to work out a concept for such a project. Since 2 June 2006, 8,000 historical artefacts from the museum’s collections have been on display over an area of 7,500 square metres, covering different historical eras from about 9 CE to the present. The twentieth century takes up the most space: 2,300 square metres. The most difficult German epoch features Hitler’s desk and his globe, saved by the Soviet troops from the burning *Reichskanzlei*, the model of the Germania-Halle designed by Albert Speer, and other historical objects, paintings, and furniture. Ottomeyer explains, “Wir leben auf den Trümmern der Vergangenheit. Sie umgeben und umzingeln uns. Alles erzählt etwas, ist Zeugnis für die zerstörerischen Kräfte des Menschen. Aber immer wieder gibt es auch dieses Ringen um Auswege, um Ausgleich und die Sehnsucht nach Frieden” (168). The unifying quest for what is German was presented symbolically with the help of historical objects. The answers were based not on a racial, regional, or national unity but on the unifying umbrella of the German language, that is, cultural identity. Finally, the museum director concluded, “Das Haus will erinnern, ein Ort nicht nur der Scham sein, sondern der Information und kritischen Selbstbetrachtung. Und der Frage: Wer sind wir?”

The *Berliner Morgenpost* of 10 June 2006 reported on how Germany was perceived by foreigners, printing interviews with eminent individuals and foreign correspondents, asking them to describe what came to their minds when they thought of Germany. Henry Kissinger thought of the destruction of 1945, the rebuilding of a democratic society, and the “common foundation of values” [with the USA] and a “common destiny” (*Berliner Morgenpost* 3). The musician and humanitarian Paul David Hewson (aka Bono) thought of “crazy creativity” and “technological genius” and the spirit that overthrew the Berlin Wall, as well as German generosity in forgiving Africa’s debt. South African bishop Desmond Tutu first thought of the Holocaust, then of the support received from the German Evangelical Church in the struggle against apartheid, then of the German soccer star Franz Beckenbauer, and lastly of the “wonderful composers of the heavenly choir music” (3). The former US ambassador to Germany John C. Kornblum described “handcuffs” that stall German strength, stating that a “jolt needs to go through the country” (echoing Roman Herzog’s Adlon speech from April 1997) and that Germany has to “wake up before it is too late” (3). Peter Liddell, a British schoolteacher, when interviewed by the *Spiegel* in 2005,

pointed out that “kids find the Nazi period interesting. A lot of things happen. There is plenty of violence” (Matussek 51). With the new coalition government and the attention drawn to Germany during the World Cup, more and more Germans became interested in changing public perceptions and projecting a new image to the world. Today’s Germany is no longer the land of crimes against humanity. Shedding that stigma is perhaps the most challenging task Germany faces, considering it has been actively built up and maintained by the left-liberal intellectuals of the 1968 generation, who saw it as their moral duty to dismantle the taboos of their parents’ generation, who had either actively or passively taken part in the Third Reich. The project of the new Germany is to reinvent itself again, to find a new balance between remembering and coming to terms with the past, and to shed the anxious paralysis that has seized the national character from within and without, and that prevents Germany from developing a healthy, productive relationship with its history and nationhood.

Roland Barthes claimed that the city is a message; it communicates with its inhabitants (qtd. in Schütz and Döring 10). In fact, there are people who construct the message that the city conveys, and one of those people is Turner, chief of Scholz & Friends and one of the marketing masterminds behind constructing Germany’s new identity during the World Cup. Interviewed by *Zitty* magazine in June 2006 (shortly after the beginning of the world cup), Turner was asked whether Berlin still needs to be marketed in Germany, to which he replied that Berlin has a lot to offer, a lot of successes. What one could add would be a unifying concept, a term that would unite all activities, something like “Paris – City of Love” (Turner 29). When asked if he had a specific idea what that unifying concept might be, he stated, “Stadt der Freiheit: Denken sie an den Mauerfall, die Luftbrücke, die Freie Universität, den früheren Sender Freies Berlin, die Offenheit der Stadt” (29). He also pointed out that “wir sind auf dem Weg zu einer Trennung zwischen der deutschen Geschichte bis 1945 und dem Land danach. Ich übertreibe mal: so wie die Schweden und die Wikinger oder Italien und die Römer. Es gibt ein historisches Phänomen und eine Gegenwart – aber beide sind nicht mehr so eng miteinander verbunden” (29). The people communicating the messages of a city are not only marketing experts but also cultural historians and analysts. The culture of a nation is being recreated – both in advertising campaigns (in the media) and on the soccer field.

Finally, the new German identity involves a multicultural nature. Culture is produced in big cities, world cities, global cities, like Berlin. Increasingly, the majority of people living in global cities are migrants from all over the world. Over time, the close proximity of living space, working space, public space, creative space, and the virtual space of cinema and internet has brought the diversities and creative drives of Berlin’s inhabitants to a boil and has created a new culture, a global culture. This global culture is both a product and an agent of change. It allows Berlin to overcome the failures of the past and emerge as the capital of a New Germany. While the process of ridding eastern Germany of Russian influences was relatively quick, if not painless, the process of ridding

West Germany of American influences is much slower and less apparent. The millennium generation, unlike any of the preceding ones, is marked by global mobility. In Germany, where the status of a *Gastarbeiter* did not guarantee full citizenship to children born in Germany until 1995, immigration reforms have become necessary not only for immigrants but also for Germans themselves. In his study *Republik ohne Mitte* (2001), Richard Herzinger claims that the current debates over German identity are generated by the need for reformation of the German immigration and citizenship laws: “Genau darin, dass diese Frage [wer heutzutage deutsch sein darf], angesichts von Einwanderung und Bevölkerung auf völlig neue Art beantwortet werden muss, liegt die aktuelle Brisanz des Themas ‘deutsche Identität’” (54). Herzinger claims that it is the holding on to the idea of “Kultur” and the related notion of “Kulturation” that prompts conservative proposals for courses on integration for immigrants that create so much friction in the debates over the problematic immigration and citizenship laws. Thus the German cultural identity is called into question (33). Herzinger’s main argument, that with the collapse of communism, not only the eastern and central European states, but also Germany is on a quest for a new “western,” liberal-democratic, stable core, provides a political explanation for the new cultural identity search evident in the New Germany today. The struggle to reinvent Germany continues.

Today’s Berlin is a laboratory of global synergy. According to Ares Kalandides, a Berlin-based international city-branding expert and executive director of the consulting firm Inpolis, “Berlin is a brand” (qtd. in Konrad), a successful one that sells, despite the economic recession, despite budget deficits. There is a growing market for everything Berlin-esque, whether it is city marking campaigns (“be divided, be united, be berlin!”), shoe stores (Shoes-Berlin.de), vintage clothing stores (Made in Berlin), or concept stores (Berlinomat). Ever since the great influx of the creative population of artists, writers, designers, and musicians to Berlin (at present, fifty-two percent of citizens are not native Berliners), Berlin’s fashion and design scene has blossomed into a new, sophisticated market landscape that has established a self-reflexive and communicative connection with its international clientele. As the mayor, Klaus Wowereit, states in his preface to Nadine Barth’s *Berlin Fashion: Metropole der Mode*, “Berlin inspires! In this city, world-openness, tolerance, and internationality unite to create a very particular Berlin climate. Not without a reason was Berlin the first European city to be included in the UNESCO Network of Creative Cities in 2005 and awarded the title of ‘City of Design’” (Barth 8). Berlin is its own model. As the *GEO Special* issue on Berlin pointed out, Berlin decorates Swabian bedrooms and Hamburg offices. Countless manufacturers hope that the charm of the metropolis transfers onto their products. “Berlin has character with corners and edges; the city fascinates through constant change,” explained Andrea Gröppel-Klein of the Institute for Consumer- and Behavioural Research at the University of Saarland (*Berlin* 12). “What GDR propaganda could not accomplish in 20 years, a new generation of young designers after reunification managed instantly. They turned

the *Fernsehturm* into a style icon and into an omnipresent symbol of Berlin” (58).

In today’s public relations– and marketing-driven world, Berlin sells particularly well, owing mainly to the creative efforts of marketing directors. Once the media and visual cultures become saturated with positive images, such as “die Welt zu Gast bei Freunden” (the World Cup slogan, in English: “Berlin invites the world to be its guest”), “Land of Ideas,” and “be vision, be inspiration, be berlin!” people (consumers) all over the world begin to believe and buy the messages that are being propagated, and some actually move to Berlin to live out their creative dreams. Today, the Berlin brand sells freedom and creativity. Although expensive, tax-paid marketing campaigns such as “be berlin” attract a lot of criticism, one should not underestimate their cultural value. One of the important criticisms was the question whether Berlin still needs another marketing campaign. While politicians (Wowereit) commission city campaigns to attract more capital investors and small entrepreneurs, artists, and designers, all of whom are good for the growing local economy, from a cultural analysis point of view, city-branding campaigns are communication platforms and media vehicles of collective identity and image formation and projection, which also produce a snowball effect: Out of a campaign slogan (“be creative, be curious, be berlin!”) emerges a fashion show – featuring young designers who were not yet part of the Mercedes Fashion Week selection – at Bebelplatz, sponsored by the city campaign and held in the city store. This, in turn, allows young designers not only to establish and cement their label but also to situate it in a pre-created Berlin discourse and branding vehicle. Furthermore, by putting Berlin in their design name or patterns, young designers become part of a by now recognized (and often senate-supported) community of entrepreneurs and creators.

Transformations and renegotiations in post-reunification identity (trans)formations continue to shape contemporary German and Berlin culture and cultural policy. Events such as the 2006 World Cup and the twentieth anniversary of the fall of the Berlin Wall have had an important effect on the German identity discourse. The shift from the academic and political media realms to the commercial, mass media, advertisement, and entertainment level, facilitated by the strategic marketing and planning campaigns of a select group of politicians, marketing directors, filmmakers, and curators, cannot be ignored in studies of German cultural analysis, and will, no doubt, continue to transform culture.

## Works Cited

- Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. New York: Verso, 1991.
- Barth, Nadine. *Berlin Fashion: Metropole der Mode*. Cologne: Dumont, 2008.
- “Be Berlin.” Urban marketing campaign. 2 June 2010. <<http://www.be.berlin.de/en/campaign/>>. Review: <<http://www.reuters.com/article/lifestyleMolt/idUSL1141387220080311>>.

- Berlin. Spec. issue of *GEO Special* 6.3 (June/July 2009).
- Berliner Morgenpost*. Saturday, 10 June 2006.
- Blank, Thomas, and Peter Schmidt. "National Identity in a United Germany: Nationalism or Patriotism? An Empirical Test with Representative Data." *Political Psychology* 24.2 (2003): 289–312.
- Bude, Heinz. *Generation Berlin*. Berlin: Merve, 2001.
- Cerulo, Karen A. "Identity Construction: New Issues, New Directions." *Annual Review of Sociology* 23.1 (1997): 385–409. <<http://dx.doi.org/10.1146/annurev.soc.23.1.385>>.
- Costabile-Heming, Carol Anne, Rachel J. Halverson, and Kristie A. Foell, eds. *Berlin – The Symphony Continues: Orchestrating Architectural, Social, and Artistic Change in Germany's New Capital*. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2004.
- The Germans: Sixty Years after the War*. Spec. issue of *Der Spiegel* June 2005.
- Giulianotti, R. *Football: A Sociology of the Game*. Cambridge: Polity, 1999.
- Herzinger, Richard. *Republik ohne Mitte: Ein politischer Essay*. Berlin: Siedler, 2001.
- Huddy, Leonie. "From Social to Political Identity: A Critical Examination of Social Identity Theory." *Psychology* 22.1 (2001): 127–56.
- Illies, Florian. *Generation Golf. Eine Inspektion*. Frankfurt am Main: Fischer, 2003.
- Inthorn, Sanna. "A Game of Nations? Football and National Identities." Tomlinson and Young 155–67.
- Köhler, Horst. *Germany, Land of Ideas*. 2006. <[http://www.land-of-ideas.org/CDA/the\\_initiative,239,0,en.html](http://www.land-of-ideas.org/CDA/the_initiative,239,0,en.html)>.
- Konrad, Jennie. "To Be or Not to Be: Be Divided, Be United, Be Berlin, Or, How the Local Government Is Spending € 5,000,000 a Year on a Branding Farce." *Save Berlin*. Spec. issue of *Exberliner* 77 (2009): 5.
- Kurbjuweit, Dirk. "Im Lande Winnetous." *Der Spiegel* 12 June 2006: 22–27.
- Leinemann, Jürgen. "Wir brauchen einen Rausch." *Der Spiegel* 3 June 2006: 64–73.
- Matussek, Matthias. "Nazi Fritz and Peacenik Jürgen – How the British See the Germans." *The Germans* 50–52.
- Ottomeyer, Hans. Interview with Matthias Matussek and Matthias Schulz. "Vaterland in der Vitrine." *Der Spiegel* 22 May 2006: 168–72.
- Palmer, Hartmut. "Honed for History." *The Germans* 20–27.
- Schütz, Erhard, and Jörg Döring. *Text der Stadt: Reden von Berlin. Literatur und Metropole seit 1989*. Berlin: Weidler, 1999.
- Sinka, Margit M. "Heinz Bude's Defining Construct for the Berlin Republic: The *Generation Berlin*." Costabile-Heming, Halverson, and Foell 187–204.
- Tomlinson, Alan, and Christopher Young, eds. *German Football: History, Culture, Society*. London: Routledge, 2006.
- Turner, Sebastian. Interview with Ulf Lippitz and Falko Müller. "Berlin fühlt sich freier an als andere Orte." *Zitty* 8–21 June 2006: 29–30.
- Who Is Deutschland?* Dir. Boaz Beerli. Ritten by Jon Medow, Abraham Singer, and Boaz Beerli. 2008. <[http://beerifilms.com/Education\\_%26\\_Research\\_Films/Pages/Who\\_Is\\_DEUTSCHLAND.html](http://beerifilms.com/Education_%26_Research_Films/Pages/Who_Is_DEUTSCHLAND.html)>.