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Das Fach Schönschreiben

Aber gewiss doch

Nach Schablone

Und in Schönschrift

Tanzt kein Buchstabe

Aus der Reihe

Liegt kein Wort

Schief

Halten alle

Den Rand

Ein

Und erhalten

Ein Lob

Nur

Die Wahrheit

Fällt immer auf

Als sehr schwer

Erziehbar

-Jürgen Fuchs: Schiftprobe, Weimar 2001, S. 62

1 Translation: “The Subject of Beautiful Writing: But of course/ By template/ And in beautiful script/ No letter/ Dances out of line/ No word/ Is askew/ Everyone keeps/ To the edge/ Consistently/ And receives/ Praise/ Only/ The truth/ Always stands out/ As very hard/ To discipline” (Fuchs, 2001).
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Abstract

Located in Lichtenberg, Berlin (part of the former borough of Hohenschönhausen), *Gedenkstätte Berlin-Hohenschönhausen* stands today as a memorial for the thousands who were killed and imprisoned there, from its construction in 1939 until its closure in 1990. This paper will trace the evolution of Hohenschönhausen from a physical space of confinement, to a sophisticated psychological apparatus designed to exert control over its political prisoners through the development of “Operative Psychology” (OP). Through an architectural and historical analysis of the prison, alongside a review of prisoner testimonies, this paper works to reveal how the environment of Hohenschönhausen was methodically designed to disorient and manipulate political detainees within the German Democratic Republic (GDR). The shift towards Operative Psychology is contextualized within the broader political, economic, and historical influences of the Cold War; highlighting how the GDR's limited resources, ideological warfare, and international pressures resulted in a move away from physical coercion to more subtle psychological techniques. This examination highlights the relationships between environment, psychology, and state power—thus offering a critical assessment of the legacy of Operative Psychology and its implications for human rights and within the psychological practice.

Introduction

Division of East and West Germany

The division of Germany post-World War II led to the emergence of two distinct states with diverging political ideologies and systems of governance. In the East, the German Democratic Republic (GDR) sought to establish a socialist society under the influence of the Soviet Union (USSR), leading to the implementation of stringent measures against perceived
enemies of the state. Conversely, West Germany, officially known as the Federal Republic of Germany (FRG), emerged under the aegis of the allied powers; the United States, the United Kingdom, and France. This division created not only a physical barrier but also an ideological chasm between the two Germanys. West Germany was aligned with democratic principles and capitalist economic policies, fostering a society that stood in stark contrast to the state-controlled model of the East. While the tensions of the Cold War began in the early 1900’s, this division of Germany would come to be the focus of the proxy war between the United States and the Soviet Union; which in turn greatly influenced the development of Operative Psychology within the GDR.

In addition to the international pressures, the GDR also faced a great deal of internal dissent from the German population within their occupational zone; particularly due to the violent history between the Germans and the USSR during WWII, as well as the dire economic situation in the East. The USSR had exhausted many resources during the war, and was unable to provide sufficient funding to rebuild Eastern Germany to the same extent that the allied powers were able to revive the economy in the West. In response to these internal and external pressures, the GDR and its Ministry of State Security (MfS), known informally as the Stasi, focused on developing advanced techniques of surveillance and psychological control, designed to maintain state authority and suppress any threat to the stability of the GDR. Limited in funding and resources, the Stasi aimed to create a self-policing society where the fear of surveillance and the psychological consequences of dissent were omnipresent; and at the same time, these covert strategies would allow for the GDR to sign international treaties with the stipulation of improving human rights, which in turn provided the GDR with greatly needed financial aid during the mid 1970’s.
Hohenschönhausen Memorial & Schematic

Located in the Lichtenberg district of Berlin, within the former borough of Hohenschönhausen, the Berlin-Hohenschönhausen Memorial is located in a place that, unlike any other site in Germany, is connected to a 44-year history of the political persecution in the Soviet occupation zone and the GDR. The architecture of this complex, with three main operative periods from 1945-1990, has been almost entirely preserved, and clearly shows the evolution of the site from a work camp and labor prison to an apparatus of sophisticated and cruel psychological torture. Figure 1 shows the schematic of the entire complex, with certain buildings that will be mentioned throughout this paper.

**Figure 1:** Schematic of the complex at Berlin-Hohenschönhausen.

Note: (Bauer, 2023).

---

2 Translations: “Wachturm” [Watch tower], “Kellergefängnis” [Basement prison], “U-Boot” [Submarine], “Zellentrakt” [Cell wing], “Vernehmertrakt” [Interrogation wing].
Special Camp No. 3 (1945-1946)

Figure 2: Outside wall and watch tower of Special Camp No. 3.

Note: (Bundesarchiv, 1955).

History & Purpose

During World War II the district Hohenschönhausen was utilized by German forces as a “factory city”; composed of several work camps with eastern European forced laborers producing armaments for the German Wehrmacht. On April 22nd, 1945, just prior to the war’s end, the forces of the Soviet Union captured the Berlin district of Hohenschönhausen, and these armament factories located in Hohenschönhausen became occupied by troops of the Soviet People's Commissariat for Internal Affairs (NKVD) (Erler & Knabe, 2008). During this time, in which battles were still being fought in the inner city, several acts of revenge—at times instigated by the forced laborers, occurred. The operative group of the Soviet counter espionage unit “SMERSH” [death to spies], and the NKVD followed suit of the earlier Soviet fighter troops. As early as late April 1945, Soviet troops conducted numerous arrests of “war criminals” in Hohenschönhausen (Erler & Knabe, 2008). In mid-May of that same year, the director of the
The special camp administration department of the Soviet Union ordered the establishment of “Special Camp No. 3”.

The purpose of Special Camp No. 3 was for the internment of “spies, saboteurs, terrorists, NSDAP members, police and Secret Service members, administrative officials and other so-called enemies” (Neumann & Von Bilavsky, 2022, pp. IX-X). Immediately after Germany’s official surrender in WWII in May, 1945, the allied powers began to completely occupy Germany, and began a series of punitive processes collectively known as “denazification.”

During the war, the USSR suffered many casualties, and many atrocities of human rights were committed against Soviet prisoners of war within the German Nazi prison camps. A large number of the infamous medical human experimentations were performed on Soviet prisoners within the German concentration camps (Weindling, 2016). The brutality of the German forces was not forgiven by the occupying Soviet power following the end of WWII, so when it came to implementing the joint directive of denazification, the Soviet authorities made wide sweeping arrests, and interned the prisoners at various “Special Camps” around Eastern Germany, including at Hohenschönhausen.

**Conditions at Special Camp No. 3**

The living conditions at Special Camp No. 3, as well as the other Soviet forced labor camps in the East were abhorrent; and could even be described as a deliberate act of revenge for past cruelty. The barracks, which were constructed in a former commercial kitchen used for factory production, housed at times over 4,000 people (Erler & Knabe, 2008). In addition to the cramped spaces, the hygienic conditions and quality and quantity of food were appalling. The weather also proved to be a struggle for those interned, as the buildings did not contain heating or proper ventilation equipment (Erler & Knabe, 2008). At the time of the camp’s shut down in...
November, 1946, around 16,000 people had passed through the camp in Hohenschönhausen. Official Soviet information states that between July 1945 and October, 1946, approximately 886 people did not survive due to the unacceptable hygienic conditions and malnutrition at the camp (Neumann & Von Bilavsky, 2022); however, modern reports estimate the number at over 3,000 fatalities (Erler & Knabe, 2008, p. 9).

The internment of “war criminals” at Special Camp No. 3 did not last long, as in October 1946, the camp was shut down, likely for consolidation reasons, and a majority of the prisoners were transferred to site of the former concentration camp in Sachsenhausen (Erler & Knabe, 2008). The remaining barracks for Nazi prisoners of war, and remaining Nazi forced labor camps were demolished, and the site was used to establish the central remand prison for the Soviet State of Ministry (MGB) at the end of 1946 (Erler & Knabe, 2008).

**Soviet Prison (1946-1947)**

**History & Purpose**

Following the closure of Special Camp No. 3, the site was repurposed as the central remand prison for the MGB within Germany. The MGB used forced labor from the previous camp to build the new structures of the central remand prison, known informally as the “Soviet Prison”. Unlike the Special Camp, the Soviet Prison was used to hold political dissidents awaiting trial—not for the detention of anyone who had committed any actual crimes. The Soviet Union was greatly concerned with protecting its occupation within Germany, particularly as a show of strength on an international stage with the United States occupying neighboring regions of Germany. The occupation by the Soviet Union was not received very well by the German population in the East, mainly due to the hostile treatment of German citizens by Soviet
forces, as seen in Special Camp No. 3 for example. While prisoners were awaiting trial at Hohenschönhausen, the goal of the MGB was to extract confessions as efficiently as possible. As resources were limited within the USSR, trials without confessions could be timely and a burden for the already struggling economy; in addition, the imprisonment of anyone suspected to be in opposition to the SED or MGB was thought to be an effective means of dissuasion for other German citizens.

New construction at Hohenschönhausen allowed for more housing of prisoners, and aided in the pursuit of gathering confessions efficiently. The basement of a former commercial prison kitchen in the complex was converted into an underground cell block that became known as the “U-Boot” [Submarine], nicknamed by the prisoners due to the dark and damp conditions of the cells (Erler & Knabe, 2008, p. 11). This underground cell section went into operation in the spring of 1947, and was used until the end of that winter (Erler & Knabe, 2008).

**Conditions at the Soviet Prison**

**Figure 3:** Photo of a cell corridor in the “U-Boot”.

*Note:* (Niedlich, 2008).
Figure 4: Larger cell that was most likely used for groups of prisoners.

![Larger cell that was most likely used for groups of prisoners.](image)

Note: (Geschichte des Ortes, n.d.).

The 60 chambers in the *U-Boot*, most of them damp and windowless, were only furnished with one wooden bed and one metal pale that served as a toilet (Erler & Knabe, 2008, pp. 56-57). There were several types of cells, with varying degrees of space, and varying overall conditions: There were larger cells meant to hold tens of prisoners at the time (though only one bed and waste pale was provided nonetheless); there were isolation cells meant for one prisoner, which were often so small that prisoners could only sit or squat in them; and there were cells described as “water cells”. A water cell is a cell without windows and furniture, with about a few centimeters of water on the floor at all times, due to guards pouring buckets of water over prisoners for days at a time (Knabe, 2007). During cold weather, the water would freeze along the walls and floors of the cell, and prisoners were only allowed the thin clothes they were already wearing as a defense against the harsh conditions (Knabe, 2007).
Physical torture as a means to compel political prisoners into confession was the primary strategy for the MGB during this time. Specifically, the use of torture within the “water cells” has been described by many former prisoners. Water cell torture, however, was only one form of torture. In order to intensify the suffering of prisoners, food and water rations were cut drastically, clothes were removed, and they were handcuffed in painful positions, or even exposed to cold air (Erler & Knabe, 2008). One disturbing report by former prisoner, Karl Heinz Reuter, states that he and another prisoner were forced to build special torture contraptions inside four cells in May 1947, including; “a bending apparatus with shackles for hands and feet, kneeling beds, and a water dripping device” (Erler & Knabe, 2008, p. 58).
Figure 6: Isolation cell in the “U-Boot”.

Note: The window shown was not added until many years after its use. This cell when it was in use in the Soviet prison, would have been completely pitch black, with the only ventilation coming from a small gap on the bottom of the cell door. (Niedrich, 2008).

In addition to the physical punishment, the actions and behaviors of the prisoners were severely regulated. Sleep deprivation was a common symptom of the prisoners kept at Hohenschönhausen. According to many prisoner testimonies, during the hours between 6:00 A.M. and 10:00 P.M. no one was allowed to lie down or sleep sitting up (Knabe, 2007, pp. 79-80), and while sleeping, prisoners had to maintain a specific form, or they were loudly woken up. Due to these conditions, many prisoners suffering from extreme sleep deprivation reported losing “all sense of time”, and that within the chambers they hallucinated or suffered a circulatory collapse (Erler & Knabe, 2008, pp. 57-58).
The interrogations that were aimed at extracting confessions from prisoners most often took place at night, and were combined with verbal threats and physical violence, including regular beatings, and destruction of personal items such as eyeglasses (Erler & Knabe, 2008). The timing of when the interrogations took place and how long they lasted, were conducted in an extremely irregular manner. Some reports recount that interrogations could last for 20 hours of longer (Michels & Weiser, 2017).

At the end of 1947, the SED decided to scale down most of its operations in Hohenschönhausen, and consolidated most of its operations to Berlin-Karlshorst. During this period of time, the exact division of German territory was still be finalized between the allied powers, and the requirements of the SED became more diverse, and the USSR had to begin to redesign its operational forces within Germany.

**Stasi Prison (1951-1990)**

**Description & Purpose (1950s/1960s)**

The Truman Doctrine, enacted by the United States in 1947, declared the official start of the Cold War between the United States and the Soviet Union. As tensions continued to rise between the East and the Western powers, Germany became the central proxy battle site of the Cold War. Following the Truman Doctrine, the Soviet Union began to redesign its occupational forces, and on October 7th, 1949, the German Democratic Republic (GDR) was officially established, and a new period began in the restricted area in Berlin-Hohenschönhausen. The Soviet occupying power gradually scaled down its administration apparatus, including its security forces operating in Germany. In July of 1950, the Soviet Ministry of State Security (MGB) dissolved its operative department in Berlin and in the following spring, the Soviet
Union gave up the restricted military area completely. By this point the site had already lost most of its importance as the headquarters of the Soviet Police and secret service authority. The persecution of political offenses was, of course, not over. More and more responsible for this was rather the GDR’s Ministry of State Security (MfS), which had just been created in February of 1950, and was now to assume the responsibilities of the Soviet security body. The MfS saw itself as the “shield and sword” of the SED, which meant its role was to eliminate any resistance to the SED (Voigt & Erler, 2011). It soon needed facilities with the capacity necessary to accommodate its remand prisoners and additional logistical activities. The Soviet Control Commission (SCC), therefore, turned the restricted military area in Hohenschönhausen over to the GDR government, effective March 1st, 1951, which shortly thereafter made it available to the State Security Service (Scheer, 2007). By the end of the GDR over 700 Stasi employees had come to work at this prison, while the number of prisoners never exceed 200 (Scheer, 2007).

**Figure 7: Image of the main complex at Hohenschönhausen.**

*Note: The red brick building which sits above the “U-Boot” can be seen adjacent to the tan construction which served as the central building for the Stasi prison. The newer construction was designed in a “U-shape” with two main corridors on each wing. The corridor seen in this image is the interrogation wing. (Geschichte des Ortes, n.d.).*
The Stasi prison at Hohenschönhausen once again became the central remand prison for the governing power in East Germany. As Cold War tensions continued to heighten, the USSR saw their possession of East Germany as more and more vulnerable, and aimed to destroy any forms of resistance to their presence. With ever-increasing internal pressure, the Stasi became more and more concerned with having complete control over its citizens. Therefore, the purpose of this new remand prison, was to continue to hold and interrogate political dissidents until confessions were given, whether or not they were fabricated was of no importance. Prisoners would not leave Hohenschönhausen until they confessed.

During the first decade of the Stasi prison’s operation, the previous constructions were utilized. The “U-Boot” was again used for the housing of prisoners. In this period, the conditions were very similar to those seen during the Soviet prison; poor hygiene, lack of food and water, lack of heating and ventilation, and the use of water cell torture, as well as other means of physical torture continued. One report from a former prisoner during the 1950’s at Hohenschönhausen described being beaten in the chest by his interrogator, even though he had a known heart condition3 (Knabe, 2007, pp. 147-153).

In the later part of the decade, the old buildings however, no longer met the needs of the MfS, and a new three-story building was constructed behind the old prison. This new construction replaced the “U-Boot” as the central remand prison in 1961. The building was constructed in a “U-shape” next to the “U-Boot”, and was intentionally designed to be a device of psychological disruption, that would aid in the Stasi’s use of Operative Psychology in later years (Knabe, 2007).

3 Full version of this testimony in Section V of this paper.
Political and Economic Influences

During the early years of the 1950’s, the East began to face the reality of several hardships within the USSR, as well as the GDR; a weakening economy, as well as continued pressures from the United States and other western allies and from its own citizens who were unhappy about the lack of prosperity and freedom within the GDR. The United States, with a flourishing domestic economy, was able to use this economic advantage over the USSR to leverage international treaties of support. The most infamous Cold-War-era international agreement was the Economic Recovery Act of 1948, which is most frequently known as the Marshall Plan. The Marshall Plan by the United States extended invitations to many international powers, including the Soviet Union and its satellite states—proposing that the United States provide economic assistance to restore the economic infrastructure of postwar Europe (Michels & Wieser, 2017). The Soviet Union and the GDR both declined to join, fearing increased U.S. involvement in their national affairs.

Although the USSR declined to join the Marshall Plan in 1948, in subsequent years, the economy in the East continued to decline, and the need for these international funds grew. In addition to the economic pressures, global attention towards the protection of human rights was increasing, with many proponents of this agenda placing pressure on the USSR to improve the treatment of its own citizens. In order for the Soviet Union and its satellite states, including the GDR, to receive economic assistance from the West, it would need to agree to abolishment of the use of torture upon its own citizens (Michels & Wieser, 2017).

In order to address the many needs of the GDR, as well as to improve its reputation on an international level, the MfS began to make major changes at its central remand prison at Hohenschönhausen. Construction of a new building was completed in 1961, and became the
main building for the prison until 1990. The Stasi designed this new construction to meet two
main needs: 1. Appease the international communities by improving the physical conditions for
their citizens and prisoners, and; 2. Improve the effectiveness of interrogation in order to
continue to oppress political opponents. The Stasi developed a solution that would achieve both
goals: the implementation of institutionalized psychological torture strategies, known as
“Operative Psychology”.

Development of Operative Psychology

Beginning in the mid 1950’s, the MfS began to investigate and improve research in the
field of psychology as a means to control a population and improve the efficiency of
interrogations. There were several main advantages to the use of psychology as opposed to the
traditional use of physical force: To begin, the use of psychology, including psychological
torture, left no physical marks or evidence on the victims. Even though the prison at
Hohenschönhausen was a “black site”, meaning it was excluded from city maps, and the location
was kept top-secret, prisoners kept there were eventually going to leave the site, and most would
eventually return home.
The use of physical torture served as direct evidence of the violation of human rights that was occurring within Stasi facilities. Operative Psychology, with its emphasis on psychological over physical coercion, offered a method of control that was harder to detect and criticize from outside the GDR's borders. Another problem with the use of physical force, and physical torture, was that it was extremely costly for the GDR to support the maintenance of large-scale detention facilities, as well as to employ the means that would carry out the physical coercion. In contrast, psychological manipulation, grounded in Operative Psychology, offered a subtler and economically viable alternative. This approach not only reduced the resources needed for direct physical repression but also aimed at reconditioning individuals, thereby potentially turning dissenters into compliant citizens or even collaborators.
In 1955 the Juridicial Academy in Potsdam, Germany was opened. This secret academy was composed of psychologists that worked to develop the strategies and principles of a new form of psychology termed, “Operative Psychology” (OP). The psychologists within the MfS did not seek to make interrogation and imprisonment more humane by dismantling the use of physical violence as torture; “[rather] they conducted their research on interrogation techniques to render them more effective” (Michels & Wieser, 2017). The academy outlined the four main goals of OP:

1. Selection and education of Stasi employees. 2. Improving methods to attract civil informants to cooperate with the Stasi. 3. Increasing the effectiveness of all methods of “operative procedures” (i.e., profiling, observation, “disintegration,” interrogation, and “regaining” of “hostile-negative forces”). 4. Combating hostile ideologies.

(Michels & Wieser, 2017).

The Academy taught these principles, and their related methods to upper level MfS agents. These principles of OP would become the main guiding factors in the construction of the new prison at Hohenschönhausen in the late 1950’s.

Operative Psychology at Hohenschönhausen (1970s-1990)

The architectural modifications under Stasi control were instrumental in the shift towards Operative Psychology, making the prison in and of itself a tool of psychological warfare. The environment of the prison was methodically designed to destabilize, disorient, and manipulate detainees, marking a significant evolution from physical to psychological methods of repression. This change not only reflected the Stasi’s sophisticated approach to maintaining state power but
also underscored the broader move within the GDR towards subtler and less overt forms of political control.

In the new building, for every 102 prisoner cells there were 120 interrogation rooms behind padded, soundproofed double doors in the long corridors of the interrogation wing. In this authoritarian and oppressive environment, entire assembles of interrogators carried out quasi-industrial production of confessions. Even the equipment, which was identical in all of the interrogation rooms, was aimed at suggesting to the prisoners that they were “weak” (Knabe, 2007). The interrogator sat in his armchair behind a large desk, was placed between the prisoners and the only glass pane window of the entire wing, which was fixated behind his back. If the interrogator so chose, he was able to pull the curtain to the side and reveal a width of a view of the green trees, and the settlement houses outside the wall. After permanent sensory deprivation, this was an extremely effective means of psychological destabilization. (Knabe, 2007).

**Figure 9:** Interrogation room.

*Note: Photo by Phillip Lohöfener (n.d.).*
The cells of the new prison were a considerable improvement over the basement cells of the “U-Boot”. Many “luxuries” were added to this new construction, which prisoners had not previously been privy to at Hohenschönhausen. In the early 1960’s, a common cell was furnished with a two-meter-long and an 85-centimeter wide wooden bed with a mattress and blanket. There was a table and stool, both of which were screwed to the floor. There was also a toilet, with seats and covers added in the later years of the 1970’s. Within the cells, there were no windows in the traditional sense, or any view to the outside; rather a construction of glass bricks and an air shaft that did allow for the muted light and a little fresh air to enter the cell. Beneath this window, there was a heater which could not be regulated from the inside, and which was covered in perforated metal sheeting. The cell doors equipped with a small hatch and a peephole, were covered on the inside by a 1.5-millimeter thick panel of steel. The neon ceiling lights, set into the wall above the cell door, could only be operated by a guard from the outside. A sink and small double door wall cabinet for holding soap, a comb, toothbrush, glasses and even dentures were added at a later date. (Erler & Knabe, 2008).

**Figure 10:** Cell in the new building.

![Cell in the new building](image)

*Note: (Geschichte des Ortes, n.d.)*
While the physical conditions of the prison improved, and the use of physical torture declined during the 1960’s, with the migration of all prisoners into the new building, it was not until after the signing of the Helsinki Accords in 1975 and the subsequent orders with Directive 1/76, that the use of physical torture within GDR facilities was completely abolished (Morawe, 2000–2001). The Helsinki Accords were a series of agreements between over thirty countries, this time including the Soviet Union and the GDR, that pledged to respect human rights and fundamental freedoms and to cooperate in economic, scientific, and humanitarian disciplines. The Soviet Union and the GDR, through signing this agreement were thus able to receive greatly needed financial aid from the West. Six months after the signing of the Helsinki Accords, the MfS published Directive 1/76 as a part of their regular “Operative Procedures” updates. In this document, MfS psychologists of the Juridical Academy offered guidance on how to use psychological means in the context of OP; Zersetzung [Disintegration] was the umbrella term for an extensive list of techniques that aimed to achieve one purpose: “The fragmentation, paralysis, disorganization and isolation of ‘hostile-negative forces’” (BStU, 1993, p. 464). Importantly, none of the “operative procedures” stated in Directive 1/76 included the use of physical violence as an accepted behavior of Stasi employees (Michels & Wieser, 2017).
Following Directive 1/76, the conditions at Hohenschönhausen would appear to have improved from an outside perspective, however the realities faced by those imprisoned at this facility were abhorrent in an entirely new way. Extreme psychological torture ensued, as every detail within Hohenschönhausen was designed with this intent: the building itself was a tool of psychological Zersetzung and OP.

In the new building, isolation cells were introduced, designed to maximize psychological pressure by preventing communication between prisoners, and creating a sense of complete isolation from the outside world. These cells featured controlled lighting and soundproofing to enhance the disorientation and helplessness of detainees. The interrogation rooms were similarly redesigned with manipulated lighting and non-standard furniture arrangements, along with one-
way mirrors for observation, all intended to unnerve prisoners and make them more susceptible to manipulation tactics.

**Figure 12:** Padded isolation cell.

![Padded isolation cell](image)

*Note:* Photo by Phillip Lohöfener (n.d.).

Moreover, the Stasi enhanced the prison's surveillance capabilities, incorporating advanced technologies and architectural features to enable constant, unobserved monitoring of prisoners. This omnipresent surveillance aimed to instill a perpetual sense of watchfulness and paranoia among the detainees. The prison's layout was also strategically altered to disorient inmates and restrict their movement, reinforcing their dependence on their captors and furthering the psychological impact. When their cell door was opened, the prisoner was expected to stand in a certain position and identify themselves by number. In addition, guards were monitoring them continuously through the peephole in the door— even when they were sleeping or using the toilet. While sleeping, prisoners were not allowed to place their hands under the blanket and their
head could not be turned away from the peephole. They were not permitted to use the wooden bed during the day. It was also forbidden to discuss news, participate in “sports” in the room, speak loudly, or sing (Erler & Knabe, 2008). During the night, checks to ensure the rules were being followed usually took place every quarter of an hour. Any form other than the permitted supine position with hands outside of the cover meant cell lights on, loud noises, being yelled at, and thus sleep deprivation (Erler & Knabe, 2008).

The Prisoner, isolated in this dreary building, unsettled, and deprived of elementary rights and freedoms. Probing questions arose; What do they know? How long are they holding you? What's at the end? In such pressure situations the interrogator could come with offers (Erler & Knabe, 2008, pp. 145-146).

**Figure 13:** Interrogation wing in the new prison building

*Note: Photo by Dirk Vogel (n.d.).*
Interrogators also exerted intense psychological pressure on detainees, leveraging personal fears, guilt, and loyalty. The threat of harm to family members, or promises of freedom or leniency, were common tactics used to exploit emotional vulnerabilities. The inconsistency of interrogation tactics — with interrogations occurring unpredictably, varying in intensity and approach — was designed to keep prisoners off balance, preventing them from adapting or anticipating what would come next.

Operations at Hohenschönhausen did not cease until the end of the GDR in 1990 following the fall of the Berlin Wall on November 9th, 1989. After the reunification of East and West Germany in 1990, the information regarding the MfS operations at Hohenschönhausen were finally brought to light, and the stories of the victims detained here became known. Today, the complex still stands as a memorial, with many former prisoners serving as tour guides for the facilities, and offering their own first-hand accounts of the horrors they faced there.

The treatment of prisoners under the use of Operative Psychology at Hohenschönhausen was characterized by a form of cruelty that left deep psychological scars, affecting individuals' mental health long after their release. The objective was not just to extract information but to break the prisoners' spirit and resistance thoroughly. This relentless psychological pressure, combined with the fear of indefinite detention, created an atmosphere of despair and hopelessness.

Survivor Testimonies

Special Camp No. 3, in conjunction with the Soviet prison, highlight the cruel physical conditions that ensued at Hohenschönhausen in the pursuit of revenge-seeking, as well as political oppression during Soviet occupation of Germany.
The primary purpose of the Stasi prison was the detention, interrogation, and psychological manipulation of individuals deemed a threat to the state's socialist ideology and authority. This facility was shrouded in secrecy, omitted from city maps, and its existence was unknown to the public. It was not until the 1990’s and thereafter, that the stories of the many victims of this prison became known. The design of the Stasi prison facilitated total control over the prisoners’ environment, enabling the Stasi to implement its psychological tactics efficiently. These tactics included sensory deprivation, extreme isolation, controlled communication, and unpredictable interrogation schedules, all aimed at breaking the prisoners' will and extracting confessions or cooperation.

This transition towards psychological manipulation within Hohenschönhausen is emblematic of the broader changes in state strategy towards dissent during the Cold War. The use of Operative Psychology was not merely a tactic for information gathering but a profound assertion of state power over the individual, aiming to recondition and rehabilitate political prisoners into compliant citizens. By examining the architectural and operational aspects of the prison in conjunction with prisoner testimonies, the extent of the psychological impact on detainees becomes apparent. These testimonies reveal the deeply personal and lasting effects of the prison's environment and the psychological tactics employed by the Stasi, underscoring the human cost of such methods of control.

**Testimonies from the 1940’s at Hohenschönhausen**

The testimonies during the 1940’s highlights the treatment of prisoners of war within the Special Camp No. 3. It was not until the later years of the 1940’s that the complex became a
reprimand center for political prisoners. Both periods are characterized by harsh physical conditions and the use of physical torture.

„Schrecken durch ein Barackenfenster hindurch Hunderte von Menschen mit kahlgeschorenen Köpfen auf dem Fußboden und den doppelstöckigen Holzpritschen der bekannten russischen Bauart liegen. Vor der Barackentür standen ehemalige NSV-Essenkübel, die jetzt als Abort dienen mußten. Sie waren gestrichen voll, denn die Latrine, die wieder ab lag, durfte in der Nacht aufgesucht werden. Um 5 Uhr wurde geweckt, und das Lager trat zum Appell an. Dann erhielten die Insassen eine dünne Kartoffelflockensuppe. Wir noch nicht, obwohl wir sehr hungrig und durstig waren.”

-Walter Pritzkow (Knabe, 2007, p. 27).

„Der Raum war schwach beleuchtet. Die Stille einer Grabkammer umfing mich. Nur die Körperbekleidung war mitgekommen aus einer weit entfernten Welt. In der etwa drei Meter mal zwei Meter mal zwei Meter großen Zelle waren die Wände, die Decke und der Fußboden nicht gestrichen, waren feucht und naß, hatten Flecken, die ich in den folgenden Monaten wie Bilder deutete…Neben dem Eingang stand links eine grün gestrichene Holzpritsche ohne Matratze. Auf ihr zu liegen, war am Tag verboten. Auf der anderen Seite neben der Tür war Platz für den

__Translation:__ Terror through a barrack window, hundreds of people with shaved heads lie on the floor and on the double-decked wooden bunks of the known Russian design. In front of the barrack door stood former National Socialist Welfare food containers, now serving as toilets. They were completely full because the latrine, which was further away, was not allowed to be used at night. The wakeup call was at 5:00 a.m. and the camp assembled for roll call. Then the inmates were given thin potato flake soup. We didn't yet receive it, although we were very hungry and thirsty”.

__5 Walter Pritzkow was a student who was sent to Special Camp No. 3 in 1945 at age 21, for possession of weapons._

-Ewald Ernst (Knabe, 2007, p. 60-61).


6 Translation: “The room was dimly lit. The silence of a tomb enveloped me. Only the clothes had come with me from a far distant world. In the cell, approximately three meters by two meters by two meters, the walls, ceiling, and floor were unpainted, damp and wet, with stains that I interpreted like pictures in the following months... Next to the entrance on the left stood a green-painted wooden bunk without a mattress. Lying on it during the day was forbidden. On the other side next to the door was space for the emergency bucket. Increasing silence, powerlessness, and helplessness. ‘Where the Lord does not help me, my soul would nearly lie in silence’.”

7 Erwald Ernst was a parliamentary group leader of the CDU in Saxony-Anhalt and was imprisoned from 1947-1948.

8 Translation: “It was very cold in January. This was further intensified by the fact that, as I was told, a window was open in the stairwell. The walls were mostly covered with white frost. I had therefore been subjected to cold solitary confinement. I had to strip down to my underwear and undershirt. My hands were tied behind my back. At first, I did not want to sit on the stone floor and alternately leaned against the wall with one shoulder and then the other until I became tired and collapsed. From there, I settled on the floor as best as I could. The already meager food was cut to about a third. I did not get food every day, often only every other day. And every night there were interrogations. Part of the treatment was that once in the next room someone I knew was being beaten. I was told..."
Testimonies from the 1950’s at Hohenschönhausen

The testimonies from 1951 and later represent the first accounts of the treatment of prisoners at the Stasi Prison. During the first two decades of this period at Hohenschönhausen, the use of physical torture is well documented, and it’s replacement by the use of Operative Psychology becomes more apparent in the late 1960’s-1970’s.

„Schon bei einer der ersten “Vernehmungen”, die Mielke persönlich gegen mich durchführte, erklärte er mir, daß er in höherem Moskauer Auftrage und mit Billigung der SED-Führung handele. Er brüstete sich, daß er ein alter Tschekist und Schüler Berijas sei, früher in der Ljubjanka gearbeitet habe und ich nicht der erste sei, den er fertigmachen würde. Ja, er sprach sogar in seiner sadistischen Art davon, daß er mehrere liquidiert habe und dabeigewesen sei, wie Knorin, Bela Khun, Piatnitzki u.a. erledigt wurden.“

-Kurt Müller

„Bei meiner Verhaftung Anfang 1951 war ich bereits Invalide infolge einer Herzmuskelverletzung. Jeder weiß, daß herzkranke Menschen viel liegen müssen. Obwohl ich that I was "next." I waited half the night for it, but was not beaten. The following night, someone else was mistreated. A woman screamed terribly. I was told it was my wife”.

9 Hermann Becker was a parliamentary group leader of the Liberalen in Thüringen, and was imprisoned from 1948-1950.

10 Translation: “Already during one of the first ‘interrogations,’ which Mielke personally conducted against me, he explained to me that he was acting on higher orders from Moscow and with the approval of the SED leadership. He boasted that he was an old Chekist and a student of Beria’s, that he had worked in the Lubyanka before, and that I was not the first one he would finish off. Yes, he even spoke in his sadistic manner about how he had liquidated several people and had been present when Knorin, Bela Kun, Piatnitzki, and others were dealt with”.

11 Kurt Müller was a deputy chairman of the KPD in West Germany, and was in the Soviet prison in 1950-1951.


Agententätigkeit, Sie werden noch im Keller krepieren.”...In diesem Zustand tiefster Verzweiflung unterzeichnete ich Protokollen, in denen meine Fehler wahrheitswidrig als Verbrechen deklariert werden.”12


Testimonies from the 1960’s at Hohenschönhausen

This testimony from 1960 highlights the mixed use of physical and psychological torture within this period. The use of psychological methods was becoming more common during this time, as the development of Operative Psychology was advancing within Potsdam, however the use of OP will become more advanced in the later decades.

„Der zweiten 21 Tage verschärften Arrests nahmen keine Ende. Es schien, daß die Drei-Tage-Abstände zwischen den Mittagessen überhaupt nicht vergehen wollten. Diese Essen halfen nicht viel, um bei Kräften zu bleiben. Sie signalisierten mehr die Etappen auf dem Wege zum

12 Translation: “At the time of my arrest in early 1951, I was already disabled due to a heart muscle injury. Everyone knows that people with heart disease need to lie down a lot. Although I was arrested directly from the hospital, I was denied permission to lie down for a long time, about three-quarters of a year. During this time, I repeatedly experienced weeks of sleep deprivation. The interrogations carried out up until November 1951, during which mostly no records were taken (softening process), were conducted at night. According to prison regulations, one could only sleep in this basement prison from 10 PM to 6 AM. I was usually taken for interrogations between 10 and 11 PM. The interrogations often lasted until the early morning hours. I was not allowed to sleep during the day. At least every two minutes, checks were made to see if I was asleep./ Besides the interrogator, I did not speak with a single person in those years. Yes, I was also beaten (temporarily). I was hit with fists, I was struck with a square steel ruler. During one interrogation, I was seated at a table. The chief of the Soviet interrogation team, who sat next to me, hit my diseased heart with the flat of his hand at short intervals, even though he knew I had suffered two heart attacks. This torture lasted about two hours. The same night, I was kicked in the shins, punched in the head, and had my hair pulled out. During another interrogation, which was conducted without witnesses, my glasses were smashed. During other individual interrogations, I had to stand for hours. My hands were handcuffed behind my back, and I was made to face the wall./ On September 9, 1952, I suffered another heart attack. I was left without any medical assistance for over a month...The head of the service, who had never been in my cell before, entered. I did not ask this colonel why I had been brought back to the basement. I did not grant him that favor. He said, 'Why don’t you make statements about your espionage activities, you will die in the basement anyway...In this state of deepest despair, I signed protocols that falsely declared my mistakes as crimes”.

13 Fritz Sperling was a deputy KPD chairman in West Germany and was imprisoned from 1951-1953.

-Wolfgang Kockrow¹⁵ (Knabe, 2007, p. 233).

**Testimonies from the 1970’s at Hohenschönhausen**

This period of time at Hohenschönhausen is characterized by a drastic shift towards the complete dependence upon Operative Psychology as a means to extract prisoner confessions. In contrast to the prior testimonies, from 1976 and later, the use of physical torture is not likely to be described by any prisoner; rather the use of psychological torture methods, such as sleep deprivation, isolation, behavior regulations, and sensory deprivation are going to be highlighted in great detail.


¹⁴ Translation: “The second 21-day intensified arrest seemed to have no end. It seemed as if the three-day intervals between lunches would never pass. These meals did little to keep up my strength. They signaled more the stages on the way to the end of the arrest. January was entering its last week when I was let out of the arrest cell. The daylight dazzled me as I was taken to the barber and the shower. Although my spirits returned very slowly and I felt somewhat better, I wanted or could no longer see anything positive about life in Camp ’X’... In this camp full of malice, envy, sycophancy, fear, intrigue, and spying, I did not want to stay”.

¹⁵ Wolfgang Krackow was detained at Hohenschönhausen from 1962-1964 due to the “transmission of messages” (Knabe, 2007, p. 231).
Auf der Pritsche, auf der er jeden Morgen die Matratzen zusammenlegen und das Bettzeug obendrauf tun mußte, durfte er weder liegen noch sitzen. Nicht mal die Beine durfte er drauflegen, wenn er auf dem Hocker saß. Auch durfte er sich beim Sitzen nicht anlehnen. Weil er es dennoch hin und wieder tat, bemerkte er bald, daß es unter dem Wachpersonal unterschiedlich strenge Dienstauffassungen gab. Es gab Schließer, die über sein Vergehen gegen die Verwahraumordnung hinwegsahen – Faulheit oder Menschlichkeit, das war hier die Frage –, andere rissen sofort die Klappe auf und schissen ihn lautstark zusammen, wieder andere kamen mit wutverzerrtem Gesicht in die Zelle gestürmt und drohten ihm alle möglichen Strafen an.

Wie die Zeit verging, konnte er nur am Stand der Sonne überprüfen, die ab dem frühen Vormittag über die Zellenwand kroch und ein zweites, sehr diffuses Gitter in den Raum zauberte. Schien keine Sonne, drang nur wenig Licht durch die Glasziegelsteine, dann mußte er sich auf seine innere Uhr verlassen, die ihn anfangs oft narrete. Aber er hatte ja längst begriffen: Desorientierung, Isolation und Langeweile, das waren die drei Foltermethoden, mit denen sie ihre Gefangenen zum Sprechen bringen wollten. Daß Untersuchungshaftlinge wie Unschuldige zu behandeln waren, interessierte sie nicht. Die sozialistischen Gesetzeshüter nahmen ihre eigenen Gesetze nicht ernst, erwarteten aber von allen anderen, daß sie sie respektieren. Absurdes Theater auf höchstem Niveau.”

---

16 Translation: “How little does a person need to feel something like happiness for a short time? When one Wednesday the distribution was missed, he was so disappointed that it led to an auditory hallucination: He smelled peppermint tea, although only chicory coffee stank up to him. After supper: the third marathon. If Lenz did not move, he sat on the stool. On the cot, where he had to stack the mattresses every morning and put the bedding on top, he was neither allowed to lie nor sit. He couldn’t even put his legs on it when he sat on the stool. Nor was he allowed to lean back while sitting. Because he did it now and then, he soon noticed that there were different levels of strictness among the guard staff. There were guards who overlooked his breach of the detention room order – laziness or humanity, that was the question here –, others immediately opened the hatch and scolded him loudly, yet others stormed into the cell with a face distorted with anger and threatened him with all kinds of punishments. /How time passed, he could only check by the position of the sun, which from early morning crept over the cell wall and cast a second, very diffuse grid into the room. If the sun did not shine, only little light came through the glass brick stones, then he had to rely on his internal clock, which initially often deceived him. But he had long understood: Disorientation, isolation, and boredom were the three torture methods with which
Testimonies from the 1980’s at Hohenschönhausen

The testimonies from the 1980’s reflect the maturation of Operative Psychology in practice, and how its use was continuously covered up by the GDR and MfS. The Stasi Prison at Hohenschönhausen was in use until 1990.


- Vera Lengsfeld (Knabe, 2007, p. 324).

„Nach dem Frühstück mit Plastikbesteck wurde ich gefragt, ob ich in die Freizeit gehen möchte. Ich sagte ja. Man führte mich in den Gipsplatz. Der Hof war lang, sehr schmal und von einer Garage ähnlichem, langgestrecktem Zement umgeben, der viele Zellentüre hatten. An beiden Ecken gab es Plattformen für die Wächter, die durch einen Käfig verbunden waren. Der they wanted to make their prisoners talk. That pre-trial detainees were to be treated like innocent people was of no interest. The socialist law enforcers did not take their own laws seriously but expected everyone else to respect them. Absurd theater at the highest level”.

17 Klaus Jordon is a writer and was imprisoned at Hohenschönhausen from 1972-1973 for trying to flee the GDR.
18 Translation: “On the third day, I asked my interrogator if solitary confinement, which is considered torture elsewhere, was the norm in East Germany. That same evening, I was given a cellmate whose biographical details so strikingly matched mine that this alone made me suspicious. When my interrogator asked me how I liked my cellmate, and I told him that she seemed very strange to me, I was moved again”.
19 Vera Lengsfeld was a GDR civil rights activist and was arrested in 1988 for “attempted rioting” (Knabe, 2007, p. 321).

---

\(^{20}\) Translation: "After breakfast with plastic cutlery, I was asked if I wanted to go to recreation. I said yes. I was led to the plaster yard. The yard was long, very narrow, and surrounded by a garage-like, elongated cement structure that had many cell doors. At both corners, there were platforms for the guards, connected by a cage. The open cage, which was unlocked for me, measured eight meters by four meters, surrounded by two-meter-high walls and topped with wire mesh, which was reinforced with barbed wire on the side where the wall met the perimeter of the prison complex. I was less shocked than amazed by the pervasive fantasy cemented into this facility. When I visited the Stasi prison in Hohenschönhausen again in early summer 1990 as a member of the Volkskammer, the open-air cages no longer existed. The partition walls had been torn down, the wire mesh had disappeared, there were benches and even concrete flower pots. Only if you looked closely could you see on the concrete floor where the partition walls had stood. The wooden cots on which one had to lie so that one's face was exposed to the constantly flashing light were also gone. The house rules also stipulated that hands must always be visible on the
Analysis of the Impact of Operative Psychology

The systematic use of psychological manipulation at Hohenschönhausen underscores a dark period where psychological knowledge was weaponized for control and repression; highlighting the importance of ethical standards in the practice of psychology. The experiences of those detained within its walls serve as a testimony to the impact that such psychological tactics can have on human dignity and autonomy, emphasizing the importance of ethical standards and the need for vigilance against the misuse of psychology and medical sciences.

To this day, survivors of the horrors within Hohenschönhausen continue to battle the long-lasting psychological scars inflicted by proponents of Operative Psychology. Even outside of the walls of the Hohenschönhausen complex, the effects of OP and the use of *inoffizieller Mitarbeiter* (IM) [unofficial collaborators] within the GDR has had a lasting impact on many German citizens. The accounts of attempted escape across the Berlin Wall has been well documented, and is a testament to the lengths that some would go to in order to escape the psychological oppression within East Germany. One testimony from West German citizen, Dieter Hötger, from 1962 highlights the dangers of OP and how its invisible nature has drastic consequences for its victims. Hötger and his acquaintance were living in West Germany when the Berlin Wall was constructed, however both were separated from their families, who were detained within East Germany, and unable to cross the border. Hötger and his acquaintance dug a blanket. The prison transporters with the metal lockers in which we had been transported were also no longer to be found. A man from the Citizens' Committee for the Dissolution of State Security had seen one at the very beginning and unfortunately thought too late to save at least one copy for the museum. The cells, which I had not gotten to know as a prisoner but wanted to visit as a member of parliament, were so filled with rubble in Rummelsburg that it was hardly possible to see anything of the State Security. Why, where, and what traces do they remove first?". 
tunnel from West Berlin to East Berlin in order to help their loved ones flee the GDR. During this attempted escape, both men travelled to the eastern side of the tunnel to guide their families through, however a Stasi agent working border control spotted them and shot both Hötger and his acquaintance, who later died at the scene. Hötger was brought to Hohenschönhausen and taken to the medical ward, where the on-site doctor attempted to remove the bullet from his leg. Hötger refused, stating: „Das bleibt schon drinre, als Beweis für später mal, dass ihr nicht sagen könnt, ihr habt nicht auf mich geschossen”\textsuperscript{21} (Voigt & Erler, 2011, p. 23). A man with a bullet in his body is unrefutable evidence of something that the SED, the GDR, and the Stasi had denied and covered up for many decades.

Psychology as a tool of violence and oppression is very powerful. As seen within Hohenschönhausen, the effectiveness and inconspicuousness of OP as a form of torture cannot be understated. Although the use of OP within the GDR ended with the fall of the Berlin Wall and the subsequent reunification of Germany, the principles and strategies of OP are still seen globally to this day. One of the most infamous examples, which has a great amount of similitude to Hohenschönhausen, is the detainment of prisoners within Guantanamo Bay. This prison opened in 2002, and serves as a reprimand center for the United States government. As in Hohenschönhausen, many of those imprisoned within the walls of Guantanamo Bay have not, or were not charged with a crime at the time of their detainment, and were exposed to several forms of extreme torture. After the end of the GDR in 1990, the studies of OP became known for the first time to the international community. The effects of OP are greatly seen within Guantanamo Bay, and other institutions around the world, where inhumane acts of psychological torture are enacted on prisoners in order to extract confessions. Extreme sleep deprivation and disruption, as

\textsuperscript{21} Translation: “That [bullet] will stay in there, as proof for later, so that you can't say you didn't shoot me.”
well as isolation and sensory deprivation are all documented forms of torture used at Guantanamo Bay. Survivor testimonies from Guantanamo Bay describe; not being allowed to sleep for 2-3 weeks at a time, extreme sensory deprivation for upwards of one month where they are in complete isolation, extreme sensory overload with loud music and indiscriminate sounds playing all through the day and night, water torture similar to that used in the Soviet and Stasi prisons, long interrogations, and more. At this time, there are still 30 prisoners confined at Guantanamo Bay experiencing extreme psychological and physical torture by the United States government.

The treatment of prisoners at both Hohenschönhausen and Guantanamo Bay exemplifies profound inhumane cruelty, underscoring a severe violation of fundamental human rights. In both contexts, the use of psychological tactics to inflict pain and suffering directly contradicts the principles of the Hippocratic Oath, which emphasizes doing no harm. Such practices reveal the critical need for adherence to ethical standards to prevent the exploitation of psychological and medical knowledge for purposes of torture and coercion.
Papier, Wir Haben Feinde:

Sie blättern nur

Flüchtig

Aber ihre Fingernägel

Graben sich tief ein

In dein Gesicht

Und sie erstatten

Anzeige

Gegen meine Worte

Wegen

Feindlicher Gruppenbildung

In Form von Gedichten

Papier

Wen auch immer sie

Anklagen:

Ich bezeuge deine Unschuld

Unter Eid


22 Translation: “Paper, We Have Enemies: They only browse through/ Fleetricly/ But their fingernails/ Dig deep/ Into your face/ And they file/ A report/ Against my words/ For/ Hostile assembly/ In the form of poems/ Paper/ Whoever they/ Accuse:/ I testify to your innocence/ Under oath” (Fuchs, 2001).
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