

In Search of Transcultural Memory in Europe

EDITED BY: BARBARA TÖRNQUIST-PLEWA, NIKLAS BERNSAND, MARCO LA ROSA
CENTRE FOR EUROPEAN STUDIES AT LUND UNIVERSITY 2017



IN SEARCH OF TRANSCULTURAL MEMORY IN EUROPE

IN SEARCH OF TRANSCULTURAL MEMORY IN EUROPE

Edited by:

Barbara Törnquist-Plewa, Niklas Bernsand, Marco La Rosa



LUND
UNIVERSITY



CFE Conference Papers Series No. 8

Lund 2017

The *CFE Conference papers series* is published by
The Centre for European Studies (CFE) at Lund University

Copyright 2017 Centre for European Studies at Lund University and the authors.

Editors: Barbara Törnquist-Plewa, Niklas Bernsand, Marco La Rosa

Assistant editors: Jeroen Bart, Eleonora Kleibel

ISSN 1654-2185

ISBN 978-91-984146-0-8

The paper is also available in PDF format at the CFE website www.cfe.lu.se

Centre for European Studies at Lund University

Box 201, SE-221 00 Lund, Sweden

Phone: +46 (0)46-222 88 19

Email: cfe@cfe.lu.se

ISBN 978-91-984146-0-8

Printed in Sweden by Media-Tryck, Lund University

Lund 2017



This publication is based upon work from COST Action IS1203 (In Search of Transnational Memory in Europe), supported by COST (European Cooperation in Science and Technology).

COST (European Cooperation in Science and Technology) is a pan-European intergovernmental framework. Its mission is to enable break-through scientific and technological developments leading to new concepts and products and thereby contribute to strengthening Europe's research and innovation capacities. It allows researchers, engineers and scholars to jointly develop their own ideas and take new initiatives across all fields of science and technology, while promoting multi- and interdisciplinary approaches. COST aims at fostering a better integration of less research intensive countries to the knowledge hubs of the European Research Area. The COST Association, an International not-for-profit Association under Belgian Law, integrates all management, governing and administrative functions necessary for the operation of the framework. The COST Association has currently 36 Member Countries. www.cost.eu



COST is supported by the
EU Framework Programme Horizon 2020

Table of Contents

Note from the editors	9
COST Action IS1203 Short Report	10
<i>Barbara Törnquist-Plewa</i>	
Memory Acts: Memory Without Representation. Theoretical and Methodological Suggestions	17
<i>Steffi Hobuß</i>	
Rethinking Remediation and Reworking the Archive: Transcultural Reappropriations of Documentary Images of Migration	39
<i>Dagmar Brunow</i>	
Forced Transcultural Memory: The Exile and Return of the Bulgarian Turks	59
<i>Galina Nikolaevna Goncharova</i>	
Population Uprooting after WWI and Politics of Memory. Expatriates from the Ottoman Empire to Greece in the Course of the 20th Century	73
<i>Emilia Salvanou</i>	
Historical Treatment of the Second World War in Post-Soviet Belarus: Sacralization of the Communist Memory	87
<i>Anna Zadora</i>	
Forensic Memories: After Testimony	95
<i>Johanne Helbo Bøndergaard</i>	
Competing Historical Narratives in Belarusian Textbooks	107
<i>Rune Brandt Larsen</i>	
Memoriography and the Anarchival Impulse	117
<i>Gitanjali Pyndiah</i>	
Memory in Relation to an Object in a Context of the Materially Deprived Total Institution of the Nazi Concentration Camp	125
<i>Lukasz Posluszny</i>	
Memory Studies in Motion – Reflections on two new research trends in the field ...	135
<i>Barbara Törnquist-Plewa, Anamaria Dutceac Segestan</i>	
Contributors to the volume	149

Note from the editors

This volume is one of the outcomes of the network project “In Search for Transnational Memory in Europe” (ISTME), which was financed during four years 2012-2016 by a grant from COST (European Cooperation in Science and Technology) as COST Action IS1203. COST is supported by the EU Framework Programmes (see www.cost.eu). The Centre for European Studies (CFE) at Lund University was grant holder for ISTME, and the Centre’s Head Prof. Barbara Törnquist-Plewa was chair. ISTME gathered researchers from 36 countries in Europe.

The volume opens with a short report of the activities of the action delivered by the chair at the final conference of ISTME in Dublin 1-3 September 2016. It is followed by a selection of papers presented at many of the action’s conferences and workshops (see the report in this volume). Most papers written by the action participants have been aimed for one of the five publications (two collected volumes and three special issues of scientific journals) prepared by the action or became included in other academic publications. However, several papers were published electronically on the action’s website, and it is a sample of those publications that are featured in this volume. The concluding chapter constitutes an attempt to look ahead and reflect over current and possible future directions in Memory Studies. It emerged in connection to the conference “Thinking through the future of Memory”, 3-5 December 2016, inaugurating the Memory Studies Association, which was initiated by a group of participants in our COST-action. That conference and the last chapter in this volume can be seen as a bridge between the activities of ISTME and the new organization for memory scholars which is now being built. Both point to the future.

The editors of this volume want to thank COST for financing ISTME in general and for the financial contribution to this volume in particular.

Special thanks go also to Jeroen Bart for technical and editorial assistance in preparing the publication.

Barbara Törnquist-Plewa

Marco La Rosa

Niklas Bernsand

Lund, 11 January 2017

COST Action IS1203: In Search for Transcultural Memory in Europe (ISTME). Short Report of the activities in the years 2012-2016

The aim of ISTME was to contribute to consolidating, developing and setting new agendas for the creative but fragmented field of interdisciplinary Memory Studies in Europe. Taking as its point of departure new theoretical insights within the field, the action made efforts to reorient Memory Studies, marked as it was by methodological nationalism thus focusing on national memories, towards the study of transnational and transcultural memories. The action explored possible alternatives to national models of memory in an increasingly globalised, networked and mediated world and made efforts to develop methodological and conceptual tools for the study of the transcultural dynamics of memory. The action focused on the questions of transculturality, agency as well as mediation and reception. The researchers participating in the action thus conducted a large number of studies about how memories are transmitted and received across borders in Europe, i.e. how memories of one and the same event are mediated and remediated not only in different media but also in different linguistic, cultural and political environments. Since memories are connected to identities and inform social action we asked: What happens when such a transfer takes place? Can it contribute to changes of identities or to the creation of new ones? Can it contribute to more open, including identities and broaden the community, extend the circle of those with whom we identify? Can transcultural memory work be helpful for accommodating divisive memories in Europe, thus promoting solidarity and integration?

The action focused especially on the remediation and reception of the so called difficult memories such as the Holocaust and Nazism, Communist crimes, memories of dictatorships (i.e. in Spain or Greece), genocide and wars. In this way, we wanted to contribute to a better understanding of how dark and disputed memories are transmitted across cultural borders and what effect they have on the societies where they circulate and are used for different purposes. Moreover, besides studying the transnational and transcultural processes of remediation and reception we paid attention to the question of agency. i.e. the role of memory actors and their politics of memory. We also searched for reconciliatory ways to handle existing conflicts between memory cultures in Europe, which can be seen as a utopian endeavor. However, the role of humanities, social sciences and arts in society is not only to help people to understand what is going on in our world but also to help them imagine a better future and urge them to try to change the world in this direction.

The action was constructed around three working groups of which the first focused on political actors, the second on mediation and the third on migration. In this way

we were able to pay special attention to the role played by politics, media and migration flows in crossing and renegotiating cultural and national borders and in evoking “imagined memory communities” beyond that of one’s own national or ethnic group.

ISTME started at the end of October 2012 and lasted for four years ending in October 2016.

The 1st Management Committee (MC) meeting in Brussels in October 2012 gathered 30 founding members from 22 COST member countries in Europe. Thereafter the action was growing constantly and in its last year the Management Committee consisted of 57 researchers from 36 countries, including 33 COST member countries, 2 Near Neighbourhood Countries (Ukraine and Georgia) and 1 International Partner Country (New Zealand). Apart from the 57 MC-members the action involved 44 researchers who acted as MC Substitutes. The action has also been open to other researchers that participated as specially invited guests in the working group meetings or plenary conferences and PhD schools of the action, as well as were the recipients of grants for shorter research visits, the STSMs (Short Term Scientific Missions).

ISTME was able to include many researchers from countries with lesser research resources and therefore targeted by the COST policy of inclusiveness. Of 36 countries involved 16 belonged to the category of ITC (Inclusiveness Target Countries), and 24 out of 57 MC Members and 18 out of 44 MC Substitutes came from these countries.

Our action was also successful in targeting gender equality with upholding a good balance between female and male participants. Among MC members there were 25 male and 31 female researchers while among the MC Substitutes 19 were male and 25 female.

ISTME managed to involve many early stage researchers in its activities. Besides being represented in the MC and acting as substitutes they have been given priority in the distribution for grants as visiting scholars (STSM). The action granted 30 STSMs. Grantees went to a large variety of countries (e.g. Macedonia, Romania, Poland, Georgia, Sweden, Germany, and France).

ISTME targeted early stage researchers in other ways as well. With the aim to educate a new generation of scholars in Memory Studies we assigned a significant part of our resources to organise training schools for PhD candidates and postdocs. Four such training schools were conducted, one in each year of the action, in Copenhagen 2013, Budapest 2014, Kaunas 2015 and in Dublin 2016. All together the PhD schools gathered 57 funded participants plus a number of other young scholars coming with their own funding or being young researchers from the local organizing university.

The ISTME-action organised a large number of conferences and WG-meetings/workshops. These were as follows:

The plenary, kick off-conference “In Search of Transcultural Memory in Europe”, Copenhagen, May 2013

A Work Group meeting for all WGs in Krakow, September 2013

The plenary conference “Transculturality and Memory”, Skopje, April 2014

“The Memories of Communism in Europe: actors, norms, institutions”, WG1 meeting, Paris, 2014

“Digital memories”, WG2 Meeting, Budapest, September 2014

“Memory on the Move. Theory and Methodology of Memory and Migration”, WG3 Meeting, Budapest, September 2014

The plenary conference “Agency and Transcultural memory”, Kaunas, March 2015

“EU Politics of Memory”, WG1 Meeting, Florence, June 2015

“The audiovisual production of transcultural memory in Europe”, WG2 Meeting, Dubrovnik, September 2015

“Migrants’ Memories and Digital Media”, WG3 Meeting, Dubrovnik, September 2015

The plenary conference “Transcultural Memory and Reception”, Sofia, April 2016

The final plenary conference “Locating and Dislocating Memory”, Dublin, September 2016

As a result of networking within the action a number of researchers involved cooperated to apply for research funding to different, both national and international, funding bodies. At least 17 applications of this kind were submitted and 10 of them were successful - 4 received funding from EU, 1 from another international organization and 5 were financed nationally. Examples of such successful applications are:

Marie-Curie project (Stijn Vervaet) on “Post-Yugoslav Literature and Art as Curators of the Socialist Past” at Utrecht University in collaboration with Prof. Ann Rigney, who hosted the project 2015.

Marie-Curie project (Marek Kucia) on “The Europeanisation of the Holocaust Memory in Eastern Europe” at Lund University in collaboration with Prof. Barbara Törnquist-Plewa who hosted the project 2014.

“Europeanisation of Cultural Heritage in Poland and Sweden”- a project financed by the Polish Science Foundation, with Swedish and Polish members of ISTME as partners – 2015-2017.

Furthermore, ISTME gave rise to new Memory Studies networks initiated by the participating scholars. These networks were:

The network “Mobile and mobilising memories: the centenary and its effects on First World War memory in Europe”. Project Leaders: Silke Arnold-de Simine (Birkbeck, London) and Tea Sindbaek Andersen (University of Copenhagen)

The Iceland-Ireland Memory Studies Network. Project leaders: Sigrun Alba Sigurdardottir (University of Iceland) and Gerardine Meaney (University College Dublin)

RCAC Zagreb, Croatia (regional network for contemporary arts and culture, new media/Macedonian Center - International Theater Institute Network). Project leader: Ivanka Apostolova (EURM European University, Skopje)

The Research Network on Transnational Memory and Identity, founded 2015 by CES (Council for European Studies). Project leaders Aline Sierp (Maastricht University) and Jenny Wüstenberg (Freie Universität, Berlin)

It should be added that the leaders of the last mentioned of these networks, Aline Sierp and Jenny Wüstenberg, in 2016 when ISTME came to its ending took the initiative to create the international organization Memory Studies Association, as an arena for the future meetings of memory scholars from different networks. The inaugurating conference took place in Amsterdam, 3-5 December 2016.

The ISTME-action resulted in many publications. The researchers were principally free to publish in the publications they found most suitable for their scientific output. However, they were also offered the opportunity to disseminate their research results via publications sponsored from the actions’ funds. Action members thus together published three collected volumes and three thematic issues of the scientific journals. Each Working Group produced a special issue of an academic journal:

WG1 Cecile Jouhanneau and Pascal Bonnard (eds): *The Memory of Communism: Actors, norms, institutions*. Special issue of *European Politics and Society*.

WG2 John Sundholm and Barbara Misztal (eds): *Memory on the Move: Theory and Methodology of Memory and Migration*. Special issue of *Crossings: Journal of Migration & Culture*, Volume 7 Number 1 2016.

WG3 Astrid Erll and Ann Rigney (eds): *Audiovisual Memory and the (Re-)Making of Europe*. Special issue of the online, open access, and peer reviewed journal *Image and Narrative*, 2017.

Sindbaek-Andersen T. and Törnquist-Plewa B. (eds) “Disputed Memory. Emotions and Memory politics in Central, Eastern and Southeastern Europe”, de Gruyter: Berlin/Boston 2016.

Törnquist-Plewa, B, La Rosa M and Bernsand N (eds): “In Search for Transcultural Memory in Europe”, CFE: conference series, Lund University, 2017

Sindbaek-Andersen T. and Törnquist-Plewa B. (eds): The twentieth century in European memory - transcultural mediation and reception, Brill 2017 (forthcoming).

ISTME also had the ambition to disseminate its research results outside academia. Thus, many action participants wrote articles on memory issues in newspapers and cultural magazines. They further gave interviews on radio and TV, cooperated with theater groups and museum curators, and were involved in educational activities (in the form of short summer courses) targeting media professionals and teachers. One participant even prepared a report for the United Nations on questions of memory and transitional justice in Serbia.

In conclusion, after our years of activities we may state that our COST Action In Search for Transcultural Memory in Europe fulfilled its main goal - to contribute to bringing further the development of Memory Studies. The action has enhanced the understanding of how transcultural memory works and has extended empirical knowledge of the circulation of memory narratives and practices across national and cultural borders in Europe. It added to the education of a new generation of memory scholars, and hopefully it also contributed to disseminate among broader layers of society knowledge about how memories of the past are used and misused.

Finally, we want to use this report to express our gratitude to COST for the grant without which most of the achievements mentioned above would not have been possible. A special word of thanks goes to the action’s Science Officer Dr Luule Mizera and administrative offer Rose Cruz Santos for their administrative support during these four years.

We would also like to thank those participants in the action who played the most active roles: first and foremost, Tea Sindbaek Andersen, vice chair of ISTME, and Working Group leaders (in alphabetical order) Astrid Erll, Carlos Closa, Zdzislaw Mach, Georg Mink, Barbara Misztal, Ann Rigney and John Sundholm.

We are also grateful to those MC-members who took upon themselves specific tasks. Tea Sindbaek Andersen, Mitja Velikonja and Steffi Hobuss worked in the committee evaluating applications for STSM grants; Andrea Petö was responsible for monitoring gender equality questions and Galina Goncharova for monitoring the involvement of early stage researchers and the involvement of the countries targeted by COST Inclusiveness Policy.

A word of thanks should also be directed to all local organisers of the conferences and workshops in Copenhagen, Krakow, Skopje, Budapest, Paris, Kaunas, Florence, Dubrovnik, Sofia and Dublin. Without your work and enthusiasm there would not have been an active, well-functioning COST-action.

Last but not least we thank the administrative coordinators of ISTME, Niklas Bersand and Marco La Rosa, at the office of the grant holder, Centre for European Studies at Lund University. Your efficient work deserves praise.

Barbara Törnquist-Plewa

Chair of ISTME, COST-action IS1203

Lund, 11 January 2017

Memory Acts: Memory Without Representation. Theoretical and Methodological Suggestions

Steffi Hobuß

“Not to be tied down by the shackles of time like a mummy, to reject all the techniques of preservation, to shed the layers, undo the knots, to go after the knotting together, to feel for the lumps, to unlace and remove the straps: this is the work of memory.”¹

(Rabinovici & Sharp, 2000, p. 181)

This quotation from Doron Rabinovici’s novel “The Search for M.” is part of a letter written by Arieh, one of the main characters, to his friend Dani. The novel offers two different Jewish father-son-relationships; the book is entangled in the specific Austrian discourses of victimhood, which are expressed in the relative lateness of the admission of Austria’s guilt. With satiric verve, Rabinovici caricatures two sons of Auschwitz survivors both living in Vienna. One of them, Arieh, is driven by the wish to detect crimes and cases of injustice, while Dani, the other, obsessively takes the blame for all kinds of incidents. Arieh’s definition describes memory as a “work”, a *practice*, as activities that are carried out in order to become free of some “layers” and “knots”. This is not only an allusion to Jewish practices. The words “to reject all the techniques of preservation” are directed against a conception of memory as a picture of the past to be preserved, against a conception of memory as *representation* of history-as-it-was. Such a conception means mummification. However, the point is that in the novel Arieh burns his letter. He does not stop at defining memory as a practice, he rather annihilates his definition that remained merely a constative claim, and begins to involve in interactions with Dani, his family and others. On the level of the whole text, even the definition of memory as a

¹ The passage in German: “Nicht in den Banden der Zeit eingelegt zu sein wie eine Mumie, allen Techniken der Konservierung eine Absage erteilen, die Schichten abstreifen, die Knoten aufdröseln, ihrer Verknüpfung nachgehen, die Knubbel ertasten, die Riemen umschnüren und ablösen, das ist Erinnerung.”

practice has to be overcome by doing such practices instead of merely stating the definition. The process does not come to an end: memory cannot be defined (even if a true definition is given), it has to be done.²

After an introduction (1.) about Wittgenstein, his arguments against private language and private memory and against representation, my paper aims to show how analyzing the contextual uses of *memory acts* (2.) will allow us to go beyond the sharp binaries between the individual and the collective, between the national and the global, and beyond the binary between history-as-it-was and memory as either something collectively construed or as a representation of the past. Even recent theories of memory might be considered as memory acts in themselves, rather than as true or false descriptions of an ‘essence’ of memory. A last part (3.) will ask about memory in transnational and polyphonic European contexts. If memory consists of contextual practices, what might be the role of the concepts of truth and truthfulness? Considering memory acts will allow accounting for and evaluating conflicting positions.

Wittgenstein, the private language argument, and collective memory and/without representation³

In his so-called private language argument Ludwig Wittgenstein (2001, pi 258) argues against theories of meaning that attempt to define the meaning of language in terms of private, mental acts.⁴ His argument is to be read as a *reductio ad absurdum* of the idea of a private memory and of the possibility of private language meaning as well. If the notion of a valid or the right memory is not to become completely arbitrary, then there cannot be any memory at all that could be founded in a private manner. Just as we are not able to create a private language, memory has no private, inner foundation. However, Wittgenstein does not want to provide a theory of collective memory, but to show that private memory cannot provide a foundation for theories of linguistic meaning. The meaning of language and memory are thought in a reciprocal relation: Someone has got the ability to remember only if she is in possession of language, and that is to belong to a group sharing a common

² Of course, there is nothing wrong with the act of preserving of something, e.g. historical sites like the place of the Auschwitz concentration camp. However, preserving is not to be understood as a model for memory in the sense of preserving something that existed in any case prior and independently from remembering.

³ Some parts of a former version of this paper are published in the *Journal of Aesthetics and Culture* 3 (Hobuß, 2011)

⁴ The argument can only be summarized at this place; for an interpretation of the text in its context in the “Philosophical Investigations” see Eike von Savigny (1994); for further details of interpretation see Steffi Hobuß (2010).

language use, and she can use language only if she has learnt a language, and that means, she needs memory in order to learn. Memory is largely framed and facilitated by social factors. Maurice Halbwachs's (1997) notion of "collective memory" is very much similar to the Wittgensteinian account in rejecting a concept of memory as coming into contact with the "innermost part of our self": instead of that, we need common "means by which our mind comes to grip either the given facts of the past, and without those means only a vague and faint memory would remain" (Halbwachs, 1985, p. 52)⁵. These common means like places, names and thoughts cannot be established by any private operation of the mind, but only by social practices of a particular group. We can reconstruct former sensations, past experiences and attitudes only insofar as they are bound to 'pictures of social meaning', as opposed to them providing a foundation for those pictures of social meaning.

Nevertheless, the theories of collective and cultural memory have been criticized from the beginning. The most frequently voiced objections are the following three arguments:

The first objection asserts that theories of collective memory deny the existence of individual memory at all. However, this is too counterfactual a claim and surely not held by Wittgenstein nor by Halbwachs. Of course, in some important senses memory can be attributed to individuals: "As a cognitive faculty memory can only be attributed to individual minds [...]; in that sense collectivities cannot remember." (Fabian, *Memory against Culture. Arguments and Reminders.*, 2007, p. 93). Moreover, even if not restricted to memory as a cognitive faculty we commonly talk of the individual as the agency of memory. Using the term "collective memory" does not in any way deny the relevance of personal memory (Fabian, 2007, p. 14f).

The second objection starts with the fact that collective or cultural memory is something socially construed by cultural practices. If not tied to the faculty of individual memory that can be right or wrong as a representation of something, according to this objection, memory becomes voluntary. Theories dealing with processes of social construction are often met with this critique of idealism or voluntarism. This misunderstanding comes only if the collective, social framework of the constructing processes and the impossibility of private remembering are neglected. This point will be discussed later.

The third objection asks whether the concepts of collective or cultural memory are based upon an essentialist or unifying notion of the collective and the cultural. It will be discussed in the third part.

⁵ My translation.

Wulf Kansteiner (2002, p. 181), who seems to share the first objection when he talks about the “determined anti-individualism” of the theories of Halbwachs and the like, defines a task for memory research that has indeed been taken up by new memory studies:

“Memory studies offer an opportunity to acknowledge that historical representations are negotiated, selective, present-oriented, and relative, while insisting that the experiences they reflect cannot be manipulated at will.”

(Kansteiner, 2002, p. 195)

Why does Kansteiner use “representations”? Talking of “historical representations” seems to be important, because memories are not arbitrary, wild constructions; but at the same time, he wants to weaken the role of social conditions, because he obviously is afraid of a theory to be a “social determinist” one. The dangers he wants to avoid are a naïve, realistic concept of memory on the one hand and completely arbitrary constructions of the remembered on the other hand, one as implausible as the other. Kansteiner uses the concept of “representation” in order to avoid this dilemma. But “representation” does not solve the problems, since the word still alludes to ideas of the past on the one hand and the memory on the other hand as two counterparts. The phrase that there are “experiences” to be “reflected” by “historical representations” shows this binary picture. Thinking memory work as a social practice has the advantage that we can avoid the problematic concept of historical representation.⁶

Why not abolish the concept of representation? Thinking about the word „representation“, there seems to be an activity of making something present, or to be present again, i.e. something is made to be present afresh. This making of a presence can either be understood as an idea, as an illustration, or as substitution.⁷ What is

⁶ A philosophical theory of memory meets those methodological needs that have often been reformulated in new memory studies since the 1980s. See Jacob Emmanuel Mabe (2007). At the beginning of his paper, Mabe points out that on the one hand the possibility to remember is attributed to individual persons, whereas cultural and social frames play a constitutive role for the formation of memory in processes of negotiating history. In later passages, he restricts the notion of collective memory to a memory shared by a group of single individuals; further he describes a “transcendental memory” resulting from an “autonomous activity of human mind” (Mabe, 2007 p. 34; my translation, S.H.).

⁷ See Krug (1969), first published in 1828: „Repräsentation (von repraesentare, vergegenwärtigen, vor- oder darstellen) heißt bald soviel als Vorstellung einer Sache, weil sie dadurch dem Gemüthe vergegenwärtigt wird, bald die Darstellung einer Sache zur äußern Wahrnehmung, bald aber auch die Vertretung einer Person durch eine andere, weil diese gleichsam jene als eine abwesende vergegenwärtigt, vor- oder darstellt“. According to that, the “Historische Wörterbuch der Philosophie” gives four meanings:

“Vorstellung” im weiteren Sinn, d.h. mentaler Zustand mit kognitivem Gehalt;

subject to representation is something absent, or something that is absent and present at the same time. Thus, the concept of representation meets Derrida's argument against the logic of presence: Following Saussure, he holds that all sorts of linguistic signs have their meanings only in relations of differences, rather than as single elements that refer to things in the world.⁸ In Derrida's perspective, every practice that is meaningful in a very broad sense is to be understood as a "jeu de differences". By his throughout critical interpretation of traditional ideas of linguistic signs as consisting in themselves and having their meaning from a reference to pre-linguistic existing, present entities, Derrida constantly works on overcoming these ideas. He sees the whole occidental philosophy marked by the faith in *presence*, in a basis: the "ungrounded ground or origin" (Derrida). Fundamental beliefs and convictions in common sense and in philosophy rely on tacit ideas of a "metaphysics of presence" (Derrida, 2007). Such a questioning of the structure of representations goes back to the 19th century⁹ and, during the 1980s, led to the so called "crisis of representation" (Berg & Fuchs, 1993). The present situation is confusing. There is neither a consistent sense of the different uses of "representation" nor a consequent and definite point of view to abolish the philosophical concept.

How did this come about? The Latin word "repraesentare" appears in Cicero for the first time (Scheerer E. , 1990, p. 5). The meanings range from "to bring something to mind", "imitation", "linguistic, pictorial or theatrical presentation" to "realization" or even "to pay cash". Though there is no consistent sense, the view has been held that there existed a common "kernel of meaning", namely the description of a "reality of an event, an action or its result" (Hofmann, 1974)¹⁰. This emphasis on the present realization is instructive compared with the meaning of secondary-subsequent re-presentation in later and modern language use. However,

"Vorstellung" im engeren Sinn, d.h. ein mentaler Zustand, der einen früheren mentalen Zustand reproduziert, aus ihm abgeleitet ist oder sich auf ihn bezieht;

"Darstellung", d.h. strukturerhaltende Abbildung durch Bilder, Symbole und Zeichen aller Art;

"Stellvertretung", (Scheerer E. , 1971). However, it remains open to interpretation what is meant by "preserving the structure"; see below.

⁸ See a passage from a dialogue with Julia Kristeva: "Das Spiel der Differenzen setzt in der Tat Synthesen und Verweise voraus, die es verbieten, dass zu irgendeinem Zeitpunkt, in irgendeinem Sinn, ein einfaches Element als solches präsent wäre und nur auf sich selbst verwiese. Kein Element kann je die Funktion eines Zeichens haben, ohne auf ein anderes Element, das selbst nicht einfach präsent ist, zu verweisen". (Derrida, 1990, p. 150)

⁹ See e.g. the debate between the followers of Ranke and those of Nietzsche that had a rather undifferentiated revival in the debate between Anglo-Saxon and continental historians during the 1990s; see Oexle (2000). One of the parties stressed the fictional and narrativ character of every reference to the past, but run the risk of neglecting the difference between facts and fictions, the other party stressed the factual character of the past, but neglected the conditions of the possibility of the knowledge of "the" past.

¹⁰ my translation.

this meaning disappears by and by during the middle Ages, while the aspect of subsequent re-presentation begins to dominate. Since then, the central meaning is a relation of similarity that can be seen and displayed. Aquinas distinguishes representations in form of pictures, marks, mirrors and linguistic signs (Scheerer E. , 1971). During the transition to the modern era, representation begins to concern the cognitive faculty. In Descartes' writings, ideas are able to represent things without being restricted to a pictorial similarity. This is the step the concept gets its meaning that will rest until the 20th century. In the 20th century - in the context of a critique of the philosophy of consciousness on the one hand and the rejection of theories of referential or pictorial meaning - , more attention has been paid on the formative force of representational systems and the productive momentum of constructing approaches to reality.¹¹

With Wittgenstein, who plays an important role as well in the critique of the philosophy of consciousness and the rejection of theories of referential or pictorial meaning, I would like to suggest abolishing the concept of representation. A passage from his "Philosophical Investigation" deals with referential and non-referential pictures. In the context of Wittgenstein's later philosophy of language, linguistic utterances, sentences and texts are in many *different* ways compared to pictures. Wittgenstein deals with pictures and with texts and investigates the consequences of thinking texts and language as images, and as well of comparing pictures with texts and language. For good reasons he does not introduce a fundamental difference between linguistic and pictorial illustrations. The critical passage starts with PI 518:

518. Socrates to Theaetetus: "And if someone thinks mustn't he think something?" - Th: "Yes, he must." - Soc.: "And if he thinks something, mustn't it be something real?" - Th.: "Apparently."

And mustn't someone who is painting be painting something - and someone who is painting something be painting something real! - Well, tell me what the object of painting is: the picture of a man (e.g.), or the man that the picture portrays?

(Wittgenstein, 2001, pi 518)

This section belongs to a context where again the question is discussed whether we assure the meanings of words and sentences by mental ideas. Such a theory of meaning would be a kind of a theory of reference, in this case assuming that words and sentences are meaningful because they are related to mental ideas. Allegedly, we are able to speak about absent things, because inner or mental ideas represent the object, or the theories use inner images. Wittgenstein refuses all such theories. After the example with Socrates taken from Plato's "Theaitetos", the second

¹¹ For the role of new techniques like photography fort he concept of "representations" Cohnen (2008)

paragraph puts the same question for painting – Wittgenstein shifts from imagining something to painting something. Socrates and Theaitetos, too, in this context talk about *pictorial* ideas or *imaginings*. Thus, we are always not only thinking something, but rather a picture. However, the question is what is the object of painting? What is this something? Wittgenstein points to the possibility of a twofold interpretation, because the question has two different answers. If the act of painting produces the “picture of a man”, i.e. the material painting that I can hang at the wall, it is doubtless something, but not necessarily in the sense of an image of something out there in the world. Alternatively, it produces “the man that the picture portrays”, whereas in this mode of speaking the object is the portrayed person exterior to the painting. It is important that Wittgenstein is not concerned with giving a consistent or paradigmatic meaning of what should be understood by the “object of painting”. Rather he spreads out the different possibilities to understand the phrase. He refuses the opinion that imaging always has to be one and the same, as well as he refuses the theory that talking about something always has to be the same.¹²

In the case of the pictorial image in PI 518 it is difficult to give a context-independent of an image. The twofold interpretation of the “something” leads to the result that *the concept of the image or picture is used in a highly problematic way*. The next section, PI 519, makes it even worse:

519. One wants to say that an order is a picture of the action which was carried out on the order; but also that it is a picture of the action which is to be carried out on the order.”

(Wittgenstein, 2001, pi 519)

For the future case, it is impossible to give a picture in the sense of a copy. Wittgenstein argues – as in many other section of the PI – against his own early philosophy, where he held the theory, sentences are *pictures* of facts. This might be plausible in the case of the sentence “A is sitting next to B”. Nevertheless, the picture theory of meaning is difficult to hold in the case of all sentences other than declarative sentences. What fact is pictured by the utterance “Who registered for the excursion to Auschwitz?”. Or by a request or an order? The words „one wants to say” refer exactly to that case one wants the picture theory to apply for the order. Then we could be inclined to say the order was a picture of the action, which was carried out on the order. However, if the order precedes the action, it will be difficult to understand it as an image of the action carried out afterwards. Moreover, what about the order that has not been carried out yet? The concept of the picture is again

¹² This is the point of using the quotation from Plato as a starting point of the passage: Usually, Socrates is in Plato’s dialogues trying to find a unified meaning of a concept. In choosing this quotation, Wittgenstein emphasizes in an implicit way in which the ideas he deals with are potent and influential from Plato until today.

used in a very problematic manner. Wittgenstein does not suggest abolishing the concept of the picture overall. However, when we are looking at a picture alone, we cannot see whether it is a picture of an existing state of affairs or not. The difference to Wittgenstein's own earlier theory consists in his higher emphasis on the fact that the character of the picture as picture leads to *forgetting* that the pictured fact need not be an existing state of affairs. Wittgenstein delivers a critique of the picture as a critique of our *practices* in using pictures. We are seducible to think that the pictured fact is an existing state of affairs. Wittgenstein throughout doubts that pictures and sentences have structural features those tell us whether the picture or the sentence or the text might have a meaningful use. It does not depend on the structure or the features of a state of affairs whether we accept or reject its 'representation' as senseless or not. Sentences can be compared with different sorts of pictures, while the use of the concept of the picture sometimes is unclear or ambiguous. And this is important for the alleged relation of 'representation' between a state of affairs and its picture.

PI 522 continues the investigation of the picture theory, now again the picture theory of language. Wittgenstein undertakes a distinction within the realm of the theory itself.

522. If we compare a proposition to a picture, we must think whether we are comparing it to a portrait (a historical representation) or to a genre-picture. And both comparisons have point.

When I look at a genre-picture, it 'tells' me something, even though I don't believe (imagine) for a moment that the people I see in it really exist, or that there have really been people in that situation. But suppose I ask: "What does it tell me, then?"¹³

(Wittgenstein, 2001, pi 522)

A portrait may be understood as a picture of an existing state of affairs, a more or less appropriate description of a living or dead person. A genre-picture might be understood as a picture of an only 'possible' fact. One could wonder whether it belongs to a *different* kind of picture or description – e.g. you *might* say, a genre-picture were a picture of fictitious or virtual persons, in opposite to the portrait. But this is not what Wittgenstein says. He does not furnish the second case with the logic of the first one. He says, the genre-picture "tells me something"; of course we can say that it "pictures something", but it is no description of one or more persons, neither historical nor fictitious persons, because this would be the wrong model. The

¹³ My interpretation does not claim to give correct definitions of portraits or genre-pictures like those given in art history; Wittgenstein just deals with two typical practices in the context of talking about pictorial images.

mistake in the case of the wrong argument consists in the transfer of the portrait-like model to the case of the genre-picture.

Wittgenstein does not develop a theory of different ways of picturing or reference to either existing or 'mere possible' states of affairs. In both cases there is a *real* existing picture. In the case of the genre-picture it is the picture in itself that is important rather than the reference to a state of affairs. What the fine arts or other picturing practices deliver cannot be captured by using the difference between a 'real or fictitious picture of an existing or mere possible state of affairs'. *If* we are seduced by that model, we are inclined to construe the genre-picture as a picture of a state of affairs that exists only in the picture itself – and that means: there is *no such thing* like a relation between a picture and a state of affairs. There is no relation between state of affairs and picture that were constitutive for the character of a picture. Wittgenstein (2001, pi 43) shares Derrida's (1988, p. 298) argument against the logic of presence and the opinion that no object of reference existing independently was needed for a picture or a sentence to mean *something*.¹⁴

What are the systematical consequences from this exegesis? There is neither "theory of meaning" nor a theory of representation in the PI. Rather, Wittgenstein throughout avoids the concepts of meaning and of representation because they are too seductive. If we can understand sentences like portraits and/or like genre-pictures, then any theory of sentence-meaning as reference to a reality will be outdated (Frege, 1980).¹⁵ Often something (a sentence, a picture, a phrase, a photograph, a movie) plays an important role in our lives and our communication, and this can be expressed in saying "this sentence (picture, movie) 'tells me something'". However, this expression should not lead us to the wrong idea, we knew about its 'real-world reference'. Sometimes there is simply no 'real-world reference' like the model of the portrait or the naïve idea of representation.

Not the structure or the features of texts, movies or pictures tell us how they work, whether like portraits or like genre-pictures or perhaps completely different. It will be helpful to follow Wittgenstein and stop talking about representation because of the seductive force of the word. There follows another result: Not certain pictures or texts or practices are on their own politically helpful, socio-critical or mere affirmations, but it always depends on their readings, their interpretations, their uses in the Wittgensteinian sense that let them gain affirmative or subversive forces. Nevertheless, in certain contexts certain readings or uses are *made possible* or are *offered*, and thus they are – in opposition to some objections – not completely arbitrary. Among these contexts are conventional rules of reading and picturing, but

¹⁴ The difference between Wittgenstein and Derrida: In Wittgenstein, there is no emphasis on the structural features of language like it can be found in Derrida's writings, rather the uses of the signs plays the most important role. See Derrida (1988, p. 298) and Wittgenstein (2001, pi 43)

¹⁵ According to Frege (1980), only such sentences have meaning that work like the logic of the portrait.

also historical and societal positions of speakers and agents.¹⁶ And this holds for memory practices as well.

Speech acts, performativity and the concept of *memory acts*

The main two points so far concern that there is no such thing as a “private memory” in the sense indicated above, and the suggestion to abolish the concept of representation. Memory and processes of remembering cannot be controlled by an autonomously and voluntarily acting subject, nor by a representational connection or reference to history-as-it-was, rather they are negotiated, consensual or not, sometimes even violently or in forms of war. This does not weaken the category of responsibility; to the contrary, it stresses the important role everybody takes in these processes of negotiation. And it does not weaken the concept of truth.

Instead of working about the distinction of various types of *memory cases*, in further research should be given more attention to different *aspects of memory acts*. Classifications of types of memory (case distinctions) include the following distinctions: individual – collective, cultural, communicative memory; cognitive – narrative; canon-like – archive-like memory; social – autobiographical – communicative memory; “direct” vs. prosthetic or post-memory, and many more. Classifications of aspects of memory acts should be understood as aspect distinctions.

A useful account for looking at aspects of memory acts is Austin’s theory of speech acts (Austin, 1975). In developing this theory, he changed it in an important way. Initially he suggested the distinction between constative and performative utterances - that constative utterances give factual descriptions of the world and are either true or false, while performative utterances are acts that do not describe the world, but do something by speaking, e.g. give a promise or cry out for help. But then Austin came to notice that utterances cannot simply be divided by a sharp distinction between cases of constative utterances on the one hand and performative utterances on the other. He changed his theory and stopped looking for different *cases*, but for different *aspects* of utterances. The case distinction has been replaced by a

¹⁶ The validity of such conventions is explained by the theory of performativity according to Austin, Butler und Derrida: The standing of conventions presupposes their repeated performance again and again, and there are always failures, miscarriages and shifts of meaning. Here lies the theoretical fundamentum of the possibility of change.

distinction of aspects. One and the same utterance can have a descriptive force and an acting, performative force at the same time¹⁷.

Table 2.1: Theory of speech and theory of memory

Theory of speech acts: world ↔ language ↓ case distinction: constative ↔ performative utterances	Theory of memory acts: history ↔ memory ↓ case distinction: true/false ↔ narrative memories individual ↔ collective memories
Aspect distinction: speech acts (locutionary, illocutionary, perlocutionary)	Aspect distinction between memory acts: Remembering-that (x) Remembering – as negotiation/narration/... Social effects of remembering

Austin's starting point for his earlier theory was his argument against theories of descriptive meaning, i.e. against theories of language as a representation of the world. Thus, his first step was directed against representation, a stance that is preserved in his later theory of aspect distinction. Both arguments can be applied to memory studies, as shown in the diagram.

We can understand Austin's change as a methodological paradigm for memory studies and ask: How are memory acts carried out in specific contexts?

How can memory acts be explained in different contexts of research? What are the specific performative forces and implications of doing so? By asking how memories are negotiated, we can find different uses of memory in research contexts and in historical, empirical contexts.

Types of memory acts could be (this open and preliminary list has to be completed):

1. the dimension of remembering that can be classified by true/false-judgments and/or the way of referring to the past,
2. those dimensions of remembering that are not accounted for by terms of correct/false representation,
3. those dimensions of remembering that concern the effects of memory acts.

These acts are not always carried out explicitly, often they remain implicit acts. It is important to note that memory acts can be such different *things* as

¹⁷ Austin then analyzed the performative force in further detail and distinguished between the well-known locutionary, illocutionary and perlocutionary forces. See eighth and ninth lecture (Austin, 1975).

- illustrating¹⁸ a past event or process (by linguistic, nonverbal, pictural, aesthetic, scientific or other means) as an individual, e.g. talking about my past experiences,
- illustrating a past event or process (by linguistic, nonverbal, pictural, aesthetic, or other means) as a member of a specific group,
- sharing memories with others,
- claiming that a specific memory tells the truth,
- asserting that a specific memory is a lie,
- acting in political struggles,
- claiming that something should be remembered by others (another individual person or a representing group),
- claiming that something should be forgotten or left to oblivion,
- doing empirical memory research in form of case studies,
- inventing theories of memory,
- inventing methods for memory research,
- and many more.

Austin always stressed the importance of the social conventions as limiting and facilitating performative acts. This can be useful for cultural memory studies in order to illustrate that as there are limited speakers' rights, there are limited rights to do certain memory acts. You need to be in an adequate position to perform certain memory acts. According to Jacques Derrida and Judith Butler, we can take into account some important further features of linguistic performativity in order to talk about other acts and practices as well, not only linguistic acts, and in order to formulate a theory of memory. The most important feature is that contexts of uses cannot be fully controlled by single individuals in intentional ways. Because linguistic meaning cannot be achieved by private acts of meaning, it exists only in forms of social practices. Thus, single individuals cannot fix meanings or new contexts arbitrarily. But they are responsible for their uses of words, especially if the words and utterances have been used before in dangerous or controversial contexts before, as Jacques Derrida puts it with his concept of the "iterability" of signs (Derrida, 1988). Something can become a sign if and only if it can be repeated

¹⁸ This is the place where the notion of "representation" is often used. But it is better to avoid the word and the misunderstanding as 'simply' copying something original that were there before that act of representation. Rather it is to be understood as memory work or process that in some cases illustrates something that exists only in the specific means of illustration. For further details about representation see: Steffi Hobuß (2012) (In this article I tried as an experiment to save the concept of representation.)

and thus “re-iterated”, i.e. a sign must be quotable or repeatable in order to be meaningful. Every single word, every sentence, every meaningful action is a quotation in this sense. And in using signs, symbols, and specific actions, we set them free, we spread them into the world, so that others can and will quote and repeat them again. Thus we cannot control or restrict the future understanding and uses of our signs, sentences, and actions. Speaking and acting are not conceived of as sovereign, autonomous practices. And all signs, symbols, and actions can be *resignified* by others in new contexts, if they are in an adequate position to do so - but again, this resignification is not something that can be completely and intentionally controlled (Butler, *Excitable Speech. A Politics of the Performative*, 1997, pp. 1-42, 72-102).

All this applies to cultural memory acts as well. Meaningful social practices like memory exist only in their relative contexts, stem from certain contexts, in some sense are repeated by us and cannot be arbitrarily controlled. We can ask here not only about the rights of agents or speakers to do certain acts, but about the responsibility for these acts as well.¹⁹ To consider memory acts as performative cultural practices and quotations does not weaken the concept of responsibility. It would be wrong to conclude from this view of memory as an active process of constructing to think of memory as the autonomous ruler of the past.

Because memory is based upon performative social practices, an individual or a group needs the social authority and must be in the right position to claim that certain memory acts should be done or what should not be remembered any more. For example, groups and agents who suffer violence, hate speech, or suppression are in a position to claim certain memory acts, while the perpetrators and related groups or agents are in a very different position.

What are the consequences for research about the dynamics of “representation” of migrants’ memory in the media, the relation between power and memory, and the problem of European memory in relation to the issue of old and new boundaries? One example is the research about constructions of the self and the other in TV-documentaries about Muslim migrants in Germany. Here has been made use of Foucault’s theory of productive power: Coming from Foucault’s theory, TV documentaries – like every other visual and textual description - can be analysed as “technology of power” (Paulus, 2007, p. 279).²⁰ According to Foucault, the connection between knowledge and power leads to the result that our perceptions and our knowledge are guided by conventions in all pictorial, textual, and any other descriptions. This is a perspective very critical against the idea of representation:

¹⁹ Judith Butler (1997; 2009) investigated utterances of hate speech and looked for possibilities of putting these utterances into new contexts. In her recent works, she has turned to questions of ethics and investigated the ethical implications of putting utterances, actions, and images in new contexts.

²⁰ my translation.

illustrations and descriptions of something are “not to be understood as (more or less) accurate picture of a [...] reality” (Paulus, 2007, p. 280). In the case of TV documentaries, programs about Muslims are not to be analyzed as programs *about* a group of people, but with regard to their ways of producing a specific normality. (Paulus, 2007, p. 280) Thus the most important question is no more, whether “the others” are false or correct or how they are ‘represented’, rather the most important aspects are the practices of illustration itself and first of all the own identity produced by the illustrations. But this research perspective still concentrates on documentaries not produced by the Muslim migrants themselves – future research will have to investigate their own productions.

In Germany of the 1990s, by the so called “Wilkomirski case” a debate about particular features of memory was initiated that had been conducted as the “False Memory Debate” in international contexts before. If memory is conceived as always codetermined by collective frames, and that it always has to fit in social patterns, the authenticity and correctness of memories cannot be assured with reference to past individual experiences and their correct reproduction.²¹ 1996, under the name of “Binjamin Wilkomirski” and entitled „Bruchstücke. Aus einer Kindheit 1939-1948“, an autobiography of a survivor of the holocaust was published that later turned out to be a fake. The described situations had not been merely imaginary; therefore the book met approval by other survivors. But in contrary to his depiction, the author had nothing thereof experienced himself. Journalists, historians and publishers had held the reported things for true and reliable, and after the detection the authenticity and correctness of memory was put in question in general (Diekmann & Schoeps, 2002). The case demonstrated explicitly how difficult it is to apply the categories of authenticity and correctness to memory, because nobody has full certainty concerning his/her memories. Always, the past is overlaid by too many incidents and negotiations. (Mächler, 2002). This accords with Wittgenstein’s conclusion that without shared practices anything that seems right to me could be called right, and that means we cannot talk of “right” at all. Memory does not only depend on the past, rather it constitutes the past in this sense. Just as Paul de Man (1993, p. 132) says for the case of autobiographical memory: The autobiographical enterprise creates life (instead of the other-way round). And Hartmut Seitz (2004, p. 17) writes about “narrative constructions” (“*narrative Konstrukte*”) and explains the aspect of construction as much more important than the aspect of reproduction. Admittedly, it would be wrong to conclude from these thoughts about memory as a process of constructing the past to think memory as the autonomous ruler of the past. In this sense, theories dealing with processes of social construction often meet the critique of idealism or voluntarism. This misunderstanding comes if and only if

²¹ This is one more of several ways to show that it is misleading to talk of “historical representation” (Kansteiner, 2002, p. 195)

the collective, social framework of the construction processes and the impossibility of private remembering are neglected. There is no such thing like an individual and sovereign mastery of memory that could be a foundation for commonly shared processes of remembering. Thus, Katherine Nelson writes about the narrative constructing of memory:

“[...] like language, narrative is assumed to be a group construction, one that turns individual emotions into shared conceptual systems.”

(Nelson, 2003)

In this quotation, Nelson compares autobiographical narration with language, with regard to the role of commonly shared systems of concepts. This comparison can be generalized in order to compare language with memory. Just as language is spoken by individual speakers while the determination of meaning does not result from a representing depiction of the world or by private acts of reference, whilst the meaning of language consists (in most cases) in the practices of its use (Wittgenstein, 2001, pi 43), memory is accounted for by collective practices, frames and conceptual systems.²²

Remembrance instead of representation: The abdication of the master concept of representation will help to examine present memory negotiations, transmissions and constructions, not just the past, and to develop thoughts about the relation between memory and truth. The theories of collective, cultural or group memory have met some criticism for being unifying or universalizing. Martin Saar (2002, p. 268) pointed out that they were a variation of theories of cultural identity. Because memory is seen as securing identity on the individual and on the collective level, there has been a close connection between theories of memory and theories of culture. But these theories of culture, Saar is trying to show, are always in some sense unifying, and his text is an argument against this universalizing stance of all “memory-based theories of culture” (Saar, 2002, p. 269) and therefore of cultural memory. He mentions Halbwachs, Assmann, Benedict Anderson and Pierre Nora as examples for this type of thinking. Instead of he holds a plea for revisited concepts of culture and memory that include their radical plurality. According to Saar, the criticized theories shared the following implications: First, that cultures are memory communities. Second, those communities are based upon shared memory or communicative memory. Third, that a structure of common references to the past in forms of institutions, rites, narratives and objects produces a framing cultural

²²Nelson puts it a bit misleading, as if individual emotions existed for them themselves and are later translated into collective systems of symbols and concepts. But the various theories about the formation of the subject by cultural imprint, performative acts, invocation or disciplinary power, developed by Sigmund Freud, Judith Butler, Louis Althusser or Michel Foucault, provide arguments against the misleading idea.

memory that is not only individual but collective. Fourth that the stability of such cultural arrangements depends upon their successful and unifying production of a common past.

But it is the third argument in this chain that might be understood in different ways. We should note the difference between the Halbwachsian and Wittgensteinian stance that there is no individual memory without collective framework and the thesis that the cultural shared memory must always be unified and unifying. The “danger” Saar ascribes to all the theories of cultural memory comes if and only if the fact is neglected that memory acts are always carried out in contexts and situations and thus are negotiations. Even if some memory acts are successful in unifying some sort of cultural memory, they are always to be seen as negotiations. Even hegemonic memories have to be accounted for their negotiated parts and contradictories. And perhaps even the so-called pre-plural societies might in a retrospective view turn out as plural ones. What Saar articulates about “plural societies”, that they cannot get rid of the “agonic” negotiations, (Saar, 2002, p. 275) might hold for all societies. But the concepts of the collective and cultural memory remain important as reminders to the fact that “articulating and representing of the past are never private affairs”²³, as Saar (2002, p. 276) admits.

Saar recurs to Foucault (and thus to Nietzsche) in order to stress the agonic, polyphonic and normative processes of memory politics (2002, p. 276). If we conceive history as discursively (re)produced and “truth effects” as a continuing process, there will never be a final ‘correct’ or ‘true’ memory. Therefore in cases of conflicting memories the conflict cannot be settled by looking for the truth of memories and comparing memories on the one hand and the ‘real’ past on the other. For example, the question whether any memory act has got the right to be represented cannot be decided in this way. But in the case of political conflicts, e.g. when conflicts deal with the acceptance of groups of victims or hierarchies of victims, there are truth claims raised in connection with the claims of collective memories. And often truth claims are raised in order to enforce some versions of collective memory against others. In sum, Saar’s argument against homogenizing culture and memory is connected with the critique of the concept of cultural memory and the suggestion to look at memory as fragmented and polyphonic while the concept of collective memory stays important as the reminder that memory is no private affair.

In his book “Memory against Culture”, the anthropologist and ethnographer Johannes Fabian (2007, p. 92) advocates what he calls “a dialectical view of memory”. Beginning with the notions of collective and individual memory, he points out that this seemingly clear distinction brings about a conceptual problem:

²³ my translation, S.H.

“The problem with a notion as plausible as collective memory is that its opposite, ‘individual memory’, is, strictly speaking, as implausible, indeed impossible as a ‘monologue’ in a strict sense of the word”.

(Fabian, 2007, p. 93)

Fabian refers to Habermas for the impossibility of the monologue, but it is exactly the argument used by Wittgenstein when he says that there is no such thing like a private memory. Thus we can reformulate Fabian’s impossibility as the impossibility of the private memory, and this concerns the notion of the collective, because ‘the collective’ cannot be accounted for as the simple counterpart of ‘the individual’. As a conclusion, there is no simple binary any more.²⁴ And like Saar, he connects this issue with the concepts of truth, lie and the selectivity of memory. He begins with the observation that we are inclined to call memory being “selective”, as one of several “attributes that tend to attach themselves to memory in a predictable and quasi- obligatory manner”. (Fabian, 2007, p. 96) But

“to diagnose selectiveness clinically requires a position above or outside the acts or practices of remembering, a position that enables the researcher to compare input and output and to sort out what, in a given experiment, protocol, and so forth is being remembered and what forgotten. Such a position often goes together with ontological claims. It puts inquiry, as it were, on the side of a reality that must exist before it can be either remembered or forgotten. In practice it may look as if that position could be attained for instance, when the clinical report is compared to independent evidence such as historical records. But that works only as long as one brackets, holds in suspense, the question of how ‘independent’ (or ‘true’) historical records are.”

(Fabian, 2007, p. 97)

Fabian begins with the “clinical” diagnose of selectiveness because he does not refer to the trivial understanding based on observing ourselves and others not telling everything that we recall. If we want to ascribe selectiveness to memory in a theoretical meaningful way, the concept seems to require the possibility to distinguish between the selective and a non-selective memory. If memory is considered as always selective, he argues, we are inclined to think of reality as existing in itself before being remembered or forgotten, existing as the full scale measure, and to think of memory as a selection compared with this reality accessible independent of our acts of giving meaning and of our memory acts. And in practice “it may look as if this position could be attained”, because in given contexts like e.g. a clinical examination of somebody who forgets too much compared to other

²⁴ Fabian also deals with the important distinction between the cognitive and the narrative understanding of the term, again putting into question the “essential difference” (Fabian, 2007, p. 93) between the two concepts.

persons, there is indeed a measure. But this measure is not ‘full reality’ but the perspective of the other members of the group.

This argument works exactly like Nietzsche’s epistemological perspectivism, for example in the beginning of his “Truth and Lie in an Extra-Moral Sense”. And it means that there is no chance to attain that context-independent position in order to compare reality with our memories, no “view from nowhere”, rather there is no other chance than “immanent critique”. The situation is much like going round in circles as productive as possible. There is no solution given by a universal perspective, but at any time other perspectives of other persons.

In the same time, the words of truth and lie do not lose their meanings (as sometimes has been argued). As Fabian points out,

“Remembering, especially in the hortative sense of commemoration, that is, something that is to be done, performed, or fulfilled, calls for stories to be told (songs to be sung, rituals to be performed, plays to be staged, images and monuments to be created). Yet stories (...) are lies. Elsewhere I called this a dialectical conception; here I only want to bring it up as a critical reminder: Especially in a constellation where theorizing about memory and practical needs for commemoration come together we should not lose sight of truth and rationality aspects of memory.”

(Fabian, 2007, pp. 99-100)

“Truth”, however, does not mean a relation between a Person/a mind and a (historical) state of affairs it does not mean any relation between two sides. The question of truth arises if and only if there are negotiations between people; it always requires more than one person.

“Telling the truth”, “asking for the truth” or “claiming the truth” are specific speech acts among others, neither more nor less.

Because memory acts are in first instance inventory practices based upon performative social practices that give meanings to experiences, an individual or a group needs the social authority and must be in the right position to claim that certain memory acts should be done or what should not be remembered any more. (No context-independent authorization is possible.) For example, groups and agents who suffer violence, hate speech, or suppression are in a position to claim certain memory acts, while the perpetrators and related groups or agents are in a very different position (resignification and responsibility). Instead of a universal „view from nowhere“, perspectivism concerning situations and contexts of memory acts as inventory practices, intersubjectivity dialogues preserve the important role of negotiations about true memories.

References

- Austin, J. L. (1975). *How to Do Things With Words. The William James Lectures delivered at Harvard University in 1955*. Cambridge, MA and London: Harvard University Press.
- Berg, E., & Fuchs, M. (1993). *Kultur, soziale Praxis, Text. Die Krise der Repräsentation in der Ethnographie*. Frankfurt/M: Suhrkamp.
- Butler, J. (1997). *Excitable Speech. A Politics of the Performative*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Butler, J. (2009). *Frames of War: When is life Grievable?* London and New York: Verso Books.
- Cohnen, T. (2008). *Fotografischer Kosmos: Der Beitrag eines Mediums zur visuellen Ordnung der Welt*. Bielefeld.
- de Man, P. (1993). Die Ideologie des Ästhetischen. In *autobiographical memory* (pp. 131-146). Frankfurt/M.
- Derrida, J. (1988). Signatur Ereignis Kontext. In *Randgänge der Philosophie* (pp. 291-314). Wien.
- Derrida, J. (1988). Signature Event Context. In *in Limited Inc* (pp. 1-24). Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press.
- Derrida, J. (1990). Semiologie und Grammatologie. Gespräch mit Julia Kristeva. In P. Engelmann, *Postmoderne und Dekonstruktion. Texte französischer Philosophen der Gegenwart* (p. 1990). Stuttgart.
- Derrida, J. (2007). *Echographien. Fernsehgespräche*. Wien: Passagen-Verlag.
- Derrida, J. (n.d.). Die Struktur, das Zeichen und das Spiel im Diskurs der Wissenschaften vom Menschen. In P. Engelmann, *Postmoderne* (p. 114).
- Diekmann, I., & Schoeps, J. H. (2002). *Das Wilkomirski-Syndrom. Eingebildete Erinnerungen oder Von der Sehnsucht Opfer zu sein*. Zürich.
- Fabian, J. (2007). Erinnerung/Gegen-Erinnerung, Sammeln/Verstreuen. Reflektionen aus einer ethnographischen Perspektive. In S. Hobuß, & U. Lölke, *Erinnern verhandeln. Kolonialismus im kollektiven Gedächtnis Afrikas und Europas* (pp. 13-31). Münster: Dampfboot Verlag.
- Fabian, J. (2007). *Memory against Culture. Arguments and Reminders*. Durham, London: Duke University Press.
- Frege, G. (1980). Über Sinn und Bedeutung. In *Funktion, Begriff, Bedeutung* (pp. 40-65). Göttingen.
- Halbwachs, M. (1985). *Les cadres sociaux de la mémoire (Paris 1925)* (German: Das Gedächtnis und seine sozialen Bedingungen ed.). Frankfurt/M: Albin Michel.

- Halbwachs, M. (1997). *La mémoire collective*. Paris: Albin Michel.
- Hobuß, S. (2010). German Memory Studies: The Philosophy of Memory from Wittgenstein and Warburg to Assmann, Welzer and Back Again. In A. Dessingué, & e. al., *Flerstemte Minner* (pp. 22-34). Stavanger: Hertervig Academic.
- Hobuß, S. (2011). Aspects of Memory Acts: Transnational Cultural Memory and Ethics. *Journal of Aesthetics and Culture* 3. Retrieved June 17, 2012, from <http://www.aestheticsandculture.net/index.php/jac/article/view/7188>
- Hobuß, S. (2012). Plädoyer für einen kritischen Repräsentationsbegriff. [A plea for a critical concept of representation]. In Repräsentation armer und fremder Familien in Text, *Arbeitskreis „Visuelle und sprachliche Repräsentationen von Fremdheit und Armut“ am Sonderforschungsbereich der Universität Trier*.
- Hofmann, H. (1974). *Repräsentation – Studien zur Wort- und Begriffsgeschichte von der Antike bis ins 19. Jahrhundert*. Berlin.
- Kansteiner, W. (2002). Finding Meaning in Memory: A Methodological Critique of Collective Memory Studies. In *History and Theory* 41.2 (pp. 179-197).
- Krug, W. T. (1969). Repräsentation. In *Allgemeines Handwörterbuch der philosophischen Wissenschaften. Nachdruck der zweiten Auflage (1832)* (p. 515f). Stuttgart.
- Mabe, J. E. (2007). Vom kollektiven Gedächtnis zur Konvergenzhistorik. Europäische und afrikanische Erinnerungen an den Kolonialismus – philosophisch hinterfragt. In S. Hobuß, & U. Lölke, *Erinnern verhandeln. Kolonialismus im kollektiven Gedächtnis Afrikas und Europas* (pp. 32-45). Münster: Dampfboot Verlag.
- Mächler, S. (2002). Das Opfer Wilkomirski – Individuelles Erinnern als soziale Praxis und öffentliches Ereignis. In I. Diekmann, & J. H. Schoeps, *Das Wilkomirski-Syndrom* (pp. 25-85). Zürich.
- Nelson, K. (2003). Self and social functions: Individual autobiographical memory and collective narrative. *Memory* 11, 125-136.
- Oexle, O. G. (2000). Im Archiv der Fiktionen. In R. M. Kiesow, & S. Dieter, *Auf der Suche nach der verlorenen Wahrheit. Zum Grundlagenstreit in den Geschichtswissenschaften* (pp. 142-167). Frankfurt/M.
- Paulus, S. (2007). Einblicke in fremde Welten. Orientalistische Selbst/Fremdkonstruktionen in TV-Dokumentationen über Muslime in Deutschland. In I. Attia, *Orient- und IslamBilder. Interdisziplinäre Beiträge zu Orientalismus und antimuslimischem Rassismus* (pp. 279-292). Münster.
- Rabinovici, D., & Sharp, F. M. (2000). *The Search for M. Ariadne* Pr.
- Saar, M. (2002). Wem gehört das kollektive Gedächtnis? Ein sozialphilosophischer Ausblick auf Kultur, Multikulturalismus und Erinnerung. In G. Echterhoff, & M. Saar, *Kontexte und Kulturen des Erinnerns. Maurice Halbwachs und das Paradigma des kollektiven Gedächtnisses* (pp. 267-278). Konstanz: UVK.
- Scheerer, E. (1971). Repräsentation. In J. Ritter, & K. Gruender, *Historisches Wörterbuch der Philosophie* (pp. 790-797). Basel.

- Scheerer, E. (1990). *Mental Representation. Its History and Present Status. I.* „Representatio“ from Cicero to Suarez. ZIF, Universität Bielefeld.
- Seitz, H. (2004). Lebendige Erinnerungen. Die Konstitution und Vermittlung lebensgeschichtlicher Erfahrungen. In *Autobiographischen Erzählungen*. Bielefeld.
- von Savigny, E. (1994). *Wittgensteins „Philosophische Untersuchungen“*. Ein Kommentar für Leser. Frankfurt/M: Klostermann.
- Wittgenstein, L. (2001). *Philosophical Investigations*. London: Blackwell Publishers.

Rethinking Remediation and Reworking the Archive: Transcultural Reappropriations of Documentary Images of Migration

Dagmar Brunow

A piece of black and white archive footage shows a white British reporter interviewing the Trinidadian Calypso singer Lord Kitchener and asking him to perform a song right into the camera. Kitchener accordingly performs an a capella version of his calypso “London is the Place for me”. This scene, taking place on June 22, 1948 when Kitchener was about to disembark from the SS Empire Windrush docking at Tilbury, is part of a newsreel produced by British Pathé.²⁵ Throughout the years the newsreel footage of the arrival of the Windrush has become part of the cultural memory of post-war migration to Britain.

The arrival of the SS Empire Windrush in Britain in June 1948 is now commonly regarded as the starting point of post-war immigration to Britain and has been described as a foundation myth of multi-cultural Britain (Mead, 2007). Today ‘the Windrush generation’ has become a household term, commonly denoting what is thought to be the ‘first generation’ of Black immigrants to Britain.²⁶ Meanwhile the

²⁵ On its homeward voyage from Australia the SS Empire Windrush had passed the Caribbean where 492 cheap tickets had been sold to West Indians looking for a job in the ‘mother-country’, many of them ex-servicemen who had fought for Britain during the Second World War. In those days immigration was not policed: before the Commonwealth Immigration Act was imposed in 1962 to restrict further immigration of Black and Asian Britons, the citizens of the colonies of the British Empire held British passports which allowed them to settle in the British ‘motherland’. Still, the authorities were alarmed by reports of several hundred Black Caribbeans coming to Britain and reports about the Windrush resulted in racist attacks by some politicians (Phillips/Phillips, 1998; Dabydeen et al, 2007). For a discussion of the number 492, see Mead 2009.

²⁶ The iconic status of the Windrush, however, is not unproblematic since its lack of a diachronic perspective tends to neglect the long-standing Black presence in Britain which dates back to the 15th century. Since then Black communities have existed in London, Cardiff, Bristol and Liverpool, among others. As Barnor Hesse criticizes: “the prevailing narratives of contemporary Black settlement in Britain tend to relegate the earlier part of the twentieth century to the shelf of curiosity studies, while suggesting that matters of real historical interest take place in the middle to late twentieth century.” (Hesse 2000:103) The Windrush topos has also marginalizes the fact that tens of thousands of Caribbeans volunteered to fight for Britain in the two World Wars. Moreover, the Windrush was not

archival footage of the Windrush can be accessed via YouTube and has been remediated widely. Among others it has been included in documentaries, both for mainstream television, community channels or for user-generated videos uploaded on YouTube. This has not always been the case, as Korte/Pirker (2011, p. 27) point out: “before the late 1990s, the Windrush had practically slipped from Britain's historical consciousness”.

Remediation (in the understanding of Astrid Erll, not of Bolter/Grusin²⁷) and its dynamics therefore opens up to various modes of theorizing around the relation of documentary (moving) images, cultural memory and the visual archive of migration. As Stuart Hall has shown in his 1991 article “Reconstruction Work” using the example of photographs representing Black Britons, each new dissemination also adds new layers of meaning to the images. The meaning of these images is therefore not stable, but changes whenever the images are recontextualised, for instance through renewed circulation. Thus, they can have different functions for cultural memory. Mediated memories of migration can be appropriated by specific groups, for example by Black Britons in order to acknowledge the presence of Blacks in Britain. They can be translated into different transcultural contexts, but their meaning can also shift within the hegemonic discourse, as the Windrush-example shows: from being used to illustrate a threat to the nation towards acknowledging the existence of multi-cultural Britain. The cultural memory of migration in Britain does not belong to individual groups, but is entangled and multi-directional.

In this paper I will take a closer look at the remediation of the Windrush footage and the ways it is being re-appropriated. In what ways can archival footage be used to acknowledge the Black past in Britain and to carve out discursive spaces for Black British cultural memory? While I argue that cultural memory does not belong to specific groups, I am interested in the multidirectionality of cultural memory (Rothberg, 2009) and the ways it translates into different contexts. Freeing the concept of ‘transculturality’ from its prevalent focus on ethnicity and nationality, we could also speak of a travelling memory (Erll, 2011b) which translates into different transcultural contexts (that is: different cultural and subcultural formations

even the first ship to bring Black workers to Britain. In 1947 the Ormonde had hundreds of Caribbean labour migrants on board, but went completely unnoticed by the media (cf. Korte/Pirker 2011: 27, fn. 15). What is also forgotten is the presence of over 60 Polish displaced persons onboard the Windrush (see Mead, 2009).

²⁷ The concept of remediation goes back to David Jay Bolter and Richard Grusin who examine “the formal logic by which new media refashion prior media forms” (Bolter/Grusin 1999, p. 273), for example paintings being remediated in photographs, television remediating radio or theatre. Astrid Erll and Ann Rigney (2009) have applied and developed the concept of remediation for cultural memory studies: “Just as there is no cultural memory prior to mediation, there is no mediation without remediation: all representations of the past draw on available media technologies, on existent media products, on patterns of representation and medial aesthetics.” (Erll and Rigney, 2009: 4)

within the nation which are not solely defined by ethnicity and the notion of container cultures).²⁸ Looking at the way archival footage is translated, reclaimed and remixed, is also a way to grant agency to subjects (migrants) whose access to dominant media production has been limited.²⁹

The aim of this paper is twofold: first, to contribute to theorizing about the mediation of migrant memory and the role of documentary images and archival footage. Second, to further conceptualize the notion of remediation. This paper sets out to examine in what ways the archival footage of the arrival of the Windrush can be used, appropriated or reworked in order to diversify the cultural memory of the nation and in order to acknowledge the legacy of Black immigration and its impact on contemporary Britain. In looking at various remediations of the footage available on YouTube, I am going to take the media specificity of the cultural memory of migration and its different forms of mediation (mediatization) into account.

Yet, I argue that we not only have to analyse the media specificity of these visual representations and their roles as performative acts, but also their specific discursive context. Only then can we get away from concepts of cultural or transcultural memory as static and fixed, as based on the notions of container culture and belonging to one specific group. Instead, I would like to show how mediated memories of migration travel (Erll, 2011b), how new layers of meaning are added to them and how they can be translated, reclaimed, reworked and re-appropriated.

Mediated memories of migration: documentary images and the issue of representation

Looking at the mediation of memory implies that mediatization is regarded not only as an ‘outlet’ of memory, but as its prerequisite. Marita Sturken describes media as “technologies of memory, not vessels of memory in which memory passively resides” (1997, 9). Also Aleida Assmann (2011) has pointed at the fact that cultural memory is defined by the kind of media available in a society at a given point in time. And Astrid Erll paraphrases Marshall McLuhan’s famous dictum “the medium is the message” when she states “the medium is the memory” (Erll, 2011a,

²⁸ I have explained elsewhere why I still prefer the term ‘cultural’ rather than ‘transcultural’ memory in the context of migration - basically because the notion of ‘trans’ tends to re-essentialize the concept of culture. In order not to re-establish a concept of culture as fixed container-culture(s) with clearly outlined borders (something that the transcultural turn set out to leave behind), I use the term ‘cultural memory’ based on an understanding of ‘culture’ suggested by the representatives of Black British Cultural Studies, such as Stuart Hall, Homi Bhabha and Paul Gilroy: as inherently hybrid, as constantly in flux and in progress, defying essentialist notions of nation, race, ethnicity, class or gender. (see also Erll, 2011b; Welsch, 1999; Schulze-Engler, 2008)

²⁹ The notion of agency is something that John Sundholm stresses in his current work on migrant filmmaking in Sweden and I am grateful to him for reminding me of the importance of this concept.

p. 115). Thus, when analysing mediated memories the specific media technologies, the modes of production, distribution and exhibition will have to be examined. Since cultural memory is always mediated and cannot be accessed outside its mediatizations, other forms of media, such as documentaries, essay films, videos or user-generated YouTube clips should be considered as being of equal importance for the transmission, translation and reworking of mediated memories of migration as fiction films or written sources.

Analysing documentary images, however, requires a specifically critical perspective. Due to their indexical relation to 'reality', documentary images are often considered a source of factual, positive knowledge. Therefore, conventional documentaries tend to use archival footage as a means of authentication, as visible evidence to show "how it really was" ("wie es einst gewesen") in the sense of Ranke. However, this misunderstanding of the ontology of the image has been problematized within documentary film theory (Minh-ha, Steyerl), in essay-films (Marker, Akomfrah, Varda) and in theoretical writings on photography (e.g. Barthes, Sontag, Hall, Sekula). Moreover, image making cannot be conceptualised outside relations of power: whose is the gaze of the camera? What perspective do we find in the images? In what way does it reproduce a colonial or Eurocentric view? Who is entitled to make pictures of others and to publish and disseminate them? Who has the prerogative of interpretation over these images? Therefore, we have to regard documentary images not as exact copies of 'reality', but as representations and thus as constructs which are the result of entangled discourses, of iconographic traditions, narrative formula and specific media technologies and their dispositifs.

What does it mean to speak of mediated memories of migration? First, we have to consider the fact that in most cases the migrants represented in the films or news reports have not been the producers of the footage. Since migrants have only had limited access to media production (with few exceptions), they are often the ones talked about and described by others - more often than not represented from the standpoint of the mainstream society. As a result, the representation of migration (immigration) has often been guided by discourses of 'threat' to the nation, by rhetoric of 'flood', by the use of increasing numbers when referring to migrants. The footage, both the images and the soundtrack, is likely to be dominated by a Eurocentric perspective through which migrants are 'othered'. Ways of 'othering' migrants or ethnic minorities are for instance the mode in which they are framed within the picture, the *mise-en-scène*, the use of camera angle and the modes of lighting.³⁰ When we examine the footage, we could, for example, ask the following questions: are migrants or ethnic minorities allowed to speak? Will they be allowed a close-up? Are they mentioned by name? Or are they just filmed in long shots as a

³⁰ For more examples, see Shohat/Stam 1994, p. 204 ff.

big group? We should also keep in mind the importance of articulation and focalization, as Shohat/Stam remind us: “Who is speaking through a film? Who is imagined as listening? Who is actually listening? Who is looking? And what social desires are mobilized by the film?” (Shohat/Stam, 1994, p. 205) Taking a closer look at the stylistic means employed in the archival footage acknowledges the construction of memory by the media and the dynamics of power at work. The politics of representation is also related to the genre of the film, for instance the different forms of documentary filmmaking, such as the newsreel, the essay film, the home movie or the video diary.

Mediated memories of migration can only have an impact on the construction of contemporary cultural memory if they are liberated from the archives and given a chance to be freed from forgetting. In short, if they change from being what Aleida Assmann terms ‘storage memory’ (which can be described as dead memory) to becoming working memory (which implies living memory) (cf Assmann, 2008). Therefore they need to be remediated and have to be circulated again and again, for example via novels, TV-series and documentaries, exhibitions or online platforms, such as YouTube, Flickr or Tumblr. The remediation of these images can enable them to become part of the ‘working memory’ in a specific socio-historical context, instead of being relegated to an existence of a shelf in the archive. As Erll states, “remediation tends to solidify cultural memory, creating and stabilizing certain narratives and icons of the past” (Erll 2008, p. 393). However, while memory studies has hitherto focussed on popular genres and mainstream cultural practice (Erll, 2009; Rigney, 2012) I would like to take a look at the remediation of archival newsreel footage, since the archive is the foundation of how and in what ways history is written. Or, as Stuart Hall has put it: “The past cannot speak, except through its ‘archive’.” (Hall 1991, p. 152)

The notion of the archive

Since the notion of the archive is entangled with the workings of cultural memory (see also A. Assmann, 2008) I will briefly introduce three conceptualisations of the archive relevant for memory studies. (1) The archive as a discursive construct which is pervaded by power relations (as theorized by Derrida, 1995 and Foucault, 1972), or (2) as a film (or television) archive storing film or newsreel footage (as theorized by Giovanna Fossati (2009), for example). The division is merely heuristic, though, since the decisions as to what stock is kept, thrown away, preserved, restored and remediated, are guided by hegemonic discourses. Therefore I would like to introduce a third concept which merges the first two: (3) the visual archive which I define as *the images circulating in public at a specific sociohistorical moment*. What images are allowed to circulate - which ones are encouraged, and which ones are restricted? The circulation of images can be restricted due to censorship or property

rights issues, but also due to hegemonic discourses prioritizing certain representations of race, gender, class or sexuality.³¹ The function of the soundtrack should not be underestimated: the accompanying sound (voice-over, music) guides the interpretation of the images by the recipient, it can prescribe a ‘preferred meaning’ (Hall), even if, as Stuart Hall has convincingly shown, alternative and contradicting interpretations are possible.

However, despite its discursivity, the visual archive is a result of materiality, of the images that can be accessed within the public sphere: on YouTube, in national film archives, in commercial archives of production companies (from Pathé to Universal). All these archives, their legal politics, their handling of the stock (whether it is to be preserved, restored or thrown away) determine what kind of images are disseminated. Nowadays, digital archives such as Facebook or Flickr, which challenge the division between private and public, contribute to the visual archive as well (see Van Dijck, 2007; Garde-Hansen, 2011).

The archival footage: The Pathé newsreel of the arrival of the Windrush (1948)

The 1948 British Pathé footage of the arrival of the SS Empire Windrush in Tilbury is about one minute long, but it comes in a package with a newsreel clip on Ingrid Bergman’s visit to Britain under the title “Pathe Reporter Meets”. Very likely the two news stories have been screened in this order. In those years before the introduction of television, newsreels would be screened in the cinemas before the main feature film. A newsreel would consist of short clips about specific political and historical events, sports events and some entertainment. Pathé was one of the leading companies at that time, producing newsreels in several countries to be screened at Pathé-owned cinema chains.³² For many decades, until digitised film footage could be uploaded on the internet, the access to the newsreel footage stored in the Pathé archives was restricted. It was mainly targeted at professionals who would have to pay for the use of the footage. Due to these circumstances the remediation of the Windrush footage was limited and its impact on the cultural memory of migration can be said to have been fairly minimal-. Instead, the visual archive of migration was dominated by photographs of West Indian migrants circulating in newspapers and magazines (see Hall, 1991). Since the digitisation of

³¹ Another factor would be legal issues, such as the criminalisation of certain groups, for example homosexuals, which kept photographic images of lesbian or gay lives in the realms of the private sphere.

³² The production company Pathé, founded in Paris in 1896, opened a branch in London in 1902, while acquiring a chain of cinemas as well.

the British Pathé archives in 2002 the Windrush newsreel footage is available online, both on the Pathé website and on YouTube.³³

The footage of the arrival of the Windrush starts with a long shot of the ship in a harbour and continues using long shots showing crowds of immigrants onboard, standing crammed along the rails. The establishing shots are followed by a sequence in which a white reporter conducts interviews with three of the passengers.³⁴ In a classical “voice-of-God”-manner the authoritarian male voice-over, speaking standard English, would comment on the pictures, thereby framing their reception by directing the audience towards a ‘dominant reading’ (Hall) as he is offering an interpretation of the images. The perspective of the clip is targeted towards an audience living in Britain and imagined to be white.

The Windrush footage is preceded by a sequence depicting Ingrid Bergman’s visit to Britain. The footage contains a dialogue with director Alfred Hitchcock who asks her questions. The clip ends with a close-up of Bergman’s face, while the voice-over states: “The Swedish-born actress wearing no make-up, yet being lovelier than Hollywood has pictured her, has come over here to star in a British film.” The close up is intercut with a long shot of a ship in a harbour. Without a break the voice-over continues, now accompanying footage of the arrival of the Windrush at Tilbury: “Arrivals at Tilbury. The Empire Windrush brings to Britain 500 Jamaicans. Many are ex-servicemen who know England. They served this country well. In Jamaica they couldn’t find work. Discouraged, but full of hope, they sailed for Britain. Citizens of the British Empire coming to the mother country with good intent. [...] Our reporter asks them what they want to do.” Reporter: “Now, why do you come to England.” Migrant: “To seek a job.” Reporter: “And what sort of job do you want?” Migrant: “Any type as long as I get a good pay.” Then the voice-over continues: “Some will go into industry, others intend to rejoin the services.” An interview with an ex-serviceman follows. The voice-over states: “Some intend to return to Jamaica [sic!] when conditions improve.” Another interview features a West Indian man who explains that he came to England to support his family. Finally, the reporter interviews calypso singer Lord Kitchener, the only interviewee who is mentioned by name.³⁵

³³ The clip, accessible at the website of British Pathé (www.britishpathe.com), is called “Pathe Reporter Meets”. It can be acquired for download as a wmv-file (Windows Media Video) at a resolution of 24 bits, for personal use only, at a prize of £30, inc. VAT.

³⁴ A description of the clip “Pathe Reporter Meets” can be found on the Pathé website. The given length of 169 seconds includes the Bergman-Hitchcock-sequence.

³⁵ The dialogue develops as follows: *Reporter*: “May I ask your name?” *Lord Kitchener*: “Lord Kitchener.” *Reporter*: „,Lord Kitchener. Now I am told that you are really the king of Calypso singers. Is that right?” *Lord Kitchener*: [*barely understandable as the reporter keeps on talking*] “Yes, that’s true.” *Reporter*: “Will you sing for us?” *Lord Kitchener*: “Right now?” *Reporter*: “Yes.” [*Lord Kitchener sings an a capella version of his calypso “London is the Place for Me” before the clip stops.*]

Especially in contrast with the previous newsreel clip showing Ingrid Bergman meeting Hitchcock on arrival in Britain we can see the modes of ‘othering’ at work in the Windrush clip. While Ingrid Bergman is represented as an individual whose coming to Britain is justified by her professional role as an actress, the passengers of the Windrush are represented as a homogenous group, as “500 Jamaicans”, according to the voice-over.³⁶ The use of long shots lumps the most diverse individuals together into seemingly homogenous groups, while having the tendency to distance the spectators from the immigrants. In the subsequent interview sequences - despite the use of medium shots - the interviewees are not named, with the exception of Lord Kitchener. Even here, though, if we look at the politics of representation from a historical perspective, we can state that Lord Kitchener singing into the camera being asked by a white person to do so ties into a long legacy of colonial images.³⁷

Overall, the interviewees are confined to the limitations of the interview situation, having to react to the question asked by the reporter. Most likely the interviews have been rehearsed beforehand. As film stock was expensive, talks would occur in advance in order to select potential interviewees and to brief both them and the reporter. Especially the interview sequence with Lord Kitchener shows that the reporter has obtained some information in advance: “Now I am told that you are really *the* king of Calypso singers.” No discursive space for a possible self-representation is carved out: the migrant cannot tell his own story, but has to articulate himself within an already given (Eurocentric) framework in which his role is reduced to an extra. Hence, the following questions arise: how can remediation contribute to translating the footage into other contexts? How have the archival images been reclaimed by different groups? Have the images - at least partly - been liberated from their white Eurocentric perspective? Before I look at examples of reworking archival footage, we will have to take a closer look at the notion of remediation and its preconditions.

³⁶ As historical research has shown, neither the number of the immigrants stated here nor their geographical origin are accurate. See Mead, 2007; Dabydeen et al, 2007; Schwarz, 2007; Mead, 2009.

³⁷ As Bill Schwarz suggests: “The first social act in Windrush Britain is for a white man to ask a black man to sing” (Schwarz, 2007, p. 7) and in 1988 Reece Auguiste, member of the Black Audio Film Collective, who reworked the footage in the essay-film *Handsworth Songs*, describes the scene such: “The sad irony of Lord Kitchener’s words ‘London is the place for me’. Kitchener standing on the deck, nervous, shaking, but desperately trying to keep the calypso rhythm together; Prospero want to hear so Caliban must continue to sing it.” (Auguiste, 2007).

What triggers remediation? Premediation (iconography and narrative) and discursive changes as a condition for remediation

In the years following the arrival of the SS Empire Windrush the number of Caribbean immigrants remained comparably low. As a consequence the British media lost interest in the Black migrants who in turn had to cope with everyday racism which went unnoticed within the predominantly white public sphere (cf. Phillips and Phillips, 1998). During the 1950s, however, despite its low numbers, immigration from the Commonwealth countries was increasingly regarded as a problem in the public discourse, culminating in the Commonwealth Immigrants Act of 1962 which regulated immigration from the colonies. As Barnor Hesse (2000, 98) notes, “[f]or forty-nine years *Windrush* signified in the public sphere the problem of ‘race’ and the racialized other.” The debate on immigration was guided by a white British perspective, from which Black or Asian migration would be described as a potential threat. For instance, migrants would be referred to in numbers, combining these (increasing numbers) with rhetoric of ‘flood’ or ‘waves’, culminating in Enoch Powell’s “Rivers of Blood” speech on 20 April 1968 and in Margaret Thatcher’s notorious 1978 television interview for current affairs programme *WORLD IN ACTION* about Britain being “swamped” by immigrants. While these racist discourses still exist today, most outspokenly in populist right-wing rhetoric, a discursive shift has occurred in hegemonic politics since New Labour’s proclamation of Britain as a multicultural society.³⁸

Since the late 1990s the Windrush footage has been remediated widely, thus turning the Windrush into an icon.³⁹ In 1998 the BBC series “Windrush” was one of the first media events which brought the experiences of the ‘Windrush generation’ into the public sphere and reached broader audiences. The series assembles testimonial interviews with historical witnesses, but also with Black British historians and cultural critics (such as Stuart Hall), as well as archival footage. Both the highly popular series and the accompanying book *Windrush. The Irresistible Rise of Multi-Racial Britain* by Mike and Trevor Phillips (Phillips and Phillips 1998) created a ‘plurimedial constellation’ (Erll) which helped to carve out a discursive space for

³⁸ Of course the notion of multi-culturalism is highly problematic, especially if it is based on a concept of container cultures, which are homogenous and clearly demarcated and which are to co-exist in a given society. However, I will not discuss the concept of multi-culturalism and its pitfalls here, but would like to stress that the British (New Labour) conceptualisation of multi-culturalism can also be understood in terms of hybridity rather than ‘cultures’, and of a multitude of heterogeneous cultural practices, not connected to an essentialist understanding of ‘nation’ or ‘race’, but one which takes the various intersections of identity into account.

³⁹ For several decades the footage would only rarely be employed in films or exhibitions. One notable exception would be the essay-film *Handsworth Songs* by the Black Audio Film Collective in 1986 (see also Brunow, 2011). According to Spence/Navarro (2011, 50), the Lord Kitchener sequence was also included in a documentary on calypso “One Hand Don’t Clap” by Kavery Dutta (1989).

migrant memory. In the same year, Channel 4 aired its series *The Windrush Years*. The Museum of London celebrated the 50th anniversary of the arrival of the Windrush in the exhibition “Windrush - Sea Change” in 1998.⁴⁰ The exhibition included contemporary film footage, most probably the Pathé newsreel. In 1998 The Essex Record Office created an entry in their sound archive called “Radio recordings: Windrush Archive”.⁴¹ 1998 also saw the publication of another oral history account: *With Hope in their Eyes*, edited by Vivian Francis, is a collection of interviews with Windrush passengers. Through its remediation, its recurrent circulation in various media formats, the Windrush topos has entered cultural memory. Over the years the Windrush topos was employed in exhibitions and musicals as well as in televised crime series, such as *Foyles War* (ITV, 2002) and *Jericho* (ITV, 2005), or in Andrea Levy’s bestselling novel *Small Island* (2004), which in turn was adapted into a popular television drama in 2009 (see Korte/Pirker, 2011, pp. 183-250). How come the Windrush topos proved so suitable for remediation? We can explain this phenomenon, at least partly, with the help of the concept of premediation (Erll).

The Windrush could become an iconic symbol because it has been premediated via another national icon with symbolic value: the white cliffs of Dover, famously depicted in Ford Maddox Brown’s painting *THE LAST OF ENGLAND* (which in turn gave the title to Derek Jarman’s 1987 film). The painting, which shows a couple in a small vessel facing the spectator while the white cliffs of Dover can be spotted in the background, was created in the years 1852 to 1855, “at the height of a period of mass emigration from the British Isles to the British colonies” (Kuhn 2002, 130). As such, the Windrush footage becomes emblematic for a reversal in the national self-understanding: from emigration to immigration.⁴² Immigration, usually sidelined and marginalised in national historiography, is now part of the national master narrative in Britain. One of the latest examples of including the Windrush into the national master narrative would be Danny Boyle’s opening ceremony for the 2012 Olympics in London. During the show a huge model of the Windrush entered the stage, accompanied by numerous extras dressed in the iconic outfit of the Windrush generation: smart dresses and gloves, suits and hats. Thus, the Windrush topos, being a symbol for multi-cultural Britain, is adding a new

⁴⁰ For the first time the passenger list, now held at the Public Record Office, was on display.

⁴¹ It is 19 minutes 47 seconds long and consists of six recordings, among them sound files from British Pathé. It uses the index terms “Migration” and “Racism” under the reference code: SA 1/1962/1. The copyright is held by BBC Essex 1998.

⁴² Although the Windrush did not dock in Dover, but in Tilbury, I would claim that the notion of Britain as an island, with its coastline as the border, is a topos which capitalizes on the symbolic value of the white cliffs of Dover.

dimension to the notion of heritage in which British identity is imagined as solely white and homogenous.

Remediation cannot be explained by premediation alone, though. The reason why the arrival of the Windrush became iconic cannot be found solely in its iconic and narratological conditions. For example, in the 1984 television series „A Passage to Britain“ (Channel 4), the Windrush is not even mentioned (see Korte/Pirker 2011, 35). There has to be a “readiness” in the hegemonic discourse to allow these images to enter the public arena and thus into the visual archive. New Labour’s redefinition of Britain as a multi-cultural society helped pave the way for this development, although it is not the only reason for the discursive shift from regarding migration as a problem to acknowledging multi-cultural Britain. Especially since the late 1980s Black Britons have been negotiating their identity as Black AND British in many sectors (literature, audiovisual media, music). Therefore the discursive shift did not come out of thin air.

From the mid-1990s the idea of Britain as a multicultural society has gained a wider appeal within the public sphere. While both everyday racism, racist attacks in the streets as well as structural racism, for example within the police and other authorities, are still part of reality, various measures have been taken to acknowledge the diversity within the British population.⁴³ For example, school curricula would be changed, museum and galleries would change their permanent exhibitions, libraries would expand their stock, the book market would increasingly publish literature by Black British or Asian British writers and the media (both radio and television) would represent multicultural Britain to a higher degree than ever before. No matter if some of these measures have been due to social engineering (school curricula) and others merely the result of market considerations (publishing) or both (museum politics) - in effect, the hegemonic discourse in Britain tends towards acknowledging the existence of a multicultural society. The 50th anniversary triggered remediations of the Windrush, and so did the 60th, and most recently the 65th anniversary. Yet, the fact that the Windrush anniversaries are celebrated is also a result of political changes in Britain’s historical programme, towards promoting ‘multiethnicity’ (cf. Korte/Pirker 2011).

⁴³ This is remarkable insofar as this discursive shift has not yet happened in other Western European countries, for instance in Germany.

Digital archives of migration: reclaiming, reappropriating and remaking mediated memories of migration - the Windrush topos on YouTube

I will use the example of YouTube as a digital archive of migration, because in contrast to official archives, such as the archive(s) of the British Film Institute or the archives of the BBC, Channel 4 or ITV, it allows for user-generated material to be uploaded and reworked to a greater extent. While its impact on cultural memory is probably lower - obviously, a YouTube clip with 5000 hits has a lesser impact than a TV series broadcast on the BBC, with an audience of a million - YouTube as a digital archive contains remediations of the Windrush footage which (might) allow for a higher degree of self-representation than the footage contained in official film and television archives due to the limited access of Black Britons to media production (see Malik, 2002). While the notion of self-representation is not unproblematic per se, the user-generated clips can tell us a great deal about the ways cultural memory travels and how it is reworked and remediated.

To what extent can we actually call YouTube an archive? While YouTube clearly lacks some of an archive's most important tasks, such as preservation and restoration, it is commonly perceived as an archive and can teach us about the workings of archives in general.⁴⁴ Indeed, the video platform is not sustainable and its politics of preservation are highly erratic. All of a sudden a clip might disappear, being removed by the users for personal reasons or due to alleged copyright infringements or other legal reasons. Therefore, the content on YouTube is in constant flux, is continuously reworked and re-edited. Nevertheless, YouTube is not only a video platform, it is indeed an archive, giving access to hitherto forgotten or inaccessible TV shows, children's programmes, music video clips, bootlegged concert recordings or interviews. It allows users to digitise their old videos (VHS or other formats) and to make them accessible - at least for a certain period of time. YouTube is also an archive of first person filmmaking, of confessional videos, make-up tutorials and manuals, as well as an archive of viral videos and their remixes, illustrating the transnational and transcultural translations and appropriations of global media.

The YouTube clips I look at are not only those which rework the Windrush newsreel footage. Some of the examples I will mention set out to preserve the cultural memory of the Windrush generation. Without using the archival footage, they record testimonial witness interviews which they then disseminate via YouTube. In these examples I would like to examine the impact of media specificity. Is this only a vessel in which memory passively resides, as Marita Sturken has put it? Or in what

⁴⁴ See Snickars/Vonderau, 2009, especially the contribution by Kessler/Schäfer, Prelinger, Snickars and Schröter.

ways do the modes of filming and distributing the footage contribute to the cultural memory of the first generation of post-war immigrants to Britain?

Although these clips are all available on YouTube (at least at the time writing), their modes of production and previous forms of dissemination differ to a great extent: the Windrush remediations are both TV series, clips from open access broadcasting, documentations of oral history interviews, stop-motion animations, etc. Some have been previously broadcast on public-service television, some on a (local) community channel with fairly limited audiences, others use YouTube to make school-related activities accessible to wider audiences. Therefore, the look of the clips can range from professional to amateur quality of camera, sound, some have undergone a complex process of postproduction, others would merely record a testimonial witness interview. All these different modes of production and previous distribution need to be taken into account. In addition, it is important to consider that reception takes place in different sociohistorical contexts: mediated memories are actualised on a regional, local or national level.”The film clips might be viewed differently by audiences in Jamaica in 1974 and in 2013, and differently again by audiences in other countries. In short, the reception of a specific film clip will vary according to the age, gender, ethnicity and personal experiences of the viewers as well as the specific emotional state that they find themselves in when watching the clip. I will now discuss some of the case studies drawn from YouTube.

Liberating archival footage from its colonialist perspective: “Windrush story” (2009)

“Windrush Story” is a short (2 min. 40 sec.) user-generated video uploaded in October 2009.⁴⁵ It reworks the Pathé footage by creating an assemblage of the archival film footage, photographs and text frames. On the soundtrack we hear Lord Kitchener's calypso “London is the Place for Me” for the duration of the whole clip. While the voice-over of the Pathé footage is deleted, the clip uses text inserts, such as “Where was this ship from?” and “Why were these people on board?” It argues that many West Indians, who had fought alongside white Britons during WWII, would have to face racism while settling in Britain. In a didactic manner the video ends with questions such as “Why were these British men and women treated in this way?” or “What were their experiences of coming to Britain?”

The “Windrush story” video is an example of the way the Pathé footage has been reworked and – at least partly – liberated from its Eurocentric perspective. Still, it

⁴⁵ The video was uploaded by the signature “mrgreen1066” who has published 300 videos online, most of them on historical topics. With over 15,000 hits in August 2013, the “Windrush Story” is clearly one of the most successful of his uploads. <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=LZf0HnnT6ZE> (07-11-2013)

is not restricted to an exclusively Black speaking position. It refrains from referring to the immigrants in terms of “us” or “our ancestors”, rather using terms such as “these people” which both distance the viewer from the migrants, while at the same time providing a broader scope of spectatorship positions. The use of the cheerful calypso performed by Lord Kitchener (this time not a cappella, but in the version of the studio recording) clearly gives the West Indian immigrants a form of agency by creating a ‘point of audition’ (‘point d’écoute’, Chion 1994) based on Black cultural practice. This mode of empowerment, however, is undermined by the textual commentary which deprives the immigrants of their agency by making them mere victims of British racism.

From social problem to asset: Kitch ~ "London".....

The short (01:11) clip entitled “Kitch ~ "London".....” is an example of a user-generated upload which stems from a VHS-recording of a TV programme.⁴⁶ The clip consists mainly of an excerpt from the Channel 4 documentary “The Great Black British Invasion”, originally broadcast in a prime time slot, on Saturday 5th August 2006 at 7.25 pm. The first nine seconds of the clip consist of a user-generated title sequence (white letters on a blue background) announcing “Lord Kitchener – King of Calypso”, before we hear a cheerful female voice-over stating: “The Afro-Caribbean servicemen who found a new life in Britain soon wrote home telling others there was plenty of work here. In the late 40s a steady stream of young men began to arrive from all the islands, but it was no surprise who stole the limelight...” Now the Lord Kitchener clip from the Pathé newsreel is inserted. His a cappella rendition of the calypso “London is the Place for Me” is fading over to the recorded version which plays on during an animated sequence in which the route of a Trinidadian entertainer from the Caribbean to Britain is shown on a map. The mickey-mousing on the soundtrack, while the drawn figure of the entertainer is speedily moved from Trinidad to Britain, adds to the cheerful atmosphere. The voice-over continues: “entertainers, many from Trinidad, would be the next migrants. They brought with them enough colour, excitement and style to make Britain smile again.”

In this clip the newsreel footage is reappropriated in order to rework the narrative of Black migration to Britain. Instead of migrants being depicted as a social problem or a potential threat, the clip establishes a story of migration which sees the Caribbean presence in Britain as an asset (bringing “colour, excitement and style”

⁴⁶ The clip was uploaded by the signature “TVybe” on December 11th, 2008. The description reads: “Lord Kitchener a master of his craft, one of my favourite Calypsonians. this clip is lifted from the superb Great British Black Invasion documentary aired on Channel 4 in 2006. (My first VHS post!!!) (Plenty more to follow...) Enjoy (:” <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=TReqIteRp7c> (2013-11-07)

and uplifting the desolate nation). This is a new version of the Windrush myth, which is a result of the changed political discourse in the late 1990s. This discourse also brought about changes in pedagogy and in politics of diversity.

Creating diversity through the Windrush myth: “THE EMPIRE WINDRUSH - The Deighton Centre Animations”

The short (02:10) YouTube clip entitled “The Empire Windrush - The Deighton Centre Animations”⁴⁷ is described as follows: “To celebrate Black History Month, children at the Deighton Centre, Huddersfield, made short stop-motion animation films of influential Black role-models, as part of the PBCA workshop – ‘Director for a Day’.” This short animation does not use any of the Pathé footage, but looks at the journey of the Windrush as a means to carve out a discursive space that allows for diversity by opening up the point of identification and integrating local and regional memories (Yorkshire) as well as global sounds (salsa) into the narrative. Since its upload on 18.11.2011 it has reached about 2000 hits. It was uploaded by a user called Barry Skillin, who seems to work with stop-motion animation commissioned by different schools because his other uploads deal with the same subject. Obviously he uses his uploads as part of public relations.

The clip is a mixture of black and white archival photographs as well as color landscape photography, showing both iconic tropical landscapes (beach, palm-trees) and English scenery (Yorkshire) as well as stop-motion animation with plasticine figures. The Deighton Centre is a multi-purpose centre, situated in Huddersfield, West Yorkshire, which might explain the use of landscape photography in which “England” equals the Yorkshire dales. In the intro we see photographic stills of a tropical landscape which we cannot locate exactly, dubbed with Salsa music. The use of salsa, which might be the result of Eurocentrism, indicates that the point obviously has not been to create a notion of authenticity. For instance, the plasticine figures in their hippie outfits look rather like characters from a 1970s Ken Russell film than the well-dressed men in their suits and hats we know from the newsreel footage.

The clip does not use any voice-over commentary. Instead some written text briefly explains the context before we hear children's voices dubbing the figures in an animated sequence with a number of clay figures, using one of the photographs in the background. On the soundtrack we hear a short dialogue sequence: “It’s lovely and warm here.” “Why are we going to England?” “To get a wide education obviously” (spoken in contemporary urban English). The figures disperse. A text insert explains: “The MV Empire is a ship that is an important part of

⁴⁷ <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=MOVuXMMI2kc> (07-11-2013)

multiracialism in the UK.” The cheerful salsa fades out and gives way to a more melancholic music accompanying a sequence of black and white photographs of the Windrush generation. Inserted are animated scenes showing a boat on the sea, a map pointing out the route from the Caribbean to Tilbury. Another text frame explains that the Empire Windrush landed in Tilbury carrying 492 passengers “wishing to start a new life in the UK”. The animated figures (more hippie-style): “It's so cold.” “Hoo!” “Really cold.” “Wish I were back in Jamaica.” The clip ends with a sequence of landscape images showing Yorkshire.

In animating the migrants, they acquire a voice of their own. Their journey is depicted not only on arrival to Britain, but their home countries are shown as attractive locations which rather remind us of iconic holiday images and which therefore nobody would want to leave voluntarily. The text insert shows how embedded the film is in the hegemonic discourse about the Windrush as the foundation myth of multicultural Britain – and as a point of common reference for a diverse group of pupils. For the names of the three young filmmakers listed in the credits - Komal Bains, Jasmin Collins, Usma Javaid - suggest how the Windrush topos is now used in a pedagogy directed at diversity, with the goal to include pupils from various cultural background, both Black British and British Asian alike. The clip is an example how Black History Month, which has been celebrated in Britain since 1987, is a trigger for reworking cultural migrant memory.

An example for televised memory triggered by anniversaries is the YouTube-clip “Sixty years on - the Windrush legacy”, uploaded by BBC Midlands Today, the YouTube channel of the BBC’s regional news programme for the West Midlands, based in Birmingham. The short clip (02:44 min), uploaded on the 23rd of June in 2008, has had over 7000 hits.⁴⁸ The YouTube channel announces it as follows: “It was a momentous moment in history. June the 22nd 1948 saw nearly 500 West Indians arrive for a new life in Britain. Some of the passengers on board the Empire Windrush would settle here in the West Midlands. Sixty years on, Genelle Aldred has been assessing how much life has changed for Black Britons - and what the future may hold.” The reggae music employed in the clip situates the point of audition within Black cultural practice, and, unlike calypso, is set out to include a younger urban audience.

These are just a few examples of the way YouTube is used to rework the cultural memory of migration. As a tendency we can find clips that are the result of anniversaries, of Black History Month, of didactic ambitions. We find televised clips or user-generated material, or clips from television recordings with additional user-generated material. However, we should not only ask what motivated the production of these films or videos, but also what motivated their upload on

⁴⁸ The number of hits refers to the time of writing, that is August 2013. <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ycNTamNIgog> (07-11-2013)

YouTube. Motivations can range from pedagogical / didactic interest to advertising or the wish to share experiences which have hitherto not been acknowledged, such as an outspokenly Christian perspective.⁴⁹ And, of course, all of these reasons might overlap. YouTube provides us with an archive of different versions of cultural memory and allows us, at least partly, to obtain a diachronic view of the most recent changes in the visual archive, especially for the last decade.

Conclusion

As cultural memory studies have hitherto mostly focussed on film as a popular medium (feature films and prime time documentary) this paper has (hopefully) shown that the relation between documentary images and cultural memory needs to be theorized more fully. Two concepts which have proved highly useful are the notions of ‘archive’ and ‘remediation’.

In order to understand the dynamics of remediation, we have to look at a) the mediation/mediatization of memory, its media specificity, its genre, at b) the politics of representation at work, and at c) the industrial context (production, distribution and exhibition).

Remediation seems to be a precondition for images to become part of working cultural memory. Yet, remediation does not occur haphazardly, but is the result of changing discourses which might carve out a space for the articulation of certain memories. The examples analysed in this paper have shown how remediation needs to be examined not only from the perspective of iconography, narrative or genre, but that the discursive context has to be reconsidered as well: a readiness to let these images become part of the visual archive and thus part of cultural memory. One important incentive for remediation can stem from the institutional context defined by political interests which initiate commemorative events. Both a general and political interest in acknowledging and celebrating these commemorative events, which for instance are triggered by anniversaries, can lead to increased funding for documentaries, especially TV productions, and exhibitions, but also for

⁴⁹ An example for the latter would be the clip called “Windrush Legacy” which was uploaded 30.06.2013 and has reached 15 hits by August 2013. It is described as follows: “On 22nd June 1948 the Windrush docked at Tilbury. Now many of those who arrived in that era are in their late 70s + and in the next decade many of them will die taking their history with them. The white British people who saw the Windrush generation arrive are similarly well advanced in years and they too will die and take their history with them. While numerous book and documentaries have been made about the Windrush generation and response of the white British to their arrival, as far as I am aware no visual resource exists documenting the experience of Caribbeans and White British people from a Christian perspective.” The clip shows testimonial witnesses who express the importance of Christian faith in order to endure the hardships of the migrant experience. http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=_JwoT5u5GJI (07-11-2013)

the publication of non-fiction, novels, or the staging of plays. For instance, the institutionalisation of anniversaries usually results in a wider media coverage. The increased production and circulation of film and other media in turn will most likely lead to more remediations which will keep the cultural memory alive.

The second aspect looks at the reworking of colonial/Eurocentric modes of the archive. As this paper has shown, the remediation of archival footage can function as a critical interrogation into the visual archive. The same footage can be used to tie into completely different narratives: from illustrating a threat to the nation to becoming a symbol for celebrating multicultural Britain. For many Black Britons (and others) the footage had another meaning than the one prescribed: despite being employed in racifying discourses, the footage could at the same time be interpreted as an archival trace of Black life in Britain. Reworking the archive can contribute to challenging hegemonic representation, but also to questioning colonial and Eurocentric perspectives. The archive has been translated and reworked in order to fulfil two functions which are interrelated: a) to become part of a national narrative promoting diversity and celebrating Britain as a multi-cultural society, and b) carving out a discursive space for the story and legacy of Black Britain in order to compensate for the absences of images and stories in the archive of Black life in Britain. Critical interrogations into the archive can reflect on the construction of cultural memory: they can create alternative and vernacular memories without lapsing into essentialism – in doing so, they are offering emancipatory potential instead of stabilizing essentialist notions of belonging.

References

- Assmann, A. (2008). Canon and Archive. In: Erll, Astrid and Ansgar Nünning (eds): *Cultural Memory Studies: An International and Interdisciplinary Handbook*. Berlin: de Gruyter, 97-107.
- Assmann, A. (2011). *Cultural memory and Western civilization: functions, media, archives*. 1st English ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press [Orig: Erinnerungsräume]
- Auguiste, R. (2007a). Handsworth Songs: Some Background Notes [1988]. In: Eshun/Sagar 2007, 156-157.
- Bolter, J. D. & Grusin, R. (1999). *Remediation: understanding new media*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press
- Brunow, D. (2011). Deconstructing Essentialism and Revising Historiography: The Function of Metareference in Black British Filmmaking. In: Werner Wolf, ed. in collaboration with Katharina Bantleon and Jeff Thoss: *The Metareferential Turn in Contemporary Arts and Media: Forms, Functions, Attempts at Explanation*. Studies in Intermediality 5. Amsterdam/New York, NY: Rodopi: 341-355.
- Chion, M. (1994). *Audio-Vision*. New York: Columbia University Press

- Dabydeen, D., Gilmore, J. & Jones, C. (eds.) (2007). *The Oxford companion to Black British history*. Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Derrida, J. (1995). *Archive Fever: A Freudian Impression*. Chicago/London: University of Chicago Press
- Erl, A. & Wodjanka S. (Hrsg.) (2008). *Film und kulturelle Erinnerung: Plurimediale Konstellationen*. Berlin/New York: de Gruyter (=MCM 9)
- Erl, A. (2009). Remembering across Time, Space and Cultures: Premediation, Remediation and the "Indian Mutiny". in Erl, A. and Rigney, A. (Eds.), *Mediation, Remediation, and the Dynamics of Cultural Memory*, Berlin/New York: de Gruyter, pp. 109-138.
- Erl, A. & Rigney A. (2009). *Mediation, Remediation, and the Dynamics of Cultural Memory*. Berlin/New York: de Gruyter (=MCM 10)
- Erl, A. (2011a). *Memory in culture*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Erl, Astrid (2011b). Travelling Memory. *Parallax* vol 17, no 4: 4-18.
- Erl, A. & Rigney A. (2009). *Mediation, Remediation, and the Dynamics of Cultural Memory*. Berlin/New York: de Gruyter (=MCM 10)
- Fossati, G. (2009). *From grain to pixel: the archival life of film in transition*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press
- Foucault, M. (1972). *The Archaeology of Knowledge*. London/New York: Routledge
- Garde-Hansen, J. (2011). *Media and memory*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press
- Hall, S. (1991). Reconstruction Work: Images of Post-War Black Settlement. In: Spence, Jo & Patricia Holland. *Family Snaps*. London: Virago, 152-164.
- Hesse, B. (2000). Diasporicity. Black Britain's Post-Colonial Formations. In Hesse, Barnor (ed): *Un/settled multiculturalisms: diasporas, entanglements, "transruptions"*. London: Zed, 96-120.
- Korte, B., Pirker, U. E. (2011): *Black History - White History. Britain's Historical Programme between Windrush and Wilberforce*. Bielefeld: Transcript
- Kuhn, A. (2002). *Family Secrets. Acts of Memory and Imagination*. [1995] New Edition. London/New York: Verso
- Malik, S. (2002). *Representing Black Britain. A History of Black and Asian Images on British Television*. London/Thousand Oaks/Delhi: Sage
- Mead, M. (2007). Empire Windrush: Cultural memory and archival disturbance. *Moveable Type* 3: 112-28.
- Mead, M. (2009). Empire Windrush: The cultural memory of an imaginary arrival. *The Journal of Postcolonial Writing* 45.2: 137-149.
- Phillips, M. & Phillips T. (1998). *Windrush. The Irresistible Rise of Multi-Racial Britain*. London: Harper Collins
- Rigney, A. (2012). *The Afterlives of Walter Scott: Memory on the Move*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Rothberg, M. (2009). *Multidirectional Memory: Remembering the Holocaust in the Age of Decolonization*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

- Schulze-Engler, F. (2008). Introduction. In: Schulze-Engler, Frank and Sissy Helff (eds.): *Cross/Cultures – Readings in the Post/Colonial Literatures in English*, Volume 102: Transcultural English Studies: Theories, Fictions, Realities. Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- Schwarz, B. (2007). The Legacy of Slavery and Emancipation: Jamaica in the Atlantic World. *Proceedings of the Ninth Annual Gilder Lehrman Center International Conference at Yale University*. Online (last access 10-10-2013)
- Shohat, E. & Stam, R. (1994). *Unthinking Eurocentrism: Multiculturalism and the Media*. London/New York: Routledge
- Snickars, P. & Vonderau P. (eds) (2009). *The YouTube Reader*. London: Wallflower Press
- Spence, L. & Navarro V. (2011). *Crafting Truth. Documentary Form and Meaning*. New Brunswick, New Jersey and London: Rutgers University Press
- Sturken, M. (1997). *Tangled memories: the Vietnam War, the AIDS epidemic, and the politics of remembering*. Berkeley, Calif.: University of California Press
- Van Dijck, J. (2007). *Mediated Memories in the Digital Age*. Stanford: Stanford UP
- Welsch, W. (1999). Transculturality – the Puzzling Form of Cultures Today. in: Featherstone, Michael and Scott Lash (eds.): *Spaces of Culture: City, Nation, World*. London: Sage, 194-213.

Forced Transcultural Memory: The Exile and Return of the Bulgarian Turks

Galina Nikolaevna Goncharova

The Story of the ‘Big Excursion’

Despite pronouncing the equality of all citizens within the ‘international proletariat’ regardless of their gender or ethnic group, the Bulgarian communist regime pursued a strong policy of assimilation and discrimination towards the Turk/Muslim minority. From the late 1950s the Bulgarian Communist Party (BCP) planned and took ‘measures for raising the political and cultural level of Bulgarians of Mohammedan faith’ (Gruev and Kalionski, 2008, p. 26). These measures varied from actions against the main elements of the traditional Muslim clothing such as feredje (cloak), yashmak and shalwars to criminalization of the sunnet (circumcision) and campaigns for renaming with Slavonic names. But the most notable and extreme expression of this policy was the so called ‘Revival Process’, which started with massive renaming under the control of the army and police (1984-1985) and finished with expulsion to the ‘homeland’ Turkey (1989).

The first ideological uses of the term ‘Revival Process’ clearly revealed the ‘perverted logic’ and dynamics of the BCP’s propaganda discourse, which transformed the claims for modernization into a project for ethnic assimilation and blended social/socialist engineering utopia with a nationalistic inclination. At a meeting of the first regional committee secretaries of the BCP on 18 January 1985, Georgy Atanasov reported: ‘During the last ten years considerable successes were achieved in reinforcing the unity of the Bulgarian socialist nation and its ethnic homogeneity. In the early 1970s the names of people from Smolyan region and from large parts of Pazardjik and Blagoevgrad regions among others, who are decedents of Bulgarians, forcibly converted to the Mohammedan faith, were restored to their Bulgarian originals. In this way the start of the ‘Revival Process’ was set up – the start of the purification and stabilization of the Bulgarian national consciousness of this population and of its much more active participation in the building up of the socialist society’ (Atanasov, 2003, p. 7).

Very soon the conception of resocialization in ethnic terms, which Atanasov defended, embraced all dimensions of the culture/cultural identity of the minority and was validated by various kinds of documents. In the original definition of Bulgarian historians Gruev and Kalionski the 'revival' was conceived as a real 'cultural revolution' as could be observed in another report from 22 February 1985: 'The revival process, which is running now in the country, is an expression of the deep change in the mentality of the citizens, who revived their Bulgarian names. It shows the depth of the changes in their way of life, customs, culture and traditions..., that have happened during the years of the people's power' (Report 'For Further Unfolding...' 2009, p. 238).

The 'deep changes' didn't occur only on paper. According to official statistics around 850 000 people were renamed with Bulgarian names (Buchsenschutz, 2000, p. 79) They were accompanied by restrictions on performance of religious rituals and prohibition to use Turkish language in public spaces among others. The Turks reacted with individual and collective protests, open demonstrations and revolts, consequently followed by waves of arrests and violence. Local and international organizations raised their voice in defense of the minority rights. The last 'measure' of the Bulgarian communist government was the expulsion to Turkey. On 29 May 1989 the head of the Bulgarian communist state Todor Zhivkov made an official announcement, broadcasted on the national radio and television. He called on the Turkish state to open the border for Bulgarian migrants. Around 360 000 people crossed the border between its opening four days after the announcement and its closing in October. Although the government insisted on the 'voluntary character' of the 'visit' to the 'homeland Turkey', which was reflected in the preposterous term 'big excursion', popularized in the media, what actually happened was a typical example of a forced migration. Those who had been declared 'descendants of Bulgarians' and renamed with Bulgarian names, were now treated as 'fanatics', dangerous for the national security and expected to leave the country for the common good (Gruev and Kalionski, 2008, pp. 185-193). Men and women of all ages, social positions and world views were compelled to desert their homes in one or two days or to sell them at ridiculously low prices. Persecuted and threatened by the local authorities with jail and violence they left behind not only properties and possessions, but also various kinds of relationships, personal achievements and cultural habits. But very soon, more than 150 000 of them returned to Bulgaria to the end of 1990 (Ibid, p. 193), regardless of the suffering they endured in the recent (socialist) past. The rest of them settled in Istanbul, Bursa, Izmir and cities located mainly in Western Turkey. On 11 January 2012 the National assembly of Bulgaria adopted a declaration that 'declare the expulsion of over 360 000 Bulgarian citizens of Turkish origin in 1989 a form of ethnic cleansing, performed by the totalitarian regime'.

What was the individual and collective memory of the ‘Revival Process’? What were the main reasons of the migrants to return and to understand those who remained in Turkey? To what extent did the remembrance of expulsion justify the collective and individual projections of the worthy life of the minority in a local and global context? In searching the answer of these questions the present paper discusses 20 in-depth biographical interviews with Bulgarian Turks, conducted in Bulgaria in 2007-2008⁵⁰. It concerns the specific dynamics of remembering of the leaving and going back home. The interviewees as a whole switched between expressions of suffering under the ‘Revival Process’ and images of a peaceful coexistence of Bulgarian and Turks, between vivid pictures of the hardships on the road to the new life in Turkey and joyful stories about visiting relatives or working abroad (not only in Turkey, but for example in Germany, Belgium and Spain, as well). At the same time they reflected their first encounter with ‘foreign’ reality as a testimony of a split and ‘contested’, but original cultural identity: *In Turkey we are called Bulgarians* (Nevin, Bulgaria); *I’m a person of Turkish origin, but my homeland is Shumen* (Nurten, Bulgaria).

It is precisely this kind of articulations and rationalizations of the experiences during the ‘big excursion’ that led certain Bulgarian and Turkish scholars to apply the notion of ‘transnationality’ in explaining biographical narratives of the migrants. They analyze the territorial attachments and the links between the societies of origin and settlement, considering the positive aspects of being homeless and the place of national(istic) discourses in individual projections of ethnicity. Thus Magdalena Elchinova talked about ‘cultural hybridity’ and a ‘transborder way of life’ as a strategy for social realization (Elchinova, 2012a) and Ayse Parla explored the ‘tensions between the phenomenological experience of dislocation and the discursive formations of nationalism that shape and limit those experiences’ (Parla, 2013, p. 3). Although both researchers relied on oral testimonies and life stories among other sources, only Elchinova highlighted the importance of the work of memory for the development of transnationality/transnational consciousness. In her words she was interested in the self-identification strategies of the stories about the past (Elchinova, 2012b). In a similar way the Bulgarian anthropologists Hicolay Vukov saw the trauma of the expulsion as ‘a main pivot point of the collective memory’, assisting the appearance of self-representations, in which the ‘the community of Bulgarian Turks’ was compared and even merged with the ‘community of migrants’ (Vukov, 2012, p. 40). Going a little bit further I aimed at discussing how the mnemonic experience of repressions on ethnicity and of forced migration at a biographical level played a crucial role in the construction of transcultural identities. The main thesis is that the individual recollections of the

⁵⁰ The interviews were taken under the framework of 2007-2010, MICROCON (‘A Micro Level Analysis of Violent Conflict’), a five-year research programme funded by the European Commission.

traumatic past of the Bulgarian Turks split between the socialist agenda of ‘cultural revolution’ and the current social framework of mobility, cosmopolitanism and free and open labor market. Furthermore, they transformed the negative meanings of the exile into positive knowledge about the contemporary social realities thus strengthening the double consciousness of the minority group and providing a unified/unifying version of what it meant to be a Bulgarian Turk.

In her recent article on the new directions of memory studies Astrid Erll defined the notion of the transnational and transcultural memory in regard to the research interest in ‘the forms of remembering across nation and cultures’ and in ‘negotiation of colonialism, decolonization, migration, cultural globalization and cosmopolitanism in literature and other media’ (Erll, 2011a, p. 2). Sharing the same interest I will try to show how this notion could be applied to the biographical narratives and how the perspective ‘from below’ of the oral history could work for the better understanding not only of the individual, but also of the collective mode of re-membering of and dwelling in different cultures/cultural pasts.

Two Stories of a ‘Conflict Situation’

What did those, who returned to Bulgaria from the ‘second’ homeland Turkey remember most? Were there any essential similarities or differences in their representations of the time spent abroad and in the meanings attached to the encounter with the ‘new’ countrymen? The cases of Zuhtu and Ilknur clearly show the ‘common places’ and routes of memory of forced migration.

Zuhtu is a 63-years old paramedic from Rakovski (a small village in the north-east of Bulgaria). Man of good fortune, married with two daughters at the age of 5 and 7, he was a convinced communist and atheist, respected by his local community for his medical skills when the ‘Revival Process’ caught him. He defined himself as an educated and ‘intelligent’ person. His story lacked any awareness of the forced nature of the ‘big excursion’. He indicated the depopulation of his village and the expected support of the ‘big family of 260 people in Turkey’ as the main reason for leaving the homeland in 1989. The only thing that marked the complicated ethnic situation just before and during the fateful year was the note about the strong wish of his brothers and sisters to move to Turkey.

‘At this time we carried only suitcases, much luggage was not allowed. My sisters and brothers ran here and there, ran through Bulgaria and I was swearing all the time. What can I tell you, suitcases stories. The suitcases...they [i.e. the siblings] also left before me, maybe weeks before me, but finally when I looked around the village – only Gypsies had remained. And when my brothers emigrated and nobody was around I said: ‘Come on, Boyanka [his wife] and took the passports, and was in Istanbul on the 4th of July.’

In contrast to his ‘amnesia’ of the repressive apparatus behind the ‘big excursion’, Zuhtu demonstrated perfect memory of the misfortunes across the border and of the distressing co-existence with the ‘new’ countrymen. The eleven months spent in Turkey he presented as series of miscommunications and mistranslations, which uncovered irreconcilable cultural differences. Thus Zuhtu related the difficulties in understanding local dialects and his reluctance to satisfy the recommendation of some fanatics to make his daughters read the Koran. He also said how the local people wanted to send his wife to a whore house, because of her indecent clothing. Responding to the request to describe the local attitudes towards the Bulgarian Turks, he mentioned the following:

‘Hey, Giaour, Giaour’ [an old Turkish word for non-Muslim with offensive connotation]. My brothers got used to it, because they are not very intelligent, they got used to their approach to us. The local population of Turkey – they are very nasty and insidious. Everybody is trying to screw you...

Ilknur is a 35-old teacher in music from Razgrad (a town in the north-east of Bulgaria), married to a Bulgarian, with one child. She defined herself and her parents as ‘intellectuals’ (the father was a dental mechanic; the mother was a teacher), who gave her nonreligious education and who approved of the communist system.

Ilknur called the ‘Revival Process’ ‘a real nightmare’ and ‘an unbearable sadness’. Already in 1984 her father was ‘mobilized’ as an army reserves soldier and was sent to another city. Five years later the whole family was on the road to Istanbul, under the influence of ‘a mass psychosis’ and ‘an euphoria of freedom’.

Ilknur’s interview is a clear example of an articulation of a traumatic experience. She recalled various details related to the material and physical parameters of the violence over the everyday world with almost mathematical accuracy: crowded banks at eight o’clock in the morning of departure; houses, sold at very low prices; sick old people, lying on suitcases; the right of one family to occupy a spot of only 80 centimeters in the cargo wagons, etc. The pictures of the clash with the foreign/other culture were no less vivid and naturalistic. Ilknur remembered how she took traditional tea, which the Turks drank at any time of the day, for cognac. Similarly she found quite unusual the long queues in front of shops and institutions. The departure from Turkey after a 9-month stay she explained with her father’s pride and honesty. He declined an offer of a rich relative (an owner of a leather factory, with a daughter, studying in England) to give him money for opening a dental technician practice. Lastly, the interviewer’s question for the reasons of departure unfastens emotional and broad comments on the double identity of the Bulgarian Turks:

The treatment of our community in Bulgaria and Turkey will always be connected to a conflict situation, regardless of where you are. We are people who never feel at the right place. First, there we were called Bulgarians. We are Turks in Bulgaria, we are Bulgarians there. Turkey is a special country for us, no other country like it in the whole world. But Bulgaria for us is one more special country and this is an eternal conflict. Things can only be better or worse.

A Culture in Exile

The above presented cases have much in common with each other, such as similar mapping of the social framework of the situation of departure, negative projections of the Turkish cultural order, importance of the family bonds and strong sense of strangeness and uncertainty in the new environment. Both Zuchtü and İlknur did not show any discontent with the communist regime and saw their participation in the ‘big excursion’ more as an unfortunate coincidence, triggered by an unfamiliar vicious power than as a manifestation of the totalitarian rule and as a political/state repression over the minority group they belonged to. The story of ‘revival of Bulgarian origins’ as violence on the century-old family traditions or on the dignity of the community was almost missing in their interviews. Like the other interviews they found difficulties in remembering repressions on the religiosity or on the use of Turkish language in public spaces. They simply talked about ‘nightmares’ and ‘suitcase stories’. Furthermore, Zuchtü pointed out that in his childhood he had a Bulgarian nickname, which he liked very much and that he didn’t find anything wrong to ‘be assimilated’ until the emergence of armed units in his native village. In her account of the ‘Revival Process’, İlknur described herself as being more terrified by the ‘mobilization’ of her father and the crowded trains than by the renaming with Bulgarian name. Although they admitted the injustice of the exile, using one and the same expression ‘It was a great mistake’, a kind of trust in and interiorization of certain ideological constructs (of the regime) could be observed even in their narratives of the unsuccessful adaptation to the reality abroad. Both Zuchtü and İlknur opposed their intellectual background to the specific combination of primitivism, religious prejudices, and material values of Turkish society. İlknur found the mustaches of Turks ‘very funny’. Zuchtü described the Turkish village, he stayed at, as ‘a recreation place, where however the intelligentsia was not welcome’. An unabashed atheist, he refused to give his daughters religious education, promoted by the local community. İlknur confused the tea with cognac, to a great extent, due to the lack of any knowledge about the basic Islamic norms of everyday behavior such as the prohibition of alcohol consumption. Early in the interview she said that just like her father and mother she was not religious. The two interviewees also neglected, although not explicitly, the money and ‘materialism’ of the non-socialist world. İlknur well understood her father for his reluctance to accept the generous offer of the rich relative and Zuchtü was delighted of his ‘villa

like' spacious apartment at the seaside combined with 'incapacity to get used to their customs'.

The lack of serious political or any other explanations and evaluations of the 'Revival Process' was compensated by imagining the happy and untroubled co-existence of Bulgarian and Turks before and after the crucial event. Ilknur didn't remember any tensions between Bulgarians and Turks in school and just like her, her mother and father were surrounded with care and attention by plenty of Bulgarian friends. Zuhtu appreciated very much the custom in his native village priests and hodjas (teachers in Islam) to meet at and to celebrate together the great Christian and Muslim holidays.

The stories of Ilknur and Zuhtu not only share one and the same narrative perspective towards the 'big excursion', they are also quite exemplary for the whole sample of the interviews of those, who returned to Bulgaria. Their memory of the exile was structured by several key complex oppositions, which mark the symbolic borders between the Bulgarian and Turkish societies from the end of 1990s: *religious vs. non-religious, inexplicable repressive behavior of Bulgarian communist state vs. manifestations of hostility by the local Turkish people, material and high standard life vs. intellectual and honest life.*

Another important opposition, which partly appeared in Zuhtu's talk and which was typical of the majority of the interviews, was the *gender division of the access to public spaces vs. freedom of women to express themselves.* There were many stories about the restrictions over some women's activities: they were not supposed to walk alone in the streets, to visit places of resorts, to walk bareheaded (not to wear headscarves) among others. All these impressions of the time spent in Turkey were very often articulated by one and the same figures of speech and were summarized by statements, repeated with a particular persistence by almost every interviewee: 'We are not Turks for them' or 'We were not welcome there'. Furthermore, the constructions and the representations of the contested identity were not bound to a particular gender, social status, professional position or worldviews. The paramedic Zuhtu and the teacher in music Ilknur provided very similar observations and interpretations of the 'otherness' in/of the Turkish society, based on the general contradistinction of the (dis)advantages of the socialist and capitalistic world.

How could the (un)subtle nostalgia for the space and time of the socialist citizenship be explained? Why was an awareness of the repressive character of the renaming and respectively of the communist regime more or less absent in the interviews and why did they lack stories about the restrictions on performing religious rituals while at the same time the 'big excursion' was presented as a highly traumatic event?

In her recent study on the legacy of 'Revival Process' Magdalena Elchinova focused her attention on an interesting discrepancy between the biographical and public

narratives of Bulgarian Turks, dedicated to the crucial event. The first ones tend to ‘forget’ the arrests and persecutions and to focus on the ‘big excursion’ as revealing the potential of the minority to survive in and adapt to extraordinary social/cultural conditions. Contrary to this, the second ones such as for example the statements in the media and at anniversaries of the event portrayed in details the collective martyrdom and victimhood of the inhumane assimilation campaigns of the Bulgarian communist government. Elchinova imputed this contrast between the two types of narratives to the different interest groups and social strategies behind them. If ordinary people aspired to a positive image of the Bulgarian Turk in order to unite the past and present in a nontraumatic way and to (re)confirm the meaningful continuity of the individual and collective life, the intellectuals and public figures of the minority demanded retribution and justice on behalf (of recognition) of certain political and cultural agendas (Elchinova 2012b: 28-29).

Another possible explanation of the interviewee’s reconciling approach to the experienced cultural repression and the nostalgia for the recent socialist past, embedded in the above discussed oppositions, is their deep rootedness in the (inter)national communist propaganda discourse of scientific atheism, equal and multifunctional education and discard of ‘the selfish accumulation of capital’. Furthermore, to a certain extent they could also be seen as a result of the interiorization of the nationalistic socialist prescriptions and standards of life, imposed on the culture of the minority and as a long-term effect of the assimilation policy of the BCP. At the beginning of the regime Bulgarian Turks were a relatively capsulated ethnic group, with low social mobility, low level of education, strong patriarchic attitudes, adhering to the Muslim traditions and religiosity and closed for the challenges of the modern global world. The family and the land were the main social values for the group. In contrast to Roma people they rarely changed the places of living and worked predominantly as farmers and builders. (Buchsenschutz, 2000; Yalamov, 2002). As the interviews clearly showed in the decades after the collapse of the regime Bulgarian Turks preserved their respect to the family and land, kept the Muslim rituals, but without serious concern of their religious contents and without following the basic religious prescriptions such as the restrains of consumption of alcohol and pork meat. They were much more secularized, educated and mobile, divided by possessions of various kinds of economic and social capital.

What happened in-between? The democratic changes in 1989 and the following overall liberalization of the economy and the public life was one of the main factors for the transformation in the Bulgarian Turks’ mentality. Long before that time they were exposed to the efforts of the communist state to turn them into ‘progressive and loyal members of the Bulgarian socialist society’, efforts which were not limited only to forced assimilative measures. The ‘fight with Islam’ (the campaigns against the traditional Muslim clothing and the sunnet) was conducted in parallel with ‘elimination of the illiteracy’ and raising up the level of education of the minority.

In 1950 a ‘Central Action Committee’ for leading the campaign for mass literacy, was created, headed by the Minister of Education K.Dramaliev’ (Gruev and Kalionski, 2008, p. 24). One year later, there was quota admittance for adolescents from Turkish origin to the institutions for secondary and higher education. During 60s special cultural programs for ‘integration’ were developed: literature, dedicated to Turkish folklore was promoted, as well as Turkish-language publications, mixed marriages were encouraged and access to the party structures was expanded. In 1966 the Department of the CC of BCP for the national minorities resumed its work in order to attract the Turkish population to the socialist mass organizations (Marinov, 2010). Those who chose to become party members were given different privileges for education and work.

What the communist state succeeded in with all these efforts was to (re)direct the respect to traditions to the ideal of the modern, emancipated from religious and ethnic prejudices, socialist mode of life. Zuhtu wished ‘to be assimilated’ and felt equally proud as a member of a family of 260 people and as an intellectual, atheist and convinced communist. In the same way, Ilknur felt happy to come back home, remembering that:

Just as they [Roma people] tried to imitate us, we tried to imitate the Bulgarians. This was our goal, this was our desire, that’s why I say that we followed the Bulgarian way. The only thing that separated us – as goals, desires and ideals – were our names...therefore, I don’t think that the act of renaming was a state mistake.

In this biographical context the ‘big excursion’ appeared as a distortion of the half-modern, half-traditional, pro-Bulgarian consciousness, cultivated by the social(ist) engineers. The interviewees were forced to reflect on their double identity, firstly, from the perspective of the unexpected replacement of ‘integration’ with expulsion, and, secondly, from the perspective of the ‘conflict cultural situation’ in Turkey. As a result, the ‘otherness’ of the minority was reconfirmed, but the trust in some socialist values was preserved.

If we return to the above presented analysis of Elhinova one important question comes to the fore in regard to the interplay of the positive and negative images of the socialist past: Could the notion of the cultural trauma be applied to the mnemonic experience of the ‘big excursion’? In his well known theory Jeffrey Alexander emphasized two key characteristics of the phenomena under review – the changing of the collective identity ‘in a fundamental and irrevocable way’ and the mediation of the memory of ‘what happened’ by different agents and ‘carriers groups’ with ‘both ideal and material interests’, who engaged in ‘meaning struggle’ in the media, radio, television, as well as on institutional and organizational level (Alexander, 2004).

In correspondence to Alexander's definition there are two difficulties in interpreting the memory of forced migration of the Bulgarian Turks as a memory of a cultural trauma. Firstly, as the interviews showed the nostalgia for the socialist past prevented the 'irrevocable transformations' of the minority's identity. Secondly, they didn't share one and the same corpus of representations with the public narratives. Furthermore, the interviewees declined to 'mediate' the repressive character of the 'Revival Process' and to provide coherent political evaluations of the 'big excursion'. Much more appropriate in this case is the broad and fluid conception of cultural exile. Although usually referring to the intellectual's or artist's experience of displacement, it puts the stress not on the representative strategies, but on the traumatic feeling of strangeness and living in/with the memory of homeland: 'Exile is predicated on the existence of, love for, and bond with, one's native place: what is true of all exile is not that home and love of home are lost, but that loss is inherent in the very existence of both' (Said, 2000, p. 148).

To paraphrase Eduard Said's words what the interviewees lost were not only their homes, but the positive recognition of their pro-Bulgarian cultural attitudes and models of public behavior, inherited by the communist regime. It is not a coincidence that most of them outlined the offensive meanings of 'Bulgarians' and '*Giaours*' in Turkey. We could even talk about culture in exile. Having gone through repressions for their Turkishness 'at home' and 'not accepted for their Bulgarianness 'abroad', they found the best way to preserve the worthy life of the minority in admitting the contested identity and by transforming the 'otherness' in a kind of virtue and advantage in the global world. Ilknur's conclusion of the 'conflict situation', created by the 'Revival Process' was immediately added like this: '*This ethnic colourfulness brings much good for us, but at the same time this type of connection with others is very fragile and could be easily discontinued*'.

'Return' to the Transnational Family

What prevented the 'ethnic colourfulness' of dissolving among the hardships and challenges of the life in an open and democratic society? If the 'big excursion' assisted the admitting of the ethnic duality in a more or less traumatic way, what exactly happened next when this duality was confronted with the experience of the community in non-totalitarian time and space? Did the interviewees distinguish and oppose 'then' and 'now', between 'forced' and 'voluntary' crossing of national borders?

The interview of Ilknur manifested a very interesting tendency of drawing together the traumatic past and the present life in a global context. The same tendency could be observed in the interview of Shukran, 33 years-old real estate agent from Razgrad . Shukran spent 5 months in Turkey in 1989, but in contrast to Ilknur, who had not

been abroad since the return to Bulgaria, she worked for a year and more in Belgium and had visited France and Germany. Twice in the course of the conversation she switched without any discursive effort or clear logical reasoning from the memories of the ‘big excursion’ to an evaluation of the current transnational experience:

There we remained for five months. We had relatives, they met us, we stayed for five months, then returned to Bulgaria when the things calmed down. We like Bulgaria very much. We’ve seen much of the world - Germany, France, Turkey, Belgium, but Bulgaria we liked the most.

Yes, there were people, who had been living in tents for months, where water was provided by tanks. And these people were compelled to live there, because they didn’t have relatives, till the moment of receiving residence. And the schools were full of people. They had a really hard time, while we had relatives and they had villas and they put us up in the villas until we found rooms and started from scratch. And generally speaking our Bulgarian people seem to always start from scratch, wherever they go. Regardless of their nationality - Bulgarian, Turkish or Gypsy. One goes to Belgium, another to Spain, a third one to the Netherlands and he always starts from the beginning. He comes back, again starts from scratch, then returns from there and so on. ‘

The intertwining and mingling the political with the economic migration, the seen and learned during the exile with the cosmopolitan openness towards new people and places was a characteristic of a representative number of interviews though the given remarks of Shukran elaborated it in the most direct way. Furthermore, the picture of the negative and positives aspects of being Bulgarian Turk remained valid for two different political and cultural contexts. When asked about the attitudes of the Turkish people towards the minority in the late 90s (during the ‘Revival Process’), the 34-old Mucho from Razgrad started to comment on the present situation:

Interviewer: How did they receive you in Turkey?

Mucho: We are not very welcome in Turkey. They think we are Bulgarian.

Just like Shukran Mucho continued the comment with a story about his sister, who had got married in Istanbul and had lived there happily for five years, but then she returned to Bulgaria, because she couldn’t adapt to the citizen’s ‘mentality’.

The easy shifting from retrospections of the hardships in the new homeland to the challenges of mobility and the merging of the meanings of the exile with the meanings of transnationality/transculturality became possible not only through (un)conscious reversals of the classification/label ‘Bulgarian Turks’, but also by revalidation of the kinship bonds on two different levels of remembrance. The first level was connected to a recollection of examples of the strength of these bonds and

the second one – to the retelling of (un)successful abroad life stories⁵¹. Thus Shukran's account the relatives made the stay of the expelled less painful and 'our people' succeeded to survive and develop in various national contexts. In the same way, the other interviewees talked enthusiastically about the family support during the exile in combination with listing lucky marriages, highly paid jobs and education of relatives in prestigious universities in Europe among others. They felt obliged in one sense or another to 'remember' the transnational adventures of the minority regardless of their personal travelling experience. Ilknur was strongly impressed of the relative's daughter, studying in England. Nurten, director of a cultural club in Shumen noted: '*Our emigrants were called Giaours*'. The 64-old teacher Ismail went into details about the culture of the immigrants in Avjalar and their attempt to preserve 'the elements of the Bulgarian everyday routine'. In this way a kind of imagined transnational community of story-tellers was created, which (re)produced a metanarrative of an extended, transborder and cohesive family of the Bulgarian Turks, where everybody could 'return' and feel home regardless of the occupied social position or concrete place of living. These peculiar networks of memory stabilized the collective cultural identity and transformed the traumatic contents of the 'big excursion' in a basis for a deeper understanding of the positive and negative aspects of the migrants' life-course. With its function to transmit cultural knowledge/knowledge of different cultures they are very similar to the 'travelling memories' of Astrid Erll (2011b) or the 'transnational family' of Anne Heimo⁵² with one important difference. They did not weaken, but rather strengthen the images of the ethnicity and nationality.

The studies of forced migration pointed out the consolidation of the repressed ethnic group either as a reintegration in the society of origin or as an isolation/capsulation through various kinds of representations and negotiations of traumatic pasts. The case of the 'Revival Process' entirely fits into such a conception. It was debated by various political parties, represented in movies and TV broadcasting and was thoroughly examined by Bulgarian and Turkish scholars. But what remains hidden under the official/public consideration is the uncontrolled and intensive exchange of the mnemonic experience of the crucial event between the members of the Bulgarian Turks minority by the assistance of family/kinship networks. In this exchange the socialist past is connected to the democratic and cosmopolitan present and the exile is projected as a cultural destiny and a basic structure of the collective identity. The memory of 'big excursion' not only played the role of 'generator of biographies' (Karamelska, 2013), but also helped the minority to continue to be traditional in a modern, global and transcultural way.

⁵¹ Elchinova also discussed the representations of the exile as "success stories" (Elchinova 2012b: 25).

⁵² See Heimo, A. Digital Memories of Migration, working paper.

References

- Alexander, J. (2004). Toward a Theory of Cultural Trauma. In Alexander et al. (eds.) *The Trauma of Social Change. Cultural Trauma and Collective Identity*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Atanasov, G. (2003). Doklad [Report]. In *Istinata za 'vazroditelnia proces' . Documenti ot archiva na Politburo na CK na BKP* [The Truth for the 'Revival Process'. Documents from the Archive of Politburo of CC of BSP], Sofia: Institute for Study of the Integration.
- Buchsenschutz, U. (2000). Malcinstvenata politika v Balgaria. Politikata na BKP kam evrei, romi, pomaci i turci [Minority Politics in Bulgaria. The Policy of BCP towards Jews, Roma, Pomaks and Turks], Sofia: MCPMKB.
- Gruev, M. A. Kalionski. (2008). *Vazroditelniat proces. Musulmanskite obshtnosti I komunisticheskiat regim* [The 'Revival Process'. Muslim Communities and the Communist Regime], 7-21, Sofia: Ciela.
- Doklad (2009). 'Za po-nanatastshoto razgrastane na rabotata za ukrepvane na balgarskoto socialisticheskoto saznanie ha nashite sagrazhdani, koito vazstanoviha balgarskite si imena [Report 'For Further Enfolding of Work for Strengthening of Bulgarian Socialist Consciousness of Our Citizens, Who Restored Their Bulgarian Names']. In *Vazroditelniat proces: balgarskata darzhava i balgarskite turci (sredata na 30-te – nachaloto na 90-te godini na XX vek)* [The 'Revival Process': Bulgarian State and Bulgarian Turks (Mid 30s to the Beginning of the 90s of the XXth Century)], 238-239, Sofia: Archives State Agency.
- Elchinova, M. (2012a). Borders and Categorization: on the Case of the Bulgarian-Born Turks, Re-Settlers in Turkey since 1989. *Sociological problems*, 1-2: 131-151.
- Erl. A. (2011a). Traumatic Pasts, Literary Afterlives, and Transcultural Memory; New Directions of Literary and Media Memory Studies. *Journal of Aesthetics and Culture*, 3, 1-5.
- Erl. A. (2011b). Travelling Memory, *Parallax*, 17:4, 4-18.
- Elchinova, M. (2012b). Preosmisliane na vsekidnevnia opit vav vsekidnevните diskursi: narativite za izselvaneto na balgarskite turci v Turcia v perespitivata na vremeto [The Reconsideration of the Everyday Experience in the Everyday Discourses: Narratives on Migration of Bulgarian Turks in Turkey in Time Perspective], In Ganeva-Raycheva, V. and all. (eds.) 2012. *Migracii ot dвете strain na balgaro-turskata granica: nasledstva, identichnosti i interculturalni vzaimodeistvia* [Migrations on the Both Sides of Bulgarian-Turkish Border: Legacies, Identities, Intercultural Interactions], 21-30, Sofia: IEFEM-BAN
- Parla, A. (2013). *Locating the Homeland: Bulgarian Turkish 'Return' Migration in Transnational Perspective*, <http://www.sant.ox.ac.uk/esc/esc-lectures/parla.pdf>. accessed 12 October 2013
- Said, E. (2000). Reflection on Exile. In *Reflections on Exile and Other Essays*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press

- Karamelska, T. (2013). Traektorii na stradaniето: 'Vazroditenia process' v biografichnite narativi na Bulgarskite Turci [Trajectories of Suffering: the 'Revival Process' in the Biographical Narratives of Bulgarian Turks], under print.
- Marinov, Ch. *Vazroditelniat proces i goliamata exkurzia* [The 'Revival Process' and the 'Big Excursion' (1984-1989)], <http://bulgaria1989.wordpress.com/2010/02/12> accessed 12 October 2013.
- Vukov, N. (2012). Izseltvania, pamet i vazpomenateni zavrashantania. Otbeliazvaneto na vazroditelnia process i politikite na pametta'Migrations [Memory and Commemoration Returns. The Commemoration of the 'Revival Process' and the Politics of Memory], In Ganeva-Raycheva, V. and all. (eds.) 2012. *Migracii ot dvete strani...*, 31-40, Sofia: IEFEM-BAN.
- Yalamov, I. (2002). *Istoria na turskata obstnost v Balgaria* [History of Turkish Community in Bulgaria], Sofia: Ilinda-Evtimov.

Population Uprooting after WWI and Politics of Memory. Expatriates from the Ottoman Empire to Greece in the Course of the 20th Century

Emilia Salvanou

Introduction

As the end of the Great War approached and immediately after the Armistice of 1918 Europe faced the largest population movement in its contemporary history. It was the result of the total reorganization of the world from an imperial to a national order, resulting in the transformation of inhabitants to citizens, refugees and minorities. While such movements were protracted as a rational solution for the optimized function of the newly formed nation states, they were in their majority experienced traumatically (Brubaker, 1995, pp 189-218). In most cases, the lens through which they are looked back to as exceptional was shaped by this traumatic experiencing. For example, Asia Minor Catastrophe and the exchange of populations is today a mnemonic topos for Greek national consciousness. Its traumatic character has elevated it through continuous resignifications to a core element of the national identity (Liakos, 2011). However, it has not always been this way. Its signification as field of memory is in need of historicisation itself.

The aim of this paper is to focus on the case of expatriates from the Ottoman Empire to Greece during the Interwar and discuss the ways they shaped and negotiated their memories in the course of the following decades so as to be included in the national narrative. In other words, to discuss the ways through which the experience was gradually nationalized and transformed into a national cultural trauma. Its main argument is that such a transformation was not a result of a linear process: it rather required the combination of multiple ways of dealing with the past and various agents to become involved, in different historical contexts. It was a slow multifocal process, within which different communities negotiated their experiences and

memories in order to come to terms with what had happened and gain the ability to imagine a prospected future. However, if the past was to be renegotiated for the future's sake, especially a past so traumatically and emotionally loaded, historiography was not the only way to do so. Historical practices, literature, commemoration and memory are only some of the additional ways used to relate with the past that played a crucial role to the transformation of 1922 to a national lieu du memoir (Reckwitz, 2011). Furthermore, it wishes to argue that memory was not always looking towards the same direction. After it was nationalized and included to the dominant discourse, it became politicized and turned towards the past instead of the future in an attempt to address the past in an ethical context of moral justification.

Memory, nostalgia and the politics of memory

Memory is central in contemporary historical discourse. Moreover, history and memory are already in a dialogical relationship since the Interwar, when the experience of the Great War and the dramatic change inflicted on everyday life because of industrialization and urbanization facilitated interest in memory: memory was a prerequisite for the present; it shaped the modern nation. At the same time, though, it longed for pre-modernity that was no longer there. This was the frame within which Halbwachs argued for the collectiveness and presentism of memory. He additionally argued that although both memory and history deal with the past, they differ in a very notable manner, since history holds the past discernible from the present, while memory functions in the opposite direction-that is- by keeping the past alive and contextualized in the present (Halbwachs, 1992). In the same direction, Assman discerns between communicative and cultural memory. By communicative memory he refers to the memory that is transmitted through the generations, while by cultural memory he refers to a more distanced past, which is transmitted through institutions, monuments and rituals (Assmann, 1989). In the same vein, Connerton underlines that memory is embodied and transmitted through participation in commemorative ceremonies (Connerton, 1989).

It was Nora though who inducted the nation into the debates on memory. Nora expanded the existing scholarship on collective memory, which referred mostly to communities that held in-between places between the individual and the nation, in order to elaborate on national memory. He argued that, although it is not possible to speak about a homogenous national memory, the collective memories of such communities that is articulated and transformed into a national memory, through the intervention of the "lieux de mémoire". Sites of memory in this sense replace experienced communities and create, through rituals, a sense of community and co-belonging to the national imaginary. They, thus, serve the purpose of restoring the link between the past, present and future (Nora, 1984).

Gradually, interest in memory studies shifted from the result to the agents and the process. Hobsbawm and Ranger argued that national commemorations and rituals are practices that not only commemorate, but also construct and diffuse national traditions, serving as connection joints for the national memory (Hobsbawm, Ranger, 1983). Jay Winter moves the discussion further on, focusing not only on the practices of the state, but on those of the agents, too, that shape and signify the narrative and the performative commemoration (Winter, 2010). Ann Rigney (2008), on the other hand, argues that more than the memory of what “really happened”, it is the narrative of what happened that forms collective memory. For similar issues, Marianna Hirsh (1997) introduces the notion of post-memory, referring to memories that do not relate to events experienced by the subjects, neither to ones they are only connected to through cultural memory, but to events they have emotionally invested to, through the experiences that were transmitted to them by the previous generations. Thus, agents emerge as central for the formation of the memory – as it is through them that narratives are diffused and resignified as performances. Focusing on the materiality of the interactions between agents and performances could lead to a broadening of the current understanding of history, focusing not on its meaning and the way it represents the past, but on the way, it functions and creates spaces for becoming (Gallant, 2012; Salvanou, 2013). This kind of materiality refers to the way agents act according to their discursive and practical consciousness, both of which are culturally constructed, and resignify the signifiers through repetition (Salvanou, 2012; Bevernage, 2009).

Connected to the discussion on memory is that on nostalgia. Initially, at the late 19th and early 20th century, nostalgia was perceived through medical terms. Gradually, though, in the post war decades and especially during the 1980’s, nostalgia obtained cultural connotations. It was related to acceleration of historical time in late modernity and the fear of which identity would be lost. Nostalgia is thus directly linked to progress, perceived as its inevitable consequence. The necessary condition of its appearance is the simultaneous disappointment with the present and the realization that the past is definitively gone. According to Shaw and Chase, in such conditions, nostalgia functions as an invented tradition and restores the disrupted community ties (Shaw, Chase, 1989). Thus, nostalgia is written in a future past, but invents, in a present past, narratives of an anticipated future. In this framework, in terms of traumatic experiences, memory became nostalgic not for the experienced past, but for the cancelled potentials of that past.

A new wave of studies on nostalgia emerged after the Velvet Revolution and the collapse of the Communist regime. Svetlana Boym distinguishes between two types of nostalgia, which although they use more or less similar symbols, result in different types of narratives. (Boym, 2001). Restorative nostalgia sanctifies the past and aims to retain it unaltered. It is the kind of nostalgia that is usually related to the national past. Reflective nostalgia on the other hand is connected to an attempt to

re-examine the past and usually affects individual and collective memory. When the issue combines both temporal and spatial distance, it is usually restorative nostalgia to which the subjects turn in order to alleviate the pain of the trauma. In such cases, restorative nostalgia combines “cultural intimacy” with the need to make sense of the traumatic experience of the destruction of traditional ties and communities. It then creates “invented traditions”, which transcends the limits of preexisting national and ethnic restrictions (Boym, 2001, pp 42-43). At the basis of modern nostalgia it is the difficulty to accept change in historical time, in other words to accept linear, abstract time (instead of experienced time) as a measure of human life. Although such change may be understood, the human gaze is looking backwards (Shaw and Chase, 1989, p. 7).

“Looking backwards” and creating modern nostalgias is not unrelated to wider shifts in historical consciousness – i.e. in the way we make sense of the past and relate it to our present⁵³ In contemporary historical discourse, the quest for memory, in the form of heritage or debt towards the dead, has defined not only historical culture, but historical consciousness as well: cultural memory is regarded as the most genuine path towards identification. It has not always been this way though. In the course of history, memory and oblivion were both regarded as imperative. Depending on the context of the present, the need to forget was equally important to that of remembrance, and it was not rare that forgetting the past was the preferable choice in order to keep things going on as late as the 1970’s (Bevernage, 2009, p. 11-13). It was only the major changes that gradually culminated during the post-war era and so made the future unpredictable. The temporal continuity of historical consciousness was thus broken and the anticipation of the future (that made history meaningful) was substituted for the exploration of the past, in the quest of gaining meaning through tracing identity and continuity (Nora, 2002). Furthermore, the shadow of World War II and the Holocaust formed the conditions for re-contextualizing the discourse on trauma from psychoanalysis to history. It was the collective trauma of the western world that was invoked by the horrifying result of the process of rationalization. Thus, memory was connected to the trauma of utopias turned into dystopias and of chances lost and paths unfollowed. During the 1980’s, memory found its way to the political discourse and was then connected not only to identity, but to justice as well. Memory took the form of recognition of past damages, which was thought to redeem communities of the burden of their past (Liakos, 2011, 360-375).

⁵³ On historical consciousness: Rösen, 2006

Historical background

Since the dawn of the 20th century, there has been increased mobility among populations of the Ottoman Empire. From the Balkans to Anatolia, the prospective of the Empire's collapse formed the conditions for ongoing wars between emerging nationalisms and a consequent movement of the populations, as the rule of their territories changed. However, such uprooting usually proved to be temporary and the groups affected returned to their homelands when circumstances changed. The Ilinden uprooting of 1903 was the starting point of a war adventure that affected all the nationalisms of the region and lasted until the end of the Greek-Turkish war and the Lausanne Treaty (1923) that determined the process of population exchange and the status of minorities. The Macedonian struggle, the Balkan wars, World War I and the following expenditure of the Greek Army at Asia Minor were the knot points of a period of clashes that lasted over a decade and reshaped the territorial organization of the Balkans and Anatolia. Favoring the prospect of national homogeneity and prosperity, massive uprooting of populations took place. Approaching and shortly after the end of the war, though, such uprooting became mandatory: its conditions was determined by Treaties, it was regularized and the population affected obtained the status of refugees and minorities. For the case of Greece, the knob point for the uprooting of populations from the Ottoman Empire and their fleeing to Greece as refugees was the defeat of the Army at Anatolia at 1922 and the signing of the Lausanne Treaty. Ottoman subjects of orthodox religion followed the army's retreat at 1922, terrified of the prospect of revenge by the kemalist troops, while the remaining of the orthodox communities were officially exchanged with the Muslims of Greece according to the terms of the Treaty.⁵⁴

Refugees from the Ottoman Empire were far from being a homogenous group. They were divided by cultural, economic and social differences, differences that derived from the part of the Empire they were settled, the networks they participated in and the way they had come in touch with the nationalization process during the last decades. Additionally, they conceptualized their collectivity according to their local communities rather than in a more abstract way, making difficult the development of symbolically constructed community. Lastly, the way they had experienced expatriation in the different communities of Asia Minor and the Balkans differed so drastically, that it defined the memory of the whole experience.⁵⁵ Moving between the state of having fled from a city in flames to the state of having crossed the river Evros that was the border between Turkey and Greece carrying along the household

⁵⁴ On forced migration as an aspect of the unmaking of the Ottoman Empire: Loizos, 1999

⁵⁵ Such differences are evocatively described in the 3 volume collection of refugees' oral stories: *I Exodos*, Centre of Asia Minor Studies (1980, 1982, 2013) (in Greek)

belongings and staying there in order to cross the river again in the opposite direction when the situation was favorable, the way the uprooting was materialized shaped the experience and its memory as a whole.

However, the defeat of 1922 was traumatic for the Greek state as well. In its case, the trauma did not refer to the uprooting of the orthodox ottoman communities. The term “Catastrophe” was coined to define the military defeat at Asia Minor. The defeat was experienced as a disaster because it had put an end to the national aspirations (even if illusionary) for the reconstitution of an Empire. At the core of the national ideology for over a century was the Great Idea, which defined the policies undertook by the Greek state and conceptualized the nation’s biography in terms of space and time. The prospected reconstitution the Greek-Byzantine Empire would restore the unity between past-present and a future of redemption. Under this scope, the army’s defeat at Asia Minor more than being an economic, political and military disaster generated a serious crisis in the way the nation identified itself and therefore, imposed the need to revisit the symbolic construction of the national community (Gazi, 2005).

The interwar years and future orientated memory

Shortly after their settlement at Greece refugees realized that, although they were granted with citizenship, they were actually excluded from the national imaginary; they were discriminated and alienated (Giannuli, 1995). The state did not take the responsibility to include the newcomers neither to the national imaginary nor to its narrative. Their story was absent from the school curriculum and a cohesive narrative about what had happened to them was lacking (Koulouri, 2002). Official narratives addressed only the military defeat at Anatolia and totally left out the refugees’ experience. Their arrival to Greece had transformed them to people with no past, people whose identity could be condensed in their present condition of refugee-hood.⁵⁶ Making their past visible, though, was imperative for the refugees. It was not a matter of working through their traumatic experience of dislocation. It concerned their future lives as part of the national imaginary. In a way that resembled a pattern, the Greek state incorporated the territories it gradually obtained by re-narrating the regional histories and re-signifying the symbols into a national manner (Liakos, 2008; Peckham, 2000). This said, if the refugees planned to change their situation of alienation and make for themselves space into the national imaginary, they had to find a way to fit into the mosaic of the nation. In other words,

⁵⁶ See Malkki 1995, p. 518: *People who are refugees can also find themselves quite quickly rising to a floating world either beyond or above politics, and beyond or above history – a world in which they are simply “victims”. [...] It is this floating world without the gravities of history and politics that can ultimately become a deeply dehumanizing environment for refugees, even as it shelters*

they had to nationalize their narration of the past and align it with the rest of the regional stories. However, the refugees did not have a region to nationalize. How could the above-mentioned goal be achieved then? How would fragmented memories of individuals and communities be transformed into a collective memory with regional reference?

Shortly after the refugees' settlement in Greece, intellectuals originating from the regions refugees had fled – still already securely settled in Greece since some years and enjoying a high symbolic status in the state's institutions - took the initiative to found associations based on the regional origin of the refugees'. The regional division was established according to the ancient Greek regions of Anatolia, serving this way as a reminder of the connection between ancient history and the present and underling, in an aptly way, the hellenicity of the refugees. The front stage task that developed around the associations was facilitating the emergence of communities of memory. Regular meetings concerning the association and negotiation of experiences to make sense of them were central into transforming a group of people -which did not up to then acknowledge belonging to regional collectivity- into a community of memory. A number of initiatives, which was undertaken by the association, cultivated the sense of community. Obituaries, scholarships attributed to refugee pupils in economic need and grants to ensure the dowry of young ladies at the age of marriage, networks of scholars collecting materials and memories useful to construct a narrative of the past, were practices that strengthened the bonds among refugees originating from the same region and constructed the imagined community based on ethnic and regional origin (Salvanou, 2012).

The main practice though connected with the associations was the issue of journals, through which they renegotiated and nationally diffused a narrative on their regional past. Their project aimed to the practical past, to which refugees maintained an affective relation and to which they backdated in order to make sense of their present (White, 2010). However, the practical past is embodied and experienced: it consists not only from written history, but also from a series of practices that make history writing possible. The journals as practices were important not only because of their content but merely because of the materiality of their functioning. Regardless the result, the practices involved in publishing a journal, in the processes of their repetition form networks and contribute to the emergence of the subjectivities of the participants. In addition, the emergence of such a subjectivity was crucial for their future in a national context. Already from the first issues, the journals' orientation towards the practical past was clearly stated (Magriotis, 1928):

In this journal shall be trusted everything that is connected, directly or indirectly, with the life and the appearance of Thrace – written or oral, history, monumental, linguistic, tradition, custom. Every aspect of the natural, national, social, patriotic, handicraft, art or any else life of the Thracians will be part of this periodical, reflecting in this way the past and the present of the Thracian intelligentsia. And all of this aiming to help a future scientist to use this rich material in order to write a general history of Thrace from its historical appearance until today

The nationalization of the past was the path that should be followed for their prospected future. Aspects from the distant and the most recent past of the refugees' homelands were re-narrated in a way that made them fall into the national canon. During the Interwar, the past was not a cause for self-victimization. It was rather the backbone for planning the future.

The Post-war decades: Testimonies, nostalgia and politicization of memory

Through the experience of the Second World War, the Resistance and the Civil War interwar divisions between refugees and locals were overcome, giving their place to new ones, based on political ideology and defining national inclusion. On the other hand, the emergence of testimony as a central category for approaching the historical experience did not leave the way refugees negotiated their past unaffected. Already at 1948, after many adventures, the Centre of Asia Minor Studies (CAMS) was founded at Athens. The Centre's prehistory goes back to the Interwar, when the director, Melpo Merlie Logotheti, collaborating with the University of Paris, undertook the task to collect and record the refugees' music tradition. The Center's work radically transformed the way refugee history was written. It was based on grassroots approach and orality. That is to say, that on the one hand for the first time voice was given to ordinary refugees, their memories were valued, and on the other hand, that orality (and memory) claimed their place not as supplementary, but as alternative approaches to the past (Papailias, 2005; Yannakopoulos, 1993). The CAMS did not only enrich the field of refugee studies with new materials, but it transformed the way it was perceived. Collecting and recording the cultural characteristics of the refugees was the catalytic that transformed refugees and their memory to a collective subject.

The decade of 1960 coincided with the commemoration of the 40 years after the Asia Minor Catastrophe. Unlike earlier commemorations, this one was given much more space and visibility in the public discourse. In an environment of dominant anti-communism, the Left was left with few choices to disseminate its ideas apart from cultural production. Moreover, the discourse on 1922 was under considerably less restrictions compared to other events of contemporary history that were

considered milestones. Additionally, the government was uneasy about the commemoration, given that it wanted to smooth the tension between Turkey and Greece, because of the Zurich Treaty. In this context, the 1962 commemoration of the Asia Minor Catastrophe was marked by cultural production by the Left, which re-established the basis of the relevant narrative. Novels written for the occasion of this commemoration underline the use of memory and orality as crucial for understanding the authenticity of the experience. Novels such as D. Sotiriou, *Farewell Anatolia* and Kosmas Politis, *Stou Hatzifragkou* are indicative of the shift being accomplished. The narrative that these novels propose questioned the dominant nationalistic narrative and suggested that the different ethnicities coexisted peacefully in the Ottoman Empire and that the involvement of the Great Powers was a decisive factor for the developments in the region (Nikolopoulou, 2007).

Developments from the 1970s onward have resulted in a breaking up of the field of studies on Asia Minor Catastrophe. On the one hand, a strand developed in the framework of the academy and the series of turns that occurred in historiography. A different strand, based on the politicization of memory, developed mostly within the refugee associations and by historians who are in some way connected to such associations. In the remaining of this paper I will briefly refer to these new strands, keeping in mind that it seems that neither has completed its development yet.

The first strand, that cultivated in the academy, has been heavily influenced by the social turn in historiography and then by the cultural turn and the memory turn – recently by the performative turn as well. Scholars became interested in refugees not as a group in need for the state's intervention for their rehabilitation, but as an agent that interplayed in the shaping of the social condition. It was not the refugees compared to the indigenous, but the social identity of the refugees that now was becoming visible. Cultural and memory turn have proved turning points for the historiography of refugees. Apparently affected by methodologies of cultural anthropology, studies now focus on the subjectivity of the refugees and reveal the multi-levelness of their identity. Comparative approaches of the Turkish and Greek experience undertaken the recent years contribute to the formation of the study of the Asia Minor exchange as an autonomous historiographic field of the South-eastern contemporary history.

The second strand relies heavily on the politicization of memory. It was somewhere at the end of the 1960's when the refugees' mnemonic narrative became nostalgic. The first generation was gradually getting old and was thus looking back to the experience of expatriation as a part of their life-cycle, a part of their youth. The social and political situation had changed as well and the post war era imposed new kind of problems for the future and new kind of discriminations among the population that washed away previous ones against the refugees. Thus, the refugees'

nostalgia was reflexive: emotion and intimacy about a utopian past replaced accounts on the multi-faceted conditions at the Greek-orthodox communities at the Ottoman Empire.⁵⁷ On the other hand, the associations were renewed by new members, the refugees' offspring, who were gradually joining in. They had not experienced the past, which the mnemonic narrative was referring to, but it was for them an isle of intimacy: they had grown up in refugee neighborhoods, where narrations about the life in the "lost homelands" and the expatriation ensured the passing on of memory (and identity). Gradually, these neighborhoods were withering, as economic development linked to the post-war decades and expansion of the cities with the simultaneous construction of block of flats led more and more families to leave the neighborhood for a modern dwelling. Thus, the disappearance of the frame that ensured a trans-generational passing over of the memory, called in the need of its cultivation – this time, though, as part of a cultural identity, or rather as heritage (Nora, 2002).

It was the broader culture of trauma that passed from psychoanalysis to cultural studies, which soon politicized the refugees' mnemonic narratives of expatriation (Liakos, 2007; LaCapra, 2001). During this period, refugee associations accused the state of having downgraded their grandparents' traumatic experience and of not having recognized their suffering to the proper extent. They claimed that their sufferings and expatriation should be recognized as a genocide, the spearhead of which was what had happened to the Pontiacs and comprised the other Anatolian Greeks as well. At this point, it was not the future that dictated avocation with the past, but an ethical quest of justice. Things climaxed further with the emergence of a new narrative on expatriation, aiming at replacing "Catastrophe" with "Genocide". Pontiacs and Anatolian Greeks in general were considered to be native in the region from the remote past, against which a genocide took place by the Ottoman Empire and the Young Turks. This narrative claimed its recognition from the Greek state, which in its turn established 14th September as the day dedicated to the memory of the Catastrophe, while at 1992 clergy that martyred during the last years of the Greek-ottoman communities were canonized. Two years later, both Pontiac and Asia Minor expatriation were declared genocides by the Greek parliament. According to speeches delivered in the Parliament, the Greek state ought to get over syndromes of the past and admit the historical truth: it should do justice to the refugees by recognizing their genocide (Exertzoglou, 2011).

From the above it is clear that the focus on memory cultivation after the 1980's was different from that during the Interwar. Contemporary memory was not future orientated: it aimed to "do justice" to the sufferings the ancestors underwent, and that could only be done through their victimization: a victimization that ought to be institutionalized, through practice (public rituals) and writing (inclusion in the

⁵⁷ On reflexive nostalgia: Boym, 2011.

history text books). This victimized version of the refugee narrative was not only included, but also became core to the national identity – and part of the historical culture of modern Greece. It was clear on the occasion of the memory war that outburst because of the 6th grade elementary textbook at 2006 and more recently in the reactions against a discussion concerning the anti-racist law at the Parliament, which at the same time banned negation of recognized genocides.⁵⁸

Conclusion

What this paper hoped to show is that memory cannot be understood if not contextualized to the politics that define its emergence. The mnemonic narrative constructed during the Interwar was heavily defined by its orientation towards the refugee's national inclusion. It was not a memory that wished to do justice to the expatriates' experience, but to form their future in a viable manner. On the other hand, constructed as it was, it was this narrative that shaped the post-memory of the generations that followed. In their turn, living in a chronotope in which historicity is understood in new ways and the past is praised as such, they radicalized and politicized this narrative, in a quest to rectify the sufferings and save the past.⁵⁹ On the other hand, though, the institutionalization of a radicalized narrative that is thought to do justice to a past that is determined a posteriori by a discourse of trauma might have a significantly negative impact in current international politics. Consequently, a question that would then emerge is which is the past that ought to be saved and under what conditions. Is it the Interwar's cohesive nationalized past, is it the 1970's nostalgic past, or is it the polemic past of the 1990's? There is no easy answer to the question, as each of these pasts relates to different needs of the subjects that constructed it. Anticipating a future, looking for roots in a cultural identity or feeling duty towards the dead, are all legitimized relations to temporality. There is no "real" past either, as it is in the bottom-line a matter of how an experience or a memory is subjectified – in memory it is the meaning of the past that matters. What is important to keep though is the way these different versions of the past remain in dynamic tension with the politics that produced them. In other words, even if mnemonic narratives are important exactly because of the subjectivity they carry with them, it is important to contextualize them in wider frameworks, such as historical consciousness, in order to be able to evaluate the trends that formed their politics and therefore the impact they could possibly have.

⁵⁸ On the elementary textbook history-war: Liakos, 2008.

⁵⁹ For the notion of chronotope: Bachtin, 1981; White, 1987.

References

- Assmann, J. (2008) Communicative and Cultural Memory. In *Cultural Memory Studies. An International and Interdisciplinary Handbook* edited by Astrid Erll and Ansgar Nünning, 109-18. Berlin, New York: Walter de Gruyter
- Bachtin, M. (1981) Forms of Time and of the Chronotope in the Novel: Notes toward a Historical Poetics. In *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays*, 84-258. Austin: University of Texas Press
- Bevernage, B. (2009) *We Victims and Survivors Declare the Past to Be in the Present': Time, Historical (in)Justice and the Irrevocable*. University of Ghent
- Boym, S. (2001) *The Future of Nostalgia*. New York: Basic
- Brubaker, R. (1995) Aftermaths of Empire and the Unmixing of Peoples: Historical and Comparative Perspectives." *Ethnic and racial studies* 18, no. 2, 189-218.
- Connerton, Paul. (1989) *How Societies Remember*. Cambridge University Press
- Exertzoglou, H. (2011) I istoria tis Prosfygikis Mnimis In *To 1922 kai oi Prosfyges. Mia nea Matia*, edited by Αντώνης Λιάκος, 191-201. Athens: Nefeli. [The history of the refugee memory in 1922 and the Refugees] (in Greek)
- Gallant, T. (2012) Long Time Coming, Long Time Gone: The Past, Present and Future of Social History. *Historiein* 12: 9-20.
- Gazi, E. (2005) Farewell Asia Minor. Writing and Telling the History of the Anatolia War (1919-2). In *University of Athens, York University (Toronto): Constructions of Mediterranean Nostalgia*. Athens.
- Giannuli, D. (1995) Greeks or "Strangers at Home": The Experiences of Ottoman Greek Refugees During Their Exodus to Greece, 1922–1923. *Journal of Modern Greek Studies* 13, no. 2 (1995): 271-87.
- Halbwachs, M. (1992) *On Collective Memory*. University of Chicago Press
- Hirsch, M. (1997) *Family Frames: Photography, Narrative, and Postmemory*. Harvard University Press.
- Hobsbawm, E.J., and T.O. (1983) Ranger. *The Invention of Tradition*. Cambridge Univ. Press
- Koulouri, C. (2002) «Katastrofi», «Ekstrateia» kai «Polemos» sto Sxoleio, *To Vima*. [Catastrophe, expenditure and war at School] (in Greek)
- LaCapra, D. (2001) *Writing History, Writing Trauma*. Johns Hopkins Univ Press
- Liakos, A. (2007) *Pos to Parlthon ginetai Istoría*. Athens: Πόλις. [How the Past turns into History] (in Greek)
- Liakos, A. (2008) Hellenism and the Making of Modern Greece: Time, Space, Language. In *Hellenisms. Culture, Identity and Ethnicity*, edited by Katerina Zacharia, 201-36: Asghate
- Liakos, A. (2008) History Wars–Notes from the Field. *Jahrbuch–Yearbook–Annales. International Society for History Didactics, XXIX–XXX* 2009, 57-74.
- Liakos, A. (2011) Eisagogi. In *To 1922 kai oi Prosfyges. Mia Nea Matia*, edited by A. Liakos, 11-23. Athens: Nefeli. [Introduction, in 1922 and the Refugees] (in Greek)

- Liakos, A. (2011) *Apokalypsi, Utopia kai Istoría*. Athens: Polis [*Apocalypse, Utopia and History*] (in Greek)
- Loizos, P. (1999) Ottoman Half-Lives: Long-Term Perspectives on Particular Forced Migrations. *Journal of Refugee Studies* 12, no. 3: 237-63.
- Magriotis I. (1928) *Pros tous apantaxou Thrakas kai tous loipous Ellinas*, Thrakika I, Ε-στ. (in Greek)
- Malkki, L. H. (1995) Refugees and Exile: From "Refugee Studies" to the National Order of Things. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 24: 495-523.
- Nikolopoulou, M. (2007) Space, Memory and Identity: The Memory of the Asia Minor Space in Greek Novels of the 1960s. *CAS Sofia Working Paper Series*, no. 1: 1-18.
- Nora, P. (1984) *Lex Lieux De Mémoire*. Paris: Gallimard.
- Nora, P. (2002) The Reasons for the Current Upsurge in Memory. *Transit–Europäische Revue* 22.
- Papailias, P. (2005) *Genres of Recollection: Archival Poetics and Modern Greece*. Palgrave MacMillan.
- Peckham, R. S. (2000) Map Mania: Nationalism and the Politics of Place in Greece, 1870–1922. *Political Geography* 19, no. 1: 77-95.
- Rüsen, J. (2006) Historical Consciousness: Narrative Structure, Moral Function and Ontogenetic Development. In *Theorizing Historical Consciousness*, edited by Peter Seixas, 63-85: University of Toronto Press
- Reckwitz, A. (2002) Toward a Theory of Social Practices a Development in Culturalist Theorizing. *European journal of social theory* 5, no. 2: 243-63.
- Rigney, A. (2008) The Dynamics of Remembrance: Texts between Monumentality and Morphing. In *Cultural Memory Studies: An International and Interdisciplinary Handbook*, edited by Astrid Erll, Ansgar N. Nning and Sara B. Young, 345-53: Walter de Gruyter.
- Salvanou, E. (2012) *I dimiourgia tis prosfygikis mnimis kai istorias. To paradeigma ton prosfygon tis Anatolikis Thrakis*. Post-doctoral thesis, University of Athens, 2012. [*The shaping of refugee memory and history. The case of refugees from Eastern Thrace*] (in Greek)
- Salvanou, E. (2013) Migrants' Nights': Subjectivity and Agency of Working-Class Pakistani Migrants in Athens, Greece. *Oral History Forum d'histoire orale* 33 Working Lives: Special Issue on Oral History and Working-Class History.
- Schwartz, A.G., Tasos S. and Void Network, eds. (2010) *We Are an Image from the Future. The Greek Revolt of December 2008*. Oakland, Edinburgh, Baltimore: AK Press
- Shaw, C., Chase, M. (1989) The Dimensions of Nostalgia. In *The Imagined Past: History and Nostalgia*, 1-17: Manchester University Press.
- White, H. (1987) The Nineteenth Century as Chronotope. *Nineteenth Century Contexts* 11, no. 2: 119-29.
- White, H. (2010) The Practical Past. *Historiein* 10: 10-19.

- Winter, J. (2010) The Performance of the Past. History, Memory, Identity. In *Performing the Past: Memory, History, and Identity in Modern Europe*, edited by K. Tilmans, F. Vree and J. Winter, 11-34: Amsterdam University Press
- Yannakopoulos, G. (1993) The Reconstruction of a Destroyed Picture: The Oral History Archive of the Centre of Asia Minor Studies. *Mediterranean Historical Review* 8, no. 2: 201-17.

Historical Treatment of the Second World War in Post-Soviet Belarus: Sacralization of the Communist Memory

Anna Zadora

Introduction

The Second World War - a Fundamental Event in Belarusian history

The historical treatment of the Second World War in Belarus, a post-Soviet state with a unique history and a unique history treatment, is extremely complex. The "most Soviet of the USSR's Republics" (Karbalevitch, 1999), Belarus, has fully adopted the interpretation of both the communist and today's political authorities on the fundamental role played by this event in the construction of historical narrative, memory and national identity.

The politics of memory deployed by the Soviet government articulated the Second World War (known in the former USSR as the Great Patriotic War) as the key event in the development of the Belarusian national consciousness.

In the USSR, victory in the Second World War became a unifying myth for the Soviet people. The Second World War was presented as a glorious event where all the peoples of the USSR joined forces in the fight against Nazism. Heroism, patriotism, and devotion to Soviet ideals under the leadership of the Communist Party led the Soviet people to victory. This victory was presented as an affirmation of the superiority of the communist system in relation to the Western model, and was widely used by Soviet propaganda. Both the Soviet government's responsibility for the war, nor the numerous crimes perpetuated against the army and the civilian population on the eve, during and after the war by the Soviets were revealed.

Nowadays when attending the parades on Victory Day, grandiose celebrations of the most important event in Soviet history, it is difficult to believe that the sacred date of the commemoration of the Great Victory - May 9 - was introduced into the Soviet calendar only in 1965. For twenty years after the victory in 1945, May 9 was a regular working day in the USSR, a fact that the history books never mention.

Even Belarusian historians ignore or conveniently forget this fact because everything is done to naturalize the articulation of this fundamental event in the history of Belarus.

In Soviet historiography, the history of Belarus begins only in 1917. The Belarusian people was able to consolidate and begin its existence as a nation state only through the framework offered by the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic (BSSR), a part of the USSR created in January 1918. The Belarusian government is a Soviet creation and the Belarusian people is primarily a Soviet people. The history of Belarus is the story of the BSSR. For this reason, the major event in the history of the USSR, the victory in the Second World War, is accepted as a fundamental myth in the memory of the Belarusian people, who have few competing myths. Even if alternative myths exist on the margin of the society, they are too weak to challenge the main communist myth.

Every Belarusian knows by heart the number of 1418 days - the period between 22 June 1941 and 9 May 1945 - that corresponds to the duration of the Great Patriotic War in the USSR. Several generations of Belarusians assimilated the idea that the sacred event and foundation of the history of the Belarusian people is the Great Patriotic War. Cities and villages are dotted with monuments to the war. Many schools have a museum dedicated to local history and to war veterans and partisans who lived and fought in the neighboring villages or towns. The victory celebrations are always pompous. Meetings with war veterans are held regularly in all schools. Educational policy and official ideology continue this Soviet tradition.

History of the War in the Education System.

The school system is a powerful tool for transmitting collective memory, for building a sense of belonging to a nation state and a national community, and reinforcing the acceptance of an institutional order. Textbooks are an effective way of transmitting historical narrative concerning national identity. History teaching and history textbooks for schools are extremely powerful and effective tools in shaping national identity in education for many reasons. First, the compulsory character of primary and secondary education for children and adolescents must be stressed: no one escapes the educational system of the countries in which they grow up. Secondly, in the specific Belarusian context, the state educational system has few concurrent agents of education: even the family often delegates its educational function entirely to the school system. Textbooks constitute a powerful force of integration since they "are diffused in hundreds of thousands, taken over several generations even in millions of copies: their texts, illustrations, and typography have been common references... for a long time" (Thiesse, 1999). The role played by history textbooks in the construction of national identity is very important. The

content of history textbooks relates directly to questions of national identity. It teaches us to be and think nationally through interpretation of the events of a particular national history and brings information about the distinction between “us” and “the other” to schoolchildren and young adults in the context of the country in which they are educated.

Many political authorities of different countries and different periods have been aware of the power of history in the formation of the consciousness of citizens, a fact proved by the resolution "On the teaching of history in secondary schools of the USSR" adopted by the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union on May 16, 1934, approved personally by Stalin. This resolution stated that "the teaching of history should no longer refer to abstract patterns of the evolution of sociopolitical formations, but the history of the Soviet state must be presented in a lively and interesting way" (Staline, 1934, pp. 83-84)

The present Belarusian administration is also aware of the role of education in weaving social ties and building identity: "history teaching is also a struggle for the minds and souls not only of individuals but also of nations." (Loukachenko, 2010) The government tends to overcome the shortcomings of education within the family in the context of a dramatic decline in the general level of the education of children, to the degree that "textbooks are probably the only books which many children lay their hands on." (Loukachenko, 2010) At the same time, the school system plays an almost exclusive role in the training of young citizens. Textbooks are the preferred and often the sole instrument of the transmission and legitimization of the particular interpretation of history and narrative of national identity, which a political administration aspires to convey.

To illustrate how the Soviet myth of the Great War was created at an academic and scholarly level, it is advisable to refer to the section devoted to the Great Patriotic War in the only textbook of the history of the BSSR published in Belarus during the Soviet period (Abetsadarski, 1968). The unique textbook of the history of the existed in the BSSR from 1960 to 1992 reflected the official discourse on the Second World War. The section devoted to the Second World War in the textbook occupies 6 percent of the editorial surface of the textbook. The interpretation of the war is only partial. The paragraph begins with the dogmatic assertion as follows: "On 22 June 1941, Nazi Germany attacked the USSR. Upon the call of the Communist Party, the whole people stood up to fight against the Nazi invaders." A subparagraph concerning the partisan movement entitled "The partisan war of the whole people" occupies half of the chapter on the war, and this movement is described in glowing terms. Three elements are highlighted. Firstly, the partisan war was a war of the whole people of Belarus. Secondly, the direction of the movement was provided by the Communist Party. Thirdly, the success of the partisan struggle is emphasized, no mention of failures or crimes committed by partisans is made. The following

sentences quoted from the only textbook of Soviet Belarus illustrate the writing of the history of the Soviet partisans: "From the first days of occupation, workers in Soviet Belarus started the war of the whole people. Brigades of partisans were created everywhere. Their number increased daily. The organizer and leader of the partisan movement was the Communist Party." The semantic and stylistic construction of the text are revealing. Short sentences and a dogmatic tone meet the objectives of communist propaganda: to point out that the information provided by the textbooks is an ultimate and indisputable truth, while objective criticism were leveled by nationalist historians at these postulates of Soviet interpretation of the war.

In 2004, when Belarus celebrated the 60th anniversary of the victory in the Second World War, a special course on this event was introduced for students in the final year of high school and the first year of university. Specific textbooks were published as a didactical support for these courses. These textbooks present a Soviet version of the war and scarcely evoke the crimes of Soviet leaders and the complex issue of collaborationism, and reduce the role of the Allies in the victory to a minimum. The Molotov - Ribbentrop Pact and its secret protocol are mentioned, but without explanation: "On August 23, 1939, a German-Soviet agreement of non-aggression was signed (the Molotov - Ribbentrop Pact). At the same time a secret protocol was signed (Kovalenia and Stachkevitch, 2004)." The Stalin's biography presented in the textbook is glorious: "Under Stalin's direction, the Soviet people won a victory over Nazi Germany". Numerous errors of the Soviet government, the high price in terms of human lives scarified for the victory, the occupation of the Central European countries after the war are not mentioned in the textbook.

In the same textbook a preface written by the Belarusian president (who has a degree in history) reads:

Some pseudo-academics try to rewrite the history of the Great Patriotic War, diminishing the role of our grandfathers and rehabilitating traitors, collaborators, and slaves of the Nazis. Young people are the main target of these lies. I have confidence in your clear minds and the honesty that allow you to distinguish between truth and falsehood. The living memory of the past will help us to build the future. To know the history of our homeland is a sacred duty of every citizen. Patriotism is the foundation of the courage and heroism with which the Belarusian people has survived all its wars and defended its independence.

This quotation proves that the collective memory of the Second World War as a glorious and victorious event is a source of pride for the people of Belarus. No alternative vision is tolerated. To underline the importance of the commemoration of Victory day in Belarus, it should be noted that the celebrations take place according to a distinctly Soviet model. During the parades on May 9, the same "techniques" and the same spectacles are enacted as in the Soviet era: columns of

people are dressed to represent state symbols, while in Stalin's time parades often figured a portrait of Stalin made out of people in costume. Gymnasts and athletes were part of all Soviet parades, and gymnastic performances in the same Soviet style feature today in Belarus on Victory Day.

The State Monopoly over the Second World War Memory

More than twenty years after the fall of the communist regime, the Great Patriotic War is a still sacred event in the history of Belarus. Political discourse underlines the heroic role of the Belarusian people, which "together with the peoples of the USSR saved Europe from Nazism (Loukachenko, 2003)." This is a winners' version of events; no mention of the victims of the War is possible. In official rhetoric, the Great Patriotic War is thus presented as a sacred event at the base of Belarusian history, and divergent interpretations are erased.

The current socio-political system is making significant efforts to impose the communist vision of the Second World War as a holy heroic war of the whole people. To defend the alternative version (less heroic, focused on victims and collaborators) of the war alternative resources are required, which are almost non-existent in Belarus. Only academics who are able to conduct historical research in institutions located outside Belarus, such as the European University, the Independent Institute of Socio-economic research and policies, the Belarusian Institute for Strategic Studies, which are all exiled in Vilnius (Lithuania), or those placed under the patronage and protection of foreign bodies (such as the "History Workshop" in Minsk) can afford to challenge the official discourse. In Belarus, in the context of a system, which derives its legitimacy from the Soviet legacy, the defense of an alternative interpretation of the war is extremely problematic. Besides costing a great deal, the ability to protest and to defend an alternative interpretation of history is conditioned by how much influence the person protesting is able to exercise. There are very few historians who feel able to influence the writing and teaching of history, which inhibits the protest (Hirschman, 1970). The alternative research is published abroad - in Poland, in Lithuania, in Germany (CHIARI, Bernhard, *Alltag hinter der Front. Besatzung, Kollabration und Winderstand in Weissrussland 1941-1944*, Droste Verlage, Dusseldorf, 1998 Lindner, Rainer, *Historiker und Herrschaft. Nationsbildung und Geschichtspolitik in Weißrußland im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert*, München, R. Oldenbourg Verlag, 1999 among others...) and it is impossible to buy these books in Belarusian libraries, only at oppositional political parties' headquarters. The alternative to the Soviet-style vision of the war, the nationalist interpretation of this event is mobilized by oppositional political forces. The glorification of the Second World War is relating to the Soviet legacy and links with Russia, contested by political opposition.

Among the few alternative institutions, which can escape the official historiographical dogmas outside the system, we have already cited the “History Workshop” in Minsk, a Germano-Belarusian institution. The Second World War is the central area of research of the workshop. The Workshop, located in the territory where the Minsk ghetto was situated, is trying to reveal the "white spots" of the war and of Nazi occupation, including the destiny of the Jewish community and collaboration. The protection of a diplomatic institution facilitates access to German sources for researchers and guarantees a certain flexibility and freedom of expression.

Political intervention in history writing in the twentieth century and today has affected the independent functioning of historiography and the narrative proved by historiography, as well as methods of history research. The role of history in the USSR has often been reduced to that of producing ideologies to legitimize political power concentrated in the hands of a single political party.

After the fall of the Soviet Union, historians were asked to debate and justify a new historical discourse and the political project of an independent Belarus, diametrically opposed to the communist project (Snyder, 2003). New history textbooks were written on political control in the post-Soviet countries at the beginning of the 1990's. Most Soviet republics conducted a selective inventory of their histories, searching for historical facts and "useful" events, which could be mobilized in order to build and to legitimate an independent state and national identity (Bassin and Kelly, 2012). The highlighting of certain events, such as victory in the Second World War, necessarily entails the treatment of other related issues, such as the responsibility of the Soviet government for the war, the purges on the eve of the war, and the occupation of liberated territories by the Red Army, including the Baltic countries. Such a reduction of history, a "happy eclecticism (Berger, 2007)" is problematic not only from the standpoint of historical research, but it creates significant political and diplomatic tensions visible in the example of the complex relationship between Russia and the Baltic countries (Lisovskaya and Karpov, 1999).

Conclusion

Present Belarusian historiography and remembrance of the past are divided into two competing interpretations of history, two approaches to producing historical narrative: the nationalist and the Soviet versions. Each of these projects mobilizes and articulates facts and historical events in order to legitimize a political discourse and a narrative of historical identity.

In current Belarusian, historiography a clear imbalance exists between the historical narratives in favor of Soviet doctrinal and dogmatic narrative. The history of the

twentieth century witnessed the misuse of history in the USSR, and the use of history in the justification of crimes, exterminations and reprisals. A single perfect historical narrative, a unique historical consciousness, a single way of interpreting the past cannot exist, but this narrative must be plural, open, without dogma and without monopoly, which is not the case in Belarus today.

The red-white-red flag, used by the Nazis during the occupation and reintroduced in 1990 when Belarus became independent, was replaced by the Soviet flag in 1995. The main reason for the replacement was the use of the flag by Nazi collaborators during the Second World War. The propagandist film "Hate. Children of lies", representing a very partial and very biased use of Belarusian nationalists' symbols, particularly the red-white-red flag, by the Nazis and their collaborators during the Second World War was broadcasted repeatedly on Belarusian television. The majority of Belarusians have not done any research into complex sociopolitical phenomena, but the image of the white-red-white flag was destroyed, because it remained forever linked to Nazism in the discourse assimilated by Belarusian citizens (Fedouta, 2005).

The nationalist discourse of historical consciousness and national identity, opposed to the official Soviet interpretation of the war is condemned to obscurity by its lack of opportunities for transmission and legitimization. The only model for historical consciousness and national identity for Byelorussians is the communist model defended and promoted by the authorities. The problem of the lack of a regular and stable point of reference is the absence of a necessary consensus on national identity.

Communist historical dogma, and in particular the cornerstone of the communist legacy - the glorification of the Second World War - has marginalized other historical interpretations. Thus, ideas of Belarusian national identity are once again based exclusively on the negative and destructive reference of war in specific communist interpretation of this war. Remembrance of the past and historical discourse, where it relates to national identity, should have an open, peaceful, pluralistic and discursive basis and should transcend controversial issues like wars and conflicts. Current definitions of Belarusian identity cannot be sustainable and will always be weak and susceptible to political manipulation because they are based on destructive historical references.

The acceptance of the official discourse on the memory is due to the marginalization of other discourses. The formative influence of the state -controlled politics of memory is powerful in Belarusian context, which generates the idea of historical truth and reinforces the belief in the commemorated history.

References

- Abetsadarski, L. (Абецадарскі, Лаурэнцій) (1968). *Гісторыя БССР (History of BSSR)*, Мінск (Minsk), Народная асвета (Public Education).
- Bassin, M. and Kelly, C. (2012). *Soviet and Post-Soviet Identities*, Cambridge University Press.
- Berger, S. (ed.), (2007). *Writing the Nation. A Global Perspective*, Oxford, Palgrave Macmillan, 2007.
- Fedouta, A. (Федута, Александр) (2005). *Лукашенко. Политическая биография (Loukachenko. Political Biography)*, Москва (Moscow), Референдум (Referendum).
- Hirschman, A. (1970) *Exit, Voice, and Loyalty: Responses to Decline in Firms, Organizations, and States*, Cambridge, MA, Harvard University Press.
- Karbalevitch, V. (Карбалевіч, Валерый) (1999). Беларускае феномен трансфармацыйнага грамадства » (Belarusian phenomenon of a Society in Transition), *Грамадзянская альтэрнатыва (Civic alternative)* №12.
- Kovalenia, A. (Коваленя, Александр), Stachkevitch, N. (Сташкевич, Николай) (2004). *Великая Отечественная война советского народа (в контексте Второй мировой войны) (The Great Patriotic War of the Soviet People (in the context of the Second World War))*, учебное пособие для общеобразовательных школ (schooltextbook), Минск (Minsk), издательство БГУ (éd. de l'Université d'Etat).
- Lisovskaya, E. and Карпов, V. (1999). "New Ideologies in Postcommunist Russian Textbooks." *Comparative Education Review* 43(4).
- Loukachenko, A. (Лукашенко, Александр) (2000). « Проблемы школьных учебников » (Problems of School Textbooks), *Настаўніцкая газета (Teachers' Newspaper)*, № 55.
- Loukachenko, A. (Лукашенко, Александр) (2003). *Исторический выбор Беларуси. Лекция президента Республики Беларусь (Historical Choice of Belarus. Lecture of the President of Belarus A. Loukachenko)*, Минск (Minsk), (Belarusian State University).
- Snyder, T. (2003), *The Reconstruction of Nations. Poland, Ukraine, Lithuania, Belarus 1569-1999*, New Haven and London, Yale University Press.
- Staline, J. (Сталин, Иосиф) (1934) Молотов, Вячеслав (Vyacheslav Molotov), « О преподавании гражданской истории в школах СССР » (On the History Teaching in the Schools of the USSR), *Историк-марксист (Marxist Historian)*, 1934, №3, p. 83-84.
- Thiesse, A. (1999). *La création des identités nationales. L'Europe XVIII^{ème}-XX^{ème} siècles*, Paris, Seuil.

Forensic Memories: After Testimony

Johanne Helbo Bøndergaard

Introduction

In the introduction to their book *After Testimony* (2012) Jakob Lothe, Susan Suleiman and James Phelan ask the question whether the disappearance of the last witness will affect the way the public discourse deals with the Holocaust. This article attempts to address that question and suggests a mode of writing that might in fact come “after” testimony. I will not be discussing literature about the Holocaust specifically but will rather suggest that a more general tendency to address past transgressions other means than testimony can be observed in contemporary literature.⁶⁰ As Lothe, Suleiman and Phelan argue, the word “after” in their title refers both to the fact that in relation to the Holocaust we are nearing an age without witnesses to the Holocaust, *and* to artistic creation, where “after” suggests that “all works dealing with the Holocaust must in some way come to terms with the historical reality that the accounts of survivors have tried to communicate” (Lothe et al., 2012, p. 2) and to the artistic legacy of the witnesses. In the following, I will attempt to describe a mode of writing in contemporary literature on memory and history, which allows later generations to address historical events to which they did not bear witness, challenging the testimonial mode while bearing its strategies and strengths in mind - “after” in both senses of the word.⁶¹

The central argument is that just as the legal concept of testimony was introduced into the cultural sphere to describe a particular genre or mode of writing, the legal concept of *forensics* will serve as a useful term for describing a number of contemporary literary works that take up the responsibility of addressing past events after testimony. In suggesting this shift of emphasis from testimony to forensics I pursue the argument made by Eyal Weizman in his book *The Least of All Possible*

⁶⁰ Our historical position in relation to the Holocaust is central to this development (as the witnesses are passing away finding other ways of writing this heritage becomes vital) but as I will argue in the following, other historical factors ought to be considered as well.

⁶¹ Taking the Holocaust as a starting point explicitly places the works that I am describing in relation to this artistic and historical legacy.

Evils (2011) and by Thomas Keenan and Eyal Weizman in their essay *Mengele's Skull* (2012) and in the following I will briefly discuss a few of the main points of their arguments, commenting particularly on their, to my mind, too clean dismissal of testimony. The shift they describe has consequences in law making, human rights discourse and transcultural memory politics – but also, as I will argue, for literature where transgressions of the past are urgently questioned in reflexive and increasingly transmedial forms. I explore two hypotheses: First, that a shift from testimony to forensics can be observed in culture in general, but also, and more specifically, in contemporary literature on memory and the past. I will discuss Javier Cercas' *The Anatomy of a Moment* (2009) as an example of what I suggest calling *forensic literature*.

The second hypothesis, which I will address through my reading of Cercas' novel, is that this forensic literary mode through its particular use of “evidence” (testimony as well as visual evidence) may provide a corrective to the assumption inherent in the forensic sciences that the scientific analysis of objects could (and should) leave behind the human subjectivity and bias (usually associated with testimony) when the past and its meanings are negotiated.

From testimony to forensics

In the last decades conceptual frameworks of testimony and trauma have been prominent in the field of cultural memory studies and in negotiations of difficult heritage across the world. The Holocaust was (and largely still is) the paradigmatic case within the field and since the Eichmann trial inaugurated what Annette Wieviorka has called the Era of the Witness (Wieviorka, 2006); testimony has stood at its (vulnerable, even vanishing) center. While many stories from camp survivors were written and published before that, the central position of the witnesses in the courtroom in Jerusalem established the witness as a pivotal figure in interpreting the Holocaust. Testimony came to be considered an inherently ethical practice (as opposed to a solely epistemic one) of establishing oneself as a legal and autonomous subject and witness rather than simply the silenced victim of violence (Givoni, 2009). A hesitant, stumbling voice and a vulnerable body testifying to trauma and transgression even more persuasively than sober juridical and political speech. Thus in the early 90s literary critic Shoshana Felman and psychoanalyst Dori Laub examined the function of testimony between aesthetic and therapeutic practice and described the last part of the 20th century as “the era of testimony” (Laub and Felman, 2002). In the literary field writers such as Imre Kertesz, Primo Levi, Jorge Semprun and many others have created extraordinary literary works that testified to the atrocities of the Holocaust and addressed its meanings and consequences for human experience in aesthetic form. In the political field testimony became an

important factor in the wave of truth commissions, human rights discourse and humanitarian work (Weizman, 2011).

On the threshold between the 90s and the 2000s Andreas Huyssen published his collection of essays (originally published from 1996 to 2001), *Present Pasts – Urban Palimpsests and the Politics of Memory* (2003). In the introduction Huyssen writes that “too much of the contemporary memory discourse focuses on the personal – on testimony, memoir, subjectivity, traumatic memory – either in poststructuralist psychoanalytic perspective or in attempts to shore up a therapeutic popular sense of the authentic and experiential” (Huyssen, 2003, p. 8). Taking Huyssen as a symptom of a shift in contemporary memory culture, there seems to be a detectable weariness with the personal experience of trauma and the therapeutic value of narrative and (faltering) linguistic representations. “If the 1980s were the decade of a happy postmodern pluralism, the 1990s seemed to be haunted by trauma,” Huyssen writes. “It was energized [...] by the intense interest in witness and survivor testimonies, and it merged with discourses about AIDS, slavery, family violence, child abuse, recovered memory syndrome, and so on.” “Surely,” Huyssen continues, “the prevalence of the concern with trauma must be due to the fact that trauma as a psychic phenomenon is located on the threshold between remembering and forgetting, seeing and not seeing, transparency and occlusion, experience and its absence in repetition. But trauma cannot be the central category in addressing the larger memory discourse [...]” (Huyssen, 2003, p. 8) Trauma cannot be the master trope of memory (anymore) even though traumatic histories exist and must be recognized: “The focus on trauma is legitimate where nations or groups of people are trying to come to terms with a history of violence suffered or violence perpetrated. But the transnational discourse on human rights may give us a better handle on such matters than the transfer of psychoanalysis into the world of politics and history.” (Huyssen, 2003, p. 9) Or as Weizman states, “the psychological framework of trauma and the call for compassion rather than for political action tends to depoliticize historical processes.” (2011, p. 113).

Keenan and Weizman show that just as the Eichmann–trial inaugurated the Era of the Witness, the exhumation of the infamous Nazi doctor Josef Mengele in 1985 inaugurated the forensic shift that we see today: forensic anthropologist Clyde Snow who participated in the identification of Mengele later trained the team that conducted the exhumations of the “disappeared” in Argentina, which started a process of turning mass graves around the world into epistemic resources for the legal processing of war crimes as well as places of mourning. In 1998, the “legalization” of human rights that followed from the establishment of the International Criminal Court finally led to a notable shift as the ethical overdetermination of testimony became a potential liability in the legal battles of the international tribunals. Instead, forensics and expert testimony became dominant as not only guilt or victimhood in general terms but also criminal liability in specific

cases and the identity of individual victims had to be established. While testimony has always been suspect in the courtrooms, the growing integration of international memory politics and legal practice and the extraordinary interactions of forensic scientist and living communities around the mass graves and scenes of atrocity has led to a forensic shift in memory culture as well.

Developments in the forensics sciences (technical and technological) are noteworthy reasons for their growing importance. The forensic sciences have more to offer now in terms of establishing the identity of victims and in ascertaining what happened and who did what. Another reason is that memory's procedural and relational character has become common knowledge. While the vulnerability of testimony has been central to its cultural importance (and while the plasticity of memory is in all probability essential to our everyday survival and to the workings of our society) it remains a juridical problem. In addition, I would suggest that a more general turn towards the materiality of places, bodies and objects can be observed in contemporary culture. Perhaps a post-postmodern insistence that the factual past – while never immediately available – can in fact be approached through its traces could also be at stake.

In recent years, then, archeology and forensic sciences have come to play a dominant role in the aftermath of human made disasters around the world. In the negotiations of the cultural memory of francoist Spain in the last decade forensics has played a pivotal role. In the clearing of Ground Zero in New York (Sturken, 2007; Gould, 2007) and in the subsequent debates about memorials, museums and rebuilding, archaeology and forensics also played an important part. New facets are even added to our understanding of World War 2 and the Holocaust as mass graves in Eastern Europe are opened. Rather than just providing facts about ruins, bodies and the events that created them, forensics provide an important interpretational framework that connects the juridical establishment of responsibility and guilt with politics of rebuilding and rehabilitation as well as with personal experiences of loss as scientist encounter families of victims by (mass) graves and in the places where atrocities and disasters have taken place (Gould, 2007).

Testimony and material evidence

There is a shift, then, but the difference between testimony and material evidence is not very clear-cut. On the surface it seems to be that “subjects can misremember or skew their testimonies in relation to their political self-interest while an evidentiary truth seems to linger, fossilized in the object, ready to be unpacked by science.” (Weizman, 2011, p. 104) A central detail in this quote is of course the word “seems”. While the rhetorical force of the object, the body and the place, not speaking from procedural and unreliable memory but simply there to be looked at and evaluated in

scientific processes of analysis and peer review may have gained prominence, Weizman argues that the forensic sciences end up facing questions that are perhaps surprisingly similar to the ones asked of testimony: as the witness is asked to approximate objectivity and the material evidence is subjected to cross-examination and interrogation, the distinction is blurred. When an object is presented in a courtroom it may in many ways seem to “speak for itself” (and may be presented as if it does so by either prosecution or defence), but it is always presented in a particular way and at a particular time by human actors (usually the expert witness) in support of a particular narrative. “Because objects do not speak for themselves, there is always a need for ‘translation’ or ‘interpretation’ – forensic rhetoric requires a person (or set of technologies) to mediate between the object and the forum: to present the object, interpret it and place it within a larger narrative.” (Weizman, 2001, p. 105) Objects when presented in the courtroom do not automatically speak objectively.

The object, then, provides its own testimony, one that does not entirely do away with the problems associated with human witnesses. In addition, I would add that one of the things the Eichmann trial and the scholarship on testimony demonstrated was that the witness is also a material presence, a body and a voice, which depend on various juridical framings and technological devices of recording and replay that must also be considered. I would make the reverse move, then, and add that just as the forensic practices of analysis and presentation of objects in the courtroom does not solve the problem of biased testimony; testimony itself is a kind of forensic evidence (evidence presented into “the forum” of the court) and is often treated as material as well as linguistic evidence. Rather than being replaced by forensics, then, testimony should be reconsidered as a particular kind of forensic evidence that can be (and often is) subjected to expert analysis and evaluation. Forensics and testimony do not replace one another, rather the recent emphasis on forensics reveals that the two work on different levels: forensics is a method (or several methods), “the art of the forum”, while testimony is a genre or mode of speech that may be used forensic argumentation or subjected to analysis.

I would also add that (eyewitness) testimony is still central to juridical proceedings as well as a dominant cultural discourse and valuable currency in the cultural sphere. Testimony still carries authority in and outside the courtroom – and (as Weizman inadvertently shows) influences the way other modes of forensic speech is understood. Testimony is a type of evidence within a broader range of forensic media and genres, whose claims to authority and authenticity are intricately linked to those of testimony.

Central to Weizman’s argument is that the practice of forensics is not just about the analysis of a piece of evidence but also the presentation of it into a forum. This forum consists not only of the courtroom or even of the laboratories where the

analysis takes place but also of a broader cultural and political arena in which they are received and made sense of⁶². Weizman's study of the relationship between these different areas addresses the intimate connection between the analysis of ruins and the *design* of them taking place in the organization of military action calculated to minimize civilian losses (Weizman, 2011). He raises the question whether these processes do not serve to legitimize violence and exploitation rather than to save lives, arguing that mechanical calculations must never be the sole foundation of political or juridical decisions. Rather, they *must* depend on the assessment of data and on values, ethics, precedent and politics. "Decision is necessary precisely because calculation cannot (and should not) provide a definite answer. Decision relies on *aesthetic operations* – that is, on the way and order by which things and events appear to us." (Weizman and Keenan 2012, 23, my emphasis) Thus conviction comes from the creation, narration and evaluation of evidence as it is performed within the courtroom.

Forensic literature

Weizman argues that the forensic shift can be observed not only within the courtroom where technological developments have made increasingly detailed analysis and convincing representations of evidential material possible but also in the cultural arena. This is evident in popular culture where detective novels and sitcoms abound in which DNA strands, aged bones, crime scenes inhabited by white clad forensics teams take center stage. It can also be seen in the many Sherlock Holmes remakes and a renewed fascination with Jack the Ripper that in very different ways refer to the early developments in forensic science and criminology in the late 19th century. I take this cultural interest in forensics as my point of entry but as I will argue in the following, it is not only in cultural productions that explicitly address forensics thematically that this development can be observed but also in the formal strategies of literary works on memory and the past.

Just as the term "testimony" was borrowed from the juridical sphere to describe a particular literary mode, I borrow the term "forensic" to describe works that address past conflicts and transgressions through the narrative performance of evidence or traces of the past to a forum of readers. These works do not deal with the forensic establishment of facts but with the complicated processes of their creation, interpretation and evaluation. They are *literary* (that is artistic) works of fiction,

⁶² Thus the forum in which the forensics functions is intricately and necessarily connected with that space in which (forensic) literature is read and distributed. In the case discussed by Keenan and Weizman, that is the identification of the infamous Nazi war criminal Josef Mengele, the connectedness of forensic practice and cultural representations of the crimes with which he was involved has obvious implications for one another.

non-fiction or something in between that include traces of the past next to the author's text and that address their interpretation and meaning in the present. While clearly inspired by earlier works of historiographical metafiction in their careful negotiations of fact, fiction and reflection on the nature of historical knowledge, these works insist on the existence and essential importance of actual historical truth that may not be available, but which can (and should) be approached and addressed with sincerity or even with analytical authority. Javier Cercas' *The Anatomy of a Moment* (2009) will be my main example in the following, but Aleksandar Hemon's *The Lazarus Project* (2008), Daniel Mendelsohn's *The Lost* (2007), Orhan Pamuk's *Istanbul* (2005), Ignacio Martínez De Pisón's *To Bury the Dead* (2005), Dave Eggers' *Zeitoun* (2009), clausbecknielsen.net's *The Suicide Mission* (2005), Göran Rosenberg's *A Short Stop on the Road from Auschwitz* and many others are (even though they are very different) also relevant to consider within this framework.

These works do not deal with the forensic establishment of facts but with the complicated processes of their creation, interpretation and evaluation. They are *literary* (that is artistic) works of fiction, non-fiction or something in between that include traces of the past next to the author's text and that address their interpretation and meaning in the present. While clearly inspired by earlier works of historiographical metafiction in their careful negotiations of fact, fiction and reflection on the nature of historical knowledge, these works insist on the existence and essential importance of actual historical truth that may not be available, but which can (and should) be approached and addressed with urgency, intense scrutiny or even with analytical authority. The forensic mode of writing, then, is concerned with the historically real and uses "evidence" of that reality addressing it and scrutinizing it explicitly, often inviting the reader to take part.

The forensic mode might (and often does) include testimony (eye-witness testimony or expert testimony, the author's, a character's or as intertextual reference etc.) and often relies on or challenges testimonial claims to authenticity, but does so carefully well aware of the cultural conventions that are bound to this mode of writing. They address past events claiming a level of serious engagement with its historical material that matches that of testimony but inherits a level of self-awareness and critical engagement with the narration of history from historiographical metafiction.

In a literary work evidence is of course not presented to a judge and jury but to a forum of interpreters that evaluate the evidence - and pass judgment: While no crime is to be punished on the back of the reader's evaluation of the evidence, the judgment of historical transgressions and circumstances are still very much at stake. Conviction after all is not just a legal term, but also one that applies more broadly in communicative acts – even in the case of fictional narratives. By suggesting that forensics can also be a productive term for describing literary works, I don't mean to suggest, then, that the works in question try in any scientific way to establish the

actual facts about past events (this is hardly literature's main concern), but rather that they rely on a similar understanding of the piece of evidence as marked by past conditions and events and being able to somehow reveal some of what it "knows" into a forum. Thus in *To Bury the Dead* Ignacio Martínez de Pison presents photographs of the protagonists in his narrative as well as drawings made by José Robles, whose disappearance in the early days of the Spanish Civil War is the focus of the book. While the photographs seem to serve as evidence of the events in question, the drawings both illustrate the narrative and visualize the traces of Robles' actual manual gestures on the page. While these drawings do not *prove* anything about past events, their presence acknowledges a character and a particular point of view that is otherwise – and essentially – missing from the narrative: That of José Robles.

A similar strategy can be observed in clausbeck-nielsen.net's *The Suicide Mission* (2005), a book that describes the journey of Nielsen and Rasmussen carrying the democracy (a metal box with "The Democracy" written on its side) into Iraq. The book is narrated from a position in the future and includes material from Nielsen's journals and newspaper articles as well as pencil drawings of the spatial lay outs of the fora established around The Democracy in which political debates take place throughout the journey. As the positioning of the narration in the future suggests, this book, while intensely political and concerned with controversial contemporary events, hardly aims to establish particular facts about the past. Instead the book addresses the political and moral question of forcing democratic processes on other countries by performing the fundamentally strange experience of entering a Middle Eastern war zone as a naïve and well-meaning westerner with a political mission, staging the traces of the journey among them the penciled traces of the transitive political spaces that the artistic project establishes along the way.

When the interpretation or presentation of evidence takes place in a literary work instead of in the courtroom it is interpreted according to a different logic: In the courtroom interpretation aims for an exact understanding of the particular facts about the event and the motivations and consequences related to it. In the forum surrounding the artwork the more general meanings raised by the particulars of the representation are exercised by the reader, felt, considered and evaluated not in relation to immediate consequences to the people involved (criminal liability, conviction, reparations etc.) but in relation to the reader's personal world view and set of values. Literature, then, establishes a forum of interpreters, a *forum of art* in which interpretation and evaluation takes place.

The anatomy of a moment

In the remaining part of this article, I will discuss an example of the forensic mode of writing that I have suggested above. I aim to show how a piece of contemporary literature, Javier Cercas' *The Anatomy of a Moment* from 2009, addresses a historical event, describing and analyzing it in the minutest detail, dissecting, if you will, its complex anatomy. This analysis is presented to the reader in the careful prose of non-fictional history writing, yet with a great sensibility for the aesthetic potential of the material in question. This material consists of interviews, documents and recorded images, oral and written testimony as well as other kinds of archival material.

In *The Anatomy of a Moment* Javier Cercas' dissects the attempted *coup d'état* in Spain on 23 February 1981 taking as his starting point the available documentary evidence; the recorded images of the storming of the Cortes. In his detailed analysis each sound, gesture and facial expression available is given urgent attention as every political maneuver, motivation and possible alliance behind the scenes is explored, always trying to explain that particular piece of visual evidence and particularly the central gesture of Adolfo Suárez: Suárez does not obey the military as they shoot their guns telling everybody to get down, but remains seated, an ex-francoist becoming at that moment a lonely defender of democracy. Cercas' book cannot, of course, include the filmed material, but depends instead on detailed ekphrasis, a literary description of visual material, which introduces each of the five main parts of the book. The ekphrasis describes (in the present tense) how a viewer (identified as Cercas himself) freezes and unfreezes the image, scrutinizing it and including the reader in his observations.

The book includes one photograph, which is *not* from the coup, but which shows an uncannily similar situation. Stretching across the top of two pages (Cercas, 2012, pp. 114-115) Suárez can be seen, seated furthest to the right, while the remaining 90 per cent of the image shows the empty row of benches. The photo is placed in the beginning of chapter 4 which addresses the period of time between the two pieces of visual evidence: the photo from September 25th 1979, when Suárez was "at the height of his power", yet "privately finished as a politician", and the film from 23 February 1981, when the coup took place. "The image was taken on 25 September 1979, but, if we ignore certain differences of colour and framing, it could be confused with that of 23 February 1981, as if, instead of photographing Suárez, the photographer had been photographing the future." (Cercas 2012, 113) Chapter 4 overall addresses the fact that, at the time of the coup, Suárez was politically all alone. This point is *illustrated* by the image, which cannot possibly serve as proof since it was taken a lot earlier. With a characteristic awareness of pattern and symmetry Cercas, then, quite explicitly chooses *not* to provide any visual evidence of the coup, but frames and highlights its absence through emphasis and visual

similarity, adding to the spectacular and enigmatic staging of the moment that is otherwise so carefully dissected.

In the prologue, called “Epilogue to a novel” Cercas states that the book is “more than anything else [...] the humble testimony of a failure: incapable of inventing what I know about 23 February, illuminating its reality with fiction, I have resigned myself to telling it.” (Cercas, 2012, p. 14) This confessional mode, with which Cercas apologetically leaves fiction behind, resigning himself to reality, frames the narrative as the epilogue (entitled “Prologue to a novel”) in the same confessional tones addresses Cercas’ personal relationship to the story of Adolfo Suárez. In the epilogue Cercas connects Suarez’ situation and character to those of his father, the book turning into a story of generational conflict and reconciliation on its final pages, as Cercas approaches a slow understanding of his father’s politics in the post-francoist years.

This framing of the story places the unwritten novel outside the narrative, the missing half of a circular structure, where fiction and non-fiction mirror each other. As the circle is cut in half and the hidden or unwritten novel is left in shadow, the reader is invited to imagine that other half, which cannot, or so it is argued, compete with the potency and power of reality itself. Through its imagined fictional shadow, the story as it is told asserts itself even more. That is, through the evocation of a non-existing fictional work, the present narrative is once again, through a strategy of absence and suggestion, given another layer of potency.

Cercas’ work, then, is not a work of fiction. Trying to understand Suárez’ gesture and the image “without the powers and the liberty of fiction” is according to the prologue “the challenge this book sets itself” even while it won’t “entirely renounce being read as a novel.” (Cercas, 2012, p. 15) This ambiguous classification of the novel by the author himself is quite precisely reflected in the book itself. Depending on interviews with the witnesses and protagonists of the *coup d’état* as well as extensive research, the book includes “a minimal bibliography” and “a few notes” marking it through paratextual features as a work of non-fiction and the meticulous analytical work certainly reflects how “liberties of fiction” are avoided. However, it *does* at times read almost as a novel. Partly because, being otherwise a writer of fiction, Cercas has the reader in a state of ambiguity from the outset. And even the carefully critical, reflexive analytical sections that form the main body of the book shows a great sense for highlighting shifting patterns, spotting unlikely symmetries and narrating the inherent dramas and complex shapes of the historical events. Moreover, as we have seen, where “demonstrative evidence” is included in the form of a photograph it refuses to prove as it is detached from the appropriate historical circumstance.

The forum of readers asked to pass judgment of these particular historical events is appealed to both by Cercas’ confessional mode, by his analytical meticulousness

and aesthetically as the historical circumstances are shaped and presented in handsome patterns. Yet judgment remains difficult as each layer of the narrative complicates the picture showing how the pieces of the puzzle fit, but also how, by a slight change of perspective, the image shifts. Thus, the book seems to question any mechanical evaluation of the recent history of Spain (that tends to distinguish clearly between good and bad, left and right) performing instead different modes of address demanding nuanced interpretation, evaluation and judgment of the complicated political situation in Spain after francoism.

Concluding remarks

Testimony has in memory culture often been treated as an ethical act rather than as an epistemic resource primarily giving legal space to a vulnerable body and a hesitant voice. Thus, rhetorically, it hardly invites counter-argumentation and critical scrutiny. Evidence on the other hand should allow violence to be soberly considered and rationally discussed, questioned and debated. It is, however, not that simple: Testimony is a central part of forensic argumentation and one that is not all that different from other genres or media. The silent object or piece of evidence presented in court seems to speak for itself, but this speech is presented and often interpreted by expert witnesses. No part of the forensic argument be it either testimony or material evidence mechanically establish what past events should mean to us today or how we should consider them and pass judgment when engaging in memory politics and law-making.

The forensic literary works, while sharing an understanding of the material presence of history with the forensic sciences and while being intimately concerned with the past as historical fact, provide a corrective to the forensic paradigm as they highlight human interpretation, judgment and sensory experience as a necessary part of understanding how the past and its traces are interpreted and negotiated. Thus the works devote themselves to political and historical reality while demonstrating that our understanding of past events cannot depend on the automatic decoding of evidence alone.

References

- Cercas, J. (2012). *The Anatomy of a Moment*, London: Bloomsbury Publishing
Beck-Nielsen, C. (2005). *Selvordsaktionen* (The Suicide Mission), Gyldendal
Eggers, D. (2010). *Zeitoun*, London: Penguin Books
Gould, R. A. (2007). *Distaster Archaeology* Salt Lake City: The University of Utah Press
Hemon, A. (2008). *The Lazarus Project*, New York: Picador

- Huyssen, A. (2003). *Present Pasts - Urban Palimpsests and the Politics of Memory*, Stanford: Stanford University Press
- Laub, D., & Shoshana F. (1992). *Testimony*, New York: Routledge
- Lothe, J., Suleiman S., & Phelan, J. (2012). *After Testimony*, Columbus: The Ohio State University Press
- Mendelsohn, D. (2008). *The Lost*, London: Harper Perennial
- Pamuk, O. (2006). *Istanbul – Memories and the City* London: Faber and Faber
- Martinez de Pison, I. (2009). *To Bury the Dead*, Cardigan: Parthian
- Rosenberg, G. (2012). *Et Kort Ophold På vejen fra Auschwitz*, København K: Tiderne Skifter
- Sebald, W. G. (2011). *Austerlitz*, London: Penguin Books
- Sturken, M. (2007). *Tourists of History – Memory, Kitsch, and Consumerism from Oklahoma City to Ground Zero*, Durham and London: Duke University Press
- Weizman, E. (2011). *The Least of all Possible Evils*, London and New York: Verso
- Weizman, E., & Keenan, T. (2012). *Mengele's Skull*, Portikus: Sternberg Press
- Wieviorka, A. (2006). *The Era of the Witness*, Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press

Competing Historical Narratives in Belarusian Textbooks

Rune Brandt Larsen

Introduction

The sudden emergence of the Belarusian nation state after the collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991 cultivated the ground for a national Belarusian history. Not only was it possible to present another version of the past than the one dictated by the Soviet regime, it could also be regarded as necessary. Leaving aside the discussions about the ontological status of the nation, it can be stated that a nation-building process is striving to establish the (new or old) nation as the primary carrier of collective identity using, among other means, an idea of a (fictitious or real) national past. History is thus legitimising the nation, and the nation is in turn legitimising the state, since it is a mainstream opinion that each separate nation has a moral right to its own state. At the same time, there is also a more direct link between state and history: Just as a long common past can be legitimising for the nation, a long tradition of statehood can be legitimising for the state, simply because it is possible to point to how the things used to be. In short: When a state appears on the map and wants to secure its independent existence, one of the tools can be history.

Within memory studies, the focus is most often on the relatively recent historical periods, and in many cases surviving eye-witnesses play a significant part. I will argue, however, that the more distant past can also be highly important in a nation-building context. What I am investigating is therefore not “communicative memory” (transmitted via living people), but “cultural memory” (transmitted via texts, pictures etc.).⁶³ This concept can relate to events taking place several centuries ago, but remembered within the community. Important elements in the nation’s self-image can be found in a distant or “mythical” past – e.g. myths of origin or golden ages.⁶⁴

Various different actors can in principle be involved in this commemoration of the national past, but most often it can be expected to be some kind of political elites.

⁶³ Following the distinction in Assmann (1988), p. 125-133.

⁶⁴ See for instance S. Berger & Lorenz (2008) p. 4.

This can of course lead to conflicting versions of the past. More scholars have pointed to at least three distribution patterns of memories within a community: They can be either homogeneous (all members of the community share the same memory), complementary (people have different, but overlapping and compatible memories) or contested (there are two or more competing memories)⁶⁵. The actors involved are bound by cultural constraints understood as a *historically formed repertoire of cultural (mnemonic) forms and themes*, and these are complemented by cultural strategies, i.e. the choices made by the actors regarding which parts of the available repertoire they use and in which form they present them (Bernhard & J. Kubik). The point is that there exists a certain pool of available historical narratives within a given community. It is very difficult to invent something totally new or omit something evident without losing credibility, but within the existing boundaries the actors have a large degree of freedom to construct their version of the past.

Textbooks in the service of the nation

In this article, the efforts of establishing a Belarusian history throughout the 1990's are studied based on history textbooks for use in the mandatory classes. Textbooks are of course designed for use within an educational context, and education has often been pointed out as an efficient tool for socialising a population. Every child is exposed to it and is taught some basic authoritative "truths". Consequently, control of education is control of a crucial factor in shaping the future inhabitants' worldview. Consequently, history textbooks have been pointed out as a highly valuable source material for investigations of historical culture and national narratives.⁶⁶

The function of the textbooks is twofold: They can be regarded as tools, which can be used to invent or modify historical narratives – as "an instrument for controlled remembering and forgetting" (Dutceac Segesten, 2011, p.47). This is an active role, in which they change the world around them – several academic works are e.g. studying how antagonistic narratives can create favourable circumstances for conflicts. At the same time, however, they can be regarded as a passive reflection of narratives within the existing collective memory. In practice, virtually all textbooks fall somewhere in between these two ideal types, showing varying degrees of modification and construction, but based on some previously existing narratives, thereby exerting an active and a passive role at the same time. Or

⁶⁵ Wertsch (2004) p. 23f. A similar distinction has been proposed by Bernhard & Kubik (2014) p. 24-28.

⁶⁶ For example in H. Pääbo (2011) p. 14.

expressed metaphorically: A textbook is *both the mirror and the reflection* (ibid.) or *both a cause and an effect* (Dietsch, 2006, p.42). Textbook analysis has its limitations, without doubt. It does not allow us to conclude anything about the reception among the target audience, and it can also be difficult to determine to which degree the textbooks reflect already existing historical narratives. What we can conclude, however, is what the authors want to tell the young citizens. Therefore, the textbooks should be regarded as an active (if not necessarily efficient) weapon, and at the same time as a passive reflection of the intentions of the actors behind the weapon and their attempts to use the past in the service of a present agenda.

These observations gather additional importance when exposed to the dynamics of nation-building, because a nation-building period is a time of contrasts and restructuring. The socialising role of education is important for the nation builders who want to establish their own version of the past (and the present) as hegemonic, and consequently, the active, instrumental role of the textbooks is more outspoken. Therefore, a nation-building context provides a good opportunity to analyse some mechanisms, which may otherwise be less evident.

Important events and persons in Belarusian textbooks

Based on the principles outlined above, three different Belarusian textbooks are analysed, from 1992, 1993 and 1999 respectively.⁶⁷ The goal is to establish similarities and differences between the various versions, and to explain these in relation to the role of the past in the present political context. The analysis is focused on the late 14th and early 15th century, when Belarus was a part of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania. Although Lithuania was a pagan state until 1385, it controlled vast areas (including present-day Belarus) which had earlier belonged to Kievan Rus and which were inhabited by orthodox Christians.

One of the most important political events at that time was the adoption of the Polish-Lithuanian union in Krewo in 1385. It was a personal union established by the marriage between the Lithuanian grand duke Jagiełło and the Polish queen Jadwiga, and one of the conditions in the agreement was that the hitherto pagan Lithuanians should adopt the Catholic faith. The textbook published in 1992 provides a quite negative evaluation of the union. The authors claim that Lithuania was simply incorporated into Poland, which caused widespread resistance due to several factors including forced conversion of Orthodox inhabitants into Catholicism. The union is described as an agreement between Jagiełło and the Polish

⁶⁷ This article is based on the research for a Ph.D. thesis. The thesis as a whole will include a larger number of textbooks from Belarus, Lithuania, Poland, and Ukraine.

feudal lords, while Jagiełło's cousin, Witold, is portrayed as the positive figure, who saved Lithuania's independence⁶⁸. The 1993 textbook presents the union act more neutrally. It also mentions resistance in Lithuania, but only among the feudal lords. As for the religious and cultural consequences, the authors state that *the Belarusian and Ukrainian population for the largest part kept its Orthodox faith and national culture*. The union is described as an agreement between the Lithuanian princes (including Jagiełło as well as Witold) and Poland, and likewise it is claimed that Lithuania's independence was saved because of an agreement between Jagiełło and Witold.⁶⁹ The 1999 textbook gives much the same picture as the one from 1992: Because of Jagiełło, Lithuania was incorporated into Poland without accept from the local Belarusian population, which led to internal religious and national tensions⁷⁰.

Another important political event was the victory over the Teutonic Knights in the battle of Grunwald in 1410. In the textbook from 1992 it is portrayed as a battle between Lithuania and the knights, and there is much focus on Witold's successful military command. The later textbooks also acknowledge Poland's contribution to the battle and even emphasise the multinational character of the army, which also included Tatar and Czech regiments. In the 1993 textbook it is added that Moscow refused to participate in the campaign. Concerning the outcome of the victory, all the authors point to the same crucial point - namely that the German aggression was stopped. They add some further achievements, for example that the economic development was strengthened, and that Poland and Lithuania were recognised as great European states (Баранова, Загарульскі & Паўлава, 1992, p.56f. Э. М. Загарульскі, 1999, p. 118ff. Штыхаў & у. К. Пляшэвіч, 1993, p. 216f).

The leading political figures at that time were the already mentioned Lithuanian princes Jagiełło and Witold. The general trend is that Jagiełło is evaluated negatively in all the textbooks, while Witold is evaluated positively. The charges against Jagiełło include secret agreements with the Teutonic Knights and dirty tricks in the power struggle with Witold. The latter is, on the other hand, remembered for saving Lithuania's independence and expanding the borders as far as the Black Sea. There are also differences between the textbooks, though, and here the one from 1999 is the most nuanced – Jagiełło's negative treats are balanced by an acknowledgement of his efforts for the sake of art and science, and at the same time Witold's glory is

⁶⁸ Баранова, Загарульскі & Паўлава, 1992, p. 54f. This book is essentially a late Soviet textbook, published for the first time in 1989 in Russian, translated into Belarusian in 1992, reprinted in 1993.

⁶⁹ Штыхаў & у. К. Пляшэвіч, 1993, p. 202ff. This book was the first totally new textbook written after independence.

⁷⁰ Э. М. Загарульскі, 1999, p. 110f. This book can be regarded as a new version of the late Soviet one. Zagarul'ski was a co-author then, and parts of the text are virtually identical.

weakened by the fact the he also collaborated with the Teutonic Knights (Баранава, Загарульскі & Паўлава, 1992, p. 54f. Э. М. Загарульскі, 1999, p. 106ff. Штыхаў & у. К. Пляшэвіч, 1993, 201ff.).

The overall impression is that the Belarusian textbook authors agree on many points, but there are some evident differences regarding the relations to the neighbouring countries. The textbooks from 1992 and 1999 focus very much on the negative aspects of the Крעво union and the foreign faith (Catholicism) associated with it. The 1993 textbook gives a more harmonic picture, including the religious and cultural influence from the West. At the same time, it gives a more negative image of the Eastern neighbour, Moscow.

Identity markers in Belarusian textbooks

All the authors use the modern nationality names when referring to the medieval population. This is most outspoken in the 1993 textbook, which consistently refers to the local population as Belarusians. This term is also used in the 1992 textbook, but here the local population is often simply referred to as “East Slavs”, and the common roots with the Russians and Ukrainians are emphasised. It also claims that Lithuania was a polyethnic state, and that the Belarusians as a separate nation emerged relatively late. In the 1999 textbook the author maintains this view of Belarusian nationality as an offspring of the old Rusian one, and he uses the term “Western Rus” as synonymous to Belarus (Баранава, Загарульскі & Паўлава, 1992, p.3, p.51. Э. М. Загарульскі, 1999, p. 92ff. Штыхаў & у. К. Пляшэвіч, 1993, p. 196).

The religious pluralism within the Grand Duchy of Lithuania is addressed in all the textbooks, but their attitudes towards it vary. The one from 1993 focuses on religious tolerance and peaceful coexistence of Orthodox and Catholics, combined with a calming notion that the Orthodox Church still had a dominant position in the Belarusian rural areas. The two other textbooks focus on the problems caused by the religiously divided population, and their sympathy is unambiguously on the side of the Orthodox Church (Штыхаў & у. К. Пляшэвіч, 1993, p. 196ff. Э. М. Загарульскі, 1999, p. 111).

Language is another identity marker mentioned in all the textbooks since the language of Lithuania’s state administration was a Slavic language, often called Chancery Slavonic. In the 1993 textbook this Slavic language is simply called “Belarusian”; in the one from 1992 it is called “Old Belarusian”, while in the one from 1999 it is called “Rusian” (Баранава, Загарульскі & Паўлава, 1992, p. 52. Э. М. Загарульскі, 1999, p. 101. Штыхаў & у. К. Пляшэвіч, 1993, p. 211). Important connotations are lurking behind these seemingly subtle differences. If the ancient language is called Belarusian, there is an obvious link between the present and the

past: The present nation can be extended backwards, and its present existence can be underpinned by a historical one. If the ancient language is called Old Belarusian, this connection is a bit more blurred, but still existing. When using the word Rusian, the connection to the modern Belarusian nation fades away, since Rusian is a catch-all name for all the East Slavic peoples.

Finally, social classes can also be used as identity markers. The 1992 textbook emphasises the feudal system and the conflicts between social classes. In the 1999 textbook this approach is maintained - for example the author explains the incorporation of Belarus into the Grand Duchy of Lithuania as a result of the feudal lords' desire to rule over the peasant population (Баранова, Загарульскі & Паўлава, 1992, p. 3. Э. М. Загарульскі, 1999, p. 99). The 1993 textbook also mentions feudal lords as a synonym for noblemen, but it does not emphasise social conflicts.

The self and the others in Belarusian textbooks

All the analysed textbooks have the words “History of Belarus” in their title. However, in a medieval context no state by that name existed, so if such a history is to be told, “Belarus” must be represented by something or somebody in the past. Therefore, it is crucial to define what or who represents Belarus in the different versions of the history – or in other words: With whom do the present Belarusians (or at least the present authors) identify in the past?

In the 1992 textbook the object of identification is first of all constituted by the East Slavic areas and populations. There is also some degree of identification with the Grand Duchy of Lithuania because of the Belarusian influence on culture and politics in this country, but they emphasise that it was not a national Belarusian state. They even put Lithuania in a position as an outer enemy by pointing to the power struggle between the Grand Duchy and the (Belarusian) Polack Duchy (Баранова, Загарульскі & Паўлава, 1992, p. 50ff.). The same approach is maintained in the 1999 textbook (Э. М. Загарульскі, 1999, p. 95ff.). A different approach is found in the 1993 textbook – here the object of identification is without doubt the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, which is called a *Belarusian-Lithuanian state*. The authors also pay attention to the relationship between Polack and Lithuania, but they claim that Polack was absorbed into the Grand Duchy as a result of a voluntary agreement rather than conquest. Furthermore, they use the struggle narrative in a positive sense, talking about the *struggle to unite the Lithuanian and Belarusian areas around Navagrudak* (a town located in present-day Belarus). To make the connection even more outspoken, they pay special attention to the “pagonja” - the ancient Lithuanian coat of arms, which was also used by the Belarusian state in the early 1990s (Штыхаў & у. К. Пляшэвіч, 1993, 197ff.).

Concerning the qualitative self-image, all the authors more or less agree on what characterises the “Self” (understood as either the East Slavic areas or the Grand Duchy of Lithuania). The past representative of Belarus was characterised by economic and especially cultural superiority compared to the surrounding areas. In the 1992 textbook this is very much connected to the heritage from the old Kievan Rus, while the 1993 textbook is vaguer concerning the sources of the superiority (Баранава, Загарульскі & Паўлава, 1992, p. 50. Э. М. Загарульскі, 1999, p. 101.). The image of the other parts of the union differs somewhat between the textbooks. Lithuania has already been touched upon: According to the 1993 textbook it is an ally, whereas the other authors see the Lithuanians as culturally inferior oppressors. (Э. М. Загарульскі, 1999, 93ff.) Concerning Ukraine, the textbooks from 1992 and 1999 regard the Ukrainians as fellow East Slavs, whereas the 1993 textbook somewhat patronising states that *Ukraine got the possibility to develop economically, culturally and politically* within the Grand Duchy of Lithuania (Штыхаў & у. К. Пляшэвіч, 1993, p. 215). Poland is playing a relatively marginal role in all the textbooks, but gets a little more attention in the 1993 textbook as a union partner and ally against the Teutonic Order (Штыхаў & у. К. Пляшэвіч, 1993, p. 204f, 216f).

The image of the “others” outside the union has some common features. All the textbooks agree that the principal outer enemy was the Teutonic Order. All of them even talk about the *German aggression* or the *aggression of the Teutonic Knights*. As Ostrovskaja points out, the word “aggression” is relatively seldom in textbooks, and it is first of all used in connection with Nazi Germany, so the Teutonic Order is here linked to some highly value-loaded connotations (Т. Островская, 2010, p.15). The image of Russia/Moscow is more mixed. In the 1992 textbook (originally written before the breakdown of the Soviet Union), Russia is a cultural relative and an ally (Баранава, Загарульскі & Паўлава, 1992, p. 61.). This approach is modified in the later textbooks, most clearly in the one from 1993 where Moscow is nevertheless portrayed more as a rival than as an actual enemy. The 1999 textbook has a third approach: It also describes the competitive relationship between Moscow and Lithuania, but here it is less clear where the author’s loyalty belongs.

Concluding remarks

The overall impression is that the authors of the 1993 textbook to a much higher degree than their predecessors focus on the Belarusians as a separate people with close ties to Lithuania. They identify with the Grand Duchy of Lithuania and emphasise all the Belarusian elements in this state, including the state language and the identification of the local people as “Belarusians”. This textbook obviously emphasises the long traditions of the Belarusian nation and the Belarusian state. The textbook published six years later represents a return to identification with the East

Slavic peoples in a broader meaning, although it does not embrace Russia to quite the same degree as the 1992 textbook.

The three textbooks are written in three different political contexts. The first one in late Soviet time; the second one in the early 1990's – a period characterised by experiments with democratisation and orientation towards the Western world; and the third one in the late 1990's after Lukaszenko established his authoritarian rule characterised by a stronger geopolitical orientation towards Russia. Most of the differences between the textbooks can quite easily be explained as reflections of these political contexts. When the late Soviet textbook emphasises the good relations to the other East Slavic peoples, it is easy to see it as a reflection of the desired situation within the Soviet Union. The later focus on Belarus as a separate nation with close ties to Lithuania can in turn be explained as a reflection of the efforts to establish Belarus as an independent nation-state oriented towards the Western neighbours. In this line of argumentation, the textbook from 1999 represents a revival of the orientation towards Russia, in accordance with the dominating political ideals. The visions of the past can thus be seen as representative for the country's present civilizational orientation.

All these cases can be interpreted as examples of ideological use of history: The political elites strive to construct an image of the past, which gives meaning to the present ideological line. The result is a memory regime with contested historical narratives. The 1993 textbook is especially spectacular as a sharp break with the earlier narratives in order to underpin a new political reality – an effort to mobilise memory for change.

References

- Баранава, М. П.; Э. М. Загарульскі & Н. Г. Паўлава: *Гісторыя Беларусі* [Baranava, M. P.; Zagarul'ski, Ê. M. & Paŭlava, N. G.: *Gìstoryâ Belarusi*], Minsk 1992.
- Загарульскі, Э. М.: *Гісторыя Беларусі: з сярэдзіны I тысячагоддзя да Люблінскай уніі 1569 г.* [Zagarul'ski, Ê. M.: *Gìstoryâ Belarusi: z sârêdziny I tysâčagoddzâ da Lûblinskaj unii 1569*], Minsk 1999.
- Т. Островская: *Генеалогия исторической памяти белорусов в контексте образовательных практик*, BISS 2010 (<http://www.belinstitute.eu/images/doc-pdf/sa012010ru.pdf>).
- ШТЫХАЎ, Г. В. & У. К. ПЛЯШЭВІЧ: *ГІСТОРЫЯ БЕЛАРУСІ: СТАРАЖЫТНЫЯ ЧАСЫ І СЯРЭДНЕВЕЧЧА* [Štyhaŭ, G. V. & Plâševič, U. K.: *Gìstoryâ Belarusi: Staražytnyâ časy i sârêdnevečča*], Minsk 1993.

- J. Assmann: "Kollektives Gedächtnis und kulturelle Identität", in: J. Assmann & T. Hölscher (ed.): *Kultur und Gedächtnis*, Frankfurt 1988
- M. Bernhard & J. Kubik: "A Theory of the Politics of Memory", in M. Bernhard & J. Kubik: *Twenty Years After Communism – The Politics of Memory and Commemoration*, Oxford 2014.
- S. Berger & C. Lorenz: "Introduction: National History Writing in Europe in a Global Age", in: S. Berger & C. Lorenz (ed.): *The Contested Nation – Ethnicity, Class, Religion and Gender in National Histories*, Palgrave Macmillan 2008
- J. Dietsch: *Making Sense of Suffering (Holocaust and Holodomor in Ukrainian Historical Culture)*, Lund 2006
- A. Dutceac Segesten: *Myth, Identity and Conflict. A Comparative Analysis of Romanian and Serbian Textbooks*, Lexington Books 2011.
- H. Pääbo: *Potential of Collective Memory Based International Identity Conflicts in Post-Imperial Space. Comparisons of Russian Master Narrative with Estonian, Ukrainian and Georgian Master Narrative*, Tartu, 2011
- J. V. Wertsch: *Voices of Collective Remembering*, Cambridge 2004

Memoriography and the Anarchival Impulse

Gitanjali Pyndiah

On 30 September 2014, Marianne Hirsch delivered her lecture entitled ‘Mobile Memories’ at the Department of Gender Studies and the Jewish Studies project, Central European University in Budapest. It was a privilege to discuss with her one more time, after meeting her a month ago, for the first time, in Stockholm. In her exposé, Marianne Hirsch discusses the age of ‘monumental memory’ focussing on the range of institutional commemorations and new museums which continue to be set up, the National September 11 Memorial Museum in New York or the Museum of the History of Polish Jews in Warsaw. In relation to the thematics of the Conference/Training School, ‘Mobilising Memory for Change’, she poses the question ‘How can memory be mobilised for a transcultural future that resists the national imaginaries and ideologies displayed in these institutions?’ In that aspect she presents a set of artworks which are presented as counter-memories where the artists ‘activate small, fragmentary archives... creating networks of connectivity and potentiality that might enable memory to move and be moved towards the future’.

My research focusses specifically on the (an-)archives activated by such artists which are ‘small, unofficial, anti-monumental memory practices’ and ‘fragmentary’ according to Hirsch, but which I argue are central to a political project and not situated on the periphery, as counter memories. I am particularly interested in the ‘multiple forms of mediation’ (Hirsch, 2012) which inspire Marianne Hirsch to develop her argument that ‘postmemory is not an identity position but a generational structure of transmission embedded in multiple forms of mediation’. Scholars of memory have referred to second-generation fiction, diaries, memoirs, testimonies, art and music, establishing a dichotomy between the rational, scientific and objective approach traditionally preferred by historians to the interdisciplinary approach of memory scholars influenced by ‘humanities disciplines from history to literary studies, anthropology, sociology and art history’ (Carrier, 2014).

Peter Carrier focuses on the rhetoric of memory and its impact on the historiography of the Holocaust and defines a new category of historiography, ‘Holocaust memoriography’, [as] a body of professional historical writings which deals with the way in which this event is recalled and understood in the present’. He refers to

the ‘many works about memory’ referring to ‘professional historical writings’ which however do not fit in the historiographical canon but which form part of a newly defined category ‘Holocaust memoriography’. For Carrier, memoriographers use ‘diaries, witness accounts, art or music’ as evidence and therefore operate on the periphery of the discipline of history.

At this COST conference on ‘Mobilising memory for change’, I argue that Memoriography is defined as a body of creative works (and not professional historical writings) which deal with the way in which events are recalled historically and understood affectively in the present. I am still developing this argument for my thesis and I will attempt to present this concept at this particularly point of my research. My background in Visual Arts and Media Theory and the influence of British Cultural Studies on my research bring me to question whether creative works in the form of protest art, performance, poetic pieces, diary narratives, fiction are actually only an alternative form of Memory. Marianne Hirsch in her lecture establishes a parallel between institutional memory (commemoration, official historiographies, monumentalisation of memory...) and the ‘small’ resistances to institutional memory in the forms of literature, visual or performative arts. She focuses extensively on photography and creative works in *The generation of Postmemory: Writing and visual culture after the Holocaust* and acknowledges that those ‘works have spawned a veritable industry of critical and theoretical work on memory’ being a ‘self-conscious, innovative, and critical aesthetics that palpably conveys absence and loss’. I argue that the terminology ‘memoriography’ is used to mean the way that memory is memorised and the study of how memory is produced, in the same way that historiography is the writing of history’ and the study of the way history is written/interpreted in a specific context.

A second use of the term ‘Memoriography’ sheds light on the production of memorial materials produced as forms of evidence of historical memories. Japanese artist Chino Otsuka, entitled her video works *Memoriography I* and *Memoriography II* in which she explores different temporalities in memory, blurring the chronological framework of historiography. *Memoriography I* transports the spectator to a doorway in Paris. The video is a 6-minute pause on a photo of the young artist leaning against a majestic wooden doorway, the image eerily superimposed by sound of walking pedestrians and the opening and closing of the heavy door creating an illusion of film. What is unnerving is to slowly witness the image of the younger Otsuka gradually fading from the filmed photograph to give way to an older self-transposed in front of the doorway. The video is an extension of the theme she explores in *Imagine Finding Me*, a series of twelve photographs from her childhood immaculately photoshopped to connect her adult self in another timeframe, that of her younger days. She superimposes two images of her childhood and adulthood to intersect at a junction in memory. The photographs transport the spectator to the various geographical locations of her childhood. Most importantly

the audience travel with the artist on her journey of meticulously superimposing her adult self in the memories provoked by the photographs collected in a family album. This memoriography for her is the reversal of temporality and the linearity of a chronological historiography. In that sense I re-appropriate this term to enclose the visual carriers of memory arguing that the notion of 'professional historical writings' is ambivalent with the embodied state of recollection - 'recall'. Carrier, whose research focused on the rhetoric of memory in political communication, and on the ethical precepts of contemporary discourse about the Holocaust, believes that Holocaust memoriography evolved from Holocaust historiography. He confesses that certain political memoriographies adopt a similarly chronological and national perspective but that the study of memory should not be 'conceived as an alternative to the study of historiography ...but as its complement'. I argue that Carrier proposes a counter historical interpretation of the Holocaust, where the shift of historical narratives have moved from a focus on glorifying the victor to a compassionate approach to the victims. Hence a shift in historiography.

While a historiography denotes the writing of History or the study of historical writings, I argue that a memoriography cannot encompass counter historical writings, nor contain counter memories as evidence. Memoriography asserts itself as a body of creative works which propels memory writings and a shift in historiographical works. If historiography is the writing of history and the study of historical writings, Memoriography is broadly the memorising of memories and the study of memorial works. In my argument I differentiate between institutional memory as deriving the kind of authority ascribed to historical writings (official commemoration, monuments, official narratives of history...) and works pertaining to memory which according to Hirsch can be found in aesthetic practices which act as counter memories. Although my research investigates contemporary visual and literary works in the activation and dissemination of memory, I take into consideration an array of performative acts which potentially act as counter-institutional projects, sometimes outside the institution, sometimes inside. I found the example given at the end of Hirsch's lecture very inspiring. Marianne Hirsch finishes her presentation on the performative act of Emma Sulkowicz, senior visual arts student at Columbia University whose project 'Carry That Weight/Mattress Performance' provoked a mobilisation of students, activists and members of the public around the handling of sexual assault in America. In my research I reflect on the performativity of certain counter-institutional creative instances like Emma's one or the living memorial on Szabadság Square in Budapest 'erected' by the ritual of the performance of a protest by Jewish organisations to the institutional 'falsification of history'. The development of the concept of Memoriography, englobes performance in art (theatre, music and contemporary art) but also art in performance (forms of performative protest).

My research is greatly influenced by Cultural Studies (less of the Birmingham Marxist and psychoanalytical approach but following a more contemporary direction in the field, specifically in Critical Theory and philosophy). From Derrida's deconstruction to Foucault's discourse on power to Feminist Theory via Butler and Braidotti which I will be exploring in the next year, I wish to build upon the relevance of memoriography, NOT as an alternative form of memory but as a mnemonic tool with prospective potentialities which transcend institutional memory.

At this point, I build my argument on the anarchival impulse of artists. According to Hal Foster (2004), critic and art historian, archival artists extract historical information often displaced or misinterpreted, and bring forward its visibility. The artist feels an impulse to 'anarchive', that is to produce counter narratives, with new perspectives to well-established histories and perceptions. 'The archives at issue here are not databases in this sense; they are recalcitrantly material, fragmentary rather than fungible, and as such they callout for human interpretation, not machinic reprocessing' (Foster, 2004). The body of creative works asserts an achronological disposition which defy the linearity and temporality of historical narratives. This paper traces my line of thought starting from the ontology of an institutional archive and the imposition of its authority to the anarchival impulse of artists which provokes a memoriography, central to the discussion of institutionalised memories. It is at this junction that the field of Cultural Studies potentially provokes new debates and interdisciplinary approaches to understanding memorial materials.

Meta narratives and counter narratives become another imposed body of knowledge which imposes a new authority and become what Derrida calls a house arrest in his lecture '*Archive Fever, a Freudian Impression*' in 1994. Derrida's deconstruction of the archival propensity of institutions to chronologically record history and instil its authority as institutional truth provides me with a starting point to analyse the Memory of the State and its institutions and how historiography pervades a collective memory. Derrida's lecture on the archive questions the philosophical practice which has privileged the authenticity of the archive as construing the natural, originary device for the preservation of meaning, securing authentic identity. His reference to the etymology of the word archive allows him to subtract two principles to the word archive: ontological and nomological. The word archive is derived from the Latin word *archeion*, which means the house magistrate but also comes from the Greek word *arkhe* which has two meanings: commencement and commandment. What is interesting in the etymology of the word archive is where things commence and can be related to how historiographies and archives are born simultaneously. As soon as an event is ascribed historical status, it is archived in collective memory. To be historical is to start remembering an event in the past and to demarcate this event from other events. This marks the beginning of archiving remembrance, hence the physical, historical principle. The archive derives its

existence from an initial private domain which acquires authority on becoming publicly recognised.

The *Archivum* or *archeion* is initially a domicile, an address, the residence of the superior magistrates, hence those who command. The museum is established in a similar way. It's usually a heritage house, a historical building or a new location designed for the project. It starts as an address simply but imposes itself as a depository of knowledge, scientifically assessed historical findings or gives itself the right to appropriate objects and narratives of others and house it in the name of preservation or restoration. Derrida calls it the topo-nomology of the archive, which means the authority and place of truth (nomology) of the public archive being possible upon its physical domicile (topology). The topological is the place, the domicile, the attribution of a physical and virtual location to the formation of an archive which marks the institutional passage from the private to the public and affirms an entity of authority and truth. Initially the house magistrate, the archive is now housed in institutions like national archives, museums, art galleries and other institutions. The house gives itself the power, the law to make the law. At this point the trespass between private and public is made. The private domicile imposes itself as a publicly recognised authority. Official documents can be filed, security is imposed upon those who the domicile judges as needful and the institution gives itself the hermeneutic right and the power to interpret the archive. Derrida calls it the house arrest where the archives would not hold power without substrate or domicile. It is this dwelling which marks the institutional passage from the private to the public.

Derrida acknowledges that a science of the archive must include the theory of this institutionalisation, that is the theory that the law begins by inscribing itself there with the right which authorises it. From here we understand the politics of an institutional archive, the political power which gives control and law to that archive. Derrida's archontic principle of the archive (the real, physical or factual existence of the archive) finds resonance in the physical and nomological existence of the historical document; the document as the archiving of events as being historically defined as an event, becomes the authority of one particular way of remembering history. The historian is thus the first archivist, the first to create the archive, the archaeologist, the first to exhibit his document. It is at this junction that I define memoriography as anarchival and intrinsic in literary works, biographies, the visual arts or music, which share 'a commitment to grounding theory in lived experience, and in revealing the way in which the world is produced through the constituting acts of subjective experience' (Butler, 2003).

Hirsh (2012) also refers to Connerton's (1989) inscriptive memorial practice which retains an 'incorporative' embodied dimension where 'photographs give rise to certain bodily acts of looking and certain conventions of seeing and understanding

that we have come to take for granted but that shape, seemingly re-embodiment, and render material, the past we are seeking to understand and receive'. I focus on memoriography, not as a counter narrative of any meta-narrative of historiography but driven by memorial materials which influence memory scholars in the writing of historical documents. An anarchival impulse in the forms of the performativity of protest or 'conceptual art, institutional critiques, feminist writings ... [is] enough so to be considered a tendency in its own right' (Foster, 2004). Drawn from the archives of historiography, memoriographical materials produced in a 'gesture of alternative knowledge or counter memory' (Foster, 2004) expose an affective and subjective reaction to an event.

Can memories be prospective instead of retrospective? Although Foster (2004) does not explore this aspect, he questions its possibility. In his footnotes, Foster raises two speculations: Archival art as counter memory to a memory culture which is prone to amnesia and secondly, contemporary art mimicking a 'society of control' with an 'archive reason' for the possibility of future behaviour prediction. At this point, I argue that memorial materials are always prospective as they exist as ways of determining future actions. These materials are fundamentally not meant to be institutionally archived, yet they are creating an archive of the future in its appropriation by memory scholars to historicise its existence. In this paper which is a developmental piece of writing, I argue that this memoriography deeply connected to 'affective memory' (Benett, 2005) 'have the capacity to address the spectator's own bodily memory; to touch the viewer who feels rather than simply sees the event, drawn into the image through a process of affective contagion'. It is this memoriography which influences historical writings from memory scholars and brings the shift from historiography appropriated by national, religious or ethnic identities to an 'authorial positioning' (Carrier, 2014) of scholars who focus on the subjective complexity of creative works such as literary pieces of victims' life stories in response to institutional historiographies. I conclude that an anarchival impulse influences the shift in institutional historiography and I provide ample case studies in my research to demonstrate its affective monumentality.

References

- Bennett, J. (2005). *Empathic vision: affect, trauma, and contemporary art, Cultural memory in the present*. California: Stanford University Press.
- Butler, J. (1988). Performative Acts and Gender Constitution: An essay in Phenomenology and Feminist Theory. *Theatre Journal, The Johns Hopkins University Press Vol.40*, 519–531.
- Carrier, P. (2014). Holocaust memoriography and the impact of memory on the historiography of the Holocaust. In: Berger, S., Niven, W.J. *Writing the history of memory. Writing history series*. London: Bloomsbury Academic.

- Connerton, P. (1989). *How societies remember, Themes in the social sciences*. Cambridge: University Press.
- Derrida, J. (1996). *Archive fever: a Freudian impression*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Hirsch, M. (2012). *The Generation of postmemory: writing and visual culture after the Holocaust*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Foster, H. (2004) An Archival Impulse. *October Magazine* Num.110, 3–22.

Memory in Relation to an Object in a Context of the Materially Deprived Total Institution of the Nazi Concentration Camp⁷¹

Łukasz Połuszny

Introduction

According to Igor Kopytoff (1986), not only individuals but things as well have biographies. In looking at a thing's biography, one tries to find answers to questions about its production, its history – within which the most significant feature is the recognizable “ages” of its life – and how its use has evolved through time and space. That perspective will enable us to see the social values and interactions of groups mirrored in the materialized dimensions of things. In the article, therefore, I would like to look into the severely deprived material life of Nazi concentration camp prisoners and their everyday struggle in a different manner from the one we are accustomed to, by taking a more materially oriented approach, and focusing on one particular object: bread.

The decision to examine bread, rather than spoons or needles, in the accounts of survivors is based on three factors. Firstly, its importance in memoirs and testimonies, both in qualitative and quantitative aspects, undoubtedly situates it as one of the core objects of everyday life in concentration camps. Secondly, its recognizable presence in private and public narratives raises the question of its role in commemoration processes. Thirdly, bread was an ambiguous object which could be easily transformed and adjusted to inmates' needs. In the article, attention will be paid to different biographies of bread in the everyday life of prisoners of concentration camps (mostly KL Majdanek), and its evolution from an object within the sphere of food to dematerialized representations in the exercise of memory.

⁷¹ The author has received funding for research from National Science Centre, Poland. Decision number 2016/20/T/HS6/00015.

Accounts come from written texts and memoirs, Majdanek State Museum's archives, together with narrative enquiries conducted with survivors by the author.

Bread in concentration camps

In the concentration camps, bread was a major food type and a great treasure. Its arrival was the main point of the day, awaited with great anticipation by the prisoners, who created rituals and tools connected with food, which in turn, allowed them to shape social relations (Latour, 2005; Hodder, 2012). Among many objects, such as sharpened spoons used as knives for cutting and spreading (Arad, AMPA-B), instruments were created to promote the fair distribution of bread. Because bread was given out in loaves, inmates had to share it: "During dividing [bread] discords arise that one got more, and another less ..." (Kwiatkowski, 1966: 71); hence, to resolve arguments, specially designed scales were introduced and/or a prisoner was assigned the role of righteous judge, thereby gaining additional respect and a better position.

Halina Birenbaum (2008) emphasizes that the camp put one in the position of having to fight for everything – a piece of the floor, a blanket, or a bowl. This is especially evident at the moment of arrival, when one is full of despair, stress, and loneliness, separated from one's primary group, without contact with relatives outside the camp or support from local groups, which have not yet been formed. Erving Goffman (1961) rightly placed the total institution in opposition to the family, which weakens the effect of the former even from beyond the camps' fences. This is so because the total institution is not only a housing community, but also a formal organization which produces other forms of group life and relationships within itself. However, even in total institutions, many informal groups or cliques arise. In that context, exceptional skills, often related to operations on things, play a much more significant role than one might expect. An excellent example of this phenomenon is an account from KL Majdanek, where, on the basis of skills connected to food management, the institution of the "family" was set up. It contained the roles of head of the family, family members, and dependent "ducklings":

We were selecting on various criteria: age, lifestyle, views, interests and ordinary human sympathy. ... The head of the family is the one who divided bread and in general was in charge of food. Parcels were taken to her (when the packages started to come), rutabaga and potatoes were brought her, and she had to "make ends meet". In the family there was a division of labor, and none of the members shirked from work ... Drones were expelled from the family or left voluntarily. However, in many families there were "ducklings": people very helpless, distracted, physically weak, elderly or of a very young age. Their survival of the camp is thanks in large part to the local families. (Woliniewska, 1988: 9).

The unofficial formation of the institution of the “family”, based on a homophilic mechanism, was very important for the survival of the prisoners (Karpiński, 2009; Somashekhar, 2014). On the one hand, the job of taking care of food represented a privileged position. On the other hand, it was a special manipulative skill concerning bread that predestined individuals to take a leading position in a group. The term “family” used in the account, plus the existence of “ducklings”, situates this organizational structure within *Gemeinschaft* rather than *Gesellschaft*, and, as such, is a form opposing the power of the total institution through mimicry of the family, reproducing its traditional hierarchies and assigning its various responsibilities and roles. The camp family provided a sense of security, but was only one among many forms of unofficial institutions created within the total institution of Nazi concentration camps. The camp family was sometimes replaced by, or functioned at the same time as, more spatially and numerically limited domestic (bunk bed), friendly, or collegial (work) relationships:

One day, Tadeusz Borowski proposed the establishment of a joint household. All packages, as well as organized food, were to be common property. Portions were supposed to be allotted by a host chosen by us. The purpose – to ensure that each of us was constantly provided with food. We adopted the project unanimously. Tadeusz Borowski became a host. (Jagoda et al., 1984: 94)

In creating this type of alliance, bread was the crucial mediator. Taking it out of one’s own mouth and dividing it with or donating it to another, was treated as an act of heroism, for which only a friend, a rare altruist, or a desperate person could muster enough courage. At the same time, hiding extra portions of bread from inmates might sometimes have been dangerous. It was better to share with neighbors, as that not only resulted in personal satisfaction and aroused sympathy, but also enforced the return of the favor, cemented relationships, and bred true life-long friendships (Jagoda et al., 1984).

In this respect, the story of Adam Nowosławski is especially striking. One night his shoes were stolen, and he had to begin saving bread to exchange for another pair. After a week of collecting bread and taking it out of his own mouth, someone stole his bread. Then, after three weeks of starving himself, he was finally able to provide the required two loaves, and, in return, received a pair of shoes. However, soon after putting them on, he learned that his colleague, who suffered from tuberculosis, had been robbed of his shoes in the night, and, knowing that the colleague might have died without them, decided to give his own shoes away. As a result, he started putting bread aside again, risking his own life. Both inmates survived, and Nowosławski received, as an expression of gratitude, a pair of shoes cast in gold, which he described as a ‘beautiful souvenir’, and which bore the following inscription: “For Adam Nowosławski, the most noble man in the darkest hours of life, J. Giergielewicz” (Nowosławski, APM). This golden “monument” not only

stays in his apartment, attracting the attention of guests, but more importantly, enables the story to endure, legitimizes it, and functions as a sign of heroism recognized.

Because bread might have determined life or death, stealing it from another inmate was considered the worst offense: “Steal, but only from magazines. Not from the prisoner” (Greń and Posuszny, 2012: 134). Cheating, as a variation of theft, was treated similarly. Failure to keep a promise to exchange items for bread could result in an inmate’s subjection to a tribunal and exclusion from the community (Błońska, 1969: 240; Pawłowski, APMM: 3-6).

Freedom and the memory in the body

In the testimonies of concentration camp prisoners after the war, one can notice a specific attitude that they express when mentioning bread. They pay the utmost respect to it, cannot stand the sight of decaying bread, and are afraid of running out of it; hence they gather it, store unmeasured quantities of it, and never throw any away: “I think of the importance of bread for life, then and now. I gently place the uneaten, non-kosher sandwich in a bag and reverently carry it home” (Rawicki and Ellis, 2011: 157). In addition, years after the war, bread is still the object of such strong desire, biologically inscribed in the body, that former prisoners’ taste buds self-activate at the sight of it (Jagoda et al., 1984; Rawicki and Ellis, 2011). The camp experience of survivors is not only reflected in the attitude towards bread, but is also expressed in embodied rituals and habits, which represent a special type of memory connected to bodily practices:

My first question when I get home from work: is there bread, and is there enough of the bread for dinner and breakfast ... I do not let myself tread on bread crumbs, which I feed to the birds. What people around find funny, for me is a kind of ritual, since for many of the prisoners, bread saved their lives. (Jagoda et al., 1984: 209)

I collect every crumb of bread, and instinctively put it in my mouth, which is often followed with a smile from my family. I feed birds with remnants of food ... (Jagoda et al., 1984: 209)

Moreover, from time to time I hide something [food] surreptitiously, for later. (Jagoda et al., 1984: 209)

I mean respect for our food, especially bread. In the camp I always dreamed that the day would come when the one-kilogramme loaf of bread would be only for me. That is why I do not allow myself to throw stale bread away, and I eat it, no matter how tough it is. I've been having periods (because that is probably what to call it) when I do not use a knife to cut the bread, but use my hands. (Jagoda et al., 1984: 208)

Just as thinking about bread and its taste during imprisonment evoked memories of home, when sent by the family and ensuring the continuity of belonging to it, so after the war, for many survivors, its qualities recalled the reality of incarceration and may have revived traumatic memories (Rawicki and Ellis, 2011; Tumarkin, 2013), as in the reference to "...certain things that are so etched in my memory, or maybe, in my sense of smell, are the memory" (Rawicki, 2009:16).

Many rituals and ways of handling the bread in the present were formed during imprisonment, which, as an experience, does not stop resonating with and echoing events of the past. That particular resocialization may be fragmentary, observed in the context of everyday life and embodied rituals that reflect the reverent attitude to bread, thus becoming both a reminder of the past and a symbol of certain values. Additionally, these habits are often transmitted intergenerationally, and can be seen mirrored in the beliefs or practices of the second or third generation (Hirsch and Spitzer, 2009; Kidron, 2012). Respecting bread means also respecting life, especially the frail and the weak; that is why bread is used to feed birds.

Bread was the most holy object in the house. They almost worshipped it. Every piece they ate was like ... I don't know ... like reliving the moment they almost died of hunger and were saved by that piece of bread ... that meant that you eat old bread until it's dry and then turn it into toast, then bread crumbs, which become meatballs ... and then when the bread crumbs are stale you feed it to the birds ... (Kidron, 2012: 203)

Differences in the way former prisoners handle bread are sometimes painfully recognized by family members or by people who witness those "oddities" in behavior, perpetuated mechanically or unconsciously, and often against the survivors' will. The power of habit and ritual can plague one with its compulsiveness, inducing a feeling of shame, and also endangering one through exposure to ridicule in social situations. For some prisoners, however, rituals practiced for years, together with the attitude to bread and food, are an important part of them. They strongly identify with this tendency and seem to treat it as a sign of a special kind of enlightenment, reserved to them alone.

Memory glued together with bread

The sharp hunger constantly present in the camp focused the prisoners' thoughts on food, and especially bread, which was considered the best possible meal. For this reason, in written and spoken memories of witnesses, one can easily hear, as it were echoing their thoughts at the time, repeated references to the topic of food and bread: "Texts dealing with threats of hunger, death or suffering were written in the hundreds – how much there was of bread, soup or deaths" (Greń and Posłuszny, 2012). Expressed in the above quote is a certain weariness of stories recalling the

same themes and patterns, a trap many prisoners fell into. This observation should raise the question: why, despite the mundaneness and universality of that experience, do witnesses in their accounts devote so much attention to everyday issues, in this case, “bread”?

One explanation may lie in the fact that bread, as is recognized worldwide, has the power to convey existential and religious symbolism of universal import, illustrating the scale of both human solidarity and wickedness:

We believed that this great misfortune united us all in one family – yet the first ones, who in January and early February returned from Majdanek, recounted how some waited for the death of their comrades, so as to get an extra ration of bread. How it was all confirmed! (Kwiatkowski, 1966: 100-101)

However, an explanation based on a cultural trope is not the only one. Stories about bread are also strongly associated with, and used to signal, exceptional cases, when prisoners faced a severe penalty, tragic event, or unexpected celebration and happiness. Nothing is remembered better than an unexpected reward in the form of an additional feast, or, by contrast, the bread for breakfast, or shoes, being stolen by a thief. However, bread appears also as if by chance and incidentally, no longer as a main subject, but at most as part of the background; it often carries no particular meaning for a story, but still runs constantly through the narrative:

I trudge to the block, and I realize that I haven’t eaten anything since morning. On the block I am given my eighth of bread. Coffee, of course, is no more. I undress. The leg is festering, throbbing. The doctor told me yesterday that I have inflammation of the periosteum. (Kwiatkowski, 1966: 41)

Crushing lice became a mandatory action in the morning and evening. There aren’t however, as in the reign of the king of the Sun, silver tweezers and a little hammer to do it; one just crushes them between his fingernails, then wipes his hands on his pants. With such hands we eat later, e.g., Bread. (Kwiatkowski, 1966: 71)

It seems that some stories lift off on bread, gravitate towards it, and return like a chorus, the bread adding consistency, or functioning as a comma to separate thoughts and events, or as a full stop to conclude a specific fragment. It is a quite ambiguous object in memory narratives. On the one hand, it signals symbolic and unique events, while, on the other hand, it marks quite daily actions, both in the context of the concentration camp, and in that of the time of freedom. Permanent repetition of the topic of bread in the background of the stories may reflect the rhythm of everyday life in a camp, with irresistible thoughts of bread haunting inmates day and night, as well as marking the passage of time, measured by the widely described highlight of the day, namely the distribution of bread and soup. In addition, bread most likely had such a strong affective impact on prisoners that it stimulated their attention to unimaginable levels, and influenced the way they

remembered things and events, which could explain in part why it occurs so often in testimonies of former prisoners and survivors:

And the smell of fresh baked bread – when it wafted in, it was just excruciating. I can only compare it with what I read and what I know about narcotics, narcotic agents – addicts. You know, how they crave a fix. They don't know; they just go out of their mind, especially if it's hard narcotics like cocaine or whatever. It's there. That's how we felt.

So when you ask me what we did, I don't know, but there we were, just spending the time – dreading the time when the smell of the bread will come. (Rawicki, 2009:16)

Concluding remarks

Bread as a staple food can metonymically represent every meal (Kowalski, 2000). Eating is a basic human practice that involves one in a social order and conditions one to live within groups. Practices connected to bread can objectify, indicate inequality, or exclude, but can also empower, bind groups, and include individuals. What from an egoistic or common-sense perspective may seem insane, like sharing food when one is hungry, may paradoxically save one's life, because in subsequent times of crisis one will find security and protection within a social group, even a dyad. Bread can be a type of food, but also the subject of trade and currency, a container, a material, and a substance. It is a plastic object that can undergo many metamorphoses, depending on social needs.

After the war, bread becomes a symbol of prison life, intensively used by survivors in their accounts. However, the memory of the camp is also conveyed through everyday practices related to bread: showing the great respect in which it is held, and recording the rituals and habits of camp provenance, which, though not always conscious, form an embodied and living memory of that time. But bread is also present as a narrative element that illustrates deeply symbolic events, both momentous and traumatic. Its function at the narrative level seems to be the bonding of what is prosaic and what is extraordinary. On the one hand, it helps the story to flow steadily and circularly in the rhythm of meals given out from one day to the other, creating bridges within the story. On the other hand, it indicates events of another order, of universal or incidental significance, which are engraved in the memory as constructions bonded with bread.

For many reasons, food should not be perceived as belonging to the category of things (Krajewski, 2013). However, the case of bread in the camp seems to weaken that claim. Bread in a concentration camp context, and most likely in many other total institutions, is an object with blurred boundaries, moving easily between its

definition as food and as things. If one creates a continuum of food–thing, bread and its various forms are located at all relevant points of the axis. Beyond that, bread immaterializes, becoming a form of representation: the foundation, and the switch, that activates memories of the camp, but also provides a secure basis for their existence.

References

- APMM (Majdanek State Museum Archive). Gorczyca T, *Relacje*, VII/M-387.
- APMM, Nowosławski A, *Zbiór nagrań video*, XXII-13.
- APMM, Pawłowski R, *Grypsy*, IV-97.
- Birenbaum H (2008) Hope is the Last to Die. Oświęcim: Auschwitz-Birkenau State Museum.
- Błońska S (1969) Pół roku i parę dni. In: Rajca C and Rosiak E and Wiśniewska A (eds.) *Jesteśmy świadkami. Państwowe Muzeum na Majdanku*. Lublin: Wydawnictwo Lubelskie, pp. 228-242.
- Greń P and Posłuszny Ł (2011) Społeczny wymiar kultury fizycznej w obozach koncentracyjnych. *Rita Baum* 24, pp. 54-58.
- Greń P and Posłuszny Ł (2012) *Pytanie o pamięć. Relacje autobiograficzne więźniów obozów koncentracyjnych*, Krakow: Aureus.
- Goffman E (1961) *Asylums: essays on the social situation of mental patients and other inmates*. New York: Doubleday, Anchor Books.
- Hirsch M and Spitzer L (2009) *The witness in the archive: Holocaust Studies/Memory Studies*. *Memory Studies* 2(2), pp. 151–170.
- Hodder I (2012) *Entangled: an archaeology of the relationships between humans and things*. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Jagoda Z, Kłodziński S and Masłowski J (1984) *Więźniowie Oświęcimia*. Kraków - Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Literackie.
- Karpiński Z (2009) Od teorii wymiany społecznej do teorii relacji międzygrupowych: socjologia teoretyczna Petera M. Blaua. In: Blau PM *Wymiana i władza w życiu społecznym*. Kraków: Nomos, pp. I–XLIV.
- Kidron CA (2012) *Silent legacies of trauma: a comparative study of Cambodian Canadian and Israeli holocaust trauma descendant memory work*. In: Argenti N and Schramm K (eds) *Remembering Violence: Anthropological Perspectives on Intergenerational Transmission*. New York: Berghahn Books, pp. 185–220.
- Kopytoff I (1986) *The cultural biography of things: commoditization as process*. In: Appadurai A (ed.) *The social life of things: commodities in cultural perspective*. New York: Cambridge University Press, pp. 64–91.
- Kowalski P (2000) *Chleb nasz powszedni. O pieczywie w obrzędach, magii, literackich obrazach i opiniach dietetyków*. Wrocław: Ossolineum.

- Krajewski M (2013) *Są w życiu rzeczy. Szkice z socjologii przedmiotów*. Warszawa: Fundacja Bęc Zmiana.
- Kwiatkowski J (1966) *485 dni na Majdanku*. Lublin: Wydawnictwo Lubelskie.
- Latour B (2005) *Reassembling the social: an introduction to Actor-Network-Theory*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Rawicki J and Ellis C (2009) *Jerry Rawicki oral history interview by Carolyn Ellis, July 1, 2009*, pp. 1–55. Available at: http://scholarcommons.usf.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1154&context=hgstud_oh
- Rawicki J and Ellis C (2011) Lechem Hara (Bad Bread), Lechem Tov (Good Bread): Survival and Sacrifice During the Holocaust. *Qualitative Inquiry* 17(2), pp. 155–157.
- Somashekhar MH (2014) *Diversity through homophily?* The paradox of how increasing similarities between recruiters and recruits can make an organization more diverse. *MCGILL SOCIOLOGICAL REVIEW* 4, pp. 1–18.
- (1988) Przeciw przemocy. In: Tarasiewicz K (ed) *My z Majdanka. Wspomnienia byłych więźniarek*. Lublin: Wydawnictwo Lubelskie.

Memory Studies in Motion – Reflections on Two New Research Trends in the Field

Barbara Törnquist-Plewa, Anamaria Dutceac Segesten

It has been eight years since the journal *Memory Studies* was launched in 2008, eight years in which the academic field of Memory Studies has become increasingly established and institutionalized. Last year several international conferences and short, intensive PhD courses entirely dedicated to the study of memory were organized, a significant number of them by COST Action ISTME (1203), the European network behind this volume financed by the EU in the years 2012-2016. The same year the action ended, plans were put forward for the founding of an International Memory Studies Association, to be legally registered as the Association in 2017. Enumerating these achievements one may think that Memory Studies has begun to look back, towards its history. In fact, the field has never been more forward-oriented. In the present chapter we strive to outline a couple of *lignes de force* that point in the direction of the future orientations the field may take. The ambition is mostly to sketch some general trends towards which memory research may orient itself and to delve a bit deeper into two aspects that we consider particularly interesting for future developments within the field: the relationship between memory and the digital world and that between memory and heritage.

A simple search in the catalogue of the book series 'Memory Studies', published by Palgrave, reveals the diversity of the academic research driven in this area. Currently at 56 titles, the series highlights the existence of numerous entry points into the study of memory, either collective or individual, cultural or communicative, private or public. Many of the books' themes converge towards the study of commemoration practices (anything between the Falklands War, Bloody Sunday and the bombardment of Dresden in World War II), together with their corollary, the practices of forgetting, leaving out or silencing memories of the past. Other themes that recur are the cultural preservation, transmission and interpretation of memory through theatre, cinema and the arts, or the role of the media (print, TV and radio) in communicating memories. Another element that appears in many publications is the focus on trauma, conflict or difficult pasts, an emphasis on the contentious nature

of dealing with a past that may harbour different meanings for different actors. The ethics of memory, the relationship of memory with the future and the various emplacements and displacements of memory in space are all themes existing either in the fore- or background for many authors.

However, some of the themes are only present in their incipient form. From all the potential avenues, we will focus here on two: the influence of digitalization processes on human memory and the connection between collective memory and cultural heritage. These two trends, we argue, are among the most promising avenues to explore for the burgeoning field of memory studies.

Human memory and digitalization

Digitalization affects every aspect of life and is understood here as the general process of transforming the way information is produced, distributed and consumed from a material to a virtual realm. Memory, both individual and collective, is affected by digitalization in profound and long-lasting ways.

The list of 'digital memories' is very long, and Garde-Hansen, Hoskins and Reading successfully manage to enumerate all imaginable items: 'Online mementos, photographs taken with digital cameras or camera phones, memorial web pages, digital shrines, text messages, digital archives (institutional and personal), online museums, online condolence message boards, virtual candles, souvenirs and memorabilia traded on eBay, social networking and alumni websites, digital television news broadcasts of major events, broadcaster websites of archival material, blogs, digital storytelling, passwords, computer games based on past wars, fan sites and digital scrapbooks' (2009: 4). Besides these specific virtual objects or spaces of memory, we should also count the processes of creating, searching, indexing, curating, sharing and deleting digital memories as part of the digitalization process typical of our tech age. In this following section, we will distinguish between three main areas where digitalization is a game changer for individual memory: storing and accessing the past (archiving), negating the process of forgetting, changing the sense of time. In accordance with the claim by Maurice Halbwachs, the father of memory studies, that all memory is both individual and social (1925), we want to argue that the three above-mentioned processes have a direct impact also on collective memory, especially on historical interpretations, collective identities and, increasingly, cultural heritage.

A. Archiving

From the very first attempts at stone carving and papyrus writing, humans have been very adept at delegating the task of storing their memories on external devices.

Dubbed 'transactive memory' (Wegner 1987), this process has been constantly under the sign of technological development, but until very recently these external memory support forms were material. Now, in the age of the digital camera, of write-on screens, of e-books and e-journals, we see the most radical transposition of individual memories into a virtual form. As the title of one of José Van Dijck's articles states: the computer becomes a personal 'memory machine' (Van Dijck 2005).

Technological development in the shape of digital media and social networking sites has completely transformed the capacity of human beings to transcend the physical limitations of the brain. The 'time capsule' project designed by Andy Warhol in 1974, in which he collected physical objects that defined his everyday life in cardboard boxes, is now not art but reality for almost anyone with access to a mobile phone and the Internet. Except now, of course, the storage is no longer in moving boxes but in information clouds. So how can one create one's own time capsule? Well, as the common saying goes, there is an app for that. As early as 2004, the phone maker Nokia offered the option of storing all the personal text messages and pictures taken with their devices (Allen 2008: 49). More recently, lifelogging applications for mobile devices like Memoir have made waves, promising full privacy, authentic memorialization of personal experiences and, most importantly, 'self's curatorial control' (Hoskins 2015: 20). Reviewed in prestigious newspapers and Internet publications such as the Wall Street Journal, The New York Times and Mashable, Memoir the app promises to create a personal database of geolocated pictures spread across several social media accounts, which the user can label and tag. The app then would calculate, via algorithms, which memories to resurface in connection to the current date and place, and then suggest with whom the user would like to share these particular nostalgic moments. As one of its founders says, 'There are a lot of products out there that are based around reliving memories/... /What we very much focused on is making it a multiplayer experience. Memoir is about giving you access to memories in a way that you can share and relive them with just the right people' (Bromwich, 2014).

Lifelogging apps such as Memoir reveal the deeply networked nature of individual memories. Social media sites encourage their users to take and share pictures where their friends are identified. Facebook has now a function that brings up pictures or posts that took place on the same day some years ago, suggesting to users to share again those moments and to comment on their significance. In this sense, Facebook works like a nostalgia machine, a reference library for personal experiences. As research shows, however, these Facebook-shared experiences are heavily filtered, creating a positive but rather inauthentic image of the personal past. The performance of identity on social media is distorting the perception of the self at the

same time as it destroys the borders between private and public. As we will discuss below, the contemporary challenge is not to remember, but to forget.

Beyond the personal scrapbook and memory album that constitute one's personal memory treasure, the digitalization of memories is expanded to the scale of entire societies. States around the world invest heavily in the digital transposition of their most valuable heritage: from scanning in precious manuscripts to the creation of virtual reality spaces reproducing exactly and in high fidelity the sights of historical monuments such as Pompeii or the Vatican . The European Union has also followed the digitization trend in creating a digital library of European cultural heritage. Named EUROPEANA, the multimedia library encourages the co-creation of content between professionals and regular citizens, and wants to be a repository of 'Europe's collective memory' (Viviane Reading, EU Commissioner, quoted in Valtysson 2011: 151). Like personal memory then, collective memory is also easily accessible, interactive, networked, shareable – a consequence of the 'outsourcing' of memory (Hoskins, 2015:19).

B. Forgetting

As a derivative of the unlimited storage capacity of computers, removing memories is increasingly an act of will and not a necessity. Even if we cannot actively keep track of everything we have witnessed, experienced or learned about in our minds, today it is very easy to access this information by performing a search on the web or within one's own private archive to retrieve, often in minute detail, events of the past. This challenges the very possibility of forgetting. Nothing that was published online is ever completely removed. Almost everything that was created in a digital form is automatically backed up on cloud storage spaces, so the disappearance of a computer or memory card does not imply automatic removal of all traces. Under these circumstances, forgetting is almost an impossibility, the only limit being the brain's capacity to process the externally stored memories.

This trend towards the permanence of the past in the present contradicts the psychological need to forget, which is necessary to the process of individual identity formation. As Burkell puts it, 'personal narratives depend crucially on the malleable nature of autobiographical memory: a strong sense of self requires that one remember what matters, and forget what does not' (Burkell 2016: 17). Our minds become overburdened by the pressure to process increasingly higher amounts of information, leading to stress and to other psychological issues (Carr, 2010).

Since users have outsourced their memories to social media platforms and mobile apps, they are increasingly given the illusion of being the sole curators of their past while in reality algorithmic selection, aimed at increasing the time spent on the

respective platforms, shape remembering and forgetting patterns. Unwanted, painful memories may resurface through the mechanics of algorithmic selection, or, as an opposite example, an idealized beautified past may be recollected. Regardless of which version of the past is brought up, it stands proof of the great access to personal memory resources held by these external sites.

Normatively speaking, this lifts the question of the right to be forgotten. In a ruling from May 2014, the European Court of Justice decided that the individual right for privacy must be upheld to the detriment of the right to the freedom of access to information (Kerr 2016). The ECJ stated that the EU's Data Privacy Directive applies not only to web sites but also to search engines. Concretely, this means that EU citizens have the right to ask internet pages and search motors to remove links about them, as long as the information contained is of public interest. In the latest development from March 2016, a court in Belgium decided in favour of a person who was involved in a traffic accident and who asked a newspaper to delete all references to him from its archive. The consequences of this ruling are substantial: people can self-censor the publically available information about themselves and in this sense alter the memory record. Since the right to forget is particularly pertinent for individuals with the ambition to play a role in the public life, it may lead to censorship and the obscuring of important but potentially compromising details about an individual who candidates for public office (Ginsberg 2016).

The right to forget is one of the measures taken to insure users' privacy. At the same time, by agreeing to the terms of service of commercial platforms the very same users give up, of their free will, the right to own data about their individual behaviour. Companies such as Facebook, PayPal and Twitter have a whole business model based on the commercial exploitation of trace data of their members (Fuchs 2014). Equally problematic is the intrusion of governments: the memories left by citizens on social media and digital storage spaces provide a wealth of information about the opinions, attitudes and potentially disobedient behaviours of individuals. Lifelogging provides an ideal opportunity for surveillance (Allen 2008: 54), especially for governments with authoritarian tendencies.

Timelessness

The process of remembering is the bringing of the past into the present and presupposes that there is a timeline connecting that which used to be and that which will take place in the future. Because of the digitalization of memory, however, the past, present and future coexist: unless one looks carefully at the time stamp of posts, algorithms can make two-day old posts pop up as having just taken place. The very idea of sending snapshots of the day via Instagram, whose name means instant sharing, is now compromised: one may appear to be on the beaches of Margarita

Island but actually post the picture much later from the greyness of a Scandinavian morning.

Even more poignant in the timelessness factor in the case of websites or social media pages that are dedicated to historical events, people or institutions. Kaun and Stiernfeldt (2014) examined the Facebook page of DT64—Das Jugendradio der DDR, a virtual memorial to an East German youth radio station active during the communist period until 1993. In their study, they uncover three different layers of temporality and introduce the concept of 'social media time'. Social media functions on the principles of immediacy, newness and even liveness. On Facebook, the algorithm governs what gets showed on individual users' feed; EdgeRank measures relevance of a post as inversely proportional to the amount of time since it has been published (Bucher in Kaun and Stiernfeldt 2014: 1161). The 'time decay' factor means that older stories will be pushed lower in the users feed and will have increasingly smaller chances to be seen and interacted with. Thus the digital architectures of the social media platform pushes memorial pages such as the Jugendradio to continuously publish old-new content, to repost and recycle their material in the hope of attracting the attention of more users. Thus, social media time negates duration and sequence and provides a feeling of timelessness.

With timelessness comes also decontextualisation. A shared image of a historical personality or event, which lacks any identifiers (who made the image, whom or what does it represent, when was the image taken/painted) becomes much harder to interpret. The door to the rewriting of the (meaning of) history is open, as symbolic figures of the past, reclaimed by new causes and communities, become symbols for new social movements or are invoked as arguments in debates that did not exist in their lifetime. Normatively, this could be seen as having both positive consequences (a jump in historical awareness) and negative ones (manipulation, lack of cultural sensitivity). It could even be illegal, like in the spreading of material created by Holocaust deniers or Nazi propagandists, but which lack the attribution of origin.

The three aspects highlighted here deserve further academic investigation. The pace of technological change is so fast that today's trending apps and social media sites are bygone by tomorrow, so exercises in tracking the archiving, forgetfulness and timelessness aspects of digital memories need to be theoretically driven and less dependent on the particulars of this or that website or tech fad. This research needs also to embrace interdisciplinarity, in particular as the materials under study, digitally created, stored and shared memories, require new methodological approaches, designed in collaboration among humanists, social scientists and computer science scholars.

Such new methods have already been applied in some pioneering studies. García-Gavilanes et al. (2017) collect data about aircraft accidents from Wikipedia and analyse it using computer models to test 'view flows', or how new accidents increase the probability that older accidents are being recalled. Recalling means, in this case, viewing the Wikipedia page of the historical event. On their basis of 10.5 million flows from source (i.e. new) events to target (old) events, the team was able to create a mathematical model of memory using variables like similarity, geography and links connecting the new and the old air incidents. The model established that on Wikipedia new events triggered a recall process for old events, a memory flow that can now be tracked and tested with the help of big data and computer-assisted methods.

García-Gavilanes and her colleagues relied on data science for their analysis. In a review article, Spinney (2017) includes information from several psychology-driven projects that show how 'social networks powerfully shape memory, and that people need little prompting to conform to a majority recollection — even if it is wrong' (168). Through various experiments, the research reviewed shows that the networked nature of the social media memory may open the door not only to 'fake news' but also to false memories and from there to fake history.

In the next section we will contemplate another trend in the study of memory, which is also interdisciplinary, located at the intersection of cultural heritage and collective memory.

Collective memory and cultural heritage

'Memory' and 'heritage' all too often have been treated as separate concepts. However, during the last two decades an increasing number of scholars has recognized that heritage must be seen as a part of cultural memory. It is our contention that heritage has to be seen as a special form of cultural memory or a specific form of memory structuring. According to the definition proposed by Jan Assmann, cultural memory 'comprises that body of reusable texts, images, and rituals specific to each society in each epoch, whose 'cultivation' serves to stabilize and convey that society's image' (1995, p.132). This means, of course, that not everything that belongs to cultural memory of a society is heritage, but has the potential to become heritage. The process of heritagisation of culture, i.e. assigning a status of cultural heritage to cultural objects and ideas, is unthinkable without memory work. Thus, heritage has an immutable place in a society's cultural memory.

Since cultural heritage is infused with memory, it follows the same temporality model as memory: it creates and expresses continuity between past, present and

future. Thus, heritage is about the uses of the past (sometimes imagined past), in the present, for the future. Heritage is connected to memory transmission and reception, memorialization and commemoration - the same processes which also are in focus of memory studies.

Taking into account this overlap between heritage studies and memory studies it should not be surprising that both fields struggle with many of the same problems. A dive into scholarly literature of heritage studies gives evidence for that. The heritage scholars decry, for example, the lack of any accepted theorization of the heritage concept. They complain that 'heritage today defies definition' (Lowenthal 1998: p.94) and thus the scholars use definitions that are as broad and malleable as possible. They point out that the field is very multi- and interdisciplinary, which is both its strength and its weakness. They worry that the heterogeneous nature of heritage studies may leave us with little more than a 'morass of case studies' (Harvey 2001: pp. 3-4). They have warned repeatedly against the risk to essentialise heritage and emphasize that 'heritage should be not seen as something we have, but something we do, that it is not about things but processes.' Memory scholars recognize all these problems from their own field. If we accept that memory and heritage scholars deal with similar topics then we should ask what the difference is between them.

To illustrate the difference, let us imagine that one memory scholar and one heritage scholar face the task to analyse a specific mnemonic/heritage place such as the Anne Frank House in Amsterdam. How will their scientific account look? Both will certainly write about why and how the place has become significant, how it has been interpreted and used and what narratives about the past were mediated there. However, since the heritage studies have developed as so-called 'applied discipline' (Howard 2003: pp. 21-23) it is expected from the heritage scholar to include in his analysis substantial practical elements, such as the questions of conservation, curatorship and often also economic management of the place. Moreover, the heritage scholar will suggest some recommendations to the practitioners who work with heritage. Consequently, having to focus on these aspects, the heritage scholars traditionally have been less dedicated to the theory development and to a more detailed analysis of the political and social context of heritage production and maintenance. They also have dealt less with the remediation and reception of mnemonic products called 'heritage'. This has instead become the domain of memory scholars with different disciplinary backgrounds.

Since heritage studies have been treated as 'applied discipline', the scholars within the field feel pressure to go beyond theorizing and act as experts. They cannot afford to withdraw from the political and social debates about heritage. Heritage making

is about making choices, which means that someone will be put at an advantage and someone else at a disadvantage. Since heritage is an inherently value-laden concept, any decision concerning it is political. Thus, heritage specialists are either themselves decision makers or advisors to the decision makers in the field of heritage, which is essentially a part of politics of memory in a given society. This puts the heritage scholars in the complex situation of acting as heritage makers and at the same time analysing the process in which they are participating, as well as the products of their own work. It goes without saying that the need for discussing one's own position, the need for self-reflection and self-criticism is on demand here. The growing awareness of this dilemma during approximately the last two decades among the heritage scholars has led to the emergence of the so-called 'Critical Heritage Studies' and the creation of the Association of Critical Heritage Studies in 2010.

In the manifesto of the Association from 2012, its founders emphasized that heritage is a political act and thus there is an urgent need to scrutinize 'the power relations that 'heritage' has all too often been invoked to sustain. Nationalism, imperialism, colonialism, cultural elitism, Western triumphalism, social exclusion based on class and ethnicity, and the fetishising of expert knowledge have all exerted strong influences on how heritage is used, defined and managed.' (<http://www.criticalheritagestudies.org/history/>) Furthermore, it is stated in the manifesto that Critical Heritage Studies want to energize the field by drawing on wider intellectual sources, among which memory studies are explicitly mentioned.

It is our contention that not only the heritage studies can be energized by memory studies, but that it can and should be a mutual process. Both fields have the potential to enrich each other. The insights from memory studies can help the heritage studies in theorizing power relations involved in heritage making, but at the same time memory scholars can learn from the heritage specialists to understand better a specific aspect of these power relations, namely the role of economic interest in the memory work. To what extent is the use of specific pasts influenced by commercial interests and needs and how are these interests balanced against other interests - existential, educational, political and ideological? When and how does memory become a commodity and what are the consequences? These issues are still insufficiently researched in memory studies.

Moreover, the insights from heritage studies can help memory studies to deepen their understanding of the concept of collective memory which is contested by some scholars (e.g. Young 1993) and sometimes even declared to be a pure metaphor (e.g. Gavriely-Nuri 2014), which leads many memory scholars to attempts to differentiate between different kinds of memory, such as 'collected', 'mass',

'public', 'institutional' (e.g. Olick and Robbins 1998: p. 112). Those who argue for the use of the concept of 'collective memory' usually point to the fact that it is about the part of cultural memory which is used to support and substantiate a group's identity (e.g. Misztal 2003: p.25). In light of this, heritage making can be seen as an inescapable part of collective memory construction and thus can give insights into how it is constructed. As argued by many heritage scholars, 'heritage' is a device to support notion of community (Harvey 2001:9) and contributes to legitimizing the further existence of the community. Heritage puts to the test the question of belonging since the word itself provokes the question of ownership: Whose heritage? Who bequeaths something to whom? Moreover, recognition of something as someone's heritage triggers not only the question of rights but also obligations. It is expected that an inheritor takes responsibility for what is declared and recognized as heritage. Thus, cultural heritage is tightly connected to community building and construction of collective identity. It is the cultural memory used to forge collective identity. It both unites and divides; it is both inclusive and exclusive. The analysis of the process of heritagization can help memory scholars to better understand the dynamics of collective memory and identity.

At the same time the recent insights within memory studies about the multidirectionality (Rothberg 2009) and multiscalearity (Rigney 2014, Kennedy and Nugen 2016) of memory can inspire heritage scholars to work against an ingrained tendency within their field to essentialize heritage and see it as more homogenous as it is. For a long time, heritage studies focused on the national level and family level, while local, regional and international levels were sometimes overlooked, not to mention transcultural and transnational entanglements. The recently emerged critical heritage studies have turned their attention to all these levels (see e.g. Graham, Ashworth, and Tunbridge, 2007) but there is still much to be done and memory studies can serve here as a source of inspiration.

Both memory studies and heritage studies have to deal with similar challenges and could join forces to approach them. One such question is their relation to history as scientific field and specially the claim of historians that history in the alleged contrast to memory and heritage deals with facts and truths about the past and thus should be privileged in the interpretation of the past. However, although heritage, as well other representation of cultural memory, is often simplified and contains omissions and generalization, it does not have a 'license to lie' (Howard 2003 p.21). Indeed, in contrast to history writing, they are sometimes allowed to present historical fictions, provided that the audience is aware of it. In all other cases, as pointed by Howard (ibid.), truth claims matter on the part of the public and memory narratives and heritage are scrutinized from the point of view of factuality and

authenticity. Thus, this is also a theoretical challenge that scholars from both fields have to meet.

Yet, another issue suitable for mutual fertilization between memory and heritage studies is the question of 'materiality of memory' – relations between material objects and memory. Heritage scholars have vast experience in examining this question which can be shared with memory scholars. Likewise, the insights achieved by memory scholars may be useful to those heritage scholars who are interested in analyses of so called 'intangible heritage'.

In this context, it should be pointed out that today there is a strong trend within critical heritage studies to 'dematerialize' heritage, i.e. attempts to disentangle it from the focus on objects and their conservation. Scholars adhering to this trend even make the claim that heritage should be simply defined as a performative act of speech – as a prelocutionary narrative (memory narrative which has a special effect). As soon as something from the past is recognised as 'heritage' it changes its status, it is selected and invested with value. This line of reasoning brings heritage scholars closer to scholars of memory, especially to those among them who work within communication studies, cultural studies and cultural sociology. Thus, a dialogue between them may be very fruitful.

Last but not least it is worth to mention another important aspect of heritage studies that memory studies can learn from. It is about a realization made by heritage scholars that heritage is an agent of change. Heritage changes people since when they recognize something as their common inheritance it gives them sense of belonging together, and a feeling of responsibility. It can motivate them to action, mobilize them and strengthen their communal solidarity. Heritage changes a place – since places recognized as heritage rises in status and value. Heritage changes politics – since it gives people a voice and authority to negotiate. Heritage changes the social order, since, as an instrument of cultural power, it gives rise to new communities, empowers some social groups and sometimes disempowers others. Hence, it can contribute to the social cohesion or to the opposite, create divisions within society.

Finally, taking into account the experiences made by scholars within heritage studies, we may also consider if memory scholars should do what heritage scholars have always done, namely to go beyond theorizing and engage ourselves in societal work with memory. We are encouraged by many societal actors (often sponsors of our research) to do that. Some of us already work with different non-academic stakeholders, act as experts in museums or other memorial locations, engage in political initiatives dealing with reconciliation processes or transitional justice, educational endeavours with NGO-activists and other so-called 'multipliers' or

'transmitters'. However, memory scholars have still a lot to learn in this field. We need more of scholarly reflection over our own simultaneous position as memory scholars and memory makers, especially in a new situation when memory studies on many occasions are expected to be an applied discipline. We need more discussions on memory studies as producer of 'situated knowledge' (Haraway 1988) and we need deeper reflection on the possibilities, but also the risks involved in 'action research' (Reason and Bradbury 2006) .

Moreover, those memory scholars who decide to go in this direction could learn from heritage studies how to create networks with practitioners and find suitable ways to communicate with them. In contrast to heritage scholars, we are not trained (and have no experience of how) to translate knowledge into practical action. Therefore, it would be valuable to call for more cooperation between memory and heritage scholars, more common research projects, where we can learn from their experience and stakeholder contacts and share our more theoretical knowledge with them.

This chapter has provided a brief overview of two trends that, we believe, will define future research in the field of memory studies. The impact of digitalization and the strong affiliation between heritage and collective memory will be useful avenues of investigation because their impact goes to the core of the issues of our field: power, identity and the circulation of ideas about the individual and collective past.

References

- Allen, Anita. L. (2008). "Dredging up the past: Lifelogging, memory, and surveillance." *The University of Chicago Law Review* 75(1): 47-74.
- Assmann, Jan (1995). "Collective Memory and Cultural identity." *New German Critique* 65.
- Bromwich, Jonah. (2014). "An App, Memoir, Guesses Your Fondest Memories." *New York Times*. New York.
- Burkell, Jacquelynn Ann. (2016). "Remembering me: big data, individual identity, and the psychological necessity of forgetting." *Ethics and Information Technology* 18(1): 17-23.
- Carr, Nicholas. G. (2010). *The Shallows: What the Internet is doing to our brains*. New York, W.W. Norton.
- García-Gavilanes, Ruth, et al. (2017) "The memory remains: Understanding collective memory in the digital age." *Science Advances* 3:4, e1602368.
- Garde-Hansen, Joanne, et al. (2009). Introduction. *Save as... digital memories*. J. Garde-Hansen, A. Hoskins and A. Reading. Basingstoke, Palgrave Macmillan: 1-21.
- Gavriely-Nuri, Dalia, (2014), "Collective memory as a metaphor: The case of speeches by Israeli prime ministers 2001-2009", *Memory Studies*, January 2014, pp. 46-60.

- Ginsberg, Jodie. (2016). "Global View: Europe's right-to-be-forgotten law pushed to new extremes after a Belgian court rules that individuals can force newspapers to edit archive articles." *Index on Censorship* 45(3): 60-61.
- Graham Brian and Howard Peter (eds) 2008, "The Ashgate Research Companion to Heritage and Identity", Aldershot-Burlington: Ashgate Publishing.
- Graham Brian, Ashworth, Gregory J. Tunbridge, John E. (2007) *Pluralising Pasts. Heritage, Identity and Place in Multicultural Societies*, London and Ann Arbor.
- Hafstein, Valdimar T (2009), "Inangible Heritage as a list. From masterpieces to representation", in Smith L. and Akagawa, N. (eds) *Intangible Heritage*, London: Routledge, pp.93-111.
- Halbwachs, Maurice. (1992), "On collective memory", Chicago, The University of Chicago Press, translated from: *Les cadres sociaux de la mémoire*, Paris, Presses Universitaires de France, 1952, originally published in *Les Travaux de L'Année Sociologique*, Paris, F. Alcan, 1925.
- Haldrup, Michael and Bærenholdt, Jørgen Ole, (2015) "Heritage as Performance" in Waterton E. and Watson, S. eds. *The Palgrave handbook of contemporary heritage research*, Basingstoke and New York: Palgrave MacMillan, pp. 52-68.
- Haraway, Donna, (1988). "Situated Knowledges: The Science Question in Feminism and the Privilege of Partial Perspective", *Feminist Studies*, Vol. 14, No. 3. pp. 575-599.
- Harrison, Rodney (2013), *Heritage. Critical Approaches*, London and New York: Routledge.
- Harvey David C. (2001) "Heritage pasts and heritage presents: Temporality, meaning and the scope of heritage studies", *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, Volume 7, no. 4, December 2001, pp. 319-338
- Hoskins, Andrew. (2015). "Archive Me! Media, Memory, Uncertainty. Memory in a Mediated World", in Pentzold, Christian, Christine Lohmeier, and Andrea Hajek (eds), *Memory in a Mediated World*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmilland: 13-35.
- Howard, Peter, (2003), *Heritage. Management, Interpretation, Identity*. London-New York: Continuum.
- Kaun, Anne. and Fredrik Stiernstedt (2014), "Facebook time: Technological and institutional affordances for media memories." *New Media & Society* 16(7): 1154-1168.
- Kennedy Rosanne and Nugent Maria (2016), "Scales of Memory: Reflections on an Emerging Concept", *Australian Humanities Review*, Issue 59, April/May 2016, <http://australianhumanitiesreview.org> (accessed 6 December 2016)
- Kerr, Julia. (2016). "What Is a Search Engine: The Simple Question the Court of Justice of the European Union Forgot to Ask and What It Means for the Future of the Right to Be Forgotten". *Chi. J. Int'l L.* 17: 217.
- Lowenthal, David, (1998), *The Heritage Crusade and the Spoils of History*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- MacDonald, Sharon (2013), *Memorylands. Heritage and Identity in Europe Today*, London and New York: Routledge.

- Misztal, Barbara, (2003), *Theories of Social Remembering*, Maidenhead – Philadelphia: Open University Press.
- Morisset, Lucie. K. “What can heritage change?” Key note speech at the conference of the Association of Critical Heritage Studies, Montreal, 5 June 2016.
- Olick Jeffrey K. and Robbins, Joyce, (1998), “Social Memory Studies: From ‘Collective Memory’ to the Historical Sociology of Mnemonic Practices”, *Annual Review of Sociology*, 24, pp. 105-40.
- Poort, Joost et al. (2013). *The value of Europeana: the welfare effects of better access to digital cultural heritage*. Amsterdam School of Economics Research Institute.
- Purchla Jacek and Murzyn, Monika A. eds. (2007) *Cultural Heritage in the XXIst Century. Opportunities and Challenges*, Krakow: Miedzynarodowe Centrum Kultury.
- Purday, Jonathan (2012). *Europeana: digital access to Europe’s cultural heritage*. Alexandria, 23: 2.
- Reason Peter and Bradbury Hilary, (2006) *Handbook of Action Research*, London: Sage.
- Rigney, Ann (2014), “Ongoing: Changing Memory and the European Project”, in De Cesari Ch. and Rigney, A. (eds.) *Transnational Memory. Circulation, Articulation, Scales*, Berlin-New York: De Gruyter, pp.339-360.
- Rothberg, Michael, 2009, *Multidirectional Memory. Remembering the Holocaust in the Age of Decolonization*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Sather-Wagstaff, Joy, (2015), “Heritage and Memory”, In Waterton Emma and Watson, Steve, eds. (2015) *The Palgrave handbook of contemporary heritage research*, Basingstoke and New York: Palgrave MacMillan, pp.191-204.
- Schramm Katharina, “Heritage, Power and Ideology”, (2015) In Waterton Emma and Watson, Steve, eds. *The Palgrave handbook of contemporary heritage research*, Basingstoke and New York: Palgrave MacMillan, pp. 442-457.
- Spinney, Laura. "The Shared Past That Wasn't: How Facebook, fake news and friends are altering memories and changing history." (2017): *Nature* 543:168, 168-170.
- Van Dijck, José. (2005). "From shoebox to performative agent: the computer as personal memory machine." *New Media & Society* 7(3): 311-332.
- Waterton Emma and Watson, Steve, eds. (2015) *The Palgrave handbook of contemporary heritage research*, Basingstoke and New York: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Wegner, Daniel M. "Transactive memory: A contemporary analysis of the group mind." *Theories of group behavior*. Springer New York, 1987. 185-208.
- Wu Zongije and Hou Song, (2015), “Heritage and Discourse”, in Waterton, Emma and Watson, Steve, eds. (2015) *The Palgrave handbook of contemporary heritage research*, Basingstoke and New York: Palgrave MacMillan, pp.37-51.

Contributors to the volume

Niklas Bernsand is a PhD student in East and Central European Studies at Lund University, where he also is the coordinator for the Centre for European Studies. His research interests include discourses of cultural diversity and the politics of memory. Among his most recent publications are “Memories of ethnic diversity in local newspapers: the 600th anniversary of Chernivtsi” in Barbara Törnquist-Plewa (ed, 2016): *Remembering Ethnic Cleansing and Lost Cultural Diversity in Eastern European Cities*; Narvselius, E & Bernsand, N (2014) ‘Lviv and Chernivtsi: Two Memory Cultures at the Western Ukrainian Borderland’, *East/West: Journal of Ukrainian Studies*, vol. I, no. 1, 59–84; and Bernsand, Niklas (2014): *Friend or Foe? Contemporary debates on Islam and Muslim immigrants among Swedish identitarians*, in Larsson, Göran, Hoffmann, Thomas (eds): *Muslims and the New Information and Communication Technologies*, Springer Verlag, p. 162–189.

Rune Brandt Larsen holds an MA in Eastern European Studies from University of Copenhagen and is a PhD candidate in Central and Eastern European Studies at Lund University, as well as lecturer in Central European politics and society. He was previously employed in the section for Cold War research at the Danish Institute for International Studies. His current research interests are history textbooks and national narratives in Belarus, Lithuania, Poland, and Ukraine after 1991. His latest publication is “Writing History in a Propaganda Institute, Political Power and Network Dynamics in Communist Romania” (book review), *Nordisk Østforum* 30 [4], 2016, p. 279–280.

Dagmar Brunow, Senior Lecturer in Film Studies at Linnaeus University. Her research interests centre on media memory studies, documentary and experimental filmmaking, avant-garde cinema, video culture and queer cinema. Current research project: “The Cultural Heritage of Moving Images” (2016-2018), financed by the Swedish Research Council (Vetenskapsrådet). Her book *Remediating Transcultural Memory: Documentary Filmmaking as Archival Intervention* (Media and Cultural Memory, Vol. 23, Berlin/Boston: de Gruyter, 2015) is a contribution to the emerging field of media memory studies, offering new takes on concepts such as transculturality, remediation and the archive.

Anamaria Dutceac Segesten is a Senior Lecturer in European Studies at Lund University and vice-chair of the Center for European Studies at the same university. Her most recent publication is “Transnational Citizen Engagement through Social Networking Media: The Factual, the Ideological, and the Moral Style”, co-authored

with Hans-Jörg Trenz and Michael Bossetta, included in the volume *Social media and European politics: Rethinking power and legitimacy in the digital era* (Palgrave MacMillan). She tweets @anamariadutceac.

Galina Goncharova holds a PhD in Cultural Studies from Sofia University St. Kliment Ohridsky. She is now an assistant professor in the Department of Cultural Studies, Sofia University. Her research interests are in the field of modern Bulgarian history, oral history, biographical methods, sociology of youth cultures and sociology of religion. She has published on socialist religious practices, generational discourses, death and dying under socialism among others. Her book “Politics of „Generation“ (in Bulgarian) is under print. Among her publications are Goncharova, N. G. (2016), ‘Getting inside the migrants’ world(s): Biographical interview as a tool for (re)searching transcultural memory’, *Crossings: Journal of Migration and Culture*, 7:1, pp.43–61; Goncharova, G. (2012), ‘Persona Ideologies of Death: Shaping the (Post)Self in Rituals’. In: *Ageing, Ritual and Social Change* (P. Coleman, J. Bornat, D. Koleva (eds), Ashgate Religion & Society series, 201–225; and Goncharova, G. (2011) ‘The Heroic Weakness: the Bulgarian Man Facing the Death of the National Ideal’, *Women's History Review*, 20:4, pp. 579-588.

Johanne Helbo Bondergaard has recently finished her PhD at Aarhus University, Denmark, on forensics in memory culture and contemporary literature (thesis defended in Feb. 2016). The thesis is currently under publication in the Palgrave Macmillan memory studies series as *Forensic Memory - Literature after Testimony*. Bondergaard has been engaged in networks, workshops and conferences in the field of memory studies (including Danish Network for Memory Studies, Mnemonics and the COST action “In search of a transcultural memory memory in Europe” and the Frankfurt Memory Studies Platform) and in narratology and fictionality studies and taught courses on memory and cultural identity. In 2014 she had a research stay with Dr. Prof. Astrid Erll at Goethe University in Frankfurt a.M.. Bondegaard has been an editor of the Danish literary journal *Passage - Tidsskrift for Litteratur og Kritik* since 2010 and served as treasurer for three years. She has published articles on forensics in literature, on aesthetics and terrorism, and on the literary construction of authenticity in fiction. The most recent publication is "Forensics and Literature after Testimony" in Z. Dziuban (ed.), *Mapping the 'Forensic Turn': The Engagements with Materialities of Mass Death in Holocaust Studies and Beyond* from New Academic Press: Vienna 2017. (Forthcoming).

Steffi Hobuss is Dr. phil. in philosophy from Bielefeld University, Germany. Senior lecturer/associate professor, teaches Philosophy and Kulturwissenschaften at Leuphana University Lüneburg (Germany). Her research interests include philosophy of language, memory studies, intercultural philosophy, epistemology, philosophy of culture, aesthetics, feminism and gender studies. Selected

publications: *Wittgenstein über Expressivität* (Hannover: Internationalismus Verlag 1997); *Konversionen. Fremderfahrungen in ethnologischer und interkultureller Perspektive* (ed. with I. Därmann and U. Lölke), Amsterdam: Rodopi 2004; *Erinnern verhandeln. Kolonialismus im kollektiven Gedächtnis Afrikas und Europas* (ed. with U. Lölke), 2nd. edition Münster 2007; *German Memory Studies. The Philosophy of Memory from Wittgenstein and Warburg to Assmann, Welzer and back again*. In: Alexandre Dessingué, Ketil Knutsen, Ann Elisabeth Laksfoss Hansen (eds.): *Flerstemte minner* (Stavanger 2010); *Silence, remembering, and forgetting in Wittgenstein, Cage, and Derrida*. in A. Dessingué & J. Winter (eds.), *Beyond memory: Silence and the Aesthetics of Remembrance*. New York: Routledge Publishers 2016; *Plato and Aristotle about Visual Perception* (forthcoming 2017); *(Post)Colonial Histories – Trauma, Memory and Reconciliation in the Context of the Angolan Civil War* (ed. with Benedikt Jäger), transcript: Bielefeld (forthcoming 2017).

Marco La Rosa is a PhD candidate in Political Science and Public Administration at Åbo Akademi University and an Adjunct at Lund University where he teaches European Studies. His research interests are EU institutions, political representation and political communication. His research focuses on political representation, legitimacy and democracy in the EU, with particular attention to role perception and political behavior of elected representatives.

Lukasz Posluszny, is a Ph.D. candidate at the Institute of Sociology at Adam Mickiewicz University in Poznań, Poland. He received his M.A. in Philosophy (2010), M.A. in Polish Literature (2011) and M.A. in Sociology (2012) from Adam Mickiewicz University. He wrote a monography *Spatial forms of Holocaust commemoration* (2014), and co-authored a book *Questions for Memory. Autobiographical Accounts of Concentration Camps Prisoners* (2012). He focuses on areas of Memory and Holocaust studies, with special interest in the sociology of things and everyday life, soundscape, material culture and urban studies. His dissertation concerns the interplay between people, space and material culture in the Majdanek concentration camp (KL Lublin) Additionally, he runs ethnographical and sociological research in the grant *Unmemorialized Sites of Genocide and their Influence on Collective Memory, Cultural Identity, Ethical Attitudes and Intercultural Relations in Contemporary Poland*.

Gitanjali Pyndiah is a London based writer, completing a PhD in Cultural Studies, at Goldsmiths, on embodied histories, memoriography and decolonial creative practices (music, language and visual art in particular). She is also engaged in creative writing. Her latest publications are *Malcolm de Chazal: Surrealism in the Indian Ocean*, Encyclopaedia of Surrealism, Bloomsbury Publishing, 2017, London

(in press); *A mother never dies (extract of a fiction-in-progress)*, Archipelago Magazine: Perspectives on Politics, Art & Pop Culture, Goldsmiths, 2017, London (in press); *Decolonising the m'other'tongue: Creative practices in Mauritian Creole*, Special Issue: Island Decolonization, Island Studies Journal, 2016, Vol. 11(2), pp. 485-504; *Book review: Writing the history of memory (Niven/Berger)*, National Identities Journal, 2016, pp. 1-2.

Emilia Salvanou is a historian of Modern and Contemporary History. She is currently an appointed lecturer of European History at the Hellenic Open University of Greece. Her current academic interests include memory studies and historical culture, migration and refugee studies, historiography and theory of history. She has published papers on issues of memory and migration and her book "The shaping of refugee memory: The past as history-writing and historical practices" will be published in Greek within 2017.

Barbara Törnquist-Plewa is Professor of East and Central European Studies at the Centre for Languages and Literature at Lund University and Head of the Centre for European Studies (CFE). Her field of research includes studies of collective memory, cultural history and relations between countries of East-Central Europe and the EU with focus on Poland and Sweden. Among her latest publications are Törnquist-Plewa Barbara (2016) "Cosmopolitan Memory, European Memory and Local Memories in East Central Europe" <http://australianhumanitiesreview.org> Issue 59, April/May 2016; Sindbaek Andersen, Tea, Törnquist-Plewa, Barbara (eds) (2016), *Disputed Memory. Emotions and Memory Politics in Central, Eastern and South-Eastern Europe*, edited by Berlin/Boston: de Gruyter; and Törnquist-Plewa, Barbara (ed) (2016), *Whose Memory? Which Future? Remembering Ethnic Cleansing and Lost Cultural Diversity in Eastern, Central and Southeastern Europe*, London – New York: Berghahn 2016.

Anna Zadora holds a PhD in Political Science and is Associated Professor at the University of Strasbourg. She has taken part in international projects such as "The Holocaust and Genocide in Contemporary Education", Institut Georg Eckert, 2016-2017; "Teaching of Controversial and Sensitive Issues", COST, 2014-2016; and "The SAGE Encyclopedia of War: Social Science Perspectives", 2014-2016. Among her recent publications are Zadora, Anna (2016): "History of the War and Wars of History: Teaching the Second World War and the Holocaust in Post-Soviet Belarus", in *Journal of War & Culture Studies* and Zadora, Anna (2016): "La Grande guerre Patriotique en tant que pilier de l'identité nationale: une étude biélorusse", in *Revue d'Etudes Comparatives Est-Ouest*, № 47, juin 2016.

In Search of Transcultural Memory in Europe

This volume is one of the outcomes of the network project In Search for Transnational Memory in Europe (ISTME), which was financed during four years 2012-2016 by a grant from COST (European Cooperation in Science and Technology) as COST Action IS1203. The Centre for European Studies (CFE) at Lund University was grant holder for ISTME, and the Centre's Head Prof. Barbara Törnquist-Plewa was chair. ISTME gathered researchers from 36 countries in Europe.

The volume opens with a short report of the activities of the action delivered by the chair at the final conference of ISTME in Dublin 1-3 September 2016. It is followed by a selection of papers presented at the action's conferences and workshops (see the report in this volume). Most papers written by the action participants have been aimed for one of the five publications (two collected volumes and three special issues of scientific journals) prepared by the action or became included in other academic publications. However, several papers were published electronically on the action's website, and it is a sample of those publications that are featured in this volume. The concluding chapter constitutes an attempt to look ahead and reflect over current and possible future directions in Memory Studies. It emerged in connection to the conference "Thinking through the future of Memory", 3-5 December 2016, inaugurating the Memory Studies Association, which was initiated by a group of participants in our COST Action.



LUND UNIVERSITY
 CFE Conference Papers Series No. 8
 ISBN 978-91-984146-0-8
 ISSN: 1654-2185

