ACTA UNIVERSITATIS CAROLINAE
STUDIA TERRITORIALIA
XX
2020
2

ACTA UNIVERSITATIS CAROLINAE

STUDIA TERRITORIALIA

XX
2020
2

CHARLES UNIVERSITY
KAROLINUM PRESS
2021

Editorial Board

Editor-in-Chief: PhDr. Jan Šír, Ph.D.

Executive Editor: PhDr. Lucie Filipová, Ph.D.

Associate Editors: Mgr. Paul Bauer, Ph.D., doc. PhDr. Miloš Calda, PhDr. David Emler, Ph.D., Ing. Mgr. Magdalena Fiřtová, Ph.D., RNDr. Vincenc Kopeček, Ph.D., PhDr. Ondřej Matějka, Ph.D., doc. PhDr. Tomáš Nigrin, Ph.D., doc. PhDr. Luboš Švec, CSc., doc. PhDr. Jiří Vykoukal, CSc.

Advisory Board:
Prof. Marek Bankowicz (Uniwersytet Jagielloński), Prof. Dr. Christoph Boyer (Universität Salzburg), Prof. Alan Butt Philip (University of Bath), prof. PhDr. Jiří Kocian, CSc. (Institute of Contemporary History of the Czech Academy of Sciences), prof. PhDr. Jan Křen, DrSc. † (Charles University), doc. PhDr. Ilja Lemeškin, Ph.D. (Charles University), Prof. Iain McLean (Nuffield College, University of Oxford), Prof. Dr. Marek Nekula (Universität Regensburg), Prof. Dietmar Neutatz (Albert-Ludwigs-Universität Freiburg), Prof. James F. Pontuso (Hampden-Sydney College), Prof. Jacques Rupnik (Sciences Po, Paris), prof. PhDr. Petr Svobodný, Ph.D. (Institute of the History of Charles University and Archive of Charles University), PhDr. Oldřich Tůma, Ph.D. (Institute of Contemporary History of the Czech Academy of Sciences), Prof. Dr. Wolfgang Wessels (Universität zu Köln)

Website: https://stuter.fsv.cuni.cz

© Charles University – Karolinum Press, 2021
ISSN 1213-4449 (Print)
ISSN 2336-3231 (Online)

CONTENTS

Editorial 7

Articles 11

"The Glory of the Nation": Black Soldier-Historians and the Continuing African American Struggle for a Usable Past 13
ROBERT COOK

Memoryscapes: Southeast Europe and the Question of "Small/Minor" Literature 39
GORICA MAJSTOROVIC

Memory in Discourse: Approaching Conflicting Constellations of Holocaust and Postcolonial Memory in Germany 57
LIANE SCHÄFER

Reports 83

Obituary: Prof. PhDr. Jan Křen, DrSc. (* 1930 – † 2020) 85

Select Bibliography of Works by Jan Křen 88

Instructions for Authors 99

EDITORIAL

The aftermath of a troubled past triggers a war between convoluted memories in actors representing all points on the political spectrum, signaling that the materialization of "collective memories" in a culture is neither objective or set in stone. The politics of memory influences the memory cultures of diverse, heterogeneous regions worldwide to a greater or lesser degree. While state-sponsored museums, commemorations, and memorials receive constant attention in academic studies, the mnemonic rendering that emerges from them or sometimes in opposition to them – the hegemonic memory culture – is less frequently addressed and critically scrutinized.

In that light, the present special issue zooms in on the multifarious memory discourses that arise in the aftermath of difficult pasts. This exploration reveals the intricacies of what, why and how we remember about the past. Beside the official institutions and places where memory dwells – which may or may not be recognized by the people as accurate "collective" memory spaces – there are also "unofficial" sites of memory. There, various mnemonic actors perform their work of memorializing outside the framework of official memory in a fresh attempt to decolonize the knowledge of a troubled past. The contributions to this issue address both official and unofficial memory practice and the spaces where collective memory is created. Those spaces and practices are not necessarily linked to the conventional sites of memory, that is, the official *lieux de mémoire*, or to the accredited ways of representing a troubled past and its victims, bystanders, and perpetrators. The common framework of the studies in this issue is the conflict between hegemonic and repressed or neglected narratives.

The struggle between institutional and unconventional memory culture has yet to be sufficiently explored, and the demarcation of the border between them is still very fluid. This means that one "official" memory culture can be replaced by another "binding" narrative of the troubled past after a new

political or social order arises from the battlefield of collective memory. By the same token, the politics of memory has revealed that the limits of "collective memory" are quite nebulous and lax. The various mnemonic groups competing to grasp the banner of official memory are demanding to have their particular versions of memory enshrined in new commemorative cultural formats.

This special issue of *AUC Studia Territorialia* seeks to contribute to the debate over memory politics by bringing together three original essays that highlight some of the various cultural settings and discursive formats in which mnemonic narratives are produced and disseminated. The papers are a response to our 2020 call entitled "Troubled Pasts and Memory Politics: Contesting Hegemonic Narratives in North America, Europe and Eurasia." Further contributions produced by that call for papers will follow in the next issue.

This volume opens with an essay by Robert Cook that unveils the controversial nature of race-centered narratives of the memory of the American Civil War of 1861 to 1865. The paper scrutinizes the works and legacy of two pioneer African American soldier-historians and Union veterans, George Washington Williams and Joseph T. Wilson. It argues that while their efforts to immortalize the role played by black Union troops in the American Civil War proved short-lived, their novel narrative strategies paved the way for the establishment in the twentieth century of an effective black counter-memory, one that has lasted to this day.

The second article takes the reader to contemporary Southeast Europe. In her essay, Gorica Majstorovic explores the relations and literary exchanges between small nations' "minor" literatures and world literature, where the translator functions as the mediator. Employing Rothberg's concept of the multidirectionality of memory, Majstorovic shows how different historical memories interact and clash in post-Yugoslav societies. To illustrate this, she analyzes the lives and works of two prominent writers who were exiled from the former Yugoslavia, Danilo Kiš and Dubravka Ugrešić.

Finally, Liane Schäfer in her contribution deals with the conflicting constellations of Holocaust memory and the memory of colonialism in Germany. Proceeding from a case study of the public controversy over an invitation to the postcolonial studies scholar Achilles Mbembe to speak at an official event, which highlighted the standoff between the two memory cultures, she proposes a discursive approach that critically questions and deconstructs the underlying discourse of German memory culture as a whole.

The regular report column in this issue is dedicated to the late founder of the Institute of International Studies at Charles University in Prague, and a long-time member of the editorial board of this journal, Professor Jan Křen, who passed away in 2020.

Wishing you a pleasant read,

Jan Šír and Maria Alina Asavei
doi: 10.14712/23363231.2021.1

ARTICLES

2020 ACTA UNIVERSITATIS CAROLINAE PAG. 13–38
STUDIA TERRITORIALIA 2

"THE GLORY OF THE NATION": BLACK SOLDIER-HISTORIANS AND THE CONTINUING AFRICAN AMERICAN STRUGGLE FOR A USABLE PAST

ROBERT COOK
UNIVERSITY OF SUSSEX

Abstract
Heated controversies in the United States over the 1619 Project's construction of a race-centered master narrative of American history highlight the need to locate public debates over this topic in historical context. This article analyzes the concerted efforts of two black Union veterans, George Washington Williams and Joseph T. Wilson, to remember African Americans' wartime military service at a critical moment in the progress of Civil War memory. By the late 1880s the northern victors' account of the southern slaveholders' revolt against the US government was fading fast under the challenge of new, hegemonic narratives that deprived African Americans of significant agency in the "War of the Rebellion". The article contends that, while the two pioneer soldier-historians were unable to sustain a national memory of black men's military patriotism into the Jim Crow era, their innovative narrative strategies helped to lay the foundations of an effective black counter-memory of the Civil War period in the twentieth century.
Keywords: American Civil War; African Americans; US Colored Troops; war memory; counter-memory
DOI: 10.14712/23363231.2021.2

Robert Cook is emeritus professor of American history at the University of Sussex. E-mail: r.cook@sussex.ac.uk.
The author thanks David Brown, Adam Gilbert, the editors of this special number, and two anonymous referees for their helpful comments on a first draft of this article.

Introduction

Heated debates in the United States over the *New York Times Magazine*'s 1619 Project reveal the controversial nature of race-centered master narratives of the American past. The Project, intended to raise public understanding of the defining role of white supremacy in American history, has been criticized by a wide range of academics and politicians. Whereas progressive historians like Sean Wilentz contend that it ignores or downplays evidence of interracial cooperation during moments of social upheaval like the Revolution, the Civil War, the New Deal and the 1960s, President Donald Trump and his right-wing allies denounce it for undermining the orthodox story of the United States as a land of freedom, democracy and opportunity for all.[1] Speaking in September 2020 to announce the creation of an alternative "1776 Commission" to promote "patriotic education," Trump excoriated the 1619 Project as an example of the way the left "has warped, distorted and defiled the American story with deceptions, falsehoods and lies."[2] The new commission, declared a subsequent executive order, would give children the alternative narrative they required: "access to what is genuinely inspiring and unifying in our history" in order to generate "the informed and honest patriotism that is essential for a successful republic."[3]

This essay contributes to ongoing public debates over the development of race-centered narratives in the United States by contextualizing them in terms of the history of Civil War memory. Specifically, it examines the efforts of two pioneering African American soldier-historians, George Washington Williams and Joseph T. Wilson, to fix in American memory remembrance of the role played by black Union troops in the Civil War of 1861–1865. These attempts proved unsuccessful during the early phase of the Jim Crow era, the late nineteenth century when southerners restored white supremacy by replacing a society based on slavery with one grounded in de jure racial segregation. However, by highlighting the agency of African Americans, the black soldier-historians

1 Adam Serwer, "The Fight Over the 1619 Project Is Not About the Facts," *The Atlantic*, December 23, 2019, https://www.theatlantic.com/ideas/archive/2019/12/historians-clash-1619-proct/604093/. For a judicious assessment of the Project see Phillip W. Magnus, *The 1619 Project: A Critique* ([Great Barrington, MA]: American Institute for Economic Research, 2020).

2 Steven Nelson, "Trump reveals 1776 Commission, aimed at promoting 'patriotic education'," *New York Post*, September 17, 2020, https://nypost.com/2020/09/17/trump-issues-1776-commission-to-promote-patriotic-education/.

3 Executive Order on Establishing the President's Advisory 1776 Commission, November 2, 2020, The White House, https://www.whitehouse.gov/presidential-actions/executive-order-establishing-presidents-advisory-1776-commission/.

contributed significantly to the construction of a usable past for their race by influencing directly the twentieth-century work of the formidable intellectual and activist W.E.B. Du Bois who has been described accurately by historian David Blight as "a self-conscious creator of black counter-memory."[4] Anchored by the conviction that ordinary black folk had played a central role in American history, this samizdat counter-memory did not achieve significant cultural influence in the United States until the advent of the civil rights and Black Power movements of the 1960s.[5] While Trump's determination to disseminate an essentially white supremacist account of US history demonstrates the contested nature of any black counter-memory, the soldier-historians' texts are potent evidence of the fact that African Americans have always been leading players in a national past scarred from the outset by profound (though not always uniform or unchanging) white hostility toward people of color.

In April 1865 four years of internecine carnage ended with the decisive military triumph of the armed forces of the United States over those of the breakaway Confederacy. Victorious Unionists heralded their defeat of what they routinely called the southern "rebellion" and the concomitant destruction of slavery as proof that democratic republics were not the unstable polities that European conservatives presumed them to be. During the Reconstruction period (1863–1877), the US government – dominated initially by antislavery Republicans – embarked on a remarkable experiment in interracial democracy in the conquered South. Congress enfranchised liberated black men, 180,000 of whom had enlisted in the Union army, in the expectation that they would use their new political power to counteract the influence of their defeated rebel masters. During the 1870s, however, southern Democrats, many of them former Confederates, used violence and intimidation against African Americans and their white allies to destroy Republican party governments in the southern states. In the decades after Reconstruction, Democratic politicians restored white supremacy in the region by disfranchising black men, by implementing de jure racial segregation to strip African Americans of their dignity and constitutional rights, and

[4] David W. Blight, "W.E.B. Du Bois and the Struggle for American Historical Memory," in *History and Memory in African-American Culture*, ed. Geneviève Fabre and Robert O'Meally (New York: Oxford University Press, 1994), 46. Although Blight discussed the work of Williams and Wilson in *Race and Reunion: The Civil War in American Memory* (Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2001), 168–170, 193, 196, 197, 301, 322, he did not make any direct connections with Du Bois's scholarship.

[5] I define "counter-memory" as an insurgent grand narrative constructed by subaltern individuals and collectivities to contest hegemonic master narratives designed by dominant social groups to help them maintain power in a given society.

by helping to foster a potent memory of the Confederates' wartime experience (the so-called "Lost Cause") which provided a durable cultural framework for the oppression of black folk in the region.[6]

Although scholars disagree over the extent to which the Civil War eroded racism in the victorious North during the turbulent 1860s, they generally concur that white northerners assisted the consolidation of Jim Crow by embracing a sentimental culture of sectional (North-South) reconciliation – a culture that was fostered by novelists' production of intersectional wartime romances and nostalgic tales of the plantation South as well as by the successful efforts of new mass-circulation magazines like *Century* to highlight the courage of the fighting men on both sides.[7] Fostered by a range of factors including industrial growth, the attainment of an overseas empire, a yearning for national peace, and a widespread (though by no means universal) lack of empathy for the plight of southern blacks, the culture of reconciliation rapidly corroded the victors' memory of the Civil War as a people's struggle waged against the slaveholders' revolt by patriotic white and black Unionists.[8] It did so by depicting the Civil War as

---

[6] There is a substantial secondary literature on the Lost Cause. See especially Charles Reagan Wilson, *Baptized in Blood: The Religion of the Lost Cause, 1865–1920* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1980); Gaines M. Foster, *Ghosts of the Confederacy: Defeat, the Lost Cause, and the Emergence of the New South, 1865–1913* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1987); and Karen L. Cox, *Dixie's Daughters: The United Daughters of the Confederacy and the Preservation of Confederate Culture* (Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 2003).

[7] Blight, *Race and Reunion*, 211–254; K. Stephen Prince, *Stories of the South: Race and the Reconstruction of Southern Identity, 1865–1915* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2014); Megan L. Bever, "Paths to Reconciliation: Northern Interracial Romances of the Civil War Era," *Civil War History* 60, No. 1 (March 2014): 32–57, doi: 10.1353/cwh.2014.0024. On northerners' growing embrace of reconciliatory culture after the Civil War, see also Nina Silber, *The Romance of Reunion: Northerners and the South, 1865–1900* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1993). Chandra Manning contends in *What This Cruel War Was Over: Soldiers, Slavery, and the Civil War* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2007), 221, that, as a result of their encounters with slavery and the enslaved during the Civil War, "astonishing changes took place in many white Union men's ideas about slavery and eventually, if more fragilely, about racial equality." However, while Blight's *Race and Reunion*, posits a broad tightening of white supremacy in the US after the social upheavals of the Civil War era, leading authorities on the commemorative culture of white Union veterans after 1865 insist that their hostility toward slavery as an institution did not translate into support for civil rights. See Barbara A. Gannon, *The Won Cause: Black and White Comradeship in the Grand Army of the Republic* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2011), 8, and Caroline Janney, *Remembering the Civil War: Reunion and the Limits of Reconciliation* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2013), 17, 113.

[8] There is no comprehensive account of the Unionist strain of historical memory but for concise assessments see Earl J. Hess, *Liberty, Virtue, and Progress: Northerners and Their War for the Union* (New York: Fordham University Press, 1997), 103–127; Barbara A. Gannon, *Americans Remember Their Civil War* (Santa Barbara: Praeger, 2017), 19–36, and Robert J. Cook, *Civil War Memories: Contesting the Past in the United States since 1865* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press,

a tragic intra-familial conflict fought between white brothers motivated by different yet authentically American principles including, on the southern side, the rights of the individual states under the original Constitution of 1787. Not unlike Trump's "patriotic" history, this avowedly consensual but highly selective narrative bolstered racial oppression in the United States by promoting public amnesia about African Americans' wartime service on behalf of the republic.

Black Soldier-Historians Remember the Civil War

George Washington Williams and Joseph Wilson intervened in fractious public debates over the evolving meaning of the Civil War by reminding Americans, black as well as white, that Unionists like themselves had fought an ideological struggle to defeat the Confederates and render the United States a genuine interracial democracy. Their texts, Williams' *A History of the Negro Troops in the War of the Rebellion 1861–1865* (1887) and Wilson's *The Black Phalanx: African American Soldiers in the War of Independence, the War of 1812, and the Civil War* (1887), were published during a decisive phase in American historical memory when Unionists' antisouthern and antislavery narrative was being subjected to growing pressure from both the South's Lost Cause and the cloying national culture of sectional reconciliation.[9]

2017), 69–94. Matthew E. Stanley, *Civil War and Reunion in Middle America* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2017), illuminates the conservative and racially prejudiced nature of Unionist commemorative culture in the lower North. For a northern state study that highlights anti-racism as a significant factor in Unionists' memory work in the upper Midwest, see Robert J. Cook, "A War for Principle? Shifting Memories of the Union Cause in Iowa, 1865–1916," *Annals of Iowa* 74, No. 3 (Summer 2015): 221–262, doi: 10.17077/0003-4827.12211. Although white northerners were, as David Blight contended in *Race and Reunion*, increasingly supportive of sectional reconciliation over time, historians have shown that the process of reconciliation was far from smooth and heavily contested by influential groups in northern society including many Union veterans and Republican leaders. On this theme see John R. Neff, *Honoring the Civil War Dead: Commemoration and the Problem of Reconciliation* (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 2005); Janney, *Remembering*; and M. Keith Harris, *Across the Bloody Chasm: The Culture of Commemoration Among Civil War Veterans* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2014). For an assessment of modern scholarship on sectional reconciliation see Robert J. Cook, "The Quarrel Forgotten: Toward a Clearer Understanding of Sectional Reconciliation," *Journal of the Civil War Era* 6, No. 3 (September 2016): 413–436, doi: 10.1353/cwe.2016.0052.

9 George Washington Williams, *A History of the Negro Troops in the War of the Rebellion 1861–1865* (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1887); Joseph T. Wilson, *The Black Phalanx: African American Soldiers in the War of Independence, the War of 1812, and the Civil War* (Hartford: American Publishing Company, 1887).

These pioneering texts reflected the fact that their authors were of mixed-race parentage and born free (Wilson in 1837 and Williams in 1849) in a society whose culture and politics were dominated by the existence of slavery.[10] After leaving his home state of Virginia at an early age, Wilson attended school in Massachusetts before working on a whaling ship in the South Pacific and a railroad construction gang in Chile. Williams received only a limited education while growing up in Pennsylvania and developed a taste for adventure that never left him. Many free blacks during the 1850s embraced the idea of emigrating to Liberia because domestic race relations were so dismal.[11] But after President Abraham Lincoln, keenly aware that attacking southern slavery would assist the Union war effort, issued the Emancipation Proclamation in January 1863, the US government enlisted growing numbers of African Americans into the Union army as US Colored Troops (USCT) to suppress the slaveholders' rebellion. Former slaves constituted the bulk of these recruits but a minority were free-born blacks like Joseph Wilson and George Washington Williams, hopeful that a new day was dawning for people of color in America.

Wilson had a particularly tough war. He enlisted first as a private in the 2nd Louisiana Native Guard (later reorganized as the 74th USCT), contracted chronic diarrhea and was honorably discharged in September 1863. He then reenlisted in the 54th Massachusetts Infantry and was badly wounded at the battle of Olustee in Florida, one of several engagements where Confederates murdered captured black troops on the field and where, in the eyes of many prejudiced northern whites, black men won their spurs.

Williams' war service is shrouded in a degree of mystery but, according to his biographer John Hope Franklin, he enlisted late in the war and served in the Union army's 41st US Colored Infantry on the bloody eastern front in Virginia. Although wounded during the Petersburg campaign in September 1864, he recovered to see the city's surrender the following April. After the war ended, he joined the republican forces of Benito Juárez in Mexico to depose the French-imposed emperor Maximilian.

---

[10] For biographical information on these authors see John Hope Franklin, *George Washington Williams: A Biography* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1985); John David Smith, Introduction to *A History of Negro Troops in the War of the Rebellion*, by George Washington Williams (1887; reprinted New York: Fordham University Press, 2012), ix–xxxvi; Elizabeth Varon and Dictionary of Virginia Biography, "Joseph T. Wilson (1837–1890)" in *Encyclopedia Virginia,* https://www.encyclopediavirginia.org/Wilson_Joseph_T_1837-1890.

[11] Peter Kolchin, *American Slavery 1619–1877* (New York: Hill and Wang, 1993), 84–85.

Ambitious and talented, both men worked tirelessly after leaving the army to try and cement the Union triumph to which they had contributed personally. This required them to overcome any personal doubts they had about the capabilities of the freedpeople and to engage as Republicans in Reconstruction-era politics to promote equal rights under the law for all African Americans.

Joseph Wilson was a prominent member of the Republican party in Norfolk, Virginia. As well as helping to establish a local black Union Club to press the case for African American suffrage on the grounds of the race's demonstrable wartime loyalty to the US government, he edited several newspapers in the town and continued to campaign vigorously for equal rights even after white Conservatives and Democrats regained power in the state during the early years of Reconstruction. A stalwart Republican hostile to cooperation with white Readjusters who opposed Democratic party rule in the state, he was a committed opponent of white supremacy. "Injustice and wrong," he told an Emancipation Day crowd in Norfolk in 1885, "seems [*sic*] to have been one of the principal sciences in the white man's civilization."[12] Wilson moved to the state capital, Richmond, in the same year and participated in working-class activism there until his premature death in 1891.

After his exploits in Mexico, George Washington Williams reenlisted in the US army in 1867 only to be discharged the following year after receiving a gunshot wound in an accident. He then undertook theological training, made himself fully literate, and became a Baptist preacher in Boston. Stirred by news of racist violence in the South, including the brutal massacre of more than 150 blacks in Colfax, Louisiana, in April 1873, he helped to organize a mass meeting to condemn the killings and demand congressional action to prevent more of them.[13] In July 1875 he secured financial support from leading black and white abolitionists to set up a new newspaper, *The Commoner*, intended to foster the growth of free-labor values like thrift and self-reliance among the freedpeople. During the fall he made a speaking tour of the South that, taking place as it did in the midst of widespread white terrorism in Mississippi, further heightened his awareness of the ex-Confederates' determination to restore white supremacy by force.

---

[12] Quoted in W. Fitzhugh Brundage, *The Southern Past: A Clash of Race and Memory* (Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2005), 96.

[13] Franklin, *George Washington Williams*, 23, contends that the Colfax massacre had "a profound effect" on Williams. LeeAnna Keith, *The Colfax Massacre: The Untold Story of Black Power, White Terror, and the Death of Reconstruction* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2007) is a sobering account of this event.

When *The Commoner* failed for lack of subscribers, Williams relocated to a church in Cincinnati to begin a new phase of his eventful career. Motivated by the widespread discrimination confronting Ohio's black population and assisted by his contacts with Union veterans of both races, he became an active Republican – one of the few African Americans who supported President Rutherford B. Hayes's conciliatory policy toward the defeated South (in part because of his strong desire for political patronage). However, although he became the first African American to be elected to the state legislature, the new Democratic president, Grover Cleveland, curtailed his political ambitions in 1885 by withdrawing his appointment as US minister to Haiti before he could reach Port-au-Prince. From this point on, he devoted his time not only to writing history but also to garnering and disseminating information about the African slave trade. He was the first westerner to report the brutal treatment of the Congolese in the personal fiefdom of King Leopold II of Belgium and died in England while writing a book on this issue in 1891.

The two Union veterans embarked on their histories in the immediate aftermath of Reconstruction. Williams gave early evidence of his intentions in Cincinnati on July 4, 1876 when he delivered a powerful centennial address centered on the view that the black man had been "his own deliverer, the defender of the Union" during the Civil War.[14] This effort induced him to undertake deeper research into the African American past – research that culminated in publication of his two-volume *History of the Negro Race in America* in 1883.[15] An anonymous and rather patronizing reviewer in *The New York Times* deemed the 190 pages on black troops by far the most "instructive and interesting" portion of the text and suggested that "it would probably be a good thing for author and publisher to republish it" as a single narrative.[16] Williams soon embarked on his *History of the Negro Troops in the War of the Rebellion* – a more comprehensive treatment of this topic based on a wide range of archival and printed sources as well as interviews with black veterans – which was published four years later. By chance this book appeared in the same year as Joseph Wilson's *Black Phalanx*. Together, these works provide scholars with a unique opportunity to assess how black soldier-historians used their race's Civil War experience to construct a usable past in an era characterized by growing white amnesia about the role of black folk in the Civil War as well as by mounting oppression evidenced by the escalating

14 Quoted in Smith, Introduction to *A History of Negro Troops*, xiv.

15 George Washington Williams, *History of the Negro Race in America from 1619 to 1880*, 2 vols. (New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1882–1883).

16 "New Publications: The Negro Race," *The New York Times*, March 11, 1883.

disfranchisement of southern black men and the US Supreme Court's ruling in the *Civil Rights Cases* (1883) that Congress could not protect African Americans from private discrimination under the Fourteenth Amendment.

Williams and Wilson were scholar-activists. They wrote their books because they believed that the faltering progress of equal rights was intrinsically connected to the fact that public remembrance of blacks' wartime military service was limited and waning, especially outside the confines of veterans' groups like the Grand Army of the Republic (GAR), the partially integrated Union ex-servicemen's organization to which they both belonged.[17] By the late 1880s, triumphant northerners had written many accounts of the Union cause in the form of national epics, regimental and local histories, and individual memoirs.[18] But writing in 1885 Thomas J. Morgan, a white officer in a wartime black regiment, observed that "history has not yet done justice to the share borne by colored soldiers in the war for the Union."[19] Williams concurred fully with this judgment, noting that most Unionist texts gave little space to the role played by African American soldiers in the Civil War. Their record, he wrote, "was not only the proud and priceless heritage of a race, but the glory of a nation," yet their "appearance … in the hundreds of histories of the war has always been incidental." He added, "These brave men have had no champion, no one to chronicle their record, teeming with interest and instinct with patriotism."[20] Members of Wilson's own GAR post urged him to write a full-blown history of the USCT.[21] He bemoaned the fact that black soldiers' "devotion" to their country had not only "been unappreciated" but that it had "also failed to receive a fitting commemoration in [the] pages of national history."[22] Both authors, then, were pursuing an urgent and ambitious goal: to fill a growing hole in their nation's memory of the Civil War before it was too late.

There are several reasons why most Unionist texts devoted minimal attention to the military contribution of Colored Troops. One was the fact that USCT units came relatively late to the war and did not participate in most of the conflict's major engagements until the siege of Petersburg in 1864–65.[23] But per-

---

[17] On the GAR see especially Stuart McConnell, *Glorious Contentment: The Grand Army of the Republic, 1865–1900* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1992) and Gannon, *The Won Cause*.

[18] On soldier texts of the Civil War see Blight, *Race and Reunion*, 140–210.

[19] Thomas J. Morgan, *Reminiscences of Service with Colored Troops in the Army of the Cumberland, 1863–65* (Providence, RI: Society of the Army of the Cumberland, 1885), 50.

[20] Williams, *History of Negro Troops*, xiv, 328.

[21] Wilson, *Black Phalanx*, unnumbered preface.

[22] Ibid., 460.

[23] Modern histories of these servicemen include Benjamin Quarles, *The Negro in the Civil War* (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1953); Dudley Taylor Cornish, *The Sable Arm: Negro Troops*

haps the most important reason is that Unionist histories were written almost exclusively by white men who, some USCT officers like Thomas Morgan aside, did not regard the black contribution to the national cause as significant as their own, even while they often acknowledged the value of black people's loyalty to the government during the war. Few free-born or liberated African Americans, moreover, had the financial resources or connections needed to research, write and secure publication of USCT histories. Most black Union veterans lived in poverty and as a result died earlier than their white comrades.[24] While often keen to mark their wartime sacrifices, they did so mainly by attending Memorial Day rituals and parades rather than by leaving more tangible reminders of their service such as memoirs and monuments.[25]

A close reading of the two soldier-historians' books reveals a common emphasis on six key themes: the manly courage of loyal black troops, the positive impact of their patriotic service on prejudiced white northerners, the capacity of southern whites for barbarism, the black troops' self-restraint when confronted by Confederate brutality, the virtue of race pride, and the importance for the group and the wider nation of remembering the sacrifice of the USCT in the Civil War.

Both authors supplied evidence of the bravery and patriotism of armed black men in the 1860s by detailing the latter's involvement in a range of military engagements fought on behalf of the US government in the second half of the late conflict. They made it clear that USCT regiments' courage under fire could have been predicted because black soldiers had been deployed not only by whites in America since the Revolutionary War of the 1770s and 1780s, but also by civilizations dating back to Egypt in ancient times. However, their narratives gave pride of place to the masculine courage of African American soldiers in the Civil War – even in putatively glorious failures such as the attacks at Port Hudson and Fort Wagner in 1863 and the battles of the Crater and Olustee in

in the Union Army, 1861–1865 (New York: Longmans, 1956); Joseph Glathaar, *Forged in Battle: The Civil War Alliance of Black Soldiers and White Officers* (New York: The Free Press, 1990); Noah Andre Trudeau, *Like Men of War: Black Troops in the Civil War, 1862–1865* (Boston: Little, Brown, 1998); William A. Dobak, *Freedom by the Sword: The U.S. Colored Troops, 1862–1867* (Washington, DC: Center of Military History, US Army, 2011); John David Smith, *Lincoln and the U.S. Colored Troops* (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 2013).

24 The many hardships confronting black veterans after the Civil War are detailed in Donald R. Shaffer, *After the Glory: The Struggles of Black Civil War Veterans* (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 2004).

25 On the commemorative culture of African Americans after the Civil War see especially Brundage, *Southern Past*, 55–104; Kathleen Ann Clark, *Defining Moments: African American Commemoration & Political Culture in the South, 1863–1913* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2005).

1864. Williams, for example, recounted how the "gallant" 54th Massachusetts had driven across the defensive ditch at Fort Wagner outside Charleston, South Carolina, and planted its flag on the battery's parapet before being cut down by the defending Confederates. "The appalling list of casualties," he wrote, "shows how bravely this Negro regiment had done its duty."[26] Wilson concurred. "The heroic courage displayed by the gallant Phalanx at the assault upon Fort Wagner," he insisted, "was not surpassed by the Old Guard at Moscow."[27]

Less predictable than such boasting (which was more than matched by white veterans) was the willingness of the two soldier-historians to stiffen their accounts of black courage under fire with occasional evidence of white Union cowardice. Both men took care in their books to acknowledge the support that white officers gave to their black troops. Williams described the 54th Massachusetts' patrician colonel, Robert Gould Shaw (who died with his men at Fort Wagner), as "brave, beautiful, and heroic," while Wilson actually dedicated his book to the white officers of black regiments.[28] Yet when it came to describing the army's desperate and ultimately unsuccessful rearguard defense of Millikens Bend, an isolated Union post on the Mississippi River in June 1863, neither historian had any qualms contrasting the bravery of the USCT with the cowardice of their white peers.[29] For Williams "the unimpeachable valor of the Negro troops" in this action would "remain a priceless heritage of the race for whose freedom they mostly contended."[30] He, like Wilson, left readers to compare this heroic conduct with that of a white regiment which fled the scene in disarray.

The books were not just catalogues of black valor in defeat. Tens of thousands of USCT participated in the Union army's decisive efforts to bring the war to a successful conclusion in Virginia in late 1864 and early 1865. Williams emphasized their role in several prominent actions around the strategically vital railroad hub of Petersburg, including their successful assault on Fort Harrison, which he hailed as "a brilliant and daring piece of work," and on Fort Gregg, which precipitated the city's surrender and the final collapse of the nearby

[26] Williams, *History of Negro Troops*, 195, 199.

[27] Wilson, *Black Phalanx*, 257. Wilson was referencing the actions of Napoleon's elite Old Guard troops in the emperor's Russian campaign of 1812. On the Union attack on Fort Wagner and its reception in the wartime North see James M. McPherson, *Battle Cry of Freedom: The Civil War Era* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1988), 686–687.

[28] Williams, *History of Negro Troops*, 195; Wilson, *Black Phalanx*, unnumbered dedication page.

[29] The Confederate assault on Millikens Bend and its later ramifications are detailed in Linda Barnickel, *Milliken's Bend: A Civil War Battle in History and Memory* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2013).

[30] Williams, *History of Negro Troops*, 228.

Confederate capital, Richmond.[31] The two historians also detailed the contribution and effectiveness of USCT units in the Appomattox campaign of April 1865 which culminated in the defeat of General Robert E. Lee's Army of Northern Virginia and presaged the end of the southern rebellion.[32]

Crucial to both narratives were their architects' insistence that black men's bravery in defense of the Union had reduced racial prejudice in the 1860s. Williams and Wilson openly conceded that at first many northerners had opposed arming African Americans and both men also noted that many white Union troops had been far from welcoming when they were enlisted. Wilson, for example, observed that it was "unpleasant ... to record that the black soldiers were subjected to many indignities, and suffered much at the hands of their white fellow comrades in arms."[33] However, he and Williams argued that the conduct of USCT in engagements like Fort Wagner had altered the racial views of many whites in the military. The courage of the 54th Massachusetts, observed Wilson, "completely removed any prejudice that had been exhibited toward negro troops in the Department of the South."[34] Williams stated that initially "the faintest intimation that Negroes should be employed as soldiers in the Union Army was met with derision" but, he continued, once military necessity had impelled the Lincoln administration to start enlisting black men, the USCT proved their worth in battle and thereby brought about a sea-change in white attitudes. He singled out the failed assault on Port Hudson in May 1863 as an event that "completely revolutionized" military sentiment in the western theater "respecting the Negro as a man and a soldier."[35]

To prove that black martial prowess on the battlefield had eroded prejudice in the 1860s, the two authors quoted liberally from white commanders like Griffin Stedman and Nathaniel Banks, who had publicly commended black soldiers for their conduct under fire, and government officers such as Secretary of War Edwin Stanton who asserted that, "[t]he hardest fighting [at Petersburg] was done by the black troops."[36] Williams found the postwar testimony of controver-

---

31 Ibid., 252, 298. On the significant contribution of the USCT to the ultimately decisive Petersburg campaign see Elizabeth R. Varon, *Armies of Deliverance: A New History of the Civil War* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2019), 386, 387.

32 According to Varon, six USCT regiments "played a key role in the last day's fighting [at Appomattox]." Elizabeth R. Varon, *Appomattox: Victory, Defeat, and Freedom at the End of the Civil War* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2013), 93.

33 Wilson, *Black Phalanx*, 207.

34 Ibid., 264.

35 Williams, *History of Negro Troops*, 221.

36 Ibid., 320.

sial Massachusetts congressman and former Union general Benjamin F. Butler particularly useful. He told readers how Butler, a onetime white supremacist Democrat who became a Radical Republican, had supported passage of a civil rights bill in the 1870s by conjuring vivid memories of how, after an assault during the Petersburg campaign, he had seen the corpses of hundreds of his black troops who had "laid down their lives" for the American flag. "[A]s I rode along among them ...," Butler remembered purposefully,

> and as I looked on their bronzed faces upturned in the shining sun as if in mute appeal against the wrongs of the country for which they had given their lives, and whose flag had only been to them a flag of stripes on which no star of glory had ever shone for them – feeling I had wronged them in the past and believing what was the future of my country to them – among my dead comrades there I swore to myself a solemn oath: "May my right hand forget its cunning, and my tongue cleave to the roof of my mouth, if I ever fail to defend the rights of those men who have given their blood for me and my country this day and for their race forever ... "[37]

It was not just the capacity of the black troops' sacrifice to corrode Butler's antebellum racism that gave the congressman's testimony particular force. Williams knew that reconciliatory sentiment was building in the 1880s and that southern Democrats, abetted by the Supreme Court, were steadily eroding African Americans' war-born rights.[38] Reminding readers of Butler's evocative comments imparted urgency as well as legitimacy and poignancy to his narrative.

Although the two chroniclers of the black martial experience took care not to oppose sectional reconciliation in principle, their texts included material that ran counter to prevailing racial assumptions in the late nineteenth century – assumptions that equated whiteness with civilization and blackness with barbarism. In doing so they remembered a unique period in American history when, during the 1850s and 1860s, northern whites had equated the institution of slavery with southern barbarism, violence and treason. The Confederates' well-documented massacre of Colored Troops at Fort Pillow in April 1864 loomed large in both books.[39] Using testimony taken by members of a Republi-

[37] Ibid., 255–256.

[38] In 1883 the US Supreme Court in the *Civil Rights Cases* significantly narrowed the scope of the Fourteenth Amendment (passed by congressional Republicans in 1867 and ratified a year later) to protect liberated blacks from discrimination.

[39] On the Fort Pillow massacre and its memory in American history see John Cimprich, *Fort Pillow, a Civil War Massacre, and Public Memory* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2005).

can-dominated congressional committee after the massacre, Williams described how black soldiers, knowing that their opponents would show them no mercy if they surrendered, had fled toward the Tennessee River only to be cut down mercilessly. Lest readers be unsure of the extent to which this incident amounted to "[o]ne of the most cruel exhibitions of Confederate malice," he added that many of the wounded had tried to feign death "but were revived by cruel kicks and blows, compelled to rise to their knees, and then shot."[40] Some wounded African Americans, he asserted, had been buried alive. Wilson illustrated his account of the "indiscriminate slaughter" at Fort Pillow with a graphic drawing of the massacre which can only have reminded sympathetic readers that the contemporary oppression of the freedpeople, soon to be underscored by a rapid increase in anti-black lynching, had its roots in white southerners' unceasing determination to subordinate African Americans by any means necessary.[41] Williams used the Confederates' brutal treatment of black prisoners of war to cement the point that readers should resist any temptation to regard the country's recent enemies generously – as misguided brothers engaged in a contest of conflicting American principles. Confederate prisons, he wrote, were "places of torture wherein every species of cruelty was perpetrated. … Christian civilization the world over will rejoice that such a cause has perished from among the governments of mankind."[42]

The two authors bolstered their reminders of southern white barbarism with evidence of the Colored Troops' self-restraint, a characteristic traditionally linked in the minds of northerners with civilization and codified in the principles of nineteenth-century warfare.[43] Such evidence, of course, was selective. The USCT were not plaster saints. Determined to avenge atrocities inflicted on their comrades, they did commit war crimes in a handful of Civil War engagements, notably at the battle of Jenkins' Ferry, Arkansas, in April 1864 and Fort Blakely outside Mobile the following spring.[44] Joseph Wilson conceded black soldiers'

---

40 Williams, *History of Negro Troops*, 257, 262.

41 Wilson, *Black Phalanx*, 330, illustration after 350.

42 Williams, *History of Negro Troops*, 304, 319. The poor treatment of captured soldiers in Union and Confederate prisons obstructed North-South reconciliation throughout the late nineteenth century. On this theme see Benjamin G. Cloud, *Haunted by Atrocity: Civil War Prisons in American Memory* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2010).

43 Of course, Confederates believed they were fighting a war for civilization against blacks incapable of civilized behavior and barbarous Yankees determined to destroy their homes.

44 Gregory J.W. Urwin, ed., *Black Flag Over Dixie: Racial Atrocities and Reprisals in the Civil War* (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 2005), 9, 14, 144–145; George S. Burkhardt, *Confederate Rage, Yankee Wrath: No Quarter in the Civil War* (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 2007), 131–132, 236–239.

desire for retaliation but not, he insisted, "in the strict sense of that term, but to fight with a determination to subdue and bring to possible punishment, the men guilty of such atrocious conduct."[45] Williams made the same point in a different way by describing the generous manner in which the black troops had treated their opponents after Lee's surrender at Appomattox. Dividing their rations with paroled Confederates and welcoming them at their camp-fires, he observed, the victors expressed "[t]he sweet gospel of forgiveness."[46] The two soldier-historians thus contrasted notionally Christian southern whites demonstrably capable of heinous brutality with allegedly barbarous black men who had exhibited in victory all the traits associated with genuinely civilized human beings.

As noted above, George Washington Williams and Joseph Wilson were politically active Republicans who saw their texts as contributions to the ongoing black freedom struggle in the United States. Their texts certainly bore traces of their mixed-race origins. Wilson, for example, acknowledged the debt owed by Colored Troops to their white commanders and Williams openly displayed a degree of class-based condescension toward the black masses in the United States by conceding that the majority were "ignorant."[47] However, both authors clearly understood the importance of establishing their narrative for the benefit of their liberated people. They aimed to educate African Americans about their active contribution to US history in order to contest efforts by white supremacists to undermine black people's pride in their race. The very title of Wilson's book, *The Black Phalanx*, announced his conception of the USCT as a close-knit formation whose unity had contributed to its effectiveness on the battlefield.

Wilson and Williams singled out one black soldier in particular in order to demonstrate the importance of race pride. André Cailloux was a soldier of color who led a company of the 1st Louisiana Native Guards in an unsuccessful Union assault on Port Hudson on the Mississippi River in May 1863. In spite of being severely wounded in the charge, Cailloux rallied his men and remained in the vanguard until he was torn apart by a Confederate artillery shell. Williams focused not only on his subject's courage under fire but also his self-respect. Captain Cailloux, he wrote, "loved to boast of genuine blackness, and his race pride

45 Wilson, *Black Phalanx*, 348.

46 Williams, *History of Negro Troops*, 303.

47 In dedicating his book to the white officers of USCT regiments, Joseph Wilson acknowledged that those same commanders had taught their men self-restraint. Wilson, *Black Phalanx*, unnumbered dedication page; Williams, *History of Negro Troops*, 332.

made him an acceptable, successful, and formidable leader."[48] Insisting that the "Phalanx soldiers always had a strong race pride," Wilson not only described Cailloux's dramatic final minutes on the battlefield but also recalled witnessing "the funeral pageant of the dead hero" in New Orleans, "the like of which was never seen in that, nor, perhaps, in any other American city, in honor of a dead negro." He also observed that Cailloux's impressive obsequies had announced to local whites the strength of "powerful" black "civic societies."[49] Wilson and Williams knew from their own experience that racial oppression stymied black progress by placing enormous strains on cooperation between African Americans. As a result they were eager to disseminate the message that race pride and racial unity were essential preconditions for black advancement in the United States.

Both authors intended African American readers to regard Colored Troops as role models for the present – as brave, patriotic, disciplined and proud black men. But determined to resist the consolidation of white supremacy in the form of Jim Crow and knowing the importance of white allies, they also made no secret of their conviction that white Americans too must remember the USCT if the prospect of an interracial republic were not to fade completely. This meant that words alone were not enough to sustain what David Blight refers to as their "emancipationist" memory of the southern rebellion.[50]

Toward the close of his book, Joseph Wilson noted the black soldiers' important financial contributions to the construction of the Freedmen's Memorial to Abraham Lincoln in Washington, DC which had been dedicated in 1876.[51] Williams went a step further. Aware that white southerners and northerners were busy erecting monuments to their respective causes and that none of the Union monuments commemorated the deeds of black troops who had "helped win the victory," he closed his history by advocating the construction of an imposing monument to those increasingly forgotten men.[52] This project, he

48 Williams, *History of Negro Troops*, 218.
49 Ibid., 214–215, 503.
50 Blight, *Race and Reunion*, 2.
51 On the Freedmen's Memorial to Abraham Lincoln in Washington see Kirk Savage*, Standing Soldiers, Kneeling Slaves: Race, War, and Monument in Nineteenth-Century America* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1997), 90–92. The monument, funded entirely by African Americans (including many USCT), depicts President Lincoln raising up an enslaved man who is prone but breaking free from his chains. It remains controversial with Black Lives Matter protesters today. See David Blight's call for it to be retained: "Yes, the Freedmen's Memorial uses racist imagery. But don't tear it down," *The Washington Post*, June 25, 2020, https://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/2020/06/25/yes-freedmens-memorial-uses-racist-imagery-dont-tear-it-down/.
52 Williams, *History of Negro Troops*, 327.

insisted, should be a national one – a congressionally funded monument to those black soldiers who had fought and in many cases died "in the struggle for national existence." Such a monument, he ventured, "would surely elevate the Negro to a proud place in the history of the nation ... [A] republic that remembers to defend its defenders in tracing their noble conduct in monumental marble and brass can never decay."[53]

Reception

The "emancipationist" accounts of George Washington Williams and Joseph Wilson were essentially race-centered variants of the once robust victors' memory of the Civil War. White northerners, Union veterans most prominent among them, were the primary architects of this memory. It prioritized two achievements: first, the saving of the nation from its southern enemies, and second, the destruction of slavery which, the majority of white northerners concurred, had been the chief source of what they regarded as the slaveholders' wicked rebellion against the United States.[54] This strain of Civil War memory was still a political and cultural force in the late 1880s. Indeed, the death of Confederate president Jefferson Davis in December 1889 gave it a new lease of life because many northerners were horrified at the sight of so many southerners mourning a man widely regarded above the Mason–Dixon Line as the mastermind behind secession.[55] However, by this date Unionist memories of the "War of the Rebellion" were rapidly losing their power because they demonized fellow Americans at a time when Civil War issues seemed irrelevant to people dealing with life in a highly competitive and increasingly industrialized society. While many Republicans had resisted the sentimental pull of sectional reconciliation during and even after Reconstruction, party leaders were more and more reluctant to be seen to be stoking national divisions for the sake of protecting southern blacks. In early

---

[53] Ibid., 328, 332.

[54] Although historian Gregory J. W. Urwin, *Black Flag Over Dixie*, 4, contends that "[t]he aging boys in blue celebrated their war as a crusade to save the Union and ignored the fact that it also destroyed slavery," white Union veterans regularly vaunted their practical contribution to the destruction of slavery in their memoirs and commemorative exercises. See Robert Hunt, *The Good Men Who Won the War: Army of the Cumberland Veterans and Emancipation Memory* (Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 2010), 20–33, and Harris, *Across the Bloody Chasm*, 108–113.

[55] Robert J. Cook, "'Not Buried Yet': Northern Responses to the Death of Jefferson Davis and the Stuttering Progress of Sectional Reconciliation," *Journal of the Gilded Age and Progressive Era* 18, No. 3 (July 2019): 324–348, doi: 10.1017/S1537781419000045.

1891 a handful of Republican senators from the Far West helped defeat their party's last serious effort to enforce the constitutional right of black men to vote in the South.[56] This issue would not feature prominently on the political agenda of both major parties in the United States again until debates over new voting rights legislation in the late 1950s.

Although some white northerners, notably a minority of Union veterans, did not forget the Colored Troops' loyal service, Richard Hinton expressed a potent countervailing view in *Belford's Magazine* in December 1889.[57] Hinton – a former abolitionist disillusioned by the fact that the US government had intervened militarily to protect black voters during Reconstruction – insisted that black folk had been passive actors in the Civil War and that they had failed to take advantage of the opportunities provided by emancipation. The USCT, he wrote, "were men of the intelligence of children and the docility of babes. They would march steadily into battle, and remain fighting as long as their [white] officers led them. This is not the material of, or foundation on, which republics are built." African Americans, he added gratuitously, lacked the manhood to look after themselves and the science of evolution left them "with the monkey."[58] Tellingly, Hinton's dim view of African Americans in wartime was replicated by contributors to the country's growing roster of amateur magazines written by and for young people. Young northern writers rarely mentioned the USCT in their accounts of the Civil War, preferring instead to praise Confederate general Robert E. Lee as a model American, to make "faithful darkeys" the lackeys of Union soldiers, and even to cast doubt on the wisdom of emancipation.[59]

The two USCT histories were probably read primarily, though not exclusively, by African Americans, largely because East Coast publishers looked to market the texts in black communities across the northern states and the former Confederacy. The country's black press generally praised them but reviews

---

56 Cook, *Civil War Memories*, 92–93.

57 For evidence of some white Union veterans' continuing support for black civil rights after Reconstruction see Hunt, *Good Men*, 88–89; William H. Armstrong, *Major McKinley: William McKinley and the Civil War* (Kent, OH: Kent State University Press, 2000), 113–114; Cook, *Civil War Memories*, 93.

58 Richard J. Hinton, "Negro Enlistments and the Negro Element," *Belford's Magazine* 2, No. 12 (December 1889): 866.

59 "Slavery," *The Correspondent* (Newburyport, MA), August 1879; "Castie, '61–'65: A Narrative of the Late Civil War," *The Patriot* (Detroit), February 20, 1881; Edwin Harris, "Two Great Men," *Punch*, 1884; Will C. Brown, "Robert E. Lee," *Clio* (Worcester, MA), September 1886. These magazines can be found in the online Gale collection of Amateur Newspapers from the American Antiquarian Society: https://www.gale.com/c/amateur-newspapers-from-the-american-antiquarian-society.

sometimes contained bitter comments on whites' treatment of the race since 1865. One writer described *The Black Phalanx* as "a volume valuable to all Negro homes," adding that African Americans had long desired a study "of our works in the late rebellion and in the free movements in this country as efforts are ceaselessly made to impress us with the fact that we have helped ourselves but little towards freedom."[60] Another review – in a Kansas newspaper – blamed local Republicans for betraying black people in the years after liberation. "[T]he Black Phalanx," wrote the author, "fought with the courage and principals [*sic*] of good loyal citizens" in the Civil War but in the last election so-called Republicans had described black people as "coons, niggars [*sic*], wenches etc. ... You are Republicans, but hell is full of just such as you are and what few of you are left here on earth, have all collected here in Leavenworth."[61]

Reviews also appeared in many mainstream newspapers, secular magazines and religious journals. As John David Smith shows in his introduction to a modern edition of Williams' book, they ranged from broadly positive to highly critical.[62] Joseph E. Roy, a Congregationalist minister, penned one of the warmest commentaries. Asserting that Williams recounted the story of the USCT with "wondrous effect," Roy reminded the well-to-do readers of the *New Englander and Yale Review* that "the black man faltered not in his patriotism" during the late conflict. Americans, he added, "are under obligation, not only to see that our Government makes good its covenant with the negroes, but to go on with the means of Christian enlightenment in order to help them maintain their rights, to make them the best possible citizens of this nation, our's and their's."[63] Other white reviewers, more inclined than Roy to highlight the texts' undoubted flaws, were not only less positive but they also ignored Roy's insistence that Americans owed black folk a debt for their wartime loyalty to the government. "Both books," asserted a condescending review in the *Nation*, "show honest intentions and a certain amount of praiseworthy diligence ... but both show a want of method and an inability to command their own materials, so that they leave the reader with a renewed interest in the subject, but with a very imperfect sense of clear comprehension."[64]

---

60 *The Cleveland Gazette*, February 18, 1888.
61 *The American Citizen* (Topeka), December 4, 1888.
62 Smith, Introduction to *A History of Negro Troops*, xxvi–xxix.
63 Joseph E. Roy, "Our Indebtedness to the Negroes for Their Conduct during the War," *New Englander and Yale Review* 15, No. 236 (November 1889): 356, 362, 363.
64 Quoted in Franklin, *George Washington Williams*, 131.

The Civil War texts of Williams and Wilson were part of a much broader effort by African Americans throughout the late nineteenth century to inscribe themselves, in the words of historian Steven Kantrowitz, "into the national narratives of democracy and fraternity."[65] This effort encompassed many different narrative strategies including that of Booker T. Washington whose famous Atlanta address in 1895 embraced a central trope of the Lost Cause by reimagining emancipated blacks as faithful slaves.[66] The fact that none of these strategies were able to halt the national spread of Jim Crow said far more about the virulence of white racism at this time than the relative strengths and weaknesses of the strategies themselves. The black soldier-historians' inability to sustain a national memory of the USCT, however, was linked specifically not only to most white northerners' refusal to grant African Americans a significant part in the Unionist narrative of the Civil War but also to that narrative's waning influence in the late 1880s and 1890s as sectional notions of the War of the Rebellion faded under pressure for an affective rapprochement between white northerners and southerners. One illustration of their inability to write the USCT into national history was the fact that Williams' innovative proposal for the building of a national monument to the USCT came to naught. Although he did help to draft a bill to fund construction, testified in its favor before a congressional committee and lobbied Union veterans of both races to petition their delegates to sign it into law, the measure eventually died in the House of Representatives after passing the Senate in December 1887.[67] Lacking the money to build monuments of their own, African Americans would have to wait more than a century for construction in Washington of a dedicated memorial to black Union troops.[68]

After the defeat of voting rights legislation in 1891 most leading Republicans embraced sectional reconciliation at the expense of equal rights for African Americans. Some white Union veterans, angered by the US government's unwillingness or inability to protect the rights of their black comrades, did support Albion Tourgée's abortive attempt to create a national civil rights organization in the early 1890s.[69] By the end of this decade, however, white southerners, further

---

65 Steven Kantrowitz, *More than Freedom: Fighting for Black Citizenship in a White Republic 1829–1889* (Penguin Press: New York, 2012), 5.

66 Cook, *Civil War Memories*, 117–118.

67 Blight, *Race and Reunion*, 196–197.

68 The congressionally-funded African American Civil War Memorial was dedicated in the Shaw neighborhood of Washington, DC in 1998. Cook, *Civil War Memories*, 188.

69 Tourgée was a white Union veteran heavily invested in the postwar struggle for equal rights for African Americans. On his ill-fated civil rights project see Mark Elliott, *Color-Blind Justice: Albion Tourgée and the Quest for Racial Equality from the Civil War to* Plessy v. Ferguson (New York: Ox-

abetted by the Supreme Court's pro-segregation ruling in the landmark case of *Plessy v. Ferguson* (1896) as well as consensual pressures induced by the country's war against Spain in 1898, had made the United States a Jim Crow nation.

Constructing an African American Counter-Memory

While the memory work of Joseph Wilson and George Washington Williams was far from unproblematic, it contributed directly to the construction of a durable African American counter-memory of the Civil War era. Preoccupied with linking masculine performance in the military service of the nation to the attainment of equal citizenship, the two soldier-historians not only erased evidence of black vengeance against Confederates but also passed over the wartime role of African American women. As historian Thavolia Glymph has shown, black women played an active role in the defense of the United States during the Civil War but were elided from most Unionist accounts of the conflict.[70] Impoverished, denigrated and disempowered as many black women were in the late nineteenth century, they hardly needed their own menfolk to press the case for equal citizenship on the basis of a gendered martial patriotism from which they were, by definition, excluded. Nevertheless, notwithstanding their selective use of evidence and ultimate inability to remind white Americans of the major role played by black soldiers in saving the republic, the two historians' emphasis on black courage, loyalty to the government and race pride impressed many African Americans in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century, even as growing numbers of black folk became disenchanted with the unfulfilled promise of emancipation and began to embrace Booker T. Washington's controversial accommodationist strategy. A major test of a counter-memory's effectiveness is its impact on the oppressed – the extent to which it enables disempowered individuals and groups to maintain not only a sense of self-respect but also a conviction that they can change society in the present because it has proved mutable in the past. In this respect the black veterans' histories helped to lay the foundations of a genuinely usable past as it was laid down most famously by W.E.B. Du Bois.

ford University Press, 2006), 252–259, 261, 266, 273–277, 295, and Carolyn L. Karcher, *A Refugee from His Race: Albion W. Tourgée and His Fight against White Supremacy* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2016), 149–195.

[70] Thavolia Glymph, "'I'm a Radical Black Girl:' Black Women Unionists and the Politics of Civil War History," *Journal of the Civil War Era* 8, No. 3 (September 2018): 359–387, doi: 10.1353/cwe.2018.0047.

John Hope Franklin, the African American biographer of George Washington Williams who acknowledged his subject's influence on his own work, intimated that the aspiring members of the Indianapolis Reading Circle read and discussed the *History of Negro Troops*.[71] It is likely that many African Americans who belonged to local uplift groups like this one were equally familiar with Wilson's book which, according to one black newspaper, attained "the largest sale of any book written by an American Negro."[72] Du Bois, a pioneering sociologist and skilled historian, admired the two soldier-historians' determination to make African Americans central to the national story and drew on their writings to make the same point himself. Convinced, as he argued in a 1909 biography of the revolutionary white abolitionist John Brown, that violence had been necessary to destroy North American slavery, he included a black Civil War soldier in the cast of his spectacular historical pageant, *The Star of Ethiopia*, which was performed in New York City in 1913 as part of the National Emancipation Exposition.[73] Audiences heard the character announce that: "I represented Ethiopia in the Civil War. I am a Union soldier. I fought for Old Glory. Who says that Ethiopia has done nothing for civilization? When civilization was about to fail in America, Ethiopia saved it."[74] Du Bois referenced the USCT in his global history of black people, *The Negro*, which appeared two years later. Citing the work of both Wilson and Williams in his chapter on the United States, he recounted the Colored Troops' "exemplary conduct" in the Civil War as well as the "barbarous" treatment of captured black soldiers at places like Fort Pillow. He also followed their narrative strategy by quoting white authorities on the heroism and importance of these men and describing the attack on Fort Wagner as "one of the greatest deeds of desperate bravery on record."[75] It is likely that Du Bois's decision in the summer of 1918 to urge black men to enlist in the US armed forces during World War I was influenced by the fact that the loyalty and bravery of the USCT had prompted watershed federal initiatives like the Fourteenth and Fifteenth

---

[71] Smith, Introduction to *A History of Negro Troops*, x; Franklin, *George Washington Williams*, 133.

[72] *Huntsville Gazette*, December 1, 1888. The newspaper provided no evidence to bolster its assertion.

[73] W.E.B. Du Bois, *John Brown* (Philadelphia: George W. Jacobs & Company, 1909). Du Bois insisted (386) that "the memory of John Brown stands to-day as a mighty warning to his country." The biography also included a chapter on antebellum black abolitionists entitled "The Black Phalanx."

[74] Quoted in William H. Wiggins, Jr., *O Freedom! Afro-American Emancipation Celebrations* (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1987), 59.

[75] W.E.B. Du Bois, *The Negro* (New York: Holt, 1915). These citations are from the 2005 Project Gutenberg text at https://ia800708.us.archive.org/4/items/thenegro15359gut/15359-8.txt. This edition does not contain page references.

Amendments to the Constitution. If black men's patriotism had levered government assistance for African Americans in the 1860s, why could it not do so again in 1917?

Du Bois had close personal experience of the viciousness of American racism in the early twentieth century – he had been teaching in Atlanta at the time of the city's 1906 race massacre – and should probably have known better. His close-ranks strategy was certainly controversial, even with former allies like Monroe Trotter who saw no reason why blacks should volunteer to fight for a country that oppressed them.[76] It failed partly because white Americans were no longer divided over slavery and secession as they had been during the Civil War. Assisted by commentators like Richard Hinton, they had either long forgotten or did not care that black men had helped to save the republic and, as the nationwide popularity of D. W. Griffith's epic movie, *The Birth of a Nation* (1915), revealed, they were enthusiastic consumers of popular narratives of the Civil War that exacerbated domestic racism. Instead of prompting fresh federal initiatives to assist marginalized African Americans, black men's enlistment in World War I culminated in a lethal surge of white-supremacist violence directed against black people across the United States. In June 1919 Du Bois admitted that black involvement in the war had resulted in the "frank realization" that the duty of America "as conceived by an astonishing number of able men, brave and good, as well as other sorts of men, is to hate 'niggers.'"[77] From this point on, he joined other black historians working in the rigidly segregated milieu of the 1920s and 1930s to fashion a robust counter-narrative of the American past that centered on Reconstruction rather than on the loyalty, heroism and discipline of the USCT.

Du Bois's decision to target Reconstruction rather than the Civil War made sense after 1918. First, the decision acknowledged the centrality of Reconstruction memories to the political and social oppression of African Americans in the Jim Crow era. White scholars like William A. Dunning of Columbia University and Woodrow Wilson of Princeton had consolidated the belief, nationwide by the late nineteenth century, that Reconstruction had been a dismal failure because liberated black men had been unfit to exercise political power over whites in the late 1860s and 1870s.[78] Southern politicians regularly remind-

---

[76] Ronald R. Krebs, *Fighting for Rights: Military Service and the Politics of Citizenship* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2006), 124–125.

[77] W.E.B. Du Bois, "An Essay Toward a History of the Black Man in the Great War," *Crisis* 18, No. 2 (June 1919): 63.

[78] Peter Novick, *That Noble Dream: The "Objectivity Question" and the American Historical Profession* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1988), 72–80.

ed their white constituents of the supposed horrors of "black rule" in order to strengthen their own position and foster intraracial unity in the service of the regionally dominant Democratic party.[79] Most white northerners, avid consumers in the interwar period of powerful fictions like *Birth of a Nation* and *Gone With the Wind* which demonized Reconstruction, had no reason to challenge the dominant narrative. However, Du Bois and other black scholars, notably Carter G. Woodson, the founder of the Association for the Study of Negro Life and History (ASNLH) in 1915, understood that the master narrative sustained white supremacy by denigrating the only period in American history when African Americans had exercised a measure of genuine political power.[80] Their response was to construct a viable counter-narrative of the Civil War era that directly challenged white assumptions. Du Bois's classic *Black Reconstruction in America* (1935), a Marxist interpretation of the turbulent postwar period, sought to undermine myths about black passivity and incompetence in the same way as the older histories of Williams and Wilson had tried to remind black and white readers, contrary to the view of commentators like Richard Hinton, that African Americans had played a leading role in their own liberation.[81]

Although black historians in the 1880s and 1920s/1930s dealt with different (though linked) historical subjects, their work was connected by a common stress on black agency in the American past.[82] Williams and Wilson focused tightly on the patriotic actions of armed black men in the war to save the Union. The work of their successors embraced a broader section of the black community and thereby laid the foundations for a more inclusive usable past. Du Bois hailed the contribution of enslaved black workers to the collapse of slavery and the Confederacy and went on to detail the effectiveness and progressive nature of

---

[79] Bruce E. Baker, *What Reconstruction Meant: Historical Memory in the American South* (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2007), 95–102; Nina Silber, *This War Ain't Over: Fighting the Civil War in New Deal America* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2018), 140–142.

[80] Woodson's efforts to sustain and disseminate a counter-memory of the African American past are detailed in Jacqueline Goggin, *Carter G. Woodson: A Life in Black History* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1993).

[81] W.E.B. Du Bois, *Black Reconstruction: An Essay toward a History of the Part which Black Folk Played in the Attempt to Reconstruct Democracy in America, 1860–1880* (New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1935).

[82] African American historians' relative lack of interest in the Civil War after World War I is evidenced by the fact that the ASNLH's *Journal of Negro History* published only two articles relating to the USCT between 1915 and 1941. These were both written by white scholars: Fred A. Shannon, "The Federal Government and the Negro Soldier, 1861–1865," *Journal of Negro History* 11, No. 4 (October 1926): 563–583, and Brainerd Dyer, "The Treatment of Colored Union Troops by the Confederates, 1861–1865," *Journal of Negro History* 20, No. 3 (July 1935): 273–286.

Reconstruction-era governments in which African Americans had played a leading role. Instructively, however, in chapter five of *Black Reconstruction*, "The Coming of the Lord," Du Bois recounted the "spectacular revolution" unleashed by the Civil War by drawing repeatedly on the writings of Wilson and Williams to demonstrate how the enslaved became self-liberators.[83] "Nothing else made Negro citizenship conceivable," he wrote, "but the record of the Negro soldier as a fighter." To make the point he illustrated the heroism of black troops at Port Hudson, singling out, as the two soldier-historians had done before him, "Captain Cailloux of the 1st Louisiana, a man so black that he actually prided himself upon his blackness" and who "died the death of a hero, leading on his men in the thick of the fight." In the same chapter Du Bois also followed Wilson and Williams by using the Fort Pillow massacre, "[t]he most terrible case of Confederate cruelty," to demonstrate the capacity of home-grown white supremacists for the most appalling violence.

Like the Civil War histories of black Union veterans, the studies of Du Bois, Carter Woodson, and Woodson's students like Alrutheus A. Taylor, focused though they were primarily on postwar Reconstruction, documented black people's active contribution to their own freedom as well as to the wider American community.[84] Just like the histories of the USCT written in the late 1880s, they had only a marginal impact on the dominant views of the white majority (communist scholars like Herbert Aptheker were the main exception in Du Bois's case). However, they too fostered intraracial commitment to political change by supplying African Americans with compelling evidence that the prevailing view of the national past was a witting fraud perpetrated by white politicians, historians, novelists and film-makers.

Although the crusading civil rights and Black Power movements of the 1960s came too late for Du Bois and other pioneering black scholars, those movements' considerable enhancement of African American cultural influence at the local and national level belatedly brought the counter-memory to the attention of increasing numbers of whites.[85] By the 1980s the concept of black agency

---

83 Chapter five of *Black Reconstruction* contained ten citations from the Civil War segment of Williams' *History of the Negro Race in America* and fifteen from Wilson's *Black Phalanx*. The quotations from *Black Reconstruction* in this paragraph are taken from the online Internet Archive edition of the book available at https://libcom.org/files/black_reconstruction_an_essay_toward_a_history_of_.pdf. This edition does not contain page references.

84 Blight, "W.E.B. Du Bois," 57–63; Baker, *What Reconstruction Meant*, 113–117,123–125.

85 White American historians belatedly rediscovered the USCT in the midst of what C. Vann Woodward referred to as "the New Reconstruction" in *The Strange Career of Jim Crow* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1955), 9. Admitting that he did not know about their existence until he

explored so vigorously a hundred years previously by the black soldier-historians had fundamentally altered the way mainstream American scholars wrote about their country's past – its influence most notable in Eric Foner's sweeping history of Reconstruction which placed liberated black folk at the center of the story.[86] However, white supremacists in the United States still seek to perpetuate old myths about the beneficence of American slavery and the latter's negligible role in the coming of the Civil War. The residual power of those myths is perhaps most evident in President Trump's politically-charged hostility, evidenced by his refusal to condemn neo-Nazi and neo-Confederate violence in Charlottesville in 2017 as well as his open contempt for the 1619 Project, to any story of the American past centered on the country's long history of prejudice against people of color. Manifestly, the present-focused challenge that confronted George Washington Williams and Joseph Wilson – to render African Americans vital players in the republic's past – remains as pressing today as it was in the late nineteenth century.

entered graduate school, Dudley Taylor Cornish wrote the first comprehensive modern history of the USCT in 1956. While noting his debt to Wilson and Williams, Cornish criticized their texts for suffering "the common faults of weak organization, lack of documentation, lack of objectivity, and a constant tendency toward extravagant praise of Negro soldiers." Cornish, *Sable Arm*, 317. Assisted by the burgeoning civil rights movement, Cornish's book triggered new interest in the USCT. In 1962 a progressive white Republican lawyer, Howard N. Meyer, secured republication of Thomas Wentworth Higginson's *Army Life in a Black Regiment* (1870), one of the most revealing memoirs written by a white USCT officer. "Two hundred thousand Negroes fought in that war," commented Meyer, "but you never hear of them. We buried their achievements, as we buried those of other leading Negroes immediately after the war, when we defeated slavery but accepted segregation." Quoted in Robert J. Cook, *Troubled Commemoration: The American Civil War Centennial, 1961–1965* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2007), 168, note 32. W.W. Norton issued a paperback edition of Cornish's history in 1966. These books laid the groundwork for later academic scholarship on the black military experience in the Civil War (see note 23 above). But popular interest in the USCT was not genuinely piqued until the appearance of Edward Zwick's Hollywood movie, *Glory*, in 1989.

[86] Eric Foner, *Reconstruction: America's Unfinished Revolution 1863–1877* (New York: Harper & Row, 1988). Black agency in the Civil War and the postwar era is also the central theme of Steven Hahn, *A Nation Under Our Feet: Black Political Struggles in the Rural South from Slavery to the Great Migration* (Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2003).

2020 ACTA UNIVERSITATIS CAROLINAE STUDIA TERRITORIALIA 2 PAG. 39–55

MEMORYSCAPES: SOUTHEAST EUROPE AND THE QUESTION OF “SMALL/MINOR” LITERATURE

GORICA MAJSTOROVIC
STOCKTON UNIVERSITY

Abstract
Drawing on recent discussions in world literature and Michael Rothberg’s concept of multidirectional memory, in the present article I explore Danilo Kiš and Dubravka Ugrešić within the formation of transactional exchanges between “small/minor” and world literatures. As I approach these exchanges, my focus is on texts and contexts in which translation and memory function as the key mediator. By reading Kiš and Ugrešić comparatively, my aim, in what I call “the minor drive,” is to address writers and translators that contest hegemonic narratives, and in doing so, examine the cultural enterprise of “small/minor” literatures from the perspective of “worlding” former Yugoslavia and Southeast Europe.
Keywords: Danilo Kiš; Dubravka Ugrešić; translation; memory; minor literatures; former Yugoslavia
DOI: 10.14712/23363231.2021.3

Introduction

Erich Auerbach wrote in Istanbul, a city that had become for him a temporary home after fleeing Nazi Germany in the 1930s, that exile allowed Dante “to correct and overcome that disharmony of fate, not by stoic asceticism and

Dr. Gorica Majstorovic is a Professor of Spanish and World Literature, Stockton University, USA. Address correspondence to 101 Vera King Farris Dr., Galloway, NJ 08205. E-mail: Gorica.Majstorovic@stockton.edu.

renunciation, but by taking account of memory and historical events."[1] Michael Rothberg's understanding of memory, through a multidirectional lens, engages the Holocaust and postcolonial histories of violence. Rothberg's concept, I argue in this essay, largely informs memory processes in twentieth-century literatures of Southeast Europe, and more specifically, the former Yugoslavia. The multidirectional memory provides a conceptual framework that allows for an understanding of violence in multidirectional terms, without reducing it to a neutralized suffering, or to historical events seen as disconnected. Rothberg maps out different contexts of multidirectionality and examines the complex set of connections and interactions between such historical contexts as Nazi Germany, slavery, colonialism, and decolonization. In doing so, he argues that the Holocaust is intrinsically connected to other types of traumatic memories. Memory should therefore not be viewed as a competitive "zero-sum struggle" for visibility and recognition,[2] but rather as a "dynamic process in which disparate and opposing memories exist alongside each other and are often linked."[3]

While the inequalities ensuing from histories of colonialism persist to the present, taking a cue from translation theory and memory studies, I am interested in alternatives and challenges that multilingualism and translation can provide to national literatures in postcolonial spaces. In doing so, I am primarily looking at exile and statelessness – through the lens of memory and translation – in two authors from small/minor literatures of Southeast Europe: Danilo Kiš (Yugoslavia/Serbia-France) and Dubravka Ugrešić (Yugoslavia/Croatia-Netherlands). While echoing a transnational/transcultural turn in memory studies, I follow Rothberg's problematization of the automatic association between memory and identity. He sustains: "Memories are not owned by groups – nor are groups 'owned' by memories. Rather, the borders of memory and identity are jagged; what looks at first like my own property often turns out to be a borrowing or adaptation from a history that initially might seem foreign or distant."[4] In other words, public, collective memory works in a cross-referencing way, and the history of the memory can only be written comparatively. While maintaining the comparative focus as I think about memory and translation in this essay, I am

[1] Erich Auerbach, *Dante, Poet of the Secular World*, trans. Ralph Manheim (New York: Riverview Books, 2001), xii.
[2] Michael Rothberg, *Multidirectional Memory: Remembering the Holocaust in the Age of Decolonization* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2009), 9.
[3] Ibid., 2–3.
[4] Ibid., 5.

departing from the concept of "translation as consecration" (Pascale Casanova)[5] and focusing on the "materiality" of translation, a literary practice that I read as contesting hegemonic, national narratives.

I examine memory and uses of translation, first in Danilo Kiš (in the 1970s and 1980s), and then in Dubravka Ugrešić (from the 1990s onward). I look at some of the ways in which both authors question in their work assumptions about originality, influence, and literary scale. These concepts are largely inherited from the interwar modernism that both Kiš and Ugrešić follow closely, either through academic study (Kiš was the first graduate of the Department of Comparative Literature at the University of Belgrade, while Ugrešić is a former professor of Slavic and Comparative Literature at the University of Zagreb's Institute for the Theory of Literature), or in their own fiction, their work in translation, and their work as translators. I focus on overlapping cultural transactions within the economies of the "minor" that produce marginal, extracanonical circuits of readership and literary exchange, to and from Southeast Europe.

Rather than examining translation and minority discourse within a single nation-state or stand-alone example of minor languages and cultures in Southeast Europe and former Yugoslavia in particular, I follow the approach exposed in *Contextualizing World Literature* that proposes the "construction of interlocking and/or reciprocally illuminating multilingual literary clusters. These ensembles are of very diverse shapes: the world, a region, a country, a language block, a network of cross-cultural 'interferences' while the so-called minor literatures invite to question the use of these ensembles."[6] This last point is especially important for my analysis: by questioning the uses of these ensembles, I am taking "small/minor" literature as a relational rather than ontological category. In doing so, I depart from the concept of translation as an organizing, constitutive concept, first for global modernism (Gayle Rogers)[7] and then for writers who live and work in the cultural fields (Pierre Bourdieu)[8] traversed by those particular modernist cultural legacies.

---

5 Pascale Casanova, *The World Republic of Letters*, trans. Malcolm DeBevoise (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2004), 135.

6 Jean Bessière and Gerald Gillespie, eds., *Contextualizing World Literature* (Brussels: Peter Lang, 2015), 3. This volume was published following the symposium on world literature held at the International Comparative Literature Association 2013 Paris Congress.

7 Gayle Rogers, "Translation," in *A New Vocabulary for Global Modernism*, eds. Eric Hayot and Rebecca L. Walkowitz (New York: Columbia University Press, 2016).

8 Pierre Bourdieu, *The Field of Cultural Production* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1993).

World Scale and Small/Minor Literatures

In "Territorial Trap: Danilo Kiš, Cultural Geography, and Geopolitical Imagination," Zoran Milutinović points to cultural mediation and the role of cultural institutions in tastemaking, cultural gatekeeping, and global promotion of literary works from smaller countries.[9] He contends that most attempts to integrate writers from "small/minor" literatures into a larger whole "tend to be inadequate, deductive, and reductionist."[10] Intrigued by this premise, I am interested in the ways in which the worlding of "small/minor" literatures (the transfer and production of such new meaning through translation, global publishing markets, and emerging cultures of reading) simultaneously reaffirms and also questions the historical memory deposited in Western European archives of the large nation states such as Germany, the UK, and France. By looking at these complex issues, several questions arise: What is the role of the nation-state and its cultural and academic institutions in minor-major literary relations? How might mutual investigation of "small/minor" and "world" literatures complicate understandings of each category's chronologies and cartographies? What is the role of translation as the mediator between the two? What kind of challenge to world literature, if any, can be associated with "small/minor" literatures? How might "the global turn" in comparative literary studies be explored by addressing constructions of "minor Europe," the figure and the practice of translation, and responses to memory and its legacies?

Following Rothberg's views on multidirectionality of memory as an important form of connection and interaction of different historical memories, I seek to explore these concepts of literary study within the formation of transactional exchanges between "small/minor" and world literatures when translation and memory function as the key mediator. In addressing these questions, however, I am not interested in focusing on the many different kinds of minority voices emanating from Southeast Europe. Rather, my aim is to examine the cultural enterprise of "small/minor" literatures from the perspective of "worlding" Southeast Europe. That is to say, I am looking at an interconnected web of cultural networks with "Central Europe" and other geopolitical categories, such as "Western Europe" and "Eastern Europe," at its core.

[9] Zoran Milutinović, "Territorial Trap: Danilo Kiš, Cultural Geography, and Geopolitical Imagination," *East European Politics and Societies* 28, No. 4 (2014): 715–738, doi: 10.1177/0888325414543082.
[10] Ibid., 715.

While questioning the boundaries of Anglophone modernism, Gayle Rogers asserts that "one of the central tenets of the modernist reconceptualization of translation is that even foundational notions such as target and source are complicated by a number of factors, geopolitics among them."[11] I would go a step further and argue that geopolitics and internal national (cultural) politics *are* key concepts in translational exchange, but especially so in the complex translation dynamics that involve what Rogers calls "nondominant languages" and "minor-language" texts. For those minor categories to exist there has to be a dominant language and a major-language text, as modernism indeed had at its core the literatures of the Paris–London–New York–Berlin nexus. The centrality of those major literatures and geolinguistic spaces (i.e., languages) in the formation of not only literary scholarship but also memory studies came to the fore, yet again, in the recent centennial commemorations of the First World War.

While a further discussion of this complex topic goes beyond the scope of this essay, the discrepancies between texts written in the "major" languages (English and German, for example) and those coming from the "small/minor" languages and literatures (Serbian and Macedonian, for example) are notable. Aleksandra Mančić, too, has effectively argued that "small" literatures are of interest to large ones only in times of conflict.[12] In the realm of comparative literary topographies, the process is always a deeply political one that complicates the relationship between large/centric and small/peripheral. Most importantly, it evolves within processes of global modernity, one that is always world-historical and inseparable from political considerations of memory.

Poetics of Memory in Danilo Kiš

Danilo Kiš (1935–1989) foregrounds in his work the condition of statelessness, the effects of the Holocaust and Stalinism on individuals and states, and the role of memory. Kiš was born in multiethnic Vojvodina, in the border city of Subotica, to a Jewish-Hungarian father and an Orthodox-Montenegrin mother. His father and several other family members died in concentration camps. *Bašta, pepeo* (1965; translated as *Garden, Ashes*) is Kiš' fictionalized biography and a tribute to his father. Kiš' other acclaimed works include titles such as *Psalm*

11 Rogers, "Translation," 259.

12 Aleksandra Mančić, "Una aproximación traductológica al problema de la cultura del extranjero" (Doctoral Dissertation, Universidad Autónoma Madrid, 2003), 56.

44 (1962; *Psalm 44*), *Grobnica za Borisa Davidoviča* (1976; *Tomb for Boris Davidovich*), *Rani jadi: za decu i osetljive* (1970; Early Sorrows: For Children and Sensitive Readers), *Peščanik* (1972; *Hourglass*), *Enciklopedija Mrtvih* (1983; *The Encyclopedia of the Dead*), and *Lauta i ožiljci* (1994; *The Lute and the Scars*), which includes the short story "Apatrid."

Kiš wrote "Apatrid" using a memory genre, a biography. This short story consists of a series of twenty-six brief fragments about the life and work of a literary character whose life closely resembles that of the real-world writer Ödön von Horváth (1901–1938). Von Horváth was a modernist writer and playwright whose work has enjoyed a contemporary revival through translations and reprints, but also theatrical adaptations of his plays, most notably by the late director Igor Vuk Torbica (1987–2020). From 2016 to 2018, Torbica put on stage von Horváth's *Tales from the Vienna Woods* to great acclaim at the Gavella Theatre in Zagreb, Croatia. The production company traveled across the region and performed in light of worrying political parallels Torbica wanted to show between the rise of fascism in Austria (that von Horváth depicted in the 1930s), and the rising right-wing populisms that currently threaten democracy in the regions of Southeast Europe.

Ödön von Horváth was born in multilingual Rijeka, then Fiume, a city that throughout its history has been marked by constantly changing borders and is now located in Croatia. At the time of von Horváth's birth in 1901, the city belonged to the Austro-Hungarian Empire, bordering Italy. The author's father was a journalist who covered shipping news for the *Pester Lloyd* newspaper and insurance company; his first posting was in Fiume/Rijeka, a port city on the map of "Europa minor." The geography of "Europa minor" that the story subsequently maps includes first Belgrade, Serbia, where the author's family lived from 1902 to 1908, then Budapest, Bratislava, and Munich. I am borrowing the term "Europa minor" from Andreas Kramer, who derived the phrase from the modernist writer Yvan Goll. Goll used the term *kleines Europa* to describe post-First World War Central and Eastern European nations (emerging from the demise of the Austro-Hungarian Empire) in a letter to Ljubomir Micić, the editor of the avant-garde journal *Zenit*, then based in Zagreb.[13] Kramer studies Goll's use of the trope "Europa minor" to destabilize the European chronotope and its self-appointed centrality and universalism. According to Kramer,

[13] Quoted in Andreas Kramer, "Europa minor. Yvan and Claire Goll's Europe," in *Europa! Europa? The Avant-Garde, Modernism and the Fate of a Continent*, ed. Sascha Bru et al. (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2009), 131. The Golls (Ivan and Claire) were themselves, like Kiš, and Ugrešić many years later, living in exile away from their "home culture."

"Europa minor" is in Goll "a spatial and temporal network where avant-garde traffic can flow in various directions at once."[14]

The map in "Apatrid" uses real topographies; however, the personal names are changed: Hungarian-Croatian-sounding von Horváth became Hungarian-German-border-located von Németh. As a student in Munich, von Németh became interested in translation:

> With the help of a poet he discovered at an early age the mysterious, encrypted language of love. As an eighteen-year-old, in love with a fellow student, a German girl, he discovered that in this poet's work there was one poem for every phase of *amour* (for raptures, disappointment, dread, regret); and he commenced translating. And so he translated – "completely *à propos*" – fifty of the poems, and at the point when the love cycle had quickened in the German language and was already in the printer's hands, love evolved for him, via the process of crystallization (to put it in Stendhal-ease), to that point in which passion begins to smolder and go out. All that remained of the whole youthful adventure and amorous delirium was this anthology of translated poems, like some dog-eared photo album.[15]

Bilingual since birth, speaking both Hungarian and German, von Németh translated a collection by the Hungarian poet and celebrated modernist Endre Ady. At this particular juncture and through the act of translation, von Németh opted for the German language: "it's the nearest to my heart. I am, good sirs, a German writer; the world is my homeland."[16]

German is also the language of Kafka's Prague and one of the multiple languages of the province of Vojvodina where Danilo Kiš grew up. Indeed, Kiš is deeply imbedded within the multidirectional memory, multicultural identification, and multilingualism of the region. As a child, he briefly lived in Novi Sad where he continued to learn Hungarian, knowledge that later enabled him to translate Ady from Hungarian to Serbo-Croatian. In "Apatrid," Kiš puts von Németh's identity in the following terms: "I am a typical mixture from the Habsburg Empire of blessed memory: simultaneously Hungarian, Croat, Slovak, German, Czech ... [with] traces of Tsintsar, Armenian, and yes, maybe even

---

[14] Kramer, "Europa minor," 136.

[15] Danilo Kiš, "The Stateless One," in *The Lute and the Scars*, trans. John K. Cox (Champaign: Dalkey Archive Press, 2012), 10.

[16] Ibid., 12. In the first chapter of Ödön von Horváth's first novel, *The Eternal Philistine* (1930), titled "Herr Kobler becomes a Pan-European," the protagonist goes from Germany to the 1929 Barcelona Universal Exposition.

Roma and Jewish blood."[17] As a key quality of what they called "a minor literature" Deleuze and Guattari emphasize the significance of Kafka's experience of multiple cultural identities as a German-speaking Jew from (the then Austro-Hungarian) Prague. Minor literatures, they argue, have a "high coefficient of deterritorialisation" of language; "everything in them is political, and the assemblage of enunciation is collective."[18] Indeed, Kiš' cosmopolitan protagonist, "the man without the country, the stateless one,"[19] is assembled through these collective histories and their overlapping geopolitical and geolinguistic marks of multidirectional memory.

In the story (and in real life), von Németh (von Horváth) subsequently travels through Italy, Yugoslavia, and Hungary before arriving in Amsterdam. It is in Amsterdam where he meets his publisher Mr. van der Lange and prepares his new novel, *Farewell to Europe*. An important stop he makes on this journey is a visit to Pest, the heart of (his familiar space of Austro-Hungarian) Europe and where his father lives. The Austro-Hungarian Empire, dismantled since the end of the First World War in 1918, lives on in the cultural memory of Kiš and his protagonist, a fellow writer. Kiš, however, is unmistakably a writer from a small country in Southeast Europe, to the south of Pest. Budapest (and Vienna, with its German language) is where high culture resided at the time. It is a place with undisputed "major" cultural capital. The publisher that von Németh meets in Amsterdam also loves German literature: "Heine was the first writer to poison him with poetic reveries and teach him the difference between the lyrical and the ironic, as well as the fragile relationship between them – a knack that is hard to find among poets as it is among readers."[20] Upon summing up the tenets of this unique style, always oscillating between the lyrical and the ironic, Kiš goes on to highlight the important work that van der Lange accomplished: in the 1930s he published books by German refugees fleeing fascism. As one such refugee during this time, the real writer, Ödön von Horváth, was forced to leave Germany and, after a brief stay in Amsterdam, went on to Paris.

Amsterdam, for several reasons, gets a much longer description in Kiš' story than Paris. Most importantly, Amsterdam is portrayed as a refuge from fascism, in contrast to Germany where "masses howled in stadiums."[21] Amsterdam, the

[17] Ibid.
[18] Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari, *Kafka: Toward a Minor Literature* (Minneapolis and London: University of Minnesota Press, 1986), 17.
[19] Kiš, "The Stateless One," 15.
[20] Ibid.
[21] Ibid., 17.

narrator says, is "another world altogether … the market women, … the young men on the bicycles … boats moved calmly along on the canals … through narrow uncurtained windows families could be seen around tables with steaming dishes of food: bright accents on idyllic scenes of family life, the way they would have appeared on the canvas of a Dutch master."[22] At the end of the story, an Amsterdam fortune-teller sends the writer on a journey to Paris, where, as if answering a death call, he goes without hesitation. One day, a storm strikes the city and a falling branch kills von Németh instantaneously.[23]

My analysis of Kiš' story brings together and confronts "center" perspectives on the world deriving from Paris with "peripheral" ones that are issued from the margins of Europe, dislocating both in the process. I would like to suggest that Kiš displays the "minor drive" though a specific lens of the "world" created by the "small/minor" literatures inflected by the Heinean principle of lyricism and irony. Sought in a series of dialectical tensions that more often than not took the form "Paris and the others," in Kiš' story those tensions are underlined with not a small amount of irony and distance. This irony is the most poignant when he addresses nationalism, as he does in regard to his protagonist's legacy:

> Back in his homeland this poet had a monument, and streets, named after him; he had generations of admirers and his own mythos, as well as followers who praised him to the skies and stood in awe of his verse and lyrics as the pure emanation of the national spirit; and he also had sworn enemies who considered him a traitor to national ideals.[24]

One cannot help but read Kiš' own life story inserted between the lines of "Apatrid," for it had not been long ago that he chose exile over literature written in a "national" key. In fact, Kiš wrote in the "minor key" (by rejecting the grandiosity of "major," national myths), and he returned the most prestigious literary award (NIN-ova nagrada), finally leaving Belgrade (and certain circles of Serbian cultural nationalism) for France. In sum, while he cannot be easily typecast as a "dissident" in exile, Kiš nevertheless left Belgrade (after a public scandal involving resentment of Kiš' cosmopolitanism by the local nationalist literary clique). He went on to teach Serbo-Croatian at the Universities of Strasbourg, Bordeaux, and Lille before permanently settling in Paris in 1979.

---

22 Ibid.

23 This is exactly how Ödön von Horváth died in 1938, in front of the Marigny Theatre on Avenue des Champs-Élysées.

24 Kiš, "The Stateless One," 7.

In the next section, let us turn to Kiš' own translations, their long-lasting impact and their relevance today. Mostly known as a short story writer whose own prose has been widely translated around the world, Kiš' life-long work as a translator has not yet been examined in the world literature contexts, except for the recent study by Sibelan Forrester.[25] He translated works into Serbo-Croatian, a language whose hyphen has been violently erased by nationalist discourse, thus converting it into "either" one "or" the other South Slavic language. In contrast to the discourses of nationalism and nationalist literatures that stirred the civil war in the Balkans, I would like to suggest that Kiš used world literature and translation as a cosmopolitan tool, an instrument through which he further resisted nationalism.

Kiš took account of historical events by writing creative fiction and by memorializing the victims of the Holocaust. In doing so, he also denounced the horrors of Stalinism and, I would argue, made particular choices as a translator. Kiš translated French poetry by Corneille, Baudelaire, Lautréamont, Verlaine, Prévert, and Queneau (including Queneau's *Exercises in Style*, a collection of 99 retellings of the same story). While most of his translations were from French, he also translated Mandelstam, Yesenin, and Tsvetaeva from Russian, and Ady, Petőfi, and Radnóti from Hungarian.

Kiš often said in interviews that he enjoyed translating poetry the most. He translated numerous poems by Marina Tsvetaeva, for example, that were published in a separate edition and also in several anthologies. According to Forrester, "He may have been drawn to Tsvetaeva's poetry not only for its quality, but especially for its treatment of loss, exile, and separation."[26]

Susan Sontag, Iosip Brodsky, Salman Rushdie, and Milan Kundera were all vocal fans of Danilo Kiš, and he was invited twice to the meetings of the American PEN. After being "consecrated" in Paris, his work appeared in *The New Yorker* in the 1980s and his novel *A Tomb for Boris Davidovich* appeared in Penguin's *Writers from the Other Europe*, curated by Philip Roth. However, despite all the previous fame, when Mark Thompson started writing his 2013 biography of Kiš, Kiš' work was all but out-of-print in English.[27] Thankfully, Dalkey Archive Press, led by late John O'Brien, has since re-translated five novels and several

[25] Sibelan Forrester, "The water of life: Resuscitating Russian avant-garde authors in Croatian and Serbian translations," in *Contexts, Subtexts and Pretexts: Literary translation in Eastern Europe and Russia*, ed. Brian James Baer (Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2011).

[26] Ibid., 123.

[27] For a brilliant critique of this biography and for the larger implications for the theory of "small/minor" literatures, see Zoran Milutinović's "Territorial Trap."

short story collections, among them Kiš' poignant anti-totalitarian collections of short stories, *A Tomb for Boris Davidovich* and *The Lute and the Scars.*

Pascale Casanova claims that "the international recognition of Danilo Kiš coincided with his consecration via translation into French, which lifted him out the shadow of his native Serbo-Croatian."[28] In Casanova's estimation, Kiš is woefully undervalued. He belongs, she claims, at the center of European literature, not on its fringes. It is interesting to note here Casanova's cosmopolitan "tastemaking" gesture but also her differentiation between large/major centers such as France and Paris and the small/minor ones of Kiš' literary topography. She tries to bring Kiš from the fringes of Europe, from a small language such as Serbo-Croatian, to the center of the "world republic of letters," Paris. As I have indicated earlier, I am interested in the concept of "translation as consecration" (as in Casanova), but also in the idea of translation as a form and practice of ideological resistance that, following Kiš, points to the craft of writing and "the relativity of all myths," especially those belonging to nationalism and nation-building.

Confiscation of Memory in Dubravka Ugrešić

The first English PEN Writers in Translation Award was given in 2005 to the Croatian writer Dubravka Ugrešić for her novel titled *Ministarstvo Boli* (2004; translated as *The Ministry of Pain*). Ugrešić is the award-winning author of essays such as *Kultura laži* (1996; *The Culture of Lies*), *Europa u sepiji* (2013; *Europe in Sepia*), and *Doba kože* (2019; *The Age of Skin*), short story collections such as *Štefica Cvek u raljama života* (1981; *In the Jaws of Life*), and novels including *Muzej bezuvjetne predaje* (1998; *The Museum of Unconditional Surrender*) and *Lisica* (2017; *Fox*). Thirty years since the outbreak of the civil war that brought the dissolution of Yugoslavia and propelled her exile, Ugrešić still lives in Amsterdam and continues to oppose Croatian nationalism (whose proponents once labeled her a dangerous "witch").[29] Ugrešić and the characters in her books formulate their own post-Yugoslav memories in multidirectional ways by connecting to people from various countries and backgrounds, and also by drawing on the institutional memories of the Holocaust in Germany (*The Museum of*

[28] Casanova, *The World Republic of Letters*, 135.

[29] "Nationalism is first and foremost individual and collective paranoia, as Danilo Kiš wrote." See "Dubravka Ugrešić by Svetlana Boym," *Bomb Magazine*, July 1, 2002, https://bombmagazine.org/articles/dubravka-ugre%C5%A1i%C4%87/.

Unconditional Surrender), the Soviet literary past in the USSR (*Fox*), and popular culture in Yugoslavia (*In the Jaws of Life*).

The Ministry of Pain begins with a translation of a 1934 poem by Marina Tsvetaeva: "Those pangs of homesickness!/ That long since detected upheaval!/ I am altogether indifferent/ As to where to be altogether … Nor am I charmed by my mother/ Tongue's call, cajoling and creamy:/ I set no great store by the tongue that others/ use to misconstruct me … And closest of all, perhaps, is the past."[30] The past, or more specifically the Yugoslav past, is what haunts the main character's memory in *The Ministry of Pain*. In this novel, Ugrešić follows a Croatian academic's flight to the Netherlands from the ruins of Yugoslavia in the early 1990s.

Like the author, the professor/protagonist of Ugrešić's novel, Tanja Lucić, is displaced from the Balkan wars of the 1990s and living in Amsterdam. Her partner, Goran, was recently fired from the University of Zagreb:

> He was a fine mathematician and much loved by his students, and even though his was in a "neutral" field he'd been removed from his post overnight. Much as people assured him that it was all perfectly "normal" – in times of war your average human specimen always acted like that, the same thing had happened to many people, it happened not only to Serbs in Croatia but to Croats in Serbia, it happened to Muslims, Croats, and Serbs in Bosnia; it happened to Jews, Albanians, and Roma; it happened to everybody everywhere in that unfortunate former country of ours.[31]

Goran ends up taking a position at the University of Tokyo while Tanja starts teaching Yugoslav literature in Amsterdam.

While recalling Tanja's and her students' mistrust of identity and the newly-established languages of Bosnia, Croatia, and Serbia, the novel is composed on the premise of multidirectional memory. Indeed, Tanja's students come from all spaces of former Yugoslavia. It is no secret, and no small irony, that they take the course on Yugoslav literature only because taking it will help them maintain legal status in the country. The work that Tanja is requesting from her students is based on memory. She asks them to recollect moments from their past lives and write essays about them, thus delving into her own trauma and loss. The students

---

[30] Dubravka Ugrešić, *The Ministry of Pain*, trans. Michael Henry Heim (New York: Harper Collins, 2009), 11.

[31] Ibid., 18.

mostly write about their childhood, seen as an idyllic time prior to "the breakup of the country, the war, the repression of memory ..., and then the exile."[32]

Memory plays a key role in all of the student narratives and throughout the book:

> stimulating the memory was as much a manipulation of the past as banning it. The authorities in our former country had pressed the delete button, I the restore button; they were erasing the Yugoslav past, blaming Yugoslavia for every misfortune, including the war.[33]

Tanja's own endless train journeys are born of a fear, David Williams notes,

> of a need to establish semantic and external coordinates, to locate fixed points of reference. This fear of disappearing is shared by her fellow Yugoslav exiles in Amsterdam, who, grieving for lost environments and places of memory, desperately search for surrogates in their new surroundings – for their benches on the waterfront, their town squares, their local cafés.[34]

However, Tanja not only questions identity but also nostalgia and her reliability as a narrator, wondering if she is using Amsterdam as a projection screen for her own memory and the collective Yugoslav trauma.

She chooses to probe her students with memories of the old country through an examination of "Yugo-nostalgia," a term that I find somewhat similar to the Gallician-Portuguese *saudade*. This term appears as one of the "untranslatability" entries in the translation from French of the *Dictionary of Untranslatables*.[35] In fact, Emily Apter has advocated for "translating untranslatability" and although she uses an entirely different set of examples, she nevertheless argues not against but for translation, albeit one that seeks to embrace infidelity to the original. The narrator in *The Ministry of Pain* sums this dynamic up in the following terms: "As for the whole, it was untranslatable: we were speaking an extinct language comprehensible only to ourselves."[36] Somewhat similar to *saudade*, Yugo-nostalgia is

---

32 Ibid., 52.

33 Ibid., 72.

34 David Williams, *Writing Postcommunism: Towards a Literature of the East European Ruins* (London and New York: Palgrave, 2013), 103.

35 "How to Use This Work," in *Dictionary of Untranslatables: A Philosophical Lexicon*, ed. Barbara Cassin, Emily Apter, Jacques Lezra, and Michael Wood (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2014), xxi.

36 Ugrešić, *The Ministry of Pain*, 78.

indeed an "untranslatable term" that at the same time paradoxically calls for the use of memory and translation as it tells the disjointed stories of "traumatic" and multilingual cosmopolitanism.

Like the narrator in Kiš' "Apatrid," Ugrešić's novel deconstructs romantic myths of home and state, a tendency that comes to the fore in the fragment of the novel in which Tanja returns to Zagreb, the Croatian city where she grew up. As David Williams succinctly observes, "Tanja's visit home also prompts some of the novel's strongest reflections on historical remembering and forgetting."[37] The city that she arrives to in order to visit her mother is no longer recognizable, the street names have changed, and the language spoken around her sounds different. While the analysis of the complex and contentious socio-political backdrop to the Balkan wars and post-Yugoslav states goes beyond the scope of this essay, another stroke of irony is added when a fellow Croatian advises Tanja that the sooner she forgets Zagreb's old street names (from the time of Yugoslavia) and learns the new ones (given by the new state of Croatia), the better.

Ugrešić's writing is especially attuned to issues of "place," "memory," and "mediation." Similar to Kiš, she has always used irony and humor as a serious political tool to examine both the past and the present. However, she has avoided facile characterizations of exile and has been actively involved in contextualizing her own condition of exile. In one interview, for example, she commented on the burden of such a position. When asked whether she disagrees with those who try to identify her as an *émigré*, political exile, or fugitive, Ugrešić responded:

> In the places I live/reside in, I do not want this identification. It is reductive and extremely manipulative. Both exiles and the environment in which exiles find themselves manipulate with this identification. Exile is citational – it has had a long tradition and its meaning has petrified, so it happens that an exile is read entirely on the basis of this "exile complex." And I do not want this. On the other hand, when I address my message to the place I had left – to Croatia and Former Yugoslavia – then I insist on exile, that is, on political exile.[38]

---

[37] Williams, *Writing Postcommunism*, 115.

[38] Quoted in Vedrana Veličković, "Open Wounds, the Phenomenology of Exile and the Management of Pain: Dubravka Ugrešić's *The Ministry of Pain*," in *Literature of Exile of East and Central Europe*, ed. Agnieszka Gutthy (New York: Peter Lang, 2009), 140. Along similar lines, Ugrešić spoke in New York on May 6, 2017, at the PEN World Voices Festival panel which was dedicated to the critique of nationalism. She shared the panel with writers Aleksandar Hemon (Bosnia-USA) and Igor Štiks (Bosnia-USA-Scotland-Serbia).

In "The Confiscation of Memory," an essay from *Kultura laži* (1996; *The Culture of Lies)*, Ugrešić writes about a couple living in Zagreb, Yugoslavia. The narrative proceeds to tell the story of old summer-time friends who are now on the wrong side of the ethnic divide during the war. The couple had come to Croatia from Bosnia, and their apartment resembled a living museum of Yugoslav everyday life, with a picture of President Josip Broz Tito (1892–1980) hanging on the wall among the family photographs, and souvenirs from summer vacations on the Adriatic Sea decorating the bookshelves. Ugrešić focuses on the problem of memory and remembering by choosing to pay attention only to small/minor detail in her evocation of Yugoslavia and the country's multiethnic past. She purposefully does so in order to counter and contest the hegemonic national narratives that were subsequently re-constructed in the post-Yugoslav societies. Multidirectional memory, in Michael Rothberg's terms, shows how cultural artefacts travel within and across the various borders of spaces, time, and social groups as Ugrešić invites the contemporary reader to think about remembering those histories and events outside of the borders of their national, social, and cultural identity.

In moving to a close, let us take a look now at some translations of Ugrešić's own work. It is interesting to note that she is perhaps read more outside of Croatia than in the country. While Ugrešić herself translated avant-garde writers such as Boris Pilnyak and Daniil Kharms (from Russian into Croatian), translators of her own work continue the task of disseminating anti-nationalist and anti-totalitarian texts and ideas. Ugrešić's novel *The Ministry of Pain*, for example, was translated by the late Michael Henry Heim. Ellen Elias-Bursać translated Ugrešić's book of essays *Nobody's Home*, among other works, including those by David Albahari, the Serbian-Jewish author who spent many years in Canada before returning to Belgrade.

David Williams translated Ugrešić's *Karaoke Culture* and *Europe in Sepia*, and co-translated (with Ellen Elias-Bursać) Ugrešić's latest novel, *Fox*.[39] He points to stark asymmetries between large/major and small/minor cultural fields (and power differentials at play) in the "task of the translator":

> The point is this: just as there is an enormous difference between being a German or Norwegian writer and a Croatian or Slovak one, there is an enormous difference

[39] Dubravka Ugrešić, *Karaoke Culture*, trans. David Williams (Rochester, NY: Open Letter, 2011); Dubravka Ugrešić, *Europe in Sepia*, trans. David Williams (Rochester, NY: Open Letter, 2014); Dubravka Ugrešić, *Fox*, trans. David Williams and Ellen Elias-Bursać (Rochester, NY: Open Letter, 2018).

> between being a translator from the German or Norwegian and being a translator from the Croatian or Slovak. The world of literature in translation is like the Olympics. It's pay-to-play, and, as a general rule, who spends most wins. To win, you need a state that finances fellowships and foundations, scholarships and subventions, consulates and cultural centers, not to mention author tours or – manna from heaven – "talks with the translator." In short, literature in translation is a state-sponsored art. This is probably a good time to mention that, given her relationship with the state of Croatia, Dubravka Ugrešić is more or less a stateless writer.[40]

This statelessness unites Ugrešić with Kiš, and, as Williams points out, "if *Museum* was primarily a novel of museums and the technologies of memory, its chronotope dispersed throughout the ruins of the European twentieth century, *The Ministry of Pain* narrows its focus to post-1989 eastern Europe,"[41] and more directly, to the dissolution of Yugoslavia.

Conclusion

When I think of Kiš' and Ugrešić's use of translation as a tool of resistance to nationalism, a novel called *An Unnecessary Woman* by the Lebanese writer Rabih Alameddine comes to mind. The protagonist of this novel, who lives alone in Beirut, previously ran a bookstore. Once a year, she translates a favorite volume into Arabic: *Anna Karenina* by Leo Tolstoy, *Austerlitz* by W. G. Sebald, *Hourglass* by Danilo Kiš. Her translations, however, sit stored in boxes in her apartment and, according to her wishes, remain unpublished. She translates not for fame or literary consecration but in order to save her soul and survive the Lebanese civil war. However, unlike the translations of Alameddine's protagonist that remain unknown, Kiš' translations and theatre adaptations were rather well-known and performed in Belgrade, especially at the avant-garde Atelje 212.

The historical events around the civil war of the 1990s and the dissolution of Yugoslavia remain intertwined with the complex memory politics of this era, as I examine the influence Danilo Kiš exerted on the theory and practice of translation and on the whole generation of exiled translators in the aftermath of the war. Kiš' work was produced in the earlier decades (he died right before the

[40] David Williams, "On the Untranslatability of Translation," *World Literature Today* (blog), January 3, 2017, https://www.worldliteraturetoday.org/blog/translation-tuesday/untranslatability-translation-david-williams.

[41] Williams, *Writing Postcommunism*, 99.

outbreak of the war), but it foreshadows what would come and speaks loud and clear against the Balkan nationalisms and right-wing populisms of today. Indeed, translation has long been a tool of resistance and survival, literally and figuratively, for Kiš and for the generation of intellectuals known as the post-Yugoslav diaspora.

Translation is cultivated with special care in smaller nations where texts from both major and minor languages and their readers intersect, exposing multidirectional memory and what I call a "minor drive." Modern-day Serbia and Croatia continue the strong translation legacy established in the former Yugoslavia as many works continue to be translated and the industry, despite the setbacks and bookstore closures, continues to resist nationalism(s) through translation. Translation offers a glimpse of critical cosmopolitanism, I would argue, of that other utopian world beyond the confines of one's nation. Indeed, Shingo Shimada states that "translation processes genuinely play a fundamental role in the ways all non-European cultures see themselves."[42] I would go even further to suggest that translation plays a fundamental role in the ways all Western and non-Western so-called "minor" cultures see themselves, including those of Southeast Europe. What strikes me in these encounters are ways in which translation and textual circulation contribute to shaping cultural contact and uses of memory.

To sum up, by addressing Kiš' and Ugrešić's work I have approached originality, influence, and the question of "small/minor" literature within the cultural production of these overlapping geopolitical and geolinguistic spaces. I argued that although the term *kleine* or "small/minor" literature implies a sense of hierarchical order, the way in which Kiš and Ugrešić use this category suggests a process of scrutinizing – if not outright breaking – of hierarchies (major/minor, dominant/non-dominant, large/small, center/periphery, etc.). However, those same breaking points simultaneously indicate (through its fissures) the residues of geopolitical history and its historically-based categories/ensembles: dominant/non-dominant, center/periphery, major/minor, metropolis/colony. While questioning the uses of these ensembles and their geographic and literary terms of reference, Kiš' and Ugrešić's texts ultimately aim at decentering some long-standing notions in world literature.

[42] Quoted in Doris Bachmann-Medick, "Introduction: The Translational Turn," *Translation Studies* 2, No. 1 (2009): 13, doi: 10.1080/14781700802496118.

2020 ACTA UNIVERSITATIS CAROLINAE PAG. 57–82
STUDIA TERRITORIALIA 2

MEMORY IN DISCOURSE: APPROACHING CONFLICTING CONSTELLATIONS OF HOLOCAUST AND POSTCOLONIAL MEMORY IN GERMANY

LIANE SCHÄFER
OSNABRÜCK UNIVERSITY

Abstract
In today's Germany, the memory of the Holocaust has become institutionalized. However, its institutionalization should not be mistaken for stability. In fact, Holocaust memory has been and still is questioned and contested. At the same time, a global phenomenon, postcolonial memory, is receiving increased attention in Germany. As postcolonial memory is better understood, new questions are arising about Germany's memory culture in the twenty-first century. Precisely because of Germany's experience with National Socialism, the memory of colonialism exists in a memory space that is heavily influenced by discussions of the Holocaust. The memories of the two phenomena appear in constellations that conflict with each other. In this paper, I address the two conflicting constellations of Holocaust memory and postcolonial memory, and propose a discursive perspective on Germany's memory culture. Analyzing a national memory culture as a creation of discourse provides an opportunity to resolve the argumentative standoff between Holocaust memory and postcolonial memory, and instead put German memory culture itself at the center of criticism.
Keywords: Holocaust memory; postcolonial memory; discourse; Germany; Achille Mbembe
DOI: 10.14712/23363231.2021.4

Liane Schäfer is a PhD candidate at the Institute of Social Sciences at University Osnabrück. Address correspondence to Universität Osnabrück, Institut für Sozialwissenschaften, Seminarstraße 33, D-49074 Osnabrück. E-mail: lischaefer@uni-osnabrueck.de.
The author would like to thank her two anonymous reviewers for their comprehensive review and instructive comments.

Introduction

In 2020, a public dispute sparked by a postcolonial historian and political scientist, Achille Mbembe, sharpened the conflict between the constellations of Holocaust memory and postcolonial memory in Germany.[1] While postcolonial memory has just recently received broader attention in German academia and public, the memory of the Holocaust has long been perceived as an integral part of German memory culture.[2] Recurrent speeches by politicians, such as those of German Federal President Frank-Walter Steinmeier given in commemoration of the 75th anniversary of the end of the World War II in 2020, illustrate how the memory of the Holocaust functions in Germany. Steinmeier said:

> "There can be no deliverance from our past. For without remembrance we lose our future. … Anybody who cannot bear this, who demands that a line be drawn under our past, is not only denying the catastrophe that was the war and the Nazi dictatorship. They are also devaluing all the good that has since been achieved and even denying the very essence of our democracy."[3]

Since the late 1990s, the German model for coming to terms with National Socialist crimes has been transnationalized.[4] On the contrary, postcolonial

---

1 Regarding the debate about Achille Mbembe see Natan Sznaider, "The Summer of Discontent: Achille Mbembe in Germany," *Journal of Genocide Research*, December 4, 2020, doi: 10.1080/14623528.2020.1847862.

2 By using the term Holocaust instead of Shoah, I am adopting the terminology preferred by Mirjam Tünschel. Shoah is a biblical term, the Hebrew word for catastrophe. As such, it began to appear in German discourse in the 1980s. The term Holocaust appeared earlier, in the 1950s, in connection with the Anglo-American debate on the meaning of National Socialism and Auschwitz. A Greek word, its literal meaning is "totally burnt." As it gained more and more popularity, the term Holocaust lost its specificity. For that reason, its continued use has drawn criticism. Nevertheless, its use is well-established internationally, which is why I use it in this paper. See Mirjam Tünschel, *Erinnerungskulturen in der deutschen Einwanderungsgesellschaft. Anforderungen an die Pädagogik* (Oldenburg: BIS-Verlag, 2009), 23–24. See also Astrid Messerschmidt, *Bildung als Kritik der Erinnerung. Lernprozesse in Geschlechterdiskursen zum Holocaust-Gedächtnis* (Frankfurt a. M.: Brandes & Apsel, 2003).

3 Frank-Walter Steinmeier, "Federal President Frank-Walter Steinmeier on the 75th anniversary of the liberation from National Socialism and the end of World War II in Europe at the Central Memorial of the Federal Republic of Germany to the Victims of War and Tyranny (Neue Wache) in Berlin on 8 May 2020," official website of German Federal President, May 8, 2020, https://www.bundespraesident.de/SharedDocs/Downloads/DE/Reden/2020/05/200508-75-Jahre-Ende-WKII-Englisch.pdf?__blob=publicationFile.

4 Here, I refer in particular to the process of the transnationalization of the memory of the Holocaust. See, for example, Daniel Levy and Natan Sznaider, "Memory Unbound: The Holocaust and

memory almost simultaneously went through a process of domestication into the German space. Beginning with a genuinely global perspective that addresses the violent aftermath of colonialism, postcolonial memory is more and more finding a home in Germany. Discussions are ongoing about the need for an official apology for the genocide of the Herero and Nama peoples in Germany's former colony of German South-West Africa, and are only one prominent example of an increasing focus on Germany's colonial crimes.[5] While this postcolonial process of reappraisal is still in full swing, the memory of colonialism is coming more often into conflict with the memory of the Holocaust in Germany. The above-mentioned public dispute about the words of Achille Mbembe is the most prominent and wide-ranging debate so far.

In this paper, I will examine the conflicting constellations of Holocaust memory and postcolonial memory in Germany. I will also ask how a discursive perspective might contribute to better understanding of both constellations. As I have mentioned, German memory culture is strongly shaped by remembrance of the Holocaust. Therefore, in the first part of this paper I review Germany's process of coming to terms with its National Socialist past. In the second part, I address postcolonial memory in Germany. Then, using the *Causa Mbembe* as an example, I illustrate how the constellations of the two memory forms conflict. At that point I also differentiate the problems that arise from the conflict between the specific forms the constellations of Holocaust memory and postcolonial memory take in the German context. Finally, I explain the potential of a discursive perspective for analyzing the conflicting constellation in a way that does not pit both memory forms against each other, but instead critically questions the discourse of German memory culture as a whole.

Before I examine the conflicting constellations of Holocaust and postcolonial memories, I want to comment briefly on the concept of memory with which I align myself in this paper.

---

the Formation of Cosmopolitan Memory," *European Journal of Social Theory* 5, No. 1 (February 2002): 87–106, doi: 10.1177/1368431002005001002. A study by Susan Neiman, *Learning from the Germans: Race and the Memory of Evil* (New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2019) is a current example of a comparison of the German Holocaust memory with memory discourses in other countries.

[5] German South-West Africa is the name for today's Namibia. It was officially been under German colonial occupation from the 1880s until 1915. See Jürgen Zimmerer and Joachim Zeller, eds., *Völkermord in Deutsch-Südwestafrika. Der Kolonialkrieg (1904–1908) in Namibia und seine Folgen* (Augsburg: Weltbild, 2014).

First, when I use the term memory, I refer to a social process that epitomizes the needs and values of the contemporary society involved. Thus, whereas history seeks to create an accurate image of past events, remembering is a "present-day operation of compiling available data," as Astrid Erll describes it. "Versions of the past change with each recall according to the changed present."[6] Remembering and memory must be understood as dynamic social phenomena. Hence, according to Aleida Assmann, one can conceive of the relation between history and memory as follows: "*History* turns into *memory* when it is transformed into forms of shared knowledge and collective identification and participation."[7]

Secondly, like Assmann, when I speak of memory and remembering I am focusing on the notion of memory as a form of shared collective knowledge and identification. Collectively shared memories do not require personal experience of a historical event. Instead, they are socially mediated and transgenerational. Collectively shared memories are materialized in museums, rituals, and education, and through individual participation and constant repetition. Thus, I am not focusing here on the bottom-up process by which individuals remember a certain historical event, but rather on how "collective units such as institutions, states and nations" shape memory within the public space, as Assmann puts it.[8]

Thirdly, even though I examine the interplay between institutionally anchored forms of Holocaust memory and collective forms of postcolonial memory, against the background of German national memory culture, I do not consider a memory culture to be a fixed, homogenous thing. In the words of Aleida Assmann, it needs to be understood as a contested "public social arena"[9] in which institutionalized collective memories often confront non-institutionalized collective memories.

---

6 Astrid Erll, *Kollektives Gedächtnis und Erinnerungskulturen. Eine Einführung* (Stuttgart: J. B. Metzler, 2017), 6.

7 Aleida Assmann, "Memory, Individual and Collective," in *The Oxford Handbook of Contextual Political Analysis*, ed. Robert E. Goodin and Charles Tilly (New York: Oxford University Press, 2006), 210–226.

8 Ibid, 215. Even though I focus on the collective side of memory I do not understand the personal side of memory as a separate process from its social side. Here I align myself with the tradition of the sociologist Maurice Halbwachs, who pointed out that each individual memory is influenced by its social surroundings. See, for example, the first chapter of Maurice Halbwachs, *On Collective Memory*, ed. Lewis A. Coser (Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1992).

9 Assmann, "Memory, Individual and Collective," 219.

The Emergence and the Fragility of Holocaust Memory in Germany

The term Holocaust has at least two meanings. One meaning refers to the historical event itself, namely the systematic extermination of Jewish people in Germany's Nazi era. The second meaning has grown beyond the historical event itself. Using the Nazi Holocaust as a point of reference, the word has come to refer to any event of outstanding malevolence, not only in Germany, but internationally.[10]

The memory of the Holocaust has not only transcended national borders but has also passed through various phases within Germany. In order to understand the dynamics of the conflict between Holocaust memory and postcolonial memory, I must first shed light on some of the stages through which Holocaust memory has gone in Germany since the end of the Nazi era in 1945. However, the following applies only to the process in West Germany after World War II. The way West German society dealt with the Nazi past was different from that of East German society.[11]

At first, remembrance of the Holocaust was not central to the memory of the Nazi era. Only with increasing distance in time from the Holocaust has its memory and the historical awareness of it grown in non-Jewish German society.[12] The immediate response of German society at large to the systematic extermination of Jewish people must be classified as a non-response. This collective silence is what Jörn Rüsen describes as the foundation stone of the new institutions of West Germany.[13] In general, the desire to re-integrate with the West and the reorientation towards a democratic political system made adapting more important than moral reappraisal.[14]

A generational change in the 1960s, from the so-called war and reconstruction generation to the postwar generation, caused a paradigm shift from silence to speaking out about the Nazi era in general and the Holocaust in particular. As

---

[10] Levy and Sznaider, "Memory Unbound," 88; Ulrike Jureit and Christian Schneider, *Gefühlte Opfer. Illusionen der Vergangenheitsbewältigung* (Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta, 2010), 12.

[11] Wolfgang Meseth, "Education After Auschwitz in a United Germany: A Comparative Analysis of the Teaching of the History of National Socialism in East and West Germany," *European Education* 44, No. 3 (2012): 13–38, doi: 10.2753/EUE1056-4934440301. See also Neiman, *Learning from the Germans*.

[12] Jörn Rüsen, "Holocaust-Erfahrung und deutsche Identität. Ideen zu einer Typologie der Generationen," in *Die Gegenwart der Psychoanalyse – die Psychoanalyse der Gegenwart*, ed. Werner Bohleber and Sibylle Drews (Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta, 2002), 95–106.

[13] Ibid., 98.

[14] Aleida Assmann, *Das neue Unbehagen an der Erinnerungskultur. Eine Intervention* (München: C. H. Beck, 2016), 49.

society began to tolerate moral criticism, the Nazi era and the Holocaust became fixed historical events of outstanding negativity. By putting the historical events at the center of controversy, the members of the postwar generation were not only able to face up to the violent crimes committed by their parents, but also to view themselves as different from the previous generation. The Nazi era and the Holocaust became negative identity-forming historical events and integral parts of modern German identity. The long traditions of German history no longer served as the sole foundation of German collective identity. Instead, the new generation adopted universal norms and values. In summary, the Nazi era and the Holocaust formed the negative pole of collective German identity while universal norms and values symbolized its positive pole.[15] The implicit equivalence between speaking out and morality was the foundation of a discourse that organized itself around the question of guilt. That discourse was not restricted to the private sphere of the family but also manifested itself in strong political protest against the recently established state of West Germany.[16]

The concept of moral responsibility for the German past continued to develop in the 1960s, 1970s, and 1980s. The use of guilt in order to break the war and reconstruction generation's silence caused a lasting shift in how Germany dealt with its past. What was formerly seen as positive – forgetting the Nazi era and the Holocaust in order to integrate the West German state into the democratic project of the West – was increasingly perceived as repression and a sign that the past was being minimized. As opposed to the war and reconstruction generation, the postwar generation focused its attention on the Jewish experience as victims of the Nazi era. Occasionally, that focus resulted in strong identification with Jewish victimhood as the wartime generation's strategy of silence broke down.[17]

By the time of the third generation after World War II, however, the war narrative was transformed by analysis of the role of the perpetrator. Since the 1980s, the grandchildren of the war and reconstruction-generation have more and more often included the historical context and their own family biographies in their discussion of the Nazi era and the Holocaust.[18] Thus, the 1980s

[15] Rüsen, "Holocaust-Erfahrung und deutsche Identität," 99–101.

[16] Assmann, *Das neue Unbehagen an der Erinnerungskultur*, 50.

[17] Rüsen, "Holocaust-Erfahrung und deutsche Identität," 101. Ulrike Jureit and Christian Schneider even go so far as to describe the German memory culture of the twentieth century as being characterized by identification with victimhood as a means of seeking redemption from moral guilt for the Holocaust. See Jureit and Schneider, *Gefühlte Opfer*, 10–11.

[18] Rüsen, "Holocaust-Erfahrung und deutsche Identität," 101. See also Assmann, *Das neue Unbehagen an der Erinnerungskultur,* 51.

marked a second important turning point for Germany's memory culture. Even the term "memory culture" itself – in German, *Erinnerungskultur* – originated in the 1980s.[19] It had its genesis in the discussion about the Nazi period and the Holocaust. In Germany, there is a strong symbolic connection between the term memory culture and the historical epoch between 1933 and 1945. Several significant events accompanied the ever-growing focus on the question of responsibility for the crimes committed during the Nazi era. The *Historikerstreit* of 1986/87 was a conflict between several German historians, which turned on the answer to the question of the uniqueness of the Holocaust. It showed the change that the meaning of the Holocaust was undergoing in German memory culture. The German historian Ernst Nolte interpreted the Holocaust not as an independent historical phenomenon of outstanding importance, but rather as a reaction to Soviet terror.[20] His position was strongly opposed by the German philosopher and sociologist Jürgen Habermas, who accused Nolte of relativizing the Holocaust.[21] The Holocaust ultimately became the central element of German memory culture in the 1980s. It did not gain its significance as the greatest violent crime of the twentieth century until 40 years after the end of World War II.[22]

Holocaust memory continued to develop in the 1990s. With the reunification of East and West Germany at the beginning of the 1990s, remembrance of the Holocaust became more and more institutionalized. The formerly unspeakable and unthinkable – the Holocaust – became utterable. The *memory* of the formerly unspeakable became an integral part of state, public and academic attention in the newly unified federal republic.[23] According to Aleida Assmann, the talk of moral guilt that had dominated public discourse since the 1960s turned into a recognition of historical responsibility for the past. The memory of the Holocaust in Germany today is shaped by an ethical imperative that manifests itself in the sentence "Remember in order not to repeat the past" – an ethical imperative that has now transcended national borders.[24]

---

[19] Assmann, *Das neue Unbehagen an der Erinnerungskultur*, 190.

[20] Ernst Nolte, "Vergangenheit, die nicht vergehen will. Eine Rede, die geschrieben, aber nicht gehalten werden konnte," in *"Historikerstreit." Die Dokumentation der Kontroverse um die Einzigartigkeit der nationalsozialistischen Judenvernichtung*, ed. Rudolf Augstein et al. (München: Piper, 1987), 39–47.

[21] Jürgen Habermas, "Eine Art Schadensabwicklung. Die apologetischen Tendenzen in der deutschen Zeitgeschichtsschreibung," in *"Historikerstreit." Die Dokumentation um die Einzigartigkeit der nationalsozialistischen Judenvernichtung,* ed. Rudolf Augstein et al. (München: Piper, 1987), 62–76.

[22] Assmann, *Das neue Unbehagen an der Erinnerungskultur*, 190–191.

[23] Ibid., 67–68. See also Messerschmidt, *Bildung als Kritik der Erinnerung*, 32–34.

[24] Assmann, *Das neue Unbehagen an der Erinnerungskultur*, 66.

However, this same German memory culture, internationally perceived as a model for reconciling with the past, is increasingly running into contradictions. First, despite all efforts to come to terms with the past, antisemitic incidents are increasing in Germany. In 2019, the German federal government's Commissioner for the Fight against Antisemitism went so far as to advise Jews not to display religious symbols such as the *kippah* in public.[25] Secondly, even though the public narrative of the Holocaust tells successful stories of coming to terms with the past, privately the situation is totally different. In 2002, interviews with Germans from three different generations revealed a strong discrepancy between public and private memory. The interviewees' stories about the Nazi period were characterized by narratives of the victimization and heroic actions of their own ancestors.[26] Although some members of the third generation after World War II embraced a coming to terms with the Nazi past in their own family history, progress in that direction later came to a standstill. Just recently, Samuel Salzborn has argued that a real, self-critical reappraisal of the Nazi era still has not taken place in Germany. Instead, the self-image that Germans have internalized is dominated by a notion of collective innocence.[27]

In fact, the ambivalence of an institutionalized, yet contested Holocaust memory has expressed itself in numerous public debates from the 1990s onwards. On the one hand, the self-image of collective innocence has repeatedly been challenged on different occasions. The publication in 1996 of the book *Hitler's Willing Executioners: Ordinary Germans and the Holocaust*, by Daniel Goldhagen,[28] was criticized by academics but was read with great interest by the German public. An exhibition in 1995 at the Hamburg Institute for Social Research about the crimes of the German Wehrmacht brought the mass participation of ordinary Germans in National Socialism to the fore and shed light on the responsibility and involvement of the broad German population in the crimes of National Socialism.[29] On the other hand, a 1998 debate between

[25] "Kann Juden nicht empfehlen, überall die Kippa zu tragen," *Zeit Online*, May 25, 2019, https://www.zeit.de/gesellschaft/zeitgeschehen/2019-05/judenfeindlichkeit-antisemit-felix-klein-kippa.

[26] Harald Welzer, Sabine Moller, and Karoline Tschuggnall, *"Opa war kein Nazi." Nationalsozialismus und Holocaust im Familiengedächtnis* (Frankfurt a. M.: Fischer, 2002), 205–210.

[27] Samuel Salzborn, *Kollektive Unschuld. Die Abwehr der Shoah im deutschen Erinnern* (Leipzig: Hentrich & Hentrich, 2020).

[28] Daniel Jonah Goldhagen, *Hitler's Willing Executioners. Ordinary Germans and the Holocaust* (New York: Knopf, 1996).

[29] Ruth Wittlinger, *German National Identity in the Twenty-First Century. A Different Republic After All?* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010), 26–27. For a detailed overview and classification

the German writer Martin Walser and the head of the Central Council of Jews in Germany, Ignatz Bubis, took the contested Holocaust memory in another direction. Walser sparked a controversy with his acceptance speech for a peace prize awarded by the German Publishers & Booksellers Association. Among other controversial statements in his speech, he described the planned construction of a national Holocaust Memorial in Berlin as the "monumentalization of shame."[30] Bubis accused Walser of aligning himself with demands for putting an end to the memory of the Holocaust and National Socialism. The debate was shaped less by a desire to deconstruct the narrative of the innocent German than by concern that the memory of the Holocaust would be trivialized.

The debate about the collective innocence of ordinary Germans and demands to shelve the memory of the Holocaust and National Socialism are still active today. Recent surveys show that many Germans, despite the dominant public narrative, still continue to underestimate their ancestors' participation in National Socialist crimes.[31] Such surveys also reveal a significant number of people who agree with the statement that Germans should abandon the focus on the memory of the Holocaust and National Socialism.[32] The recurring debate exemplifies the contradictions and struggle that continue around the memory of the Holocaust. Astrid Messerschmidt describes this duality between an institutionalized yet contested Holocaust memory as the "fragility" of Holocaust memory.[33]

This short ride through the history of Germany's Holocaust memory shows that remembering and forgetting are not one-dimensional, but rather complex social processes. In fact, remembering and forgetting should not be misunderstood to be opposites, but rather as processes that are entangled. As Maja

of the controversy about the Wehrmacht exhibition, which contradicted the narrative of the innocent German, see Maja Zehfuss, *Wounds of Memory: The Politics of War in Germany* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 129–141.

30 Martin Walser, "Dankesrede von Martin Walser zur Verleihung des Friedenspreises des Deutschen Buchhandels in der Frankfurter Paulskirche am 11. Oktober 1998. Erfahrungen beim Verfassen einer Sonntagsrede," https://hdms.bsz-bw.de/frontdoor/deliver/index/docId/440/file/walserRede.pdf.

31 "Die Haltung der Deutschen zum Nationalsozialismus. Januar 2020. Ergebnisse einer repräsentativen Erhebung. Tabellarische Auswertung im Auftrag von DIE ZEIT," 43, https://www.zeit.de/2020/19/zeit-umfrage-erinnerungskultur.pdf.

32 Astrid Schläffer, "Ein Viertel will Abschluss mit NS-Zeit," *ZDF*, December 05, 2020, https://www.zdf.de/nachrichten/politik/holocaust-umfrage-ns-zeit-100.html.

33 Messerschmidt, *Bildung als Kritik der Erinnerung*, 32–36.

Zehfuss puts it: "In order to forget, one has to remember in the first place. Conversely, in order to remember, one has to forget."[34]

The central point behind the debates about Holocaust memory is actually not that the National Socialist past *should* be remembered, but *how* to remember it.[35] Accordingly, the ethical imperative to accept historical responsibility – to remember, in order not to repeat the past – must be understood not in a literal but in a metaphorical sense. The National Socialist past will most likely not repeat itself in the same way, but an active decision to remember the Holocaust and National Socialism acknowledges historical responsibility in the present for the past. As I have pointed out earlier, the act of remembering serves a purpose for contemporary society. Even though the Holocaust is in fact not forgotten, the ethical imperative that the participants in the memory culture accept their historical responsibility still remains at the center of a process of negotiation.

Hereinafter, I will take a closer look at postcolonial memory in Germany, which has recently received more and more attention.

Postcolonial Memory in Germany

In summer 2020, the social movement *Black Lives Matter* sparked a broad public and political debate about racism and colonialism in Germany. In one of her speeches Aminata Touré, a member of the Green faction and the Vice-President of the Schleswig-Holstein state parliament, pointed at the German participation in the European colonial project, in which Germany was not only a global colonial power for 30 years, but especially contributed intellectually to the development and spread of racist ideologies:

> The current debate about racism in Germany cannot be understood if one does not know about Germany's colonial crimes. ... A debate about colonialism can only be carried out if it names those who suffered from these inhuman crimes and who still feel its effects today – Black people. In order to understand that racism is an ideology which was scientifically developed here in Germany, we have to look back. It is not just about a racist moment, but about colonial crimes that still have an impact today. ... The search for an evolutionary theoretical argument for the subordination

[34] Zehfuss, *Wounds of Memory*, 63.
[35] Ibid., 63–64.

of Black people within the human species began with the German exploitation of the African continent. It was Kant, Hegel and Winckelmann who, among others, created a pseudoscientific basis for all this.[36]

The involvement of Germany in colonialism has never been completely forgotten, especially in academia. Nevertheless, in the historiography, the German colonial project has long been portrayed as motivated mainly by material and economic interests. Cultural factors were mostly ignored.[37] As for the public and political sphere, and for the vast majority of society, there has for a long time been no critical reflection on colonialism. When it is discussed, the conversation often relativizes the commission of crimes in the colonies.[38]

Postcolonial memory nowadays presents a counter-narrative to this relativizing discourse. It can be classified as both a research field and a claim that the attention of memory must be shifted to colonialism and the racism that globally prevailed in that epoch. It is an impetus for investigating the consequences of the colonial past and its racism for the present global order.[39] Postcolonial thinking can be found worldwide today not only in academia, but also in social movements and in public and political debates. In a sense, the statement by Aminata Touré quoted above represents this postcolonial thinking and refers to a multitude of claims, ideas, and knowledge of postcolonial memory. The beginning of postcolonial thinking is often dated back to the 1980s, as a form of intellectual "countertelling" in the field of critical anglophone literary and cultural studies. Since then, the application and analysis of postcolonial thinking has become

[36] "Schwarze Akteur*innen bei der Aufarbeitung von Kolonialismus einbinden," official website of Aminata Touré, June 18, 2020, https://aminata-toure.de/schwarze-akteurinnen-bei-der-aufarbeitung-von-kolonialismus-einbinden/. For an analysis of Kant's and Hegel's pseudoscientific argumentation on the differences between human 'races,' see chapters four and ten in Emmanuel Chukwudi Eze, *Race and the Enlightenment. A Reader* (Malden, Oxford, Victoria: Blackwell Publishing, 1997).

[37] Sebastian Conrad, *Deutsche Kolonialgeschichte* (München: C.H. Beck, 2012), 12.

[38] Kien Nghi Ha, "Postkoloniale Kritik als politisches Projekt," in *Postkoloniale Soziologie. Empirische Befunde, theoretische Anschlüsse, politische Intervention,* ed. Julia Reuter and Paula-Irene Villa (Bielefeld: transcript, 2010), 259–280.

[39] I use postcolonial thinking and postcolonial memory interchangeably because the act of remembering in postcolonial thinking is highly intertwined with topics such as the history of colonialism and the legacy of racism. In a sense, because it is a central tenet of the postcolonial perspective that the colonial past still shapes our present, it would be misleading to separate the theoretical claims of postcolonial thought from the act of remembering. Instead, postcolonial memory must be understood as a central theme of the postcolonial idea itself. The broader field of memory studies has started to adopt postcolonial thinking. See, for example, Dirk Göttsche, ed., *Memory and Postcolonial Studies: Synergies and New Directions* (Oxford: Peter Lang, 2019), doi: https://doi.org/10.3726/b14024.

highly interdisciplinary and heterogeneous.[40] In this paper, I will outline some of the basic assumptions of postcolonial thinking that underlie postcolonial memory practices.

In a nutshell, Leela Gandhi defines postcolonial thinking as "a disciplinary project devoted to the academic task of revisiting, remembering and, crucially, interrogating the colonial past."[41] In this regard, the prefix "post" can cause some confusion. Indeed, postcolonial thinking does not start at a point *after* the official end of the colonial age. Rather, in the words of Leela Gandhi, it tries to emphasize how "a relationship of reciprocal antagonism and desire between coloniser and colonised"[42] continues to have aftereffects in the present. Postcolonial thinking not only focuses on the formerly colonized societies, but also analyzes the effects of colonialism on the European colonizing countries, which is a very central point.[43] Postcolonial thought understands that history is not a linear process and focuses on the contradictions inherent in the process of decolonization. One of the central contradictions of postcolonial thinking, for example, is the ambiguity of modernity and the Enlightenment. Very often, modernity is imagined as an intra-European achievement, while at the same time the idea that formerly colonized countries should be measured by that standard is implicitly assumed. This Eurocentrism ignores the fact that it was colonialism's scientifical invention of the races that made it possible to imagine Europe as being of higher value. To this day, the violent side of the supposedly rational and enlightened modern Europe has been ignored or relativized.[44] Postcolonial thinking makes it possible to criticize the way in which colonialism is remembered and to point out the relativization of colonial violence in the global and local contexts. The many postcolonial initiatives that have been

40 Tanja Ernst, "Postkoloniale Theorie und Politische Praxis: Die Dekolonisierung Boliviens," *PROKLA. Zeitschrift für kritische Sozialwissenschaft* 40, No. 158: 49–66, doi: 10.32387/prokla.v40i158.400. Ina Kerner, *Postkoloniale Theorien zur Einführung* (Hamburg: Junius, 2012), 10. See also the publications of Homi K. Bhabha, Edward W. Said, and Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak, whose ideas form the basis for much of postcolonial research: Homi K. Bhabha, *The Location of Culture* (London: Routledge, 1994); Edward W. Said, *Orientalism* (New York: Vintage Books, 1979) Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak, *A Critique of Postcolonial Reason. Toward a History of the Vanishing Present* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1999).

41 Leela Gandhi, *Postcolonial Theory. A Critical Introduction* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2019), 4.

42 Ibid.

43 María do Mar Castro Varela and Nikita Dhawan, *Postkoloniale Theorie. Eine kritische Einführung* (Bielefeld: transcript, 2020), 15–16.

44 Enrique Dussel, "Europe, Modernity, and Eurocentrism," *Nepantla: Views from South* 1, No. 3 (2000): 465–478.

spreading through German civil society since the 2000s are good examples of postcolonial memory practice. Among other things, those initiatives are calling for streets and places that honor German colonial rulers to be renamed in order to honor instead people who fought against slavery or racism in former German colonies or within Germany itself.[45]

In addition to that very concrete application of postcolonial thinking, scholars have repeatedly pointed out Germany's intellectual colonial legacy. The link between Germany as the center of the Enlightenment and its significant contributions to the ideology of racism as a justification for European colonialism supported Germany's and other powers' involvement in the colonizing movement.[46] Because postcolonial memory shifts the focus onto the societies of the former colonizing countries, it is possible to deconstruct the current forms of racism in Germany and demonstrate how racist ideas of inferiority and superiority still persist.[47]

Black people and People of Color have long fought against racism in Germany.[48] In doing so, they have relied on the intellectual works of anti-colonial activists that were the precursors to postcolonial memory.[49] Black people and People of Color had to confront racism every day. Because they could not find any representations of their own histories and experiences in Germany's public space, they reclaimed their histories by creating empowering structures of their own. In 1986, the same year that the *Historikerstreit* took place, May Ayim and Katharina Oguntoye, along with others, published a feminist anthology by and for German Black people and People of Color in order to share their realities with white Germans.[50] Ayim and Oguntoye met in a university seminar led by Audre Lorde, a scholar, writer and activist from the United States who started a visiting

45 See, for example, a very recent project on the nationwide mapping of the German colonial legacy: "Tear This Down. Kolonialismus jetzt beseitigen," https://www.tearthisdown.com/de/, accessed January 26, 2021.

46 See, for example, the chapters about Immanuel Kant and Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel in Eze, *Race and the Enlightenment*. See also Nikita Dhawan, "Affirmative Sabotage of the Master's Tools: The Paradox of Postcolonial Enlightenment," in *Decolonizing Enlightenment. Transnational Justice, Human Rights and Democracy in a Postcolonial World,* ed. Nikita Dhawan (Opladen: Barbara Budrich, 2014), 19–78.

47 See, for example, Kien Nghi Ha, "Macht(t)raum(a) Berlin – Deutschland als Kolonialgesellschaft," in *Mythen, Masken und Subjekte: kritische Weißseinsforschung in Deutschland*, ed. Maureen Maisha Eggers et al. (Münster: Unrast, 2009), 105–117. See also Natasha A. Kelly, *Afrokultur. "der raum zwischen gestern und morgen"* (Münster: Unrast, 2016).

48 See Kien Nghi Ha, "Postkoloniale Kritik als politisches Projekt" as well as Kelly, *Afrokultur.*

49 Castro Varela and Dhawan, *Postkoloniale Theorie*, 23–28.

50 Katharina Oguntoye, May Ayim and Dagmar Schultz, *Farbe bekennen: Afro-deutsche Frauen auf den Spuren ihrer Geschichte* (Berlin: Orlanda, 1986).

professorship at the Free University of Berlin in 1984.[51] Today, postcolonial thinking builds on the struggles and the work of Black people and People of Color in Germany. The fact that the realities of Black Germans and German People of Color have still received scant attention in German public debates is an opportunity to claim the importance of postcolonial memory culture. Similar to discussions on Holocaust memory, postcolonial memory is asking questions about both *what* to remember (colonialism and its connection to racism) and *how* to remember, by countering opposing relativizing narratives.

Conflicting Constellations of Holocaust Memory and Postcolonial Memory

In the following section I illustrate some of the areas of conflict between Holocaust memory and postcolonial memory. Since the beginning of the 2000s, points of friction between the two memories have repeatedly arisen in academia and public debate.

Postcolonially inspired historiographers started to emphasize the parallels between German colonialism and National Socialism at the beginning of the 2000s.[52] The theses of the postcolonial historian Jürgen Zimmerer sparked a lot of discussion in particular. Focusing on the genocide of the Herero and Nama committed by Germans in the former colony of German South-West Africa, Zimmerer argued that colonial violence and the violence of the National Socialist era were similar and just different in degree, but not in their structure.[53] Other

---

[51] "Mit 'Farbe bekennen' machten May Ayim und Katharina Oguntoye die Lebensrealität afrodeutscher Frauen zum Thema," *Bayerischer Rundfunk*, April 21, 2020, https://www.br.de/radio/bayern2/sendungen/zuendfunk/farbe-bekennen-von-may-ayim-und-katharina-oguntoye-100.html.

[52] See, for example, Jürgen Zimmerer and Joachim Zeller, *Genocide in German South-West Africa. The Colonial War of 1904–1908 and its Aftermath* (London: Merlin Press, 2008); Jürgen Zimmerer, "Nationalsozialismus postkolonial. Plädoyer zur Globalisierung der deutschen Gewaltgeschichte," *Zeitschrift für Geschichtswissenschaft* 57, No. 6 (2009): 529–548; Konstant Kpao Sarè, "Abuses of German Colonial History: the Character of Carl Peters as Weapon for völkisch and National-Socialist Discourses: Anglophobia, Anti-Semitism, Aryanism," in *German Colonialism and National Identity,* ed. Michael Perraudin and Jürgen Zimmerer (New York: Routledge, 2001), 160–172; Jürgen Zimmerer, *Von Windhuk nach Auschwitz? Beiträge zum Verhältnis von Kolonialismus und Holocaust* (Berlin: LIT, 2011); Mark Terkessidis, *Wessen Erinnerung zählt? Koloniale Vergangenheit und Rassismus heute* (Hamburg: Hoffmann und Campe, 2019).

[53] Jürgen Zimmerer, "Holocaust und Kolonialismus. Beitrag zu einer Archäologie des genozidalen Gedankens," in *Von Windhuk nach Auschwitz? Beiträge zum Verhältnis von Kolonialismus und Holocaust,* ed. Jürgen Zimmerer (Berlin: LIT, 2011), 140–171.

researchers strongly opposed his idea of a structural identity between colonialism and National Socialism and pointed out fundamental differences between them.[54] This discussion took place at the beginning of the 2000s. It tended to focus on questions of historical fact and not particularly on the postcolonial views that underlay Zimmerer's work. The increasingly broader acceptance of postcolonial thinking within German academia has been met with general and systematic criticism of it. Good examples of this can be found in the work of Steffen Klävers, who recently examined and criticized postcolonial approaches to historiography, and also in the contributions of Ingo Elbe, who analyzes and criticizes postcolonial approaches to philosophy and the social sciences. Both authors see the roots of the problems with postcolonial thinking in the fact that antisemitism is often subsumed under racism and thus the special factors that led to the Holocaust are minimized.[55]

Some postcolonial scientists note that the level of awareness of the Holocaust that prevails in Germany does not exist for colonial violence.[56] This view draws on the work of anti-colonial intellectuals like Aimé Césaire. In a German publication on postcolonial approaches to political science, Aram Ziai used a quote from Césaire to point out that approaching the Holocaust from a purely intra-European perspective is problematic because it fails to recognize that human lives were already being sacrificed much earlier during colonialism. Ziai adopts a theoretical postcolonial perspective in which the fading memory of colonial violence is seen as a form of "colonial hypocrisy" and the "application of different ethical standards."[57]

---

[54] See, for example, contributions written by Birthe Kundrus as well as Stephan Malinowski and Robert Gerwarth. Birthe Kundrus, "Kontinuitäten, Parallelen, Rezeptionen. Überlegungen zur 'Kolonialisierung' des Nationalsozialismus," *Werkstattgeschichte*, No. 43 (2006): 45–62; Stephan Malinowski and Robert Gerwarth, "Der Holocaust als 'kolonialer Genozid'? Europäische Kolonialgewalt und nationalsozialistischer Vernichtungskrieg," *Geschichte und Gesellschaft*, No. 33 (2007): 439–466; Robert Gerwarth and Stephan Malinowski, "Hannah Arendt's Ghosts: Reflections on the Disputable Path from Windhoek to Auschwitz," *Central European History* 42, No. 2 (2009): 279–300, doi: 10.1017/S0008938909000314.

[55] Steffen Klävers, *Decolonizing Auschwitz? Komparativ-postkoloniale Ansätze in der Holocaustforschung* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2019) and Ingo Elbe, "'... it's not systemic.' Antisemitismus im akademischen Antirassismus," in *Irrwege. Analysen aktueller queerer Politik*, ed. Till Randolf Amelung (Berlin: Querverlag, 2020), 224–260.

[56] Joachim Zeller, "Decolonization of the Public Space?" in *Hybrid Cultures – Nervous States: Britain and Germany in a (Post)Colonial World*, ed. Ulrike Lindner et al. (2011), 65–88, doi: https://doi.org/10.1163/9789042032293_005. See also Jacob Emmanuel Mabe, "Criticism of Colonialism and the Colonial Memory Work in Germany," *Philosophy Study* 9, No. 6 (2019): 310–317, doi: 10.17265/2159-5313/2019.06.002.

[57] Aram Ziai, "Einleitung: Unsere Farm in Zhengistan. Zur Notwendigkeit postkolonialer Perspektiven in der Politikwissenschaft," in *Postkoloniale Politikwissenschaft. Theoretische und empirische Zugänge,* ed. Aram Ziai (Bielefeld: transcript, 2016), 11–24.

In light of the clear points of friction between postcolonial memory and Holocaust memory, some studies in areas such as social science, cultural science, and educational science are trying to evaluate the intersection of antisemitism and racism.[58]

The debate within academia is also taking place more and more often in the German public space. Especially the German genocide of the Herero and Nama and the demands of those peoples' descendants for an official apology from the German state have been discussed by the public and politicians now for years. In 2018, they resulted in Germany returning human remains of Herero and Nama individuals held in hospitals, museums, and universities.[59] Overall, the German colonial past is increasingly receiving a critical re-evaluation, which manifests itself in manifold conversations about returning looted colonial property exhibited in German museums.[60] One event in particular fueled a broad public debate about the intersection of Holocaust memory and postcolonial memory in the spring of 2020. As this public debate exemplifies the complicated relationship between the memories of the Holocaust and Germany's colonial legacy, I will take a closer look at that incident.

At the center of the turmoil lies the invitation of the renowned Cameroonian postcolonial historian and political scientist Achille Mbembe as keynote speaker for the Ruhrtriennale, an international arts festival in the German federal state of North Rhine–Westphalia that is a major German cultural event. The so-called *Causa Mbembe* raised important questions about the tension between Holocaust memory and postcolonial memory. It began with an open letter signed by a Free Democratic Party (FDP) member of the state parliament of North Rhine–Westphalia, Lorenz Deutsch, in March 2020. Therein, he demonstrated Mbembe's association with the Palestinian-led Boycott, Divestment, and Sanctions (BDS) movement that Germany classifies as antisemitic.[61] Moreover,

---

[58] See, for example, Sabine Schiffer and Constantin Wagner, *Antisemitismus und Islamophobie: Ein Vergleich* (Wassertrüdingen: HWK, 2009); Astrid Messerschmidt, "Postkoloniale Erinnerungsprozesse in einer postnationalsozialistischen Gesellschaft – vom Umgang mit Rassismus und Antisemitismus," *Peripherie* 28, No. 109–110 (2008): 46–60; Claudia Bruns, "Antisemitism and Colonial Racism. Transnational and Interdiscursive Intersectionality," in *Racisms Made in Germany,* ed. Wulf D. Hund, Christian Koller, and Moshe Zimmermann (Münster: LIT, 2011), 99–121.

[59] "Germany returns human remains from Namibia genocide," *Deutsche Welle*, August 29, 2018, https://www.dw.com/en/germany-returns-human-remains-from-namibia-genocide/a-45268717.

[60] Barbara Weber, "Debatte um Restitution kolonialer Kunst," *Deutsche Welle*, January 24, 2019, https://www.deutschlandfunk.de/provenienzforschung-debatte-um-restitution-kolonialer-kunst.1148.de.html?dram:article_id=439063.

[61] In his essay on the *Causa Mbembe*, Natan Sznaider explains the BDS movement as following: "'Boycott, Divestment and Sanctions,' [is] a loose global movement asking for a cultural, academic, economic, and political boycott against Israel. It was founded by various Palestinian orga-

Deutsch characterized some sentences in Mbembe's publications as relativizing the Holocaust. Deutsch's open letter was addressed to the director of the Ruhrtriennale festival.[62] He referred to a resolution of the German Federal Parliament passed in 2019 that condemned the BDS movement and another of the state parliament of North Rhine–Westphalia passed in 2018 that prohibited financial and any other support for BDS-related events.[63] The Ruhrtriennale festival was ostensibly subject to those resolutions because it relies on state funding. This clash between governmental and cultural institutions illustrated how previously subtle conflicts could break out into a public dispute that ultimately took on a life of its own. The discussion came to the fore of the public agenda when the German federal government's Commissioner for the Fight against Antisemitism, Felix Klein, joined Deutsch in his critique.[64] Mbembe's invitation as speaker thus became a political issue.[65]

To start with, two tendencies can be identified in the debate about Mbembe's invitation. One position can be described as opposition to antisemitism whereas the other one can be described as opposition to racism. While Mbembe's critics pointed out a structural blind spot for antisemitism in postcolonial research, his defenders identified a structural blind spot for racism in German society.[66] A third position can be identified as well and described as an extension

nizations. Many supporters of Israel claim that it is an antisemitic movement. For critics of Israel it is an anti-colonial movement. For many Jews and supporters of Israel, the term 'boycott' itself provokes associations connected to anti-Jewish sentiments, especially in Germany," Sznaider, "The Summer of Discontent."

62 Lorenz Deutsch, "Antisemitismus keine Plattform bieten. Offener Brief," official homepage of Lorenz Deutsch, March 24, 2020, https://www.lorenz-deutsch.de/antisemitismus-keine-buehne-bieten/2234/.

63 "Der BDS-Bewegung entschlossen entgegentreten – Antisemitismus bekämpfen," Dokumentations- und Informationssystem für Parlamentarische Vorgänge, May 15, 2019, https://dip21.bundestag.de/dip21/btd/19/101/1910191.pdf; "In Nordrhein-Westfalen ist kein Platz für die antisemitische BDS-Bewegung," Dokumentarchiv des Landtags NRW, September 11, 2018, https://www.landtag.nrw.de/portal/WWW/dokumentenarchiv/Dokument/MMD17-3577.pdf.

64 "Protest gegen Auftritt von Mbembe," *Jüdische Allgemeine*, April 17, 2020, https://www.juedische-allgemeine.de/politik/protest-gegen-auftritt-von-mbembe/.

65 For detailed insight into the dispute as well as the underlying conflicting structures, especially those that universalize and particularize Holocaust and colonial crimes, see Sznaider, "The Summer of Discontent."

66 As examples of the structural blind spot for antisemitism within postcolonial research, see an article by Meron Mendel and Saba-Nur Cheema, "Leerstelle Antisemitismus," *tageszeitung*, April 25, 2020, https://taz.de/Postkoloniale-Theoretiker/!5678482/, as well as Ingo Elbe, "Die postkoloniale Schablone," *tageszeitung*, May 14, 2020, https://taz.de/Debatte-um-Historiker-Achille-Mbembe/!5685526/. As examples of an argument that a structural blind spot for racism exist in Germany, see Bonaventure Ndikung, Interview with Christiane Habermalz, "Debatte um Achille Mbembe ist rassistisch," *Deutschlandfunk*, September 9, 2020, https://www.deutsch-

of the accusation of racism. Michael Rothberg, for example, identifies a problem within German memory culture as a whole, arguing that the central role of the Holocaust in Germany's memory culture since the 1980s results in less space for other forms of memory. Rothberg says that the criticism of Mbembe and postcolonial memory practice in general reveals a defensive attitude to forms of memory that are located "beyond residual Eurocentrism."[67] According to Rothberg, the classification of challenges to the uniqueness of the Holocaust and critical approaches to Israel as "antisemitic" ultimately originate in a desire to suppress any postcolonial reappraisal of Germany's colonial history.[68] If one follows Rothberg's logic to its end, any critique of postcolonial memory would have to be interpreted as based in a German provincialism or eurocentrism that refuses to reappraise racism and colonialism in Germany. In that view, defending the memory of the Holocaust would naturally be an obstacle to postcolonial memory.

All three of these positions involve a kind of standoff that positions each memory form as irreconcilable with the other. This, in turn, creates a tendency to generalize about the other side, leaving little room for recognizing different positions *within* each form of memory. To put it bluntly, this standoff harbors the danger of imagining postcolonial memory as generally antisemitic and hostile towards Israel. On the other hand, it also harbors the danger of imagining Holocaust memory as unambiguous and conflict-free, or in the worst case, as a tool to prevent the rise of postcolonial memory in Germany.

Before the *Causa Mbembe*, the German scientist Astrid Messerschmidt had already pointed out the pitfalls that could result from the existing constellations of postcolonial memory and Holocaust memory in Germany. What is especially interesting is that Messerschmidt applied the idea of a break in the continuity of the past and present, which is implied by the prefix *post* in the word "postcolonial," to the history of National Socialism in Germany. Thus, for Messerschmidt, the current society in Germany cannot be viewed only through a postcolonial lens but also through a *post-National Socialist* lens. Messerschmidt suggests that even today the collectively shared thought patterns of the National Socialist past

landfunk.de/kunstkritiker-ndikung-debatte-um-achille-mbembe-ist.911.de.html?dram:article_id=483358 and an open letter from some African intellectuals, May 18, 2020, https://simoninou.files.wordpress.com/2020/05/brief-von-afrikanischen_intellektuellen_an-die-dt-bundeskanzler-in_-angela-merkel.pdf.

[67] Michael Rothberg, "Comparing Comparisons: From the 'Historikerstreit' to the Mbembe Affair," *Geschichte der Gegenwart*, September 23, 2020, https://geschichtedergegenwart.ch/comparing-comparisons-from-the-historikerstreit-to-the-mbembe-affair/.

[68] Ibid.

still shape current German society, but with a different logic.[69] Messerschmidt assumes, however, that it is easier to speak of a postcolonial than of a post-National Socialist Germany. The problem with labeling Germany as a post-National Socialist society can, according to Messerschmidt, be explained by the society's still-ambivalent attitudes toward war and defeat. The discontinuous process of historical reappraisal in Germany recognizes that the culpability of many parts of German society is still having effects on families today.[70] Be that as it may, in parallelizing Holocaust memory and postcolonial memory, Messerschmidt says that *both* historical events and their underlying ideologies have left traces in Germany. Now, when it comes to remembering both historical events at the same time, Messerschmidt warns against the idea that postcolonial memory can just be added to German memory culture next to Holocaust memory.[71] It is precisely the recognition that German society is a post-National Socialist one and as such is in many respects still shaped by the experience of National Socialism that prevents such a simple "plus" calculation. Rather, postcolonial memory has to be related to the memory of the Holocaust in some form of entanglement. One can visualize that entanglement as something in which the postcolonial present is shaped by self-images and world-images that are collectively based on the thought patterns of National Socialism. At the same time, the post-National Socialist present is shaped by self-images and world-images that are collectively based in the thought patterns of colonialism.[72] It still remains unclear exactly how this entanglement looks in the practice of memory.

According to Messerschmidt, whenever postcolonial thinking imagines Holocaust memory to be unambiguous and even regards Holocaust memory as an obstacle to postcolonial memory, it oversimplifies the debate over remembrance of the Holocaust and National Socialism.[73] Messerschmidt thus provides a counter-argument to Michael Rothberg's identification of Holocaust memory as an obstacle to postcolonial memory. It is precisely the oscillation between stability and fragility in Holocaust memory that complicates unraveling the entanglement of Holocaust memory and postcolonial memory.

---

[69] Messerschmidt, "Postkoloniale Erinnerungsprozesse," 56 and Astrid Messerschmidt, "Postkoloniale Selbstbilder in der postnationalsozialistischen Gesellschaft," *FKW. Zeitschrift für Geschlechterforschung und visuelle Kultur,* No. 59 (2016): 24–37.

[70] Messerschmidt, "Postkoloniale Selbstbilder," 34–35.

[71] Messerschmidt, "Postkoloniale Erinnerungsprozesse," 53.

[72] Messerschmidt, "Postkoloniale Selbstbilder," 25.

[73] Messerschmidt, "Postkoloniale Erinnerungsprozesse," 56–57.

The stable side of Holocaust memory, which is shaped by the ethical imperative of accepting historical responsibility, is strangely decoupled from the current reappearance of antisemitism. In other words, even a long tradition of remembering the Holocaust and National Socialism is not preventing a resurgence of antisemitic violence. At second glance, one might ask whether the ethical imperative to accept historical responsibility for the Holocaust has developed a logic of its own that can be instrumentalized for different purposes.[74] In that context, Astrid Messerschmidt points out that the German education system teaches the history of the years 1933 to 1945, but its teaching is decoupled from any discussion of its antisemitic ideological preconditions. This makes it possible for students to distance themselves from the Nazi era and thus to believe that the past has been successfully overcome, even though antisemitism is in reality still prevalent. More precisely, post-1945 antisemitism is viewed as a secondary form of antisemitism that reverses the perpetrators and the victims or suggests that the need to preserve the memory of the Holocaust is at an end.[75] The ethical imperative to accept historical responsibility for past antisemitism can operate to negate or excuse one's own antisemitism because one cannot be antisemitic when German society has done so and faced up to its historical moral guilt. To sum it up: obviously, Holocaust education does not go hand in hand with education on antisemitism. The idea that the National Socialist past has been successfully overcome can also be instrumentalized to strengthen a positive national self-image that pictures Germany as a successful democratic society exactly *because* it has dealt with its problematic past. For Messerschmidt, this is a problem, in that not only antisemitism becomes unspeakable but so does racism, because the existence of racism contradicts the positive national self-image.[76] Michael Rothberg's concern that Germans will instrumentalize Holocaust memory in order to repress postcolonial memory is not completely unthinkable anymore.

In view of this complex situation, I suggest making neither Holocaust memory nor postcolonial memory the focus of any analysis, but rather to start paying attention to the discourse of German memory culture in order to find a way out of the conflict between the two memory forms. However, the attention that I propose below is not to be understood as the same attention implied by Michael Rothberg. Instead of imagining Holocaust memory as an obstacle to postcolonial

[74] Messerschmidt, "Postkoloniale Selbstbilder," 31–35.
[75] Ibid., 29–30.
[76] Ibid., 32–33.

memory, or classifying any criticism of postcolonial memory research as German Eurocentrism, I try to offer a way to stay sensitive to both.

Approaching Holocaust Memory and Postcolonial Memory Through a Discursive Lens

Holocaust memory and postcolonial memory, as well as the complex relationships between the two memory forms, essentially revolve around questions about *what* can be said and, above all, *how* it can be said. This is why I propose to look at German memory culture from a discursive angle.

The main focus of remembering the Holocaust and National Socialism in general has shifted through the decades, but at the same time certain constant verbal acts used to discuss Holocaust memory have shaped ways of speaking that have become institutionalized. That is, they have become to a certain extent established forms of speaking.[77] These institutionalized forms of speaking can also be understood as strands in the broader discourse of German memory culture. According to Michel Foucault's theory of discourse, the institutional consolidation of knowledge does not happen by coincidence but on the basis of power relations built upon fields of knowledge.[78] Consequently, discourse, including the discourse of German memory culture, reveals that which is accepted as the truth at a given point in time in a specific social context. If one wants to analyze how and why a certain piece of knowledge is accepted as true at a certain point in time, one has to look at the statements that are being made about it in discourse. In a nutshell, application of Foucault's discourse theory reveals that what is considered to be true and accepted at any given point in time and in any specific context is not the result of chance, but of a complex relationship between power and knowledge which manifests itself in the linguistic surface of discourse and is at the same time reproduced by the discourse. If one follows Foucault's theory of discourse, analysis of discourse does not deal with the question of how to separate true from false, but rather tries to discern the rules by which truth is endowed with power and separated from the false. Discourse

[77] For an understanding of the institutionalization of ways of speaking in discourse analysis, see Margarete Jäger and Siegfried Jäger, *Deutungskämpfe. Theorie und Praxis Kritischer Diskursanalyse* (Wiesbaden: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften, 2007), 19, as well as Reiner Keller, *Wissenssoziologische Diskursanalyse. Grundlegung eines Forschungsprogramms* (Wiesbaden: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften, 2011).

[78] Michel Foucault describes the complex relationship between power and knowledge in Michel Foucault, *Überwachen und Strafen. Die Geburt des Gefängnisses* (Frankfurt a. M.: Suhrkamp, 1994), 39.

reveals the struggle over the status of truth.[79] Accordingly, discourse analysis reveals how discourse itself regulates the statements that are being made.[80] In order to be able to understand *what* can be said about a specific field of interest and *how* it can be said, one must try to deconstruct the discourse in question at a given point in time.

Applying the foregoing to the conflicting constellations of Holocaust memory and postcolonial memory, I propose to place both forms of memory within the framework of a single common discourse, the discourse of German memory culture. Hereinafter, I mention some of the possibilities such a discursive approach offers for better understanding the conflicting constellations of Holocaust memory and postcolonial memory.

The first possibility arises from identifying both forms of memory as discursive strands in a broader discourse. This gives us an answer to the question of *what* can be said. It dissolves the argumentative standoff between the two memory forms. Instead, the discourse of German memory culture becomes the center of analysis. It becomes possible to analyze various statements about remembering the Holocaust and about remembering colonialism at the same time.

Taking the discursive side of memory culture into consideration broadens our perspective on the genesis of that culture and makes it possible to understand the relationship between recent statements about postcolonial memory and the statements that have already been institutionalized. In particular, a discourse can be imagined as a flow of knowledge through time.[81] Elements of knowledge do not easily change, and some elements are retained over time. Other elements reappear in a new form, and new elements can be added to existing elements. The discourse of German memory culture can be thought of as such a flow of knowledge through time. Over time, certain ways of speaking have become institutionalized and the discourse itself has developed its own history. When postcolonial memory encounters this discourse, statements about it have to align with the already existing elements of knowledge, at least to a certain extent, in order to be heard.

The discursive perspective offers the possibility of analyzing why some statements made by the advocates of postcolonial memory are highly contested. It is because they resemble similar statements that have been lying on the border between true and false in past discourse. An example is the term

[79] Michel Foucault, "Wahrheit und Macht. Interview von A. Fontana und P. Pasquino," in *Dispositive der Macht: Über Sexualität, Wissen und Wahrheit* (Berlin: Merve, 1978), 21–54.
[80] Jäger and Jäger, *Deutungskämpfe*, 23.
[81] Ibid.

Historikerstreit 2.0, which was used by Michael Rothberg to describe the *Causa Mbembe*.[82] This discursive element refers to the old *Historikerstreit* and brings to mind the earlier conflicts in the contested field of Holocaust memory and the German memory culture that postcolonial thinking is entering. It draws a parallel between the older conflicts and the newer ones.

However, as I have already mentioned, when it comes to Holocaust memory one can ask to what extent the ethical imperative to accept historical responsibility has been instrumentalized to create a positive national self-image in which everyday antisemitism is unspeakable. A systematic analysis of the statements of German memory discourse will not only reveal the extent to which postcolonial remembering is regulated, but the extent to which speaking about antisemitism is regulated as well, because the appearance of discursive elements of antisemitism may contradict the image of a successful reappraisal of the National Socialist past.

The second possibility offered by a discursive lens is the chance to more deeply examine the relationship between the different forms of memory *within* the German cultural memory discourse and their effect *on* the discourse. A discursive perspective not only offers a way to gain a better understanding of the history of the discourse, but also to analyze current movements within it. That gives us an answer to the question of *how* the memories of the Holocaust and colonialism are expressed in relation to one another.

According to Siegfried Jäger, strategies for *how* to say something within a discourse include "direct prohibitions and restrictions, allusions, implicates, explicit taboos, but also … conventions, internalizations, consciousness regulations" that narrow or expand the scope of discourse.[83] At this point it is important to bring up the understanding of power according to the discourse theory of Michel Foucault. Foucault imagines power as neither static (i.e., as a fixed point that belongs to one position alone and is absent for another), nor as a destructive force. Instead, power must be understood as a productive force and as something that can be found in all places at all times. Even resistance to power is not the lack of power, but rather has to be understood as counter-power.[84]

---

[82] Rothberg, "Comparing Comparisons."

[83] Siegfried Jäger, "Diskurs und Wissen. Theoretische und methodische Aspekte einer Kritischen Diskurs- und Dispositivanalyse," in *Handbuch Sozialwissenschaftliche Diskursanalyse*, Vol. I: *Theorien und Methoden,* ed. Reiner Keller et al. (Opladen: Leske und Budrich, 2001), 84.

[84] Michel Foucault, *The History of Sexuality, Vol. 1: An Introduction* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1978), 92–98.

By analyzing discourse one can pin down power relations and visualize the effects of power. The understanding of power as a relationship rather than a fixed force in the hands of one side prevents us from creating a simplified schema of dominant and suppressed forms of memory and gives us a way to visualize the fragile side of Holocaust memory. Lastly, discourse analysis makes it possible to analyze the relationship between statements that demand a postcolonial reappraisal of German colonialism and statements that warn against certain postcolonial approaches. Such an analysis might reveal points at which statements systematically and automatically contradict each other, and also where other statements cross each other unproblematically. Ultimately, discourse analysis can reveal the possibility of an interlaced memory practice while at the same time being sensitive to areas of difference.

A third possibility arises from the use of a discursive angle on the conflicting constellations of Holocaust memory and postcolonial memory. Because power is conveyed discursively, discourse analysis is also a critique of power. It questions the practices and systems of expression that form a memory culture. Power does not belong to an individual or a group, but rather should be imagined as a force which pervades an entire discourse. Therefore, a critique of power is directed in all conceivable directions. Discourse analysis can not only dissolve the argumentative standoff between Holocaust memory and postcolonial memory, but it can analyze the power relations that drive the entire discourse of a memory culture. As such, discourse analysis does not ask if either Holocaust memory or postcolonial memory has more power or less power. Rather, it asks *how* both memory forms are regulated through the discourse itself, meaning how the discourse shapes the conflicts between the two forms. The object of the critique of power thus becomes the discourse of German memory culture itself.

Finally, I would like to address something that goes beyond analysis of the discourse itself. Discourses are not only carriers of knowledge, but they themselves have a powerful effect. They create a first-order reality with material consequences.[85] A discursive analysis of German memory culture serves not only to better understand the standoff between Holocaust memory and postcolonial memory, but also leads to a critique of the material consequences of such a discourse. More precisely, if antisemitism can only be uttered implicitly or not at all, it has real consequences for the victims of antisemitic violence. The same can be said for racism: if the discursive elements of postcolonial memory are repressed

[85] Jäger, "Diskurs und Wissen," 85.

in order to avoid dealing with the relicts of racism within Germany, it has real consequences for the victims of racist violence.

Since postcolonial memory cannot simply be juxtaposed with Holocaust memory and since the tangled design of the memory culture of Germany has so far rather been vaguely perceived, a discursive perspective on these conflicting constellations can provide a first step toward clarity. In a sense, discourse analysis creates an inventory of the current systems of statements and logic. Ultimately, the academic and public focus in Germany should be on questioning the discourse of German memory culture itself in a self-critical manner, instead of playing off both forms of memory against each other. Therewith, I align myself with Natan Sznaider, who recently presented a detailed analysis of the conflicting constellations of memory that intersected in the *Causa Mbembe*. For Sznaider, a "postcritical theory leaves the 'either/or' and moves towards an 'as well/as.'"[86] Such an approach demands that one self-critically deal with one's own prerequisites for thinking and acting in relation to one's counterparts.[87]

Conclusion

In the introduction to this paper, I quoted Frank-Walter Steinmeier's speech commemorating the 75th anniversary of the end of the World War II. In it, he not only mentioned Holocaust memory as being necessary for the present and future, but also draws a parallel between democracy and the remembrance of National Socialism and the Holocaust. As I have tried to show, whether it is remembering the Holocaust or remembering colonialism, the act of remembering always serves a specific purpose and is thus not an end in itself. That is why I argue that in order to understand the conflict between the constellations of Holocaust memory and postcolonial memory in Germany one needs to understand the different purposes for which both forms of remembering are being used within the public space. If, as Steinmeier's speech suggests, Holocaust memory is being used to fulfill democratic standards, this always involves danger. One might lose sight of the fragility of the Holocaust memory, or contrarily, Holocaust memory might be used to immunize society from the need to reappraise colonial racist violence.

[86] Sznaider, "The Summer of Discontent."
[87] Ibid.

In this paper I have tried to reveal the game that the discourse of Germany's memory culture is playing. This game sometimes makes it impossible to acknowledge antisemitism and racism in equal measure and instead creates a standoff between Holocaust memory and postcolonial memory. I have therefore proposed analyzing the public discourse of German memory culture in order to understand how the statements made by both sides are structured and regulated by and within the discourse. Ultimately, this may result in an opportunity for Germany to become a post-National Socialist society and a postcolonial society at one and the same time.

REPORTS

Obituary
Prof. PhDr. Jan Křen, DrSc.
(* 1930 – † 2020)

Source: Profimedia.CZ a.s.

On April 7, 2020, the coronavirus added one of the leading figures in the Faculty of Social Sciences of Charles University to its severe toll on society, when Professor Jan Křen passed away.

Jan Křen's life path was capricious and marked by the common experiences of many members of his World War II-scarred generation, from joining the ranks of the builders of Communism and then making a futile attempt to repair it, to exclusion from public and academic life after 1968, signing Charter 77, and returning to the fore of his profession after 1989.

In the early days of his professional life, Křen focused on Czech history with a special emphasis on its external context. His study of the Czechoslovak exile community and the resistance during World War II drew on his understanding of Czechoslovak and Czech history as a part of broader processes in the world. He shifted the interpretation of his country's history away from the influence of official Party doctrine and self-centered nationalist views, clearing the way for further research.

For twenty years, Křen was deprived of the opportunity to practice his profession as a historian. He supported himself until the end of the Communist regime by maintaining the pumps at the Vodní zdroje waterworks in Prague, a state-owned water management enterprise. Nevertheless, Křen devoted himself to independent research into modern Czech history and Czech-German relations, including the expulsion of the Sudeten Germans and related domestic and external issues, which at the time were marginalized and interpreted with political expediency in mind. The result of his work was a valuable 1986 monograph on the history of Czech-German coexistence in the Czech Lands, *Konfliktní společenství: Češi a Němci 1780–1918 (A Community of Conflict. Czechs and Germans 1780–1918)*. The book was first published in exile by Sixty-eight Publishers in Toronto, Canada.

Prof. Křen's second interest was in area studies, which in the early 1990s was a field not very well known to us, but long developed in the Western world. His desire to introduce the field to the Czech Republic was based on his foreign experiences. The newly established Faculty of Social Sciences at Charles University offered him space to do so and area studies began to develop at the Institute of International Studies, of which Jan Křen was the "founding father." In addition to area studies, Prof. Křen was also at the forefront of the field of modern history, focusing first on the history of German-speaking countries and the Central European area, including Czech-German relations, and then moving on with the Institute to the history and current situation of territories from North America to Western Europe, the Balkans, and the post-Soviet area.

From the late 1990s, Prof. Křen focused his professional interests on Central Europe, culminating in an acclaimed monograph *Dvě století střední Evropy* (*Two Centuries of Central Europe*), which won the Czech Magnesia Litera book award in 2006. His work embraced Central Europe as a great historical region from the Enlightenment to the end of the twentieth century. In the autumn of 2019, Křen published his final book, *Čtvrt století střední Evropy* (*A Quarter Century of Central Europe*), which examined the post-communist development of the Central European region. Křen taught courses on the Central European and the wider European context of modern Czech history through the 2015–16 school year at the Institute of International Studies.

Jan Křen's organizational work and public activities were an inseparable part of his life. In addition to his invaluable efforts to bring the new institute and the field of area studies to life at Charles University, he strove to repair and stabilize Czech-German relations. To that end, he co-founded the Czechoslovak-German Commission of Historians and took part in the Czech-German Future Fund as a member of its managing board. He also taught and lectured at academic institutions and universities in Bremen, Berlin, Vienna, and Marburg. Prof. Křen's work brought him domestic and international acclaim, awards, and decorations, which highlighted the significant mark that he left on the Faculty of Social Sciences and its Institute of International Studies – the space that was always at the heart of his professional and public interest.

We will remember him!

Jiří Vykoukal

doi: 10.14712/23363231.2021.5

Select Bibliography of Works by Jan Křen: Monographs, Co-authored Books, Edited Volumes, Book Chapters, and Journal Articles from the Period 1956–2019

This select bibliography is based on four sources: an unpublished bibliography compiled by Jan Křen himself,[1] a list of his texts from the 1980s and 1990s compiled by Jiří Pešek and Jiří Vykoukal and republished in 2013,[2] an online database, the Bibliography of the History of the Czech Lands, maintained by the Institute of History of the Czech Academy of Sciences,[3] and the catalogue of Germany's Deutsche Nationalbibliothek.[4] I did my best to include all books that were authored, co-authored, edited or co-edited by Jan Křen. From among the numerous articles he wrote, I selected only those focusing on Czechoslovak, Czech, or Slovak history, Czech-German relations, the history of Central Europe, and area studies in general; these were published in collections and academic journals or illegally reproduced as *samizdat*. Due to space constraints, it was not possible to include Jan Křen's shorter pieces, such as book reviews, reports on the activities of various committees and bodies (e.g., the Association of Historians of the Czech Republic and the Czech-German Commission of Historians), or his tributes to and reminiscences about prominent members of the community of Czech and German historians. Jan Křen's contributions to Czech daily and weekly newspapers, as well as to history magazines and cultural revues, were also omitted.[5]

Monographs

Československo v období odlivu poválečné revoluční vlny a upevňování panství buržoasie (1921–1923) [Czechoslovakia in the time when the post-war revolutionary tide was ebbing and the domination of the bourgeoisie was being consolidated (1921–1923)]. Praha: Rudé právo, 1956.

Československo v období dočasné a relativní stabilisace kapitalismu (1924–1929) [Czechoslovakia in the period of relative and temporary stabilization of capitalism (1924–1929)]. Praha: Státní nakladatelství politické literatury, 1957.

Do emigrace: západní zahraniční odboj 1938–1939 [Into exile: The foreign resistance in the West 1938–1939], Vol. 1. Praha: Naše vojsko, 1963.

Mnichovská zrada: pomůcka pro referenty 25. výročí Mnichova [The Munich betrayal: a guide for speakers on the 25th anniversary of Munich]. Praha: Svaz protifašistických bojovníků, 1963.

1 "Jan Křen. Bibliografie [1963–2010]," electronic document in the possession of the Institute of International Studies, Faculty of Social Sciences, Charles University (IMS FSV UK).

2 "Bibliografie otištěných textů," in *Historik v pohybu. Jan Křen,* ed. Jiří Pešek and Jiří Vykoukal (Praha: Karolinum, 2013), 409–410.

3 "Bibliografie dějin Českých zemí," website of the Institute of History of the Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic (Historický ústav AV ČR), https://biblio.hiu.cas.cz/.

4 "Katalog der Deutschen Nationalbibliothek," website of the German National Library, https://portal.dnb.de/opac.htm.

5 My thanks go to Simona Ježková for her assistance in putting this bibliography together.

Do emigrace: Západní zahraniční odboj 1938–1939. 1939 [Into exile: The foreign resistance in the West 1938–1939], Vol. 1. 2nd ed. Praha: Naše vojsko, 1969.
V emigraci: západní zahraniční odboj 1939–1940 [In exile: The foreign resistance in the West 1939–1940], Vol. 2. Praha: Naše vojsko, 1969.
Konfliktní společenství: Češi a Němci 1780–1918 [A community of conflict: Czechs and Germans 1780–1918]. Praha: [samizdat], 1986.
Historické proměny češství [Historical transmutations of Czechness]. Praha: [samizdat], 1988.
Konfliktní společenství: Češi a Němci 1780–1918 [A community of conflict: Czechs and Germans 1780–1918]. Toronto: Sixty-Eight Publishers, 1989.
Bílá místa v našich dějinách? [Blind spots in our history?]. Praha: Lidové noviny, 1990.
Konfliktní společenství: Češi a Němci 1780–1918 [A community of conflict: Czechs and Germans 1780–1918]. Praha: Academia, 1990.
Historické proměny češství [Historical transmutations of Czechness]. Praha: Karolinum, 1992.
Die Konfliktgemeinschaft. Tschechen und Deutsche 1780–1918. München: Oldenbourg, 1996.
Die Konfliktgemeinschaft Tschechen und Deutsche 1780–1918. 2nd ed. München: Oldenbourg, 2000.
Dvě století střední Evropy [Two centuries of Central Europe]. Praha: Argo, 2005. Reprint, Praha: Argo, 2006.
Historik v pohybu. Jan Křen [Historian in motion: Jan Křen]. Praha: Karolinum, 2013 (edited by Jiří Pešek and Jiří Vykoukal).
Konfliktní společenství. Češi a Němci 1780–1918 [A community of conflict: Czechs and Germans 1780–1918]. 4th ed. Praha: Karolinum, 2013.
Čtvrt století střední Evropy. Visegrádské země v globálním příběhu let 1992–2017 [A quarter century of Central Europe: The Visegrad countries in the global story 1992–2017]. Praha: Karolinum, 2019.
Dvě století střední Evropy [Two centuries of Central Europe]. 2nd ed. Praha: Argo, 2019.

Co-authored Books

Jak se žilo na vesnici [How they lived in the villages]. Praha: Státní zemědělské nakladatelství, 1958 (co-authored by Jaroslava Hájková).
Mnichovská zrada [The Munich betrayal]. Praha: Státní nakladatelství politické literatury, 1958 (co-authored by Jan Fajkus).
Dějiny Komunistické strany Československa [History of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia]. Praha: Státní nakladatelství politické literatury, 1961 (main author Pavel Reiman).
Náboženství, církve, klerikalismus a naše dějiny [Religion, churches, clericalism, and our history]. Praha: Nakladatelství politické literatury, 1962 (co-authored by J. Laurová, R. Wohlgemuthová, and J. Lisý).

Dějinná křižovatka: Slovenské národní povstání, předpoklady a výsledky [Historical crossroads: The Slovak National Uprising, preconditions and results]. Praha: Nakladatelství politické literatury, 1964 (co-authored by Ferdinand Beer, Antonín Benčík, Bohuslav Graca, Václav Kural, and Jaroslav Šolc).
Odboj a revoluce 1938–1945. Nástin dějin čs. odboje [Resistance and revolution 1938–1945: An outline of the history of the Czechoslovak resistance]. Praha: Naše vojsko, 1965 (main author Oldřich Janeček).
Słowacja na przełomie. Powstanie słowackie 1944 r. [Slovakia on the brink: The Slovak Uprising 1944]. Warszawa: Książka i Wiedza, 1969 (co-authored by Ferdinand Beer, Antonín Benčík, Bohuslav Graca, Václav Kural, and Jaroslav Šolc).
Integration oder Ausgrenzung? Deutsche und Tschechen 1890–1945. Bremen: Donat und Temmen, 1986 (co-authored by Václav Kural and Detlef Brandes).

Edited Volumes

La Cecoslovacchia in lotta: Documenti sul movimento di Resistenza del popolo cecoslovacco degli anni 1938–1945. Praga: Edizioni dell'Accademia delle Scienze Cecoslovacca, 1961 (co-edited by Jiří Doležal).
La Tchécoslovaquie en lutte: Documents sur la Résistance du peuple tchécoslovaque de 1938 à 1945. Prague: Maison d'édition de l'Académie des sciences, 1961 (co-edited by Jiří Doležal).
Czechoslovakia's Fight: Documents on the Resistance Movement of the Czechoslovak People, 1938–1945. Prague: Czechoslovak Academy of Science, 1964 (co-edited by Jiří Doležal).
Die kämpfende Tschechoslowakei: Dokumente über die Widerstandsbewegung des tschechoslowakischen Volkes in den Jahren 1938–1945. Prag: Orbis, 1964 (co-edited by Jiří Doležal).
Sborník historických studií [A collection of historical studies]. Praha: [samizdat], 1979 (co-edited by Karel Kinský, Milan Otáhal, and Miloš Hájek).
Z dějin. Sborník studií [On history. A collection of studies]. Praha: [samizdat], 1981 (edited by Jan Křen et al.).
Historické a sociologické studie: Sborník [Historical and sociological studies: A collection]. Praha: [samizdat], 1982 (co-edited by Radim Palouš, Jozef Jablonický, Jaroslav Klofáč, and Hana Mejdrová).
Z českých a slovenských dějin [On Czech and Slovak history]. Praha: [samizdat], 1982 (co-edited by Jaroslav Mezník).
Historický sborník [A historical anthology]. Praha: [samizdat], 1985 (co-edited by Dietrich Beyrau and Jozef Jablonický).
Historické studie [Historical studies]. Praha: [samizdat], 1989 (co-edited by Jaroslav Mezník and Milan Otáhal).

Češi, Němci, odsun. Diskuse nezávislých historiků. [Czechs, Germans, transfer. A discussion by independent historians]. Praha: Academia, 1990 (co-edited by Bohumil Černý, Václav Kural, and Milan Otáhal).
Německá a rakouská studia v České republice a ve světě. Sborník referátů ze stejnojmenné konference [German and Austrian studies in the Czech Republic and the world. Conference proceedings]. Praha: Centrum německých a rakouských studií FSV UK, 1994.
Im geteilten Europa: Tschechen, Slowaken und Deutsche und ihre Staaten 1948–1989. Essen: Klartext, 1998 (co-edited by Hans Lemberg and Dušan Kováč).
Obraz Němců, Rakouska a Německa v české společnosti 19. a 20. století [The image of Germans, Austria, and Germany in the Czech society of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries]. Praha: Karolinum, 1998 (co-edited by Eva Broklová).
V rozdelenej Európe: Česi, Slováci, Nemci a ich štáty v rokoch 1948–1989 [In a divided Europe: Czechs, Slovaks, Germans and their states in the years 1948–1989]. Bratislava: Academic Electronic Press, 1998 (co-edited by Dušan Kováč and Hans Lemberg).
Konkurence i partnerství. Německé a československé hospodářství v letech 1918–1945 [Competition and partnership. The German and Czechoslovak economies in the years 1918–1945]. Praha: Karolinum, 1999 (co-edited by Boris Barth, Jozef Faltus, and Eduard Kubů).
Konkurrenzpartnerschaft. Die deutsche und die tschechoslowakische Wirtschaft in der Zwischenkriegszeit. Essen: Klartext-Verlag, 1999 (co-edited by Boris Barth, Jozef Faltus, and Eduard Kubů).
Křižovatky dvou životů: sborník k poctě Hany Mejdrové a Miloše Hájka [The crossroads of two lives: A collection honoring Hana Mejdrová and Miloš Hájek]. Praha: Masarykova dělnická akademie, 2008 (co-edited by Milena Janišová).

Book Chapters

"Palackého představy střední Evropy (1848–1849)" [Palacký's vision of Central Europe (1848–1849)]. In *Sborník historických studií*, edited by Karel Kinský, Jan Křen, Milan Otáhal, and Miloš Hájek, 116–144. Praha: [samizdat], 1979.
"Palacky's Mitteleuropavorstellungen." In *Unabhängige Geschichtsschreibung in der Tschechoslowakei 1969–1980: vorgelegt dem XV. Internationalen Kongreß für Geschichtswissenschaften (Bukarest, August 1980)*, edited by Vilém Prečan. [Scheinfeld]: Čs. středisko nezávislé literatury, 1980.
"Alternativy nacionalismu. Česká pozitivní politika a její obdoby ve střední a východní Evropě" ["Alternatives to nationalism. Czech positive politics and its analogues in Central and Eastern Europe]. In *Historický sborník*, edited by Dietrich Beyrau, Jozef Jablonický, and Jan Křen,18–29. Praha: [samizdat], 1985.
"Historische Wandlungen des Tschechentums." In *Mitteleuropa – Traum oder Trauma?*, edited by Hans-Peter Burmeister, 191–232. Bremen: Temmen, 1988.

“Češi a Němci v čs. státě 1918–1945” [Czechs and Germans in the Czechoslovak state 1918–1945]. In *Kapitoly z dějin střední Evropy*. München: Tschechischer Nationalausschuss in Deutschland, 1989.
“Der ‘Historikerstreit’ aus tschechischer Sicht.” In *Der deutsche Historikerstreit aus mitteleuropäischer Sicht. OsteuropaForum* No. 77, 63–72. Hamburg: Osteuropaforum, 1989 (co-authored by Václav Kural).
“Mitteleuropa von Böhmen aus betrachtet.” In *Mitteleuropa und die deutsche Frage*, edited by Heino Berg, 32–46. Bremen: Temmen, 1990.
Deutsche und Tschechen – neue Hoffnung? Češi a Němci – nová naděje?, edited by Franz Olbert and Petr Prouza, 215–230. Praha: Nadace B. Bolzana, 1992.
Die Diskussion über Mitteleuropa – historisch betrachtet. In *Wissenschaftskolleg – Institute for Advanced Studies – zu Berlin. Jahrbuch 1990/91*, edited by Wolf Lepenies, 253–269. Berlin: Nicolaische Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1992.
“Vergebung: Entschuldigung und Blick in die Zukunft?” In *Ztracené dějiny, aneb, Ziemie odzyskane? – Verlorene Geschichte oder Wiedergewonnenes Land?*, 50–67. Praha: Goethe-Institut and Osródek Kultury Polskiej, 1992.
“De Munich à Prague.” In *L’Allemagne vue d’ailleurs*, edited by Michel Korinman, 169–186. Paris: Balland, 1993.
“Deutschlandbilder bei den Tschechen.” In *Deutschlandbilder in Polen und Rußland, in der Tschechoslowakei und in Ungarn. Dokumentation der Tagung, Nettetal 16.–19. Dezember 1992*, edited by Fritz Pleitgen and Hans Süssmuth, 222–234. Baden-Baden: Nomos, 1993.
“Das Integrationsproblem in Ostmitteleuropa zwischen den beiden Weltkriegen.” In *Mitteleuropa-Konzeptionen in der ersten Hälfte des 20. Jahrhunderts*, edited by Richard G. Plaschka et al., 153–164. Wien: VÖAW, 1995.
“Kolik máme minulostí?” [How many pasts do we have?]. In *Dialogy o občanské společnosti*, edited by Josef Alan, 95–101. Praha: Slon, 1995.
“Naše dějiny – Unsere Geschichte.” In *Češi a Němci historická tabu. = Tschechen und Deutsche historische Tabus*, edited by Eva Malířová, 36–46. Praha: Prago Media – Nadace B. Bolzana, 1995.
“O česko-německých vztazích” [On Czech-German relations]. In *Dialogy o občanské společnosti*, edited by Josef Alan, 218–223. Praha: Slon, 1995.
“Odsun v německých ohledech. Die Abschiebung aus deutscher Sicht.” In *Češi a Němci – ztracené dějiny? Tschechen und Deutsche – verlorene Geschichte?*, 86–92. Praha: Prago Media – Nadace B. Bolzana, 1995.
“Probleme und Chancen der Kooperation tschechischer und deutscher Historiker.” In *Aspekte der Zusammenarbeit in der Ostmitteleuropa-Forschung. Tagung des Herder-Instituts und des J. G. Herder Forschungsrates am 22./23. Februar 1994*, edited by Hugo Weczerka, 17–26. Marburg: Herder-Institut, 1996.
“Předmluva” [Preface]. In *Edvard Beneš. Odsun Němců z Československa. Výbor z Pamětí, projevů a dokumentů 1940–1947*, edited by Karel Novotný, 13–15. Praha: Dita, 1996.

"Epilogue." In Christoph Stölzl. *Kafkovy zlé Čechy: k sociální historii pražského žida*, 157–165. Praha: Nakladatelství Franze Kafky, 1997.
"Notizen zu den Beziehungen zwischen der tschechischen und der deutschen Geschichtswissenschaft." In *Die böhmischen Länder in der deutschen Geschichtsschreibung seit dem Jahre 1848. Vorträge des 3. Aussiger Kolloquiums in Aussig vom 25. bis 26. April 1996*, Vol. 2, edited by Michael Neumüller, 139–157. Ústí nad Labem: Albis international, 1997.
"Tschechen, Deutsche, Vertreibung. Übereinstimmungen und Streitigkeiten." In *Tschechen, Deutsche und der Zweite Weltkrieg. Von der Schwere geschichtlicher Erfahrung und der Schwierigkeit ihrer Aufarbeitung*, edited by Robert Maier, 9–22. Hannover: Georg-Eckert-Institut, 1997.
"Changed in Identity. Germans in Bohemia and Moravia in the Nineteenth Century." In *Bohemia in History*, edited by Mikuláš Teich, 324–343. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.
"Deutsche historische Nachkriegsliteratur über die böhmischen Länder." In *Im geteilten Europa: Tschechen, Slowaken und Deutsche und ihre Staaten 1948–1989*, edited by Hans Lemberg, Jan Křen, and Dušan Kováč, 193–244. Essen: Klartext, 1998.
"Deutschland-Forschung im Bauwagen." In *Dissidenten, Präsidenten und Gemüsehändler. Tschechische und ostdeutsche Dissidenten 1968–1998*, edited by Doris Liebermann, Jürgen Fuchs, and Wlasta Wallat, 155–175. Essen, Klartext: 1998.
"Obrazy Němců a Německa v české společnosti [The images of Germans and Germany in Czech society]." In *Obraz Němců, Rakouska a Německa v české společnosti 19. a 20. století*, edited by Eva Broklová and Jan Křen, 21–32. Praha: Karolinum 1998.
"Poválečná německá literatura o českých zemích" [Post-war German literature about the Czech Lands]. In *V rozdelenej Európe. Česi, Slováci, Nemci a ich štáty*, edited by Dušan Kováč, Jan Křen, and Hans Lemberg, 125–156. Bratislava, Academic Electronic Press, 1998.
"Die Tradition der tschechischen Demokratie." In *Europäische Zivilgesellschaft in Ost und West. Begriff, Geschichte, Chancen*, edited by Manfred Hildermeier, Jürgen Kocka, and Christoph Conrad, 173–202. Campus: Frankfurt a. M. 2000.
"Úvod" [Introduction]. In *Porozumění: Češi – Němci – východní Evropa 1848–1948*, edited by Hans Lemberg, Kristina Kaiserová, and Jiří Pešek, 7–12. Praha: Nakladatelství Lidové noviny, 2000.
"Neue tschechische Studien zum Jahr 1945." In *Mentalitäten – Nationen – Spannungsfelder. Studien zu Mittel- und Osteuropa im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert. Beiträge eines Kolloquiums zum 65. Geburtstag von Hans Lemberg*, edited by Eduard Mühle, 183–190. Marburg: Herder-Institut, 2001.
"Předmluva" [Preface]. In *Edvard Beneš. Odsun Němců z Československa. Výbor z Pamětí, projevů a dokumentů 1940–1947*, edited by Karel Novotný, 13–15. 2nd ed. Praha: Dita, 2002.
"Rok 1945 – mezník, a jaký?" [The year 1945 – What kind of milestone?]. In *Československo na rozhraní dvou epoch nesvobody. Sborník z konference k 60. výročí konce druhé*

světové války, edited by Zdeňka Kokošková, Jiří Kocian, and Stanislav Kokoška, 309–318. Praha: Národní archiv, 2005.
"Sociálně-politické paradoxy sovětského bloku" [Socio-political paradoxes of the Soviet bloc]. In *Spoznal som svetlo a už viac nechcem tmu. Pocta Jozefovi Jablonickému*, edited by Vladimír Bakoš et al., 239–332. Bratislava: Veda, 2005.
"Česká otázka v německé a rakouské politice do roku 1918" [The Czech question in German and Austrian politics until 1918]. In *Hledání jistoty v bouřlivých časech. Češi, Slováci, Němci a mezinárodní systém v první polovině 20. století*, edited by Zdeněk Beneš, Dušan Kováč, and Hans Lemberg, 13–40. Ústí nad Labem: Albis International, 2006.
"Historické proměny češství" [Historical transmutations of Czechness]. In *Spor o smysl českých dějin 2. 1938–1989*, edited by Miloš Havelka, 557–594. Praha: Torst, 2006.
"K diskusím o pojetí českých dějin" [On the discussions about the concept of Czech history]. In *Spor o smysl českých dějin 2. 1938–1989,* edited by Miloš Havelka, 603–608. Praha: Torst, 2006.
"K právu na dějiny" [On the right to a history]. In *Hlasy k českým dějinám. Sborník diskuse. Praha 1984–1985*, edited by Luboš Kohout. Praha: Křesťanskosociální hnutí, 2006.
"K právu na dějiny" [On the right to a history]. In *Spor o smysl českých dějin 2. 1938–1989*, edited by Miloš Havelka, 394–396. Praha: Torst, 2006.
"Über ein wenig bekanntes Buch zu einem von Detlef Brandes' großen Forschungsthemen," In *Die Deutschen und das östliche Europa. Aspekte einer vielfältigen Beziehungsgeschichte. Festschrift für Detlef Brandes zum 65. Geburtstag*, edited by Dietmar Neutatz and Volker Zimmermann, 355–369. Essen: Klartext, 2006.
"1867–1871: Deutschland, die Deutschen und der österreichische Ausgleich." In *Wendepunkte in den Beziehungen zwischen Deutschen, Tschechen und Slowaken 1848–1989*, edited by Detlef Brandes, Dušan Kováč, and Jiří Pešek, 85–110. Klartext: Essen, 2007.
"Miloš Hájek a Hana Mejdrová: dvojportrét jedné generace" [Miloš Hájek and Hana Mejdrová: A dual portrait of one generation]. In *Křižovatky dvou životů: sborník k poctě Hany Mejdrové a Miloše Hájka*, edited by Milena Janišová and Jan Křen, 8–28. Praha: Masarykova dělnická akademie, 2008.
"Nachwort." In Samuel Salzborn, *Geteilte Erinnerung: die deutsch-tschechischen Beziehungen und die sudetendeutsche Vergangenheit*, 125–134. Frankfurt a. M.: Lang, 2008.
"Die böhmische Frage in der deutschen und österreichischen Politik bis zum Jahr 1918." In *Suche nach Sicherheit in stürmischer Zeit. Tschechen, Slowaken und Deutsche im System der internationalen Beziehungen der ersten Hälfte des 20. Jahrhunderts*, edited by Hans Lemberg, Michaela Marek, Zdeněk Beneš, and Dušan Kováč, 13–44. Essen: Klartext, 2009.
"Tři poznámky k národnímu státu" [Three notes on the nation state]. In *24th World Congress of the Czechoslovak Society of Arts and Sciences (SVU), 50th Anniversary of the SVU,* Vol. I., edited by Dalibor Mikuláš, 60–67. Ružomberok: Catholic University, 2009.

“Podivné počty migrací po roce 1918” [Strange numbers concerning the migrations after 1918]. In *Historie prožité minulosti. K šedesátinám Oldřicha Tůmy*, edited by Jiří Kocián, Milan Otáhal, and Miroslav Vaněk, 150–154. Praha: Ústav pro soudobé dějiny and Institut mezinárodních studií FSV UK, 2010.
“Central Europe and Its Alternatives.” In *Mitteleuropa? Zwischen Realität, Chimäre und Konzept*, edited by Johann P. Arnason et al., 189–194. Praha: FF UK, 2015.
“Obtížné, leč plodné dvacetiletí první republiky” [The difficult but fruitful twenty years of the First Republic]. In *Česko na cestě*, edited by Pavel Baran and Petr Drulák, 43–46. Praha: Academia, 2017.

Journal Articles

“L’historiographie sur la Seconde Guerre mondiale et la résistance en Tchécoslovaquie.” *Revue d’histoire de la Deuxième Guerre mondiale* 13, No. 52 (1963): 79–92.
“Beneš – problém politického vůdcovství (1939–1940)” [Beneš – The problem of political leadership (1939–1940)]. *Revue dějin socialismu* 8 (1968): 180–202.
“Hodža – slovenská otázka v zahraničním odboji” [Hodža – The Slovak question in the foreign resistance]. *Československý časopis historický* 16, No. 2 (1968): 193–214.
“Češi a Němci na přelomu století. Pokus o historickou bilanci” [Czechs and Germans at the turn of the century: An attempt at a historical appraisal]. In *Sborník historický* 16 (1990): 131–174.
“Alternativy nacionalismu. Česká pozitivní politika a její obdoby ve střední a východní Evropě” [Alternatives to nationalism. Czech positive politics and its analogues in Central and Eastern Europe]. *Historické listy* No. 1 (1991): 18–29.
“Czech Historiography at a Turning-Point,” In *East European Politics and Societies* 6, No 2. (1992): 152–169. Doi: 10.1177/0888325492006002003.
“Dějiny Němců v Čechách” [The history of the Germans in Bohemia]. *Res historica* No. 1 (1992): 45–55.
“Česká ‘German Studies’?” [Czech ‘German Studies?’]. *Soudobé dějiny* 1, No. 1 (1993): 125–128.
“Die Vergangenheit bei Tschechen und Sudetendeutschen.” *Bohemia: Zeitschrift für Geschichte und Kultur der böhmischen Länder* 34, No. 2 (1993): 381–389.
“Česká a německá historická paměť – včerejšek a dnešek. Úvahy k 8. sjezdu českých historiků v Hradci Králové” [Czech and German historical memory – yesterday and today. Thoughts on the Eighth Congress of Czech Historians in Hradec Králové]. *Český časopis historický* 97, No. 2 (1999): 321–331.
“Interpretace národních, středoevropských a evropských dějin. Více otázek než odpovědí” [The interpretation of national, Central European, and European history. More questions than answers]. *Soudobé dějiny* 6, No. 4 (1999): 488–513.
“Dvakrát střední Evropa” [Central Europe Twice]. *Soudobé dějiny* 8, No. 1 (2001): 131–139.

"O historických pojmech, zvládání minulosti a evropských dějinách. Tři diskusní poznámky" [On historical concepts, mastering the past, and European history. Three discussion notes]. *Soudobé dějiny* 11, No. 4 (2004): 82–96.
"Dokumenty StB jako pramen poznání minulosti" [State Security files as a source of knowledge of the past]. *Soudobé dějiny* 12, No. 3–4 (2005): 708–733.
"'Jak se to tedy mělo dělat jinak?' Historická komise Občanského fóra a Pithartovy otázky ["'How should it have been done differently, then?' The Civic Forum's historical commission and Pithart's questions"]. *Soudobé dějiny* 16, No. 2–3 (2009): 436–443 (co-authored by Pavel Seifter).

Compiled by Lucie Filipová

doi: 10.14712/23363231.2021.6

INSTRUCTIONS FOR AUTHORS

1. Manuscript Submission

The journal *Acta Universitatis Carolinae – Studia Territorialia* publishes original scholarly manuscripts that have not been published anywhere else, are not currently awaiting publication in other journals, and are not being considered for publication by another journal. Manuscripts are accepted in English, Czech, and German. In the case of English-language manuscripts, American English is preferred, but British English is also acceptable so long as the quality of the writing meets the necessary standards and the spelling is consistent. Insofar as style is concerned, authors should consult either the Chicago Manual of Style or the Oxford Style Manual.

Manuscripts for consideration are to be uploaded online through the AUC Studia Territorialia journal management system, or sent to the editorial team via the e-mail address stuter@fsv.cuni.cz, in a standard document format (.doc, .docx or .rtf). All correspondence between the author and the editorial team will take place via e-mail.

Manuscripts considered for publication are subject to double-blind peer review. The period between the submission of manuscripts and their return to respective authors for authorization, resubmission of the revised manuscripts based on reviewers' comments, or with an outright rejection will not exceed four months. The editorial team reserves the right to edit the article in accordance with its own editorial standards or to reject the article with no further obligation to provide reasons.

Manuscripts requiring excessive editing due to the failure to respect the journal's editorial guidelines, poor quality of the text or not meeting the necessary language standards will be returned to the respective authors.

2. Author's License Agreement

By submitting their contributions, the authors authorize the editors to sign the publishing contract with the Charles University Karolinum Press. A license agreement with the publisher shall govern the use of the print version of the work. An electronic version will subsequently be published under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives license (CC BY-NC-ND 4.0 International).

3. Editorial Guidelines

The journal publishes articles, book reviews, and reports.

An article should normally be between 6,000 and 9,000 words long (excluding footnotes and abstract), whereas a book review would ideally be 1,500 to 2,500 words long. Longer texts may also be considered if the subject matter warrants such treatment. All articles, regardless of language, must contain an English-language abstract between 100 and 150 words in length as well as four to six keywords.

A submitted manuscript must contain the following items: title page, abstract, keywords, main text, and annexes (if there are any). In a covering letter, the author must provide his or her full name, institutional affiliation, a brief biographical note in the language of the manuscript, an address to which author's copies are to be sent, and additional contact information. Articles by more than one author must have a single contact person designated for the purposes of correspondence.

Words from other alphabets must be provided in the Latin alphabet. A transliteration table valid for the given language must be consulted when transliterating bibliographical items in footnotes (Library of Congress, Oxford Dictionary, ČSN). Standard transcription should be used for foreign terms and names in the main text.

4. Reference Style

Authors should adhere to the classical reference style. References should be presented in the form of footnotes. Bibliographical information from consulted works should be included in the footnotes themselves, not in a separate bibliography. Journal articles should always include a DOI (Digital Object Identifier), if the journal has one. Electronic sources may be cited including the access date, if appropriate.

5. Reference Examples

Books

One Author or Editor

Richard Sakwa, *Postcommunism: Concepts in the Social Sciences* (Buckingham: Open University Press, 1999), 51–58.

Two Authors or Editors

Roy Allison and Christoph Bluth, eds., *Security Dilemmas in Russia and Eurasia* (London: The Royal Institute of International Affairs, 1998).

Three Authors or Editors

Martha Brill Olcott, Anders Åslund, and Sherman W. Garnett, *Getting it Wrong: Regional Cooperation and the Commonwealth of Independent States* (Washington, DC: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 1999), 105–8.

More than Three Authors or Editors

Viktor N. Rudenko et al., eds., *Politicheskaia nauka i gosudarstvennaia vlast' v Rossiiskoi Federatsii i Novykh Nezavisimykh Gosudarstvakh* (Ekaterinburg: Ural'skoe otdelenie Rossiskoi Akademii Nauk, 2004).

Chapter or Other Part of a Book

Branislav Makyta, "Energetický dialóg EÚ a RF," in *Energie pro Evropu: energetická spolupráce Ruska a zemí postsovětského prostoru s Evropskou unií,* ed. Bohuslav Litera et al. (Praha: Eurolex Bohemia, 2006), 50–72.

Introduction, Foreword, or Similar Part of a Book

Anatol Lieven, Preface to *An Endless War: The Russian-Chechen Conflict in Perspective*, by Emil Souleimanov (Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 2007), 13–15.

Electronically-Published Books

Catherine Guicherd, *The Enlarged EU's Eastern Border: Integrating Ukraine, Belarus and Moldova in the European Project*, SWP-Studien 2000/S 20 (Berlin: Stiftung Wissenschaft und Politik, 2002), 31–32, http://swp-berlin.org/common/get_document.php?asset_id=319.

Repeated Citation

Makyta, "Energetický dialóg," 66.

Olcott, Åslund, and Garnett, *Getting It Wrong*, 80–84.

Consecutive Citation

Ibid., 66–69.

Journals

Article in a Print Journal

Zbigniew Brzezinski, "The Premature Partnership," *Foreign Affairs* 73, No. 2 (March/April 1994): 67–82, doi: 10.2307/20045920.

Article in an Online Journal

Farkhad Tolipov, "Uzbekistan and Russia: Alliance against a Mythic Threat?" *Central Asia-Caucasus Analyst* 7, No. 1 (January 11, 2006): 3–5, www.cacianalyst.org/files/20060111Analyst.pdf.

Item in an Online Database

Halford J. Mackinder, "Modern Geography, German and English," *The Geographical Journal* 6, No. 4 (1895): 367–79, http://www.jstor.org/stable/1773888.

Book Review

Cameron Ross, review of *Political Parties in the Regions of Russia: Democracy Unclaimed*, by Grigorii V. Golosov, *Slavic Review* 63, No. 4 (Winter 2004): 898–99.

Newspapers and Magazines

Svante Cornell, "The War That Russia Wants," *The Guardian*, August 8, 2008.

Markus Feldenkirchen and Horand Knaup, "Schulz Heads to Berlin. The Man Who Could Shake Up German Politics," *Spiegel Online*, November 25, 2016, http://www.spiegel.de/international/germany/eu-parliament-president-schulz-could-shake-up-german-politics-a-1123130.html.

Theses and Doctoral Dissertations

Jeff Sahadeo, "Creating a Russian Colonial Community: City, Nation, Empire in Tashkent, 1865–1923" (Doctoral Dissertation, University of Illinois, 2000), 96–108, 116.

Presentations at Symposia, Meetings or Conferences

Jonathan Wheatley, "Democratization in Georgia since 2003: Revolution or Repackaging?" (Paper presented at the Third International Workshop for Young Scholars, Slavic Research Center, Hokkaido University, Sapporo, Japan, July 5, 2006).

Archives and Manuscript Collections

Sh. Z. Eliava and G. I. Broido to the People's Commissariat of Foreign Affairs, V. I. Lenin, L. D. Trotsky and L. B. Krasin, telegram, Tashkent, December 27, 1919, file 588, fol. 13, container 4-39-43, Chicherin Papers, Foreign Policy Archive of the Russian Federation, Moscow.

Interviews

Published and Broadcast Interviews

Paris Hilton, Interview with Larry King, *Larry King Live, CNN,* June 28, 2007.

Unpublished Interview

Petr Šochman (EC Directorate General for Competition), interview with author, September 24, 2008.

Unattributed Interview

Interview with a Border Guard officer, August 28, 1998.

Website

"Growth of Welfare of Kazakhstan's Citizens is the Primary Goal of State Policy. Address by the President of the Republic of Kazakhstan H. E. Mr. Nursultan Nazarbayev to the People of Kazakhstan," Official Site of the President of the Republic of Kazakhstan, accessed October 2, 2008, http://www.akorda.kz/www/www_akorda_kz.nsf/

sections?OpenForm&id_doc=0793D9432423DDE5062573EC0048005B&lang=en&L1=L2&L2=L2-22.

Stephen Blank, „The Russian Balance Sheet at Hangzhou," *Atlantic Council* (blog), September 7, 2016, http://www.atlanticcouncil.org/blogs/new-atlanticist/the-russian-balance-sheet-at-hangzhou.

Personal Communication

Hans-Uwe Stahlmann, e-mail message to author, December 29, 2007.

Adapted from *The Chicago Manual of Style*, 16th ed. (Chicago: Chicago University Press, 2010), 653–784.

Please consult our web site https://stuter.fsv.cuni.cz for further details, including the Ethics and Malpractice Statement.

ACTA UNIVERSITATIS CAROLINAE

STUDIA TERRITORIALIA

XX
2020
2

Published by Charles University,
Karolinum Press, Ovocný trh 560/5, 116 36 Praha 1
Czech Republic
www.karolinum.cz
Typeset by Karolinum Press
Printed by Karolinum Press
MK ČR E 18588
ISSN 1213-4449 (Print)
ISSN 2336-3231 (Online)