

(Un)Rühmliche Opfer?
Die Paradigmen der
europäischen Gedächtnispolitik
auf dem Prüfstand

*(In)Glorious Victims?
Challenging the Paradigms
of Memory Politics in Europe*

27.-29.11.2017

Palais Epstein
1010 Wien, Dr.-Karl-Renner-Ring 1

SIMON WIESENTHAL CONFERENCE

WIENER WIESENTHAL INSTITUT
FÜR HOLOCAUST-STUDIEN (VWI)

Simon Wiesenthal Conferende 2017

Abstracts & CVs

Daniele Giglioli (Università degli Studi di Bergamo) Keynote: A Critique of Victimhood. An Experiment in Ethics	4
Peter Pirker (Universität Wien) Shaping Victims. Agents of Memory and Memory Regimes in Austria in the European Context	6
Fiorenza Loiacono (Università degli Studi di Bari Aldo Moro) 'Unthinkability' and 'Incomprehensibility'. Cultural, Social and Psychological Factors Impairing the Representation of the Shoah Within Society	7
Kitty Millet (San Francisco State University) The Constitutive Side of Victimisation the Holocaust	8
Oonagh Hayes (Universität Tübingen/GESIS Cologne) Victims, Sacrifices, and Perpetrators Hidden in Plain Sight. Concepts of Victimhood in Common War Memorials	9
Zoë Roth (Durham University) The Other Vichy: Algerian Jews, Racial Politics, and the Holocaust in North Africa	11
Dirk Rupnow (Universität Innsbruck) Die „neue Unübersichtlichkeit“. Holocaust-Erinnerung im Zeitalter des Trumpismus	12
Lidia Zessin-Jurek (Europa-Universität Viadrina, Frankfurt/Oder) Between Hitler and Stalin. New Trends in the Memory Culture of the Polish Jewish Deportees to Siberia	14
Joanna Michlic (University College of London) “At the Cross-Roads”. Jedwabne and the Polish Historiography of the Holocaust	15
Sławomir Kaprański (Uniwersytet Pedagogiczny, Kraków) “Thieves of Suffering”. The Non-Memory of the Holocaust in Poland as Mnemonic Security	16
Alicja Podbielska (Vienna Wiesenthal Institute for Holocaust Studies – VWI) The Righteous Victims. Memory of Help to Jews as a New Mode of Holocaust Memory in Poland	17
Edith Raim (Universität Augsburg) Commemoration through Trials?	19
Valentina Pisanty (Università degli Studi di Bergamo) Paradigm Shifts. From Heroes to Victims to Survivors	20
Ljiljana Radonić (Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Wien) Narratives of Collective Victimhood and Individual Victims in Post-Communist Memorial Museums	21

Marie Dominique Asselin (Ottawa) The Foundation of the Second Republic of Poland as a Vector of Violence During the German Occupation. Deconstruction of the Polish National Narratives of Victimhood for a Better Understanding of Polish-Jewish Relations.	23
Amy King (University of Bristol) A Martyr for Antifascism. International Commemoration of Giacomo Matteotti	24
Anna Wylegała (Polska Akademia Nauk, Warszawa) (In)Glorious Heroes, (not) our Victims. Remembering Holocaust in Contemporary Ukraine	25
Gábor Egry (Politikátörténeti Intézet, Budapest) The Trauma that Never Was? Trianon, Politics of Memory, Victimhood and Trauma in Post-Communist Hungary	27
Georgi Verbeeck (Universiteit Maastricht) The Holocaust Paradigm in an Age of Competing Memories	28
Thomas Lutz (Stiftung Topographie des Terrors, Berlin) Gedenken und Identitätspolitik in Deutschland. Opfergruppen des NS-Regimes zwischen Anerkennung und Verdrängung	29
Alexandru Muraru (Universitatea „Alexandru Ioan Cuza“ din Iași) Victimhood, Denial, Mystification and Political Instrumentalization in the Early 90s. The Romanian Case of Competing Memories and Political Rehabilitation of Marshal Ion Antonescu	30
Kateryna Budz (Kyiv) Remembering the Second World War. Ukrainian Greek Catholics under the Soviet and German Occupation of Galicia	32
Angela Boone (Independent Researcher, Driebergen) Memory Politics. The Forgotten Operation Black Tulip and the Commemoration of Srebrenica	33
Evgenia Ivanova / Velcho Krustev (Stara Zagora) Holocaust, Historical Memory, Archival Documents. The Case of Romani in Bulgaria	34
Mykola Borovyk (Ludwig-Maximilian-Universität München) “There is the Place of Our Golgotha Now”. The Tragedy of Babyn Yar and the Narratives of Victimhood in Kyiv Notes by Iryna Khoroshunova	36
Anastasia Felcher (Sankt Petersburg) “Our Suffering” versus “Your Suffering”. At the Cross-Roads. Non-reconciliatory Rhetoric in the Holocaust Scholarship and Public Discourse in Moldova	37
Marta Simó (Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona) Spanish Narratives of the Holocaust and the Second World War, their Antecedents, and their Consequences	38

Daniele Giglioli
(Università degli Studi di Bergamo)

Keynote: A Critique of Victimhood. An Experiment in Ethics

Why has the Victim become the Hero of our time? What paradigm shift has caused contemporary societies to identify more and more with a figure of utter impotence and passivity such as the Victim? Why has the status of Victimhood become the object of social envy, to the point of determining that disconcerting phenomenon referred to as “the competition of victims”? What gives witnesses – once marginal characters both in the field of historical studies and in the theory and practice of literature – a unique relevance that they were never granted before? A post-democratic society such as ours, undergoing a blatant deficit of legitimisation, finds a powerful instrument of self-justification in its constant appeal to victimary mythology. Being a Victim warrants identity in a time obsessed by the quest of identity (rather than subjectivity, which is something one *does*, not something one *is*). Victimhood guarantees recognition (a category that in postmodern politics has taken the place of an aspiration to equality). And it offers a chance to possess, as if it were a form of personal property, a story that everybody is obliged to listen to, in a time when everybody is eager to tell their story but nobody has much time for anyone else’s.

daniele.giglioli@unibg.it

Daniele Giglioli, Researcher and Professor for Comparative Literary Theory at the Dipartimento di Lettere e Filosofia of the University of Bergamo. His publications include *Senza trauma. Scrittura dell'estremo e narrativa del nuovo millennio* (2011) and *Critica della vittima* which was translated into German as *Die Opferfalle. Wie die Vergangenheit die Zukunft fesselt*.

Chair:

Éva Kovács (Vienna Wiesenthal Institute for Holocaust Studies – VWI)

eva.kovacs@vwi.ac.at

Éva Kovács, sociologist, studied sociology and economics at the Universities of Economics in Pécs and Budapest, PhD 1994, habilitation 2009. She is Head of the Department of Methodology and History of Sociology in the Institute of Sociology at the Hungarian Academy of Sciences. Her research fields are the history of the Holocaust in Eastern Europe, memory and remembrance, Jewish identity in Hungary and Slovakia. She authored five monographs, edited eight volumes and published numerous articles in peer-reviewed journals. She co-founded the audiovisual archive “Voices of the Twentieth Century” and was a member of the VWI International Academic Board from 2010 to September 2012. Éva Kovács is Research Programme Director at the Vienna Wiesenthal Institute for Holocaust Studies (VWI) since October 2012.

Panel 1: Representations of Victimhood

Monday, 27 November 2017
13:30 – 15:50

Chair: Béla Rásky (Vienna Wiesenthal Institute for Holocaust Studies – VWI)

belarasky@vwi.ac.at

Béla Rásky, historian, studied history and history of art at the University of Vienna. Contributed to numerous projects and exhibitions in contemporary history, research at the Österreichische Kulturdokumentation. Internationales Archiv für Kulturanalysen, expert on Cultural Policy for the Council of Europe, until 2003 director of the Austrian Science and Research Liaison Office, Budapest; then freelance and at the Wien Museum. Currently, he is Managing Director of the VWI.

Peter Pirker
(Universität Wien)

Shaping Victims. Agents of Memory and Memory Regimes in Austria in the European Context

In Austria during the last twenty years, the politics of remembrance regarding the country's Fascist and National Socialist past has – according to many observers – changed considerably. Among other things, one key feature of the so-called *Neue Erinnerungskultur* was a move away from national self-reference – in one way or another centred on the infamous victim myth – and a turn towards positioning remembrance in frames beyond the nation.

Against the background of a recently conducted survey of all relevant memorials erected in Vienna since 1945, I will analyse what is actually new in the politics of remembrance performed in Austria during the last ten to fifteen years in terms of shaping victimhood. I will tackle this question through an analysis of the character of mnemonic actors and the constellation of power among the relevant actors. Building on the theory of politics of memory developed by Michael Bernhard and Jan Kubik, I will present a concept of memory regimes that differentiates fractured (1945-1965; 1988-2005), pillarised (1956-1988), and dominant (2006-present) patterns of memory politics.

Within this framework, I will analyse the respective positions and shapes of 'victims' and 'victimhood' in politics of remembrance. Subsequently, I will discuss the findings referring to international debates on politics of remembrance as an arena of democratisation in terms of a broader social reconstruction of national identity and transnational identity-building through the inclusion of hitherto "forgotten victims" of state violence and discrimination. Finally, I will draw some conclusions on patterns of shaping victims and their political value in the national and European context.

peter.pirker@univie.ac.at

Peter Pirker is a postdoc researcher at the Department of Governance, University of Vienna and Co-Principal Investigator of the project "Politics of Remembrance and the Transition of Public Spaces. A Political and Social Analysis of Vienna" (2014-2017). Current projects: *re_map*. A digital map of remembrance for Vienna; Operation Greenup. Transnational Resistance, Liberation and Memory.



Fiorenza Loiacono
(Università degli Studi di Bari Aldo Moro)

'Unthinkability' and 'Incomprehensibility'. Cultural, Social and Psychological Factors Impairing the Representation of the Shoah Within Society

According to Primo Levi, the victims of the Shoah should not be glorified, since their death is nothing heroic but rather devastating. Yet, in the last decades rhetorical or "sugar-coated" narratives have spread widely in the global public sphere, involving politics, media, and education. The representation of Anne Frank, for instance, is an example of how the story of an annihilated human being has been encircled over time by a 'sacralised' aura. The most appalling aspects of her story have been 'hidden' by a comforting vision, aimed to stress Anne Frank's confidence in human beings and to celebrate universal values, such as fraternity and peace. The result is often that of producing an unanchored vision which prevents people from truly reflecting on the dynamics that led to the destruction of her life. Popular culture, the traumatic impact of the Shoah, and the denial of historical responsibilities have influenced the shaping of this process. In particular, several studies have highlighted how dealing with the memory of the Shoah may have traumatic implications, especially when an adequate historical knowledge is lacking.

Therefore the sense of 'unthinkability' and 'incomprehensibility' related to this historical event risks to be accentuated by several factors not properly managed, pushing to search for comforting contents and psychological distance. In these cases, the process of remembrance ends up becoming a rhetorical, empty, and useless ritual, nullifying the attempts to spread real knowledge and comprehension within society.

This paper aims to highlight which conditions may worsen the sense of 'unthinkability' and 'incomprehensibility' associated with the memory of the Shoah.

fiorenza.loiacono@uniba.it

Fiorenza Loiacono is a researcher in the field of political education and a psychoanalytically oriented psychotherapist. She received a PhD in Educational Dynamics and Political Education (University of Bari, Italy) and an MSc and postgraduate degree in Clinical Psychology (University of Padova, Italy). In 2015, she was a Visiting Research Fellow at The Hebrew University in Jerusalem. She also works as a journalistic contributor. Following an interdisciplinary approach, her research interests are related to memory studies, trauma and memory, psychological dynamics of violence, human rights education, focussing her attention on the necessity of developing critical thinking and individual responsibility within society. Her theoretical framework encompasses authors such as S. Freud, S. Ferenczi, T.W. Adorno, P. Freire, H. Arendt, and G. Anders.

Kitty Millet
(San Francisco State University)

The Constitutive Side of Victimisation the Holocaust

In *Eine Reise*, H.G. Adler's novel of one family's murder during the Holocaust, Paul Lustig, the family's sole survivor, escapes from a camp through a sea of ashes. He emerges outside, on a road, surrounded by a crowd of "Anybodies" that march "from rubble to rubble". Each "Anybody" is interchangeable with any other. When he attempts to find his way home to Stupart, this anonymous crowd transforms into "unrecognisable voices", clamouring about liberation, but lacking any idea of the specific experiences of victimisation in the nearby camp. Consequently, Adler positions the crowd around a "plague memorial", implying that it is a collective representation of all victims during the Holocaust.

Paul realises that the crowd tears into a rabbit, eating it raw, and he remembers suddenly his sister's screams just before her death in the camp; she begged her captors to remember her as their "little pet rabbit" who had entertained them. She had been their plaything and she pleads for them to spare her because they share history. In horror, Paul screams and implores the crowd not to eat "her". They respond that they are entitled to eat "it" as they have suffered too. They are hungry. Paul turns away to find his own way home.

My short summary of Adler's novel hints at the problem of presuming that the Holocaust can be shared equally as an object of knowledge because for victims of death camps, the event is never just an object of historical epistemology. As an object, scholars describe persecution usually in terms of its quantification – how many were affected? – and the causes we ascribe to its occurrence – why did it happen? The amount of data gathered becomes meaningful objectively, through patterns we deduce in order to construct a causality behind events. These patterns posit a narrative, a history. Thus, histories of persecution include the number of dead and maimed, the property lost: the objects scholars can list, the data they can collect, and the bodies they can count, always with a view to revealing the causes of persecution. This production of knowledge weights quantification over qualification to the extent that, as Imre Kertész and Jean Améry once argued, survivors have become obstacles to the collective memorialisation of the Holocaust. It has become important to exclude the subjective experience of Jewish victims, a thesis advanced by Dirk Moses, in favour of subsuming the event within history. To that end, we have to understand how scholars currently view persecution as an object, the unarticulated concepts that legislate the interpretation of its data and what is lost, inevitably, in discussions of persecution that do not focus on, or even include, victim experiences.

This paper traces the subjective experiences of victims in two related groups – Poles under Nazi rule and Jewish extermination camp deportees – to compare the concepts and principles they used to survive different forms of persecution. From the outlines of these experiences, I examine victims' intuition of persecution to demonstrate that the epistemologies of persecution are not necessarily reducible to each other, although different victim groups share the same historical data or even the same historical oppressor. This difference presupposes that persecution extends beyond its role as data because it seeps into a victim's *sensus communis*, internalised as part of a sensibility about the self and how that self belongs to an imagined community. I ask if it is possible to describe, as Thomas Kühne did for Wehrmacht and Nazi soldiers, the "constitutive side rather than the destructive side" of persecution for these two specific groups of victims?

kmillet1@sfsu.edu

Kitty Millet, Professor of Modern Jewish Thought and Comparative Jewish Literatures. ICLA Research Committee on Religion, Ethics and Literatur

Oonagh Hayes
(Universität Tübingen/GESIS Cologne)

Victims, Sacrifices, and Perpetrators Hidden in Plain Sight. Concepts of Victimhood in Common War Memorials

War memorials imply concepts of victimhood that are taken for granted. These concepts were rarely reflected upon by local decision-makers who designed them; nevertheless, they correspond to notions of collective identity and are precise responses to power relations at the time of their creation. As monuments are modified or taken down if they become inopportune, they are also representative of the society and times in which they stay unaltered. For this reason, concepts of victimhood that were materialised for instance in the 1950s and 1960s, and that are still to be found in virtually every town and village, should be critically analysed. This paper attempts to unveil occurrences of various concepts of victimhood, using the memorial landscape of a middle-sized German city as a case study. The goal is to observe 'usual' remembrance, so as to define which 'common' concepts of victimhood are widespread today, as they are not in the limelight of national and international attention.

Considering the wordings and iconographies of over twenty memorials, the paper will elaborate a typology of the victims commemorated and how this evolved in different post-war periods. 'Fallen' soldiers, civilians, and war criminals are (or are not) encompassed within the German term 'Opfer', which can be understood either as 'victim' or as 'sacrifice'. Further elements of the monuments contribute to a more precise definition of the intended meaning. Most importantly, the analysis leads to an explicit statement about which victims are included and which are excluded from the collective memory of a given period. In doing so, we can reconstruct the limit drawn by the historical actors, thereby defining war monuments as historical objects, and detaching them from a romanticised, a-historical, and uncritical view that glorifies war memorials without distinction regarding their content and that ignores any deliberate choice to later draw the line otherwise and recognise victims of the Holocaust and of Nazi persecutions. Assuming that collective memory defines our society, we must pay attention to the whole spectrum of memory landscapes.

oonagh.hayes@gesis.org

Oonagh Hayes graduated in History from the University of Tübingen in 2006. Her PhD is a French-German comparison of collective memories of wars and genocides in the public sphere from the First World War until today. She is also involved in various projects for historical and political education, often involving research and vulgarisation of National Socialism and/or current forms of discrimination, as well as the formation processes of mainstream narratives.

Panel 2: Looking in from Outside

Monday, 27 November 2017
16:20 – 18:05

Chair: Béla Rásky (Vienna Wiesenthal Institute for Holocaust Studies – VWI)

belarasky@vwi.ac.at

Béla Rásky, historian, studied history and history of art at the University of Vienna. Contributed to numerous projects and exhibitions in contemporary history, research at the Österreichische Kulturdokumentation. Internationales Archiv für Kulturanalysen, expert on Cultural Policy for the Council of Europe, until 2003 director of the Austrian Science and Research Liaison Office, Budapest; then freelance and at the Wien Museum. Currently, he is Managing Director of the VWI.

Zoë Roth
(Durham University)

The Other Vichy: Algerian Jews, Racial Politics, and the Holocaust in North Africa

The 1870 Crémieux Decree granted French citizenship to the majority of Algerian Jews. The French *mission civilisatrice* created an 'in-between' population between the French colonisers and the Arab and Berber colonised, setting up a divisive political system whose tensions would emerge later on. In 1943, Algerian Jews' citizenship was revoked under Vichy racial laws, but the community was not deported to concentration camps, leaving it embattled but largely intact. During the War of Independence, however, it was a victim of both French paramilitaries and Algerian nationalists. Following independence, most Algerian Jews moved to mainland France. They were marginalised from a Jewish community shaped by the trauma of the Shoah, while the majority culture, invested in heroic narratives of resistance to Fascism, saw them as an unwelcome reminder of colonial humiliation.

The Holocaust thus reverberated across Algeria unevenly. It provides a distinct site through which to explore both the specificity of Jewish victimhood and the Holocaust's transnational nature, in particular its connection to longer histories of European imperialism and colonialism in Africa. Scholars such as Michael Rothberg and Debarati Sanyal have explored the nature of Holocaust memory in France when it comes into contact with memories of colonialism. But despite a long tradition of Maghrebi Jewish writers, including Jacques Derrida, Albert Memmi, and Hélène Cixous, writing about experiences of living under Vichy racial laws, little scholarship has addressed specifically Algerian experiences of the Holocaust. This paper argues that Algerian Jews represent a paradigm of 'deferred victimhood'. It explores how literature, in particular, enables these writers to imagine connections between traumatised communities: Jewish, Arab, French, Algerian. In doing so, the paper argues that the 'belated' nature of Jewish victimhood in Algeria provides a model that decentres Eurocentric narratives of victimisation.

zoe.roth@durham.ac.uk

Dr. Zoë Roth is Assistant Professor of French at Durham University. Her research focuses largely on two things: bodies and Jews. She has been awarded grants and fellowships by the Vienna Wiesenthal Institute, the Harry Ransom Center (UT Texas at Austin), the British Academy, and the Leverhulme Trust. She has articles published and forthcoming in such journals as *Word & Image* and the *Journal of Modern Literature* on Jewish literature and visual culture, the Holocaust, and aesthetic form.

Dirk Rupnow
(Universität Innsbruck)

Die „neue Unübersichtlichkeit“. Holocaust-Erinnerung im Zeitalter des Trumpismus

Eine Reihe überraschender Aussagen Donald Trumps selbst sowie offizielle Verlautbarungen des Weißen Hauses während der ersten Wochen und Monate der Trump-Präsidentschaft legen nahe, (wieder einmal) über den aktuellen Stand der Holocaust-Erinnerung im globalen Kontext nachzudenken: Will man – zugegebenermaßen wohl etwas verfrüht und dementsprechend sehr vorsichtig – eine Art Trump'sche Geschichtspolitik analysieren, wird man in diesem Zusammenhang auch seine Äußerungen zur „African American History“ und zum Bürgerkrieg beachten müssen. In Europa werden währenddessen Holocaust-Bezüge zur Skandalisierung gegenwärtiger Abschottungspolitiken gegenüber Migranten wie auch zur Disziplinierung von Migranten in europäischen Gesellschaften verwendet.

Der Vortrag versucht, den aktuellen Stand und die gegenwärtigen Herausforderungen der Holocaust-Erinnerung im europäischen, ‚westlichen‘ und globalen Kontext zu skizzieren. Aufgeworfen werden damit (erneut) Fragen nach der Bedeutung der Holocaust-Erinnerung in den europäischen Migrationsgesellschaften, nicht zuletzt in Zeiten der als krisenhaft wahrgenommenen Zuwanderung nach Europa und der daraus resultierenden Abschottungstendenzen sowie eines sich deutlich zeigenden Rassismus und einer im stetigen Wachsen begriffenen Islamophobie; und gleichzeitig nach dem globalen Konkurrenzverhältnis zwischen der Erinnerung an den Holocaust und an die Verbrechen europäischer Kolonialmächte in der Welt sowie deren Stellenwert in einem europäischen Gedächtnis – allesamt nicht neu, aber weiterhin bzw. wohl zunehmend relevant und umstritten, wie sich zeigt.

dirk.rupnow@uibk.ac.at

Studium der Geschichte, Germanistik, Philosophie und Kunstgeschichte in Berlin und Wien. Mag. phil. 1999 (Wien), Dr. phil. 2002 (Klagenfurt), Habilitation 2009 (Wien). 1999/2000 Mitarbeiter der Historikerkommission der Republik Österreich. Gastaufenthalte in Deutschland, Frankreich, Israel und den USA, 2016/17 Distinguished Visiting Austrian Chair Professor / Stanford University. Seit 2010 Leiter des Instituts für Zeitgeschichte / Universität Innsbruck. Forschungsschwerpunkte: Europäische Geschichte des 20./21. Jahrhunderts, Holocaust- und Jüdische Studien, Wissenschafts- und Migrationsgeschichte, Erinnerungskulturen und Geschichtspolitik, Museologie.

Panel 3: Victimhood in Move: Memory Politics in Today's Poland

Tuesday, 28 November 2017
10:00 – 12:20

Chair: Gerhard Baumgartner (Dokumentationsarchiv des österreichischen Widerstands)

gerhard.baumgartner@doew.at

Gerhard Baumgartner is Director of the Documentation Centre of the Austrian Resistance, co-author of two monographs edited by the Austrian Historikerkommission about "Aryanisation" in Burgenland, Amstetten, Baden, Hollabrunn, Horn, Korneuburg, Krems, Neunkirchen, St. Pölten, Stockerau, Tulln, Waidhofen a.d. Thaya (Wien 2004), project leader of the project "Name-Database of Austrian Holocaust Victims among the Roma and Sinti", and author of *The Fate of the European Roma and Sinti During the Holocaust*, Wien/Paris 2013.

Lidia Zessin-Jurek

(Europa-Universität Viadrina, Frankfurt/Oder)

Between Hitler and Stalin. New Trends in the Memory Culture of the Polish Jewish Deportees to Siberia

The memory of the Polish Jews who survived the war in Soviet exile does not belong to the mainly Catholicised Polish memory culture of the Gulag, nor has it been truly embraced by the Holocaust culture of remembrance. This is the case in great part because the survivors themselves, paralysed by the enormity of the Holocaust which they had managed to escape, rarely demanded a commemoration of their own experience and questioned their own status as victims.

This paper analyses the factors which preempted memorialisation in the past. It also describes the present moment in which the de-territorialised and free-floating memory of the Polish Jewish forced labourers in Siberia is slowly assuming shape. An important question in this respect is to what extent the recent boom in the published memoirs and historical research on this topic imply that we may be witnessing a birth of a new culture of remembrance.

jurek.lidia@gmail.com

Lidia Zessin-Jurek teaches at the European University Viadrina, Frankfurt/Oder. She holds a PhD from the European University Institute, Florence, has been a Fellow at the Imre-Kertész Kolleg, Jena, the European Holocaust Research Infrastructure, and in 2018 will be a Research Fellow at Fordham University, New York.



“At the Cross-Roads”. Jedwabne and the Polish Historiography of the Holocaust

In 2009, the eminent Polish historian Jerzy Jedlicki named the difficulty of disseminating the historical accounts of the uncomfortable dark aspects of Polish-Jewish relations during the Holocaust to broader segments of Polish society as ‘powerlessness’ (bezradność). At the same time, he regarded as a cultural renewal the process of self-critical assessments of the Polish national past on the part of public intellectuals, including professional historians. The Jedwabne debate of 2000-2002, triggered by the publication of Jan Tomasz Gross’s book *Neighbors* in May 2000, facilitated this renewal. Gross’s *Neighbors* set out a definite counter-memory to all narratives of the accepted old, biased, hegemonic historical canon of Polish-Jewish relations and Polish society during the Second World War. That canon spoke about the solidarity of the greater majority of Poles with Jews and minimalised the issue of blackmailing and any other wrongdoings directed at Jewish fugitives to a small group of individuals defined as outside the healthy fabric of Polish society. That canon had developed in its different versions including those tinted by overt antisemitic tropes of the ‘ungrateful Jew’ in the post-war period from 1945 to the end of Communism in 1989–1990s.

Today, in the post-Jedwabne debate era, (2002–present), the Jedwabne massacre of Jews by their Polish neighbours on 10 July 1941 does not simply function as a single, painful, and shameful historical fact. Jedwabne has become the key symbol of the counter-memory of the old, biased, hegemonic narratives of the Holocaust disseminated between 1945 and the 1990s, and as such demands both a full scale archaeology and an integration of all events representing a difficult and painful past in Polish-Jewish relations before, during, and after the Holocaust into the historical narratives of twentieth-century Polish social history and the Holocaust of Polish Jewry.

In this paper, I will examine the current memory wars over Jedwabne in the Polish press and historiography. I will discuss the key centres of amnesia and resistance to the difficult past related to the treatment of the Polish Jewish community in Nazi-occupied Poland. My main argument is that in the current political climate, we can observe an intensified campaign defined by its chief disseminators as ‘a total war’ against the archaeology of the difficult past in relation to the Holocaust. Suppression, omission, obfuscation, skilful manipulation of the difficult past with an emphasis on one’s own suffering (and of one’s own ethnic collective), and aggressive attempts using a wide variety of social media and new laws to silence the difficult past are the key strategies of returning to or rather rewriting new terms of amnesia. Right-wing, ethno-nationalist, conservative politicians, clergymen, journalists, and writers are the driving force behind this process.

Why is the proclamation of telling history ‘anew’ in all its complexities met with the insistence to suppress and reject the difficult past in Poland and other parts of Eastern Europe? Is the new amnesia represented by the right-wing nationalist elites a form of the old amnesia developed during the Communist era, 1945–1989? There are the salient questions that I will address in the paper.

j.michlic@ucl.ac.uk

Joanna Beata Michlic is a social and cultural historian and founder and first director of the HBI (Hadassah-Brandeis Institute) project on Families, Children, and the Holocaust at Brandeis University. She is an Honorary Senior Research Associate at the UCL Centre for the Study of Collective Violence, the Holocaust and Genocide, UCL Institute for Advances Studies, and an Honorary Senior Associate at the School of Slavonic and East European Studies (SSEES) in London. She teaches at the Leo Baeck College in London. Her latest publication is an edited volume, *Jewish Family 1939–Present. History, Representation, and Memory*, Brandeis University Press/NEUP, January 2017.

Sławomir Kaprański
(Uniwersytet Pedagogiczny, Kraków)

“Thieves of Suffering”: The Non-Memory of the Holocaust in Poland as Mnemonic Security

This paper presents a hypothesis regarding the silencing of the Holocaust in contemporary Polish social memory. In spite of several efforts made after the fall of Communism, the Holocaust is still not critically absorbed and recognised as part of Polish history; it remains commemorated in the public sphere by formalised and institutionalised ceremonies, but is not remembered on the level of communicative social memory. The recognition of the fate of the Jews does not make up an important part of Polish discourse about the Second World War.

I argue that one of the reasons for this silencing of the memory of the Holocaust is the fact that social remembering is understood as part of the process of identity construction/maintenance and the key concept involved in the Polish symbolic construction of identity is one of ‘suffering’. Poles believe to be “chosen people” whose mission is to suffer in history in order to protect virtues and redeem the sins of humanity.

The public commemoration of the Holocaust that followed the encounter with the globalised Holocaust discourse in the 1990s has therefore been perceived as unfair competition and an assault on the cornerstone of Polish identity, as though Jews were trying to identify with Poles (against social exclusion) or deny them the first place in the hierarchy of victims (against the order of the Polish symbolic universe). Therefore, in Polish perceptions of the Holocaust we often see a defensive activation of the antisemitic cultural script in which Jews are presented as attempting to take a place not designed for them and as being to blame for all their misfortunes. This mechanism can be explained as a “mnemonic securitisation” within the theoretical framework of Lacan’s concept of *stealing the jouissance* (which in this context will be re-interpreted as “stealing of suffering” as suffering is precisely Polish masochistic *jouissance*), embedded in Žižek’s interpretation of nationalism and antisemitism.

s_kaprański@hotmail.com

Sławomir Kaprański, PhD, Professor of Sociology at the Pedagogical University of Kraków and a recurrent visiting lecturer at the Centre for Social Studies in Warsaw. He graduated from the Jagiellonian University in Kraków where he also received his PhD in Sociology. For many years associated with the Central European University (Prague, Warsaw, Budapest). His main fields of research are memory and identity, commemoration of the Holocaust, and Roma communities.

Alicja Podbielska

(Vienna Wiesenthal Institute for Holocaust Studies – VWI)

The Righteous Victims. Memory of Help to Jews as a New Mode of Holocaust Memory in Poland

In the early 2000s, a new surge of interest in rescue emerged as a defensive reaction to revelations about Polish complicity in the Holocaust. With the onslaught of right-wing populism, this reaction turned into a backlash. In the current Polish government's politics of memory, the rescuers represent the entire nation's heroism and innocence. The master narrative of universal, altruistic, community-supported assistance fosters uncritical national pride. The Ulma Family Museum of Poles Saving Jews in the Second World War, opened by the Polish president in 2016, and the meeting between the Pope and rescuers in Birkenau a couple of months later, sealed the rescuers' newly esteemed status in Polish national memory. It also put them in the very centre of Holocaust remembrance. This mode of memory focusses on Poles as the major actors and victims, while Jews serve merely as props in the story of Christian sacrifice. It resuscitates the decades-old Polish obsession with primacy in suffering and raises pressing questions about encroaching on the memory of the victims and whitewashing of the past. Can the memory of rescue – if used to suppress discussion of the local population's role in the destruction of Jewish communities – constitute a kind of Holocaust denial? Scrutinising Polish public discourse, this paper examines how the focus on rescue has become the preferred, indeed the only acceptable, mode of Holocaust memory.

Tuesday, 28 November 2017, 11:15
Panel 3: Victimhood in Move: Memory Politics in Today's Poland

alicja.podbielska@vwi.ac.at

Alicja Podbielska, a Junior Fellow at the Vienna Wiesenthal Institute, is a PhD candidate at the Strassler Center for Holocaust and Genocide Studies at Clark University. In her dissertation, *The Memory of Rescue in Poland*, she examines when, how, and why Polish Holocaust rescuers were officially designated national heroes. She has received fellowships from the European Holocaust Research Infrastructure, Yad Vashem, and the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum.

Panel 4: From Trials to Museums

Tuesday, 28 November 2017
14:00 – 15:45

Chair: Kinga Frojimovics (Vienna Wiesenthal Institute for Holocaust Studies – VWI)

kinga.frojimovics@vwi.ac.at

Kinga Frojimovics is historian and archivist, in charge of archiving the correspondence of Simon Wiesenthal at the VWI since March 2017. Different diplomas in history, archaeology, and archival sciences at ELTE University Budapest, PhD at Bar-Ilan University on the religious tendencies of Judaism in Hungary, Head of the Hungarian Department of the Archives at Yad Vashem since 2016.

Edith Raim
(Universität Augsburg)

Commemoration through Trials?

In the immediate post-war period, commemoration was left to survivors who organised ceremonies and published articles and books. Concentration camp memorials were either products of the initiative of the former camp inmates or were used to legitimise the antifascist Socialist state, as in the German Democratic Republic. West German historians were reluctant to touch either the Holocaust or the concentration camps as topics in their research. Only since the early 1980s has this issue undergone a massive change as both German scholars and grassroots historians started to examine the Holocaust and the persecution of minorities during the Third Reich.

This paper elaborates on the idea first put forward by Donald Bloxham in his book *Genocide on Trial. War Crimes Trials and the Formation of Holocaust History and Memory* that the trials played a crucial role in commemoration. It argues that the German path to current Holocaust commemoration would not have been possible without the trials of Nazi crimes which began as early as 1945 and continue to this day.

The judicial dealings with the Nazi past acted as a trailblazer both for commemoration and historical research. While many of the early German trials are now forgotten, the trials of the 1960s (especially the Frankfurt Auschwitz trials) with their international media coverage made obvious that the genocidal past could not be set aside easily. This forced German society to a confrontation with the crimes of the past. Only then did historical research react. While in the 1950s an end of 'transitional justice' was eagerly clamoured for, Nazi trials in the 1960s and 1970s brought Nazi crimes once more to the fore.

Furthermore, the initial purpose (researching the facts of the crime, sentencing the guilty, and sending them to prison) has changed considerably: Today, the trials offer a forum for the last victims to testify to their suffering in Nazi camps. While monuments offer space for commemoration, they usually also close discussion on the topic. Trials, on the other hand, trigger research as well as public discussion.

raimedith@gmail.com

Edith Raim, born in 1965 in Munich, read history and German literature at Munich and Princeton Universities from 1984–1991. She completed a dissertation in Munich on the Jewish satellite camps Kaufering and Mühldorf in 1991, was German Academic Exchange Lecturer at University of Durham, England, from 1991–1995, and a researcher at the Institute for Contemporary history in Munich from 1999–2014, completing a Habilitation in 2012 at Augsburg university with a study on the West German administration of justice and the West German prosecution of Nazi criminals in 1945–1949. She has published several works on concentration camps, Jewish survivors after 1945, and the prosecution of Nazi crimes.

Valentina Pisanty
(Università degli Studi di Bergamo)

Paradigm Shifts. From Heroes to Victims to Survivors

When a historical paradigm becomes hegemonic, it acquires the power to absorb a wide range of diverse experiences within its own set of scripts, values, and recurring metaphors. Such was the case of the Revolutionary Master Narrative, with its heroic history of emancipation and self-determination that shaped the consciousness of European modernity for over a century. Based on the memory of racial persecutions, the narrative of victimhood crushed the revolutionary paradigm: hence its popularity with the liberal ideology that presented itself as post-ideological and humanitarian. Thereafter, it set itself as a universal matrix, saturated with the content of other major or minor traumatic events. In the past few years, several scholars have denounced the limits of the Holocaust narrative as a biopolitical paradigm whose rhetorical corollaries and side-effects are often functional to the preservation of a sense of political and moral order that is presented as indisputable, with the blackmail of absolute evil that makes any minor evil acceptable. On a more general level, teachers, journalists, and other cultural workers are complaining about the saturation deriving from overexposure to the rituals of institutionalised remembrance. My hypothesis is that the phenomenon known as Holocaust fatigue is but the tip of a deeper transformation involving a gradual acknowledgement of the paradigm's failure to encompass the diverse traumatic experiences we are currently struggling to make sense of. With reference to the most recent fictional attempts to convey the so-called 'Holocaust experience', I shall tie my hypothesis to the shift of popular interest from the role of the Victim to that of the Survivor.

valentina.pisanty@unibg.it

Valentina Pisanty is an Italian Semiotologist teaching at the University of Bergamo. Her publications include *L'irritante questione delle camere a gas: logica del negazionismo*, Bompiani 1998/2014, *Semiotica e interpretazione*, with R. Pellerey, Bompiani 2004, *La difesa della razza. Antologia 1938-1943*, Bompiani 2006, *Semiotica*, with A. Zijno, McGraw-Hill 2009, and *Abusi di memoria: negare, banalizzare, sacralizzare la Shoah*, Bruno Mondadori 2012.



Ljiljana Radonić
(Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Wien)

Narratives of Collective Victimhood and Individual Victims in Post-Communist Memorial Museums

After the end of the Cold War the “memory-boom” in western countries has spotlighted the Holocaust as the negative icon of our era. In the course of the ‘Europeanization of the Holocaust’ the EU accession process generated informal standards of confronting and exhibiting the Holocaust. This is indicated by the fact that the Holocaust Memorial Center in Budapest opened almost empty only weeks before Hungary joined the EU although the permanent exhibition had not been ready until 2006. So how do post-communist museums dealing with the World War II period perform given those informal standards? Some museums stress being part of Europe, refer to ‘international standards’ of musealization and claim to focus on ‘the individual victim’. Is this a mere ‘invocation’ of Europe or a proof that new, transnational forms of ‘negative memory’ are spreading? In other memorial museums narratives of Nazi occupation are predominantly used to frame an anti-communist interpretation of history. ‘Threatening’ aspects of the memory of Nazism are ‘contained’ so that it could not compete with stories of Soviet crimes. Yet both kinds of museums refer to the archetypical aesthetics of the US Holocaust Memorial Museum. The House of Terror e.g. adopted the “Tower of faces” by exhibiting portraits of the victims on a wall that ranges up to the roof. These aesthetics originating from the turn towards the individual victim in ‘western’ museology is here placed in a narrative of collective (Hungarian) suffering from Hungarian Nazis and Communists. Does the ostensible equation of Nazi and Communist crimes turn into the struggle to ‘contain’ Holocaust memory while at the same time demonstrating its predominance as the European negative founding myth by adopting its symbolism and aesthetics?

ljiljana.radonic@univie.ac.at

Ljiljana Radonić writes her postdoctoral thesis on the “World War II in Post-Communist Memorial Museums” at the Institute of Culture Studies and Theatre History, Austrian Academy of Sciences (APART fellowship). She teaches at the University of Vienna since 2004 and was a visiting professor at the Center for Jewish Studies in Graz in 2017 and at Gießen University in 2015.

Panel 4: From Trials to Museums
Tuesday, 28 November 2017, 14:50

Panel 5: Rethinking Master Narratives

Tuesday, 28 November 2017
16:15 – 18:00

Chair: Jana Starek (Vienna Wiesenthal Institute for Holocaust Studies – VWI)

jana.starek@vwi.ac.at

Dr. Jana Starek, historian, translator. She works for the Vienna Wiesenthal Institute for Holocaust Studies (VWI) since September 2010. Studied history and Slavic studies at the University of Vienna. Co-founded and worked at the International Helsinki Federation for Human Rights (1982-1990). Director of the Austrian Science and Research Liaison Office Brno (1991-2004). Teaches at the at the University of Defence in Brno and at the University of Vienna. Author of studies and co-author of anthologies on the history of Austro-Czech relations. Contribution to projects on contemporary history, including at the Institute of Contemporary History at the Czech Republic Academy of Sciences, *Documentation of the Fates of Opponents to the Nazi Regime who had to leave Czechoslovakia after the Second World War.*

Marie Dominique Asselin
(Ottawa)

The Foundation of the Second Republic of Poland as a Vector of Violence During the German Occupation. Deconstruction of the Polish National Narratives of Victimhood for a Better Understanding of Polish-Jewish Relations.

If the Holocaust is the only recognised and accepted transnational European historical event, it does not have the same interpretation in every country. In Poland, the dominant narrative regarding the Holocaust has shifted from the Jewish victims to the Polish heroes and martyrs, creating a 'de-judaisation' of the Holocaust. This overshadowing of Jewish memory is a result of the historical politics in place that refuse to recognise local collaboration with the Nazi regime. Today, the national narrative states that the Poles did all they could to protect and save Jews from Nazi policies, even if their lives were on the line. While the Polish government (PiS) highlights the importance of the "Righteous among the Nations", other historians highlight that while some Poles were helping Jews, others were collaborating with the Nazis. The main argument raised by the PiS to explain the violence committed against the Jews is that anti-semitic acts were due to Nazi regulations. Antisemitism has been a long-standing tradition since well before the war.

To deconstruct the present myth put forward by the PiS and to return the memory of the Jewish victims, we need to reconsider Polish-Jewish relations from before the war. To repeat, violence perpetrated by Poles against their Jewish neighbours began before the war. This paper will examine the legal status of Jews through official Polish documents which were at the heart of the reaffirmation of Polish identity (the Minority Treaty, Constitution, Penal Code, and Penal Code of Procedure) in order to look at the deterioration of Polish-Jewish relations on the eve of the Second World War. Thereby, the paper will address the following topics: First, the rebirth of Poland and the writing of its principal democratic documents; second, the creation of the justice system and its codes; and, finally, judicial cases of violence against Jews. This analysis will demonstrate that the violence perpetrated against Jews stood in continuity with pre-war antisemitic acts and were not a result of Nazi regulations.

md.asselin@hotmail.fr

Marie-Dominique Asselin's research examines the fate of the Polish Jews during the Holocaust, as seen through the prism of court records. Her research seeks answers to the various questions relating to everyday life and death in the ghettos, as well as to the nature of relations between Poles and Jews. Finally, here research looks at the role played by the Polish justice system in shaping and altering the fate of Jews whose cases were heard by the court. Currently, Marie-Dominique Asselin is a Saul Kagan Fellow in Advanced Shoah Studies (2016–2018).

Amy King
(University of Bristol)

A Martyr for Antifascism. International Commemoration of Giacomo Matteotti

This paper will address international commemoration of the Socialist politician Giacomo Matteotti. The first prominent victim of Italian Fascism, Matteotti was kidnapped on his way to parliament on 10 June 1924 by men linked to Mussolini's regime. His body was not found until mid-August. Matteotti's death sparked outrage across Italy; strikes occurred, a constant vigil was held at the site of his kidnapping, and protests took place across the country. Aware of the power of Matteotti's martyrdom, Mussolini quickly banned public commemorations and appointed a second-in-command to 'smatteottizzare' (de-Matteottise) Italy. Remembrance was thus pushed into private, domestic spaces, becoming a private act of resistance.

This was not the case abroad. This paper will analyse the narratives employed by Socialist groups and international antifascists in commemoration of Matteotti, showing the pacifist rhetoric employed by the former and the belligerent tone used by the latter. The paper will argue that the status of the battle in which the martyr's memory is wielded shapes the rituals and rhetoric of commemoration. Matteotti's memory was used within the political struggle, which had not yet reached its climax. As such, it held a present-day function, operating as a war-cry to inspire commitment to the on-going fight against Fascism around the globe.

amy@amyking.me

Amy King is a final year PhD candidate in Italian Studies. Her research considers the construction, maintenance, and role of secular martyrdom in contemporary Italy. She is currently a Rome Awardee at the British School at Rome, and a former Kluge Fellow of the Library of Congress, Washington D.C. Amy holds an MA in Cultural Memory and a BA in French and Italian. She was previously a financial journalist.

Anna Wylegala
(Polska Akademia Nauk, Warszawa)

(In)Glorious Heroes, (not) our Victims. Remembering Holocaust in Contemporary Ukraine

To the newly established Ukrainian state, independence in 1991 meant not only necessarily going through a painful process of political and economic transformation, but also facing various moments of its 'difficult past' as well as the possibility to pursue – for the very first time – an independent politics of memory. As in most other countries of East Central Europe, Ukraine's relationship to its history was twofold, focussing on the commemoration of forgotten victims and the glorification of silenced heroes. In the case of Ukraine, it concerned first and foremost victims of the Great Famine – the mass man-made hunger in Soviet Ukraine in 1932/33 – and members and soldiers of the OUN and UPA, the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists and Ukrainian Partisan Army, both actively involved in the fight for an independent Ukrainian state during and after the Second World War.

The Holocaust has never been an important part of Ukrainian memory politics, nor has it become the subject of an influential intellectual debate in Ukrainian society. This paper will explain why Ukrainian victims of the Holocaust have lost in the fight for attention, research, and commemoration, first through the example of the victims of the Holodomor, and second with the UPA partisans. I will argue that while during the first two decades of Ukrainian independence the Holocaust was treated rather instrumentally, as a parallel to the Great Famine ('Holocaust of the Ukrainians'), not without chances for an honest academic and public discussion, the memory politics of the last few years has radically decreased these chances. Several circumstances are to be blamed. What bears mentioning first is the palpable and still not overcome heritage of the decades-long Soviet politics of oblivion, which included Holocaust victims in the general number of the "civilian victims of the war". A passiveness of successive post-1991 governments, lack of funding, and lack of incentive for research and commemoration followed. A great collective will to commemorate other victims, more "our" victims, equally forbidden during Soviet times, is also not without significance.

However, among the most important reasons is the current trend of glorifying the OUN and UPA, to some degree present in Ukrainian memory politics since 1991, but enforced particularly by the government established after the Revolution of Dignity in 2014. While nobody denies the OUN and UPA contribution to the Ukrainian struggle for independent statehood, it is also hard to deny that members of these formations actively participated in the Holocaust. A mass public debate on the variety of attitudes the Ukrainians took towards their Jewish neighbours during the Holocaust has yet to occur, but it is very clear that in the current political situation of frozen war with Russia, a new powerful heroic canon and not the "politics of regret" (borrowing Jeffrey Ollick's term) is needed in Ukrainian society. And the more anti-Russian (anti-Soviet) the new heroes are, the less consent to any critical attitude to them. The research and commemorative activities of the Ukrainian Institute of National Remembrance, the legislative activity of the Verkhovna Rada (Ukrainian parliament), and various grassroots projects confirm this rule persuasively. It is most likely that as long as there is no space for an open discussion on Ukrainian collaboration, the commemoration of Holocaust victims will be limited to the forms not endangering the only accepted vision of national history.

This paper will show that the current need and attempt to consolidate Ukrainian society around a glorious history creates new Ukrainian heroes, but at the same time silences Jewish victims. I will also argue that it is not (only) about the ethnicity of the 'not ours' victims, but rather about the lack of political will and symbolic discomfort that the Jewish victims pose in the current political situation. The same unwillingness to commemorate also concerns other minorities that experienced UPA violence during the war, namely the Poles of Galicia and Volhynia.

annawylegala@gmail.com

Anna Wylegala, Assistant Professor at the Institute of Philosophy and Sociology of the Polish Academy of Sciences; PhD in Sociology, with the thesis on *Displacement and Memory. Study of a Social Memory – Example of Ukrainian Galicia and Polish 'Reclaimed Lands'* which will be published in English in 2018

Panel 6: Memory Politics in Trouble

Wednesday, 29 November 2017
10:00 – 12:20

Chair: Dirk Rupnow (Universität Innsbruck)

dirk.rupnow@uibk.ac.at

Studium der Geschichte, Germanistik, Philosophie und Kunstgeschichte in Berlin und Wien. Mag. phil. 1999 (Wien), Dr. phil. 2002 (Klagenfurt), Habilitation 2009 (Wien). 1999/2000 Mitarbeiter der Historikerkommission der Republik Österreich. Gastaufenthalte in Deutschland, Frankreich, Israel und den USA, 2016/17 Distinguished Visiting Austrian Chair Professor / Stanford University. Seit 2010 Leiter des Instituts für Zeitgeschichte / Universität Innsbruck. Forschungsschwerpunkte: Europäische Geschichte des 20./21. Jahrhunderts, Holocaust- und Jüdische Studien, Wissenschafts- und Migrationsgeschichte, Erinnerungskulturen und Geschichtspolitik, Museologie.

Gábor Egry

(Politikátörténeti Intézet, Budapest)

The Trauma that Never Was? Trianon, Politics of Memory, Victimhood and Trauma in Post-Communist Hungary

Trianon and the dismemberment of Hungary is a cornerstone of the politics of memory in Hungary today. Postulated as a unique catastrophe, the start of a century of suffering never remedied, it epitomises victimhood as the essence of twentieth-century Hungarian history. Since 2010, it is an official commemorative day, inviting Hungarians everywhere to recall suffering and national unity.

Its rationale was officially to overcome the so-called ‘trauma of Trianon’. While social sciences cast doubt over the existence of this trauma, mainstream historiography agrees that the collapse of the country and the subsequent fate of minority Hungarians constitute a trauma as a broad social experience felt by every Hungarian – even today.

This paper argues that the effects of the collapse were at best limited to parts of the middle class. The interwar years offered a broad range of experiences for minority and majority Hungarians, and solidarity towards minority Hungarians was lukewarm at best, despite propaganda efforts. Paradoxically, it was the success of territorial revisions that forced people to obliterate from memory this multiplicity of experiences and that set the stage for the emergence of a more uniform traumatic experience at the end of the Second World War.

In the light of the time that has passed since 1918, it is more appropriate to think of the gradual emergence of Trianon as the symbol of uniform, unitary, and common national suffering as the result of conscious efforts to create a cultural trauma. As an authentic, Hungarian national catastrophe it was often also juxtaposed with the Holocaust. Finally, the acceptance of the trauma of Trianon has become a normative expectation. Thus, with every attempt to overcome it, people are invited to construct their own history of victimhood, leading to a self-feeding cycle of re-traumatisation.

egry.gabor75@gmail.com

Gábor Egry is a historian and director general of the Institute of Political History, Budapest. He researches nationalism, everyday ethnicity, regionalism, and the politics of identity and memory in modern Eastern Europe. He has been a visiting fellow at NEC-IAS, Bucharest, Imre Kertész Kolleg, Jena, and CREES, Stanford University. Currently, he leads the research project “Negotiating post-imperial transitions 1918-1925. A comparative study of local transitions from Austria-Hungary to the successor states”.

Georgi Verbeeck
(Universiteit Maastricht)

The Holocaust Paradigm in an Age of Competing Memories

More than seventy years after the end of the Second World War, the Holocaust remains firmly embedded within Western public memory. The extermination of Jews by Nazi Germany, or rather its universal acknowledgment, has become the 'admission ticket' to the community of civilised European nations (Tony Judt). Those who call into doubt or who do not fully acknowledge the Jewish tragedy condemn themselves to the role of international pariah. Denying or belittling the Holocaust is equal to placing oneself beyond the pale of civilised public discourse. 'Auschwitz', in other words, has become the benchmark of post-1945 European identity. Rather than receding, academic investigations as well as popular representations have increased to the point where those not familiar with this event are a vanishing minority. That the Holocaust has become overwhelmingly present within Western culture and society is beyond doubt, but what remains debatable is the degree to which this increased awareness of literally the worst crime in modern history is necessarily desirable. And indeed, it could be argued that the compensatory ubiquity with which we generally acknowledge, study, and remember the tragic fate of the Jewish people does not come without risks. Serious criticism could be addressed to the omnipresence of the Holocaust in our political discourse and cultural imagination. Questions could be raised not only concerning the political and ideological use of the Holocaust and the expectations regarding the 'lessons' that could be learned, but also on the often unintended moral and pedagogical consequences of 'over-representing' the Holocaust.

However, criticism of the obvious ubiquity of the Holocaust should certainly not be equated with a willingness to erase the Holocaust from our collective memory, but should rather be perceived as a call to critically engage with some problematic aspects of Holocaust education and remembrance and an attempt to promote a different and better understanding of the past. This paper aims at a critical discussion on the uniqueness of the Holocaust in the public imagination and historical research, in an age of competing memories. And more specifically, it asks what impact it has on the notion of victimhood. Since victimhood has long been central to the politics and practices of remembrance, how will a changing memory landscape in Europe in recent years affect the traditional narratives of the emblematic victim?

georgi.verbeeck@maastrichtuniversity.nl

PhD in History at the University of Leuven, Professor of German History, head of the Department of History at the University of Maastricht; most recent publication: *Het Derde Rijk. Een geschiedenis van het nationaalsocialisme*.

Thomas Lutz
(Stiftung Topographie des Terrors, Berlin)

Gedenken und Identitätspolitik in Deutschland. Opfergruppen des NS-Regimes zwischen Anerkennung und Verdrängung

Deutschland wird weltweit für die Art und Weise gelobt, wie es die Geschichte der NS-Verbrechen aufgearbeitet hat. Die in diesem Prozess entwickelte Form der ‚negativen Erinnerung‘ und deren große Bedeutung für die Anerkennung der NS-Opfer wird als Begriff dargestellt.

Das Gedenken hat eine über 70-jährige Entwicklung. Wie Opfergruppen nach Jahrzehnten des Verdrängens um ihre Anerkennung gekämpft haben und wie sich ihre Wahrnehmung in der Gesellschaft, aber auch untereinander mit der Zeit verschoben hat, wird in dem Vortrag dargelegt. Dabei wird in vier Kapiteln die politische Bedeutung der Erinnerung an die NS-Opfer für heute aufgezeigt; sowohl für die deutsche Gesellschaft, als auch für die Gruppen der ehemals Verfolgten:

- Jahrzehntelange ‚affirmative‘ Erinnerung in Deutschland
- Politische und jüdische Überlebendenverbände
- Streit um Opferzahlen – das Beispiel Sinti und Roma
- Wer ist ein NS-Opfergruppe – feministisch-lesbische Forderungen in der Gedenkstätte Ravensbrück

Ziel ist es, das Beispiel Deutschland zu nutzen, um Kategorien für eine gute Ausklärung nach dem Ende einer Verbrechensgesellschaft zu entwickeln, die auch bei der Beurteilung anderer Formen von Diktaturen oder Menschheitsverbrechen angewandt werden können.

lutz@topographie.de

Thomas Lutz, Dr. phil., ist Historiker und Politikwissenschaftler: Er leitet des Gedenkstättenreferats der Stiftung Topographie des Terrors, Berlin. Verantwortlicher Redakteur des GedenkstättenRundbrief und des Online-GedenkstättenForum. Mitglied im Expertengremium der Beauftragten für Kultur und Medien der Bundesregierung für den Bundesgedenkstättenfonds, deutscher Delegierter in der International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance (IHRA), Vorstand des International Committee for Memorial Museums for Victims of State Crimes (IC MEMO im ICOM) und Vorsitzender des internationalen Beirats der Stiftung Brandenburgische Gedenkstätten.

Alexandru Muraru

(Universitatea „Alexandru Ioan Cuza“ din Iași)

Victimhood, Denial, Mystification and Political Instrumentalization in the Early 90s. The Romanian Case of Competing Memories and Political Rehabilitation of Marshal Ion Antonescu

This paper aims at researching the forms, manifestations, and consequences of the post-Communist debate related to the memory of Marshal Ion Antonescu, mass-murder policies, and extermination sites. In post-Communist Romania, in the years when the country was starting the process of becoming an EU member, an enormous societal process took place in which Marshal Ion Antonescu was constructed as a positive image. The “dictator Marshal” who led Romania to the greatest tragedy the nation had ever been involved in was rehabilitated in the early 1990s with the help of state institutions, against the background of an orchestrated ‘memory competition’. Beginning in the 1970s, dictator Ion Antonescu’s rehabilitation had official reasons. The historians of the party developed scientifically justified theses that attempted to free state and society from the guilt of the crimes committed against the Jews as well as to uncritically rehabilitate the army, thus saving Nicolae Ceaușescu’s role as highest leader of the army from the accusation of having participated in the Holocaust. Ion Antonescu’s posthumous rehabilitation, with the endorsement of the political class, fully contributed to his reevaluation in a very close political struggle whose purpose was to discredit the victims of the Holocaust and to develop feelings of victimisation and heroisation of the Romanians and their substitution as the main victims of history and of the great powers.

amuraru@gmail.com

Alexandru Muraru is a Researcher in Political Science in the Department of Research, Faculty of Philosophy and Socio-Political Sciences, Alexandru Ioan Cuza University of Iasi, Romania. He has participated in fellowships and advanced programmes at the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum (USHMM), Royal Holloway, the Geoffrey Nice Foundation in the Netherlands, and Northwestern University among others. He has published one monograph, two edited collections, and dozens of articles in various scientific journals.



Panel 7: Invisible Victims

Wednesday, 29 November 2017
14:00 – 15:45

Chair: Philipp Rohrbach (Vienna Wiesenthal Institute for Holocaust Studies – VWI)

philipp.rohrbach@vwi.ac.at

M.A., Historian, PhD candidate at the Institute for Contemporary History at the University of Vienna. Working at the VWI since 2010. Curator of and collaborator in different projects and exhibitions: „recollecting“ (MAK/Austrian Museum for Applied Arts/Contemporary Art, 2008), „Kampf um die Stadt“ (Wien Museum 2009), „Black Austria. The children of African-American GIs“ (The Austrian Museum of Folk Life and Folk Art, 2016); „Forgotten Children“ and „Lost in Administration. Afro-Austrian GI Children – A Research Project“ (University of Salzburg, 2013-2014, 2015–2017); together with Mag. Adina Seeger, since 2013, head of the project „The Austrian Heritage“ (Verein GEDENKDIENTST/VWI).

Kateryna Budz
(Kyiv)

Remembering the Second World War. Ukrainian Greek Catholics under the Soviet and German Occupation of Galicia

The idea of victimhood is central to the Ukrainian historical narrative. Martyrdom also lies at the heart of the contemporary identity of the Ukrainian Greek Catholic Church (UGCC), the Eastern-rite Catholic Church which was banned in Soviet Ukraine.

During the Second World War, Eastern Galicia, a part of the Second Polish Republic in the interwar period, underwent a triple (Soviet-German-Soviet) occupation. When retreating from Galicia in June 1941, the Soviets murdered 10,000 prison inmates, mostly Ukrainians. By blaming Jews for these NKVD atrocities, Germans provoked the outbursts of anti-Jewish violence. Subsequent pogroms in July 1941 led to the deaths of 12,000 Galician Jews. The events of the summer of 1941 are remembered differently by local Ukrainians and Jews.

The Greek Catholic priests among the June victims were beatified by Pope John Paul II in 2001. Generally, the designation of the UGCC as the “Church of the Martyrs” refers to the Greek Catholics’ suffering under the Soviets, whereas the German occupation is usually remembered as the lesser evil.

Based predominantly on published memoirs and interviews with the former members of the clandestine Church, this paper aims at studying the Greek Catholic narratives of victimhood vis-à-vis the wartime occupation authorities. First, this paper analyses to what extent the Greek Catholic martyrdom discourse is based on the idea of opposition to the Soviet atheist regime. Second, it looks at the current interest in the rescue initiatives of the Greek Catholic hierarchy and clergy during the Holocaust. The paper views the attempts to integrate the rescue efforts on the part of the Greek Catholic clergy into the Church’s collective memory as a pro-European tendency.

katebudz@gmail.com

Kateryna Budz holds a PhD in History from the National University of Kyiv-Mohyla Academy (2016). During 2012–2015, she was a Black Sea Link Fellow at the New Europe College (Bucharest, Romania), an exchange student at the University of Toronto (Canada), and a DAAD Fellow at the Max Planck Institute for Social Anthropology (Halle/Saale, Germany). Her current research focusses on the history of the Ukrainian Greek Catholic Church (UGCC) during the Second World War.

Angela Boone
(Independent Researcher, Driebergen)

Memory Politics. The Forgotten Operation Black Tulip and the Commemoration of Srebrenica

German Jews who fled to the Netherlands were confronted with a triple persecution: prior to the Second World War in Germany, during the war in the Netherlands and after the war by the Dutch government.

At the end of the Second World War, the Dutch government decided to no longer make a distinction between Jews and non-Jews, but to qualify every resident with German nationality as an enemy of the Netherlands (until July 1951). German Jews in the Netherlands had to apply for a non-enemy declaration individually in order not to have their property expropriated and be deported to Germany. From October 1945 onwards, German residents were deported in groups. German Jewish refugees were among the first to be arrested by the Dutch police, imprisoned in internment camps, and deported.

From 11 September 1946 onwards, this post-war ethnic cleansing was named Operation Black Tulip. The post-war deportations lasted far longer than the deportations during the war. According to the Dutch government, the number of disappeared and deceased Germans due to Operation Black Tulip has not been registered. From 15 October 1946 onwards, the Dutch Defence Ministry buried over 31,500 Germans at the Ysselsteyn cemetery in the Netherlands. Thousands of Germans buried there (including an unknown amount of civilians) have so far not been identified. Collective forgetting, silencing, and spatial erasure characterise this dark page in Dutch history.

In July 1995, Dutchbat III was responsible for the protection of Bosnian Muslims who were the target of ethnic cleansing and genocide in Srebrenica. Dutchbat failed to do so, and over 8000 Bosnian Muslims were killed within a few days. Many victims are still missing and many are yet to be identified. The International Court of Justice in The Hague and the International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia have stated that the crimes in Srebrenica were acts of genocide. The cemetery (where currently over 6000 victims are buried) is located opposite the former Dutchbat Headquarters. At the Memorial Centre in Potočari, an attempt has been made to integrate divergent victimhood narratives and different views on the ethnic cleansing and genocide in Srebrenica in 1995.

Srebrenica remains another dark page in Dutch history, but this dark page is exposed to an international audience, whereas the post-war ethnic cleansing in the Netherlands remains unknown to many.

Operation Black Tulip and Srebrenica are two examples of ethnic cleansing in which the Dutch Defence Ministry fulfilled a role. So far no attention has been given to the similarities between Operation Black Tulip and Srebrenica, for example with regard to persecution, deportation, and enforced disappearances.

The Dutch memorandum describes who should be commemorated during the national commemoration in the Netherlands: "During the National Commemoration, we commemorate the Dutch victims of war: all – civilians and military – who in the Kingdom of the Netherlands or wherever in the world passed away or were murdered since the start of the Second World War and after the Second World War in war situations and during peace operations." The purpose of this text was to clarify who should be included in the commemoration and to give direction to national commemoration in the Netherlands. The memorandum was formulated in 1946. In 1961, the war situations and peace operations after the Second World War were added to the text. Only since 2011 was the word 'murdered' added to the text upon request of the Jewish community in the Netherlands, to refer to the deliberate destruction of Jews during the Shoah. According to the memorandum, the German victims of Operation Black Tulip should not be commemorated.

ae_boone@hotmail.com

Angela Boone, MA in Cultural Anthropology (Free University of Amsterdam) and MA in Humanitarian Action (Network On Humanitarian Action, University of Groningen). She has conducted her field research in Southeast China. Currently independent researcher concerning post-war ethnic cleansing in the Netherlands. 2016 Fellow European Holocaust Research Infrastructure (fellowship for conducting archive research at the International Tracing Service in Bad Arolsen). Angela Boone has presented her ongoing research during international scientific conferences in the Netherlands, Belgium, the United Kingdom, Germany and Bosnia.

Evgenia Ivanova / Velcho Krustev
(Stara Zagora)

Holocaust, Historical Memory, Archival Documents. The Case of Romani in Bulgaria

During the last decades, as a result of different politics and economic factors, particular Gypsy/Romani circles have been trying to form a definite politics of memory regarding the Holocaust in Bulgaria. Attempting to correct the Gypsy/Romani collective historical memory themselves, their aim is to prove that a Holocaust against them took place in Bulgaria during the Second World War.

Research of archival documents and long-standing field work does not confirm that. There were no anti-Gypsy laws in Bulgaria and no repressive steps were taken for expropriation of property, deportation, and slaughter. During these years, Gypsies were not excluded in the social and economic policies of the government, excepting some violations of their rights. Gypsies served in the Bulgarian army and were equal in rights in all events in which it engaged.

evgenia_iv@abv.bg / tehnitari@gmail.com

Evgeniya I.Ivanova is an Associate Professor and Head of the ethnographic department in the Regional Historical Museum of Stara Zagora, Bulgaria.

Velcho M. Krustev is president of a managing committee of a regional association of craftsmen "Tehnitary" in Stara Zagora.

Scholarly Interests: Investigation of the history, customs, and traditions, group religious and social belonging, and economic engagement of the Romany and their depiction in books, scientific publications, and scientific forums. Ivanova and Krustev are the authors of eight books on Gypsies / Roma in Bulgaria and numerous articles on these topics. They are engaged in the investigation, collection, and storing of objects connected with the customs, crafts, and traditions of the Romany from a historical point of view and their presentation through mobile exhibitions.

Panel 8: Articulating Suffering in the European Peripheries

Wednesday, 29 November 2017
16:15 – 18:00

Chair: Éva Kovács (Vienna Wiesenthal Institute for Holocaust Studies – VWI)

eva.kovacs@vwi.ac.at

Éva Kovács, sociologist, studied sociology and economics at the Universities of Economics in Pécs and Budapest, PhD 1994, habilitation 2009. She is Head of Department of Methodology and History of Sociology in the Institute of Sociology at the Hungarian Academy of Sciences. Her research fields are the history of the Holocaust in Eastern Europe, memory and remembrance, Jewish identity in Hungary and Slovakia. She authored five monographs, edited eight volumes and published numerous articles in peer-reviewed journals. She co-founded the audiovisual archive “Voices of the Twentieth Century” and was a member of the VWI International Academic Board from 2010 to September 2012. Éva Kovács is Research Programme Director at the Vienna Wiesenthal Institute for Holocaust Studies (VWI) since October 2012.

Mykola Borovyk
(Ludwig-Maximilian-Universität München)

“There is the Place of Our Golgotha Now”. The Tragedy of Babyn Yar and the Narratives of Victimhood in Kyiv Notes by Iryna Khoroshunova

This paper is devoted to the representation of the Holocaust in *Kiev Notes* (Kievskie zapiski) by Iryna Khoroshunova. The text had been presented by its author as her war diary. In fact, it is rather an autobiographical work that was written most likely in the late 1960s on the base of a real diary. From the moment of writing, this text has been changed, supplemented, and rewritten several times. There are currently at least three different versions of *Notes* in archives and museums in Kiev. Analysing the evolution of this text, I plan to show how the author was looking for a possible form of correlation of her own truth about the war that would justify the people who were in occupation and were forced to co-operate with the Germans with the official Soviet narrative. The Holocaust theme occupies a special place in the strategies of self-victimisation chosen by the author. Depending on the change of the social context, the execution of Jews in Kyiv is transformed from a horrible but stranger’s tragedy to the symbol of the suffering of all the Soviet people, as well as the sacred place of memory, which gives meaning to the suffering and death of members of her own family.

m.borovyk@lmu.de

Mykola Borovyk received his PhD in History from the Taras Shevchenko University of Kyiv where he founded and ran the research and teaching laboratory “Center for Oral History”. Currently, he is a research fellow at the Graduate School for East and Southeast European Studies/LMU Munich and Associate Professor at the Taras Shevchenko University of Kyiv.



Anastasia Felcher
(Sankt Petersburg)

“Our Suffering” versus “Your Suffering”. At the Cross-Roads. Non-reconciliatory Rhetoric in the Holocaust Scholarship and Public Discourse in Moldova

This paper analyses national narratives of victimhood in historiography and memory politics in the Republic of Moldova. It examines the cases where the latter is used as an argument within the rhetoric that either justifies the Holocaust in Bessarabia and Transnistria or argues for the absence of a serious urgency in researching and promoting the latter. Though Moldovan historiography of the Holocaust since 1991 advanced from “silence” to “justification” (V. Solonari) to “reluctant integration” (D. Dumitru), the body of published texts and pronounced speeches that promote competing victimhood narratives is genuinely present in the country’s intellectual milieu. The paper seeks to trace the articulation and consolidation of the national narrative of victimhood via debates on Stalinist deportations of local civilians from 1941 to 1949. The promotion of the latter as a core national collective trauma intensified after 2009 due to memory politics encouraged by the government. Since that time, the advance of Holocaust commemoration and research in Moldova also became apparent due to international pressure and the intensified activity by the local Jewish community. This in turn generated a discourse within which it was intolerable to deny the Holocaust in Bessarabia and Transnistria, but references to Stalinist deportations allowed a niche for ‘balancing’ the collective trauma divided according to ethnic lines. The paper will exemplify such cases through a close reading of academic publications, media, and addresses given on commemorative occasions.

Wednesday, 29 November 2017, 16:40
Panel 8: Articulating Suffering in the European Peripheries

anastasia.felcher@alumni.imtlucca.it

Anastasia Felcher, MA in Central European History at the CEU, Budapest, PhD in Management and Development of Cultural Heritage at IMT Institute for Advanced Studies Lucca (Lucca, IT), dissertation on *New Perspectives for Preservation, Management and Museum Representation of Jewish Cultural Heritage in Post-Soviet Cities*.

Marta Simó
(Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona)

Spanish Narratives of the Holocaust and the Second World War, their Antecedents, and their Consequences

Spain although, traditionally considered a Neutral country during the Second World War, played various different roles affecting today's narratives of the Holocaust. Moreover, the fact that Spain remained a dictatorship until the 70s, together with the memory transition process through Pacts of silence and Bill of Amnesty, presents today a situation of discomfort and competitiveness of this memory among different political groups and different groups of victims. This paper, based on the PhD of the author, will present all these different roles in order to try to understand some of the problems still facing today concerning Historical and collective memory, identity and memory policies about the Holocaust in Spain.

The starting point is the Spanish Civil War and its consequences. Secondly, the collaboration of Spain with Nazi Germany as a way of payment for the help received during the civil war to defeat the Spanish Republic. Thirdly, it would present the different roles played by Franco concerning Jewish Refugee policy and how was used after the war and especially during the cold war to build a positive narrative as Franco as a Jewish Saviour. In this part it will be analysed the policy to the Jewish Refugees who cross the Pyrenees looking for safety, the Jewish Refugees who already were in Spain, the Sephardic Jews in the Balkans, the role of the diplomats helping Jews, the help to the Nazis after the war.

Finally, It would be presented a research done to study the impact of the International Day of Commemoration in memory of the victims of the Holocaust celebrated in the Catalan Parliament last January. The research carried out semi-structural interviews to all participants: politicians, students, teachers and representatives of all the victims who participated it.

batllosimo@hotmail.com

Marta Simó, degree in sociology. UAB Barcelona, MA in Central and Eastern European Studies, Jagellonska University, Poland. Since 2011, she is a PhD candidate working on a thesis about Spaniards and the Holocaust. Since 2012, she is a researcher at the ISOR (Research Group of Sociology and Religious Studies) at the same university. From 2013 to 2016, she was a member of the Multilingual Expert Team for the Education Research Project of the Multiyear Program of the IHRA.