

COLLECTIVE VS COLLECTED MEMORIES

1989–91 FROM AN ORAL HISTORY

PERSPECTIVE

ABSTRACTS

KEYNOTE SPEECH , NOV. 6, 13:15 - 14:30, ROOM 316

CHAIR: KRZYSZTOF KOSEŁA

Krzysztof Koseła is a sociologist, Professor of University of Warsaw and Dean of the Faculty of Philosophy and Sociology, University of Warsaw. His research interests include social sciences methodology, sociology of religion and sociology of youth.

JAMES V. WERTSCH

MNEMONIC COMMUNITIES AND HABITS

One of the hallmarks of national communities is that they have different accounts of the past. These differences may be so great that nations can find themselves in “mnemonic standoffs,” such as that between Indians and Pakistanis over the 1947 Partition or between Jews and Palestinians over the formation of Israel in 1948 – not to mention the many memory disputes in Europe. When we encounter members of other groups who have a completely different account of the past, we often end up accusing them of being brainwashed by their governments or local media, but such charges appear to have less credibility in today’s connected world. In order to account for seemingly intractable differences over the past, we need to consider something deeper in the form of underlying codes that are sometimes labeled “cultural DNA.” I shall argue that these underlying codes take the form of “narrative templates” and that the habits of memory associated with these templates are a form of non-conscious “fast thinking” that has been at the heart of contemporary analyses in cognitive science. Modern nations are very good at creating these narrative templates and habits, presenting some very high barriers to international understanding and respect. In trying to overcome these barriers, the most important tool we may have is a kind of humility about our own perspective, an approach that does not eschew the notion of truth or accuracy, but that does allow for productive communication across mnemonic communities. As an illustration of these claims I shall

examine a Russian narrative template concerned with expelling alien enemies and its recent elaboration under the heading of “neo-Eurasianism”.

James V. Wertsch is the Marshall S. Snow Professor in Arts and Sciences, Vice Chancellor for International Affairs, and Professor of Anthropology at Washington University in St. Louis. He is the founding director of the McDonnell International Scholars Academy, which is Washington University’s lead international initiative. Wertsch’s research is concerned with language, thought, and culture, with a special focus on national narratives and identities. He is the author of over 200 publications appearing in over a dozen languages. These include the volumes *Voices of the Mind* (Harvard University Press, 1991), *Mind as Action* (Oxford University Press, 1998), and *Voices of Collective Remembering* (Cambridge University Press, 2002). After finishing his PhD at the University of Chicago in 1975 Wertsch was a postdoctoral fellow in Moscow at the USSR Academy of Sciences and Moscow State University. Wertsch has held faculty positions at Northwestern University, the University of California, San Diego, Clark University, and now Washington University in St. Louis. In addition he has been a visiting professor at the University of Utrecht, Moscow State University, the University of Seville, the Swedish Collegium for Advanced Study in Social Sciences, Bristol University, and the University of Oslo. Wertsch is a Fellow of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, holds honorary degrees from Linköping University in Sweden and the University of Oslo in Norway, and is an honorary member of the Russian Academy of Education.

KEYNOTE SPEECH, NOV. 6, 15:30 – 17:00, ROOM 316

CHAIR: DANILLO FACCA

MICHAEL BERNHARD AND JAN KUBIK

THE POLITICS OF MEMORY AND COMMEMORATION

We address the explosion of the politics of memory triggered by the fall of state socialism in Eastern Europe, and in particular the politics of its commemoration twenty years later. While there exist a number of both normative and empirical studies on collective memory and its links to historical justice, this is the first study that offers a disciplined comparative analysis of the politics of memory across a broad range of post-communist states. We recognize that there are many layers of public memory as different institutions and various groups in the society remember the old system and the regime transformation differently. But we focus in this study only on the way the old system and its demise are commemorated (or not commemorated) in public ceremonies designed by major political actors, such as governments and political parties. The study uses techniques of structured focused comparison to test an original theory of the emergence of different types of memory regimes – fractured, pillarized, and unified. Based on the detailed descriptions and analyses of commemorative ceremonies in seventeen countries, we explain the emergence of mnemonic warriors and the fracturing of memory regimes, by examining several factors, including patterns of extrication from state socialism, patterns of ethnic and class conflict, the strategies of communist successor parties, and the cultural traditions of a given country that influence the way official collective memory is constructed. It is important to emphasize that we are not interested in judging the events of

1989/1991, but in better understanding them as milestones in the histories of the respective societies and the role their recollection plays in politics, even twenty years after the fall of communism.

Michael Bernhard is Ehrlich Professor of Political Science at the University of Florida. He is the author of *Institutions and the Fate of Democracy: Germany and Poland in the Twentieth Century* (University of Pittsburgh Press, 2005) and *The Origins of Democratization in Poland: Workers, Intellectuals, and Oppositional Politics, 1976-1980* (Columbia University Press, 1993). His research interests include the role of civil society in democratization, institutional choice in new democracies, the political economy of democratic survival, and the legacy of extreme forms of dictatorship. He is the former Chair of the European Politics and Society section of the American Political Science Association and the current Chair of the Research Network on the Historical Study of States and Regimes of the Council on European Studies. His most recent work on post-communist Europe (co-edited with Jan Kubik) is the volume *Twenty Years after Communism: The Politics of Memory and Commemoration* (Oxford University Press, 2014).

Jan Kubik is Professor and Chair in the Department of Political Science, Rutgers University in New Brunswick. In January 2015 he will become the Director of the School of Slavonic and East European Studies, University College London. His earlier publications include: *The Power of Symbols against the Symbols of Power. The Rise of Solidarity and the Fall of State Socialism in Poland* and *Rebellious Civil Society: Popular Protest and Democratic Consolidation in Poland, 1989-1993* (with Grzegorz Ekiert). His recent work deals with the relationship between political science and cultural anthropology (*Anthropology and Political Science: a convergent approach*, with Myron Aronoff, Berghahn Books, 2013); critical analysis of post-communist studies (*Postcommunism from Within. Social Justice, Mobilization, and Hegemony*, co-edited with Amy Linch, NYU Press, 2013); and the politics of memory (*Twenty Years After Communism: The Politics of Memory and Commemoration*, edited with Michael Bernhard, Oxford University Press, 2014). Among his research interests are: culture and politics, protest politics and social movements, communist and post-communist politics, and interpretive and ethnographic methods in political science. He received MA (Sociology and Philosophy) from the Jagiellonian University in Krakow, Poland and PhD (Anthropology, with distinction) from Columbia University.

**ORAL HISTORY IN POST-WAR HUMANITIES WEST AND EAST: INTERNATIONAL TRAVELOGUE,
NOV. 7, 14:30 – 16:00, ROOM 316**

Both panels will pay special attention to 1989 as a turning point. The first panel will focus on Lutz Niethammer's intellectual biography and historiographical practice with a focus on his contribution to oral history. The second panel aims to bring together some of his closest colleagues from Europe, several of whom are also his former students, and raise some central theoretical, methodological, political and ethical questions. Drawing on the participants' unique shared experiences with oral history, the question: what has it meant and what it ought to mean to be an oral historian today, will be explored. What have the scholarly, ethical and political aspects of such an identification been in the history of oral history and what are their current ones? Does being an oral historian still imply more than to conduct interviews as part of one's research toolbox?

WŁODZIMIERZ BORODZIEJ

History Professor at the History Department of University of Warsaw. Co-director of Imre Kertész Kolleg in Jena. Editor in chief of *Polish Diplomatic Documents*, published by the Polish Institute of International Affairs. Chairman of Academic Committee of the House of European History in Brussels. His most recent publication in English is *Legacies of Violence. Eastern Europe's First World War* (2014, co-edited with Jochen Böhrer and Joachim von Puttkamer).

LUTZ NIETHAMMER

Lutz Niethammer studied theology, history, and social sciences mainly at Heidelberg. Professor of Modern History at Essen (1973), Hagen (1982), and Jena (1993), Emeritus (2005). Senior advisor in Imre Kertész Kolleg on Europe's East in the 20th century. Visiting scholar at Oxford, Paris, both Berlins of the later Cold War, Basel, Florence, Vienna, and Warsaw. Founding director of the Institute for Advanced Studies in the Humanities (Essen), member of the Kuratorium Buchenwald, and government advisor on compensation for Nazi forced labor. Niethammer's fields of research include German and European transformations after 1945 and after 1989, social and urban history, oral history, memory and generational studies, and intellectual history.

PIOTR FILIPKOWSKI

Piotr Filipkowski (PhD) is associate professor at the Institute of Philosophy and Sociology of the Polish Academy of Sciences, member of Chair of Sociology and Anthropology of Culture. In 2008 he defended his PhD on concentration camp experiences in biographical-narrative perspective. In 2002-2011 coordinated the Oral History program at the KARTA Centre, where he was engaged in numerous Polish and international oral history documentation and research projects. Co-founder and associate of Oral History Archive of the History Meeting House – the biggest and most diverse Polish oral history collection. Member of Social Memory Laboratory at the Institute of Sociology, University of Warsaw and founding member of Polish Oral History Association. His general research interests concentrate on the relationships between experience, memory, and autobiographical narrative.

FRANKA MAUBACH

Franka Maubach is a research assistant at the Friedrich Schiller University Jena, has conducted oral history interviews for her PhD on the experiences of German women auxiliaries in the Second World War, which was published in 2009. Moreover she co-edited books on the history of women soldiers (2010) and on the International Oral History Association (2013). Currently she works in the field of intellectual history and history of historiography.

ORAL HISTORY TODAY AND TOMORROW, NOV. 7, 16:30-18:00, ROOM 316

ALEXANDER VON PLATO

Alexander von Plato is a founder and long-time director of the Oral History Centre at the Open University Hagen, and the German oral history journal BIOS. He is also a founder and former secretary and vice president of the International Oral History Association. Von Plato taught at the universities of Essen, Hagen, Winnipeg, and Vienna. His main research field is the study of historical experience and mentality while his publications included: *Hitler's slaves: life stories of forced labourers in Nazi-occupied Europe* (edited with A. Leh., Ch. Thonfeld, 2010) and *Opposition als Lebensform: Dissidenz in der DDR, der SSR und in Polen* (with T. Vilímek, 2013).

MIROSLAV VANĚK

Miroslav Vaněk is director of the Oral History Center and senior researcher at the Institute of Contemporary History of the Czech Academy of Sciences in Prague. A former president of the International Oral History Association and honorary President of the Czech Oral History Association. He lectures at the Charles University in Prague, at Faculty of Arts and Faculty of Humanities. He specializes in modern Czech history, primarily the period of Czechoslovak socialism, with special attention to the young generation under socialism, including student and ecological movements, dissidents, political communist elites, workers, economic managers, as well as the oral history method.

DOROTHEE WIERLING

Dorothee Wierling studied History and English Literature at the Ruhr University, Bochum. She gained her doctorate at the University of Essen in 1986 with a dissertation on the everyday experience of housemaids: *Maid of all Work. Biographies and Everyday Labor of Urban Housemaids around the Turn of the Century*. In 2000 she completed her habilitation at the University of Potsdam with the study: *Born in Year One. The Birth Cohort of 1949 in the GDR. An Attempt at a Collective Biography*. From 1990 to 1993 she built up an external branch of the Essener Kulturwissenschaftlichen Instituts NRW in Leipzig. This was followed by a DAAD Professorship at the University of Washington, Seattle, and several other Fellowships and Visiting Professorships, at institutions such as the University of Tel-Aviv, the Zentrum für Zeithistorische Forschung in Potsdam, the Max-Weber-Kolleg in Erfurt and the University of Michigan, Ann Arbor. Since 2003 she has been Deputy Director of the Forschungsstelle für Zeitgeschichte in Hamburg (FZH) and Professor at Hamburg University. Her research interests are in the sphere of social history and the history of mentalities in the late 19th and 20th centuries, with special reference to the links between gender, generation and class, and the relationship between biography and history.

HORIZONS OF EXPECTATION AND SPACES OF EXPERIENCE: BETWEEN ACCIDENT, HOPE AND TRAUMA, NOV. 6, 17:30 – 19:30, ROOM 316

CHAIR:

GERTRUD PICKHAN

Gertrud Pickhan is a professor at the Free University Berlin, Institute for East European Studies. She is interested in the historical cultural landscape of Central and Eastern Europe, its multiethnic and intercultural conditions, plurality and diversity, and the resultant contacts and conflicts. Her recent projects include: “Zwangsarbeit 1939-1945: Erinnerungen und Geschichte. Ein digitales Archiv für Bildung und Wissenschaft”, “Charlottengrad und Scheunenviertel. Osteuropäisch-jüdische Migranten im Berlin der 1920/30er Jahr”, and “Die Verfolgung und Ermordung der europäischen Juden durch das nationalsozialistische Deutschland 1933-1945.”

JOACHIM VON PUTTKAMER

MAKING SENSE OF THE UNEXPECTED: HOW THE RESHAPING OF THE POLISH POWER APPARATUS IN 1989 IS BEING REMEMBERED

The notion of a “thick line” is highly contested. Mazowiecki coined this phrase in August 1989, upon taking office as the first non-communist prime minister within the Warsaw Pact. For some, it embodies the deliberate compromise of the victorious *Solidarność* with the old communist elites, which allowed the latter to get away with their crimes. Mazowiecki himself termed this interpretation a “devilish invention” of the right. After all, he chose this image to hold the communists responsible for the economic collapse and to see them wither away by themselves.

Based on a set of memoirs (Czesław Kiszczak, Krzysztof Kozłowski, Jan Rokita, Leszek Lamparski, and others) and confronting them with archival evidence, the paper explores the origins of this debate in the dismantling of the Polish state security and the reform of the police. It will focus on four issues:

1. Witch-hunt scare and verification.
2. Destruction of state security files.
3. Trustful cooperation within the government and its collapse.
4. Reforming the police along democratic standards.

The paper aims to demonstrate that today’s conflicting memories of the fall of communism can be traced back to the very beginnings of the Mazowiecki government, but formed only from early 1990 onwards. The charge of having been too soft on the communists was raised only after the Berlin Wall had come down, when Solidarity had fully secured its victory and the communists had suffered a complete defeat. The contested remembrance of 1989, which underpins today’s political conflict, has been shaped by events whose outcome had been unforeseeable at the time.

Joachim von Puttkamer, Professor of History, director of the Imre Kertész Kolleg Jena, chair for Eastern European History at the Friedrich Schiller University Jena. His main areas of research include: state-building and statehood in Eastern Europe, nationalism in East Central and Southeastern Europe, history of schooling and education, Eastern European cultures of memory, historical comparison. His most recent publication in English is *Legacies of Violence*.

Eastern Europe's First World War (co-edited with Jochen Böhrer and Włodzimierz Borodziej, 2014). Currently he is preparing a research project on the transformation in Poland in 1989/90.

RAUF R. GARAGOZOV**COLLAPSE OF THE SOVIET UNION AS A CULTURAL TRAUMA****AND RUSSIAN COLLECTIVE MEMORY**

In my report I am going to discuss the peculiarities of the Soviet-Russian and Azerbaijani collective memory regarding the collapse of the Soviet Union. I will employ the notions of cultural (collective) trauma and collective identity as basic analytical tools for my analysis. It should be noted that the breakdown of the Soviet Union is rarely discussed in terms of a cultural trauma. One of the reasons for neglecting this issue probably stems from the widespread belief that the fall of the Communist system was welcomed by the international community, including the peoples of the former Soviet Union. However, even if the Soviet plan to shape a new “Soviet man” failed and the majority of Soviet nationalities preserved their ethno-national identity, there still were people with inculcated Soviet identities, the so-called “internationalists.” For them the fall of the Soviet Union was a catastrophe. They undoubtedly experienced a threat to their collective identity. In this connection, a nostalgia emerged for the Soviet Union with a selective and positive memory of the Soviet period, along with a feeling of humiliation caused by the breakdown of the Soviet Union, especially in the context of growing social inequality and oligarch capitalism. Thus, for example according to a Levada Center survey, 57% of Russians regretted the collapse of the Soviet Union in 2013. In this regard, I argue that recent events in the Crimea, or re-emergence of Eurasianism are to certain extent the result of the socio-political processes which are deeply influenced by feelings of nostalgia and positive memory about the former Soviet Union. In my presentation I will also introduce a few excerpts from the rememberings of a number of top party, state, and military figures of the Soviet period, and exhibit the “individual” and “collective” types of memory.

Rauf R. Garagozov (PhD in Psychology) is a senior research fellow at the Center for Strategic Studies (Baku, Azerbaijan). He is currently working on such topics as collective memory and narrative intervention into the conflict resolution. His model of progressive narrative transformations is aimed to contribute to change of memories, emotions and attitudes towards reconciliation. This framework was applied to Armenia-Azerbaijani conflict over Nagorno Karabakh (2011) and to the Russo-Georgian war in August (2008). His recent publications on collective memory and narrative intervention include articles in the *Journal of Russian and East European Psychology*, *Peace and Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology*, *The Caucasus & Globalization*, *Dynamics of Asymmetric Conflict: Pathways Toward Terrorism and Genocide*. His books include *Metamorphoses of Collective Memory in Russia and the South Caucasus* (in Russian, 2005), which presents his comparative analysis of the historical narratives peculiar for Russian, Armenian, Azerbaijani, and Georgian cultural traditions.

TOMASZ STRYJEK WHAT DOES 1991 MEAN FOR UKRAINIANS?

The question of why contemporary Ukraine pays relatively little attention to memorialize the beginning of its independence, concerns fundamental political problem in Ukrainian post-Soviet reality. There are two main reasons which influenced such perception of 1991 in the Ukrainian public memory. Firstly, after gaining state independence, people of Ukraine did not become the subject of political process. The power remained in the hands of former *nomenklatura* and was then transferred to the new elite – oligarchy. Compared with the late Soviet times, social conditions after 1991 dramatically worsened and the social cleavages were unveiled.

Only ten years later Ukraine achieved economic growth and people could think about their own future with the country. Secondly, the Ukrainian cultural memory was shaped under Soviet influence. In 1991 alternative communicative memory was almost entirely destroyed, apart from the small social enclaves in the Western Ukraine. Political and military events of 1917, 1941 and 1945 still molded the public historical imagination. The authorities, trying to create a new historical canon, fought the old vision of the past on the ground delineated by the latter. They tried to overcome the old Soviet myths by new national ones by paying more attention to the 1914, 1918-1920, 1939 and 60. (dissidents). Still, the battle of memory concerned mainly the events more distant in time than the year 1991 itself. After dramatic change in Kiev in the winter of 2014, the fundamental change in the state politics of memory didn't come. Maidan and war of Donbas added the new heroes to those of national emancipation fighting against Russia/USSR, Germany and Poland in both world wars. But events of 1991 still belong rather to the sphere of collective oblivion and don't have much of a chance to become an important point of reference for the national identity.

Tomasz Stryjek is a professor in the Institute of Political Studies of the Polish Academy of Sciences and in Collegium Civitas. He published several books on Ukrainian nationalism, historiography and Anti-Soviet underground in Central-Eastern Europe. In his newest book *Ukraina przed końcem Historii. Szkice o polityce państw wobec pamięci* (Ukraine before the end of History. Sketches about politics of memory pursued by states, Warsaw 2014) he compares the Ukrainian politics of memory 1991-2013 with new UE states such as Spain, Baltic states, and Croatia. He also summarizes the results of Ukrainian revolution in 2014 and reconsiders in what direction the state politics of identity will be conducted in the following years.

DISCUSSANT: PADRAIC KENNEY

Padraic Kenney is Professor of History and International Studies and Director of the Russian and East European Institute and of the Polish Studies Center at Indiana University. He is the author or editor of seven books on Polish, Eastern European, and global history, including *Rebuilding Poland: Workers and Communists, 1945-1950* (Ithaca, NY, 1997); *A Carnival of Revolution: Central Europe, 1989* (Princeton, 2002); and *1989: Democratic Revolutions at the Cold War's End* (Boston, 2010). His work has been translated into seven languages: Polish, Ukrainian, Czech, Romanian, Croatian, Italian, and Spanish.

CHAIR: FERENC LACZÓ

Ferenc Laczó (PhD), historian, research fellow at Imre Kertész Kolleg Jena and guest lecturer at the University of Basel. Main fields of interest: Central and Eastern Europe in the 20th century, particularly intellectual and cultural history, memory studies, Jewish history, Holocaust, and genocide studies. An author of the Hungarian-language monograph *Felvilágosult vallás és modern katasztrófa közt. Magyar zsidó gondolkodás a Horthy-korban* [Between Enlightened Religion and Modern Catastrophe. Hungarian Jewish Thought in the Horthy Era] (Budapest 2014). Peer reviewed publications in the *Contributions to the History of Concepts*, *Holocaust Studies. A Journal of Culture and History* and the *Journal of Modern Jewish Studies*, etc.

KATHARINE WHITE SHIFTS IN EAST GERMANS' SPATIAL IMAGINARIES

What significance did the collapse of the German Democratic Republic (GDR) have in East Germans' collective memory? And to what extent did East Germans experience the loss of important transnational spatialized realms with the disappearance of the GDR in 1990? This paper explores the impact of the GDR's demise through the lens of the "spatial imaginary," which Geoff Eley describes as "a metaphorical space of projections, ideology, cultural claims, mythologizing, narrative aggrandizement and geopolitical fantasy." I am particularly interested in how East Germans experienced the loss of certain transnational spatial imaginaries and the emergence of new ones from the socialist to post-socialist period. For instance, in 1989 East Germans experienced the loss of an "imaginary West" as it had formerly existed as well as perceived connections to the Eastern Bloc and the Third World. At the same time, the disappearance of the GDR resulted in the emergence of an "imaginary East" in the East German collective memory through the rise of an *Ostalgie* (nostalgia for the East) movement. This paper will outline a theoretical framework for using the concept of "spatial imaginary" in connection with shifts in East Germans' collective memory in 1989–1990, drawing on newspaper accounts and other published materials. It will also consider how oral history accounts of individual memories collected during future research might fit into this interpretive framework.

Katharine White is a fourth-year Ph.D. candidate in History at the George Washington University (US). Her research focuses on East German socialist and postsocialist cultural history from a transnational perspective, with a particular emphasis on the intersection of material culture, identity, and memory. She completed her Master's degree at McGill University (Canada) in 2008, focusing on German-German relations during the Cold War and the impact of German reunification on East Germans' lives. She is currently conducting research in Berlin, Germany towards her dissertation.

INA ALBER NARRATING THE "TRANSITION TO DEMOCRACY": ON THE INTERDEPENDENCY OF DISCOURSES AND BIOGRAPHIES

The changes of 1989–91 have often been interpreted and remembered as the "transition to democracy" or the victory of civil society in Western scientific discourse. In later publications, however, the "Weakness of Civil Society" and a lack of democratic political culture have become the dominant patterns of

interpretation. Despite the changes in the analysis of the events, the hegemonic discourse states that transition to democracy and a vivid civil society are something morally good that could either be reached or not. But on which and whose experiences are these narrative patterns based?

In my approach using discourse analysis in the tradition of the sociology of knowledge and biographical research, I am interested in the interdependency of discourses and biographers in creating these narrations. Generally, I would like to argue that the hegemonic discourse has influenced and shaped the (collective) memory about the transition/transformation processes. However, collective memory is not only constructed by discourse, but also by social actors who reproduce and transform these discourses through their everyday actions. The way in which they do this is influenced by their biographical experiences. The questions I would like to discuss in my paper are: how do people who are engaged in democracy promotion today remember and interpret this period of time in their biographical narrations? Which biographical significance does the “transition to democracy” have in their memories? How do they narrate the transition? And do they offer an alternative, non-hegemonic contribution to the scientific discourse? Analyzing these questions I would like to draft a theoretical generalization on the interdependency of discourses and biographies in constructing narrations about the period of 1989–91.

Ina Alber studied political science, sociology, media and communication studies in Göttingen, Germany and in Poland. She works at the Herder-Institute for Historical Research – Institute of the Leibniz Association in Marburg and is the executive director of the Leibniz Graduate School “History, Knowledge, Media in East Central Europe.” Her research topics focus on interpretative social research, mainly biographical research, discourse and text analysis on the one hand side, on East Central Europe and post-socialist transformation, on democracy, civil society and human rights on the other hand side. Currently she is finishing her PhD thesis on “Civic Engagement in Poland in Times of Transformation – an Approach Using Biographical Research and Discourse Analysis” at the Center of Methods in Social Research (Prof. Dr. Gabriele Rosenthal, Prof. Dr. Ilja Srubar) at the University of Göttingen.

NATALIA COJOCARU 1989-1991 IN MOLDOVA: MEMORY, DISCOURSE AND REPRESENTATION

This paper is intended to be a contribution from the social psychological perspective to the in-depth understanding of the 1989 events from Soviet Moldova. Data was collected through a series of interviews with participants in diverse meetings and protest actions or with active witnesses of the events from 1988–1991, especially students and intellectuals. Further on, I have employed the narrative analysis to analyze the oral histories. The main question of this endeavor was how the performers’ representations were *initially* founded in the direct confrontation with the eventful tumult and how it is reflected *now* by means of narrative discourses.

The signal for the *perestroika* was given by intellectuals; they were those who engaged actively in the promotion of the new reforms. Our interest was to elucidate the ways their narratives are structured and presented, laying special emphasis on *how* people speak about/narrate that period. Likewise, we endeavored to identify the ways in which they subjectively *re-construct* the 1989 events and how that reality is reflected in the *post factum* analyses and evaluations, their *a posteriori* representations about the protests, as well as the connections established between the cognitive and the affective mechanisms. From

this point of view, the narrations about the 1989 events unfolded in four categories of discourses called: *pragmatic discourse, idealistic-romantic discourse, militant discourse, and academic discourse.*

Natalia Cojocar (PhD) provides a number of courses dedicated to Social Psychology, Organizational Psychology and Qualitative Research at the State University of Moldova. In 2006 she received a PhD in Psychology from A. I. Cuza University in Iasi, Romania (doctoral dissertation topic: “*Social Representations of the Protest Movements: The Case of Moldova,*” Academic Advisor: Professor of Social Psychology A. Neculau). Between 2001 and 2005 she carried out a series of research projects concerning various psychosocial realities in the Republic of Moldova within the Institute for Public Policies in Chisinau.

DISCUSSANT:

KAJA KAŻMIERSKA

Kaja Kaźmierska (PhD), is an assistant professor of sociology at the Institute of Sociology (Chair of Sociology of Culture) at the University of Łódź, Poland. Her research work is based on biographical narrative interview analysis and she works on problems such as collective identities, biographical experiences of the war and collective memory.

CHAIR: BURKHARD OLSCHOWSKY

Burkhard Olschowsky, PhD, studied history and history of Eastern Europe in Göttingen, Warsaw and Berlin. In 2002 he received a doctoral degree at Humboldt University, Berlin. In 2003–2005 he worked as contractual lecturer of Contemporary History and Politics at Humboldt University. In 2004–2005 he worked in the Federal Ministry of Transport, Building and Housing. Since May 2005 he has been a research worker in the Federal Institute for Culture and History of the Germans in Eastern Europe. Since 2010 he has worked as a researcher in the Secretariat of European Network Remembrance and Solidarity.

LJUBICA SPASKOVSKA THE LAST YUGOSLAV GENERATION: MAKING SENSE OF POST-SOCIALISM AND THE END OF YUGOSLAVIA

The post-socialist period saw members of the last Yugoslav generation take prominent roles in the political, media and cultural spheres of the different successor states. Many of those who had pioneered novel ideas, alternative styles and approaches in culture, journalism and politics in the 1980s became well-known editors, musicians, artists, senior managers, successful businessmen, and high ranking politicians at the helm of the contemporary cultural and political developments in the post-Yugoslav region.

The violent break-up of Yugoslavia and the radical socio-political transformation had a profound impact on personal experiences and biographies. The paper uses oral history interviews (in addition to other interview material) to reflect both on the trajectories that have been followed in the wake of Yugoslavia's demise, and the way in which respondents have attempted to make sense of their experiences in these new contexts. It reflects on what in similar contexts has been termed "shifts across major moments of historical ruptures" (Fulbrook 2011) and it addresses different patterns of remembering, i.e. how people's trajectories have influenced their memory of this period.

Although different groups followed different trajectories – some remaining progressive, some turning conservative – there is a significant part of this generation who have refused to appropriate the anti-Yugoslav/anti-communist discourse or to think about the socialist past in these terms. They tend to understand generation as the progressive wing of this younger age cohort, who lost in their progressive fights against an older post-Second World War generation who embraced nationalist politics in the late 1980s. In addition, oral history testimonies tend to frame their experiences through the narrative of the generation that "lost": its freedom, its dignity, and its superiority compared with other formerly state socialist countries in the region.

Ljubica Spaskovska (PhD) is a research fellow engaged in a project "1989 after 1989: Rethinking the Fall of State Socialism in Global Perspective" at the University of Exeter, UK. She completed her doctoral dissertation on youth policy and culture in Late Socialism Yugoslavia at the University of Exeter in 2014. She has also worked as a research fellow at the University of Edinburgh on a project "Europeanisation of Citizenship in the Successor States of the Former Yugoslavia (CITSEE)."

DEANNA WOOLEY “WE WERE THE GENERATION OF UNSPOKEN ASSUMPTIONS”:
GENERATIONAL IDENTITY AND THE “VELVET REVOLUTION”

Vaclav Bartuska, a Czech ex-student activist, spoke those words in 2005 while describing his generational cohort’s role in bringing down the Czechoslovak communist regime during the “Velvet Revolution” of 1989. Across Eastern Europe, students and young people such as himself played an integral role in the collapse of communism; for the Czechoslovak student movement in particular, the revolutionary events created a generational entelechy, a formative moment of identity articulation in which the “89er” generation emerged. However, as Bartuska indicates, while young men and women were brought together in November 1989 by the “unspoken assumptions” of what they as students should do, their unity masked many internal divisions. Among those unspoken assumptions was both the existence and desirability of a collective “89er” identity.

This case study explores the historically-contextualized nexus between what Jeffrey Olick calls the two “cultures” of (socially-constructed) collective and (individually-aggregated) collected memories. Taking the metaphor of “unspoken assumptions” as a starting point, it traces the dynamics of generational memory from 1989 into the 1990s and 2000s, focusing on the ex-student activists for whom the “Velvet Revolution” represented a biographical and political “interpretive turning point” (Gabriele Rosenthal) which created the reflective space to redefine past, present, and future. Using material from twenty-one oral histories conducted between 2004 and 2006, the investigation explores two main themes. Firstly, what were the social and cultural dimensions of these common assumptions, why were they unspoken, and how did ex-students construct a “we-feeling” of revolutionary solidarity in their narratives? Secondly, as young people across the former communist bloc revised their biographies towards new cultural norms, in particular a social imaginary privileging individuality over the collective, how were these unspoken assumptions (re)evaluated? In other words, how did ex-students navigate the political dimensions of this social identity in the post-communist period?

Deanna Wooley is a PhD candidate in Eastern European and Cultural History at the Department of History at Indiana University (Bloomington, US). Her dissertation explores the cultural history of the “Velvet Revolution” from the perspective of the 1989 Czechoslovak student movement. Wooley is the author of several articles on the student movement and the collective memory of 1989 in the Czech lands. She is currently a visiting lecturer at Indiana University-Purdue University (Fort Wayne, Indiana).

DISCUSSANT: LARS BREUER

Lars Breuer is a research associate at the Institute for Sociology at Freie Universität Berlin, working in the research project “Collective Memory as a Basis for Identification with Europe” funded by German Research Foundation (DFG). He studied cultural studies, politics, and sociology in Berlin, Copenhagen and Lüneburg and received his MA in cultural studies from Humboldt University in Berlin. From 2004–2006 he was research assistant in the project “International Traditions of Historical Consciousness” at the Center for Interdisciplinary Memory Studies (CMR), Institute for Advanced Study in the Humanities, Essen. In 2013 he received his PhD from Leibniz Universität Hannover with a dissertation on German and Polish vernacular memory of the Second World War.

CHAIR: BURKHARD OLSCHOWSKY

Burkhard Olschowsky (PhD) studied history and history of Eastern Europe in Göttingen, Warsaw and Berlin. In 2002 he received a doctoral degree at Humboldt University, Berlin. In 2003–2005 he worked as contractual lecturer of Contemporary History and Politics at Humboldt University. In 2004–2005 he worked in the Federal Ministry of Transport, Building and Housing. Since May 2005 he has been a research worker in the Federal Institute for Culture and History of the Germans in Eastern Europe. Since 2010 he has worked as a researcher in the Secretariat of European Network Remembrance and Solidarity.

KATJA DOOSE “HERE, EVERYTHING TUMBLED DOWN MUCH EARLIER”: COLLIDING
MEMORIES OF THE SOVIET COLLAPSE AND THE ARMENIAN EARTHQUAKE

The political developments towards independence of the Soviet republics have been widely discussed in historical and political sciences, which often emphasize the role of the Baltic republics. The changes were perceived and are now remembered differently in each former Soviet republic. In Armenia, however, they were much more abrupt due to a destructive earthquake in late 1988, which serves until today as a key moment in the individual but not in the official narrative. This paper addresses the question of how the entangled memories of the earthquake and of the Soviet demise developed and changed over time.

In particular, this paper looks at how the earthquake is used as a time caesura in people’s narratives to explain the confusing events of 1991. This is shown by interviews conducted in Armenia in 2013, which display an idealization of the pre-disaster period implying an apparent suddenness of the collapse with innocent stakeholders. Furthermore, by looking at individual memories of the rebuilding phase between 1989 and 1991 the paper explores how expectations – first towards the Soviet Union, then towards the West – are reconstructed. Subsequently, it analyses how the disappointments are articulated and transmitted to the next generation. Narratives especially of older generations mirror the dominant official discourses, thereby reflecting the state controlled communication during Soviet times. Furthermore, through the exploration of text productions, rituals and statues dedicated to the victims, the paper reflects upon the emergence of a collective narrative necessary to make the past meaningful and differing from individual storytelling.

I argue that the earthquake helps to put order into chaotic events in people’s memories by giving the collapse of the Soviet Union a beginning. By focusing on how the events of 1991 were commemorated in Armenia the project sheds new light on the way individual memories can be sublimed into collective memory.

Katja Doose is a researcher at in the Eastern European Study Department the Karls Eberhard University in Tübingen, Germany. Her current research is focused on the impact of natural catastrophes on politics and society in the Soviet Union. Her academic interests include late Socialism, Soviet environmental history, memory studies, and nationalism.

ANDREA BRAIT
AUSTRIA

ABOUT THE INTERPRETATION OF 1989 AS AN EPOCH YEAR IN

On account of various circumstances, in particular the inaccessibility of archival sources and the distance of contemporary history from the objects under investigation, which political science still claims for itself, the events of the year 1989 in Austria have long remained a research desideratum. This was the starting point for the research project sponsored by the Future Fund of the Republic of Austria and located at the Dr. Wilfried Haslauer Library (Salzburg) entitled: *Offene Grenzen, neue Barrieren und gewandelte Identitäten. Österreich, seine Nachbarn und die Transformationsprozesse in Politik, Wirtschaft und Kultur seit 1989 (Open borders, new barriers and changed identities. Austria, its neighbors and the transformation processes in politics, the economy and culture since 1989)* (Project Leader: Michael Gehler). The presentation proposes to introduce some of this project's key findings.

About 25 years later, it cannot be expected that "1989" has already become a "long-lasting crystallization point of collective recollection and identity, outlasting generations," which is "integrated into social, cultural and political conventions," as is ordinarily expected from a "memorial." However, the fact is that, in particular during the anniversary years of 1999 and 2009, numerous efforts were made by scientists, politicians, journalists and, ultimately, also exhibition organizers, to make a "memorial" of "1989": various scientific conferences and exhibition openings, substantial political engineering took place, indicating how positively the event and its consequences are regarded in Austria.

Nevertheless, social recognition is necessary for a description of "1989" as a "memorial." Konrad H. Jarausch argues that "the chronological distance is still too small for the formation of a mutual 'culture of remembrance' which is not only propagated by the politicians but also accepted by the citizens." However, an Austria-wide representative opinion poll, carried out within the scope of the project, shows that the Austrian population attach great significance to 1989: the overwhelming majority (more than 91%) is of the view that the fall of the "Iron Curtain" in 1989 and the subsequent democratization in Austria's eastern neighboring states respectively were very important for Austria. Asked about the different importance of various political changes, Austrians attach the greatest importance with regard to the consequences for Austria to the "fall of the Iron Curtain in 1989," even above the "EU entry of Austria in 1995."

Andrea Brait (PhD) studied history, political sciences and German studies in Vienna. He is a lecturer at the Institute of History at the University of Vienna.

VALENTINA NEDELICHEVA THE “SUDDEN DEATH” SYNDROME: REMINISCENCE OF THE BULGARIAN 10 NOVEMBER 1989

The fall of socialism defines the end of the 20th century in Eastern and Southeastern Europe. The years between 1989 and 1991 proved to have caused a big impact on people’s minds, since they became unforgettable for several generations. In Bulgaria, particularly, on 10 November 1989 Todor Zhivkov was overthrown by the Central Committee of the Bulgarian communist party. This marked the fall of the regime that had ruled the country for the previous 40 years. Now, 25 years later, memories of these events are still vivid. 10 November 1989 is seen as an unexpected turning point in Bulgarian history but as such it also been loaded with additional aspects. Events, symbolic for the period of transition, sometimes are firmly associated with this date, irrespective of the fact that they occurred later, in the 1990s. This paper analyses this exact ambiguity and comments on the reflections that the so-called “transition period” has caused on people’s memory. This text is based on a field research conducted between 2011 and 2012. Its main aim was to examine the memories, which people in several Bulgarian towns share about the fall of socialist rule and the years after. My argument is that 10 November 1989 is a stable significant symbol in collective memory and due to that different associations are wrongly ascribed to it. This phenomenon shows that for the Bulgarians this date represents the “sudden death” of socialism, in spite of the lack of any fundamental or fatal change. So, in conclusion, this text shows the transformation (or corruption) of collective memory, its elusiveness and at the same time consistency concerning certain events. It discusses how the change has been both remembered and disseminated.

Valentina Nedelcheva is a PhD candidate in Balkan ethnology at St. Kliment Ohridski University in Sofia, Faculty of History. She received her Master’s Degree in Modern and Contemporary Bulgarian History in 2012 for the thesis entitled *Bulgaria and the UN Sanctions upon Yugoslavia (1992-1995) – official state policy and the borderland’s reality (with examples of the Northwestern Bulgarian border)*.

CONSTANTIN SCHMIDT THE TRANSNATIONAL REMEMBRANCE OF THE PANEUROPEAN PICNIC

Was the breakthrough of the Berlin Wall on 9 November 1989 the first opening of the Iron Curtain? If we take a closer look at the shores of Balaton, we will see that the first Eastern German tourists started to flee when the Hungarian opposition groups organized a Paneuropean Picnic at the border strip. This picnic was initially planned as a meeting of Hungarian and Austrian politicians and people, but was presented as an option for illegal border crossings by the international media, which had reported intensively about the wish of Eastern Germans to leave their home country. This led to the official border opening run by Gyula Horn and constituted the first crack in the Berlin Wall.

After 1989 the picnic appears to have only been part of national memory. In the Hungarian picnic the remembrance was overlaid by the social transformation, but in former Eastern Germany it became part of the unification story. In the late 1990s a mutual reception of the narratives started; Hungarians began to understand the picnic as part of their transformation. The former Eastern Germans started to remember Hungary as a holiday paradise. So German and Hungarian historians working together on the perception of these events, at conferences and in institutions, are now interested in the cooperation of their former secret services, the everyday life of tourists and the possibilities of escape. The picnic

became an important space of remembrance, as witnessed by the different exhibitions in Berlin and Balatonfüred and a memorial in Sopron. Through the joint work of remembrance of contemporary witnesses and historians, the Paneuropean Picnic has become a European space of remembrance.

I want to show in my contribution how this transnational event gets its transnational remembrance.

Constantin Schmidt (MA) studied Modern and Recent History and Philosophy at Humboldt University in Berlin. The topics of his specialization include the philosophy of Peirce (pragmatism and semiotics) and Marx, contemporary history of Eastern Germany and of the Soviet Union. He studied one year at the Eötvös Lorand Tudományos Egyetem, Budapest. Since 2011 he has also worked as a tutor at the Institute of History at Humboldt University. The title of his MA dissertation is *East German Mass Flight Across Hungary*.

FIRST DISCUSSANTS: DOBROCHNA KAŁWA AND JAN KUBIK

Dobrochna Kałwa is associate professor in the Institute of History, University of Warsaw. She graduated from Jagiellonian University (MA and PhD degree). She was visiting professor at Erfurt University and visiting fellow at Universität Konstanz. Her research interests include oral history, methodology of history, women's history, socialism, and post-socialism. Her most recent publication in English is the monograph *From mentalities to anthropological history. Theory and methods*, (with B. Klich-Kluczevska, Kraków 2012).

Jan Kubik is Professor and Chair in the Department of Political Science, Rutgers University in New Brunswick. In January 2015 he will become the Director of the School of Slavonic and East European Studies, University College London. His earlier publications include: *The Power of Symbols against the Symbols of Power. The Rise of Solidarity and the Fall of State Socialism in Poland* and *Rebellious Civil Society: Popular Protest and Democratic Consolidation in Poland, 1989-1993* (with Grzegorz Ekiert). His recent work deals with the relationship between political science and cultural anthropology (*Anthropology and Political Science: a convergent approach*, with Myron Aronoff, Berghahn Books, 2013); critical analysis of post-communist studies (*Postcommunism from Within. Social Justice, Mobilization, and Hegemony*, co-edited with Amy Linch, NYU Press, 2013); and the politics of memory (*Twenty Years After Communism: The Politics of Memory and Commemoration*, ed. with Michael Bernhard, Oxford University Press, 2014). Among his research interests are: culture and politics, protest politics and social movements, communist and post-communist politics, and interpretive and ethnographic methods in political science. He received MA (Sociology and Philosophy) from the Jagiellonian University in Krakow, Poland and PhD (Anthropology, with distinction) from Columbia University.

CHAIR: FERENC LACZÓ

Ferenc Laczó (PhD), historian, research fellow at Imre Kertész Kolleg Jena and guest lecturer at the University of Basel. Main fields of interest: Central and Eastern Europe in the 20th century, particularly intellectual and cultural history, memory studies, Jewish history, Holocaust, and genocide studies. An author of the Hungarian-language monograph *Felvilágosult vallás és modern katasztrófa közt. Magyar zsidó gondolkodás a Horthy-korban* [Between Enlightened Religion and Modern Catastrophe. Hungarian Jewish Thought in the Horthy Era] (Budapest 2014). Peer reviewed publications in the *Contributions to the History of Concepts*, *Holocaust Studies*, *A Journal of Culture and History* and the *Journal of Modern Jewish Studies*, etc.

BEN GOOK NACHTRÄGLICHKEIT: BELATEDNESS AND THE FALL OF THE BERLIN WALL

As old documents can be brought to light in the archives and shock us in the present, so can the ego be surprised by what it finds in its archives. In this paper, I look at *Nachträglichkeit*, an aspect of Freud's metapsychology radicalized by Lacan and Laplanche, to explain how events take on belated meaning. The unending recomposition of subjectivity and identity attempts to mend the supposed errors and failures of our pasts, aligning events with norms and plans. But *Nachträglichkeit's* temporal structuring is radically non-linear, based on revision and composition, and is a permanent threat to our self-conception. I explore in this research German reunification and the GDR's end. I point to the *Wende*, the period between the *Mauerfall* and reunification, as a time that prompts subjects to return repeatedly to their past.

Nachträglichkeit names the way subjects and nations review and reconfigure earlier events through unconscious processes. But resolute narratives about the past presuppose as already given what they purport to show. They tell stories—without surplus—of how masterly subjects went about demanding exactly what they have now. Yet an emphasis on *Nachträglichkeit* enables us to detect the temptation for successful narratives to “jump into the past” and appear as their cause, occluding what “failed” in history. *Nachträglichkeit* is thus a conceptual tool to claim there has been a partial narrative of the *Mauerfall* and *Wende* constructed which, in history's configuration as a narrative of achieving reunification within a liberal democratic capitalist parliamentary system, sidelined the “embarrassing” calls, among others, for a renewed socialism in the East. Accounts from ethnographic fieldwork will be used to illustrate this claim. This paper begins a project attempting to overcome the deficient English-language work on *Nachträglichkeit* in history and cultural studies.

Ben Gook recently completed a PhD at the University of Melbourne in Social Theory and Cultural Studies. His research project analyzes the German reunification and its discontents. He has published in *Memory Studies* and the edited volume, *The Everyday of Memory: Between Communism and Postcommunism* (2013), as well as articles forthcoming in: *Journal of the Circle for Lacanian Ideology Critique* and *Studies in Social and Political Thought*.

BARBARA GAWĘDA ANTI-FEMINISM OF TRANSFORMATION: A NARRATIVE ABOUT SIDELINING WOMEN'S ISSUES

This paper looks at the discursive construction of feminism as an enemy in dominant narratives following the changes of 1989–91 in Eastern Europe. After the fall of state socialism, Eastern Europe experienced a rejection of anything seen as even vaguely connected with what the contemporary political elites called “communist.” As part of this phenomenon, women’s rights and feminism (broadly defined) were also negated and ridiculed in the dominant political discourses. In the 1990s and early 2000s, both feminist and mainstream political science looked at the process of democratic transformation and its consequences. Yet, despite having important insights, the generally available Western scholarly analyses did not show sufficient engagement with national literatures on the topic. The article combines the above approaches in order to show the gendered nature of transformation discourses and narratives in Eastern Europe. Taking the anti-feminism of the 1990s as its starting point, this paper asks the question of how the dominant narrative differs from a “women’s perspective” on transformation. The article also includes a discussion of the different ideals as to the rightful place and position of both women and men in society after 1989–91, which are engraved in the various social and political practices through a gendered division of labor, cultural definitions of femininity and masculinity and a gendered approach to the articulation of women’s and men’s interests. It is argued that the anti-feminism of the early 1990s served specific economic and political purposes. By taking apart this discourse, the paper provides an alternative to analyzing the connection between the exclusion of women from active participation in the transformation processes and their absence as agents of memory who construct the narratives about the ways we conceptualize and understand the changes of 1989–91 today.

Barbara Gawęda is a second-year doctoral researcher and PhD candidate at the University of Edinburgh. Her dissertation aims to understand the conceptualization and use of gender in political discourses of Eastern Europe. Previously, she worked in Brussels as a public affairs consultant on energy and environment policies. She also holds a Master’s degree in International Studies from the Vienna School of International Studies (Austria) and a Bachelor’s degree with honor in International Studies at the York University Toronto (Canada).

JENS BOYSEN FORCING THE REDS OUT OF THE NATIONAL REMEMBRANCE

The Round Table talks of 1989 are the no. 1 hallmark event of systemic change in Poland, bringing about the *de facto* take-over of *Solidarity* already in August 1989 – embodied by the election of non-Communist prime minister Tadeusz Mazowiecki – and thus effectively breaking Poland out of the Communist bloc, which in turn accelerated similar developments in neighboring countries.

Since the mid-2000s, the fact that the price for this peaceful change was the far-reaching impunity of former Communist leaders, has been a major source for a permanent, and growing, rage of right-wing nationalists – i.e. a considerable part of the political class and the population – over the “betrayal” committed by

Solidarity's moderate leadership around Lech Wałęsa, Tadeusz Mazowiecki, Bronisław Geremek, Jacek Kuroń, and Adam Michnik.

Next to lambasting those opposition leaders, right-wing nationalist writers have time and again targeted General Czesław Kiszczak, the then Communist Minister of the Interior, and arguably main architect of the Round Table talks. Despite Kiszczak's having been put on trial for killings that happened under martial law in 1981–83, those writers perceive a lack of public awareness for his pro-Soviet and especially his Tchevist background.

While seeking to prove the “illegitimacy” of the general's actions, they show an ambiguous fascination with his political agility and cunning ability to create a situation in which the opposition was finally prepared to agree to what the regime had been offering for years as a “national agreement.” In fact, their ardent anti-Communism serves to conceal an unpleasant ideological kinship: in contrast with the liberal *Solidarity* leaders, the right-wing nationalists represent the majority of that movement, which – notwithstanding their conservative convictions – shared with the Communists a strong nationalism that was the main glue keeping Polish society together ever after 1945.

Jens Boysen (PhD) has from 2010 till now been a research fellow at the Historical Institute in Warsaw (Poland). Previously he was a research assistant at College of Europe in Bruges and research fellow at the Fraunhofer Center in Leipzig and the University of Leipzig, where he also was a lecturer.

SYLVIA BALGARINOV

WHOSE HISTORY SHOULD WE TEACH TO OUR CHILDREN?

1989 was the year when Polish history textbooks were fully freed from the official control of the communist state. It was also the time when the Pandora's box was already opened and diverse and often conflicting memories and narratives of the past were promoted not only by domestic, but also transnational and international actors. This paper asks what institutions and individuals have had the biggest influence over the evolution of these narratives in history textbooks since 1989, and if and how have they competed for their memories to be embodied in textbooks? What memories were perceived as the most important? In my paper I will present the findings of the analysis of networks of dominant institutions and individuals who have influenced the narratives of history textbooks. I will offer the comparison of networks in three points in time: 1989, 1999 and 2009. First of all, I will discuss the emergence of these networks in the 1980s. Secondly, I will describe the domestic and transnational networks in the 1990s and will elaborate on how institutions and individuals tried to influence history textbooks to include their preferred forms of remembering the past. Thirdly, I will explore recent “history wars” in education and the contestation involving different actors and their often conflicting versions of the past.

Sylvia Balgarinov (formely Bobryk) is a second year PhD student at the University of Portsmouth, UK. Her project paper “Narrating the Past: Changing Images of a Nation and Europe in Polish History Textbooks Since 1989” is supervised by Professor Wolfram Kaiser. In her research Balgarinov links the study of narratives with the analysis of networks of dominant domestic, transnational and international institutions and individuals who influence the content of history textbooks. By conducting the research she is going to show how domestic actors express their vision of the past and their memories to be embodied into history textbooks.

This paper analyzes how the public understanding of the 1989 Romanian Revolution (as a new beginning) has shaped the post-communist Romanian society. The revolution as a schism between the communist regime and a newborn society acts like a prism through which Romanians understand their communist past, but also the developments the country has taken after it. Once discourses about the revolution are reinterpreted, the present and the past gain new attributes which are laid over older concerns, sometimes obliterating former remembrances. In a fragmented post-communist society, the first days of the Revolution were recalled as the society's meeting point with the national imaginary (based on unity and solidarity), in contrast to an evolving reality, which unveiled a nation marked by social distrust and systemic corruption. By analyzing the media anniversaries of the Romanian Revolution, this paper shows how the representations of the break with the past changed from "heroic moment" (1989, 1990) to "tragedy" (1994, 1999) and later to "farce" (2004, 2009). These discursive changes are closely linked to the news media understanding of the Romanian post-communist society. In the early 1990s the journalists framed the Romanian nation in terms of unity, solidarity and victimhood, following the nationalist imaginary developed/inflated during the Ceaușescu regime. Communism was depicted as completely alien to national identity and a historical derailment caused by external factors. The contribution of local actors to enforce an extreme regime in Romania started to be acknowledged one decade after the collapse of communism, when the first manifestations of nostalgia for the recent past emerged also because of the present economic security. While (re)interpreting the Romanian Revolution as an unfinished attempt to break with communism, Romanian society was in fact longing for a different future that showed its promise in the moment of the Revolution.

Alina Thiemann (formerly Hoge) is a visiting fellow at the Institute for Social Research in Frankfurt am Main, Germany. She received her PhD in media and communication from Temple University, Philadelphia. Previously she studied at the New School and University of Bucharest. Her research interests include collective memory, communism, Eastern European history, and national identity. Her work was published in *Studies of Transition States and Societies* and *Romanian Journal of Journalism and Communication*.

FIRST DISCUSSANTS: MARCIN NAPIÓRKOWSKI AND JEFFREY K. OLICK

Marcin Napiórkowski (PhD 2010), is an Assistant Professor of the Faculty of Polish Studies at the University of Warsaw and a Postdoctoral Visiting Researcher at the University of Virginia. His interests focus on collective memory, aesthetics, and contemporary forms of mythical imagination. He is an author of two books on contemporary culture and collective imagination: *Mitologia współczesna (The Contemporary Mythology, 2013)* and *Władza wyobraźni (The Power of Imagination, 2014)*.

Jeffrey K. Olick is Professor of Sociology and History at the University of Virginia. His interests focus particularly on collective memory, critical theory, transitional justice, and postwar Germany. Olick is author or editor of six books, including: *The Collective Memory Reader* (with Vered Vinitzky-Seroussi and Daniel Levy), Oxford 2011; *The Sins of The Fathers: Governing Memory in The Federal Republic of Germany, 1949-1995*, Chicago 2011; *The Politics of Regret: On Collective Memory and Historical Responsibility*, New York 2007. His work has been translated into many languages. He is on the editorial board of the journal *Memory Studies* (Sage Publications).

CHAIR: JOANNA WAWRZY尼亚K

Joanna Wawrzyniak (PhD) works at the Institute of Sociology, University of Warsaw, where she is the head of the Social Memory Laboratory and the vice director for student affairs. She holds MAs in history (University of Warsaw) and political science (Central European University) and a doctorate in sociology (University of Warsaw). Her academic interests and areas of study include: history of memory studies as a field, politics of memory, veteran and war victims' organizations in postwar Poland, historical city museums in Central and Eastern Europe, as well as oral history of democratic opposition and privatization processes. In 2012/2013 she was a visiting fellow at Freiburg Institute for Advanced Studies and in 2013/2014 she was a fellow at Imre Kertész Kolleg Jena.

JANNIS PANAGIOTIDIS HORIZONS OF TRANSITION: ECONOMIC EXPERTS AND THE MAKING OF THE "LONG YEAR 1989"

This paper will deal with the horizon of expectations developed by economic experts for the East European transition during "the long year 1989." Economists played a crucial role in the shaping of this particular moment of historical change, as one of its key components was the transformation of the increasingly unsustainable socialist planned economy. While in retrospect the direction of the reform process towards a capitalist market economy might appear pre-ordained and without alternative, neither the goal nor the methods of transition were necessarily clear from the outset.

Johanna Bockman has recently argued that most contemporary economists in fact favored some version of market socialism, but were sidelined by a few influential economists like Jeffrey Sachs who advocated a rapid "shock therapeutic" transition to a liberal market economy. While it is difficult to establish with certainty the quantitative dimension of economist majority and minority opinions on the topic, it is indeed imperative from a historical perspective to reconstruct the options and possibilities that were weighed at the time – crucially, including those that were eventually dismissed.

Two contexts are particularly important in this regard: one is the pre-history of experiments with reform socialism in different countries, such as Poland, Hungary, and the Soviet Union under Gorbachev. Another one is the global mainstream of economic thinking during the 1980s, which is often defined by the label "neoliberal." It was against the backdrop of these trends and experiences that both "Western" and "Eastern" scholars working within the global sphere of economic thinking developed their ideas and visions for transition.

By reconstructing such voices, this paper will aim to gauge the expectations of the economic transformation of the contemporaries, including the disappointed. The latter, in particular, constitute a crucial element of the subsequently developing memory of the event.

Jannis Panagiotidis is Junior Professor for Russian German Migration and Integration at the Institute for Migration Research and Intercultural Studies (IMIS), University of Osnabrück. He obtained his PhD in history from the European

University Institute in Florence in 2012. His research project is about co-ethnic immigration to West Germany and Israel (1948-1992). As a postdoctoral research fellow at Imre Kertész Kolleg (Jena), he investigated the role of economists on transformations in East Europe after the end of the Soviet Era. Furthermore, he was a Manfred Lahnstein fellow at the Bucerius Institute for Contemporary German History at the University of Haifa, Israel in 2010/11.

AGNÈS ARP A SECOND NATIONALIZATION OF THE PRIVATE ENTREPRENEURS FROM THE GDR, 1989-1990?

I have done my PhD about the very particular life stories of the private entrepreneurs from family-owned enterprises in the GDR. The GDR was the only east European state where the private industrial sector was tolerated longer than anywhere else among the communist European democracies. The coexistence of the public and private industrial sectors (without handicrafts) persisted in the GDR for 27 years, from 1945 until 1972. This persistence of the old industrial middle class (*Mittelstand*) results among other factors from different entrepreneurial strategies: I have distinguished seven survival strategies that the entrepreneurs used to keep their enterprise.

If the whole nationalization of the East German economy in February 1972 abolishes the statute of the private enterprises, it does not eradicate the chiefs, their families and their employees. What did they do during and after this nationalization?

My contribution offers reflections on the role of those entrepreneurs, who in 1989–1990 were suddenly confronted with the possibility of regaining their property. Were they ready to manage it? What kinds of conditions were necessary to be successful in this process? I would like to explain how their experiences of the GDR were articulated, transmitted, and reconstructed in the 1990s. And I want to show how for a majority of them the process of restitution or compensation of their enterprises came short of their expectations.

Agnès Arp (PhD) studied Philosophy, German Studies and Contemporary History in Paris, Berlin and Jena. She completed her PhD under Lutz Niethammer at the FSU in Jena about the life stories of private industrial entrepreneurs in the GDR. Her fields of research are oral history, life stories, social psychology, narrative medicine, German 20th-century history, memory, and historiography.

KAMIL LIPIŃSKI SAILING TO THE “ISLANDS OF THE NORMAL”: 1989-1991 IN THE EYES OF POLISH BUSINESS ELITE

One of the most recognizable aspects of the economic and political transition in Poland, and in Eastern Europe in general, was the emergence of a new social group: the business elite. A radical reform of the economy gave many Polish entrepreneurs an opportunity to achieve relatively fast private fortunes comparable to those of the wealthiest families of Western Europe. The uniqueness of this experience raised the expectations of the middle class and made business elites authors of the dominant narration of new capitalist order.

The years 1989–1991 were crucial for Polish businessmen. “It was greenfield – you could do whatever you wanted.” When describing this period, some top Polish businessmen tend to use anecdotes to cover the

unpleasant and not prestigious fact of converting social (political and apolitical) and cultural capital into economic capital. They claim that personal uniqueness and creativity and hard work were the main sources and justifications of their success.

The presentation summarizes the results of my research on business elites. I have managed to reach 13 biographical interviews with top Polish managers and entrepreneurs, important figures of the Polish economy. I try to prove that the memory of transition as expressed by the economic elites is important for many reasons.

Firstly, the business elites are an influential group, with a significant social impact. Secondly, a prestigious narration of “self-designed men,” people who created themselves, makes the top businessmen Sloterdijk “elites of grief,” or a justified fulfillment of ambitions and dreams of society. The memory of transition they reproduce becomes a temptation for the middle classes. Thirdly, business elites produce a narration that describes the rejection of “sick” communism and a pursuit of “normal,” i.e. neoliberal order of contemporary economy. The story of their successful struggle for adaptation to capitalism might help to understand how the upper class uses the neoliberal framework to create their own “islands of the normal,” heterotopias of fulfilled capitalism.

Kamil Lipiński is a first-year PhD student at the Institute of Sociology of University of Warsaw. He graduated in Sociology and Environmental Engineering. A former editor of *Kontakt. Magazyn Nieuziemiony*. A founder of two NGOs: “Solidarna Białoruś” and “Miasto Jest Nasze.” A coauthor of a book *Style życia i porządek klasowy (Lifestyle and Class Order)*, published in Poland two years ago.

KAROLINA MIKOŁAJEWSKA REMEMBERING PRIVATIZATION IN THE POLISH FOOD INDUSTRY

The history of some of the most popular, iconic Polish industrial plants founded in the 19th century and surviving the turmoil of the 20th century – first the nationalization of the late 1940s and then privatization starting in early 1990s – represents the history of modern Polish economy in a nutshell. Interestingly enough, some of the now-classical brands, part of the Polish national identity, were founded by foreigners.

The paper endeavors to analyze two such cases from the food industry, both over 150 years old: the E. Wedel chocolate factory in Warsaw and the brewery in Żywiec. The first one was founded by a German protestant family, and the story of Żywiec is closely linked with the Habsburg rule in Silesia. The analysis is focused on the role of these families in the collective memory of contemporary employees of these factories, which within the last quarter of the century have become elements of the world’s casino capitalism (Strange, 1986).

The proposed presentation draws upon biographical narratives of employees of both E. Wedel and Żywiec Brewery, conducted as part of two research projects affiliated at the Institute of Sociology, University of Warsaw, in cooperation with History Meeting House¹, in which the author of the paper is a research team

¹ A project led by Dr. Joanna Wawrzyniak, IS UW: “Prywatyzacja doświadczeniem biograficznym// Privatization as biographical experience,” (2010-2012, agreement no. N N116 639740; “Od socjalistycznej fabryki do międzynarodowej korporacji. Archiwalna kolekcja narracyjnych wywiadów biograficznych z pracownikami przemysłu // From a socialist factory to a transnational corporation. A collection of narrative biographical interviews with industrial employees” (2013-2016, agreement no. 0103/NPRH2/H11/81/2012).

member. In preliminary findings concerning E. Wedel, K. Mikołajewska and J. Wawrzyniak (2013) showed the figure of the last pre-war owner, Jan Wedel, as a *lieu de mémoire* (Nora, 1989) and a tool of description and critique of the changing factory regime after 1989. The paper compares this figure with important memories of the Habsburg family for Żywiec Brewery – the Archduke Charles Stephen of Austria and Archduke Karl Albrecht of Austria-Teschen, the last owner of the factory prior to the Second World War.

Karolina Mikołajewska graduated from the Institute of Sociology, University of Warsaw, in 2012. She is a teaching assistant at the Center for Research on Organizations and Workplaces at Koźmiski University, Warsaw, and PhD candidate at the Institute of Sociology, University of Warsaw.

FIRST DISCUSSANTS: MACIEJ GDULA AND JOACHIM VON PUTTKAMER

Maciej Gdula, PhD, works in the Institute of Sociology, University of Warsaw. He is a member of Political Critique (Krytyka Polityczna). His research interests include social and political theory, and class formation. He has translated into Polish and edited Polish editions of Bruno Latour and Pierre Bourdieu's works. His recent publication is entitled *Style życia i porządek klasowy w Polsce* (2012, ed. with P. Sadura).

Joachim von Puttkamer, Professor of History, director of the Imre Kertész Kolleg Jena, chair for Eastern European History at the Friedrich Schiller University Jena. His main areas of research include: state-building and statehood in Eastern Europe, nationalism in East Central and Southeastern Europe, history of schooling and education, Eastern European cultures of memory, historical comparison. His most recent publication in English is *Legacies of Violence. Eastern Europe's First World War* (2014, co-edited with Jochen Böhrer and Włodzimierz Borodziej). Currently he is preparing a research project on the transformation in Poland in 1989/90.

CHAIR: MAŁGORZATA PAKIER

Małgorzata Pakier (PhD) is Head of the Research and Publications Department at the Museum of the History of Polish Jews. She is a member of the Social Memory Laboratory at the Institute of Sociology, University of Warsaw. She received her PhD degree from the European University Institute (Florence), History and Civilization Department. Her thesis titled *The Construction of European Holocaust Memory: German and Polish Cinema after 1989* was published with Peter Lang in 2013. In 2010, she was a Research Fellow at the Center for Advanced Holocaust Studies at the US Holocaust Memorial Museum, Washington, DC. Together with Bo Stråth she co-edited the volume *A European Memory? Contested Histories and Politics of Remembrance* (2010).

DENISE THORPE SIFTING AND SHIFTING MEMORY: LITHUANIAN VĒLINĖS PRACTICES AS THE PERFORMANCE AND CONSTRUCTION OF MEMORY

Drawing from ethnographic research among a diverse group of Lithuanians, my paper will consider 1989–1991 as it is constructed, performed, and transmitted within Lithuanian All Souls’ Day practices, referenced here as *Vėlinės*. Framing the discussion within generational dynamics of family, state, and church, I will offer individual stories to argue for the complexity and elusiveness – perhaps even the impossibility – of framing 1989–1991 as a collective memory in Lithuania. As an alternative, I will draw on Gilles Deleuze’s theories of space, Paul Connerton’s, Michael Rothberg’s, and Marianne Hirsch’s work on memory and post-memory, and Muslim ethicist Ebrahim Moosa’s image of the *dihliz* to suggest that we think about Lithuanian *Vėlinės* cemeteries as porous, pliable space where memory is constructed, de-constructed, and re-constructed – or to use Deleuze’s language, a spatial *assemblage* where memory is constantly territorialized, de-territorialized, and re-territorialized. In particular, I will give attention to the fact that *Vėlinės* cemeteries are marked but not controlled by the Roman Catholic Church. After outlining the basic structure of Roman Catholic teaching and practice during *Vėlinės*, I will highlight both passive and active agency in the construction of memory within Christian church traditions with particular attention to church-state relationships. A significant focus will be the varied relationships (or lack of relationship) with Christian churches among Lithuanians who participate in *Vėlinės* practices and the implications of those varied relationships for the construction of 1989–1991 memory.

Denise Thorpe is a scholar in practical theology who recently earned her ThD from Duke University, Durham, NC, USA, with a focus on material culture and religion. Denise’s dissertation, entitled *Memory on Fire: The Remembering of the Lithuanian Body Politic*, is an ethnographic exploration of All Souls’ Day practices in Lithuania. Denise is ordained as a minister of word and sacrament/teaching elder in the Presbyterian Church (USA) (MDiv, Yale University) and she is also trained as a lawyer (JD, Duke University). Denise currently serves as the project director for the Race, Church, and Theological Practices Collaborative Inquiry Team sponsored by the Louisville Institute and she is a mentor in the Macedonian Ministries program sponsored by the Cousins foundation.

Liberalization in the Soviet Union in the second half of the 1980s affected the sphere of state-church relations among others. It was a crucial period, a decay of a system which had oppressed believers and churches for many years. A widespread celebration of the Christianization of Kievan Rus' in 1988 and the adoption of the Law of the USSR on Freedom of Consciousness and Religious Organizations in 1990, which made creation and reconstruction of many religious communities possible, were the most important events for the believers of that time, which is why they associate those years with real, true freedom in their reflections. Besides, those years, as believers among our interviewees remember, were a time of personal freedom for many of them, as they faced religion thereat for the first time.

Our presentation is based on published memoirs and numerous biographical interviews conducted with Christians of different denominations in the scope of four long-term projects on the history of Protestant churches in Tyumen region; on the history of "Word of Life" Pentecostal churches in Khanty-Mansi autonomous region; on the personal biographies of contemporary religious leaders; and on the life of believers in the 1980s.

As almost all of our interviewees point out, 1989–1991 were the beginning of the biblical time to sow, to spread the word of Christ at least to the end of the Soviet Union, if not to the end of the earth. For believers it was a time full of biblical symbols leading to the second Christianization of Russia. In this respect, 1989–1991 is often contradistinguished with the end of 1990s and the beginning of 2000s, considered by Russian Christians as a time of harvest.

Vera Klyueva graduated from the Tyumen State University (Russia) in 1996. In 2000 she finished her PhD project *City Classes in Tobol'sk province in the 18th c. – first third of the 19th c.* Her current interests are focused more on Soviet and contemporary history. She has worked at the Siberian Branch of the Russian Academy of Sciences (Institute for Problems of the Development of the North) since 2000. She was Head of the Laboratory for Social and Historical Research from 2007 to 2012. Currently she is Senior Researcher of the Laboratory of Anthropology.

Roman Poplavsky graduated from the Tyumen State University, Russia (Institute of History and Political Sciences, Department of Modern History and International Relations) in 2008. His academic project is focused on international relations of Tyumen religious communities. Four years earlier, as a first-year student, he was invited to participate in a project about the history of Tyumen Protestant communities. This project was a basis for his later interests in religious studies and sociology of religion. Besides, he shows interest in relations between the State and the Church and in the history of religious movements in the Soviet Union and contemporary Russia.

The commemorations of the twentieth anniversary of the fall of Berlin Wall and German reunification constituted a specific context for my research: an oral history project I conducted in Berlin from 2009 to 2010. It comprised 30 interviews with individuals, residents of the GDR by the year 1989. Most of them were

engaged in dissident activities. In particular, I was interested in how the events of the 1989 revolution were remembered and how the dominant narratives were reflected in/contested by individual memories. In my presentation I will address two issues. The first one regards the incorporation and reflection of official narratives in one's own biography. Here I will point to the role of visual representations of the past, such as open-air exhibitions and installations displayed in public space, which shape individual memories. The second issue to be discussed are memories of the role of the Church during the 1989 revolution. Informants viewed the Church as a realm of freedom in the GDR. However, the narrative according to which the Church acted as a catalyst for protests and overthrow of the regime has been contested. Referring to visual culture, I will explain how this narrative has established itself. The examples discussed will facilitate a more general reflection on mediatization of memory within the context of 1989.

Dagmara Dudek (MA) graduated in Ethnology from the University of Warsaw. Currently studies Culture and History of Central and Eastern Europe at the European University Viadrina, Frankfurt (Oder). A Fritz Stern and DAAD Scholarship holder.

MALKHAZ TORIA GEORGIAN-ABKHAZIAN CONFLICT IN THE RECOLLECTIONS OF INTERNALLY DISPLACED HISTORIANS

After the Georgian-Abkhazian conflict in 1992–1993, thousands of ethnic Georgians were forced to leave their homeland. The Georgian national narrative paints this conflict as the explosions of mines planted by Russia in order to hinder Georgia's aspiration to escape from Russian domination. Within this narrative, Abkhazians are depicted as having been "tricked" by imperial Russia into starting the war against their true "brothers" Georgians. Memories of Georgian IDPs fully correspond to the national narrative, but are distinguished by an emotional, intense and dramatic representation of the conflict and displacement. Exemplary evidence could be found in personal recollections of IDP "memory agents" or "cultural memory specialists" (historians, writers, teachers, public figures). They focus on Russia's role in escalating the Georgian-Abkhazian conflict in a more radical form and blame it for fueling ethnic phobias in the region. Apart from this, the key constitutive elements of IDP memories are recollections of ethnic cleansing committed against Georgians. Reproducing the narrative of forced migration in a broader nationalistic narrative about the "exodus" supports these claims to ethnic cleansing. Consequently, memories of IDPs are inevitably reflected through the lenses of a national trauma. We can see how the collective wound left from ethnic cleansing and forced migration returns and repeats itself permanently in written or oral recollections (in historical research, memoirs, novels, memory books, oral histories) of IDP "memory agents."

Malkhaz Toria (PhD) is an Assistant Professor at Ilia State University, Georgia. He received his PhD in history from Tbilisi State University (Georgia) in 2009. His research interests focus on historical discourse and collective memory in medieval and modern Georgia, and on imperial legacies, ethnic minorities and regional conflicts in post-soviet Georgia. He was a visiting researcher at the Central European University in Budapest, a DAAD Visiting Researcher at Zentrum für Literatur-und Kulturforschung in Berlin in 2010, a Fulbright Scholar at The New School, New York, in 2011, a visiting scholar at The Harriman Institute, Columbia University, in 2013, a Carnegie Fellow at UC Berkeley in 2013, and an OSF visiting scholar at the Mount Holyoke College, Massachusetts, US, in 2014.

MIMOZA TELAKU COLLECTIVE NARRATIVE OF THE INTERETHNIC CONFLICT IN KOSOVO

The aim of this research is the examination of the collective narratives of Albanian and Serbian groups about the interethnic conflicts. The focus of this research is on the conflicting narratives of these interethnic conflicts. The armed conflict in 1998–1999, NATO intervention in 1999, Kosovo independence declaration in 2008, and other preceding historical events/conflicts are perceived and justified differently by these ethnic communities. The current interethnic tensions are deeply rooted in the experiences and intergenerational transmission of the memories of abovementioned events. As these two ethnic groups still have incompatible attitudes and different aspirations for the future of Kosovo, the normalization of the interethnic relations seems far away. The levels of nationalistic attitudes, which are very high and prevent improvement of interethnic relations, are mostly influenced by collective memories and interpretations of the interethnic conflicts. This study is based on qualitative research methods. The collective narratives are gathered from the focus groups from different sites in Kosovo. The target of this research is Albanian and Serb ethnic communities in Kosovo. Half of the focus groups are mono-ethnic and the other half are bi-ethnic.

Mimoza Telaku is a PhD candidate at the Department of Interdisciplinary Studies/Program of Conflict Management & Resolution at Ben Gurion University of the Negev, Israel. Her MA thesis in Psychology was titled *Acculturation Diversity among Minority Young People* (University of Pristina, Kosovo).

LÁSZLÓ SZABOLCS THE HOPEFUL DECEMBER AND THE BLACK MARCH: DOCUMENTARY FILMS AS COLLECTIVE MEMORY PROJECTS IN ROMANIA

In Romania, the revolution of 1989 could potentially become a foundational historical event for the development of a pluralist democracy and an inclusive political community in a multiethnic country. Yet the subsequent 25 years saw the promotion of an exclusively ethno-cultural definition of the nation-state, the legislative codification of state nationalism, and the continued nationalist rhetoric of both majority and minority political actors. Shortly after the revolution, in March 1990, in the city of Târgu Mureș/Marosvásárhely, such nationalist incitements caused the outbreak of a violent conflict, later to be seen as the first ethnic conflict in Europe after the fall of communism. Regarding collective memory, both December 1989 and March 1990 are highly contested and ambiguous, although it now seems that the conflicting, ethnicized discourses causing the latter event have eliminated the initial civic and pluralist visions arising from the former. Thus, my study will address the wider problem of how the “politics of identity” and the “politics of memory” interact generally in Romania. Drawing on constructivist theories of collective memory and ethnicity, I argue that the creation of “mnemonic communities” engenders parallel, ethnicized collective memories connected to historical events, and as a result they constantly reproduce the separateness and exclusivity of “ethno-cultural worlds.” This constructed opposition goes against the development of a common, civic, Habermasian public memory of (and inspired by) December 1989, and undermines the possibility of building an inclusive political community against the legacy of March 1990. To illustrate my point, I will discuss the state level “cultural amnesia” and ambiguity which surrounds these events, together with the analysis of three documentary films (*Balkan Champion*, Réka Kincses, 2006; *The Black March of Marosvásárhely*, Gyula Miholcsa, 2010; *Does Your Head Hurt?*, Edit Bereczki and Cornel Mihalache, 2010) seen as parallel, vernacular memory projects dealing with the collective remembrance of 1989 and 1990.

László Szabolcs has a BA in Hungarian and English literature from the Babeş-Bolyai University in Cluj-Napoca, MA in British cultural studies from the University of Bucharest (Romania). Moreover, he got MA in nationalism studies from Central European University (Budapest, Hungary). His research interests include: multiculturalism, ethnicity, identity construction, intellectual and political history of East Europe, literary translations, and discourse analysis. Currently an editor at the CEU Press.

FIRST DISCUSSANTS: LUTZ NIETHAMMER AND JAMES WERTSCH

Lutz Niethammer studied theology, history, and social sciences mainly at Heidelberg. Professor of Modern History at Essen (1973), Hagen (1982), and Jena (1993), Emeritus (2005). Senior advisor in Imre Kertész Kolleg on Europe's East in the 20th century. Visiting scholar at Oxford, Paris, both Berlins of the later Cold War, Basel, Florence, Vienna, and Warsaw. Founding director of the Institute for Advanced Studies in the Humanities (Essen), member of the Kuratorium Buchenwald, and government advisor on compensation for Nazi forced labor. Niethammer's fields of research include German and European transformations after 1945 and after 1989, social and urban history, oral history, memory and generational studies, and intellectual history.

James V. Wertsch is the Marshall S. Snow Professor in Arts and Sciences, Vice Chancellor for International Affairs, and Professor of Anthropology at Washington University in St. Louis. He is the founding director of the McDonnell International Scholars Academy, which is Washington University's lead international initiative. Wertsch's research is concerned with language, thought, and culture, with a special focus on national narratives and identities. He is the author of over 200 publications appearing in over a dozen languages. These include the volumes *Voices of the Mind* (Harvard University Press, 1991), *Mind as Action* (Oxford University Press, 1998), and *Voices of Collective Remembering* (Cambridge University Press, 2002). After finishing his PhD at the University of Chicago in 1975 Wertsch was a postdoctoral fellow in Moscow at the USSR Academy of Sciences and Moscow State University. Wertsch has held faculty positions at Northwestern University, the University of California, San Diego, Clark University, and now Washington University in St. Louis. In addition he has been a visiting professor at the University of Utrecht, Moscow State University, the University of Seville, the Swedish Collegium for Advanced Study in Social Sciences, Bristol University, and the University of Oslo. Wertsch is a Fellow of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, holds honorary degrees from Linköping University in Sweden and the University of Oslo in Norway, and is an honorary member of the Russian Academy of Education.

CHAIR: PIOTR FILIPKOWSKI

Piotr Filipkowski (PhD) is associate professor at the Institute of Philosophy and Sociology of the Polish Academy of Sciences, member of Chair of Sociology and Anthropology of Culture. In 2008 he defended his PhD on concentration camp experiences in biographical-narrative perspective. In 2002-2011 coordinated the Oral History program at the KARTA Centre, where he was engaged in numerous Polish and international oral history documentation and research projects. Co-founder and associate of Oral History Archive of the History Meeting House – the biggest and most diverse Polish oral history collection. Member of Social Memory Laboratory at the Institute of Sociology, University of Warsaw and founding member of Polish Oral History Association. His general research interests concentrate on the relationships between experience – memory – and autobiographical narrative.

ADAM MIELCZAREK EXPERIENCE AND MEMORY OF POLISH SOLIDARITY MOVEMENT

Personal participation is an experience that can profoundly alter the manner in which people view reality and shape the values they espouse. Events connected with the rise of the Solidarity movement and the introduction of martial law were of this type. They led to changes in the attitudes of parts of society about the system of real socialism, which disrupted considerably the basic principles of its reproduction. This, in turn, led to profound social divisions. Later on, recollections of the events from the early 1980s were not ordinary memories either, but experiences actively shaping cognitive frames, values and attitudes among the active segment of Polish society. The frames developed in the 1980s continue to play a key role in the commonly accepted current interpretations of political changes.

The narrative representations created by the media have an influence on the memory of the events connected with the fall of communism. They are also a reflection of existing social cleavages, however. Today's disputes about the results of the political transformations should also be seen as the long term impact of a social movement which, on the one hand met with a counter-mobilization from the supporters of the system of the day and, on the other, has split into different currents, each seeking to enforce its own self-serving interpretation of that movement's legacy.

Adam Mielczarek is a sociologist interested in the Solidarity movement. He currently works on the project: "Opposition – Solidarity – Underground. An Attempt to Theorize the Oppositional Social Movements of the Last Decade of Communist Poland" (in the Institute of Sociology of the Jagiellonian University). His presentation is based on his recently finished project "The Consciousness of a Great Change: Social Perception of the Solidarity Movement's Role in the Fall of the Communism in Poland" (at the Public Opinion Research Center).

The paper takes under scrutiny two aspects of the remembering of the period of 1989(87)–1991 in Estonia. Firstly, we will ask how this period is presented in Estonian museums: which aspects of the crucial events are selected and which narratives stressed, and what mediums are used for this purpose. Secondly, we will ask if and how recent history staged at museums is reflected in individual narratives.

Museums could be treated as one of the main agents in public memory making, providing individuals with cultural tools (Wertsch 2002) for creating narratives about their past. According to A. Assmann’s concept of cultural memory (1999), we could interpret museums as carriers of cultural memory (*Speichergedächtnis*). We will concentrate on two central Estonian museums by asking which national and transnational contexts are used to mediate narratives of recent past. We will show how this period is presented at the exhibition opened in 2008 at the Estonian History Museum in Tallinn. The second narrative studied is the planned permanent exhibition at the Estonian National Museum in Tartu, to be opened in the autumn of 2016.

Besides, we will look on how the generation born in 1970s is reflecting on the same events in their biographical interviews. People born in the 1970s experienced the transformation of the society during their formative years. Today, they are gradually making their presence in public and discursive fields in Estonian society and therefore their treatment of the time under scrutiny is important in terms of analyzing public narratives.

By looking at these different angles we will be able to see in which way the collective narrative is created, which are the overlapping aspects of “freedom narrative,” and if there are some contested issues.

Kirsti Jõesalu is a researcher at the University of Tartu (Estonia). She is currently working on her PhD thesis on remembering “mature socialism.” Her main fields of research are cultural and political memory of socialism, study of socialist everyday life and oral history. She is the author of several articles focused on the topic of remembering socialism.

Raili Nugin is a researcher at Tallinn University (Estonia). She obtained her PhD, which was dedicated to the 1970s cohort in Estonia. Her main fields of research are transition to adulthood, construction of generations and rural youth transitions. She has published on these topics in several journals and books.

Football clubs are cultural phenomena that played and still play an important identification role in East(ern) Germany. The identification with these clubs sometimes been interpreted as a political standpoint. Studying football culture thus makes it possible not only to discern continuity but also discontinuity as well as alterations after 1989. In the paper I discuss how identity formations among football fans have been affected by the social, political, economic and cultural changes that took place in Europe in general, and in East(ern) Germany in particular, in 1989–1991.

Using tools from oral history and ethnology I analyze empirical data from interviews and participating observations carried out with fans from FC Erzgebirge Aue, FC Union Berlin, Berliner FC Dynamo, and FC Magdeburg. In the analysis I use an intersectional approach to identity formation, making it possible to find

intersections between the identification with the clubs on the one hand and various social or cultural categories such as nation, gender, locality, hegemony, and generation, on the other.

The purpose of the paper is to discuss how the interviewed fans articulate their experiences of *die Wende* more than 20 years after the actual events and how these articulations are formed by different discourses on and consequences of the collapse of the GDR, the German unification and its football equivalent. The latter is a key issue, since many clubs have experienced dramatic changes in the wake of the unification.

Another important focus of the paper is to analyze what the identification with the clubs might signify in different situational, relational and temporal contexts, analyzed on individual and collective levels.

Joakim Glaser obtained the Bachelor's Degree (BA) in historical studies at Malmö University (Sweden). He is currently writing his doctoral thesis, which is dedicated to the theme of football fans' identification with football clubs in Eastern Germany from 1966–2014. The research is going to be completed and published until the end of the current year. His Bachelor's thesis named *Med muren i backspegeln. Nationens betydelse för ungas identitetsskapande i östra Tyskland (With the Wall in the Rearview Mirror. The Significance of Nation in Identity Formation among Teenagers in Eastern Germany)* was published in 2011 and was based on interviews made with young Germans in Brandenburg. He has a university Diploma dedicated to educational process in upper-secondary school (Lund University). He was employed as a teacher of history, English, social science, German and Swedish for 15 years.

CĂTĂLIN PARFENE FOOTBALL, WRITING AND POLITICS IN THE MEMORY OF AN ETHNIC HUNGARIAN IN ROMANIA

The paper discusses the oral interview I made in Budapest with Karoly Oroszhegyi, writer, journalist and Romanian international football player of Hungarian ethnicity in the 1950s, whose life can be seen as part of larger migration/remigration processes and historical traumas between Romania and Hungary during the 20th century. After a biographical sketch, I describe the methodology of the interview: Rosenthal's biographical-narrative method. Then I make its evaluation, starting from the interviewee's oral narratives about the political implications of his life as an ethnic Hungarian in Romania.

The paper's findings deal with the ethnic Hungarians' status during the Romanian National Legionary State and with their subsequent problems within the Hungarian state following the 1940 Vienna Dictate, problems only partially solved through Lady Horthy's sympathetic interventions.

Furthermore, the paper emphasizes the ambiguous relationship between an ethnic Hungarian who was never a member of the Romanian Communist Party but represented Romania through his selection in the national football team, and the communist regime. The communist authorities oscillated between dismissing Oroszhegyi from his jobs as football player and journalist, on the one hand, and almost warmly warning him in order to avoid mainly the problems with the feared Securitate, like it happened in 1956, during the Hungarian Revolution, or later through some "unofficial" channels like tapped phone conversations, on the other hand. Thus, the paper underlines several new ways of negotiating and new modes of avoiding conflicts, and proposes the term "reversed collaboration."

Finally, the paper emphasizes what some of the Hungarians from Hungary were mistakenly thinking in the years 1989–1990 about the level of the Romanianization of the Hungarians in Romania and explains the reasons behind Oroszhegyi's decision to settle down for good in Budapest as part of ethnic Hungarians' larger migration process from Romania to Hungary in the late 1980s and early 1990s.

Cătălin Parfene is a second-year PhD student in History at the University of Bucharest, Romania. Previously, he got a Master's degree in history at Central European University in Budapest and graduated in medieval studies from the University of Bucharest. The title of his Master's thesis was *Between "Foreigners" and Romanianization: the Romanian National Football Team in the Interwar Period*, while his PhD project is entitled *How Hungarian Team can be Romanian: Football, Politics and National Identity in Communist Romania*.

FIRST DISCUSSANTS: OLENA IVANOVA AND MIROSLAV VANĚK

Olena Ivanova is a Professor of Psychology and a Head of the Chair of General Psychology at the Department of Psychology in the Vasyl Karazin Kharkiv National University (Ukraine). Her research interests include memory, namely construction and reconstruction of collective memory and its connection with identity and individual memory. She studied collective memory of the Holocaust in Ukraine: narratives about the Holocaust in the history textbooks, collective memory of students, regional differences in the collective memory about the Holocaust, changes in the collective memory and its connections with individual memory. Ivanova has published a number of articles in the *Journal of Holocaust and Genocide Studies*, Russian-American Journal *Ab Imperio*, *Journal of Museum Education*, and several Ukrainian and Russian journals.

Miroslav Vaněk is director of the Oral History Center and senior researcher at the Institute of Contemporary History of the Czech Academy of Sciences in Prague. A former president of the International Oral History Association and honorary President of the Czech Oral History Association. He lectures at the Charles University in Prague, at Faculty of Arts and Faculty of Humanities. He specializes in modern Czech history, primarily the period of Czechoslovak socialism, with special attention to the young generation under socialism including student and ecological movements, dissidents, political communist elites, workers, economic managers, as well as the oral history method.

GROUP AND GENERATIONAL MEMORIES, NOV 8, 9:00-12:00 ROOM 316 (UNIVERSITY OF WARSAW LIBRARY)

CHAIR: FRANKA MAUBACH

Franka Maubach is a research assistant at the Friedrich Schiller University Jena, has conducted oral history interviews for her PhD on the experiences of German women auxiliaries in the Second World War, which was published in 2009. Moreover she co-edited books on the history of women soldiers (2010) and on the International Oral History Association (2013). Currently she works in the field of intellectual history and history of historiography.

MAGDALENA WNUK THE 1989 DILEMMA: "TO STAY ABROAD OR TO RETURN TO POLAND?"

1989 affected many people – in 1988 many would not have believed it was coming. The disbelief was strong for those who lived in Poland, but even stronger for the emigrants building a new life in Western Europe or the USA. Many of them did not expect the collapse of the communist system they had escaped from. And when it happened, they must have reconsidered whether to stay or to return to Poland. In spite of a difficult adaptation to Western reality the emigrants' decision whether to come back to Poland was not so easily taken, often because of the distrust and material reasons (many of them did not even have a house to return to). Today they face the consequences of the decisions they made at this specific moment of European history. My current research concerns the experience of emigrants who left Poland in the 1980s. and decided to stay in Sweden, Austria and Italy. The purpose of this project is to deepen knowledge of the cultural and social meaning of migration processes from the People's Republic of Poland (the PRL) at the time. The narratives I am gathering in my research will shed some light on the great transition in Poland from different perspectives – the specific points of view of emigrants.

Magdalena Wnuk graduated from the Institute of Ethnology and Cultural Anthropology at University of Warsaw. At the moment she is a PhD candidate in the Institute of History in the Polish Academy of Sciences.

ELENA BOGOMYAGKOVA RUSSIAN STUDENTS REMEMBERING 1993

The attitudes towards the events that took place in the early 1990s in the post-Soviet zone rarely draw contemporary scientists' attention. Basing on the transactions of M. Halbwachs and M. Foucault, we use two fundamental terms: historical memory and contre-memory. Historical memory is a part of historical awareness, it forms spontaneously. Contre-memory is designed by power groups to legalize existing political and social order.

The purpose of this research is analysis of the channels of forming modern students' historical memory about events that took place in 1993 (political turnover attempt), notably, a study of contre-memory influence over historical memory. Technical and humanities students aged from 17 to 22 from two Saint Petersburg universities have taken part in the research. The research included 3 parts: questioning online (200 participants); unstructured personal interview (10 participants); media content analysis (TV and

newspapers) and Russian history textbooks for the 2013/2014. The research was conducted with assistance of George Nikolaenko and Ekaterina Evsikova. We found out on the content analysis basis that the interpretation of the 1993 events in the media is opposite to the legal version of it. The image of Boris Yeltsin as a central personality prevails in all sources analyzed, while his opponents are hardly mentioned. The events that happened in 1993 are virtually disregarded by Russian history textbooks. That is how the “insignificance” of these events is being formed. The results of the survey and interviews are similar. Contemporary media and institutes of education are the main means of forming contre-memory.

We came to the conclusion that historical memory falls under the contre-memory influence. Constructs of contre-memory form actuality, interpreting different historical events for the benefit of ruling groups.

Elena Sergeevna Bogomyagkova is a Candidate of Science in Sociology at St. Petersburg State University, Sociological Department. From 2006 she has been a Lecturer at this University’s Department of Sociological Theory and History.

George Alexandrovich Nikolaenko and Ekaterina Evsikova Valerievna are students in the Chair of Theory and History of Sociology, Faculty of Sociology, St. Petersburg State University.

KAJA KAŻMIERSKA EXPERIENCE OF THE PROCESS OF TRANSFORMATION IN POLAND IN GENERATIONAL PERSPECTIVE

My presentation will be based on the ongoing research project focused on the sociological analysis of biographical experience of the process of transformation in Poland. The project has the following aims: (1) to grasp and analyze the dynamics of the process of transformation in the perspective of biography; (2) to focus on the sociological analysis of everyday experience and the biographical reconstruction of the process of transformation before and after the year 1989; (3) to find out how various biographical circumstances (education, profession, social status, political commitment, etc.) influenced adaptive strategies to the transformation experience and what their interpretation in the narration is; (4) to comment on and possibly criticize common, simplified interpretative schemes of the process of transformation present in the public discourse by showing a diversity of experiences contextualized in biographies and influencing different ways of dealing with transformation; (5) to get insight into collective social processes in which biographical experiences appear prominent. In my presentation I would like to comment on some of our findings.

Kaja Kaźmierska (PhD), is an assistant professor of sociology at the Institute of Sociology (Chair of Sociology of Culture) at the University of Łódź, Poland. Her research work is based on biographical narrative interview analysis and she works on problems such as collective identities, biographical experiences of the war and collective memory.

JOLANTA STECIUK VOICES OF THE 1970–75 GENERATION IN POLAND

The paper examines the voice of the 1970–75 generation in the context of the fall of communism and transformation in Poland (1989).

People from the generation in question fall into a certain gap. On the one hand, they were not old enough to be fully involved in official political activity or democratic opposition under communism. On the other hand, they were still too young to be leaders of the 1989 transformation and of the new system in its initial phase.

However, as children and young people, they experienced important historical events. They were 6-11 years old when martial law was imposed in Poland. They witnessed the fall of communism at the age of 14-19. Thus, they made important life decisions themselves during the transformation from one political, cultural, economic, and social system to another. They were also affected by decisions made by older people from their social circles (e.g. parents), role models. In their first books, writers from this generation cover diverse fields (e.g. work in international corporations, feminism, voice of the third generation after the Holocaust).

The paper aims to analyze the voice of a generation (intellectual and ideological horizon, topics of interest evoked in the literature created by writers born in Poland within 1970–75) vs. individual stories collected in oral history interviews (maximally diverse cases). It offers reflection on collective versus individual memory.

Jolanta Steciuk obtained a degree in law from the University of Warsaw, Law and Administration Faculty. She was a fellow at Columbia University in 2012 at “Historical Dialogue and Accountability Program.” PhD student at the Graduate School for Social Research at the Institute of Philosophy and Sociology of the Polish Academy of Sciences. She published a book *All Shall Be Different*, which includes interviews with Polish human rights activist and publicist Halina Bortnowska.

GRAŻYNA KUBICA-HELLER AND AGNIESZKA KRÓL **TRAJECTORIES OF POLISH TRANSFORMATION: BIOGRAPHICAL NARRATIVES OF THE 1989 GENERATION**

Our paper summarizes the results of a project that we carried out together with a group of sociology students in January 2014. We collected 35 full biographical interviews with people who were young adults in 1989. Coming from South-Eastern Poland, towns and villages, they were of various class background.

Apart from a regular analytical procedure, a performance was organized in which the students presented fragments from their interlocutors’ narratives. The performance was video-recorded. Both the scientific and artistic procedures brought about very interesting results and insights. One of the main outcomes is a general observation. People narrated their stories as trajectories (in the Fritz Schutze’s sense) but not regular ones. After initial traumatic changes, they did not lose their sense of agency but managed to cope with the situation.

Agnieszka Król is a doctoral student in the Institute of Sociology, Jagiellonian University. She has participated in several historical projects, which resulted i.a. in documentary films: *Jugów: pamięć i zapomnienie*; *Stacja kolejowa Krasne-Busk. Opowieści przesiedlonych kobiet*.

Grażyna Kubica-Heller is a lecturer of Social Anthropology at the Institute of Sociology, Jagiellonian University (Kraków). One of her research areas is the history of anthropology. She wrote an introduction and several annotations of the full version of Bronisław Malinowski's diary *Dziennik w ścisłym znaczeniu tego wyrazu* (2002). Later she published a feminist book *Siostry Malinowskiego (Malinowski's Sisters, 2006)*, in which she shows the role of women in Bronisław Malinowski's academic career. She has also recently published a second book about the Silesian region entitled *Śląskość i protestantyzm. Antropologiczne studia o Śląsku Cieszyńskim, proza, fotografia (Silesianess and Protestantism. Anthropological Essays on Teschen Silesia, Prose, Photography 2011)*. She has been also involved in Polish-Ukrainian history projects.

Transitions from authoritarian regimes to democracy in Latin American countries such as Chile and Argentina have constructed an official memory of the past that recognizes and condemns the gross human rights violations committed during the dictatorships. Political authorities and social organizations involved in this process have employed different transitional justice strategies, such as truth commissions, material and symbolic reparations to victims and memorialization initiatives. One of the main goals of this process has been to rebuild and maintain the democratic order. However, the master narratives of transitional governments that emphasizes a democratic order are being challenged in particular by new generations. Those young people attempt to construct a 'counter-politics' of memory resisting the idea of a society that has reached reconciliation and political stability through the process of transition.

This paper explores how new generations remember, enact and recreate the recent past. Specifically, I analyze the memory of the armed resistance against dictatorships in Argentina and Chile. This is a memory where violence has a fundamental role: this memory emerged in the resistance against the repression and human rights violations of the military regimes and has been enacted in some cases by using violent means. By performing the memory of the armed resistance young people from different territories and social locations are challenging the assumptions that have sustained the official discourses of transitional governments. Understanding how this process occurs for generations that did not experience those violent periods can shed light on the role of the discourses and meanings of violence within these particular transitional processes and the effects of politics of memory in post-transition stages.

Manuela Badilla Rajevic is a PhD student in sociology at The New School for Social Research (New York, USA). Currently, she is exploring the connection between memories of new generations, political and symbolic violence and the construction of an official narrative of the past in post dictatorship societies in Latin America. Her work falls within the scope of political sociology and sociology of knowledge and memory; in particular topics related to power, political violence, political identity and citizenship.

FIRST DISCUSSANTS: ALEXANDER VON PLATO AND LJUBICA SPASKOVSKA

Alexander von Plato is a founder and long-time director of the Oral History Centre at the Open University Hagen, and the German oral history journal BIOS. He is also a founder and former secretary and vice president of the International Oral History Association. Von Plato taught at the universities of Essen, Hagen, Winnipeg, and Vienna. His main research field is the study of historical experience and mentality while his publications included: *Hitler's slaves : life stories of forced labourers in Nazi-occupied Europe* (ed. with A. Leh., Ch. Thonfeld 2010) and *Opposition als Lebensform : Dissidenz in der DDR, der SSR und in Polen* (with T. Vilímek, 2013).

Ljubica Spaskovska (PhD) is a research fellow engaged in a project "1989 after 1989: Rethinking the Fall of State Socialism in Global Perspective" at the University of Exeter, UK. She completed her doctoral dissertation on youth policy and culture in Late Socialism Yugoslavia at the University of Exeter in 2014. She has also worked as a research fellow at the University of Edinburgh on a project "Europeanisation of Citizenship in the Successor States of the Former Yugoslavia (CITSEE)."

1989–1991 IN COMPARATIVE AND TRANSNATIONAL PERSPECTIVES, NOV. 8, 13:00 – 15:00,
ROOM 316

CHAIR: PIOTR FILIPKOWSKI

Piotr Filipkowski (PhD) is associate professor at the Institute of Philosophy and Sociology of the Polish Academy of Sciences, member of Chair of Sociology and Anthropology of Culture. In 2008 he defended his PhD on concentration camp experiences in biographical-narrative perspective. In 2002-2011 coordinated the Oral History program at the KARTA Centre, where he was engaged in numerous Polish and international oral history documentation and research projects. Co-founder and associate of Oral History Archive of the History Meeting House – the biggest and most diverse Polish oral history collection. Member of Social Memory Laboratory at the Institute of Sociology, University of Warsaw and founding member of Polish Oral History Association. His general research interests concentrate on the relationships between experience – memory – and autobiographical narrative.

BURKHARD OLSCHOWSKY 1989 AS A LIEU DE MÉMOIRE IN POLAND AND GERMANY

The year 1989 was far-reaching for Poland and Germany, it has changed the constitution of the state and the life chances of people in unexpected ways. In both countries "people`s autumn" symbolizes self-liberation of the guardianship of the late real socialism. The memory of "1989" is subject to – according to Ernest Renan – an almost daily construction based on unexpected changes in the political order and the paths of life that have not found their completion yet.

The presentation will analyze the different interpretations and perceptions of the year 1989 in both countries. In this study a particular focus will be drawn to the following agents of memory: public and political discourses, anniversaries, memorials, films and other media. In addition, these agents of memory will be examined with regard to their influence on traditions and national heritage. In this way, based on Pierre Nora`s theory, comparisons can be drawn on the mechanisms and motives in the manifestation and establishment of memories and the emergence of lieux de mémoire in the two countries.

A focus should be drawn on experiences and associations which might come to the minds of Poles and Germans with this caesura and contribute to form a specific identity. Finally, it will be asked whether and under which conditions "1989" could be established as a founding myth for Europe based on the experience of the freedom revolutions.

Burkhard Olschowsky, PhD, studied history and history of Eastern Europe in Göttingen, Warsaw and Berlin. In 2002 he received a doctoral degree at Humboldt University, Berlin. In 2003–2005 he worked as contractual lecturer of Contemporary History and Politics at Humboldt University. In 2004–2005 he worked in the Federal Ministry of Transport, Building and Housing. Since May 2005 he has been a research worker in the Federal Institute for Culture and History of the Germans in Eastern Europe. Since 2010 he has worked as a researcher in the Secretariat of European Network Remembrance and Solidarity.

The paper presents some preliminary findings from an ongoing research project on ordinary people's images of the past, based on focus groups with people of different educational background and with differences in international experience from four European countries (Germany, Poland, Spain, and the United Kingdom). As expected, the changes beginning in 1989 hardly play any role for respondents from Spain and the UK, while they are among the key historic events in Germany in Poland. Our analysis shows that German respondents' memories are rather framed nationally, i.e. they tend to stick to national events, namely the fall of the Berlin Wall. Polish respondents also mention a series of national events most frequently, such as the Solidarity movement, but tend to frame them in a broader, transnational context. However, in both countries, we can observe quite interesting differences between our respondents' memories and the official memory in the respective countries.

Lars Breuer is a research associate at the Institute for Sociology at Freie Universität Berlin, working in the research project "Collective Memory as a Basis for Identification with Europe" funded by German Research Foundation (DFG). He studied cultural studies, politics, and sociology in Berlin, Copenhagen and Lüneburg and received his MA in cultural studies from Humboldt University in Berlin. From 2004–2006 he was research assistant in the project "International Traditions of Historical Consciousness" at the Center for Interdisciplinary Memory Studies (CMR), Institute for Advanced Study in the Humanities, Essen. In 2013 he received his PhD from Leibniz Universität Hannover with a dissertation on German and Polish vernacular memory of the Second World War.

Anna Delius (formerly Leidinger) is research associate at the Institute for Sociology at Freie Universität Berlin, working in the research project "Collective Memory as a Basis for Identification with Europe" funded by German Research Foundation (DFG). She studied history, political science and Polish philology at Freie Universität Berlin and University of Potsdam. She received her MA in 2011. From 2009–2001 she was student research assistant at the office of the former Federal President Dr. Richard von Weizsäcker in Berlin. In 2008 she was student research assistant at the Federal Foreign Office, Berlin.

The question of how to deal with memories of war and dictatorship after the transition to democracy has divided nation states for centuries. Particularly since 1989 and the end of the Cold War, memory as an element of transitional justice has increasingly become a contested issue, also on the European level. Previous research has tried to describe developments within EU institutions in terms of policy conflict, concentrating on the East-West divide within the Union in trying to explain the dynamics in different policy venues. And both connect memory closely to identity, recognition and justice questions.

What so far has not been looked at is the wider context of those memory clashes that concern in particular the events surrounding 1989. How is the end of the Cold War remembered on the European level? Do we really only deal with an East-West divide that in some cases overlaps with a Right-Left divide? How do representatives of countries with an equally contested history (Spain, Italy, Greece, Portugal) react to the sometimes aggressive demands by Eastern European MEPs? Which role do the trans-national party groups

play? To what extent do they manage to frame the debate? Do they put forward a collective or collected framing of memories?

The proposed paper will dig deep into the complex dynamics lying at the heart of memory contests concerning the end of the Cold War within the EU. By closely analyzing protocols of EP, JHA Council and Council of Europe meetings using frame analysis, it will be possible to dissect the different levels of actions and reactions within the EU. It thus will provide a more differentiated view on discussions preceding EU decisions on policies of memory.

Aline Sierp is Assistant Professor in European Studies at Maastricht University (NL). She holds a PhD in Comparative European Politics and History from the University of Siena (IT). Her thesis analyzed the Politics of Memory and Identity in Western Europe. Before joining the University of Maastricht, Aline Sierp worked as researcher at the Dachau Concentration Camp Memorial Site (DE). She is the author of *History, Memory and Transeuropean Identity: Unifying Divisions* (Routledge, 2014).

DISCUSSANT:

MICHAEL BERNHARD

Michael Bernhard is Ehrlich Professor of Political Science at the University of Florida. He is the author of *Institutions and the Fate of Democracy: Germany and Poland in the Twentieth Century* (University of Pittsburgh Press, 2005) and *The Origins of Democratization in Poland: Workers, Intellectuals, and Oppositional Politics, 1976-1980* (Columbia University Press, 1993). His research interests include the role of civil society in democratization, institutional choice in new democracies, the political economy of democratic survival, and the legacy of extreme forms of dictatorship. He is the former Chair of the European Politics and Society section of the American Political Science Association and the current Chair of the Research Network on the Historical Study of States and Regimes of the Council on European Studies. His most recent work on post-communist Europe (coedited with Jan Kubik) is the volume *Twenty Years after Communism: The Politics of Memory and Commemoration* (Oxford University Press, 2014).