

Genealogies of Memory 2022. History and Memory in International Relations

26-28th October 2022, Warsaw/Zoom

ABSTRACTS

1st Day

Keynote lecture:

Georges Mink – *Geopolitics, History and Memory Games: Jumping from the 20th to the 21st Century*

PANEL: THEORY & METHODOLOGY

Bartosz Dziewanowski – Stefańczyk – *History in Foreign Affairs, Theoretical Approaches and Their Practical Implications*

Douglas Becker – *On Statism and Constructivism: Memory Conflicts and Contestations in the Construction of Memory*

Constructivism in international relations theory posits the importance of identity in the construction of state interests. Ontological security pursues this line of analysis and hypothesizes the maintenance of identity as a fundamental interest demanding security. And memory scholars have cited historical narratives and memory as a key component in the creation of this identity. But these theories still presume the state as a fundamentally unitary actor. Identity is relatively singular. But memory discourses reveal contestations and even conflict over history and over the state formulation of identity. Citing both theory and specific examples such as the debates over “Critical Race Theory” in the United States, this essay will advocate for a greater theoretical understanding of these contestations. It offers the promise both of a deeper understanding of how identities are formed out of these conflicts, and an opening to internal conflicts over the meanings of the past.

Itai Apter – *Memory in International Norm-making Forums – International Relations and International Law Perspectives*

Global or domestic memory impacts international law and international relations. To better understand this role in state-to-state interactions, the paper explores states’ statements in

international norm-making forums. Analysis applies international relations and international law theories to assess the utility of using memory in global state-to-state discourse, to advance scholarship and assist policy makers promoting memory driven agendas on global stages. Discussion begins by addressing scholarship on memory's role in international relations and international law.

The second section harnesses these ideas to explore states' statements in the UN Sixth (Legal) Committee, the Human Rights Council and the UN General Assembly on hard and soft law instruments. As statements are public and relate to various issues, references to historical events can help understanding how states perceive memory's role in international relations regulation.

The paper's third section applies international relations theories to analyze the statements, including realism, liberalism and constructivism. Debate questions whether memory is used to promote states' interests; to justify cosmopolitan values-based responses; or to promote states' social and cultural values or enhanced roles for non-state actors.

The fourth section applies international law-based state centric and globalization-based modalities, asking in what circumstances is memory used in statements to resist norms intruding on sovereignty and territorially or to promote global governance.

As statements can impact bilateral and multilateral relationships or reflect state practice and *opinio juris* (CIL), the paper's final section offers optimal ways for states to utilize memory in statements in international norm-making forums. States' statements in international norm-making forums present lab like settings for evaluating practical aspects of memory's role in international relations and international law. The paper demonstrates the benefits of closely exploring such statements in the memory context for scholars and policy makers alike.

Bradley Reynolds – *What's So Critical about 'Critical Oral History'*

In the 1980's James Blight and Janet M. Lang introduced Critical Oral History (COH) as a field of interdisciplinary research to offer new perspectives on diplomatic history. The idea was that by organizing interview seminars with decision-makers and officials involved in key historical events, collective remembering could shed new light on the hereto 'document based' historical record. The endeavour has left an important methodological mark on the writing of foreign policy history.

However, there has been little methodological or epistemological reflection on the meaning of memory in this form of interview data – a large movement in oral history that COH neglects. In fact, COH has more in common with expert interview methods from political science than oral history. Oral historians have not reached out to political historians or IR scholars, or vice-versa, in such a way that fruitful cross-pollinations could be produced. This paper thus focuses on the epistemological and methodological advantages of utilizing a true oral history method and methodology for collecting and interpreting data in foreign policy history research. I ask how should we problematize memory in interview data and what analytical benefits can this offer?

I use examples from collective COH seminars looking at Finland's foreign policy at the end of the Cold War (1989-1991), as well as new oral history interviews I collected on Finnish foreign policy in the mid-1990s. I argue that problematizing memory and oral history methodology offers an analytical focus that prioritizes the emotional truths interviewees hold at a certain temporal moment about the past. By looking at what is not said as much as what is helps deemphasize the traditional focus on uncovering factual narratives and nuances how and why the past is recounted by those with power.

PANEL: ACTORS, COMMUNICATION AND NARRATIVES

Krzysztof Wasilewski – *Cross-border Politics of Memory – Definition, Actors, and Actions*

Cross-border politics of memory is a term first introduced to discourse by German political scientists Hans Henning Hahn (2013). It refers to an international dimension of historical politics, carried out by various actors, mostly in the borderland area. In other words, cross-border politics of memory allows international actors to impact collective memory and memory discourse in foreign societies. As such, cross-border politics of memory is an element of transborder relations, which may be developed by both state and local authorities, as well as private companies, NGOs, and even individuals (scholars, journalists, heritage activists, etc.).

The paper will aim to provide a definition of cross-border politics of memory, since this concept remains vague and may be variously interpreted. Another goal of the paper is to indicate actors and evaluate their abilities to perform cross-border politics of memory. It will investigate actions taken by the actors and group them according to their goals (e.g. reconciliation, conflict, integration, disintegration). Finally, the paper will also analyse the effects of cross-border politics of memory in the Polish-German borderland and their relation to the official politics of memory of the Polish and German states. The paper will draw from theoretical concepts concerning memory and politics of memory, most of all social theory of international relations (Wendt, 2012), and transnational history (Saunier, 2013).

Rafał Rogulski – *ENRS as an Example of Conducting Politics of Memory*

Gábor Danyi – *Soft Power and Competing Historical Narratives: Radio Free Europe and the Memory of the 1956 Hungarian Revolution*

In the post-1956 history of the Cold War, 'soft power' has played an increasingly important role in relations between the two ideologically, politically, and economically opposed superpowers: the United States and the Soviet Union. In all the countries of the Soviet bloc, the American effort to promote the slow democratic transformation of communist regimes by bringing Western goods and intellectual products beyond the Iron Curtain was felt. The rivalry between the superpowers has of course also deepened the differences between competing historical narratives and different memories of the past, putting them at the service of various interests.

Such a fault line was drawn in the memory surrounding the events of 1956 in Hungary, which were interpreted officially as a counter-revolution beyond the Iron Curtain and as an uprising/revolution in the West. In Hungary, after the 1956 revolution was crushed by Soviet troops and the Soviet-appointed puppet government was consolidated, the tradition of the 1956 revolution was forced to withdraw from the public to the private sphere. In this situation, the activity of émigré actors and institutions – including e.g. the broadcasts of Western radios – played a crucial role in keeping alive memories of the revolution.

The proposed presentation examines the memory of the 1956 Hungarian Revolution in the light of the activities of Radio Free Europe, interpreted as soft power, by focusing primarily on the radio's commemorative programmes in 1986. Based on archival documents of Radio Free Europe the presentation will seek to answer the question of why the narrative broadcast by Radio Free

Europe was successful in contrast to the official Hungarian media's interpretation of the past: what factors underpinned the narrative's credibility and authenticity, and how these factors were linked to the horizons of Hungarian listeners during the reception process.

Gruia Bădescu – *Reshaping Space, Reshaping Memory: International Actors and the Post-war Reconstruction of Cities*

This paper examines the urban and spatial dimension of memory diplomacy by analysing how international actors are involved in the reconstruction of cities after conflict. It discusses the post-war reconstruction of cities as a process of spatialization of memory battles between groups by tracing how rebuilding favours particular identities and contributes to dynamics of remembering, amnesia and silencing.

First, it interrogates the motivations and agendas of international actors in taking part in reconstruction in connection with memory narratives. Second, it analyses the impact of urban and architectural interventions connected to international actors on domestic memory politics. Discussing the constellations of international actors in three urban reconstructions in the former Yugoslavia and the Middle East, it shows that the urban reconfiguration of cities after war has become an arena of international actors who mobilize different narratives of power and memory threads, reshaping conflict using other means. It draws from a variety of situations, including reconstruction of urban sites in Belgrade after the 1999 NATO bombing as an arena of intersections of actors and memory narratives, including EU, Russia and the United Arab Emirates, and the reconstruction of Sarajevo and Beirut, which show the double play between internal nation-building/conflicting memories and an array of international actors and agendas. For instance, through supporting the rebuilding of religious buildings connected with a particular identity, or building memorials, these international actors contribute to the reshaping of memory landscapes.

Moreover, it shows the role of non-state actors by highlighting the important role of the municipality of Barcelona in rebuilding Sarajevo and its links with Catalan memory politics, reflecting forms of multidirectional memory. It is based on interviews with architects, urban planners, representatives of the local authorities and NGOs, on an architectural hermeneutic analysis of sites, as well as an examination of local media coverage of such projects. The paper argues that the entanglement of local, national, and international actors in reconstructions play a role in reshaping both memory dynamics and conflict even after peace treaties are signed.

Tomasz Cebulski – *Auschwitz as a Subject of Polish and Israeli Politics of Memory*

The term politics of history represents a dichotomic juxtaposition of two terms which belong to different incongruent realities, especially in describing processes in democratic states. It may be more accurate in relation to fully centralized and politicized narratives created by authoritarian regimes where ideological needs do often redefine history.

In democratic environments we shall rather consider the phenomena of the politics of memory carried by political agents in search for a usable past in service of current policy. The final goal of political agents is the influence and control of the collective social identity which relies more on the collective memory than the objective history. Applying logic, any public announcement by the state agents about having or conducting its politics of history stands in exact opposition with the agenda which this policy is to reach. In other words the state announces its intention to control or

manipulate history thus making such distorted narrative unreliable. Assuming logic and rationality represent commonly shared values.

The two above paragraphs will make an introduction into further considerations on Auschwitz as a site of memory, site present and resonating in international relations. I would like to focus on the analysis of two events around Auschwitz which became formative for the new politics of memory in Israel and Poland. The 2003 IDF memorial flight of F-15 fighter planes over Birkenau and the 2007 UNESCO formal change of Auschwitz museum name into German Nazi Concentration and Extermination Camp (1940–1945). Thanks to WikiLeaks I am analyzing diplomatic cables to show the international politics in making but I also follow popular press narrative which had an impact on collective memory of those events. I am asking questions about the impact of historical trauma on international relations and about the limits of presence of politics and politicians in memorial sites.

PANEL: HERITAGE, MEMORY AND INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

Jan Rydel – *The Commemoration of KL Gusen and Its Victims as an Issue Fuelling*

International Controversies

Alena Pfoser – *Memory Diplomacy in Tourism: Navigating Contested Pasts in Russian Post-imperial Tourism*

While the tourism industry is oriented towards creating attractive images of destinations, histories of violence and suffering have increasingly been incorporated into tourism offers. The representation of such pasts is however challenging because it is likely to be subject to particular sensitivities and controversy. In a globalised tourism industry, the conversation around how to interpret troubled pasts takes place in a transnational arena between actors whose understanding of the past is often shaped by different traditions of historiography.

The paper focuses on the communication of contested pasts in transnational encounters between tour guides and tourists, focusing on the case of Russian tourism to three post-Soviet cities, Tallinn, Kyiv and Almaty. Based on comparative ethnographic data and interviews, I first introduce the notion of ‘temperatures of remembering’, highlighting the differences in the contestedness of the past across the post-Soviet space (depending on the host country’s relations to Russia) as well as significant interregional connections.

The paper then analyses how contested pasts are dealt with by guides and tourists, showing how they use a range of strategies to avoid confrontation such as adopting a ‘neutral’ position, engaging in interpretative compromises and the silencing of difficult issues. The paper discusses these strategies as part of diplomatic approach to memory that I see as a key way of dealing with contested memories in a contested international arena. Diplomatic approaches to difficult pasts should not be seen as inadequate and superficial forms of remembering, instead I highlight both their limitations and advantages, drawing on recent writings that have problematised ‘coming to terms with the past’ as the only way of dealing with histories of violence and suffering.

Iuliia Eremenko – *Memories and World Heritage Status: The Impact of Local Expertise*

This study explores World Heritage status's role in the (re)construction of memory. This paper uses a case study approach and answers the questions about one site currently applying for World Heritage status. This site is Hellerau, which covers 140 hectares above Dresden's Elbe Valley, which, with some 800 buildings constructed between 1909 and 1914, represents one of the earliest and most successful garden cities projects. Founded in Hellerau, the Rhythm Institute of Émile Jacques-Dalcroze attracted renowned artists and intellectuals of the European avant-garde and is considered one of the earliest germ cells of modern expressive dance. From the 30s, the police and the SS used the territory of Hellerau and the Festival Hall building. From 1945 the site was used for the needs of the Soviet Army. Until late summer 1992, it was home to several hundred Soviet soldiers, officers and civilians.

The main materials for the study are semi-structured expert interviews with representatives of the city administration, the staff of the organisation responsible for the site, city activists, and representatives of the expert community in Saxony who are assisting in the preparation of the World Heritage application. Also, the research uses narrative analysis of texts presented on the exhibition panels on the grounds of the Visitor center in Hellerau.

The study shows that obtaining World Heritage status is a mechanism for constructing a historical image of a modern expressive dance centre, and at the same time, erasing the memories of the use of the site by the SS and the Soviet army. Despite the monumental restoration work that has been done, parts of the complex still require significant work. Several actors believe that the perception of the site as a Soviet barracks could have a negative impact on obtaining funding.

Vjeran Pavlaković – *The Muralization of War Memories: Bilateral Relations and Memory Politics in the Yugoslav Successor States*

While monuments, street names, memorial museums, and commemorative practices remain at the center of struggles over contested histories in the former Yugoslavia, graffiti, murals and other forms of street art are increasingly serving as new frontlines for these battles over the past. Collective remembrance can facilitate “dealing with the past”, but also allows mnemonic actors to perpetuate ethno-nationalist discourses and hinder reconciliation in post-conflict societies. Once considered subversive and exclusively in the realm of subculture, murals are now reproducing official state war narratives across the region.

This research examines the impact this new form of memorialization has on post-Yugoslav societies thirty years after the conflict ended, specifically on bilateral relations between Bosnia-Herzegovina, Croatia, and Serbia. Drawing on almost two decades of fieldwork on ‘memoryscapes’ of war, this project seeks to understand how murals fit into the larger mosaic of mnemonic production: who is financing them, who is creating them, what is the legal framework for graffiti in public space, and what kind of typologies emerge when analyzing them across the region.

While football Ultras (hooligans) have always been active in graffiti actions to demarcate territory and challenge rivals, in recent years this has shifted beyond tagging, vandalism, and radical right hate speech into aesthetically impressive murals that at times also function as semi-official sites of memory, indicating a troubling resurgence of nationalist politics intertwined with the aggressive street culture of disenfranchised youth in the Yugoslav successor states. Authorities in the Yugoslav successor states have either turned a blind eye to provocative murals that celebrate war criminals or international acts of aggression, or have actively encouraged them, indicating a dangerous new frontline in the abuse of memory politics in the field of international relations.

2nd Day

Keynote Lecture:

Beata Ociepka – *History in International Relations: A Roadmap or Just a Context?*

PANEL: STUDIES ON MEMORY IN INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS: CASES AND APPROACHES

Marek Cichocki – *The Impact of Memory about the End of the Cold War on International Politics after 30 Years*

The paper examines the practical consequences of different memory narratives in Europe about the end of the Cold War for state's political strategy choices. These differences in perceiving and memorizing the key events of the end of the Cold War are analyzed in the paper through three major issues. The first issue is related to the geopolitical understanding of the division between the West and the East and to the still existing dispute, whether the bipolar division of Cold War times was more stable than unjust. This point is raised especially by the political realists and remains influential for criticizing the current security order in Europe after 30 years. However it is objected by the ethical argument that security should not always prevail freedom.

The second issue examined in the paper is the forgotten experience of the war in former Yugoslavia which was the alternative scenario of the end of the Cold War. The fact that that war completely vanished from the European memory tell us a lot of how the image of the post-Cold War order was created through the last three decades. The final issue is about how the understanding of the end of the Cold War in terms of the victory determined the approach to the new security architecture in Europe and why in some countries the enthusiasm about the end of the Cold War was tamed.

Monika Albrecht – *Postcolonial Memory and Europe-Africa Relations*

When global actors like China and Russia use postcolonial arguments to undermine relations between Europe and Africa, it becomes clear how much and in what complex ways history and memory can influence international relations. The entirely justified postcolonial critique of colonialism in Africa plays into the hands of these new global actors, who use it as a political tool to legitimize their own actions and to present their African economic, political, and cultural partners with a desirable image that is free of colonial baggage. The paper discusses this dilemma: critique of colonialism, which is almost everywhere seen as a progressive movement with emancipatory goals, can be used as an instrument of global politics that ultimately undercuts these very emancipatory goals.

The paper will pay particular attention to the current situation and ongoing developments: the fact that (1) postcolonial activists, NGOs, and scholars are calling for colonial heritage to be embedded in national and EU memory landscapes; that (2) there is a growing willingness to do so

at the national level in many Western European countries, and that (3) the EU strategy with regard to Africa has until very recently been to remain silent about the colonial past. (Where exactly the call in the New EU-Africa Strategy of 25 March 2021 "to establish a 'memorial' culture" will lead is at this point not yet foreseeable, but will be taken into account if applicable.) The paper will draw on official EU and AU documents, independent expert and think tank reports, postcolonial and decolonial scholarship and other research, as well as public and media discourse.

Paula Rhein-Fischer – *Ahead to the Past: How the Future Will Govern Memory of the Past*

The paper delves into the under-studied question about “self-inculpatory” memory. In particular, it investigates whether self-inculpatory memory governance, beyond the evident aim of preventing the repeated commission of historical atrocities and defend democracy, is used to excuse the passivity of the State in foreign relations. For this, the paper attempts to induce general findings from an in-depth examination of Germany that possesses a particularly dense landscape of self-inculpatory memory laws and jurisprudence. It analyses recent German foreign relation “passivity” – decisions on a limited support or non-support of international military operations and the political and legal justifications of its engagement and nonengagement in international conflicts – with regard to explicit or implicit mnemonic reasoning. These findings are selectively compared to France and the UK that do not possess many self-inculpatory memory laws.

By this, the study sheds light on whether the conceptual relationship between self-inculpatory memory and self-exculpation for international non-commitment is accidental, causal or, at least today, even intended. On this basis, the paper explores conceptual tensions that arise: How does a use for self-exculpation fit in with the concept of militant democracy that underlies self-inculpatory memory laws? Can responsibility for historical crimes legitimately justify the non- or only limited support of states like Ukraine that were the precise victims of these crimes? And what does it mean for self-inculpatory memory when the concerned states slowly start to assume a more active role?

Harutyun Marutyan – *How the Holocaust Is Part of Universal Memory While the Armenian Genocide Is Not*

The presentation is aimed at making a comparative analysis of two similar human catastrophes by key factors of how in one case it has become a universal memory, while the other does not belong to the that family. The Holocaust is part of the collective memory of Europe, meanwhile the knowledge of the Armenian Genocide was disseminated mainly through the European press in the early XX century and contacts with Armenian refugees in France, remained largely in the frames of historical memory.

The paper strives to analyse types of behaviour of the orchestrators or successors (Germany, Turkey), capacities of two diasporas (Jewish/Armenian communities), perception by international community, lobbying (the Armenian/Jewish lobby), ways of teaching, etc.

Christoph Teubner – *A Clash of Memories? The Impact of Memory and History on the Diplomatic Relationships between West Germany and the Arab States Following the Commencement of West German–Israeli Relations in 1965*

While memory has become a well-established element in research and evaluation of West German domestic and social policy, especially with regard to the Holocaust and Second World War, it has played a limited role in research on West German foreign policy. While the role of memory of National Socialism in the diplomatic confrontation with the young state of Israel has been researched, memory diplomacy with the Arab counterpart is also of interest. While the establishment of diplomatic relations with Israel led to a normalisation of bilateral political relations, this decision resulted in a rupture in relations with the Arab world. In addition to traditional diplomatic aspects, the clash of different conceptions of memory and the past is a substantial element of the dispute.

This involves both the mutual use of different memory narratives as well as different historically derived images of self and of the other. In my contribution, I intend to pursue central questions of the conference about actors, narratives and their development in the diplomatic context in the case of West German-Arab relations based mainly on sources from the West German ministry of foreign policy. More so, I want to show how memory in a diplomatic context is socially constructed, depends on discursive structures and forms new anchors as a basis for memory alliances.

PANEL: THE POLITICS OF THE PAST IN POST-SOCIALIST SPACES

Tamar Karaia – *Foreign Policy Priorities as a Factor in the Formation of the Memory Policy in Post-Rose Revolution Georgia*

As a former Soviet republic, Georgia began dealing with the soviet inheritance in 1990s, but during this period, these processes were limited and delayed. There was not the contiguous politics of memory until 2003. The submitted paper aims to analyse the influence of foreign policy priorities on the formation and transformation of master narratives in post-Rose Revolution Georgia. One of the leading indicators of this process was implementing a systematic memory policy, developing a master narrative, and consolidating the nation.

This narrative had a hegemonic character and was strongly influenced by foreign policy priorities. According to the research hypothesis, while regulating relations with the Russian Federation, the official discourse was oriented to recall the glory time of Georgia, invent traditions, heroes, or traitors, and establish commemorative ceremonies, including society in the commemorative process. To analyse the main aspects of the formation and transformation of these narratives, we studied the political discourse of state officials from 2003-to 2012. Among them were speeches and interviews of former President Mikhail Saakashvili (approx. 250 speeches), rapports of commissions, etc. We conducted in-depth interviews with state officials, representatives of museums, historians, etc.

Aijan Sharshenova, Zarina Adambussinova – *Memory Sites: Post-Soviet Nostalgia in Bishkek and Russian Public Diplomacy*

Our paper explores the interconnectedness between the phenomenon of post-Soviet nostalgia seen as Russia's one of the soft power instruments articulated in particular memory sites in contemporary Bishkek, the capital of Kyrgyzstan. Russia's use of post-Soviet nostalgia to evoke

positive public attitudes in the former Soviet republics has become a feature of its recent foreign policy and public diplomacy efforts. This trend can also be traced through the increasing funding allocated by Russia to certain local sites and memory practices which are significant for particular social and cultural communities in their collective or individual engaging with the post-Soviet nostalgia.

We specifically focus on analysing three case studies: two memory sites, the Russian Drama Theatre named after Chingiz Aitmatov and the Home Museum in honour of Mikhail Frunze (a Bolshevik leader and a prominent Soviet politician), and one commemorative practice, better known as the Immortal Regiment on May 9th ('bessmertnyi polk').

Through these case studies we strive to understand how specific urban communities in Bishkek engage with these sites and practice at emotive, commemorative, and political levels. In our interdisciplinary research, we largely rely on Pierre Nora's concept of memory sites and other works generated within the international field of memory studies as well as the existing relevant research on international relations (primarily, Russian foreign policy and soft power) to address such broader issues as instrumentalisation of domestic memory politics, realisation of memory diplomacy, negotiation of collective memories at the state and public levels, and understanding how various attitudes to the shared past co-exist and serve specific purposes and needs of various social and cultural groups.

Marat Iliysov – *The Clash of Collective Memories in Post-war Chechnya*

Established at the beginning of the Second Russo-Chechen war in 1999, Russia's-backed Chechen government is actively engaged in a reinterpretation of the nation's history. This paper explores Chechen memory politics of the last three decades through these two dominant clashing interpretations. The article answers the question: What Chechen collective memories are the most contested and why? Relying upon qualitative methodology the article uses four primary sources of data.

Firstly, it explores Chechen state TV news, which became a mouthpiece of the government and an excellent source of information regarding all activities of the ruling elite.

Secondly, the article analyzes the attitudes of the Chechen politicians in exile, which are expressed through their public addresses posted on YouTube. The article strives to compare the politics of memory pursued by the current government in Chechnya with the politics of memory that was implemented by the currently exiled politicians.

Thirdly, the paper relies on the interviews with Chechens from Chechnya, which were collected during the several field visits in 2014-2019. The fourth source of information are interviews with the Chechen refugees collected in Europe during the same period. These interviews enable the comparison of the ideas regarding the memory politics that prevailed among the Chechens. This comparison, in turn, allows to evaluate the success of the memory politics pursued by the current Chechen government.

Dimitrije Matić – *The Role of Russia and the EU in Shaping Serbian Memory of the Second World War (2000–2014)*

The main goal of this paper will be to analyze the influence of the EU and Russia regarding structural changes of the Serbian politics of memory of WWII at the beginning of the XXI century.

The fall of Slobodan Milošević in October 2000 has provided significant changes in Serbian society and politics. This was particularly noticeable in the way the state has changed its relation towards the past experiences from the Second World War. Strong anti-communist sentiments among the new authorities in Belgrade have led to the portrayal of 'chetniks' and partisans as movements with almost equally good (antifascists freedom fighters) and bad (war crimes, collaboration with occupying forces) traits. Even though these processes related to the politics of memory were driven mostly by internal factors, the international community and its role cannot be dismissed.

Serbia's EU accession has made an impact on domestic mnemonic processes, which is why Serbian political elites have tried to promote two types of values they perceived as undoubtedly European – antifascism and anticommunism. However, similarly to the disputes in the European Union at that time, debates about the significance, interpretations, and codependence of these terms have become prominent in Belgrade as well. On the other hand, the bonds between Serbia and Russia also deepened, which had its reflection on the public memory about Second World War in Serbia. Having in mind the history of the liberation of Serbia by both the Partisans and the Red Army in 1944, the two countries intensified their efforts in the joint commemorations of the liberation of Belgrade in 2009 and 2014.

PANEL: RUSSIA – UKRAINE: MEMORY WARS

Tina Peresunko – *I SING, THEREFORE I AM. How Ukraine Struggled for International Recognition and Independence from Russia 100 Years Ago Through the Means of Cultural Diplomacy*

The paper covers the 1919-1924 Ukrainian People's Republic choir's world tour of 18 countries to gain international recognition to Ukraine and counter Russian propaganda. By singing, Ukrainians sought to prove to the world that the Ukrainian people do exist, they had their distinct language and culture that differed from the Russian ones, and thus had the right to independence. The hit of the Ukrainian concerts abroad was the song "Shchedryk" composed by Mykola Leontovych, better known today worldwide under the brand of its English version as "Carol of the Bells".

In 1922, it was presented in New York and then its text was translated into English. The year before, the song's author, Mykola Leontovych, had been shot dead by a Russian agent and Ukraine that never attained the support and recognition by the West remained occupied by Soviet Russia for the long 70 years (1921-1991). Still, the world knows little about the Ukrainian origins of the popular Christmas hit.

Nadija Honcharenko – *A Deconstruction of the Soviet Mythology of the Second World War in Ukrainian Memory Policy*

This paper analyzes the changes taking place in independent Ukraine's memory policy concerning the Second World War. It highlights the gradual transformation of ideas regarding the causes, course, and consequences of the Second World War, the deconstruction of Soviet mythology of the "Great Patriotic War", and the formation of a "Ukrainian dimension" of the Second World War.

The paper also assesses the role of key actors in Ukraine's memory policy:

- presidents of Ukraine and politicians who, by decrees and laws, formed official discourse by either supporting or rejecting Soviet ideas and memorial practices;
- scholars who introduced into circulation ideas and interpretations deconstructing the Soviet mythology of the "Great Patriotic War";
- authors of history textbooks who updated content and methods of teaching;
- Ukrainian media and civil society centers that promoted the introduction of new memorial practices or opposed the decommunization of official discourse and condemned the updating of textbooks and memorial practices.

The paper also examines the reaction of Russian politicians and propagandists to changes in the decommunization of state memory policy discourse and the formation of a "Ukrainian dimension" of the Second World War. Finally, the paper stresses that Russia's accusations of Ukraine's distortion of the "truth" about the war and the spread of "fascism" and "neo-Nazism" in Ukraine play a significant role in the hybrid war against Ukraine which started in 2014—and in 2022 evolved into justification for full-scale aggression under the slogans of "denazification".

Oleksandr Svyetlov – *Weapons of Mass Delusion: Russia's Anti-Ukrainian Policy in Discourse and Practice*

Alternative history promotion serves as a tool of domestic and international manipulation by Putin, who utilizes his amateur and anti-scientific biased and skewed views on Moscow's heritage and Ukraine's history to profess "ruskiy mir" in Russia's "near abroad". I will analyse some key theses of Putin's alternative history in order to depict fact-twisting techniques and motivations behind, i.a. in the light of IR approaches, such as (neo) realism and constructivism.

Laying verbal claims to Ukrainian lands and culture eventually paved the way for real-life ongoing invasion attempts, resulting in massive bloodshed and territorial secessions from 2014 onwards. Making Russia's theoretical history-discursive underpinnings devoid is thus indispensable for putting end to aggression.

Jade McGlynn – *Ukrainian and Russian Memory Diplomacy in Wartime: A Comparative Study*

Since Russia launched its full-scale invasion of Ukraine on 24th February 2022, descriptions of the ensuing war have inevitably involved manifold World War II analogies – from all sides. This paper explores the use of these comparisons where they are the product of Russian and Ukrainian official and semi-official memory diplomacy. Defined here as political actors' identification, creation and development of commonalities of memory for geopolitical purposes and/or bilateral relations, memory diplomacy was especially prevalent during the first few weeks of the war. I compare Russian and Ukrainian memory diplomacy during the first month of the war by analysing all Presidential speeches and Ministry of Foreign Affairs social media output, as well as identifying large-scale semi-official initiatives involving both the memory of World War II and the war on Ukraine.

In comparing how the two countries' representatives use the memory of World War II to influence other foreign audiences, I will examine tactics, narratives, channels of delivery, target audiences (countries, sections of society), tone, multimedia formats. Through such comparisons,

the paper will address theoretical gaps in our understanding of memory diplomacy, including how states apply it during wartime and differences in the way democracies and autocracies apply memory diplomacy.

3rd Day

Keynote Lecture:

Zheng Wang – *Historical Memory and Wars: From Ukraine to Taiwan*

PANEL: MEMORY, INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS AND DISINFORMATION

Eric Langenbacher – *German Memory Orthodoxy in the Aftermath of the Russian Invasion of Ukraine*

Paweł Surowiec, Philip Arceneaux – *The Hijacking of Public Diplomacy Issue: Misinformation, Populism, and the International Dispute Over Strategic Narratives of Holocaust Memory*

Building on the hybridity approach to soft power statecraft (Surowiec & Long, 2020), this paper answers the following question: how does the governance by populist political actors effect the formation of the Holocaust memory narratives in public diplomacy? Focusing on Poland, we explore how the Law and Justice sponsored (org. the PiS) politics of memory has led to the hijacking of the issue of misinformation about the Holocaust, the international dispute with Israel and the US, and the subsequent public diplomacy crisis. Our study centers on the politics of memory devised at the Polish Ministry of Justice, relying on a populist policy ‘innovation’ blending the narrative arch of ‘Polocaust’ with the 2018 legislation criminalising public attribution of any responsibilities for the Holocaust to either the Polish state or the nation (and reported by foreign news media as the ‘Polish Holocaust law’).

We find that the revisionist approach to the politics of memory, and the introduction of criminalising legislation in particular, resulted in an international dispute, the consequence of which was the marginalisation of public diplomacy at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs to aid partisan domestic political gains. In addition, by abandoning a multi-level diplomatic game, the PiS policy-makers adapted a centralised approach to the formation of strategic narratives.

Finally, as well as analysing ‘schematic narrative templates’ and ‘specific narratives’, we reveal the types of response strategies used by the PiS majoritarian government at various stages of the 2018 international dispute with Israel and the US. Our paper concludes that nationalistic political actors tend to shift the orientation of soft power statecraft towards domestic publics at the expense of international gains, and shift its function towards ‘negative soft power’, in which public diplomacy advantages are compromised by the politics of memory based on national conceptions enveloped in the populist style of delivery.

Félix Krawatzek, Piotr Goldstein – *Historical Awareness, Local Legacies, and Attitudes towards Refugees among Young Poles*

The migration crises unfolding on the borders of Poland since the summer of 2021 have met very different responses from Polish politicians and to some extent society. Whereas the individuals that were forced to the Polish border via Belarus were violently pushed back to Belarus, those fleeing Ukraine during the Russian war of aggression since February 2022 were welcomed in Poland. These crises represent the most recent and pressing challenge to Polish national identity and at the same time to Europe as a whole.

In the current situation, the sense of identity among young Poles has been profoundly unsettled. We see this in attitudes towards the two different migratory crises and in what young people make of Polish history in that context. This paper sets out to investigate the sense of identity and national belonging that young Poles express in the current situation with a particular focus on their historical awareness and the historical narratives that they identify with. We are particularly interested in regional variation (down to the level of ‘powiat’ and city) and the way young people think about local (often multi-ethnic) history.

We conducted a survey on a representative sample of young people aged 16–34 from different parts of Poland. We aim to investigate young people’s attitudes towards refugees, their sense of local, national and European identity, their views on their cities’ as well as on Polish, European and East European history.

PANEL: TOWARDS AN ETHICS OF POLITICAL COMMEMORATION

David Wood – *Commemorating to Transform Conflicts: Rightsizing Justice and Peace*

The process of peacemaking is one that helps those living in conflict to collectively interpret the past in a manner that transforms relationships in the present and builds more constructive shared societies in the future. This entails, as John Paul Lederach, creatively penned a ‘moral imagination’ rooted in the challenges of the real world, and the pain and trauma of recent and remembered violence, yet capable of giving birth to that which does not yet exist.

The speaker will argue that social and political conflict represents the interplay of divergent stories or “narratives” about the past, with each narrative establishing the rightness of one’s case, and legitimizing acts of violence against the other. This has been evident most recently in the historic rationale given for Russia’s military incursion into Ukraine. He will also argue that, if conflict represents diverging stories, conflict transformation means working with conflict parties to share stories, to see the value in others’ narratives and to enable stories to co-exist. This, in turn, entails expanding the sphere of ‘legitimate controversy’ on past events (Daniel Hallin) – meaning that official narratives can be questioned and nuanced. It is critical that we support constructive political commemoration, so as to avoid future spirals into conflict.

Nour A. Munawar – *Commemoration Practices and Heritage Re-making in the Middle East*

Wars and conflicts are undeniably the most devastating human-made reasons that threaten any cultural heritage site. The current conflicts in Arab region, and the rise of non-state radical

actors, such as the so-called the Islamic State in Iraq and Levant (Daesh, ISIS, IS, or ISIL), have placed a spotlight on the destruction of cultural heritage in Syria, Iraq, Libya, Yemen, and elsewhere.

The deliberate devastation of pre-Islamic remains has obviously angered many people in the Middle East, as well as the Western observers and scholars (Bowley 2014; Danti 2015). The ancient city of Aleppo, one of Syria's six World Heritage Sites, has been drastically damaged by the Syria's contemporary conflict (Munawar 2018). Similarly, Syria's bride of the desert, Palmyra, has been hit-hard during the warfare hostilities between the Syrian government and armed opposition groups, and the destruction later intensified during Daesh double-occupation of the World Heritage Site. Several governmental and non-governmental organizations have started to plan the post-war reconstruction of Syria cultural heritage (Azoulay 2018; McDowall 2017; Munawar 2019a; Stoughton 2017; UNESCO 2015a, 2018; Isakhan and Meskell 2019). The speaker will explore how decisions on reconstructing heritage sites reflects social understandings of the wars experienced, and political visions for the future.

Hans Gutbrod – *The Ethics of Political Commemoration as a Paradigm*

This paper will argue that the Ethics of Political Commemoration can be understood as a paradigm. This paradigm would provide an overall framework that helps bring a certain structure to many debates on memory. In this, it offers a multidimensional ethics that covers various concerns that often are highlighted, in improvised responses to memory conflicts. In that way, too, it overcomes the current inchoate state of the ethical debate on memory.

The Ethics of Political Commemoration meets three philosophical tests for 'truth': the approach is internally consistent, also in following the established just war tradition. As several concrete examples show, the framework corresponds to commemoration that many find compelling, and those that are less convincing. Lastly, it also can draw on an implicit consensus, in that it synthesizes suggestions made by a range of authors, from Margaret McMillan via the President of the Republic of Ireland across Michael Rothberg and Timothy Snyder.

Timothy William Waters – *How Good We Were: Yugoslav War Crimes Trials as Memory*

E.H. Carr's *The Twenty Years' Crisis* devoted a surprising amount of discussion to international courts and arbitration. His thesis was that without a shared political minimum – an international society – law could not usefully mediate disputes. Were Carr to look at the rise of courts since the end of the Cold War, he might say the lesson has not been learned.

The canonical narrative about the end of the Cold War asserts a binary division of history into a 'bad before' and a 'good after' – a transit from Communism to rights-respecting liberal market democracy, Volksrepublik to Rechtsstaat, a continent divided to a Europe whole and free. In the case of Yugoslavia, however, that transit was complicated by the savage wars of the 1990s. A different interpretation is required.

That interpretation has been supplied through international criminal law – itself a product of the post-Cold War's fin de siècle, end-of-history Stimmung. The International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia aimed not only to punish, but to reconcile. This implied a particular orientation towards history that could not dismiss the Communist past but had to assign something of 'the good' to it. The result was a narrative inflection, placing criminal acts in a morally comprehensible arc that bends, through great violence, towards an imagined Europe.

This essay identifies a transformational narrative at a war crimes tribunal: a curious digression in a European teleology. This has implications for how we use trials: if we expect courts not merely to adjudicate crimes, but produce useful narratives, then we risk yoking our judgments about the past to a particular agendas; and through our illuminations, we will obscure other, darker things.